# 2nr

Gov collapses to individuals

**Laurence 11** [Ben Laurence 2011 (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago) “An Anscombean Approach to Collective Action” in Ford and Hornsby, Eds. Essays on Anscombe's Intention (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011) 293-294]

“It is enough that the same order displayed in collective action explanation can also be represented as a set of rational transitions justifying the actions undertaken by members of a group in light of a shared objective. In this way, whether or not there is strictly speaking a unitary knowing subject of the whole action, we can still see the actions in question as recommended by reasoning. This reasoning will not, of course, occur through the exercise of a separate practical reason possessed by the group, but rather through the reasoning of the individual members as the execute their shared objective. We might sum this up by saying that just as a collective agent can only act through the actions of its individual members, it can only know through their knowing, and reason through their reasoning.”

#### Prefer ideal-theory – it’s inevitable and frames non-ideal judgments which means everything collapses.

**Arvan 14** Posted by Marcus Arvan on 05/03/2014 at 11:05 AM What's not wrong with ideal theory http://philosopherscocoon.typepad.com/blog/2014/05/whats-not-wrong-with-ideal-theory.html#sthash.rHY1Rv7v.dpuf

This is fallacious. I entirely agree that it is important not to confuse the things that Wedgwood mentions, and that philosophers who work in ideal theory often do confuse those things -- but none of this shows that ideal theory is methodologically flawed. It shows, at most, that many people have done it badly! Wedgwood then writes of certain "theoretical mistakes" he sees in ideal theory: For evaluative and normative theorizing, what is most important is to articulate a plausible conception of what it is for one item in the relevant category to be better than another. I think this is just wrong. I don't think "the most important thing" in normative theorizing is to know "what is better than what." That is an important thing to know, but to say it is the most important thing -- without argument -- is simply an assertion. Here, instead, is what I want to say: There are many important things in normative theorizing. We should want to know what is better than what. But that is not all. We have every reason to want to know what would be best. To ignore ideal theory -- without argument for why "what is best" is not something worth knowing -- is to arbitrarily set aside an important question as irrelevant. Second, I do not think that we can [not] specify what is better than what without at least some ideal in the background. To say that it would be better for people of different races to have equal rights than for one race to have more than others is to say that it is more ideal. But, what is it to say that something is more ideal? It is to say that it is closer to some ideal. Thus, I say (along with Rawls), the idea what we can do "nonideal theory" without ideal theory is nonsense. Any attempt to do nonideal theory inevitably -- if only tacitly -- appeals to ideals.

# NC

### 1

#### Interp – The aff must disclose the right AC doc when emailed requesting it.

#### They violate – screenshots prove and they disclosed a different doc and changed it last minute, the first one they sent is in file share and email. To clarify, they changed the plan text, fw and added a contention.

#### 1] Evidence Ethics – disclosing deters mis-cutting and power tagging cards, outweighs because reinforces bad research habits that carries outside the round.

#### 2] Prep skew – Aff has infinite time to prep ATs for their particular case while the neg has to do it in round.

#### 3] Accessibility – they could read evidence that is blocked by a paywall that I can’t access – disclosure allows me to read the evidence before the round. Even if they don’t read ev that’s behind a paywall they could’ve and I wouldn’t know and they permit other to do it. That outweighs because accessibility is key to debate.

#### 4] Strat skew – I couldn’t decide on my NC strat b/c the aff changed – I was gonna read T against teachers and had to change that, as well as my util responses.

#### 5] academic integrity – they essentially lied by sending the wrong doc, I had to prep and then reprep a new case just because one judge switched who doesn’t even have a paradigm so they can’t argue they had to tailor it to them.

#### The voters are

#### 1] Fairness b/c a) it’ an intrinsic good b) it control the internal link to education c) debate is a game, if it’s unfair no-one will want to play.

#### 2] Education b/c a) portability, it’s useful for the real world b) constitutive purpose, this is an educational activity.

