# UT Dubs v CeshCao

## 1

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

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just governmnt” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a VACCUM, not in 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) LHSLA JC/SJ

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 [x]

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### [2] limits – the UN says there are 195 national governments but even that’s not an agreed upon brightline – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing. There’s been China, Hungary, EU, Kazakhstan, US, India, UK, Egypt and now brazil

#### [3] tva – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole res advocacy, solves all ur offense- Potential abuse doesn’t permit 1AC abuse – allows you to be infinitely abusive in the 1AC-– if the neg doesn’t have specific prep, they’ll resort to cheaty word PICs which are net worse

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### International Relations is the royal science of empire – the aff engineers “sustainable warfare” through a mutating geopolitics of violence.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Because I wanted this book to inspire curiosity beyond the boundaries of international relations (ir), I considered ignoring the field altogether, removing all mentions of ir or ir theory. However, upon closer reflection, I have decided to keep these references as I think they are relevant for those outside the discipline and for those who, like myself, often feel alienated within its disciplinary boundaries. In the former case, it is important to know that, unlike some more humble fields, ir has always held itself to be a kind of royal science. Scholarship in ir, particularly in the United States, is half research, and half biding time until you have the prince’s ear. The hallowed names in the mainstream of the field are still known because they somehow changed the behavior of their intended clients—those being states, militaries, and international organizations. Therefore, some attention to ir is necessary because it has an all-too-casual relationship with institutional power that directly impacts the lives of real people, and ir is all too often lethal theory. As an American discipline, the political economy of the field is impossible without Department of Defense money, and its semiotic economy would be equally dwarfed without contributory figures like Woodrow Wilson, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington. The ubiquity of Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis and Kissinger’s particular brand of realpolitik are undeniable throughout the field, as well as the world. Each, in their own way, has saturated the watchwords and nomenclature of geopolitics from an American perspective so thoroughly that both political parties in the United States fight over who gets to claim the heritage of each. Although many other fields such as anthropology and even comparative literature have found themselves in the gravitational pull of geopolitics, international relations is meant to be scholarship as statecraft by other means. That is, ir was meant to improve the global order and ensure the place of its guarantor, the United States of America. Having spent the better part of a decade listening to national security analysts and diplomats from the United States, South Korea, Japan, Europe, China, Brazil, and Russia, as well as military strategists around the planet, I found their vocabulary and worldview strikingly homogeneous.

If this seems too general a claim, one should take a peek at John Mearsheimer’s essay “Benign Hegemony,” which defends the Americanness of the ir field. What is most telling in this essay is not a defense of the U.S. as a benign hegemonic power, which Mearsheimer has done at length elsewhere. Rather, it is his vigorous defense that as a field, ir theory has done well by the world in setting the intellectual agenda for global challenges, and for creating useful theoretical approaches to addressing those problems. For Mearsheimer, the proof that American scholarly hegemony has been benign is that there is nothing important that has been left out. A quick scan of the last ten or twenty International Studies Association conferences would suggest otherwise.

That issues like rape as a weapon of war, postcolonial violence, global racism, and climate change are not squarely in the main of ir demonstrates just how benign American scholarly hegemony is not. As one prominent anthropologist said to me at dinner after touring the isa conference in 2014, “it was surreal, like a tour through the Cold War. People were giving papers and arguing as if nothing had ever changed.” These same provincial scholars aspire and succeed at filling the advisory roles of each successive American presidency. One cannot help but see a connection between the history of the ir field, and the catastrophes of U.S. foreign policy during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. One could repeat the words of the anthropologist I mentioned to describe the 2016 presidential campaign debates over the future of U.S. foreign policy: it is as if “nothing had ever changed.” And yet these old white men still strut around the halls of America’s “best” institutions as if they saved us from the Cold War, even as the planet crumbles under the weight of their failed imperial dreams.

If international relations was meant to be the science of making the world something other than what it would be if we were all left to our own worst devices, then it has failed monumentally. The United States is once again in fierce nuclear competition with Russia. We are no closer to any significant action on climate change. We have not met any of the Millennium Development Goals determined by the United Nations on eradicating poverty. War and security are the most significant financial, creative, social, cultural, technological, and political investments of almost every nation-state on Earth. The general intellect is a martial intellect.

Despite all this failure, pessimism does not exist in international relations, at least not on paper. The seething doom of our current predicament thrives at the conference bar and in hushed office conversations but not in our research. In public, the darkness disavowed possesses and inflames the petty cynicisms and hatreds that are often turned outward at tired and predictable scapegoats.

After the fury of three decades of critique, most ir scholars still camp out either on the hill of liberal internationalism or in the dark woods of political realism. Neither offers much that is new by way of answers or even explanations, and each dominant school has failed to account for our current apocalyptic condition. One is left wondering what it is exactly that they think they do. Despite the seeming opposition between the two, one idealistic about the future of international order (liberals) and the other self-satisfied with the tragedy of cycles of war and dominance (realists), both positions are optimists of the positivist variety.

For both warring parties, ir optimism is expressed through a romantic empiricism. For all those who toil away looking for the next theory of international politics, order is out there somewhere, and dutifully recording reality will find it—or at least bring us closer to its discovery. For liberal internationalism, this will bring the long-heralded maturity of Immanuel Kant’s perpetual peace. For second-order sociopaths known as offensive realists, crumbs of “useful strategic insight” and the endless details that amplify their epistemophilia for force projection and violence capability represent a potential “advantage,” that is, the possibility to move one step forward on the global political board game of snakes and ladders. Still, the cynicism of ir always creeps back in because the world never quite lives up to the empirical findings it is commanded to obey. Disappointment here is not without reason, but we cynically continue to make the same policy recommendations, catastrophe after catastrophe.

I have an idea about where ir’s recent malaise comes from. I think it is a moment, just before the awareness of the Anthropocene, after the Cold War and before September 11, when the end of everything was only a hypothetical problem for those of a certain coddled and privileged modern form of life. The catastrophe of the human predicament was that there was no catastrophe, no reason, no generation-defining challenge or war. Now the fate of this form of life is actually imperiled, and it is too much to bear. The weird denial of sexism, racism, climate change, the sixth extinction, and loose nukes, all by a field of scholars tasked with studying geopolitics, is more than irrationalism or ignorance. This animosity toward reality is a deep and corrosive nihilism, a denial of the world. Thus ir as a strategic field is demonstrative of a civilization with nothing left to do, nothing left to destroy. All that is left is to make meaning out of being incapable of undoing the world that Euro-American geopolitics created. Emo geopolitics is not pretty, but it is real. The letdown, the failure, the apocalypse-that-was-not finally arrived, and we are too late.

