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### T

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a just government in which a right to strike ought to be recognized

#### ‘A’ is indefinite – means you have to prove the rez in a vacuum, not a particular instance

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

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation: they spec Germany

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – they justify arbitrarily doing away with words in the rez which decks ground and prep. Voter for jurisdiction since the judge can’t vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits – there are 195[[1]](#footnote-1) governments but other metrics means even more – explodes limits since there are tons of affs and combinations with different situations i.e. inherency in France is different from the US – there are no DAs that apply to every aff. Some examples are Hungary, EU, Kazakhstan, US, India, UK, Egypt, etc.

#### 3] TVA – read your advantage under a whole rez aff. Answers PICs – potential doesn’t justify actual abuse and lack of prep means cheaty word and process PICs.

#### Fairness is a voter and outweighs – debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention while encouraging a race to the bottom.

#### No RVIs – A] Logic – you don’t win for being fair, outweighs since arguments must be logical, B] Incentivizes baiting theory which proliferates abuse

#### NC theory first 1] They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] We have more speeches to norm over it 3] It was introduced first so it’s lexically prior.

#### DTA on 1AR shells – they can blow up blippy shells in the 2AR but I have to split time and can’t preempt the 2AR which causes intervention and makes it irresolvable so don’t stake the round on it

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that don’t get responded to

## 2

### DA

#### Euro inflation controlled now, but the aff accelerates union demands – creates a self-fulfilling spiral.

Arnold 10/1 [Martin; 10/1/21; Martin Arnold leads the Frankfurt bureau, while writing about the European Central Bank and the eurozone economy. He has worked for the FT since 1999 in roles including banking editor, deputy companies editor, private equity correspondent and Paris correspondent; “German workers strike for higher pay as eurozone inflation surges,” Financial Times, German workers strike for higher pay as eurozone inflation surges] Justin

Increasing numbers of German workers are demanding higher pay amid rising inflation, with some going on strike, causing economists to worry that widespread demands for higher wages could start a self-fulfilling inflationary spiral in Europe’s biggest economy. German inflation rose to a 29-year high of 4.1 per cent in September, while in the 19-countries that share the euro it accelerated to a 13-year high of 3.4 per cent, official data showed on Friday. Lifted by soaring energy prices, that is higher than the 3.3 per cent rate expected. Most economists believe euro area inflation will reach 4 per cent by the end of this year, twice the European Central Bank’s target, but then fade next year. That also remains the main message to date of ECB president Christine Lagarde. However, such forecasts could prove wrong if higher prices prompt widespread wage increases that send inflation higher still. In one example this week, workers at German motorhome maker Carthago went on strike over pay, demanding their share of the spoils from a surge in orders thanks to a pandemic-fuelled rise in “staycations”. “Inflation in Germany keeps going up,” said Frederic Striegler, an official at the country’s biggest union, IG Metall, explaining its demand for a 4.5 per cent pay increase and extra early retirement funds for wood and plastic workers at Carthago and other companies in the Baden-Württemberg region of southern Germany. “The motorhome industry has got so many orders and so much profits and employees just want a share of the cake,” said Striegler, adding that more strikes were planned in two weeks at makers of motorhomes and caravans, as well as furniture companies across the country. Unions are making similar pay demands for German workers in other areas, such as banking and in the public sector. This week, retailers and mail order companies in the Hesse region agreed to raise their workers’ pay by 3 per cent this year and a further 1.7 per cent in April next year. “The narrative that German wage settlements were well-behaved this year belongs to history,” said Carsten Brzeski, head of macro research at ING. “Latest announcements show that unions are going into upcoming negotiations with demands linked to current inflation numbers, not to inflation expectations.” Propelling inflation higher are rising energy costs and supply chain bottlenecks which have sent shipping costs soaring and left manufacturers short of everything from steel to semiconductors. On Wednesday, Lagarde said: “How long these bottlenecks will take to fade out is a question we are monitoring very closely and this is on our radar screen.” Another potentially inflationary factor is that unemployment continues to fall both in Germany and across Europe, and more companies are reporting labour shortages. The European Commission said the proportion of construction companies reporting that a lack of workers was limiting their activities hit a record 27 per cent in its latest survey. The German association of freight transport and logistics companies has warned of a shortage of more than 60,000 truck drivers, which it expects to increase by 15,000 a year as more drivers retire than are trained. However, the pay demands of German unions are still below the equivalent ones they were making before the pandemic hit, according to Allianz economist Katharina Utermöhl. who said: “We expect wage demands to remain in check for now.” Furthermore, the country’s Kurzarbeit furlough scheme supported the wages of just under 1m people in July, but it is due to be scaled back at the end of the year. Utermöhl said this meant “the labour market’s current record recovery pace is likely to hit a speed bump in the coming months”. As central bankers debate how “transitory” the latest surge in inflation will be, they are watching the progress of wage negotiations in Germany and elsewhere with particular interest. Lagarde has said the ECB would “look very attentively” at this, adding: “At the moment we are certainly not seeing any widespread contamination of those price increases into wages.”

#### Euro inflation goes global – multiplication effect and largest internal link

Sinn 21 [Hans-Werner; 3/24/21; Hans-Werner Sinn is professor of economics at the University of Munich. He was president of the Ifo Institute for Economic Research and serves on the German economy ministry’s advisory council; “Why is no one in Europe talking about dangers of rising inflation?” <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/mar/24/why-is-no-one-in-europe-talking-about-dangers-of-rising-inflation>] Justin

Moreover, today’s unprecedentedly large government bailout programmes will have powerful inflationary multiplier effects.

But the international debate has been strangely US-centric. Few people have yet considered the particular inflationary dangers that lurk in the eurozone, where the monetary base has risen in recent years to a much higher level than in the US, relative to annual economic output.

In January 2021, this ratio, known as the cash-holding coefficient in the economy, was 43% in the eurozone, almost double the 24% recorded in the US. By contrast, when the global financial crisis began in 2008, the figures were almost identical – 12% and 11%, respectively.

Since then, the monetary base in the eurozone has risen to about 3.5 times the level that was once sufficient for transactional purposes; in the US, it rose to double its previous level.

Accordingly, of the total central-bank monetary base of €5tn (£4.3tn) recorded by the European Central Bank (ECB) in January, close to three-quarters (72%), or €3.6tn, is a mere overhang of money that is not really needed for transactions.

