## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must defend the appropriation of outer space by PRIVATE ENTITIES is unjust. To clarify, they may not influence public entities.

#### Violation – Legal Precedent dictates that a Res Communis principle applies to Public Entities.

Oxford Reference. [Oxford Reference. “Res Communis.” <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100408305>] Justin

An area of territory that is not subject to legal title of any state. Examples would be the high seas (see Article 2 of the Geneva Convention on the High Seas and Article 89 of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea) and outer space (see UN General Assembly Resolutions 1962 (XVII), 1721 (XVI), and 1884 (XVIII). See common heritage of mankind principle.

#### Plan text in a vacuum is a useless guideline since words are contextually defined based on function – the only basis should be if the implementation of the plan as per their 1AC solvency evidence follows the topic's intent – anything else allows the 1AR to recontextualize what they defend forcing the 1NC to predict infinite spin since they're not tied to their evidence.

#### Standards

#### 1~ Precision—they justify doing away with random words because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution which decks predictability. Independent voter for jurisdiction—the judge can't vote aff if there wasn't a legitimate aff.

#### 2~ Limits—tangentially related affs are unpredictable and infinite because there's no stasis to the resolution—exacerbated by 195 governments and permutations. Two impacts: A~ Kills neg prep and ground because they can spike out of links by defending governments and create infinite prep burdens of unpredictable affs—exacerbated by infinite preround prep. B~ They inflate aff solvency by allowing a laundry list of external actions that private entities can't do like government mission, NASA operations, testing ASATs, and more because private entities are qualitatively different. That impossible to negate because generics are beaten by overpowered affs.

#### 3~ TVA – defend only private entities – solves your offense. Drop the debater to deter future abuse.

#### CI- A~ Reasonability is arbitrary since we don't know your BS meter until the 1AR which invites judge intervention B~ Collapses since it uses an offense/defense paradigm to win it

#### No RVIs/Impact turns- A~ Illogical- you don't win for being fair B~ Baiting- encourages baiting theory which proliferates abuse C~ Chilling effect- chills checking abuse for fear of the RVI D~ Exclusions inevitable- neg has burden of rejoinder which means we inevitably have to exclude parts of the aff.

## 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not specify a part of outer space where private entities appropriation is unjust

#### Violation: they spec mars

#### Limits: They can spec an infinite number of celestial bodies, every plan, each comet, and infinite permutations of them – explodes neg prep and makes it impossible to engage in the aff turns any 1ar clash standard.

#### TVA Solves- read a whole res aff with a mars advantage

## 3

#### Ethics must begin a priori and the meta-ethic is bindingness.

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which is self-justified.

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [2] Theory – Frameworks are topicality interps of the word ought so they should be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—a focus on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debate under my framework can easily be won without any prep since huge evidence files aren’t required.

#### [3] No 1AR Framework: It moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and exacerbates the AFF infinite prep time so I should be able to compensate by choosing. They justify substantive skews by shifting frame of offense.

#### Negate:

#### [1] A model of freedom mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

#### [2] Banning private space appropriation inhibits the sale and use of spacecraft and fuel- that’s a form of restricting the free economic choices of individuals

**Richman 12**, Sheldon. “The free market doesn’t need government regulation.” Reason, August 5, 2012. // AHS RG

Order grows from market forces. But where do **market forces** come from? They **are the result of human action. Individuals select ends and act to achieve them by adopting suitable means.** Since means are scarce and ends are abundant, **individuals economize in order to accomplish more rather than less.** And they always seek to exchange lower values for higher values (as they see them) and never the other way around. In a world of scarcity, tradeoffs are unavoidable, so one aims to trade up rather than down. (One’s trading partner does the same.) **The result of this**, along with other **features of human action**, and the world at large **is what we call market forces. But really, it is just men and women acting rationally in the world.**

## Case

#### Framing issue – if we win cap’s good, then capitalist’s use of technology is also good – any risk of our impacts is sufficient to hijack their tech offense

#### They can’t solve capitalism on earth – there is 0 aff evidence why res communism spills over to solve their impacts

#### Space is not to immediately be a separate realm from Earth – the people who operate FALC have vested interests on Earth which makes space intrinsically intertwined with the Earth’s political systems.

#### Economic data restricts biases, promotes critical thinking, and prevents flawed decision-making errors---rejecting economists plagues public discourse with innumeracy that results in worse outcomes.