Still, the United States of America continues to follow the advice of “the best and the brightest,” testing the imperial waters, not quite ready to commit out loud to empire but completely unwilling to abandon it. Stuck in between, contemporary geopolitics—as curated by the United States—is in a permanent beta phase. Neuro-torture, algorithmic warfare, drone strikes, and cybernetic nation-building are not means or ends but rather are tests. Can a polis be engineered? Can the human operating system be reformatted? Can violence be modulated until legally invisible while all the more lethal? Each incursion, each new actor or actant, and new terrains from brains to transatlantic cables—all find themselves part of a grand experiment to see if a benign or at least sustainable empire is possible. There is no seeming regard for the fact that each experiment directly competes with Thomas Jefferson’s democratic experiment. One wonders if freedom can even exist anywhere other than temporarily on the fringe of some neglected order. Is this some metaphysical condition of freedom, or is the world so supersaturated with martial orders that the ragged edges between imperial orders are all that we have left? It feels like freedom’s remains persist only in the ruins of everything else. No space is left that can be truly indifferent to the law, security, or economy. Such is the new life of a human in debt. The social contract has been refinanced as what is owed and nothing more: politics without equity. Inequity without equality.

What about the impending collapse of the post–World War II order, the self-destruction of the United States, the rise of China and a new world order? If humanity lasts long enough for China to put its stamp on the human apocalypse, I will write a new introduction. Until then, we live in the death rattle of Pax Americana. While I think the totality of this claim is true, I do not want to rule out that many of us throughout the world still make lives otherwise. Many of us even thrive in spite of it all. And yet, no form of life can be made that escapes the fact that everything can come to a sudden and arbitrary end thanks to the whim of an American drone operator, nuclear catastrophe, or macroeconomic manipulation like sanctions. There are other ways to die and other organized forms of killing outside the control of the United States; however, no other single apparatus can make everyone or anyone die irrespective of citizenship or geographic location. For me, this is the most inescapable philosophical provocation of our moment in time.

The haphazard and seemingly limitless nature of U.S. violence means that even the core principles of the great political realist concepts like order and national interest are being displaced by subterranean violence entrepreneurs that populate transversal battlefields, security corridors, and border zones. Mercenaries, drug lords, chief executive officers, presidents, and sports commissioners are more alike than ever. Doomsayers like Paul Virilio, Lewis Mumford, and Martin Heidegger foretold a kind of terminal and self-annihilating velocity for geopolitics’ technological saturation, but even their lack of imagination appears optimistic. American geopolitics does not know totality or finality; it bleeds, mutates, and reforms. Furthermore, the peril of biopolitics seems now almost romantic. To make life live? Perchance to dream. The care and concern for life’s productivity is increasingly subsumed by plasticity—forming and reforming without regard to the telos of productivity, division, or normative order.

There are, of course, still orders in our geoplastic age, but they are almost unrecognizable as such. When so many citizens and states are directly invested in sabotaging publicly stated strategic ends, then concepts like national interest seem equally quaint. We are witnessing creative and horrifying experiments in the affirmative production of dying, which also deprive those targeted and in some cases whole populations from the relief of death. To follow Rucker, I want to try to see the world for what it is. We can only say that tragedy is no longer a genre of geopolitics. Tragedy redeems. The occluded character of contemporary geopolitics shoehorned into experience produces the feeling that there is no relief, no reason, no victory, no defeats, and no exit within the confines of national security’s constricted world. This is not tragedy: it is horror. We live in an age of horror that, like the victims of gore movies who never quite die so that they can be tortured more, furthers our practice of collective violence and goes on for decades as a kind of sustainable warfare.

#### The aff’s fear of a Chinese war over Taiwan is grounded in an aversion to anything that challenges Western modes of economic and racial identity – you should note the ease by which a threat to Taiwan equates to a threat to the world – that association is made possible by injecting American identity into the Taiwanese nation-state which results in mass warfare

Turner 14 (Oliver Turner, Hallsworth Research Fellow at the University of Manchester, PhD from the University of Manchester, April 2014, “American Images of China: Identity, Power, Policy,” pp 133-141, modified) gz

