### 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may only defend that a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Resolved means a policy

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

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

#### A just government is a moral government – that’s a hypothetical gov

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Just”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/just // MNHS NL

fair; morally correct:

#### Recognize means to accept as legal

Cambridge Dictionary No Date, (Cambridge Dictionary, “Recognize”), https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/recognize // MNHS NL

to accept that something is legal, true, or important:

The international community has refused to recognize (= officially accept the existence of) the newly independent nation state.

[ + (that) ] He sadly recognized (that) he would die childless.

You must recognize the seriousness of the problems we are facing.

#### A worker is one who works manually or in an industry for a certain wage

Merriam Webster ND <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worker> VM

“one that works especially at manual or industrial labor or with a particular material”

#### They violate— they don’t defend a just government implementing the right to strike.

#### Vote neg to preserve substantive engagement --

#### 1] Preparation- changing the topic gives the aff a huge edge, they can prepare for 6 months on an issue that catches us by surprise. Preparation is better than thinking on your feet- research demonstrates pedagogical humility and research skills are the only portable debate training – the process of debate outweighs the content – only our interp generates the argumentative skills needed to rigorously defend their affirmative out of round and create engaged citizens

#### 2] Limits- there are an infinite number of non topical affirmatives. not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months.

#### 3] Truth testing - you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### 4] Switch side debate is good -- it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives which prevents ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

#### 5] fairness – debate is fundamentally a game which requires both sides to have a relatively equal shot at winning and is necessary for any benefit to the activity. That outweighs om decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

#### 6] small schools disad: under-resourced are most adversely affected by a massive, unpredictable caselist which worsens structural disparities

#### TVA: read a soft left cap aff in which the just government enforces the unconditional right to strike – none of their offense indicts a just government, but even if it does, x-apply switch side debate – the aff can rectify problems in the squo via policy

#### Disads to the TVA prove there’s negative ground and that it’s a contestable stasis point, and if their critique is incompatible with the topic reading it on the neg solves

#### Winning their thesis doesn’t answer T because only through the process of clash can they refine their defense of it—they need an explanation of why we switch sides and why there’s a winner and loser under their model

#### Reject the team—T is question of models of debate and the damage to our strategy was already done. Drop the team on theory generally to deter infinite abuse

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary, you can’t be reasonably topical, and causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### RVIs and impact turns encourage all in on theory which decks substance and incentivize baiting theory with abusive practices.

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### CP Text:

#### 1] vote neg to affirm an unconditional right of workers except for police officers to strike.

- A police officer is a warranted law employee of a police force. "police officer" is a generic term not specifying a particular rank.(wikipedia)

#### 2] vote neg to affirm, through the corresponding union body in their society, a threat to remove police unions from the set of member unions unless they: eliminate due-processes protections police have won that prevent accountability from police misconduct through processes outlined in greenhouse

#### Only the CP can force police unions to change – this is definitely responsive to the aff bc it indicts the way the aff endorses the right to strike

Greenhouse, 20, The New Yorker, “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, Steven Greenhouse is an American labor and workplace journalist and writer. He covered labor for The New York Times for 31 years, 2010 Society of Professional Journalists Deadline Club Award: Beat reporting for newspapers and wire services, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2010 New York Press Club Award: Outstanding enterprise or investigative reporting, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2009 The Hillman Prize for The Big Squeeze: Tough Times for the American WorkerURL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, KR

The string of police killings captured on mobile phones increased public dismay with police unions. After the killing of George Floyd, they became a pariah. Many protesters, and even some unions, including the Writers Guild of America, East, have called on the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the nation’s main labor federation, to expel the International Union of Police Associations, which represents a hundred thousand law-enforcement officers. The Association of Flight Attendants adopted a resolution demanding that police unions immediately enact policies to “actively address racism in law enforcement and especially to hold officers accountable for violence against citizens, or be removed from the Labor movement.” The Service Employees International Union, with two million members, has called for “holding public security unions accountable to racial justice,” and the Seattle area’s main labor coalition issued an ultimatum to the local police union: acknowledge and address racism in law enforcement or risk being kicked out.

If the A.F.L.-C.I.O. expelled the International Union of Police Associations, it would be a huge blow to police unions.

So far, Richard Trumka, the federation’s president, has balked at kicking out a member union, saying that it’s best to work to reform unions from inside labor’s tent. “The short answer is not to disengage and just condemn,” Trumka said. “The answer is to totally reëngage and educate,” to improve police unions.

Suddenly, it seems, there are countless proposals to make police unions more accountable. Campaign Zero, a reform group, wants to eliminate many of the due-process protections that the police have won. Javier Morillo, a former president of a Twin Cities union that represents thousands of janitors, wrote an unusually sharp critique of a fellow union, the Minneapolis Police Federation: “Until we see big, fundamental and structural change in the [police] department and the union, Black and brown residents of Minneapolis cannot feel safe.” Morillo wrote that, “for decades, arbitrators have relied on bad precedent” to “justify overturning discipline against officers.” Paige Fernandez, the A.C.L.U.’s policing policy adviser, said that community members should join city officials at the bargaining table during police-contract negotiations. “There should be public input from communities that have been historically overpoliced, black communities and low-income communities,” Fernandez said.

Benjamin Sachs, the Harvard labor-law professor, argues that the union movement needs to join the push for police reform. “When unions use the power of collective bargaining for ends that we . . . deem unacceptable it becomes our responsibility—including the responsibility of the labor movement itself—to deny unions the ability to use collective bargaining for these purposes,” he wrote. “We have done this before. When unions bargained contracts that excluded Black workers from employment or that relegated Black workers to inferior jobs, the law stepped in and stripped unions of the right to use collective bargaining in these ways.” Sachs proposes amending the law to curb the range of subjects over which police unions can bargain, perhaps even prohibiting negotiations over anything involving the use of force.

Some labor leaders warn that conservatives are using today’s outrage against police unions to promote their long-term agenda of hobbling or eliminating public-sector unions. “Everyone should have the freedom to join a union, police officers included,” Lee Saunders, the president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, wrote. “The tragic killing of George Floyd should not be used as a pretext to undermine the rights of workers.”

Randi Weingarten, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, told me that it’s important to persuade police unions to stop vehemently defending every police officer who is accused of misconduct. She pointed to her own union’s past. “Our position used to be that the member was always right, that, whatever happened, you did everything in your power to keep the member’s job,” she said. “It didn’t matter if you knew there was a problem.” She added that as public anger mounted against this hard-line approach—many said that it was shortchanging children—local A.F.T. branches moved away from rigidly defending every teacher accused of misconduct or poor performance. Weingarten told me, “Ultimately, if we are members of our community, we have to hold ourselves to a standard of treating people respectfully and decently, and misconduct has no place in that.” McCartin, the labor historian, told me, “Police unions haven’t done nearly as much as the teachers to counter the perception that they’re indifferent to the public’s concerns. They can learn a lot from the teachers.”