Ip 17, \*Greg Ip is a Canadian-American journalist, currently the chief economics commentator for The Wall Street Journal. A native of Canada, Ip received a bachelor's degree in economics and journalism from Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario; (August 25th, 2017, “In Defense of the Dismal Science”, https://www.wsj.com/articles/in-defense-of-the-dismal-science-1503679118) Recut Jet

But such misjudgments don’t justify the charges leveled at economists. Take, for example, their inability to predict financial meltdowns. Crises almost by definition are unpredictable. In a recent essay, Ricardo Reis, an economist at the London School of Economics, argues that failing to foretell a financial crash is no more an indictment of economics than failing to predict when a patient will die is an indictment of medicine. Economists didn’t predict the financial crisis, Prof. Reis notes, but they did help to arrest it by applying theory and experience: “The economy did not die, and a Great Depression was avoided, in no small part due to the advances of economics over many decades.” Another caricature of economists is that they try to emulate physicists, fetishizing elegant, abstract mathematical models disconnected from economic reality. Paul Romer, the chief economist at the World Bank, derisively calls this approach “mathiness.” The critique is certainly fair in some corners of academia, but it is increasingly untrue of the profession as a whole. In 1963, roughly half the papers published in the top three American economics journals were theoretical, according to a tally by Daniel Hamermesh, now at Royal Holloway, University of London. By 2011, that figure had shrunk to 28%; the remainder were empirical papers based on public data, on data gathered by the authors or on experiments. Economic debates these days are won not by the best theory but by the best data: Statistics are more important than calculus. Economists are far more obsessed with measurement than with math. When public discourse is plagued by innumeracy, this capacity to count is no small thing. Economists are also instinctively skeptical of simple explanations. They are trained to look for equilibrium, which is another way of saying, “When you change one thing, how do other things respond? Where do things settle once all interactions have occurred?” Advocates for a higher minimum wage extol the benefits to workers. Economists ask: Will it change employers’ demand for workers who earn the minimum wage? Or what they pay workers who earn just above the minimum? Or the prices they charge, or how much market share they lose to companies that don’t face the higher minimum or how much they invest in automation? Does it reduce turnover and thus make workers more productive? Advocates of tariffs on imported steel focus on the benefit to domestic steelmakers and their workers. But economists ask: What happens to steel-consuming companies that now face higher prices, as well as to their workers and customers? Does penalizing imports boost the dollar and hurt U.S. exports? The more data economists collect, the better they can map such complex interactions. Seemingly simple questions seldom have simple answers. A higher minimum wage helps workers in some circumstances but hurts them in others. Tariffs help some workers but hurt many others. Global warming will do some economic harm, but not enough to justify banning fossil fuels. Sometimes, this attachment to numbers conveys a false precision. Critics say that the Congressional Budget Office overestimated how many people would get insurance under Obamacare and must therefore be overestimating how many will lose it if the law were to be replaced. But the CBO always warned that its estimates were highly uncertain; what no economists doubted, including those working in Mr. Trump’s administration, is that the number would be large. Economists could confidently predict that price controls would lead to shortages in Venezuela, though not how severe they would be. Non-economists see all this as hopeless equivocation, but it is actually the way that evidence drives science. Economists still have their ideological leanings, but data has helped to restrict these biases. Surveys of top academic economists by the University of Chicago show considerable agreement, even among liberals and conservatives. For example, the scholars almost all agree that fiscal stimulus reduced unemployment after the last recession and that trade with China benefits Americans by providing them with cheap goods. A study by Gordon Dahl and Roger Gordon of the University of California, San Diego, found that disagreement among economists was greatest where the empirical research was most sparse, as with the issue of whether natural-gas fracking helps U.S. exports. Though economics remains an imperfect science, it has come a long way in 200 years. Its greatest challenge today isn’t the quality of the analysis it supplies, but whether there is still sufficient demand for it.

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

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

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

#### Green tech is thriving

Smith 21 (Noah, was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University, “Clean-Tech Investment Isn't Just a Bubble This Time,” Bloomberg Opinion, 3/18/21, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-03-18/clean-tech-investment-isn-t-just-a-bubble-this-time>, ccm)

Green energy investment is hot again in the U.S. To some, the new boom will raise the specter of the clean-tech bust that followed a streak of exuberance a decade ago. But there are reasons to believe that this time the trend is no bubble or mirage.

In the late 2000s and early 2010s, there was an explosion of investment in clean technology — renewable energy, plus other technologies to reduce carbon emissions. At first the money came largely from venture capitalists, but then the federal government stepped in and began providing cheap loans and subsidies. Then in 2011, solar manufacturer Solyndra spectacularly failed, causing an immense political backlash. And that was only the most prominent failure; overall, investors lost about $25 billion when the sector crashed. Money dried up fast. For years, "clean tech" was a dirty word in venture capitalists’ conversations.

But the worm turns, and clean tech is back.

A venture fund led by billionaire philanthropist Bill Gates (in which Michael R. Bloomberg, founder of Bloomberg News, also invests) is committing billions of dollars. Funding for battery companies and electric-vehicle companies has skyrocketed. And investment in solar and wind energy dwarfs everything else.

This raises fear of another bubble for some — of history repeating itself. My colleague Liam Denning believes that the rapid rise in valuations is a clear indicator of overpricing, which he expects to collapse when interest rates rise. Others see investors repeating the mistakes of a decade ago.

I’m more optimistic. Although investors will certainly experience some ups and downs — already the Wilderhill Clean Energy Index has had a major correction since early February — I’m pretty confident that the clean-tech industry as a whole won’t experience the kind of bust it did last time.