#### And it’s drop-the-debater, k2 deterring further abuse and substance is skewed b/c I had to spend time on theory.

#### No RVI, a) logic, you don’t win for being fair, b) debaters will act abusively on purpose to bait out theory and dump on the RVI.

#### Competing interpretations, a) reasonability is bad it requires judge intervention and b) arguing about the norms is the only way to get to the best norms possible.

### 2

#### For ethics to be binding it must be universal and constitutive of all individuals – thus the metaethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Problem of regress – I can keep asking ‘why value this’ to other frameworks, which falls to moral skep; the only value which solves this is ‘reason,’ as to ask for a reason to value reason, you concede reason’s authority.

#### 2] Universality – for ethics to be objective it must be universal; 1+1=2 can’t be true for me but not for you.

#### 3] Action Theory – Every action can be broken down to infinite movements. Only reason can unify the parts of an action into one, thus all action collapses to reason.

#### 4] Is-ought gap – external conditions can never prescribe action since no set of is statements can ever prove we ought to do something objectively.

#### Bindingness outweighs a] for the resolution to be true or false it must be binding, otherwise the round is irresolvable, b] it presupposes bindingness since ought implies moral obligations, and c] otherwise people could just ignore ethics and do whatever they want.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with Categorical Imperative – the metaethic implies that any ethical theory must guarantee freedom as an unconditional good.

Sorens 17 Jason Sorens, 2-10-2017, "Immanuel Kant and the Philosophy of Freedom," No Publication, <https://fee.org/articles/immanuel-kant-and-the-philosophy-of-freedom/>

The Categorical Imperative The moral law takes the form of an unconditional or categorical imperative. It says, for instance, “Do not murder, even if you can achieve your goals by doing so.” It’s not a hypothetical imperative like “if you don’t want to burn your hand, don’t touch the hot stove,” or “if you don’t want to go to jail, don’t murder.” It commands our wills regardless of what our particular goals are. Kant thinks all particular moral commands can be summed up in a fundamental, categorical imperative. It takes three forms. I’ll mention two of them here. The equal freedom of each individual is perfectly consistent with the utmost inequality in the degree of possessions. One form of the categorical imperative focuses on the notion that human beings are special because of our capacity for moral responsibility. Kant assumes that this capacity gives each individual human being a dignity, not a price. What that means is that we must not trade off the legitimate rights and interests of any human being for anything else. We must not treat other people or ourselves as means only to some other end, but always as ends in ourselves. The other, perhaps more frequently cited form of the imperative is highly abstract: “Always act according to that maxim that you can will as a universal law of nature.” In other words, think about the principle or rule that justifies your action; then figure out whether it’s universalizable. If so, it is an acceptable principle or rule for you to follow; if not, it is not. “Steal when I can gain an advantage thereby” [stealing] is not universalizable because it implies that others may steal from me, that is, take what I own against my will. But I cannot will against my own will. Rights and Freedoms Now, this understanding of the dignity of the individual human being implies that persons have rights, in other words, that we have an enforceable duty to respect the freedoms of all persons. So we can’t trample on the freedoms of one person to help one or many others (contra the “act utilitarians”). For instance, it would be wrong to kill one healthy person to distribute [t]he[i]r organs to several sick people, even if doing so was necessary to [would] save two or more lives. Each person has a dignity that must not be trampled, no matter what. (Another misunderstanding of Kant says that he thinks your intentions are the only thing that matter and you can ignore the consequences of your actions. To the contrary, to ignore consequences is to act with ill intent. Consequentialists differ from Kant in believing that only aggregate consequences of actions need be taken into account. Kant’s political theory is individualistic, while consequentialist theories are inevitably collectivist.) In an essay titled “Theory and Practice” (short for a much longer title), Kant gives an overview of his political theory. Once a civil state has been established to secure our rights, he says, No one can compel me to be happy in accordance with his conception of the welfare of others, for each may seek his happiness in whatever way he sees fit, so long as he does not infringe upon the freedom of others to pursue a similar end which can be reconciled with the freedom of everyone else within a general workable law — i.e. he must accord to others the same right as he enjoys himself. Kant, therefore, endorses the law of equal freedom, that everyone should have maximum freedom to pursue happiness consistent with the like freedom of everyone else, or what some libertarians have called the “Non-Aggression Principle.” This principle applies under government, not just in the state of nature. The only justification for coercion in his philosophy seems to be [is] the defense of self or others. The equal freedom of each subject in a civil state, Kant says, “is, however, perfectly consistent with the utmost inequality of the mass in the degree of its possessions, whether these take the form of physical or mental superiority over others, or of fortuitous external property and of particular rights (of which there may be many) with respect to others.” Kant is no Rawlsian; he is a classical liberal who realizes that liberty upsets patterns and should be preserved in spite of (or because of) that. In the same essay, Kant endorses Locke’s view of the social contract. A legitimate state with a right to rule can emerge only after unanimous consent to the initial contract. To do otherwise would be to violate the non-consenters’ rights. We now know that unanimous consent to the social contract has rarely occurred in human history, and so Kant’s strong theory of individual rights sets us up for a rejection of political authority. If we reject political authority, the largest state we can possibly justify is a minimal state, and, according to some, not even that. Kantian Liberalism Kant’s moral philosophy justifies extremely strong individual rights against coercion. The only justification for coercion in his philosophy seems to be the defense of self or others. His ideal government, therefore, seems to be extremely limited and to allow for the free play of citizens’ imaginations, enterprise, and experiments in living.