Last week, Patrick Yoes, the president of the Fraternal Order of Police, the nation’s largest law-enforcement group, told NPR he agrees that reforms are needed. “We welcome the opportunity to sit down and have some meaningful, fact-based discussions on ways to improve the law-enforcement community,” Yoes said. But some police-union leaders are less amenable to reform. Last week, Michael O’Meara, the president of the New York State Association of P.B.A.s, said, “Stop treating us like animals and thugs and start treating us with some respect. . . . We’ve been vilified.”

Mindful of the Black Lives Matter protests, many mayors and cities will seek to push through contract changes in the next round of police bargaining, but no one should expect police unions to roll over. Many police-union officials believe that the harder the line they take in defending officers (and ignoring the public’s concerns) the better their chances of being reëlected by their members. As a result, the unions’ critics might have a better shot at winning reforms through city councils and state legislatures. O’Meara’s remarks make clear that police unions often have an us-against-the-world view. The question now is whether police unions will get the message that they shouldn’t think only of protecting their members, that they should also think of the original purpose of labor unions: protecting all workers—in other words, protecting the public.

#### Police misconduct erodes democracy – only holding them accountable can change the situation

Bonner, 18, University of Victoria, “Three Ways Police Abuse Affects Democracy”, 4/27/18, Michelle Bonner is Professor of Political Science in the Department of Political Science at the University of Victoria. Among other publications, she is the co-editor of Police Abuse in Contemporary Democracies , URL: <https://onlineacademiccommunity.uvic.ca/globalsouthpolitics/2018/04/27/three-ways-police-abuse-affects-democracy/>, KR

On August 9, 2014, 18-year-old Michael Brown was fatally shot by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri. He was suspected of petty theft but was unarmed. A subsequent trial found the officer’s actions to be justified as self-defense. Despite the institutions of democracy working as they are designed, large protests (themselves met with police repression and arrests) registered profound public disagreement with the outcome. For many protesters this was one example, among numerous others, of police abuse aimed at African Americans that undermines their inclusion in American democracy.

Such powerful disagreements are not unique to democracy in the United States. Abuse of police authority happens in all democracies. It can include arbitrary arrest, selective surveillance and crowd control, harassment, sexual assault, torture, killings, or even forced disappearances. In newer democracies, police abuse is often thought to be a legacy of a previous authoritarian regime or civil war. Its persistence is understood to reflect weak democratic institutions and poorly functioning police forces. In established democracies, police abuse is more often thought to be an exception that is easily addressed through existing or tweaked institutions of accountability, such as the judiciary. Yet, as we argue in Police Abuse in Contemporary Democracies, police abuse has more significant implications for all democracies. We examine three.

Citizenship. Democracy includes the exercise and protection of rights for all citizens. This includes the right to protest, to mobility and not to be arbitrarily arrested or tortured. Rather than the courts, police are the first state actors to decide when citizen rights are protected and when they are ignored. They also have a great deal of discretion to decide who are (potential) wrongdoers and how much force to use to confront them. Marginalized groups in many countries find that it is in fact the police who determine the boundaries of their rights as citizens. Not all citizens’ rights are protected in the same way, creating pockets of authoritarian rule within democracy.

Some citizens, based on their identity, find, for example, that police watch them more closely, will arbitrarily arrest them for being in the “wrong place”, and police are more likely to mistreat them during arrest or while they are held in custody. This is particularly true for those who are economically poor (we examine cases from India, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and South Africa). It also includes racialized minority groups such as Arabs in France or Blacks in France, South Africa and the United States (cases examined in the book). It can also include those who hold political views considered “radical” such as alter-globalization activists in Canada or those protesting or striking against neoliberal economic polices in South Africa (also examined in the book). That is, police abuse creates an unequal experience of democracy as it pertains to citizenship rights. To change this, we argue that we need to better understand how police use their discretion, why they profile some citizens over others, and the consequences of police profiling on the quality of democracy for all citizens. Another answer would be to strengthen police accountability.

Accountability. At first glance it might appear, at least in established democracies, that we already have the answer to reducing police abuse. If police abuse their power then they will be held accountable by the judiciary. This is an important feature of liberal democracy. Yet, the studies in our book reveal that in fact, in many countries (we examine the US, Chile, and to a lesser extent Argentina and India) the judiciary tends to be very lenient with police abuse.

Police have the right in a democracy to use violence. As the case of Michael Brown highlights, right and wrong is determined by the willingness of the judiciary to accept the justification provided by the police officer for his or her action (or inaction). In the case of Michael Brown, the office claimed he killed in self-defense and the courts accepted this justification as valid. As our chapters on Chile and the United States reveal, judicial accountability is often very sensitive to the need for police to maintain a good public image. So police wrongdoing is frequently blamed on an individual officer, a “bad apple”, or the judiciary accepts the officer’s justification in order to reinforce the power of all officers’ to respond as they see fit to different situations.

Of course, as in the Michael Brown case, the public can voice their disagreement with the judiciary. Yet, as one chapter on the US shows, whether or not the public perceives that the police have abused their powers and whether or not they demand judicial accountability is influenced by unconscious racial bias. To overcome these biases and the reluctance on the part of the judiciary to punish the police, another chapter suggests we need to encourage and support a wide variety of grassroots organizations, like Cop Watch, that are dedicated to keeping an eye on police conduct. All the authors agree that the answers to reducing police abuse lie beyond judicial or institutional police reforms. Tweaking institutions is not enough to reduce police abuse.

Socioeconomic Inequality. Finally, most studies of democracy argue that a certain level of socioeconomic equality is needed to sustain it. High levels of inequality of wealth weaken democracy. Political economists, including those in the World Bank, agree that neoliberal economic policies increase inequality in wealth. Yet, to ensure the implementation and protection of neoliberal economic policies, many governments rely on police abuse targeted against those who either oppose these policies or who are excluded from the economic model.

Our chapters on South Africa and Canada reveal repressive police responses to protests and strikes against neoliberal economic policies. Our chapters on France, South Africa, the United States, and Brazil all document government official’s encouragement of police abuse as the appropriate response to rising crime; preventive socioeconomic programmes, shown to better reduce crime, run counter to neoliberal economic policies. For example, in Brazil, state officials have drawn from international experience to establish Pacification Police Units (UPPs). UPPs occupy favelas (shantytowns) in large numbers in order to control crime, opening up opportunities for police abuse. Indeed, globally, with the spread of neoliberal economic policies, we have seen the rise of tough on crime rhetoric and policies in many countries. From this perspective, if we want to reduce police abuse, it is important to consider how some models of political economy might be more compatible with democracy than others.

To conclude, most people associate police abuse with authoritarian regimes. Yet, it occurs in all democracies and, if not checked, can reduce or even erode democracy. While in our book we examine three key ways police abuse affects democracy, there are many other ways it can do so, such as impacting elections, public policy, and or the construction of political ideologies. Given the global decline of democracy noted by academics and international organizations, such as Freedom House, it is important that we begin to ask how we can better address police abuse and the fuzzy line between democracy and authoritarianism that it represents.