#### Extinction.

McLennan 21 – Strategic Partners Marsh McLennan SK Group Zurich Insurance Group, Academic Advisers National University of Singapore Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, University of Pennsylvania, “The Global Risks Report 2021 16th Edition” “http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\_The\_Global\_Risks\_Report\_2021.pdf //Re-cut by Elmer

Forced to choose sides, governments may face **economic** or diplomatic **consequences**, as proxy disputes play out in control over economic or geographic resources. The deepening of geopolitical fault lines and the lack of viable middle power alternatives make it harder for countries to cultivate connective tissue with a diverse set of partner countries based on mutual values and maximizing efficiencies. Instead, networks will become thick in some directions and non-existent in others. The COVID-19 crisis has amplified this dynamic, as digital interactions represent a “huge loss in efficiency for diplomacy” compared with face-to-face discussions.23 With some **alliances weakening**, diplomatic relationships will become more unstable at points where superpower tectonic plates meet or withdraw. At the same time, without superpower referees or middle power enforcement, global **norms** may **no longer govern** state **behaviour**. Some governments will thus see the solidification of rival blocs as an opportunity to engage in regional posturing, which will have destabilizing effects.24 Across societies, domestic discord and **economic crises will** **increase** the risk of **autocracy**, **with corresponding** **censorship, surveillance**, restriction of movement and abrogation of rights.25 Economic crises will also amplify the **challenges for middle power**s as they navigate geopolitical competition. **ASEAN countries, for example, had offered a potential new manufacturing base as the United States and China decouple, but the pandemic has left these countries strapped for cash to invest in the necessary infrastructure and productive capacity.26** Economic fallout is pushing many countries to debt distress (see Chapter 1, Global Risks 2021). While G20 countries are supporting debt restructure for poorer nations,27 larger economies too may be at **risk of default** in the longer term;28 this would **leave them further stranded**—**and unable to exercise leadership—on the global stage**. Multilateral meltdown **Middle power weaknesses** will be **reinforced** in weakened institutions, which may translate to **more uncertainty and lagging progress on shared global challenges such as climate change**, **health, poverty reduction and technology governance**. In the absence of strong regulating institutions, **the Arctic and space represent new realms for** potential **conflict** as the superpowers and middle powers alike compete to extract resources and secure strategic advantage.29 If the global superpowers continue to accumulate economic, military and technological power in a zero-sum playing field, some middle powers could increasingly fall behind. Without cooperation nor access to important innovations, middle powers will struggle to define solutions to the world’s problems. In the long term, GRPS **respondents forecasted “w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction” **and “state collapse**” as the two top critical threats: in the absence of strong institutions or clear rules, clashes— such as those in **Nagorno-Karabakh or the Galwan Valley**—**may more frequently flare into** full-fledged **interstate conflicts**,30 which is particularly worrisome where unresolved tensions among nuclear powers are concerned. These conflicts may lead to state collapse, with weakened middle powers less willing or less able to step in to find a peaceful solution.

## 3

### PIC

#### CP Text - The Federal Republic of Germany ought to:

#### recognize an unconditional right of non-Air Traffic unions to strike.

#### make striking by all Air Traffic unions a federal crime and implement penalties modelled after New York City Taylor Law including two-for-one fines, lifetime bans from federal jobs, and jail time.

#### We’ll answer 1AC Leyton here—the PIC solves the aff—frame it through specificity—

#### The Counterplan shuts down Air Traffic Strikes.

Bauernschuster et Al 17, Stefan, Timo Hener, and Helmut Rainer. "When labor disputes bring cities to a standstill: The impact of public transit strikes on traffic, accidents, air pollution, and health." American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 9.1 (2017): 1-37. (Faculty of Business Administration and Economics, University of Passau, Innstra)//Elmer

New York City's **Taylor Law,** which was put into effect **in response to a transit strike** in 1966, represents an example of a particularly draconian measure. Under Section 210, the law **prohibits** any **strike or** other concerted **stoppage** 01 worn or slowdown by public employees (Division of Local Government Services 2009). Instead, it prescribes binding arbitration by a state agency to resolve bargaining deadlocks between unions and employers. **Violations** against the prohibition on strikes are **punishable with hefty penalties**. The fine for an individual worker is **twice** the striking employee's **salary** **for each** **day** the strike lasts. In addition, union leaders face **imprisonment**. Since its inception in 1967, the Taylor Law has generated a lot of controversy. To proponents, it was **successful in averting several potential transit strikes** that would have imposed significant costs on the city and its inhabitants (OECD 2007). Indeed, New York City has only seen two transit strikes over the past four decades—in 1980 and in 2005. In both cases, harsh monetary penalties were imposed on workers and unions. The 2005 transit strike additionally led to the imprisonment of a union leader, and saw the Transport Workers Union (TWU) filing a formal complaint with the ILO. Since then, the ILO has urged the United States government to restore the right of transit workers to strike, arguing that they do not provide essential services justifying a strike ban (Committee on Freedom of Association 2011, 775). So far, the Taylor Law has not been amended in this direction.

#### EU Air Traffic Strikes cause massive disruption – singular strikes can have ripple effects on international flights.

Xinhua 18 4-10-2018 "Germany faces air transport chaos as public sector strikes" <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-04/10/c_137100895.htm> //Elmer

FRANKFURT, April 10 (Xinhua) -- Warning **strikes across Germany began** early on Tuesday morning, **affecting** an estimated **90,000** passengers. Public sector workers across the country are demanding a pay rise of 6 percent, according to the local media. On Monday, public service union Ver.di announced that nationwide warning strikes would take place the following day. **Thousands of employees at airports and local transport companies stopped working** on Tuesday. An estimated 90,000 air passengers reportedly have been affected by **flight cancellations across the country**. German airline giant **Lufthansa** **cancelled** **more than 800 out of its 1,600 flights** scheduled for Tuesday. **Frankfurt Airport**, Germany's largest airport, has already **reported "considerable delays" and cancellations**. Aircraft handlers and the fire brigade stopped working at Frankfurt Airport in the morning. A spokesman for the hub's operator Fraport also said that flight safety control was affected. Major German labor union Ver.di leading the strike, which represents 2.3 million public workers in the country, is asking for a six percent pay increase for public service workers from state and local governments, with a minimum increase of 200 euros per month.