#### Prefer additionally –

#### 1] Actor spec – governments operate based on rights constitutive of all citizens – side constraints like constitutions and courts prove.

#### 2] Performativity – the only way we’re able to debate is because of free speech which is a right guaranteed by the state.

#### 3] Culpability – you can only have responsibility over your actions if you freely choose them – if I rob a bank that’s bad but if someone forces me at gunpoint it’s not.

#### Now negate –

#### 1] Specifically with hospital workers, an unconditional right to strike is immoral as it uses patients as a bargaining chip and thus as a means to an end.

Loewy 0, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

“Essential” Work and Strikes Healthcare professionals, garbage collectors, and other “essential” workers have a responsibility that is considered to be different from, say, the responsibilities of workers in a supermarket chain. There are almost certainly other supermarkets, but there is generally only one municipal garbage collection service**, one police force, and one fire department; and in general, only one healthcare system available to us. In the medical setting, furthermore, workers are much more apt to deal with identified lives**: they know their patients and often have known them for some time. Striking against their employer (even if it is done in part to benefit the patient) is **denying meaningful and often essential services to some of these identified lives**. We tend to relate differently with those lives we know and therefore call “identified” from those whom we consider “unidentified” or statistical lives, in part, because we have obligations as a result of relationships; in part because we fail to recognize that these so-called unidentified lives are not in fact unidentified but are merely not identified by us.4 When strikes are called by healthcare professionals, both types of lives are apt to be injured or, at least, severely inconvenienced. Except in the pocketbook, strikes in the healthcare setting generally do not directly hurt the employer. The employer **is hurt through the** **patient**. The patient thus becomes a **means toward the employees’ ends**, a football being kicked between two contending parties—**even if one of the employees’ goals is to serve the good of patients in general.** Theoretically, patients will then bring pressure on the employer (be it the government or a managed care organization), thus, quite frankly, using the patient as a means toward the ends of the health professionals.5 The dilemma, of course, is that without significantly inconveniencing or even endangering patients, no pressure is likely to be brought and, therefore, no amelioration of working conditions is effected. To be effective, a strike of healthcare professionals has to “hurt” patients and often patients known to the healthcare professionals.