**Extinction**

**Kasparov 17**

Garry Kasparov, Chairman of the Human Rights Foundation, former World Chess Champion, “Democracy and Human Rights: The Case for U.S. Leadership,” Testimony Before The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, February 16th, <https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/021617_Kasparov_%20Testimony.pdf>

As one of the countless millions of people who were freed or protected from totalitarianism by the United States of America, it is easy for me to talk about the past. To talk about the belief of the American people and their leaders that this country was exceptional, and had special responsibilities to match its tremendous power. That a nation founded on freedom was bound to defend freedom everywhere. I could talk about the bipartisan legacy of this most American principle, from the Founding Fathers, to Democrats like Harry Truman, to Republicans like Ronald Reagan. I could talk about how the American people used to care deeply about human rights and dissidents in far-off places, and how this is what made America a beacon of hope, a shining city on a hill. America led by example and set a high standard, a standard that exposed the hypocrisy and cruelty of dictatorships around the world. But there is no time for nostalgia. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War, Americans, and America, have retreated from those principles, and **the world has become much worse off as a result**. American skepticism about America’s role in the world deepened in the long, painful wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and their aftermaths. Instead of applying the lessons learned about how to do better, lessons about faulty intelligence and working with native populations, the main outcome was to stop trying. This result has been a tragedy for the billions of people still living under authoritarian regimes around the world, and it is based on faulty analysis. You can never guarantee a positive outcome— not in chess, not in war, and certainly not in politics. The best you can do is to do what you know is right and to try your best. I speak from experience when I say that the citizens of unfree states do not expect guarantees. They want a reason to hope and a fighting chance. People living under dictatorships want the opportunity for freedom, the opportunity to live in peace and to follow their dreams. From the Iraq War to the Arab Spring to the current battles for liberty from Venezuela to Eastern Ukraine, people are fighting for that opportunity, giving up their lives for freedom. The United States must not abandon them. The United States and the rest of the free world has an unprecedented advantage in economic and military strength today. What is lacking is the will. The will to make the case to the American people, the will to take risks and invest in the long-term security of the country, and the world. This will require investments in aid, in education, in security that allow countries to attain the stability their people so badly need. Such investment is far more moral and far cheaper than the cycle of **terror, war**, refugees, and **military intervention** that results when America leaves a vacuum of power. The best way to help refugees is to prevent them from becoming refugees in the first place. The Soviet Union was an existential threat, and this focused the attention of the world, and the American people. There **existential threat** today is not found on a map, but it **is very real**. The forces of the past are making steady progress against the modern world order. **Terrorist** movements in the Middle East, extremist parties across Europe, a paranoid tyrant in **North Korea threatening nuclear blackmail,** and, at the center of the web, an **aggressive KGB dictator in Russia**. They all want to turn the world back to a dark past because their survival is threatened by the values of the free world, epitomized by the United States. And **they are thriving as the U.S. has retreated**. The global freedom index has declined for ten consecutive years. No one like to talk about the United States as a global policeman, but **this is what happens when there is no cop on the beat. American leadership begins at home**, right here. America cannot lead the world on democracy and human rights if there is no unity on the meaning and importance of these things. **Leadership is required to make that case clearly and powerfully**. Right now, Americans are engaged in politics at a level not seen in decades. It is an opportunity for them to rediscover that making America great begins with believing America can be great. The Cold War was won on American values that were shared by both parties and nearly every American. Institutions that were created by a Democrat, Truman, were triumphant forty years later thanks to the courage of a Republican, Reagan. This bipartisan consistency created the decades of strategic stability that is the great strength of democracies. Strong institutions that outlast politicians allow for long-range planning. In contrast, dictators can operate only tactically, not strategically, because they are not constrained by the balance of powers, but cannot afford to think beyond their own survival. This is why a dictator like Putin has an advantage in chaos, the ability to move quickly. This can only be met by strategy, by long-term goals that are based on shared values, not on polls and cable news. The fear of making things worse has paralyzed the United States from trying to make things better. There will always be setbacks, but the United States cannot quit. The spread of **democracy is the only** proven **remedy for** nearly **every crisis that plagues the world today. War, famine, poverty, terrorism**–all are generated and exacerbated by authoritarian regimes. A policy of America First inevitably puts American security last. American leadership is required because there is no one else, and because it is good for America. There is no weapon or wall that is more powerful for security than America being envied, imitated, and admired around the world. Admired not for being perfect, but for having the exceptional courage to always try to be better. Thank you.

### Case

#### ROB – vote for the better debater – anything else is self serving and arbitrary and moves the debate away from the core controversies of the resolution which also decks clash by making it impossible for the negative to engage

#### Straight up negate on presumption – the aff doesn’t do a single thing to actually resolve problems in the debate space – even if the judge votes to affirm the unconditional right to strike, how do we do that in debate? Do we just go like we hate all tournaments or we hate tabroom and start calling for new institutions to be built? Obviously not which means that the aff doesn’t actually do anything and you vote neg on presumption or any risk of offense since there’s no distinction in pre and post fiat argumentation in a space like debate

#### Affirmative ideological construction fails—only the government can restructure the economy fast enough – also proves the TVA

Roosevelt Institute 19 “Decarbonizing the US Economy: Pathways Toward a Green New Deal SAMPLE POLICY: ELIMINATING FOSSIL FUEL SUBSIDIES” Policy Brief, 2019 RE

The climate crisis is here. According to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, limiting climate change to 1.5°C—and avoiding some of its most harmful impacts—would require a 45 percent cut in humancaused CO2 emissions by 2030 and carbon neutrality by mid-century. We argue that decarbonizing at this rapid pace is not only possible, but that it will improve our economic outlook, create jobs, and promote equity. Such an endeavor, however, necessitates immediate action and a broad range of policy tools. In Decarbonizing the US Economy: Pathways Toward a Green New Deal, we outline the three pillars of such an approach: 1) carbon pricing that promotes an equitable transition while meeting our emissions goals; 2) comprehensive regulations to redirect private spending and to ensure climate targets are met; and 3) large-scale public investments. Solving these sizable problems will require a sizable actor: government. To change the everyday decisions of businesses, individuals, and communities, and to provide a true alternative to the dirty “business-as-usual” economy, we must put a price on carbon and deploy direct environmental regulation. Though necessary, regulations and carbon pricing alone will be insufficient to meet the scale of the challenge and to address the dislocation associated with decarbonization. Carbon pricing and regulation may reduce fossil fuel extraction, for example, but they won’t ensure that workers in carbon-intensive industries find quality jobs; they may reduce transportation-related emissions, but they won’t offset increased driving costs or expand access to alternative modes of transit. Fortunately, the choice between decarbonization and meeting other social needs is a false one. A rapid transition to a carbon-neutral economy will raise living standards for the majority of Americans. We must rewrite the rules of our economy to promote a rapid and equitable transition, with an increase in public investment at the core of such an undertaking. To transform our economy on the scale that a Green New Deal would require, we need a large degree of coordination—coordination that can and must be directed by the government. While the economics of decarbonization are often misunderstood as a problem of scarcity, in which doing more to avert climate change means doing less to meet other social needs, we argue that a more robust public sector to facilitate this transition is both affordable and attainable. In Decarbonizing the US Economy, we outline a set of policy proposals that demonstrate how we can decarbonize the economy in ways that promote growth and ensure equitable outcomes. These sample policies show that decarbonizing the US economy can create quality jobs, reduce inequality, and tackle the existential threat of climate change. Here, we explore one of these policies: eliminating fossil fuel subsidies.