William Overholt notes that the so-called China Threat Theory of modern times is based at least partly on the representation of China as a post-Cold War communist successor to the Soviet Union. Yet, he argues, this is to overlook the pattern of China’s behaviour since 1989 which, as generally cooperative and peaceful, does much to challenge that perception. 76 Certainly, the PRC’s capabilities have increased substantially in recent years. Among other things China now has the world’s largest population, the fastest growing economy, the largest army, the largest middle class, a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, a manned space programme and a nuclear arsenal. 77 However, these things do not necessarily make China a threat. Certain other countries which share variations of these characteristics, such as rapidly growing economies, active space programmes and the possession of nuclear weapons, are not perceived in this way. India, for example, is very rarely considered a danger to Western interests or security. Moreover, the PRC has had a large population for centuries, a significant standing army since its founding in 1949, nuclear weapons since 1964 and a seat on the Security Council since 1971 without consistently being interpreted as a threat. As ever, then, it is impossible to explain the recent resurgence of Threatening China within American imaginations in terms of material forces alone. While China’s military and economic strengths are far greater now than at any point in history, Threatening China is another social construction. Joseph Nye reinforces this understanding by noting that the China Threat Theory, rather than being neutral and unproblematic, has the potential to become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Based on the crude hypothetical assumption that there exists a 50 per cent chance of China becoming aggressive and a 50 per cent chance of it not, Nye explains that to treat China as an enemy now effectively discounts 50 per cent of the future. 78 In this way, he emphasises the ideational constitution of material forces and the power of discourse to create particular truths about the world while marginalising others, with important implications for Sino-US relations. Indeed, Chengxin Pan argues that China’s material capabilities are a distraction to the extent that its mere existence makes it a strategic other to the United States. In consequence, the China threat exists for, and as a product of, American identity. 79 Modern-day China (along with the ‘dangers’ it presents), in other words, is still largely what American discourses allow it to be. 80 This is reflected in the proliferation over the past two decades of popular and academic China threat literatures which do much to establish and perpetuate truths about the real or potential ‘dangers’ China represents. 81 In Death by China by Peter Navarro and Greg Autry, for example, the foreword reads: facts are facts and the truth is the truth . . . the rulers in Beijing . . . flood the world with dangerous products, use a potent arsenal of mercantilist and protectionist weapons to destroy the economies of America and the West, and rapidly arm themselves with the best weapons systems their elaborate spy network can steal from the Pentagon. 82 These ‘facts’ and ‘truths’ are, as ever, subjective interpretations of the world rather than unquestionable realities. Moreover, they are exaggerated and misleading, not least because myriad other nations – in particular the United States – possess and use against others mercantilist trade policies, high-tech weapons systems and elaborate spy networks. This, however, is seemingly of little interest in Navarro and Autry’s hyperbolic vision of the China ‘threat’: ‘It’s Not China Bashing If It’s True,’ the opening chapter irresponsibly proclaims. ‘We Will Bury You, Chinese Style’, Part III somewhat bizarrely suggests. 83 Elsewhere, Robert Kaplan states that ‘[t]he American military contest with China in the Pacific will define the twenty first century’. 84 He does not question if or even when China might become a threat. He emphasises its inevitability. Warren Cohen argues that ‘historically, a strong China has brutalized the weak’, and points to a likelihood that it will now follow great powers of the past by seeking regional dominance before expanding its influence further. 85 In Showdown: Why China Wants War With the United States, Babbin and Timperlake provide a fictional narrative of rising Sino-­ American tensions in which, among other things, China uses cyber warfare to shut down American defence systems. The hostile scenario they present, it is argued, ‘could easily become fact. . . . The Verdict: China means war’. 86 This type of imagery is lamentably comparable in tone to the types which circulated in the late 1800s and the mid-twentieth century. As we have seen, in these moments China ‘threats’ were emotively constructed for the purpose of establishing realities in which particular responses to the ‘threats’ could be seen as justified and even seemingly unavoidable, because to not respond would be to risk US ‘defeat’. Resistance discourses continue to be produced. 87 ‘Sino-American relations in the 21st century . . . will not inevitably be conflictual’, declares Peter Hays Gries. 88 ‘The nature of any threat’, argues Al-Rodhan, ‘is far more nuanced than the “China Threat” theorists claim it to be’. 89 Nonetheless, powerful circulating truths about Threatening China work to shape the contours of the literature itself. For example, the British writer Will Hutton’s 2007 volume The Writing on the Wall: China and the West in the 21st Century was published in the United States as The Writing on the Wall: Why We Must Embrace China as a Partner or Face It as an Enemy. 90 In the same year Edgar Snow’s 1938 volume Red Star Over China was reprinted in as Red Star Over China – The Rise of the Red Army . 91 This title is particularly misrepresentative, and is illustrative of the fantasised constitution of Threatening China, since the content of Snow’s book is fundamentally sympathetic to China’s communist forces. The key messages of volumes such as The Coming Conflict with China and When China Rules the World are also significantly less alarmist than their titles suggest. 92 Each of these examples demonstrates the tight regulation of discourse and how certain ideas about China continue to be promoted while others are actively suppressed. An example of the type of visual imagery of Threatening China which has become widespread since the 1990s – and which complements Figure I.2 in the introduction – is provided in Figure 5.3. A 1996 cover of Newsweek magazine not only depicts China as a threat to the United States, but also highlights the various ways in which that threat might be projected. Newsweek imagined a modern and technologically advanced society which is at least half militaristic and aggressive: ‘The “New Giant” Flexes Its Muscles’, the magazine observed. The Chinese themselves are depicted as soulless and machine-like. Importantly, its red flag is prominent so as to emphasise a continued threat to non-communist American identity. The importance of communism to the construction of modern-day Threatening China is reflected in American anxieties and suspicion of the so-called Beijing Consensus. The Beijing Consensus is a political and economic model of growth and development which is understood to be advanced by the PRC. 93 For some it represents a challenge to the traditional development model of the United States and the wider West – the so-called Washington Consensus. 94 The Washington Consensus utilises policy instruments such as free market forces and private property ownership as key components of development. The Beijing Consensus, in contrast, has been described as ‘state-led development’, and is advanced today particularly within less developed regions of Africa and South America. 95 Stefan Halper argues that while China’s ‘market-authoritarian model’ provides high rates of growth and stability and promises of improved living conditions, it is devoid of the norms and values expected in the West. ‘Absent are the freedoms we believe essential – freedoms of speech, belief and assembly, and the notion of the loyal opposition’, he asserts. 96 The existence of the Beijing Consensus as a Western social construct is demonstrated by it only emerging as a topic of debate in China after the American Joshua Ramo of The Foreign Policy Centre in London coined the term in 2004. 97 The anxieties the Beijing Consensus generates, argue Cho and Jeong, are not primarily due to what it actually prescribes, but to the challenges it appears to present to the West. Indeed, Chinese leaders refrain from promoting the Beijing Consensus internationally because they are keen to avoid tensions with the United States. 98 The aim in Beijing has been to project the image of a responsible new power, and yet China’s development is itself less stable, organised and coherent than many assume. 99 A clear Beijing Consensus, in short, has never existed. Moreover, China’s broad global approach to international politics (its soft power strategy) is often misinterpreted as being targeted directly at the West, when it is actually intended for multiple audiences. 100 The contemporary China threat as a ‘danger’ to the American values of democracy and free markets has many parallels with that which became so pervasive during the Cold War. In addition, however, it also intrinsically threatens notions of American exceptionalism and the understanding that the US exists as Madsen’s ‘redeemer nation’, the responsibility of which is to disseminate Enlightenment values abroad. 101 If, as Halper explains, the Beijing consensus is successful in providing high rates of growth and improved living standards around the world, it renders vulnerable the idea that the United States, as both Thomas Paine and Ronald Reagan declared, retains the power to ‘begin the world over again’. 102 China, in other words, is not the object of attention simply because of its physical and historical attributes. It is interpreted as a potential rival to established frameworks of Western-led development, with the intention to replace them with an alternative paradigm. Threatening China, then, (along with American identity) has evolved over time so that it is no longer widely perceived as, for example, a racial threat to an imagined White United States. As such it remains a socially constructed threat and a product of American imaginations in the same way it always has been. Viewed through an American lens, it is not interpreted dispassionately, but from subjective understandings about the United States itself. Ultimately, it is still integral to the enactment of US China policy. This was demonstrated between 1995 and 1996 when the PRC conducted a series of provocative missile tests in the Taiwan Strait. The aim was to influence presidential elections on the island and deter voters from appointing a pro-independence candidate. 103 In the previous chapter it was established that the United States’ Two China policy throughout the Cold War was partly enabled by imagery of Taiwan as a threatened bastion of American values, and Eisenhower’s intention to ‘preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa’ 104 was shared by President Bill Clinton four decades later. In response to the PRC tests, Clinton ordered more American vessels into the Strait than had been assembled in East Asia since the end of the Vietnam War. 105 In 1996, as in the past, American policy itself served to reproduce China as an uncivilised and threatening polity beyond the free world and as the legitimate subject of disciplinary measures. By exporting American interpretations of the world it also reconfirmed the United States as the necessarily more civilised entity. The China of the late twentieth century remained a projection of American imaginations and its democratic-capitalist ideology. So, Taiwan was still not just any island or any population threatened by a larger aggressor; this scenario is played out in various regions throughout the world in the absence of US intervention. When Clinton sent American warships to Taiwan the aim was to defend American interests there. However, those interests were still constitutive of particular discourses which gave them meaning. Specifically, they were interests grounded upon the core values of American identity which were still present and vulnerable there. The goal, Clinton asserted, was to encourage the long-­ term process of ‘deepening the roots of democracy in Asia’. 106 Of course, efforts to lessen the possibility of conflict are rarely to be condemned, but the events confirmed the salience of Threatening (and Uncivilised) China within the US political process. China’s material capabilities were increasing. However, the imbalance of Sino-US relations of power remained such that American discourse could construct a reality in which Washington was able to legitimately intervene in the region in order to protect its interests and values. In fact, the most powerful representational processes ensured that anything other than intervention was deemed unthinkable. In July 1996 the Clinton administration declared that ‘the United States has a continuing interest . . . in the Asia-Pacific region and . . . we’re not going anywhere’. 107 Once again, American discourses contained inconsistencies which helped them function consistently in the service of power. 108 They allowed the United States to justify behaviours identical to those for which it has long criticised the PRC. In particular, Washington could seek to strengthen democracy in Asia and facilitate the survival of its core values in Taiwan, while simultaneously accusing China of attempting to do the same. Washington also maintained the embargo on the sale of military equipment to China first implemented after the events in Tiananmen Square. The embargo was less a continuing punishment for a past misdemeanour, however, than it was a policy performance complicit within the protection of American identity. In 2005, for example, it was argued in the Senate that China specifically threatened Taiwan and the United States. 109 The continuing isolation of these two polities within the context of the China ‘threat’ exposes their inextricability so that a danger to Taiwan is necessarily still a danger to the United States. The embargo reaffirmed China as uncivilised in comparable terms to states such as North Korea, Cuba, Iran and Burma, to which Washington has also long prohibited the sale of arms. To reiterate, China’s increasing material power is not considered inconsequential here; however, that power remains constitutive of certain ideas which make