#### 2] That specifically violates the categorical imperative.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is **a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society **is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions**. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society **is not seen as crucial** **and as an 'end'**, but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### 3] And those strikes violate the Kantian duty not to cause harm.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

In addition to the above, engaging in a labor strike demonstration is a gross violation of the **prima facie duty of the social worker**, nonmaleficence: **to not cause harm**, and display a commitment to the well-being of the client, organization as well as society. As Social Workers withdraw their labor, services are ceased, and automatic disruption occurs which can inflict serious harm on clients, organizational functioning as well as society. According to Mehta and Swell (2014), examples of the harm caused to clients and organizational functioning include severe and fatal delays in executing or developing timeous interventions **for at-risk clients,** miscommunication, and no service delivery. Moreover, by withdrawing their labor in a strike demonstration, ethical principles such as beneficence and social justice are also not adhered to as no acts of kindness, empathy is shown, and the most vulnerable members of society **will be impacted the most**.

# Case

### FW

#### Reject consequences – a] we can only observe the consequence of an action after it has occurred which means they can’t prescribe actions, b] the problem of induction precludes looking at consequences and undermines causality.

Vickers 14 [John Vickers, 2014, The Problem of Induction, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/]

The original problem of induction can be simply put. It concerns the support or justification of inductive methods; methods that predict or infer, in Hume's words, that “instances of which we have had no experience resemble those of which we have had experience” (THN, 89). Such methods are clearly essential in scientific reasoning as well as in the conduct of our everyday affairs. The problem is how to support or justify them and it leads to a dilemma: the principle cannot be proved deductively, for it is contingent, and only necessary truths can be proved deductively. Nor can it be supported inductively—by arguing that it has always or usually been reliable in the past—for that would beg the question by assuming just what is to be proved.

#### c] aggregation fails – pleasure and pain are incommunicable, since each person has their own scale of pain and we can’t experience each other’s feelings, d] resolvability – margin of errors make weighing impossible, only libertarianism solve by having a brightline for ethical violations, e] butterfly effect – actions have infinite cascading consequences which effect vast numbers of people,

#### Util collapses to rules which collapses to deontology, since calculus is infeasible.

Chappell on Mackie 5 “Indirect Utilitarianism” June 11 2005 Philosophy, et cetera <http://www.philosophyetc.net/2005/06/indirect-utilitarianism.html>

J.L. Mackie (p.91) offers six utilitarian reasons for opposing "the direct use of utilitarian calculation as a practical working morality": 1. Shortage of time and energy will in general preclude such calculations. 2. Even if time and energy are available, the relevant information commonly is not. 3. An agent's judgment on particular issues is likely to be distorted by his own interests and special affections. 4. Even if he were intellectually able to determine the right choice, weakness of will would be likely to impair his putting of it into effect. 5. Even decisions that are right in themselves and actions based on them are liable to be misused as precedents, so that they will encourage and seem to legitimate wrong actions that are superficially similar to them. 6. And, human nature being what it is, a practical working morality must not be too demanding: it is worse than useless to set standards so high that there is no real chance that actions will even approximate to them

#### Reject extinction first a] freezes action – every policy has a non-zero risk of causing extinction, b] It’s consequentialist – if we beat util, we beat extinction since it’s a consequence and we don’t look at them

### Contention

#### Teacher’s unions use strikes to stop school choice efforts

Sledge 3/26 Sledge, Hayley. “Unions Deploy Teacher Strikes to Stop School Choice.” The Heartland Institute, 26 Mar. 2021, [www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/unions-deploy-teacher-strikes-to-stop-school-choice](http://www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/unions-deploy-teacher-strikes-to-stop-school-choice).