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts – their robinson card is overdone fear mongering – prefer well explained warrants

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

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

#### We’re going to defend the ideology of capitalism and impact turn the case – they can’t get out of the impact turn because it’s a question of which ideology they defend

#### CCS. Markets are key.

Gregory F. Nemet et al. 16, Associate Professor, La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Martina Kraus, German Institute for Economic Research Vera Zipperer, German Institute for Economic Research, November, 2016, The Valley of Death, the Technology Pork Barrel, and Public Support for Large Demonstration Projects, La Follette School Working Paper No. 2016-007

Because the ultimate (but not immediate) goal of supporting demonstrations is to facilitate widespread adoption, demand a6nd thus markets are of course key (Kingsley et al., 1996). In climate change, policies are central to those markets (Taylor et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2015), thus credibility in those policies is also central (Rai et al., 2010; Finon, 2012). But it is striking how many demonstration programs confronted markets that involved negative shocks around the time that projects came on-line—we see it in synfuels, biofuels, and solar thermal electricity (Figure 9), and CCS (Figure 10). The 1.9 year average lag from project initiation to time on-line is crucial. It would be a mistake to assume a Hotelling price path in which prices of an exhaustible resource (e.g. oil, atmospheric storage of CO2) rise at a constant pure rate of time preference. In this case the relevant price is the level at which avoided CO2 emissions are remunerated. Rather the experience of the past suggests we are more likely to see shocks and boom–bust cycles (Krautkraemer, 1998; Zaklan et al., 2011). We see it in our data in the prices related to each demonstration program (Figure 8). Lupion and Herzog (2013) attribute the failure of the NER300 program to stimulate the construction of any CCS projects to 4 factors: competition with renewables, project complexity, low carbon prices, and a combination of fiscal austerity and weak climate policy around the global financial crisis. Note that three of the four problems involved future demand, not the funding structure itself. Demonstrations need markets that pay off innovation investments not just under a steadily increasing Hotelling-style market, but under a broad range of market conditions. Features of robust demand pull include niche markets (Kemp et al., 1998), hedging across jurisdictions (Nemet, 2010), and flexible production (Sanchez and Kammen, 2016). Government price guarantees have played an important role as we have seen on synfuels, solar thermal electricity, and on a smaller scale, photovoltaics.

#### Try or die for CCS to solve warming – this is the best evidence on the question

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

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

It has been almost four years since the Paris climate agreement was signed. But as leaders gather in New York this week for the United Nations Climate Change Summit, the world remains far off track from meeting the Paris objective of limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius -- and pursuing efforts at 1.5 degrees.

To meet that target, the world must achieve a 100 percent clean economy — one that produces net zero emissions, or no more climate pollution than can be removed from the atmosphere — soon after mid-century, with the United States and other advanced economies reaching that milestone no later than 2050. It’s a daunting but doable task.

The consequences of falling short are enormous. This year, the U.S. government’s fourth National Climate Assessment documented the huge economic and social impacts of unchecked warming. The Pentagon has repeatedly warned of the impacts on national security and our troops.

Achieving a 100 percent clean economy will require a swift transition to renewables and other zero-carbon energy sources. But we also need to face the reality that meeting the Paris target will require taking carbon out of the atmosphere at massive scale. In part, that’s because eliminating emissions will be very challenging for some sectors, especially the transportation industry and agriculture. Removing carbon from the atmosphere would also bring concentrations down, helping to stabilize the climate at safer levels. So, the push for clean energy must be supplemented by a suite of technologies known as carbon dioxide removal (CDR).

It is not a question of what we’d prefer. It’s a question of insurmountable math.

The crucial role carbon removal must play is becoming more widely recognized. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report stressed the importance of carbon removal, and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine late last year estimated that ten billion tons of CO2 will need to be pulled from the atmosphere annually by 2050, and double that by 2100. For context, today’s global emissions are less than 40 billion tons per year. If the 10 billion tons of CO2 from CDR were stored underground, that would be roughly double the world’s annual oil production.

The good news is that there are a surprisingly large number of promising pathways for carbon dioxide removal. Nature-based approaches include reforestation and forest management as well as agricultural practices that increase carbon stored in soils. Some of the attendant challenges include competition for land and permanence of the carbon sequestration.

Technological approaches include direct air capture — machines that actually suck carbon from the air — and technologically-enhanced natural processes, such as plants genetically modified with deep roots to fix carbon in the soil; enhanced mineralization, which uses certain reactive rocks to bind with carbon from the air; and accelerated ocean uptake in phytoplankton. These technologies are immature and require considerable research, development and demonstration to ensure viability and affordability at very large scale.

Despite the urgency, there is no dedicated federal effort to develop these crucial technologies; existing programs are piecemeal and largely focused on sequestering emissions from industrial and electricity generating sources.

The National Academies recommended the rapid establishment of a robust, focused, scalable and accelerated federal research program spanning the Departments of Energy and Agriculture, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. Such a program would encompass the full range of technological pathways that can remove CO2 from the environment. ‘’Clearing the Air,’’ an analysis of CDR’s value and a proposed plan to deploy it, has been completed by the Energy Futures Initiative. Over the next decade, the program scale would be about a billion dollars a year.

Carbon dioxide removal is not a magic bullet. We must do everything we can to deploy innovative low- and zero-carbon methods to generate electricity, heat homes, fuel vehicles, and power industry, creating new economic opportunities in the process. Tackling the climate crisis also requires placing a declining limit and a price on carbon pollution, as well as a significant increase in energy technology innovation and deployment across the board.

But CDR is also not a “Plan B.” It is a critical part of any “Plan A”

for climate, a necessary complement to emission reduction. It can provide more flexibility and optionality in policy planning, which could ease the transition to a carbon-neutral economy while minimizing transition costs and providing greater assurance that science-based climate goals can be met in a timely manner. It would eventually enable a net negative global economy that could bring the atmospheric carbon concentrations down — and global temperatures with it.

We have delayed meaningful action for far too long. As a result, the scale and urgency of the challenge is such that we cannot simply work on doing better in the future. We need to correct what we did in the past. Carbon removal is the enabler.