#### Voting negative adopts failed IR for a healthy dose of pessimism – at the end of the world, all we can do is hope to be buried alive together.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Failed ir affirms the power of this kind of negative thinking as an alternative to the endless rehearsing of moralizing insights and strategic foresight. The negative is not “against” or reacting to something. Rather, it is the affirmation of a freedom beyond the limits of life and death. That is, it is making a life by continuing to think about the world, even if that thinking is not recuperative, and even if nothing we think can save us. In the face of it all, one celebrates useless thinking, useless scholarship, and useless forms of life at the very moment we are told to throw them all under the bus in the name of survival at all costs. This is a logic referred to lately as hope and it is as cruel as it is anxiety inducing. Hope is a form of extortion. We are told that it is our obligation to bear the weight of making things better while being chided that the failure of our efforts is the result of not believing in the possibility of real change. In such an environment, pessimism is often treated as a form of treason, as if only neoliberals and moral degenerates give up—or so goes the op-ed’s insisting upon the renewed possibility of redemption.

In response to these exhortations, pessimism offers a historical atheism, both methodologically and morally. The universe does not bend toward justice. Sometimes the universe bends toward the indifference of gravity wells and black holes. Affirming negativity, inspired by Achille Mbembe, is grounds for freedom, even if that freedom or relief is only fleeting and always insecure. I am not arrogant enough to think a book can attain freedom of this sort, but this book is inspired by refusals of critique as redemption in favor of useless critique and critique for its own sake.

That the pursuit of knowledge without immediate application is so thoroughly useless, even profane, is a diagnosis of our current moment. The neoliberal assault on the university is evidence of this condition, as is the current pitch of American politics. Our indifference as intellectuals to maximizing value has not gone unnoticed. We are still dangerous, worthy of vilification, of attack, sabotage, and derision because we fail so decadently. We are parasites according to Scott Walker, Donald Trump, and the rest. So be it. We are and shall remain irascible irritants to a worldwide assault on thinking that is well underway and facing few obstacles in other jurisdictions.

What would failed scholarship do? Learn to die, learn to live, learn to listen, learn to be together, and learn to be generous. These virtues are useless in that they do not prevent or manage things. They do not translate into learning objectives or metrics. Virtues of this order are selfsame, nontransferable experiences. They are meaningful but not useful. These are luxurious virtues. Like grieving or joy, they are ends unto themselves. But how will these ideas seek extramural grants, contribute to an outcomes-based education system, or become a policy recommendation? They will not, and that is part of their virtue.

Even if there is no straight line to where we are and where we ought to be, I think we should get over the idea that somehow the U.S. project of liberal empire is conflicted, or “more right than it is wrong,” or pragmatically preferable to the alternatives. I hope this book can contribute to the urgent necessity to get out of the way by reveling in the catastrophic failure that should inspire humility but instead seems to embolden too many to seek global control yet again. Demolition may be an affirmative act if it means insurgents and others can be better heard. And yet this may fail too. If we can accomplish nothing at all, we can at least, as Ta-Nehisi Coates and other pessimists have said, refuse to suborn the lie of America any longer. Telling the truth, even if it cannot change the outcome of history, is a certain kind of solace. In Coates’s words, there is a kind of rapture “when you can no longer be lied to, when you have rejected the dream.” Saying the truth out loud brings with it the relief that we are not crazy. Things really are as bad as we think.

If there are those of us who want to break from this one-hundred-year-old race to be the next Henry Kissinger, then why do we continue to seek respect in the form of recognizable standards of excellence? I am not sure where the answer finally lies, but I do know that professionalization will not save us. To appear as normal and recognizably rigorous will not be enough to stave off the neoliberal drive to monetize scholarship, or to demand of us strategically useful insights. The least we can do in the face of such a battle is to find comfort in meaningful ideas and the friendships they build rather than try to perform for those we know are the problem. Some will ask, who is this “we” or is that “they”—where is your evidence? More will know exactly what I am talking about.

The virtues I seek are oriented toward an academy of refuge, a place we can still live, no matter how dire the conditions of the university and the classroom. It is not the think tank, boardroom, or command center. We are, those of us who wish to be included, the last of the philosophers, the last of the lovers of knowledge, the deviants who should revel in what Harney and Moten have called the undercommons.