**Teacher strikes in Chicago and Los Angeles were two of the largest union actions in 2019, among an increasing number of protests by educators in government schools that included demands for restrictions on charter schools. Charter schools, a form of school choice, are less-regulated public schools. Chicago teachers unions expressed their opposition to charter schools in 2019 by demanding the continuation of a moratorium on additional charter schools in the city. The charter moratorium caps charter enrollment over the life of the five-year contract that ended the two-week strike on October 31. Strikes advocating similar freezes on charter schools occurred in California, Ohio, and South Carolina in 2019. The strike actions have proliferated since teachers in West Virginia left work in February 2019 to protest an education reform bill that would have authorized the state’s first charter schools. The legislature did not pass the bill, but a compromise law that allows the creation of three charter schools by 2023 was signed into law by Gov. Jim Justice on June 28. Unions ‘Slinging Mud’ The strikes show teachers unions feel pressure from charter school competitors, says Larry Sand, president of the California Teachers Empowerment Network. “The teachers’ unions are threatened by any disruption to their education monopoly,” Sand said. “Instead of trying to compete with these schools of choice, the unions try to kill them off.” Teachers unions routinely slander charters and private schools, says Sand. “Private schools are almost never unionized, and only a very small percentage—about 11 percent—of charters are,” Sand said. “[Unions] demean charters by accusing them of ‘cherry-picking students’ or claim that private schools are racist. Both are untrue, but when you are desperate to win a battle, slinging mud is just part of the deal.” ‘Throwing a Tantrum’ Teacher strikes come at the cost of students, says Teresa Mull, a policy advisor on education issues to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Budget & Tax News. “In striking, teachers are basically throwing a tantrum and refusing to do the work they were hired to do ... and while they strike, who suffers? Innocent parents and children,” Mull said.**

#### Teacher’s unions also lobby against school choice

OCR 19 “Local News, Sports and Things to Do.” Orange County Register, [www.ocregister.com/?returnUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ocregister.com%2F2019%2F08%2F08%2Fteachers-union-spends-millions-to-stifle-school-choice-in-california%2F%3FclearUserState%3Dtrue](http://www.ocregister.com/?returnUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ocregister.com%2F2019%2F08%2F08%2Fteachers-union-spends-millions-to-stifle-school-choice-in-california%2F%3FclearUserState%3Dtrue).

**Teachers’ union spends millions to stifle school choice in California Members of the California Teachers Association and supporters marched to the Capitol as part of RedForEd Day of Action Wednesday, May 22, 2019, in Sacramento, Calif. (AP Photo/Rich Pedroncelli) Members of the California Teachers Association and supporters marched to the Capitol as part of RedForEd Day of Action Wednesday, May 22, 2019, in Sacramento, Calif. (AP Photo/Rich Pedroncelli) By THE EDITORIAL BOARD | opinion@scng.com | PUBLISHED: August 8, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. | UPDATED: August 8, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. Anyone who wonders about the importance of the United States Supreme Court’s Janus decision, which declared that unions can no longer force public-sector workers to pay dues, should heed the latest lobbying numbers released by the state of California. The California Teachers’ Association spent more than $1 million a month since April to influence lawmakers as it pushed bills aimed at cracking down on charter schools, according to a report this month in the Sacramento Bee. The union topped the list of the state’s biggest spenders on lobbying. Its money wasn’t directed toward improving the lot of public-school teachers, but toward crushing a bright spot in public education. Charter schools are publicly funded, but their success has been an embarrassment to the union. They are exempt from many union-backed administrative rules and often hire teachers who are not members of unions. But they’ve been particularly successful in low-income communities where traditional public schools are failing. In Janus, the justices ruled last year that workers should not be forced to pay dues to an organization that espouses views they might not support. The court revisited the 1977 Abood case, which declared that public employees may withhold the portion of their dues used for direct political activities. The plaintiffs in Janus argued, correctly, that even the collective bargaining-related dues that unions collect, known as agency fees, amount to a form of coerced support. But there was a secondary benefit to the decision. Giving union members a choice means that many of them will opt out of union membership. “Members and money are power in politics,” Stanford political science professor Terry Moe told The New York Times soon after the decision. “This will weaken the teachers unions nationwide as a political force.” If the CTA has fewer members and less of a war chest, it will presumably have less money and time to spend lobbying the Legislature to hobble charter schools or promote other causes. Janus backers argued that the decision could force unions to focus on bread-and-butter issues. RELATED ARTICLES FPPC opens door to taxpayer-funded elections Government unions’ campaign to undermine the First Amendment GOP’s anti-tech efforts will give Democrats new power Ensure access to public meetings in California Higher education is on an unsustainable path Obviously, the CTA — as the Bee story makes clear — has yet to scale back its political activities. But recent statistics suggest that many unions are losing members and even the unions themselves expect to cut their budgets over time. The jury still is out, but it would be good news for public employees, taxpayers and maybe even the unions themselves if union must focus more on improving their services and less time influencing the Legislature. This session, some anti-charter measures already have failed, but one major remaining bill would strip charter schools of the ability to appeal for support beyond the local school board. That’s crucial, because many school boards have anti-charter majorities because of local union political efforts. The CTA is so active this year because of election changes. Jerry Brown was a dependable charter supporter, but was replaced by Gov. Gavin Newsom, whose support is less certain. Democrats also enhanced their supermajorities. Instead of spending millions of dollars pushing anti-competitive measures that will hurt kids, the unions should focusing on improving the education at unionized public schools. There’s so much work to be done on that front. They’re unlikely to do that on their own, which is why Janus offers some hope for the future.**