#### Independently, Private Actor Fiat is a voting issue –its unpredictable – u can choose a billion actors, organizations, and turns off because it’s literally impossible for that kind of action to happen because they don’t have the infrastructure to succeed ie sorry judges, but you can’t singlehandedly start a revolution

#### Capitalism is key to growth – and also reductions in poverty.

Skarbek, 10 – Research Fellow at the Independent Institute, founding Director of the Institute's Center on Entrepreneurial Innovation (COEI) and the COEI Government Cost Calculator, and Lecturer in the Department of Political Economy at King's College in London, England. She received her Ph.D. in economics from George Mason University, and she has been Assistant Professor of Economics at San Jose State University and an F.A. Hayek Scholar, and she is the recipient of the Don Lavoie Memorial Award.

Emily C. Skarbek, “Capitalism and Economic Growth,” Independent Institute. April 15, 2010. <https://www.independent.org/issues/article.asp?id=2769>

When the current administration talks of entrepreneurship, they speak of politically favored businesses and privileged recipients of the taxpayers’ dollars. To be clear, that is not entrepreneurship. It has become conventional to say that those who openly embrace capitalism, free markets and free trade are dogmatic, ideologues, idealistic, or market fundamentalists. And if you look to the media and our leaders, you get the impression that being in favor of free markets is somehow an unreasonable position.

Unless one is ashamed of unprecedented increases in income, rising life expectancy, greater education, and more political freedom, there is no reason to be a fair-weather fan of capitalism. Sprawling free markets in countries that became more capitalist over the last 25 years have meant many more people enjoy improvements in well being and opportunities to advance human capabilities.

There is no evidence that countries that eschewed freer markets and embraced substantially greater state control performed better on any of these major indicators. On the contrary, those countries that adopt increased taxation, increased regulation, fiscal mismanagement and enormous public debt have performed demonstrably worse.

From a global perspective, we have witnessed remarkable progress of mankind through the increased acceptance of free market policies in both rich and poor countries. Before the industrial revolution, 80% of the world’s population lived in abject poverty. By 1980, that number has fallen to 34.8% and by 2000, less than 20% of the population lives on less than $1 a day. In five years, the number is expected to fall to 10% if free trade is allowed to flourish.

In just the past 25 years increased private ownership, increased free trade, and lower taxes all came at the hands of politicians like Deng Xiaoping in China, Margaret Thatcher in England, and Ronald Reagan in United States. In the years following the adoption of these policies by these global leaders, per capita income nearly doubled from 1980 to 2005; Tariffs fell and trade increased; Schooling and life expectancy grew rapidly, while infant mortality and poverty fell just as fast.

In the average country that became more capitalist over the last 25 years, the average citizen gained a 43% increase in income, nearly half a decade in life expectancy, and a 2-year increase in the average years of schooling. In my lifetime alone, freer markets have improved the lives of billions of people from all walks of life.

When we look back at our own history, the tremendous economic growth that Americans experienced from the time of the original Tea Party up to 1914 was the result of economic freedom from government regulation, open boarders for free immigration, and very few trade restrictions on the global flow of goods, services, and capital. Anyone could get on a boat, land on Ellis Island and become an immigrant and this benefited both domestic Americans and the immigrant alike. Business and labor were free to be entrepreneurial—and entrepreneurship created wealth. But we don’t want wealth for wealth’s sake. Wealth allows for the improvement of the human condition.

For example, in 1905, our average life expectancy in the U.S. was 47. Today it is 78. A hundred years ago only 14% of homes had a bathtub; 8% had a phone; 95% of all births took place at home; most women washed their hair once a month; and the average worker made about $300 per year.

As recent as 1984, it took the average American wage earner 456 hours of labor to earn enough to purchase a cellphone. Today, it takes the average American 4 hours. A computer has fallen from costing 435 hours of labor to less than 20. None of this accounts for the tremendous improvements in technological capacity. There are several reasons that the costs of goods have dropped so drastically, but perhaps the biggest is increased international trade.

Simply put, the free market means the poor are less poor. Globalization extends and deepens a capitalist system that has for generations been lifting American living standards—for high-income households, of course, but for low-income ones as well. When the world embraces free market reforms, the world economy expanded greatly, the quality of life improves sharply for billions of people, and dire poverty was substantially scaled back.

This is not a coincidence.

It is a well-established fact that when people are free to buy from, sell to, and invest with one another as they choose, they can achieve far more than when governments attempt to control economic decisions. Widening the circle of people with whom we transact—including across political borders—brings benefits to consumers in the form of lower prices, greater variety, and better quality, and it allows companies to reap the benefits of innovation, specialization, and economies of scale that larger markets bring. Free markets are essential to prosperity, and expanding free markets as much as possible enhances that prosperity.

Voluntary economic exchange is inherently fair and does not justify government intervention. When two free people come together on terms they have agreed upon to exchange peacefully, both benefit. Government intervention in voluntary economic exchange on behalf of some citizens at the expense of others is inherently unfair. One person is coerced in order to privilege another. It really is that simple.

When goods, services, labor and capital flow freely across U.S. borders, Americans can take full advantage of the opportunities of the international marketplace. They can buy the best or least expensive goods and services the world has to offer; they can sell to the most promising markets; they can choose among the best investment opportunities; and they can tap into the worldwide pool of capital. Study after study has shown that countries that are more open to the global economy grow faster and achieve higher incomes than those that are relatively closed. This is capitalism.

Growth is not guaranteed. It seems obvious that the central challenges facing America have to do with the with predatory regulatory and tax policies conducted by governments domestic and abroad. From an economic perspective, then, the case for unilateral trade liberalization—that is reducing our own trade barriers and subsidies without preconditions or reciprocal commitments from other countries—is the best policy to promote peace and prosperity globally.

Politically, however, the concentrated and organized beneficiaries of protectionism are powerful relative to the much larger, disorganized, beneficiaries of free trade. Politicians tend to be most responsive to the loudest interest groups and are therefore inclined to view free trade unfavorably. But we as Americans must be clear—capitalism is not evil. It has done more good for more people than any acts of state, any stimulus spending, any health program or welfare initiative. Americans can no longer afford to fear freedom.

Finally, acknowledging the relationship between free markets and economic prosperity does not make someone “dogmatic”. It is unreasonable to continue to ignore these facts. Capitalism’s superiority for economic growth and development deserves the unqualified support of everyone who believe that wealth is better than poverty, life is better than death, and liberty is better than oppression.

#### That outweighs---and turns sustainability.

Smith ’18 – assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University

Noah. September 19. “Saving the Planet Doesn’t Mean Killing Economic Growth” <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-09-19/saving-the-planet-doesn-t-mean-killing-economic-growth>

In the 19th and 20th centuries, a few countries got fabulously rich. These included most of Europe, parts of East Asia, some small oil producing states and parts of the former British Empire. In recent decades, more of the world — large parts of China, portions of India, Southeast Asia and part of Latin America — have joined the rich world, thanks to an unprecedented explosion of global growth. But for large swathes of the world, life remains a grinding daily struggle. Women in poor countries spend hours every day carrying water. Hundreds of millions of people contract malaria every year. Almost a billion people still defecate outdoors.