#### Empowered Unions is our Link – they take and endorse aggressive Strike Action.

France24 10 2-23-2010 "Air traffic controller strike to disrupt flights from French airports" <https://www.france24.com/en/20100223-air-traffic-controller-strike-disrupt-flights-french-airports> //Elmer

School holidays will likely be disrupted this week as a strike by air traffic controllers gets underway at French airports, the civil aviation authority has said. Five **air traffic unions** have **called for a strike to protest Europe’s single sky policy**. AFP - Travellers in Europe faced more misery on Tuesday as French air traffic controllers launched a five-day strike and British and German **airlines sought to head off threats of industrial action.** A quarter of flights from Paris Charles de Gaulle, a major international hub, were cancelled, along with around half out of Paris Orly, which mainly serves domestic routes and the French overseas territories. The strike also **disrupted flights due to pass through French air space from other hubs**, including Amsterdam, Brussels and Geneva, airlines and authorities said. Some French provincial airports were closed. Queues built up at Orly, but most passengers appeared resigned as flights flashed up "cancelled" on information screens. Air France vowed to fly all long-haul services during the strike, to last until Saturday morning. Dutch carrier KLM reported major delays on southbound flights from another of Europe's biggest airports, Amsterdam-Schiphol. Swiss International Air and Lufthansa also reported delays on flights due to overfly France. "I was supposed to leave at 8:20 am for Barcelona but my flight is cancelled," said Bruno Lacroix, 49, who turned up to Orly early but was told to come back and get a flight in the evening. "I'm crossing my fingers but I have no guarantee for the return flight on Friday." A spokeswoman for Europe's busiest airport, London Heathrow, said there was "no major impact on our operations" though some airlines were "consolidating flights," bundling passengers onto fewer departures. Four French unions called Tuesday's strike in order to protest against the planned merger of the Belgian, Dutch, French, German, Luxembourg and Swiss air traffic control networks. More widespread air chaos was prevented, or at least postponed, late on Monday, when German flag-carrier Lufthansa persuaded pilots to return to negotiations after only one day of a planned four-day stoppage. Lufthansa, which normally offers 1,800 flights daily, had scrubbed 800 as a preventive measure ahead of the strike. This special schedule was also in force on Tuesday. Lufthansa, Europe's biggest airline in terms of passenger numbers, said Tuesday it hoped to get services running normally by the end of the week as talks with unions started. "Our goal is to have the network running at 100 percent by Friday at the latest," airline spokesman Klaus Walther told ZDF television. The Cockpit **union** is **pressing for** a 6.4-percent **pay raise** but its main **demand** is that **pilots not lose their jobs** when Lufthansa begins to operate more flights using cheaper foreign affiliates. **British Airways** meanwhile **faced the threat of** a crippling **protest after cabin crew voted** by more than 80 percent **in favour of new strike action** **in** a long, bitter **dispute over working conditions** and a planned pay freeze. European **airlines have been fighting for survival** as they battle with the low-cost airlines poaching customers, soaring fuel costs and the worst global recession in decades. French air traffic controllers meanwhile fear the merger plans will end their protected role as French state employees, but the French aviation authority DGAC has insisted that its status will not be changed. France's national audit office gave a severe assessment of the air traffic control sector last month. It estimated controllers get 30 weeks' holiday a year, winning generous allowances because bosses fear disputes with them. The report hinted that the threat of a strike in the security-sensitive sector made bosses reluctant to crack down on the excessive leave system, which is defended by labour unions. Howard Wheeldon, an analyst at BGC Partners financial group in London, said Tuesday's strike was a symptom of "a bad industrial relations situation that seems evenly spread across Europe."

#### Strong Airline Industry key to global trade and the economy – strikes obliterate these benefits.

PWC 16, Pricewaterhouse Coopers. "Economic impact of air traffic control strikes in Europe." (2016). (PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP)//Elmer

2.2.1 The importance of connectivity The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) defines connectivity as an indicator of a network’s concentration and its ability to move passengers from their origin to their destination seamlessly22. **Air connectivity is key to economic growth**, in part because it **enables States to attract business investment and human capital**. An increase in air connectivity **also spurs tourism, which is vital to many countries’ economic prosperity**. There is a **range of evidence produced** by airline industry authorities and academics which **suggests** that **as aviation expands, productivity and hence GDP increases**.23 In 2013 PwC completed a **deep-dive analysis** into **how aviation connectivity** **contributes to** the UK’s economy. The study identified five channels through which aviation plays a “positive enabling role”: **trade** in services, trade in goods, tourism, **business investment and innovation**, and productivity. A key finding emerging from academic and industry studies is the **strong linkage that has been observed over the last 20 years between airline industry growth and GDP growth.** In addition, studies have found that **a 10 percent increase in business air usage, or air travel connectivity, leads to an increase in whole economy productivity of between 0.07 percent and 0.9 percent.24** This includes: x reducing air travel times, giving businesses greater efficiency of access to a wider marketplace; x facilitating oversight of far-flung operations and thereby helping control their risks; thus x enabling investment and human capital to flow more freely across borders and exploit comparative advantages. In particular, a 2006 Oxford Economics study highlights the statistical linkage between business air usage and the level of GDP – in technical terms the study found that business air usage and Total Factor Productivity have a robust co-integrating relationship. Their key result implies that, “other things equal, a 10% increase in business air usage could raise GDP by 0.6% in the long run”. The report also notes that the growth in air transport in the 10 years prior to 2006 “boosted long-run underlying productivity by 2.0% across the EU25.”25 Further evidence on the specific channels of impact of aviation on GDP is outlined in the literature review in Section 4.3 of this report. Air transport is an important enabler to achieving economic growth and development. **Air transport facilitates integration into the global economy** **and provides vital connectivity on a** national, regional, and **international scale**. World Bank In the context of this study, if an **air traffic control strike** **causes** a reduction in the ability for airlines to operate flights as scheduled, this reduces the number of passengers and shipments able to reach their desired destinations as planned. Both **cancelled and delayed flights** **obstruct trade and connectivity**. Furthermore, a **pattern of disruptions will create** **uncertainty and discourage businesses** and consumers **from activities** that require air travel, therefore **reducing trade and connectivity further**. Given the importance of the link between the whole economy productivity and the airline sector output, it is therefore crucial to incorporate this linkage directly into our economic modelling of the impact of ATC strikes.