#### School choice is key to improving education- robust meta analysis confirms

DeAngelis 18 DeAngelis, Corey A. “What Leads to Successful School Choice Programs? A Review of the Theories and Evidence.” Cato.org, Cato Institute, 2018, [www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2018/what-leads-successful-school-choice-programs-review-theories-evidence](http://www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2018/what-leads-successful-school-choice-programs-review-theories-evidence).

**There is substantial evidence that private choice programs have positive effects for students. A meta‐​analysis of 19 voucher experiments around the world indicates that private school choice improves student math and reading test scores (Shakeel, Anderson, and Wolf 2016). Out of 20 experimental evaluations of private school choice in the United States, only two find negative impacts on student math and reading test scores (Abdulkadiroglu, Pathak, and Walters 2015; Dynarski et al. 2017). One notable experiment (Wolf et al. 2013) shows that the D.C. voucher program increased the likelihood of high school graduation by 21 percentage points and one quasi‐​experiment (Cowen et al. 2013) finds that the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) increased high school graduation rates by 3 percentage points. While research of school choice effects on educational attainment is limited, a review of 12 studies suggests that private and public school choice has a positive effect on student attainment (Foreman 2017). A review of the experimental and quasi‐​experimental evidence finds that U.S. private school choice programs reduce criminal activity, increase civic engagement, and increase tolerance of others (DeAngelis 2017b). Another review of the evidence shows that seven out of eight voucher studies conclude that private school choice improves racial integration (Swanson 2017). Furthermore, Egalite’s (2013) review finds that 20 out of 21 empirical studies indicate that competitive pressures from school choice programs improve test scores for students who remain in traditional public schools. In addition, more than 20 evaluations (Forster 2016) have found that all of these benefits result in state (e.g., Costrell 2010, Spalding 2014, Trivitt and DeAngelis 2016) and district‐​level (Scafidi 2012) financial savings.**

### C2

#### Democracy will catastrophically delay action on climate change---authoritarianism is necessary to ensure rapid state-led transformation

Mann & Wainwright ’18 (Geoff, teaches political economy and economic geography at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Centre for Global Political Economy, Joel *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*, pp. 38-40, ME)