In one of his final lectures, Bataille speaks of the remnants of a different human species, something not quite so doomed, something that wasted its newly discovered consciousness and tool-being on the art that still marks the walls of prehistoric caves. This lingering minor or vestigial heritage is philosophy’s beginning. Philosophy survives war, atrocity, famine, and crusades. Thinking matters in a very unusual way. Thinking is not power or emancipation. Thinking matters for a sense of belonging to the world, and for believing in the fecundity of the world despite evidence to the contrary.

How do you get all this from pessimism, from failure? Because willing failure is a temptation, a lure to think otherwise, to think dangerous thoughts. Pessimism is a threat to indifferentism and nihilism in the sense of the phenomenon of Donald Trump. Pessimism is a provocation and an enemy of skepticism, particularly of the metaphysical variety. It is not redemption from these afflictions, but in pessimism there is solace in the real. To put it another way, to study the world as it is means to care for it.

The exhortation that our care or interest should be contingent on how useful the world is and how much of it conforms to our designs is as much opposed to care as it is to empiricism. We can study airports, poetry, endurance races, borders, bombs, plastic, and warfare, and find them all in the world. To consider the depth of their existence can be an invitation to the world rather than a prelude to another policy report. One cannot make a successful political career out of such pursuits, but you might be able to make a life out of it, a life worth repeating even if nothing else happens.

At the end of Jack Halberstam’s The Queer Art of Failure, we are presented with the Fantastic Mr. Fox’s toast as an exemple of something meaningful in these dark times of ours.

They say all foxes are slightly allergic to linoleum, but it’s cool to the paw—try it. They say my tail needs to be dry cleaned twice a month, but now it’s fully detachable—see? They say our tree may never grow back, but one day, something will. Yes, these crackles are made of synthetic goose and these giblets come from artificial squab and even these apples look fake—but at least they’ve got stars on them. I guess my point is, we’ll eat tonight, and we’ll eat together. And even in this not particularly flattering light, you are without a doubt the five and a half most wonderful wild animals I’ve ever met in my life. So let’s raise our boxes—to our survival.

Halberstam says of this queer moment:

Not quite a credo, something short of a toast, a little less than a speech, but Mr. Fox gives here one of the best and most moving—both emotionally and in stop-motion terms—addresses in the history of cinema. Unlike Coraline, where survival is predicated upon a rejection of the theatrical, the queer, and the improvised, and like Where the Wild Things Are, where the disappointment of deliverance must be leavened with the pragmatism of possibility, Fantastic Mr. Fox is a queerly animated classic in that it teaches us, as Finding Nemo, Chicken Run, and so many other revolting animations before it, to believe in detachable tails, fake apples, eating together, adapting to the lighting, risk, sissy sons, and the sheer importance of survival for all those wild souls that the farmers, the teachers, the preachers, and the politicians would like to bury alive.

Although not as much fun as Halberstam’s monument to low theory, Savage Ecology is for all the other wild animals out there studying global politics. May we be buried alive together.

#### The Role of the Judge is to adopt martial empiricism.

Bousquet et al ‘20

[Antoine Bousquet, University of London, Jairus Grove, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, and Nisha Shah University of Ottawa. 2020. “Becoming war: Towards a martial empiricism,” <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0967010619895660>] pat

Haunting the formations and deformations of global life, war confronts us as an abyss in the face of which cherished interpretative frameworks perilously buckle and warp. Indeed, Tarak Barkawi and Shane Brighton (2011: 129) accurately identify a ‘conceptual black hole surrounding the notion of war’ that has insistently gnawed at the study of the phenomenon. Locating the source of this lacuna in the absence of an ‘ontology of war’, they propose to ground one in ‘fighting’ (Barkawi and Brighton, 2011: 136). Although we concur on the diagnosis, we take issue with the suggested remedy. War does not obey any neat philosophical division between epistemology and ontology. For us, the resolute elusiveness of any definitive understanding of war is inherent in that very object. Every attempt to conceptually shackle war is undone by the creative advance of its new modes, residences and intensities. This speaks against the value of ontology per se less than it calls for a strange, paradoxical and provisional ontology that is consonant with the confounding mutability of war. Such an ontology, suspended between infinity and totality, being and nothingness, the sheer fecundity and utter catastrophe of war, may not be too uncanny for its object. In fairness, Barkawi and Brighton (2011: 133) gesture towards this in acknowledging ‘war’s recalcitrance as an object of knowledge’ and allowing for war to unmake any truth. Yet they seem unwilling to embrace the full force of their own insight, which Marc von Boemcken (2016: 239) ultimately declares: ‘even the statement that “war is fighting” may well be eventually undone by war. In a very fundamental manner, war escapes human intelligibility.’

This special issue on ‘Becoming War’ grapples with war as obdurate mystery. In its recurring persistence yet constant reinvention, its paradoxical ordering of life for the generation of death, or its stubborn affront to the better world we all purport to want, war never ceases to perplex us. Our world is one shot through by war, manifest in the nation-states we inhabit, the ecologies of technics that bind us to one another, and the very thoughts ricocheting through our communities of sense. And yet we still do not know war.

Rather than endeavour yet again to ‘say something fundamental about what war is’ (Barkawi and Brighton, 2011: 134, emphasis in original), we choose to explore how war becomes. This is not to say that we deny any durability or regularities in the phenomenon of war over time. Simply that, as Alfred Whitehead (1978: 35) puts it, ‘there is a becoming of continuity, but no continuity of becoming’. Accordingly, we seek to trace the lines of becoming that congeal into what comes to count as war, even as it continually frays at the edges and insolently defies habituated frames of reference. We do not, therefore, offer a theory of continuity, a formula for what all lines of becoming war might have in common, but instead sketch a style of investigation that encompasses both the enduring cohesion and the radical dispersion of war. We call this endeavour ‘martial empiricism’ to renounce attempts to devise a definitive theory of war. Instead, we favour an open-ended conceptual arsenal for following the trail of war wherever it leads us, as opposed to camping in the places where we already expect to find it.

Although we do not aim to circumscribe the remit of its investigations, martial empiricism is nonetheless inherently situational, spurred by the impulse to grasp the present martial condition we inhabit in all its calamity and promise. We would be far from the first to point out the growing inadequacy of the conceptual frameworks of war inherited from the Westphalian historical interval. Yet we still collectively flounder in the face of a combined and uneven landscape of armed conflict populated by metastasizing war machines encompassing overseas contingency operations, fullspectrum hybrid theatres, ethno-supremacist militias, crowd-sourced paramilitaries, Incel shooters and narco-state assassins. The game is definitely up when a task force led by the former head of United States Central Command can write that ‘basic categories such as “battlefield,” “combatant” and “hostilities” no longer have clear or stable meaning’ (Abizaid and Brooks, 2014: 35). Confronted with this reality and the persistent bewilderment it induces, we contend that a certain epistemic humility is in order. Rather than professing to know where war begins and ends, martial empiricism starts in the middle, with only the barest tentative intuitions necessary to explore the logistics, operations and embodiments that engender armed conflict as an unremitting condition of global life.