#### Germany is key to Global Trade.

Sprich 19 Christoph Sprich 11-11-2019 "Germany in World Trade: A Clear Winner of Globalisation" <https://english.bdi.eu/article/news/germany-in-world-trade-a-clear-winner-of-globalisation/> (Senior Manager External Economic Policy)//Elmer

Germany as Trading Power **Germany** **has long known how to take advantage of the benefits of globalisation**. Today, exports of goods and services account for around half of the country’s value added. One in four jobs depends on exports; in industry, this is true for even more than every other job. Exports are not the only decisive factor here. As a manufacturing nation, Germany also heavily depends on inexpensive, high-quality imports. According to WTO data, around 25 percent of the value added in German exports in goods was directly attributable to foreign suppliers in 2015. **For years**, **Germany has ranked high on the list of top trading nations, placing third in 2018** (exports of goods and services taken together); **only China and the U**nited **S**tates **sold more globally**. The nation is also **one of the top three importing countries** after the United States and China. Germany could not maintain its position as a competitive exporter without **German industry being** **deeply integrated in reliable, international value chains**.

#### Collapse of Trade causes Hotspot Escalation – goes Nuclear.

Kampf 20 David Kampf 6-16-2020 “How COVID-19 Could Increase the Risk of War” <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28843/how-covid-19-could-increase-the-risk-of-war> (Senior PhD Fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies at The Fletcher School)//Elmer

But that overlooked the ways in which the risk of interstate war was already rising before COVID-19 began to spread. Civil wars were becoming more numerous, lasting longer and attracting more outside involvement, with dangerous consequences for stability in many regions of the world. And the global dynamics most commonly cited to explain the falling incidence of interstate war—democracy, economic prosperity, international cooperation and others—were being upended. If the spread of democracy kept the peace, then its global decline is unnerving. **If globalization and** economic **interdependence kept** the **peace, then** a looming global depression and the **rise of** nationalism and **protectionism are disconcerting**. If regional and global institutions kept the peace, then their degradation is unsettling. If the balance of nuclear weapons kept the peace, then growing risks of proliferation are disquieting. And if America’s preeminent power kept the peace, then its relative decline is troubling. Now, the pandemic, or more specifically the world’s reaction to it, is revealing the extent to which the factors holding major wars in check are withering. The idea that war between nations is a relic of the past no longer seems so convincing. The Pessimists Strike Back More than any other individual, it was cognitive scientist Steven Pinker who popularized the idea that we are living in the most peaceful moment in human history. Starting with his 2011 bestseller, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Pinker argued that the frequency, duration and lethality of wars between great powers have all decreased. In his 2019 book, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress,” he wrote that war “between the uniformed armies of two nation-states appears to be obsolescent. There have been no more than three in any year since 1945, none in most years since 1989, and none since the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.” Optimists like Pinker held that, rather than the world falling apart, as a quick glance at headline news might suggest, the opposite was true: Humanity was flourishing. More regions are characterized by peace; fewer mass killings are occurring; governance and the rule of law are improving; and people are richer, healthier, better educated and happier than ever before. In their book, “Clear and Present Safety: The World Has Never Been Better and Why That Matters to Americans,” Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko argued that the evidence is so overwhelming that it is difficult to argue against the idea that wars between great powers, and all other interstate wars, are becoming vanishingly rare. Even when wars do break out, they tend to be shorter and less deadly than they were in the past. John Mueller, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, also reasoned that the idea of war, like slavery and dueling before it, was in terminal decline, while Joshua Goldstein, an international relations researcher at American University, credited the United Nations and the rise of peacekeeping operations for helping win the “war on war.” But in recent years, a range of critics have begun to poke holes in these arguments. Tanisha M. Fazal, an international relations professor at the University of Minnesota, contends that the decline in war is overstated. Major advances in medicine, speedier evacuations of wounded soldiers from the field of battle and better armor have made war less fatal—but not necessarily less frequent. Fazal and Paul Poast, who is at the University of Chicago, further assert that the notion of war between great powers as a thing of the past is based on the assumption that all such conflicts resemble World War I and II—both are historical anomalies—and overlooks the actual wars fought between great powers since 1945, from the Korean War and the Vietnam War to proxy wars from Afghanistan to Ukraine. Meanwhile, Bear F. Braumoeller, an Ohio State political science professor, analyzed the same historical data on conflicts used by Pinker, Mueller and Goldstein, and found no general downward trend in either the initiation or deadliness of warfare over the past two centuries. What’s more, Braumoeller contends that the so-called “long peace”—the 75 years that have passed without systemic war since World War II—is far from invulnerable, and that wars are just as likely to escalate now as they used to be. Just because a major interstate war hasn’t happened for a long time, doesn’t mean it never will again. In all probability, it will. And by focusing solely on interstate wars, the optimists miss half the story, at least. Wars between states have declined, but civil wars never disappeared—and these **internal conflicts** **could easily escalate into regional or global wars**. The number of conflicts in the world reached its highest point since World War II in 2016, with 53 state-based armed conflicts in 37 countries. All but two of these conflicts were considered civil wars. To make matters worse, new studies have shown that civil wars are becoming longer, deadlier and harder to conclusively end, and that these internal conflicts are not really internal. Civil wars harm the economies and stability of neighboring countries, since armed groups, refugees, illicit goods and diseases all spill over borders. Some 10 million refugees have fled to other countries since 2012. The countries that now host them are more likely to experience war, which means states with huge refugee populations like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey face legitimate security challenges. Even after the threat of violence has diminished in refugees’ countries of origin, return migration can reignite conflicts, repeating the brutal cycle. A Yugoslav Federal Army tank. Perhaps most importantly, recent research indicates that civil wars increase the risk of interstate war, in large part because they are attracting more and more outside involvement. In a 2008 paper, researchers Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Idean Salehyan and Kenneth Schultz explained that, in addition to the spillover effects, two other factors in civil wars increase international tensions and could possibly provoke wider interstate wars: external interventions in support of rebel groups and regime attacks on insurgents across international borders. Immediately after the Cold War, none of the ongoing civil wars around the world were internationalized. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, there were 12 full-fledged civil wars in 1991—in Afghanistan, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and elsewhere—and foreign militaries were not active on the ground in any of them. Last year, by contrast, every single full-fledged civil war involved external military participants. This is due, in part, to the huge growth in U.S. military interventions abroad into civil conflicts, but it’s not only the Americans. All of today’s major wars are in essence proxy wars, pitting external rivals against one another. Conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya are best understood not as civil wars, but as international warzones, attracting meddlers including the United States, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, France and many others, which often intervene not to build peace, but to resolve conflicts in a way that is favorable to their own interests. These internationalized wars are more lethal, harder to resolve and possibly more likely to recur than civil wars that remain localized. It is not that difficult to imagine how these conflicts could spark wider international conflagrations. Wars, after all, can quickly spiral out of control. As Risks Increase, Deterrents Decline To make matters worse, most of the global trends that explained why interstate war had decreased in recent decades are now reversing. The theories that democracy, prosperity, cooperation and other factors kept the peace have been much debated—but if there was any truth to them, their reversals are likely to increase the chance of war, irrespective of how long the coronavirus pandemic lasts. Democracy is often considered a prophylactic for war. Fully democratic countries are less likely to experience civil war and rarely, if ever, go to war with other democracies—though, of course, they do still go to war against non-democracies. While this would be great news if democracy and pluralism were spreading, there have now been 14 consecutive years of global democratic decline, and there have been signs of additional authoritarian power grabs in countries like Hungary and Serbia during the pandemic. If democracy backslides far enough, internal conflicts and foreign aggression will become more likely. Other theories posit that **economic bonds between countries** have **limited wars** in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that **countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade**, **but war becomes** increasingly **possible when trade is predicted to fall.** If **globalization brought peace**, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike. The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade. This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945. Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world. It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right. Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. **Mistrust is growing**, and the **chance of an** unwanted **U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is** arguably as **high** as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis. The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North **Korea’s** **nuclear menace** **doesn’t get** even **more potent**. In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors. If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war. If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But **together**, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of **World War III** and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good. The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next **proxy wars** **could** soon **precipitate all-out international conflicts** if outsiders aren’t careful. **With** the **usual deterrents to conflict declining** around the world, **major wars could soon return**.