The most basic reason is that the fundamental underlying technology has matured in a way it simply hadn’t a decade ago. In 2009, the levelized cost of solar photovoltaic electricity was $359 per megawatt-hour — more than four times as expensive as electricity from a natural gas plant. By 2019, solar PV had fallen in price to $40 per megawatt-hour, 28% cheaper than gas. That’s an 89% decline in 10 years, with more cost drops yet to come. Meanwhile, lithium-ion batteries have experienced a similar drop in prices.

That order-of-magnitude drop in costs makes all the difference. First of all, it means that solar and wind aren’t risky new technologies. Solyndra failed because it was trying to market an innovative new kind of solar cell, which ended up being too expensive when the tried-and-true design came down in cost. Future investments in solar won’t have to bet on any difficult technological breakthroughs. Batteries might be a different story — lots of money is being thrown at startups trying to create solid-state batteries, which would be a true breakthrough. But Tesla Inc. is doing just fine with the old kind, so that sector is probably going to do OK as well. Venture investing does well when it doesn’t have to bet on “hard tech”, and much of clean tech is no longer hard.

Second, cost drops in clean energy mean that success doesn’t depend on government intervention. In the earlier boom, fickle government subsidies were often necessary for capital-intensive energy companies to succeed. Now, even though President Joe Biden is planning a big push into clean-energy investment, the market is investing quite a lot in renewables all on its own.

Finally, investors have probably learned their lesson. Clean energy itself was never a good fit for venture. It’s capital intensive, since buying solar panels and wind turbines entails a lot of money up front; venture capital tends to focus on cheap, small investments that scale. And instead of companies creating highly differentiated products and new markets, as in software, clean electricity companies are basically all trying to provide the same commodified product.

This time around, venture capitalists are letting bigger investors handle the build out of solar and wind, and finding other niches where low-cost, differentiated startups can add value — such as solar services and financing, lab-grown meat and electric vehicles. Some of those bets are certainly going to fail, but that’s always the case in private equity. The success of Tesla — now with a market cap of almost $700 billion, or 28 times the amount that was lost in the clean-tech bust — demonstrates the time-honored principle that a few big hits can compensate for a lot of little failures.

In other words, clean tech is entering the final stage of the famous Gartner Hype Cycle — a pattern that describes the progression of emerging technologies and business models, starting with an innovation that sees expectations climb and then crash, before they finally rise again to sustained productivity.

#### Tech dematerialization secures sustainability.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### People use low-cost fuels instead of renewables.

George MONBIOT 9. Fellowship and Professorships, Oxford. “Is There Any Point in Fighting to Stave Off Industrial Apocalypse.” *Guardian*. August 17. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change>.

The problem we face is not that we have too little fossil fuel but too much. As oil declines, economies will switch to tar sands, shale gas and coal; as accessible coal declines they’ll switch to ultra-deep reserves (using underground gasification to exploit them) and methane clathrates. The same probably applies to almost all minerals: we will find them, but exploiting them will mean trashing an ever greater proportion of the world’s surface. We have enough non-renewable resources of all kinds to complete our wreckage of renewable resources: forests, soil, fish, fresh water, benign weather. Collapse will come one day, but not before we have pulled everything else down with us.¶ And even if there were an immediate economic cataclysm, it’s not clear that the result would be a decline in our capacity for destruction. In east Africa, for example, I’ve seen how, when supplies of paraffin or kerosene are disrupted, people don’t give up cooking; they cut down more trees. History shows us that wherever large-scale collapse has occurred, psychopaths take over. This is hardly conducive to the rational use of natural assets.

#### Capitalism solves war – its anti-imperialist.

Mousseau 19, Michael. "The end of war: How a robust marketplace and liberal hegemony are leading to perpetual world peace." International Security 44.1 (2019): 160-196. Props to DML for finding. (Professor in the School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs at the University of Central Florida)//Elmer