## Case

### FW

#### Utilitarian calculus doesn’t account for the geopolitical structure of aggregate conceptions of the good – that makes it incapable of grappling with the causes of apocalypse.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Rather than see these two career trajectories as opposed, I think Crutzen’s thinking displays a continuous concern for the Northern Hemisphere and a particular cartography, rather than a geography, of human survival. Crutzen, as well as the concept of the Anthropocene itself, cannot escape preceding geopolitical conceptions of the Earth. Crutzen and others who rush so quickly to the necessity to transition efforts from climate abatement to climate modification are unsurprisingly not moved by claims that artificial cooling will likely cause droughts and famines in the tropics and subtropical zones of the global south; nor are they moved by how such plans may accelerate ocean acidification. The utilitarian risk calculus that favors the greatest good for the greatest number has no geographical or historical sensibility of how unequally aggregate conceptions of the good are distributed around the planet.

Global thinking, even in its scientific and seemingly universalist claims to an atmosphere that “we” all share, belies the geopolitics that enlivens scientific concern, as well as the global public policy agenda of geoengineering that seeks to act on behalf of it. Saving humanity as an aggregate, whether from nuclear war, Styrofoam, or climate turbulence, has never meant an egalitarian distribution of survivors and sacrifices. Instead, our new cosmopolitanism—the global environment—follows almost exactly the drawn lines, that is, the cartography or racialized and selective solidarities and zones of indifference that characterize economic development, the selective application of combat, and, before that, the zones of settlement and colonization. More than a result of contemporary white supremacy or lingering white privilege, the territorialization of who lives and who dies, who matters and who must be left behind for the sake of humanity, represents a five-hundred-year geopolitical tradition of conquest, colonization, extraction, and the martial forms of life that made them all possible through war and through more subtle and languid forms of organized killing.

I am not suggesting that Crutzen and others are part of a vast conspiracy; rather, I want to outline how climate change, species loss, slavery, the elimination of native peoples, and the globalization of extractive capitalism are all part of the same global ordering. That is, all of these crises are geopolitical. The particular geopolitical arrangement of what others have called the longue durée, and what I am calling the Eurocene, is geologically significant but is not universally part of “human activity” despite the false syllogism at the heart of popular ecological thinking that a global threat to humanity must be shared in cause and crisis by all of humanity.

Departing from Sloterdijk, I am hesitant to so easily locate modernity or explication as the root or cause of the global catastrophe. No single strategy, war, act of colonization, technological breakthrough, or worldview fully explains the apocalypse before us. However, there is something like what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari call a refrain that holds the vast assemblage together, a geopolitical melody hummed along with the global expansion of a form of life characterized by homogenization rather than diversification. Accordingly, if we are to make some sense of such a vast world that is, even for Crutzen and Birks, “quite complex and difficult to model,” I think we must consider the particular refrain of geopolitics that is capable of, by scientific as well as more humbly embodied standards, destroying worlds along with the world. To eschew geopolitics simply because, as a refrain, it is too big, too grand, or too universal would ignore the conditions of possibility for nuclear weapons, power politics, and carbon-based globalization, and would greatly impoverish the explanatory capability of even the best climate models. So maybe it is not so strange that Crutzen and others’ attention to the nuclear threat of great powers has all but disappeared despite the fact that Russia and the United States still possess thousands of nuclear weapons, and as of late have been all too vocal about using them. Instead, the Anthropocene, as envisioned by Crutzen as a universal concern, requires with it a depoliticization of the causes of that concern.

##### Off ASPEC – A. We’ve Impact turned the intentions of governing bodies as sustaining the crumbling system of ir. B. Alt isn’t inaction – disengaging with policy reform is key to finding “life in death” C. Is/Ought fallacy – just because governments do use util doesn’t mean they should

### Advantage

#### Labor movements leaders will be bribed- circumvention

Estlund 18 Estlund, Cynthia (Rein Professor of Law at the New York University School of Law). "6. Can China Secure Labor Peace without Independent Unions? Strikes and Collective Bargaining with Chinese Characteristics." A New Deal for China’s Workers?. Harvard University Press, 2018. 123-148.

Collective appeasement is only one facet of the official response to unrest, of course. Another option is individual appeasement or co-optation. **Some grassroots leaders might be neutralized by being promoted into management or hired onto a local union staff.** A Chinese labor scholar described this tactic as an application of Mao’s advice on dealing with dissenters: “Mix with sand” (chan sha zi). 28 Of course, grassroots worker activists in the West may also be co-opted by employers or entrenched union officials**.** **But the temptation to succumb to such inducements is much greater in China. First, there is no alternative “career path” as a worker-leader within an independent union movement,** as there is in the West (difficult though it may be). **Second, workers who persist in their independent activism in China face a high risk of serious reprisals**. For **whether or not workers’ collective demands are addressed, their leaders face a range of sanctions.**

#### Unions are controlled by the CCP- representation is an alt cause

Estlund 18 Estlund, Cynthia (Rein Professor of Law at the New York University School of Law). "6. Can China Secure Labor Peace without Independent Unions? Strikes and Collective Bargaining with Chinese Characteristics." A New Deal for China’s Workers?. Harvard University Press, 2018. 123-148.

Collective bargaining, and especially sectoral bargaining, can constrain wages at both the high and low ends. That is so even in democratic countries with independent labor movements. Nationally organized independent unions can take a long and broad view of workers’ interests, and can bargain for a fair quid pro quo in exchange for “wage restraint” that benefits the economy as a whole. **But unless workers are well represented, sectoral bargaining can become a vehicle for simple employer collusion**—a way to cap wage levels below what the market would bear, and to limit employer competition in tight labor markets, without any future rewards for workers’ forbearance. **The risk of employer collusion is high in China, where the workers’ official representatives answer to party officials, who are in turn often beholden to local businesses. Especially when multiemployer bargaining is a response to tight labor markets and rising wages, as in Zhejiang, one suspects it does more to restrain workers’ bargaining power than to enhance it.**

#### Chinese economy’s resilient

Reuters, 9/17/15- global news agency (Reuters, 9/17/15, “China's Xi says economy resilient, has huge potential - state radio,” <https://uk.news.yahoo.com/chinas-xi-says-economy-resilient-huge-potential-state-110701900--business.html#HCTFG6T>)

BEIJING (Reuters) - China's economy is resilient and has the capacity to maintain a long-term medium-to-high growth rate, state media reported President Xi Jinping telling U.S. business leaders and former officials. Xi said slowing growth was the result of the country shifting to a different mode of development, adjusting its economic structure and digesting earlier stimulus moves, according to the official Xinhua news agency and state broadcasters. Speaking to the business leaders in advance of his trip to the United States next week, Xi acknowledged that the economic slowdown has raised international concern. The economy has huge potential and room for manoeuvre, Xi was reported to have said. China's economy is on track to post its slowest growth in 25 years and a big crash in the stock market has added to uncertainty.