Relative to the institutional means currently available to capitalist liberal democracy and its sorry attempts at “consensus,” this trajectory has some distinct advantages with respect to atmospheric carbon concentration, notably in terms of the capacity to coordinate massive political-economic reconfiguration quickly and comprehensively. In light of our earlier question—how can we possibly realize the necessary emissions reductions?—it is this feature of Climate Mao that most recommends it. As the climate justice movement struggles to be heard, most campaigns in the global North are premised on an unspoken faith in a lop-sided, elite-biased, liberal proceduralism doomed to failure given the scale and scope of the changes required. If climate science is even half-right in its forecasts, the liberal model of democracy is at best too slow, at worst a devastating distraction. Climate Mao reflects the demand for rapid, revolutionary, state-led transformation today. Indeed, calls for variations on just such a regime abound on the Left. Mike Davis and Giovanni Arrighi have more or less sided with Climate Mao, sketching it as an alternative to capitalist Climate Leviathan.35 We might even interpret the renewal of enthusiasm for Maoist theory (including Alain Badiou’s version) as part of the prevailing crisis of ecological-political imagination.36 Minqi Li’s is arguably the best developed of this line of thought, and like Arrighi he locates the fulcrum of global climate history in China, arguing that Climate Mao offers the only way forward: [U]nless China takes serious and meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation of emissions reduction, there is little hope that global climate stabilization can be achieved. However, it is very unlikely that the [present] Chinese government will voluntarily take the necessary actions to reduce emissions. The sharp fall of economic growth that would be required is something that the Chinese government will not accept and cannot afford politically. Does this mean that humanity is doomed? That depends on the political struggle within China and in the world as a whole.37 Taking inspiration from Mao, Li says a new revolution in the Chinese revolution—a re-energization of the Maoist political tradition—could transform China and save humanity from doom. He does not claim this is likely; one need only consider China’s massive highway expansions, accelerated automobile consumption, and subsidized urban sprawl.38 But he is right that if an anticapitalist, planetary sovereign is to emerge that could change the world’s climate trajectory, it is most likely to emerge in China.

#### And climate change leads to extinction.

Strona 18 Giovanni, Flinders University, Bradshaw, Corey J. A., Scientific Reports, Science Daily, “Climate Change risks ‘extinction domino effect,’” https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/11/181129122506.htm

New research reveals the extinction of plant or animal species from extreme environmental change increases the risk of an [leads to] 'extinction domino effect' that could annihilate all life on Earth. This would be the worst-case scenario of what scientists call 'co-extinctions', where an organism dies out because it depends on another doomed species, with the findings published today in the journal Scientific Reports. Think of a plant's flower pollinated by only one species of bee -- if the bee becomes extinct, so too will the plant eventually. "Even the most resilient species will inevitably fall victim to the synergies among extinction drivers as extreme stresses drive ecosystems to collapse." says lead author Dr Giovanni Strona of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre based in Ispra in northern Italy. Researchers from Italy and Australia simulated 2,000 'virtual earths' linking animal and plant species. Using sophisticated modelling, they subjected the virtual earths to catastrophic environmental changes that ultimately annihilated all life. Examples of the kinds of catastrophes they simulated included runaway global warming, scenarios of 'nuclear winter' following the detonation of multiple atomic bombs, and a large asteroid impact. "What we were trying to test is whether the variable tolerances to extreme global heating or cooling by different species are enough to explain overall extinction rates," "But because all species are connected in the web of life, our paper demonstrates that even the most tolerant species ultimately succumb to extinction when the less-tolerant species on which they depend disappear." "Failing to take into account these co-extinctions therefore underestimates the rate and magnitude of the loss of entire species from events like climate change by up to 10 times," says co-author Professor Bradshaw of Flinders University in South Australia Professor Bradshaw and Dr Strona say that their virtual scenarios warn humanity not to underestimate the impact of co-extinctions. "Not taking into account this domino effect gives an unrealistic and exceedingly optimistic perspective about the impact of future climate change," warns Professor Bradshaw. It can be hard to imagine how the demise of a small animal or plant matters so much, but the authors argue that tracking species up to total annihilation demonstrates how the loss of one can amplify the effects of environmental change on the remainder. "Another really important discovery was that in the case of global warming in particular, the combination of intolerance to heat combined with co-extinctions mean that 5-6 degrees of average warming globally is enough to wipe out most life on the planet," says Dr Strona. Professor Bradshaw further warns that their work shows how climate warming creates extinction cascades in the worst possible way, when compared to random extinctions or even from the stresses arising from nuclear winter.