Is war becoming obsolete? There is wide agreement among scholars that war has been in sharp decline since the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945, even as there is little agreement as to its cause.1 Realists reject the idea that this trend will continue, citing states' concerns with the “security dilemma”: that is, in anarchy states must assume that any state that can attack will; therefore, power equals threat, and changes in relative power result in conflict and war.2 Discussing the rise of China, Graham Allison calls this condition “Thucydides's Trap,” a reference to the ancient Greek's claim that Sparta's fear of Athens' growing power led to the Peloponnesian War.3 This article argues that there is no Thucydides Trap in international politics. Rather, the world is moving rapidly toward permanent peace, possibly in our lifetime. Drawing on economic norms theory,4 I show that what sometimes appears to be a Thucydides Trap may instead be a function of factors strictly internal to states and that these factors vary among them. In brief, leaders of states with advanced market-oriented economies have foremost interests in the principle of self-determination for all states, large and small, as the foundation for a robust global marketplace. War among these states, even making preparations for war, is not possible, because they are in a natural alliance to preserve and protect the global order. In contrast, leaders of states with weak internal markets have little interest in the global marketplace; they pursue wealth not through commerce, but through wars of expansion and demands for tribute. For these states, power equals threat, and therefore they tend to balance against the power of all states. Fearing stronger states, however, minor powers with weak internal markets tend to constrain their expansionist inclinations and, for security reasons, bandwagon with the relatively benign market-oriented powers. I argue that this liberal global hierarchy is unwittingly but systematically buttressing states' embrace of market norms and values that, if left uninterrupted, is likely to culminate in permanent world peace, perhaps even something close to harmony. My argument challenges the realist assertion that great powers are engaged in a timeless competition over global leadership, because hegemony cannot exist among great powers with weak markets; these inherently expansionist states live in constant fear and therefore normally balance against the strongest state and its allies.5 Hegemony can exist only among market-oriented powers, because only they care about global order. Yet, there can be no competition for leadership among market powers, because they always agree with the goal of their strongest member (currently the United States) to preserve and protect the global order

#### Physical limits aren’t absolute---laundry list of warrants.

Bailey 18 [Ronald; February 16; B.A. in Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Is Degrowth the Only Way to Save the World?” https://reason.com/2018/02/16/is-degrowth-the-only-way-to-save-the-wor; RP]

Unless us folks in rich countries drastically reduce our material living standards and distribute most of what we have to people living in poor countries, the world will come to an end. Or at least that's the stark conclusion of a study published earlier this month in the journal Nature Sustainability. The researchers who wrote it, led by the Leeds University ecological economist Dan O'Neill, think the way to prevent the apocalypse is "degrowth."

Vice, pestilence, war, and "gigantic inevitable famine" were the planetary boundaries set on human population by the 18th-century economist Robert Thomas Malthus. The new study gussies up old-fashioned Malthusianism by devising a set of seven biophysical indicators of national environmental pressure, which they then link to 11 indicators of social outcomes. The aim of the exercise is to concoct a "safe and just space" for humanity.

Using data from 2011, the researchers calculate that the annual per capita boundaries for the world's 7 billion people consist of the emission of 1.6 tons of carbon dioxide per year and the annual consumption of 0.9 kilograms of phosphorus, 8.9 kilograms of nitrogen, 574 cubic meters of water, 2.6 tons of biomass (crops and wood), plus the ecological services of 1.7 hectares of land and 7.2 tons of material per person.

On the social side, meanwhile, the researchers say that life satisfaction in each country should exceed 6.5 on the 10-point Cantril scale, that healthy life expectancy should average at least 65 years, and that nutrition should be over 2,700 calories per day. At least 95 percent of each country's citizens must have access to good sanitation, earn more than $1.90 per day, and pass through secondary school. Ninety percent of citizens must have friends and family they can depend on. The threshold for democratic quality must exceed 0.8 on an index scale stretching from -1 to +1, while the threshold for equality is set at no higher than 70 on a Gini Index where 0 represents perfect equality and 100 implies perfect inequality. They set the threshold for percent of labor force employed at 94 percent.

So how does the U.S. do with regard to their biophysical boundaries and social outcomes measures? We Americans transgress all seven of the biophysical boundaries. Carbon dioxide emissions stand at 21.2 tons per person; we each use an average of 7 kilograms of phosphorus, 59.1 kilograms of nitrogen, 611 cubic meters of water, and 3.7 tons of biomass; we rely on the ecological services of 6.8 hectares of land and 27.2 tons of material. Although the researchers urge us to move "beyond the pursuit of GDP growth to embrace new measures of progress," it is worth noting that U.S. GDP is $59,609 per capita.

On the other hand, those transgressions have provided a pretty good life for Americans. For example, life satisfaction is 7.1; healthy life expectancy is 69.7 years; and democratic quality stands at 0.8 points. The only two social indicators we just missed on were employment (91 percent) and secondary education (94.7 percent).

On the other hand, our hemisphere is home to one paragon of sustainability—Haiti. Haitians breach none of the researchers' biophysical boundaries. But the Caribbean country performs abysmally on all 11 social indicators. Life satisfaction scores at 4.8; healthy life expectancy is 52.3 years; and Haitians average 2,105 calories per day. The country tallies -0.9 on the democratic quality index. Haiti's GDP is $719 per capita.

Other near-sustainability champions include Malawi, Nepal, Myanmar, and Nicaragua. All of them score dismally on the social indicators, and their GDPs per capita are $322, $799, $1,375, and $2,208, respectively.

The country that currently comes closest to the researchers' ideal of remaining within its biophysical boundaries while sufficient social indicators is…Vietnam. For the record, Vietnam's per capita GDP is $2,306.

"Countries with higher levels of life satisfaction and healthy life expectancy also tend to transgress more biophysical boundaries," the researchers note. A better way to put this relationship is that more wealth and technology tend to make people happier, healthier, and freer.