#### [1] Downturn won’t cause war – prefer post-COVID evidence

Walt ‘20 (Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University; 5/13/20; "Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?"; *Foreign Policy*; https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/)

One familiar argument is the so-called diversionary (or “scapegoat”) theory of war. It suggests that leaders who are worried about their popularity at home will try to divert attention from their failures by provoking a crisis with a foreign power and maybe even using force against it. Drawing on this logic, some Americans now worry that President Donald Trump will decide to attack a country like Iran or Venezuela in the run-up to the presidential election and especially if he thinks he’s likely to lose. This outcome strikes me as unlikely, even if one ignores the logical and empirical flaws in the theory itself. War is always a gamble, and should things go badly—even a little bit—it would hammer the last nail in the coffin of Trump’s declining fortunes. Moreover, none of the countries Trump might consider going after pose an imminent threat to U.S. security, and even his staunchest supporters may wonder why he is wasting time and money going after Iran or Venezuela at a moment when thousands of Americans are dying preventable deaths at home. Even a successful military action won’t put Americans back to work, create the sort of testing-and-tracing regime that competent governments around the world have been able to implement already, or hasten the development of a vaccine. The same logic is likely to guide the decisions of other world leaders too. Another familiar folk theory is “military Keynesianism.” War generates a lot of economic demand, and it can sometimes lift depressed economies out of the doldrums and back toward prosperity and full employment. The obvious case in point here is World War II, which did help the U.S economy finally escape the quicksand of the Great Depression. Those who are convinced that great powers go to war primarily to keep Big Business (or the arms industry) happy are naturally drawn to this sort of argument, and they might worry that governments looking at bleak economic forecasts will try to restart their economies through some sort of military adventure. I doubt it. It takes a really big war to generate a significant stimulus, and it is hard to imagine any country launching a large-scale war—with all its attendant risks—at a moment when debt levels are already soaring. More importantly, there are lots of easier and more direct ways to stimulate the economy—infrastructure spending, unemployment insurance, even “helicopter payments”—and launching a war has to be one of the least efficient methods available. The threat of war usually spooks investors too, which any politician with their eye on the stock market would be loath to do. Economic downturns can encourage war in some special circumstances, especially when a war would enable a country facing severe hardships to capture something of immediate and significant value. Saddam Hussein’s decision to seize Kuwait in 1990 fits this model perfectly: The Iraqi economy was in terrible shape after its long war with Iran; unemployment was threatening Saddam’s domestic position; Kuwait’s vast oil riches were a considerable prize; and seizing the lightly armed emirate was exceedingly easy to do. Iraq also owed Kuwait a lot of money, and a hostile takeover by Baghdad would wipe those debts off the books overnight. In this case, Iraq’s parlous economic condition clearly made war more likely. Yet I cannot think of any country in similar circumstances today. Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that Trump occasionally hints at—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible. If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished. On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy . To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).” Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself. The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success. Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term. To be sure, I can’t rule out another powerful cause of war—stupidity—especially when it is so much in evidence in some quarters these days. So there is no guarantee that we won’t see misguided leaders stumbling into another foolish bloodletting. But given that it’s hard to find any rays of sunshine at this particular moment in history, I’m going to hope I’m right about this one.

#### [2] Growth causes extinction via climate change, aging crisis, food and water wars, and global inequality—try or die for dedevelopment

Gagulina, 21

(Natalya Gagulina, Institute for Regional Economic Studies Russian Academy of Sciences Leading researcher, Artur Budagov, 2State University of Aerospace Instrumentation, Director of the Institute of Enterprinership Technologies, Elena Yanova, ITMO University, Faculty of Technological Management and Innovations, Department of Economics and Strategic Management, “Global Challenges of the Modern Paradigm of Economic Development,” SHS Web of Conferences 92 2021 NL)