The obvious solution to lifting these people out of poverty — without inflicting poverty on some of those who have already escaped it — is economic growth. But there is a small but vocal group of environmentalists telling us that growth is no longer possible — that unless growth ends, climate change and other environmental impacts will destroy civilization. Writing in Foreign Policy, anthropologist Jason Hickel declares:

Once we reach the limits of efficiency, pursuing any degree of economic growth drives resource use back up … Ultimately, bringing our civilization back within planetary boundaries is going to require that we liberate ourselves from our dependence on economic growth—starting with rich nations.

Hickel cites analyses by the United Nations Environment Program and others showing that even big improvements in resource efficiency, encouraged by very high carbon taxes, will be unable to halt overall resource use or global carbon emissions. But this evidence doesn’t support Hickel’s conclusions, which rely on several misconceptions about the nature and the importance of growth.

First, Hickel doesn’t seem to grapple with the fact that most economic growth now happens in countries that are relatively poor. The International Monetary Fund estimates that from 2010 to 2015, emerging markets and developing countries were responsible for about 70 percent of global output and consumption growth, while advanced economies were responsible for the rest. The World Bank’s forecasts for 2017-2019 are similar:

China’s contribution to global growth will be double that of the U.S., and India’s will be larger than that of the entire euro zone.

The same is true of greenhouse gas emissions. Since about 1990, emissions from the U.S. and EU have fallen, while emissions from developing countries, especially China and India, have exploded:

In 2017, the International Energy Agency estimated that the growth in energy-related carbon emissions in China and the rest of developing Asia was more than five times the growth in the European Union, while U.S. emissions declined.

In other words, if Hickel and others stop economic growth, it won’t be rich countries that bear the brunt of the change. It will be poor and middle-income countries like India and China. African countries that are still desperately poor will not even get their chance.

Hickel tries to avoid this outcome by declaring that “We can improve people’s lives right now simply by sharing what we already have more fairly,” but even total global redistribution — which is, of course, far outside of the realm of political and logistical possibility — would afford the average person a standard of living only slightly better than that now enjoyed in China. A realistic amount of redistribution would do far less for the global poor — meaning they’d be the ones on the hook in a zero-growth world.

The second thing that Hickel leaves out is the connection between growth and fertility. Once countries pass per-capita gross domestic product of $10,000, fertility rates rapidly drop to or below the replacement rate of 2.1 children per woman. Halting growth now would leave most African countries trapped well below that magic level, meaning their population growth — and thus, the world’s population growth — would continue without limit. That in turn would eventually overwhelm the world’s resources — if not in terms of the climate, then certainly in terms of fresh water and food.

Fortunately, Hickel and the zero-growth environmentalists ignore a third crucial factor — technology. In rich countries, growth has shifted somewhat from physical things to digital services, which require much less energy consumption. Even more importantly, green energy, especially solar power, has progressed by leaps and bounds:

In many regions, wind and solar are already cheaper than coal power, and electric vehicles are rapidly becoming more common. This incredible technological progress means that rich countries could see a renewable-powered electrical grid and fully electrified transportation before the century is out. More importantly, cheap renewable energy means that poor countries in Africa and South Asia will be able to follow a different, cleaner path to industrialization without sacrificing living standards. Ultimately, technological progress will be much more important for limiting global resource use than the energy-efficiency measures Hickel considers.

In the movie “Avengers: Infinity War,” the supervillain Thanos kills off half the universe in a misguided attempt to prevent resource overuse. The zero-growth environmentalists are embracing a solution only slightly less destructive. Thanos’s better course would have been to use his vast powers to provide the universe with renewable energy technology that would let them get rich — and lower their fertility rates — without destroying the environment. Environmentalists in the real world should take that approach as well.

#### Transition is impossible – lack of support, consumption habits, and elite power domination

Burch-Hansen 18

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

Political projects do not become hegemonic just because they embody good ideas. For a project to become hegemonic, (organic) intellectuals first need to develop the project and a constellation of social forces with sufficient power and resources to implement it then needs to find it appealing and struggle for it. In this context, it is worth noting that degrowth, as a social movement, has been gaining momentum for some time, not least in Southern Europe. Countless grassroots' initiatives (e.g., D'Alisa et al., 2013) are the most visible manifestations that degrowth is on the rise. Intellectuals – including founders of ecological economics such as Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen and Herman Daly, and more recently degrowth scholars such as Serge Latouche and Giorgos Kallis – have played a major role in developing and disseminating the ideas underpinning the project. A growing interest in degrowth in academia, as well as well-attended biennial international degrowth conferences, also indicate that an increasing number of people embrace such ideas.

Still, the degrowth project is nowhere near enjoying the degree and type of support it needs if its policies are to be implemented through democratic processes. The number of political parties, labour unions, business associations and international organisations that have so far embraced degrowth is modest to say the least. Economic and political elites, including social democratic parties and most of the trade union movement, are united in the belief that economic growth is necessary and desirable. This consensus finds support in the prevailing type of economic theory and underpins the main contenders in the neoliberal project, such as centre-left and nationalist projects. In spite of the world's multidimensional crisis, a pro-growth discourse in other words continues to be hegemonic: it is widely considered a matter of common sense that continued economic growth is required.

It is also noteworthy that economic and political elites, to a large extent, continue to support the neoliberal project, even in the face of its evident shortcomings. Indeed, the 2008 financial crisis did not result in the weakening of transnational financial capital that could have paved the way for a paradigm shift. Instead of coming to an end, neoliberal capitalism has arguably entered a more authoritarian phase (Bruff, 2014). The main reason the power of the pre-crisis coalition remains intact is that governments stepped in and saved the dominant fraction by means of massive bailouts. It is a foregone conclusion that this fraction and the wider coalition behind the neoliberal paradigm (transnational industrial capital, the middle classes and segments of organized labour) will consider the degrowth paradigm unattractive and that such social forces will vehemently oppose the implementation of degrowth policies (see also Rees, 2014: 97).

While degrowth advocates envision a future in which market forces play a less prominent role than they do today, degrowth is not an anti-market project. As such, it can attract support from certain types of market actors. In particular, it is worth noting that social enterprises, such as cooperatives (Restakis, 2010), play a major role in the degrowth vision. Such enterprises are defined by being ‘organisations involved at least to some extent in the market, with a clear social, cultural and/or environmental purpose, rooted in and serving primarily the local community and ideally having a local and/or democratic ownership structure’ (Johanisova et al., 2013: 11). Social enterprises currently exist at the margins of a system, in which the dominant type of business entity is profit-oriented, shareholder-owned corporations. The further dissemination of social enterprises, which is crucial to the transitions to degrowth societies, is – in many cases – blocked or delayed as a result of the centrifugal forces of global competition (Wigger and Buch-Hansen, 2013). Overall, social enterprises thus (still) constitute a social force with modest power.