O'Neill and his unhappy team fail drastically to understand how human ingenuity unleashed in markets is already well on the way toward making their supposed planetary boundaries irrelevant. Take carbon dioxide emissions: Supporters of renewable energy technologies say that their costs are already or will soon be lower than those of fossil fuels. Boosters of advanced nuclear reactors similarly argue that they can supply all of the carbon-free energy the world will need. There's a good chance that fleets of battery-powered self-driving vehicles will largely replace private cars and mass transit later in this century.

Are we about to run out of phosphorous to fertilize our crops? Peak phosphorus is not at hand. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) reports that at current rates of mining, the world's known reserves will last 266 years. The estimated total resources of phosphate rock would last over 1,140 years. "There are no imminent shortages of phosphate rock," notes the USGS. With respect to the deleterious effects that using phosphorus to fertilize crops might have outside of farm fields, researchers are working on ways to endow crops with traits that enable them to use less while maintaining yields.

O'Neill and his colleagues are also concerned that farmers are using too much nitrogen fertilizer, which runs off fields into the natural environment and contributes to deoxygenated dead zones in the oceans, among other ill effects. This is a problem, but one that plant breeders are already working to solve. For example, researchers at Arcadia Biosciences have used biotechnology to create nitrogen-efficient varieties of staples like rice and wheat that enable farmers to increase yields while significantly reducing fertilizer use. Meanwhile, other researchers are moving on projects to engineer the nitrogen fixation trait from legumes into cereal crops. In other words, the crops would make their own fertilizer from air.

Water? Most water is devoted to the irrigation of crops; the ongoing development of drought-resistant and saline-tolerant crops will help with that. Hectares per capita? Humanity has probably already reached peak farmland, and nearly 400 million hectares will be restored to nature by 2060—an area almost double the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River. In fact, it is entirely possible that most animal farming will be replaced by resource-sparing lab-grown steaks, chops, and milk. Such developments in food production undermine the researchers' worries about overconsumption of biomass.

And humanity's material footprint is likely to get smaller too as trends toward further dematerialization take hold. The price system is a superb mechanism for encouraging innovators to find ways to wring ever more value out less and less stuff. Rockefeller University researcher Jesse Ausubel has shown that this process of absolute dematerialization has already taken off for many commodities.

After cranking their way through their models of doom, O'Neill and his colleagues lugubriously conclude: "If all people are to lead a good life within planetary boundaries, then the level of resource use associated with meeting basic needs must be dramatically reduced." They are right, but they are entirely backward with regard to how to achieve those goals. Economic growth provides the wealth and technologies needed to lift people from poverty while simultaneously lightening humanity's footprint on the natural world. Rather than degrowth, the planet—and especially its poor people—need more and faster economic growth.

#### Pandemics –

Jackson 16 Kerry Jackson 12-19-2016 “Free Market Policies Needed To Incentivize Creation Of New Life-Saving Treatments” <https://www.pacificresearch.org/article/free-market-policies-needed-to-incentivize-creation-of-new-life-saving-treatments/> (Researcher at the Pacific Research Institute)

“Our strongest antibiotics don’t work and patients are left with potentially untreatable infections,” Director Dr. Tom Frieden said when the CDC issued its warning. He asked doctors, hospitals and public health officials to “work together” to “stop these infections from spreading.” The 2014 Report to the President expressed a similar concern: “The evolution of antibiotic resistance is now occurring at an alarming rate and is outpacing the development of new countermeasures capable of thwarting infections in humans. This situation threatens patient care, economic growth, public health, agriculture, economic security and national security.” For those thinking this sort of thing shouldn’t be happening when medical science is more advanced than can almost be conceived, be assured that it is. And unless there are public policy interventions, it’s likely to get worse. “More and more microorganisms will continue to gain resistance to the current drug therapies because (antimicrobial resistance, or AMR) is basic evolution,” Wayne Winegarden writes in the Pacific Research Institute’s newly-released report “Incenting the Development of Antimicrobial Medicines to Address the Problem of Drug-Resistant Infections.” The International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers says the problem is caused by “a dearth of new antibiotic medicines.” At the same time that there’s been an increase in AMR, there has been “a sharp decline in the development of new antibiotic medicines.” The group reports that only two new classes of antibiotics have been discovered in the last three decades compared to 11 in the previous 50 years. The answers to many medical problems are still not within reach of researchers. But the hazards of AMR can be diminished. Winegarden suggests we begin with public health campaigns that encourage handwashing, which he calls a highly effective and low-cost way to reduce the spread of infection. He further recommends policy that would address the problem of antibiotic overuse and greater use of vaccines to cut the incidents of infection. But Winegarden’s primary concern is establishing the correct incentives for developing new antimicrobial medicines that would be effective against AMR microorganisms. He’s specifically referring to policies “based on a thorough understanding of the disincentives that are currently inhibiting their development.” “These disincentives are well-recognized,” he writes. “Despite the medical need, and despite the generally strong return on investment for many other drug classes, the return on investment for developing new antimicrobial medicines (particularly antibiotics) is too low.” Producing a new drug is a grinding and expensive endeavor. It can take 10 to 15 years to develop a single prescription drug that is introduced to the market, and a company can spend as much as $5.5 billion on research and development for each medication that is eventually approved and prescribed. Less than 2 percent of all projects launched to create new drugs succeed. This is not an environment in which pharmaceutical companies can get too amped up about pursuing new treatments. Yet new drug approvals increased over the last decade. Don’t look for a surge of antimicrobial drugs in that pipeline, though. Winegarden says that particular drug class is among several that “face unique impediments” that serve as disincentives for innovation. To overcome the steep hill that impedes the development of new AMR drugs, lawmakers must implement policies that unleash the incentives of the free market. Policymakers also should look at the 1983 federal Orphan Drug Act and its market-oriented reforms that increased the number of drugs developed to treat rare diseases. More than 400 have been introduced to the market since the law was enacted, compared to fewer than 10 in the 1970s. Put another way, government needs to remove its anchors from the process and let the market do what it does so well. In this case, that’s restoring patients’ health, enriching innovative companies that create jobs, and inspiring biotech start-ups such as the group of Stanford undergraduates that has been capitalized to develop new antibiotics. If the proper incentives are in place, the needed treatments will follow.