#### Any nuclear war causes extinction – ice age and famine.

Steven Starr 15 [Director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the [Physicians for Social Responsibility](http://www.psr.org/). He has worked with the Swiss, Chilean, and Swedish governments in support of their efforts at the United Nations to eliminate thousands of high-alert, launch-ready U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons; he maintains the website [Nuclear Darkness](http://www.nucleardarkness.org/). “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html>] TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create [a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food](http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/RobockToonSAD.pdf). Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout, produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

# Case

### FW

#### Impact calc – extinction outweighs:

#### A] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### B] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### C] Comes before value-to-life.

Tännsjö 11 (Torbjörn, the Kristian Claëson Professor of Practical Philosophy at Stockholm University, “Shalt Thou Sometimes Murder? On the Ethics of Killing,” <http://people.su.se/~jolso/HS-texter/shaltthou.pdf>) //BS 1-27-2018

\*\*Bracketed to avoid triggers

I suppose it is correct to say that, if Schopenhauer is right, if life is never worth living, then according to utilitarianism we should all [die] commit suicide and put an end to humanity. But this does not mean that, each of us should commit suicide. I commented on this in chapter two when I presented the idea that utilitarianism should be applied, not only to individual actions, but to collective actions as well.¶ It is a well-known fact that people rarely commit suicide. Some even claim that no one who is mentally sound commits suicide. Could that be taken as evidence for the claim that people live lives worth living? That would be rash. Many people are not utilitarians. They may avoid suicide because they believe that it is morally wrong to kill oneself. It is also a possibility that, even if people lead lives not worth living, they believe they do. And even if some may believe that their lives, up to now, have not been worth living, their future lives will be better. They may be mistaken about this. They may hold false expectations about the future.¶ From the point of view of evolutionary biology, it is natural to assume that people should rarely commit suicide. If we set old age to one side, it has poor survival value (of one’s genes) to kill oneself. So it should be expected that it is difficult for ordinary people to kill themselves. But then theories about cognitive dissonance, known from psychology, should warn us that we may come to believe that we live better lives than we do.¶ My strong belief is that most of us live lives worth living. However, I do believe that our lives are close to the point where they stop being worth living. But then it is at least not very far-fetched to think that they may be worth not living, after all. My assessment may be too optimistic.¶ Let us just for the sake of the argument assume that our lives are not worth living, and let us accept that, if this is so, we should all kill ourselves. As I noted above, this does not answer the question what we should do, each one of us. My conjecture is that we should not [die] commit suicide. The explanation is simple. If I [die] kill myself, many people will suffer. Here is a rough explanation of how this will happen: ¶ ... suicide “survivors” confront a complex array of feelings. Various forms of guilt are quite common, such as that arising from (a) the belief that one contributed to the suicidal person's anguish, or (b) the failure to recognize that anguish, or (c) the inability to prevent the suicidal act itself. Suicide also leads to rage, loneliness, and awareness of vulnerability in those left behind. Indeed, the sense that suicide is an essentially selfish act dominates many popular perceptions of suicide. ¶ The fact that all our lives lack meaning, if they do, does not mean that others will follow my example. They will go on with their lives and their false expectations — at least for a while devastated because of my suicide. But then I have an obligation, for their sake, to go on with my life. It is highly likely that, by committing suicide, I create more suffering (in their lives) than I avoid (in my life).

#### D] Mathematically outweighs.

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### The ROTB is to vote for the better debater – anything else is self serving, arbitrary, and unpredictable.