Ougaard (2016: 467) notes that one of the major dividing lines in the contemporary transnational capitalist class is between capitalists who have a material interest in the carbon-based economy and capitalists who have a material interest in decarbonisation. The latter group, for instance, includes manufacturers of equipment for the production of renewable energy (ibid.: 467). As mentioned above, degrowth advocates have singled out renewable energy as one of the sectors that needs to grow in the future. As such, it seems likely that the owners of national and transnational companies operating in this sector would be more positively inclined towards the degrowth project than would capitalists with a stake in the carbon-based economy. Still, the prospect of the “green sector” emerging as a driving force behind degrowth currently appears meagre. Being under the control of transnational capital (Harris, 2010), such companies generally embrace the “green growth” discourse, which ‘is deeply embedded in neoliberal capitalism’ and indeed serves to adjust this form of capitalism ‘to crises arising from contradictions within itself’ (Wanner, 2015: 23).

In addition to support from the social forces engendered by the production process, a political project ‘also needs the political ability to mobilize majorities in parliamentary democracies, and a sufficient measure of at least passive consent’ (van Apeldoorn and Overbeek, 2012: 5–6) if it is to become hegemonic. As mentioned, degrowth enjoys little support in parliaments, and certainly the pro-growth discourse is hegemonic among parties in government.5 With capital accumulation being the most important driving force in capitalist societies, political decision-makers are generally eager to create conditions conducive to production and the accumulation of capital (Lindblom, 1977: 172). Capitalist states and international organisations are thus “programmed” to facilitate capital accumulation, and do as such constitute a strategically selective terrain that works to the disadvantage of the degrowth project.

The main advocates of the degrowth project are grassroots, small fractions of left-wing parties and labour unions as well as academics and other citizens who are concerned about social injustice and the environmentally unsustainable nature of societies in the rich parts of the world. The project is thus ideationally driven in the sense that support for it is not so much rooted in the material circumstances or short-term self-interests of specific groups or classes as it is rooted in the conviction that degrowth is necessary if current and future generations across the globe are to be able to lead a good life. While there is no shortage of enthusiasts and creative ideas in the degrowth movement, it has only modest resources compared to other political projects. To put it bluntly, the advocates of degrowth do not possess instruments that enable them to force political decision-makers to listen

to – let alone comply with – their views. As such, they are in a weaker position than the labour union movement was in its heyday, and they are in a far weaker position than the owners and managers of large corporations are today (on the structural power of transnational corporations, see Gill and Law, 1989).

6. Consent It is also safe to say that degrowth enjoys no “passive consent” from the majority of the population. For the time being, degrowth remains unknown to most people. Yet, if it were to become generally known, most people would probably not find the vision of a smaller economic system appealing. This is not just a matter of degrowth being ‘a missile word that backfires’ because it triggers negative feelings in people when they first hear it (Drews and Antal, 2016). It is also a matter of the actual content of the degrowth project.

Two issues in particular should be mentioned in this context. First, for many, the anti-capitalist sentiments embodied in the degrowth project will inevitably be a difficult pill to swallow. Today, the vast majority of people find it almost impossible to conceive of a world without capitalism. There is a ‘widespread sense that not only is capitalism the only viable political and economic system, but also that it is now impossible to even imagine a coherent alternative to it’ (Fisher, 2009: 2). As Jameson (2003) famously observed, it is, in a sense, easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism. However, not only is degrowth – like other anti-capitalist projects – up against the challenge that most people consider capitalism the only system that can function; it is also up against the additional challenge that it speaks against economic growth in a world where the desirability of growth is considered common sense.

Second, degrowth is incompatible with the lifestyles to which many of us who live in rich countries have become accustomed. Economic growth in the Western world is, to no small extent, premised on the existence of consumer societies and an associated consumer culture most of us find it difficult to completely escape. In this culture, social status, happiness, well-being and identity are linked to consumption (Jackson, 2009). Indeed, it is widely considered a natural right to lead an environmentally unsustainable lifestyle – a lifestyle that includes car ownership, air travel, spacious accommodations, fashionable clothing, an omnivorous diet and all sorts of electronic gadgets. This Western norm of consumption has increasingly been exported to other parts of the world, the result being that never before have so many people taken part in consumption patterns that used to be reserved for elites (Koch, 2012). If degrowth were to be institutionalised, many citizens in the rich countries would have to adapt to a materially lower standard of living. That is, while the basic needs of the global population can be met in a non-growing economy, not all wants and preferences can be fulfilled (Koch et al., 2017). Undoubtedly, many people in the rich countries would experience various limitations on their consumption opportunities as a violent encroachment on their personal freedom. Indeed, whereas many recognize that contemporary consumer societies are environmentally unsustainable, fewer are prepared to actually change their own lifestyles to reverse/address this.

At present, then, the degrowth project is in its “deconstructive phase”, i.e., the phase in which its advocates are able to present a powerful critique of the prevailing neoliberal project and point to alternative solutions to crisis. At this stage, not enough support has been mobilised behind the degrowth project for it to be elevated to the phases of “construction” and “consolidation”. It is conceivable that at some point, enough people will become sufficiently discontent with the existing economic system and push for something radically different. Reasons for doing so could be the failure of the system to satisfy human needs and/or its inability to resolve the multidimensional crisis confronting humanity. Yet, various material and ideational path-dependencies currently stand in the way of such a development, particularly in countries with large middle-classes. Even if it were to happen that the majority wanted a break with the current system, it is far from given that a system based on the ideas of degrowth is what they would demand.

#### Transition causes war

**Reghr 13**

Ernie Reghr, Senior Fellow in Arctic Security at The Simons Foundation, 2-4-13, “Intrastate Conflict: Data, Trends and Drivers” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Special-Feature/Detail/?lng=en&id=158597&tabid=1453496807&contextid774=158597&contextid775=158627>