#### Calls for communism anywhere triggers far right backlash and increases extremism – answers Bastani 4

Karen Stenner and Jessica Stern, 2/11/21, Foreign Policy, "how to live with authoritarians," https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/02/11/capitol-insurrection-trump-authoritarianism-psychology-innate-fear-envy-change-diversity-populism/, mm

Even after the Jan. 6 insurrection at the U.S. Capitol, 60 percent of Republican and Republican-leaning voters still approved of Donald Trump's performance as president. Though this level of popular support baffles many Americans, it follows in the tails of an approval rating that while generally hovering around a modest 40 percent remained remarkably steady throughout Trump's blunderous presidency and near-constant assault on democratic norms and institutions. Knee-jerk Beltway attempts to explain away this loyal adherence tend to revert to suggestions that Trump supporters are uneducated or impoverished or both mostly angry at being 'left behind' by the new economy. Now, after a mob of Trump supporters quite literally laid siege to U.S. democracy, it's clear that there are more significant and enduring factors at play. Growing evidence suggests that Trumpism and right-wing populist movements like it must prompt a serious reckoning with vulnerabilities not just within the U.S. political system but within liberal democracy more generally. It may take years to arrive at a complete understanding of Trump's surprising mass appeal, but prior research and preliminary studies already suggest a more nuanced view of how authoritarians and malignant nationalists rise. Rather than tangible economic grievance, decades of cross-national empirical research show that feelings and perceptions of sociocultural threat are the principal drivers of surging authoritarian sentiment among the electorate and the demagoguery that rises up to service it. In a modern, multicultural society, certain citizens simply become overwhelmed by growing complexity and rapid change. These individuals fear a loss of their social order, status, and familiar way of life. Whether rational or not, this trepidation provokes intolerance of threats to the collective order, in which they are unusually invested. Trump's support, then, is derived in large part from those who believe he understands and speaks to these kinds of fears. This finding is not meant to excuse Trump, the overt racism of many of his supporters, nor the very real harm they have caused. It is simply derived from decades of research. About a third of the population in Western countries is predisposed to authoritarianism, which is about 50 percent heritable. Authoritarians have an inherent preference for oneness and sameness; they favor obedience and conformity and value strong leaders and social homogeneity over freedom and diversity. That diversity can take any form: whether based on racial or ethnic lines or moral and political difference. Authoritarianism is also associated with some cognitive limitations. Comparative data suggests that the United States may be somewhat overstocked with authoritarians, though they may simply be more easily identifiable in the country's high-arousal political environment. This predisposition to favor oneness and sameness exists on a spectrum, from very low to very high authoritarianism. Importantly, the predisposition which is stable and enduring but normally latent is activated and expressed when triggered by perceived political or social disorder. Once authoritarianism is understood in relation to suppressing difference especially in the face of threats to oneness and sameness a whole array of seemingly disparate Trumpian stances assume a more universal character: Whether in Washington or Warsaw, Western liberal democracy's ongoing struggle with populism is united by fear. People with innate authoritarian tendencies can be found on both the right and left of the political spectrum, although they are somewhat less common on the left. This leads us to a critical point: Authoritarianism is not the same as conservatism, although they are modestly correlated. Authoritarians' fundamental aversion to diversity complexity and variety is distinct from traditional conservatives' aversion to change which is more about novelty and uncertainty. When the status quo is a modern liberal democracy, traditional conservatives by nature ought to defend any established regime of institutions and laws designed to protect individual rights. Authoritarians, by contrast, can welcome vast social change and blithely overthrow established authorities and institutions if some charismatic strongman is promising them greater oneness and sameness on the other side of their revolution. This distinction may seem counterintuitive given the modern U.S. political system where erstwhile conservatism has largely become synonymous with Trumpism. But it also means that, under the right conditions, conservatives can be a liberal democracy's strongest bulwark against the dangers posed by authoritarian social movements. Still, the rapid demographic transformation of the United States likely provokes both authoritarians opposed to diversity and traditional conservatives averse to change. More nonwhite than white babies have been born in the country since 2013, and the United States will be majority nonwhite by 2043. In concert with the declining life expectancy of white American men, this trend away from a white majority has helped give rise to 'white genocide' and 'Great Replacement' conspiracy theories among white supremacists. Multiculturalism, changing gender norms, and rapid globalization can also provoke both groups some become overtly racist and anti-immigrant or enraged at the acceptance of LGBTQ rights and behaviors they view as morally deviant. Since classic authoritarian defensive stances are invoked to defend a whole regime of oneness and sameness, perceived threats in one domain can provoke defenses in other or all domains. For example, the strongest predictor of a Brexit 'leave' vote ostensibly rooted in racial and ethnic intolerance was support for the death penalty and for the public whipping of sex criminals. In a recent study[ by the Vanderbilt political scientist Larry Bartels, over half of Republicans agreed 'the traditional American way of life is disappearing so fast that we may have to use force to save it. 