### Cap

#### Cap is good:

#### 1] 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).

#### 2] 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**.

#### 3] The alternative locks in warming – its Try-Or-Die.

**Klein** 8/31/**21**, Opinion Writer at the New York Times, former Founder of Vox, and author of “Why We’re Polarized” (Ezra, “Transcript: Ezra Klein Answers Listener Questions” from ‘The Ezra Klein Show’ podcast, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/31/podcasts/transcript-ezra-klein-ask-me-anything.html>, Accessed 09-1-2021)

But now let me talk about degrowth more in the terms of it is a direct political project, which is as an answer to climate change. I would cut this into a few pieces. Is degrowth necessary for addressing climate change? Is it the fastest way to address climate change? And is it desirable? It has to be at least one of those things to be the strategy you’d want to take. And I don’t think it is. Let’s start with necessary. Many countries in Europe, even the United States, are **growing while reducing their carbon footprint**. Now, you could say they’re not doing so fast enough depending on the country. But they could all do so much faster if there was enough political will to deploy more renewable technology, to tax carbon, to do a bunch of things that we have not been able to pass. So it is clearly true that we **can decouple growth and energy usage**. Hickel, to be fair, will say that that may be true. But given the speed at which we need to act, we can’t just be deploying renewable energy technology. It would also help the situation if we stopped using as much through material consumption. That is, I think, conceptually true and politically false. I mean, let’s just state that **speed** is, first and foremost, a **political problem**. There is a delta between where we are right now in terms of what we are doing on climate change and where we could be. That delta is big, and that delta gets bigger every year because it gets harder every year. And the time we have to act before we start getting some of the really truly catastrophic feedback loops in play is **shortening**. So you’re now talking here about the speed at which you can move politics. So for something to be faster, it doesn’t just need to be faster if you implemented it. It needs to be something you can implement such it **accelerates the politics** of radical climate action. And that’s where I think **degrowth** completely **falls apart**. And I have tried to look for the answer people give on this, and I’ve never found one that is convincing.

#### 4] 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.

#### 5] 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

#### 8] Yes Transition Wars and they cause Extinction

Nyquist 5 J.R. Nyquist 2-4-2005 “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash” [www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html](http://www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html) (renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations)//Elmer

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of **anti-capitalist** majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the **U**nited **S**tates from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would **catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion** people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold **millions would die of starvation**. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be **waged with mass destruction weapons** and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs.

#### Reject Robinson – they highlighted three lines of the card with no warrants why capitalism causes any of the impacts – hold the line on the 1AR. No mention of extinction and you should gut check the warrants for how it causes extinction.

### Climate Strikes

#### 1] THERE IS NOT AN IL FOR THIS ADVANTAGE- zero evidence on how an unconditional RTS expands trade unions or why workers will strike now

#### Germany is investing in global climate initiatives now

IADB 11/2 “Germany, IDB Create $20 Million Fund to Strengthen Green Fiscal Policies.” IADB, 2 Nov. 2021, https://www.iadb.org/en/news/germany-idb-create-20-million-fund-strengthen-green-fiscal-policies. //sid

The government of Germany and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) launched today a $20 million (EU17.5 million) fund to strengthen green fiscal policies in Latin America and the Caribbean.   
  
The trust fund will finance country-specific technical assistance projects. It will also help create a regional knowledge-sharing platform for finance ministries to exchange best practices in the design and implementation of climate-related fiscal policies.

#### 3] Climate activism creates counter-mobilization by the far right, and workers protest green jobs- Strake reads blue

Bergfeld 19 (Mark Bergfeld is the Director of Property Services & UNICARE at UNI Global Union - Europa. He is a PhD student at Queen Mary University of London. He researches immigration, trade unions and new forms of worker organisation.), “German Unions Are Waking up to the Climate Disaster”, Jacobin Magazine, 8-16-19, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2019/08/german-unions-climate-environment-fridays-for-future/Recut> SJKS