“The **most robustly significant predictor** of conflict risk and its duration is some indicator of economic prosperity. At a higher income people have more to lose from the destructiveness of conflict; and higher per-capita income implies a better functioning social contract, institutions and state capacity.”[3] This correlation between underdevelopment and armed conflict is confirmed in a 2008 paper by Thania Paffenholz[4] which notes that “since 1990, more than 50% of all conflict-prone countries have been low income states…. Two thirds of all armed conflicts take place in African countries with the highest poverty rates. Econometric research found a correlation between the poverty rate and likelihood of armed violence….[T]he lower the GDP per capita in a country, the higher the likelihood of armed conflict.” Of course, it is important to point out that this is not a claim that there is a direct causal connection between poverty and armed conflict. To repeat, the causes of conflict are complex and context specific, nevertheless, says Paffenholz, there is a clear correlation between a low and declining per capita income and a country’s vulnerability to conflict. It is also true, on the other hand, that there are low income countries that experience precipitous economic decline, like Zambia in the 1980s and 1990s, without suffering the kind of turmoil that has visited economically more successful countries like Kenya and Cote d’Ivoire. Referring to both Zambia and Nigeria, Pafenholz says these are cases in which “the social compact” has proven to be resilient. Both have formal and informal mechanisms that are able to address grievances in ways that allowed them to be aired and resolved or managed without recourse to violence. A brief review of literature on economics and armed conflict, published in the Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, indicates the complexity and imprecision behind the question, “does poverty cause conflict?” While many of the “world’s poorest countries are riven by armed conflict,” and while poverty, conflict and under-development set up a cycle of dysfunction in which each element of the cycle is exacerbated by the other, it is also the case that “conflict obviously does not just afflict the poorest countries” – as Northern Ireland and the former Yugoslavia demonstrate. “Many poor countries are not at war; shared poverty may not be a destabilizing influence. Indeed, economic growth can destabilize, as the wars in countries afflicted by an abundance of particular natural resources appear to show.”[5] Another review of the literature makes the general point that “the escalation of conflict during economic downturns is more likely in countries recovering from conflict, or fragile states.” That makes Africa especially vulnerable on two counts: economic deprivation and recent armed conflict are present in a relatively high number of states, making the continent especially vulnerable to economic shocks. As a general rule, “weak economies often translate into weak and fragile states and the presence of violent conflict, which in turn prevents economic growth.” One study argues that “the risk of war in any given country is determined by the initial level of income, the rate of economic growth and the level of dependency on primary commodity exports.” Changes in rates of economic growth thus lead to changes in threats of conflict. As unemployment rises in fragile states this can “exacerbate conflict due to comparatively better income opportunities for young men in rebel groups as opposed to labour markets.”[6] The concentration of armed conflict in lower income countries is also reflected in the conflict tabulation by Project Ploughshares over the past quarter century. The 2009 Human Development Index ranks 182 countries in four categories of Human Development – Very High, High, Medium, Low. Of the 98 countries in the Medium and Low categories of human development in 2009, 55 per cent experienced war on their territories in the previous 24 years. In the same period, only 24 per cent of countries in the High human development category saw war within their borders, while just two (5 per cent) countries in the Very High human development ranking had war on their territory (the UK re Northern Ireland and Israel). The wars of the recent past were overwhelmingly fought on the territories of states at the low end of the human development scale. A country’s income level is thus a strong indicator of its risk of being involved in sustained armed conflict. Low income countries lack the capacity to create conditions conducive to serving the social, political, and economic welfare of their people. And when economic inequality is linked to differences between identity groups, the correlation to armed conflict is even stronger. In other words, group based inequalities are especially destabilizing.[7] These failures in human security are of course heavily shaped by external factors, notably international economic and security conditions and the **interests of the major powers** (in short, globalization),[8] and these factors frequently combine with internal political/religious/ethnic circumstances that create conditions especially conducive to conflict and armed conflict.

#### The process of affirming alone represents an impossible process which justifies suffering and genocide

Žižek 12 [Slavoj, All-Around Badass Philosopher, June 8, “Don’t Act, Just Think,” http://bigthink.com/ideas/45126/AKG]

Slavoj Zizek: Capitalism is . . . and this, almost I’m tempted to say is what is great about it, although I’m very critical of it . . . Capitalism is more an ethical/religious category for me. It’s not true when people attack capitalists as egotists. “They don't care.” No! An ideal capitalist is someone who is ready, again, to stake his life, to risk everything just so that production grows, profit grows, capital circulates. His personal or her happiness is totally subordinated to this. This is what I think Walter Benjamin, the great Frankfurt School companion, thinker, had in mind when he said capitalism is a form of religion. You cannot explain, account for, a figure of a passionate capitalist, obsessed with expanded circulation, with rise of his company, in terms of personal happiness. I am, of course, fundamentally anti-capitalist. But let’s not have any illusions here. No. What shocks me is that most of the critics of today’s capitalism feel even embarrassed, that's my experience, when you confront them with a simple question, “Okay, we heard your story . . . protest horrible, big banks depriving us of billions, hundreds, thousands of billions of common people's money. . . . Okay, but what do you really want? What should replace the system?” And then you get one big confusion. You get either a general moralistic answer, like “People shouldn't serve money. Money should serve people.” Well, frankly, Hitler would have agreed with it, especially because he would say, “When people serve money, money’s controlled by Jews,” and so on, no? So either this or some kind of a vague connection, social democracy, or a simple moralistic critique, and so on and so on. So, you know, it’s easy to be just formally anti-capitalist, but what does it really mean? It’s totally open. This is why, as I always repeat, with all my sympathy for Occupy Wall Street movement, it’s result was . . . I call it a Bartleby lesson. Bartleby, of course, Herman Melville’s Bartleby, you know, who always answered his favorite “I would prefer not to” . . . The message of Occupy Wall Street is, I would prefer not to play the existing game. There is something fundamentally wrong with the system and the existing forms of institutionalized democracy are not strong enough to deal with problems. Beyond this, they don't have an answer and neither do I. For me, Occupy Wall Street is just a signal. It’s like clearing the table. Time to start thinking. The other thing, you know, it’s a little bit boring to listen to this mantra of “Capitalism is in its last stage.” When this mantra started, if you read early critics of capitalism, I’m not kidding, a couple of decades before French Revolution, in late eighteenth century. No, the miracle of capitalism is that it’s rotting in decay, but the more it’s rotting, the more it thrives. So, let’s confront that serious problem here. Also, let’s not remember--and I’m saying this as some kind of a communist--that the twentieth century alternatives to capitalism and market miserably failed. . . . Like, okay, in Soviet Union they did try to get rid of the predominance of money market economy. The price they paid was a return to violent direct master and servant, direct domination, like you no longer will even formally flee. You had to obey orders, a new authoritarian society. . . . And this is a serious problem: how to abolish market without regressing again into relations of servitude and domination. My advice would be--because I don't have simple answers--two things: [First,] (a) precisely to start thinking. Don't get caught into this pseudo-activist pressure. Do something. Let’s do it, and so on. So, no, the time is to think. I even provoked some of the leftist friends when I told them that if the famous Marxist formula was, “Philosophers have only interpreted the world; the time is to change it” . . . thesis 11 . . . , that maybe today we should say, “In the twentieth century, we maybe tried to change the world too quickly. The time is to interpret it again, to start thinking.” Second thing, I’m not saying [that while] people are suffering, enduring horrible things, that we should just sit and think, but we should be very careful what we do. Here, let me give you a surprising example. I think that, okay, it’s so fashionable today to be disappointed at President Obama, of course, but sometimes I’m a little bit shocked by this disappointment because what did the people expect, that he will introduce socialism in United States or what? But for example, the ongoing universal health care debate is an important one. This is a great thing. Why? Because, on the one hand, this debate which taxes the very roots of ordinary American ideology, you know, freedom of choice, states wants to take freedom from us and so on. I think this freedom of choice that Republicans attacking Obama are using, its pure ideology. But at the same time, universal health care is not some crazy, radically leftist notion. It’s something that exists all around and functions basically relatively well--Canada, most of Western European countries. So the beauty is to select a topic which touches the fundamentals of our ideology, but at the same time, we cannot be accused of promoting an impossible agenda--like abolish all private property or what. No, it’s something that can be done and is done relatively successfully and so on. So that would be my idea, to carefully select issues like this where we do stir up public debate but we cannot be accused of being utopians in the bad sense of the term.