'More than 40 percent concurred that 'a time will come when patriotic Americans have to take the law into their own hands. 'But it's not just Republicans: Significant proportions of both Democrats and Republicans appear willing to endorse violence or violate democratic procedure to defend their values, especially where the president is concerned. A 2019 survey by political scientists at Louisiana State University and the University of Maryland found around18 percent of Democrats and 13 percent of Republicans thought violence would be justified if the opposing party won the 2020 election. In 2014, when Barack Obama was president and Republicans controlled Congress, 30 percent of Democrats supported the president closing Congress and governing without it 'when the country is facing very difficult times.' Still, Bartels's study reveals that the strongest predictor of anti-democratic attitudes among Republicans was not partisanship or political expediency; it was ethnic and racial antagonism. This vitriol was often explained as being rooted in concerns about the political power of immigrants, African Americans, and Latinos, as well as these groups' claims on government resources. An alternative explanation is that this grievance is partly a rationalization on the part of many white Americans and that their expressed racial antagonism is a product of and proxy for underlying authoritarian inclinations. All people have an innate bias toward those like themselves; studies confirm that humans are wired to be tribal. For authoritarians, this bias is greatly magnified. And when put under pressure or given leaders' approval, people may nurture and act on their biases against the 'other.' Prejudice evokes emotions like disgust, fear, pity, and envy but of all these, envy proves the most dangerous. An uptick in envy helps explain why violent hate crimes in the United States are on the rise. The social psychologist Michael Hogg of Claremont Graduate University has argued that dramatic social disruption can lead to highly aversive identity confusion, causing people to demarcate and identify with in-groups as opposed to people different from themselves. In these situations, he says, people may be drawn to extremist groups with exclusionary ideologies and 'strong, directive leadership.' Strongman authoritarians fit the bill. Some Trump supporters feel humiliated by rapid social change. Diana Mutz, a political scientist at the University of Pennsylvania, found that the most important driver of electoral support for Trump in 2016 was a perceived status threat among high-status groups, which she delineates as white people, Christians, and men. Specific anxieties included declining dominance as a percentage of the overall U.S. population, African Americans' perceived rising status, and insecurity about U.S. global economic power which collectively left them feeling 'under siege.' A recent poll by the Pew Research Center shows that voters' attitudes about gender and race are even more divided today than they were four years ago. All of this paints a grisly picture. But are there any relevant policy lessons for the Biden administration? Joe Biden's electoral victory rested in part on his ability to embrace change and diversity while also representing more traditional values. Now in office, he will need to walk a very fine line to avoid triggering destructive fears among those in the electorate predisposed to authoritarianism .In terms of policy, the Biden administration's emphasis on making permanent the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program seems a promising start, since it has overwhelming public support probably because undocumented immigrants who arrived as children and never knew another home feel more like 'us' than 'them.' It might also be very fruitful for the administration to promote, early on, an emotionally compelling narrative about the critical role played by (loyal, self-sacrificing) immigrant health care workers in saving American lives during the pandemic. But most importantly, those who are predisposed to favor freedom and diversity over authority and conformity must recognize that the authoritarian preference for oneness and sameness is largely innate and unlikely to change. A polyglot, multiethnic populace of mixed morals and lifestyles will almost inevitably prompt flare-ups of both racial antagonism and political or moral intolerance, activating a latent longing for obedience and conformity even autocratic rule that will continue to threaten democracies periodically. The new U.S. administration should promote equity and justice while avoiding a loud and provocative display of stances and messaging that unnecessarily aggravates authoritarians. The progressive policy agenda shouldn't be amended; it should simply be promoted more subtly. Given the ongoing threats of right-wing extremist violence, this may seem unreasonable, if not wholly untenable. But it is achievable if the Biden administration recognizes that even creating the mere feeling or appearance of oneness and sameness can be reassuring to authoritarians. Critically, authoritarian predispositions are not a problem that can just be educated away: In fact, liberal democracy's loud and showy celebration of freedom and diversity drives authoritarians not to the limits of their tolerance but to their intolerant extremes. For this reason, a strong rhetorical focus on a unified Americanness can play a vital role in reassuring and deactivating the innately intolerant.