**Germany has an especially deep-seated history of ecological mobilization**, with even radical campaigns enjoying wide popular support. Its environmental movement has historically been characterized by a strong anti-authoritarian current — indeed, in the 1970s and 1980s, the movement to halt nuclear-waste transports used forms of civil disobedience associated with the US civil rights struggle. Unlike in many other countries, these movements are not on the fringes of politics but are deeply rooted in neighborhoods and communities. **Yet whatever the strength of climate activism, labor unions have traditionally remained aloof from green struggles**. But now, riding the wave driven by the Fridays for Future movement, organized labor is beginning to adopt the call for the green transition as its own. Jobs First? There’s plenty of obstacles to such a conversion. In recent years, civil-disobedience climate activists have focused their attention on shutting down two open-cast lignite coal mines, one in the Rhineland and the other in Lausitz in the former East Germany. Lignite coal is one of the least efficient and dirtiest energy sources, but a key job creator in both regions. This has sparked repeated clashes between members of the chemical and miners’ union — the IG BCE — and the activists who came to the Rhineland to occupy the Hambach Forest and the open-cast mine. The IG BCE’s general secretary, Michael Vassiliades, insisted on the need to put jobs first and think about environmental issues second — guaranteeing conflict between labor and climate activists. This stance matched the IG BCE union’s record participating in the German government commission to phase out lignite — a slow process that actually sets the country in contradiction with the Paris climate agreement. For now, all stakeholders, including the unions, agree that coal production should stop by 2038, yet IG BCE’s focus on jobs alone has isolated it from any notion of “climate justice.” Certainly, there are reasons for concern — the renewable energy sector (both wind and solar) is notoriously anti-union, in contrast with the social dialogue and partnership engrained in older forms of production. Yet the risk is that precisely this blindness to green issues will allow employers alone to assume the mantle of directing the ecological transition. Not all of organized labor remains mired in such a purely defensive position. Following Fridays for Future’s demand to shut down coal production by 2030, the ver.di services union’s general secretary, Frank Bsirske, stated that the phaseout should be hastened as far as possible. This call has sparked a mobilization by the far-right Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), which has opportunistically attacked Bsirske as anti-industry and wanting to harm the German worker. Nor have Bsirske’s comments endeared him to all unions. During activists’ “Ende Gelände” climate camp, the youth wing of the IG BCE camped out to demand job security and the continuation of the open-cast mine. Out of the Rut As we see, Germany’s green consciousness, the rising fortunes of the Green Party, and the prevalence of Bioläden stores selling ecologically friendly food do not necessarily translate into unions taking more progressive stances on climate issues. If anything, the radicalism of the climate activist milieu, as well as the corporatism of “jobs first” trade unionism, has created a deeper rift between labor and environmental groups than exists in other countries. However, the climate strike on September 20 promises to begin to overcome the diffidence between unions and environmental groups. While German labor law does not permit political strikes of any kind, Fridays for Future’s climate strikes have already struck a chord with trade unions in both manufacturing and services industries. And **they’re beginning to mobilize**. In June, Germany’s largest union, the IG Metall, organized a demonstration to demand a fair and ecological transition. The wider crisis of the German car industry, concentrated in the scandal over Volkswagen faking its emissions figures, has highlighted the particular ills of the auto sector. Given the close relations between industrial manufacturing unions, German companies listed on the DAX stock exchange, and the German state, this demonstration could represent a step forward for a convergence between unions and environmental groups. This labor-green alliance is particularly necessary given that climate change, as well as new technological developments, are going to force German auto factories to switch to producing e-cars or different vehicles altogether. Organizing this demonstration, IG Metall chartered ten trains and eight hundred buses to fill the streets of Berlin with tens of thousands of metalworkers. This represented a significant step for the union and its engagement with the green transition. While no representative from Fridays for Future addressed the demonstration, it is unthinkable that it could even have happened without the ongoing Fridays for Future mobilizations. At the time of writing, the IG Metall is still discussing whether to support the September 20 climate strike. More promising are developments in the transport sector, where railworkers’ union EVG has advertised its own members’ presence on the Fridays for Future demonstrations as well as its support for the movement’s goals. This should not come as a surprise given the movement’s demands for better and more accessible public transport. The next step is for this self-interested solidarity to also translate into conductors and other staff bringing trains to a halt for the Earth Strike. But the unions quickest and most vocal in aligning themselves with the burgeoning climate strike movement and the strike call are those in the services sector. Here, the relationship between employers, the state, and unions is not so defined by corporatism, and workers do not need to fear job loss to the same extent. Last week, Bsirske argued that ver.di members should follow Greta Thunberg’s call and join the September 20 strike. Ver.di’s Twitter account shows Bsirske saying, “Whoever can do so should clock out and go out on the streets. I will definitely go.” Luisa Neubauer, one of Germany’s most prominent young climate strikers, termed Bsirske’s call “an infinitely important step,” showing that the climate strikers are taking note of the power of organized labor. Ver.di is not directly calling its members out on strike. But the union is encouraging members to collectively take a day off to support the movement or organize an “active lunch break” — a lunchtime assembly outside of their workplaces. This could be a useful way to engage union members and other workers in the fight for the planet and at the same time raise the profile of the Earth Strike. Given that a recent rank-and-file-led petition on climate change gathered more than 46,000 signatures, it appears that service workers in both the public and private sectors could begin to move into action. Unlike in the United States, where teachers have been at the forefront of building social-movement unionism and striking across right-to-work states, German teachers are civil servants and thus do not have the right to strike. While they cannot walk out, the education union GEW has, however, backed the students in doing so. The union’s executive member for schools, Ilka Hoffmann, has publicly supported the strike but also criticized it for not doing enough to emphasize the issues of labor exploitation and social justice that relate to workers. The North Rhine–Westphalian section of the GEW has also decisively argued for a stop to reprisals against students who take strike action, though it remains unclear what forms of action educators will themselves be taking in the Earth Strike week. The strike also looks set to affect the construction sector. Germany’s largest construction and property services union, the IG BAU — which coincidentally has the word “umwelt” (environment) in its name — has called on its members on building sites to join the climate strike. It demands that Germany reduces its CO2 emissions by 40 percent by 2020. **German labor law forbids workers from taking political strike action.** The IG BAU is thus pressuring employers to give their employees the opportunity to participate in the Fridays for Future demonstrations. This intelligent move plays the ball back into the employers’ court, forcing them to show how far their proud identification with “corporate social responsibility” and “green workplace” initiatives really goes. Such a move to pressure employers to shut down could give the Earth Strike an entirely different dimension. Making Transition Reality If unions are going to marry the green transition to the defense of workers’ interests, they need to think hard about how they can use their institutional and organizational power at the workplace and sectoral **level. After all, 53 percent of workers and employees are still covered by collective agreements, giving many unions a great deal of leverage in shaping the labor market.** Those enjoying such a strategic position could use it to demand upskilling for workers in key industries that have no future in a carbon-neutral economy, enshrine new health and safety regulations that could **contribute to a decrease in carbon emissions, and force employers to change the way goods are produced and services are provided.** Among others, unions could use their collective agreements to move toward a four-day week, which would also reduce CO2 emissions.

#### 4] 1AC Fisher and Nasrin is in the context of school strikes- those are not workers- the aff doesn’t scale up nor solve

#### 7] GERMAN UNIONS INCREASE SUPPORT FOR RIGHT WING POPULISM, POPULIST PARTIES PREY ON PERCEIVED ECONOMIC ANXIETIES CAUSED BY CLIMATE CHANGE LEGISLATION AND MIGRATION

Richard Detje 19 (member of WISSENTransfer, a scientific association for the analysis of capitalism and social policy, and an editor of the journal Sozialismus) and Dieter Sauer, 3/11/2019, Why are German Workers Turning Right? <https://tribunemag.co.uk/2019/11/the-far-right-at-work>

On 1 September right-wing populist party Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) achieved stunning second place finishes in two former East German regions, Brandenburg, and Saxony. Its 23.5 percent of the vote in the former and 27.5 percent in the latter marked a significant breakthrough two years after the AfD had become the largest opposition party in the national parliament or Bundestag. In late October they repeated the feat, finishing second in the east German region of Thuringia with 24 percent of the vote. This result was more than double the vote share they had achieved on the previous occasion. **Over seventy years after the defeat of Nazism, the rise of the AfD has sent shockwaves through the German political system. What’s more, their success owes significantly to support from parts of the working class. The AfD received a disproportionate number of votes from trade unionists in the 2017 federal election** (15 per cent, compared to 12.6 per cent overall); **in the eastern states the party even managed to win 22 per cent of trade union votes. This led the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, one of Germany’s leading newspapers, to ask whether a new right-wing workers’ movement was emerging.** But what is behind this lurch to the right among workers? To answer this question we set about investigating workers’ responses to the 2008 economic crash, which provides the backdrop to the rise of the populist right across the West. Since 2010, with the help of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, we have mapped the changes in German workers’ attitudes to crisis, politics, and the far-right. During this time, we encountered a striking contrast between the picture of a successful German economy — one that triumphed as global export leader until early 2019 and pushed unemployment in the domestic market to under 5 per cent — and how it was perceived by its workers. **Workers and Crisis** In our research we found a different perception of the crisis among workers than is generally portrayed in public discourse. Workers did not see 2008 as conjunctural but rather as something that was ongoing. ‘There’s always crisis’ was the dominant opinion, with the crash just another phase in a seemingly endless cycle of pressure on working conditions, demands for flexibility, and performance testing. For workers, ‘crisis’ was experienced in the workplace as permanent restructuring, as well as questioning of qualifications, experience, and professional status. Anger emerged from this among a segment of the workforce, but it remained without a defined target — meaning it did not lead to widespread protest or resistance. Furthermore, the demands raised by the workers were increasingly difficult to address in a finance-driven market economy. Germany overcame the financial crisis relatively rapidly, leading many in the trade unions to expect that successful crisis corporatism would lead to stronger representation of workers’ interests in the political field. However, we noticed no such development. In fact, the ‘crisis of representation’ continued unbroken. The state was perceived to be captured by political and economic elites and the delegitimisation of the organs of institutional politics continued apace. This became a breeding ground for the extreme right’s anti-establishment criticisms. But if the immediate aftermath of the economic crash saw systemic obstruction and political locking out of criticism and anger, this period was broken by the so-called ‘refugee crisis’ in autumn 2015. The refugees and asylum applicants who had made it to Germany became a target of popular anger, planes for the projection of rage and perceived helplessness, while the rightward-turning AfD positioned itself to speak for popular anger against a political establishment that many felt had locked them out. This marked a turning point in the history of post-war Germany. Populism and the Workplace Although migration is not the cause, it functioned as a catalyst for increased everyday racism and prejudice. Since the refugee crisis’, right-wing orientations on social questions are now more openly expressed. Migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers came to be perceived by some workers as messengers of misfortune on the one hand, a mirror of our own social vulnerability, as well as representing a social bottom above which they can still raise themselves. This is where the particularities of right-wing populism come into play. Alongside and sometimes instead of situating social disputes on a vertical axis — between ‘above’ and ‘below’, or, in class terms, between capital and labour — populism tends to construct a horizontal politics of ‘us’ against ‘the others’. In the hands of right-wing populists the vacuous notion of ‘us’ is redefined along national and ethnic lines. The AfD’s electoral successes have had the effect of normalising right-wing prejudice. Trade union opposition to this is criticised by some parts of the workforce, arguing that the AfD ought to be treated as a party ‘like any other’. The line of demarcation vis-à-vis ultimately anti-democratic politics has, unfortunately, grown increasingly blurred. The multi-ethnic composition of workforces can partially function as a ‘firewall’ against everyday racism. According to our survey, however, this only works where workplace integration has been successfully practiced against ethnic division over a longer time. We also observed a reconstitution in worldviews, forms of living, and political outlooks among migrants during this period. It would be wrong to deny that right-wing activists have a sense for processes of workplace transformation. They often appear as those ‘taking care’ of the ‘minor everyday concerns’, combined with the criticism that works councils and trade unions no longer operate in the interests of workers but as mediators between workers and management at best, more oriented towards the latter in terms of appearance and experience. **Climate change provides a useful example of how the populist right are weaponising perceived left-wing causes against the trade union movement. The AfD regard climate change as ‘fake’, and advocate for maintaining production of fossil fuel engines as a contribution to securing the employment of automobile workers, as well as the continuation of anthracite mining in western Germany and lignite mining in the east. For some workers, that approach by the AfD offers an illusory promise of security against the politics of the social-ecological transformation advocated by the left and liberal parties, and the unions themselves. Seeds of Discord** Capitalism and its crises were a constant presence in the answers of the workers we surveyed. A central finding of our investigation is the conclusion that contradictions are intensifying in the world of work. ‘There’s always crisis,’ people said, ‘but it’s getting worse’. The dimensions are multi-faceted, ranging from anxiety over how long a worker’s job might be safe, growing unrest about accelerated flexibilisation, a constant mix of out- and insourcing, the ongoing unbounding of work, working hours and conditions, and the extension of a wide belt of precarious employment around no-longer-secure core workforces. Rising pressure to perform is almost always at the forefront of problem descriptions. New processes of transformation (digitisation, decarbonisation, new transnational value chains) have added to older experiences of rationalisation and restriction to raise the tempo of change and expand insecurity. This also applies to more qualified workers, for whom market-driven self-direction and promises of autonomy mutate into losses of control. A triad of losses of control, recognition, and prospects devalues trade union-based solidarity. This occurs at a time in which — inversely — the workplace system of order tends to be coming apart at the seams. Capitalism as an incentive system is based on a promise: whoever performs their work well and effectively, and qualifies themselves for it through education and training, receives a promise of (relative) prosperity and security. And, if things go well, this is followed by upward social mobility. This was the foundation of every corporatist policy. Our experience is that workers feel that promises of security have vanished in a regime of unpredictability. Workers report that now only ‘raw numbers’ matter, people and their labour are written off. Where even continuous self-optimisation no longer promises to secure advancement, one risks slipping into downward mobility. **The Far-Right Challenge for the Unions** Unlike Germany’s discredited political parties, trade unions can still claim a degree of legitimacy in the country. In their political orientation and decisions, the trade unions have positioned themselves clearly against right-wing populism. Nevertheless, they face significant challenges in the practical fight. **Ever since right-wing populism ceased ‘hiding behind the curtains’ in the workplace, it has developed new tools to advance its politics. This emergence from the shadows has changed the relationship between right-wing populism and the trade unions. Trade union and right-wing populist activism are no longer mutually exclusive. AfD supporters can receive support from their fellow workers and have that reflected in union positions. Today, one sometimes encounters colleagues who are engaged in trade union representation as well as being active politically for the AfD. This blows up the two predominant union logics: that of unions representing workers’ interests without politics, and that of unions being aligned to left-wing forces. Where right-wing populism or extremism makes it into the workplace and is not immediately linked to an anti-trade union attitude, it becomes an internal organisational and political problem.**

1. https://theconversation.com/how-many-states-and-provinces-are-in-the-world-157847#:~:text=There%20are%20195%20national%20governments,not%20recognized%20by%20the%20U.N. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)