#### Socialism fails and causes a reversion back to capitalism – empirics

Muravchik 19 (Joshua, distinguished fellow @ World Affairs Institute, adjunct professor @ Institute of World Politics, former fellow at the Foreign Policy Institute of Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, “Socialism Fails Every Time,” Wall Street Journal, 4/9/19, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/socialism-fails-every-time-11554851786>, ccm)

Self-described socialist Bernie Sanders has become a favorite of young voters by posing as an apostle of daring new ideas. Socialism, however, is anything but new. It’s hard to think of another idea that has been tried and failed as many times in as many ways or at a steeper price in human suffering.

The term “socialism” was coined by followers of Robert Owen (1771-1858), whom Karl Marx would label a “utopian socialist.” In 1825 Owen founded New Harmony, an Indiana commune, to demonstrate the superiority of what was first called the “social system.” The same year, Owen explained his experiment to a joint session of Congress attended by Supreme Court justices, President James Monroe and President-elect John Quincy Adams. Although Owen poured his fortune into it, New Harmony collapsed in disarray and recrimination within two years.

Owen’s son Robert Dale Owen salvaged the community by implementing what he called “a policy the very reverse” of socialism: “giving each respectable citizen every facility and encouragement to become (what every adult ought to be) a landed proprietor.”

Undeterred, others founded some 40 to 50 similar communes during the 19th century, and all collapsed quickly. New Harmony’s two years proved to be their median lifespan.

Based on the uniformly dismal results, the idea of socialism might have died a quiet death were it not for Marx (1818-83), who transformed socialism from an experiment—tried, tested and failed—into a prophecy, “the riddle of history solved.” Ironically, he called his vision “scientific socialism.”

Inspired by the dream of proletarian revolution overthrowing capitalist immiseration, socialist parties sprouted across Europe. Yet instead of growing poorer, workers in industrialized countries saw improvement in their living standards; and instead of disappearing, middle classes expanded—all disproving Marx.

It took Vladimir Lenin’s “vanguard” and the horrors of World War I to give socialism new life. In Russia, Lenin pioneered modern communism, which in the 20th century was imposed on 18 countries and one-third of mankind. Repression was justified by socialism’s purported economic benefits, but the actual trade-off entailed economic misery and the snuffing out of as many as 100 million lives.

Today Communist parties rule six countries. Most follow the lead of China, where the party redefined itself to include entrepreneurs. A 2012 Wall Street Journal report identified 160 people with an average net worth of more than $1 billion holding high government or party seats. No Chinese Bernie Sanders rails against them.

“Social democrats” and “democratic socialists” rejected Lenin’s methods. But their goals remained transformational. As British Labour Party leader Clement Attlee, who became prime minister in 1945, explained: “Our policy was not a reformed capitalism but progress toward a democratic socialism.” Labour sought to bring “main factors in the economic system”—including banks, mining and energy—under “public ownership and control.” Nationalization worked so badly, however, that Attlee soon beat a retreat and was voted out in 1951.

In 1981 Socialist François Mitterrand was elected president of France promising a clean “rupture” with capitalism. The results of his spending and nationalizations were so alarming that in 1982 Mitterrand reversed course and implemented austerity measures, which he dubbed “socialist rigor” to save face. “The aim is to bring about a real reconciliation between the left and the economy,” explained Socialist Party chief Lionel Jospin.

American socialists like Mr. Sanders, while often defending the likes of Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega, Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro, prefer to point to Scandinavia as a model. But Scandinavian social democrats learned to settle for dense social safety nets underwritten by remarkably free, capitalist economies. On the World Bank’s Ease of Doing Business scale, Denmark ranks third of 190 countries, Norway seventh and Sweden 12th.

Still other forms of socialism arose in the Third World. Encouraged by United Nations development experts, virtually all newly decolonized states adopted “African Socialism,” “Arab Socialism” or other variants. The result was years of economic stagnation until the successful models of East Asia began to reverse their thinking.

Successful socialism has been created in only one place on earth, the kibbutzim of Israel. They were democratic and egalitarian; sharing possessions, meals, even child rearing. But once the Jewish state was securely on its feet, kibbutzniks chose to switch to private enterprise. Socialism, they learned to their surprise, was not a happy way to live.

Socialism has failed everywhere it’s been tried—even where it succeeded. Surely today’s young people can create their own ideas and make their own mistakes rather than repeat those that darkened the times of their parents, grandparents and the generations before.