1 Introduction Comprehension of the global problems at the beginning of the third millennium prompts us to take new approach to assessing the development of modern civilization, and sometimes to question the inviolability of values formed over centuries. For more than three centuries, the development of the world’s leading countries has been based on the paradigm, according to which realization of human creative potential occurs through the transformation of world and nature, and then society. Continuous growth of production and improvement of the human living standards, provided by the modern paradigm of development, are based on the ideas of progress, democracy, freedom and personal initiative. The flip side of the coin is exacerbation of key contradictions generated by the current paradigm of economic development: between wealth and poverty, liberal social practices and government guarantees, economic growth and the resource potential of nature. 2 Economic Development Paradigm Methods The progressive development of mankind within the framework of accepted scientific paradigm is continuous process of improving the laws, conditions of life, social reproduction, art, science, values. One of the most important results of formation of the modern development paradigm is to recreate the world general scientific picture as an integral system of scientific ideas about nature, man and society [1]. The important role in this is played by the rapid convergence of methodology of natural science and humanitarian knowledge. Thus, the ideas of irreversibility and variability in decision-making, the variety of directions for development of complex systems at bifurcation points and many other ideas that have been developed in synergetics are becoming more and more important for the humanities. The change in the place and role of man in the representation of most self-developing systems became manifestation of the principles of global evolutionism in the scientific paradigm of development and contributed to even greater dissemination of its ideas both in the scientific knowledge space and in the modern civilization space. The dominance of global evolutionism principles in the development paradigm has determined its influence on cultural values on the scale of the entire world economy. Besides convergence of the methodology of natural science and humanitarian knowledge, prerequisites are created for the convergence of the main, at first glance, diametrically opposed models of development of the modern East and West countries, which the main features are given in Table 1. Containing the human mind progress history, the modern paradigm of economic development has formed the basic laws, the laws of emergence and development of social relationships at all levels for many years to come. The manifestation of global evolutionism principles in the modern paradigm of economic development is becoming the important factor in cross-cultural interaction between East and West in connection with overarching significance of globalization, liberalization and informatization. Globalization has become tool for formation of world markets for goods, labour and capital, has expanded the information space to planetary scale. Liberalization, pushing the boundaries of private initiative in the implementation of economic activity, stimulated investment and entrepreneurship, created conditions for the effective use of information technologies. Informatization has created new capital-intensive and rapidly growing markets for infocommunication technologies and mass media. Perhaps the most significant result of the influence of these factors in formation of the cultural space at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries was the rooting and spread of the consumer society model on global scale, closed at consumption as a way of life. First of all, this was facilitated by new opportunities for standardizing the way of life, consciousness and behaviour, education, in increasing the role of supranational structures and transnational corporations, opened under the influence of globalization. The economy of consumer society is based on the principle of individual consumption, supported by system of attitudes and values that often ignore the laws of morality. Rapidly developing, dynamic and aggressive economy with its innovative guidelines and pronounced individualism of free personality, with active transformative vector in relation to the natural and social world, has had a huge impact on the entire social structure, starting with forms of human behaviour and social communication and ending with the rationalization of thinking in the whole [2,3]. The consumer economy does not encourage passivity and frugality, because they are accompanied by loss of consumer ability. Economic choice based on real human needs is replaced by choice dictated by the consumer society structure and the corresponding abstract values. Global scale result: overproduction and excessive consumption, accumulation of production and consumption wastes, anthropogenic pollution of atmosphere and water resources, energy overloads, etc. The processes generated by globalization are closely related to the tightening of competition in the world market for control over natural resources and information space through the use of the latest technologies. Market relations include natural resources that were previously outside the competition [4]. The problems of preserving the natural environment and ecology associated with degradation, and sometimes destruction of the environment of human life, are ignored. Social connections and relationships are increasingly falling into the sphere of private interests. Common human values are being levelled, creating the basis of morality, humanity and social justice. The influx of cheap labour into the labour market of prosperous countries complicates interethnic relations [5,6]. The influence of psychological shock of globalization processes creates the fertile ground for nationalism outbursts. Currently, the internationalization of all key problems is taking place against the background of globalization, liberalization and informatization: from interethnic and interconfessional conflicts to security problems [7,8]. This leads to the question of the crisis of the modern paradigm of economic development. 3 Results: Economic Development Paradigm Crisis The modern paradigm of economic development is continuation of the general development paradigm formed by the centuries-old history of scientific discoveries and achievements. At the present stage, the great influence on the general development paradigm, generally, and on the economic development paradigm, particularly, was exerted by convergence of methodology of natural science and humanitarian knowledge, exchange of attitudes of the current paradigm both within the natural science segment and in the field of natural sciences and social sciences and humanities. The combined application of principles of evolutionary and systemic approaches in the paradigm of economic development not only opened up new opportunities in describing complex self-regulating and self-developing systems, the search for approaches to managing such systems, but also identified problems that called into question the viability of paradigm itself. The aggravation of crisis situations in the economic, financial, socio-political, environmental and socio-spiritual spheres of the modern society life makes us take a new approach to understanding the modern paradigm of economic development. Achieving the better quality of life within the accepted paradigm of economic development seems to be difficult due to the problem of dominance of interests of subjects whose sources of income are non-renewable resources, harmful industries and outdated technologies. They not only stand in the way of progress, but also contribute to the emergence of such social risks as the loss of jobs, cuts in investment programs, reduction in tax payments to budgets of various levels, etc. Regarding the complication of classical contradictions and problems of the economy, some market instruments, mechanisms, institutions become poorly managed, stochastic, and acquire a spontaneous character. The existing classical contradictions are supplemented by new ones (Figure 1). Particularly, the classical contradiction between labour and capital was supplemented by contradictions between various forms of capital, rapidly developing science-intensive technologies of material production and archaic forms of capital reproduction, etc. At the international level, the contradiction between the world market globalization process and the national interests of the participating countries is growing [9], the crisis has emerged in the post-war system of international law and international organizations. A series of problematic situations that have no explanation by modern science and crises that arise in vital spheres of the economy indicate a crisis of the very economic development paradigm. At the same time, problems and challenges that are urgent for all countries of the world deserve special attention. 3.1 Global Problems and Challenges The term "global problems" began to be used in scientific literature in connection with concerns about population growth, environmental pollution, depletion of natural resources, etc., that is, almost simultaneously with the first models of J. Forrester, D. Meadows, and others. Understanding global problems as a set of social, natural-resource and socio-cultural problems, as the progressive development and preservation of civilization depends on the attitude towards them and which require the united efforts of all mankind for their resolution, we will group them (Figure 2). Among the problems of humanitarian nature are the problems of eliminating poverty, exploitation and other forms of social inequality, problems of education, health care, planning and regulation of the life level and quality. Natural resource problems include a wide range of problems caused not only by the objective limited natural resource potential of the planet, but also by the alarmingly high rates of its use. Comparing the growth rates of the planet's population and the rate of changes in the volumes of extraction of the main types of mineral raw materials, we see that the intensity of oil and gas consumption per capita is growing (Table 2). Problems that cannot be solved without revising international relations owe their origin to the loss of functionality by some codes of international law and international organizations. The close analysis of global problems, which are becoming more acute as the modern paradigm of economic development takes root, enable singling out the following ones from them: Climatic, ecological and biological aspects of the problem of human survival. The problem of preserving the individual integrity in the context of the disintegration of the traditional structures of transmission from generation to generation of such eternal global values as the value of labour, the living control of society over moral behaviour, etc. The inclusion of person simultaneously in many systems of social relations leads to personality splitting and stress. The problem of communicative unity of mankind and the need to resolve conflicts without the use of force. For successful dialogue focused on consent, tolerance, pluralism of opinions, new criteria and approaches are needed, and the use of double standards is unacceptable. The exacerbation of existing or the emergence of new global problems due to failures, which is adopted the economic development paradigm as a basis, produces global challenges (Figure 3). Challenges are consequence of the emergence of new factors in world development that disrupt the stability of the normal functioning of reproduction mechanisms, intercultural relations, etc. Thus, the acceleration of historical time is facilitated by a constant reduction in the life cycles of goods, services, infrastructures and ways, endless and rapid change of new methods of labour and technologies in the context of accelerating the period of implementation of scientific discoveries. This complicates the adaptation of people to changes in the technological, social and cultural environment. Not having time to fully realize the benefits of change, to take advantage of them, people are faced with new, more and more technically complex aspects of life. The global demographic imbalance, which manifests itself in the population structure change, the birth rate decrease and the indigenous population decline in developed countries, the general aging of the world's population, including the spread of the demographic deficit to some countries in Asia and South America, contributes to the emergence of migration waves, increases economic instability. The problem of shortage of food and fresh water in the world is caused not only by the fact of limited natural resources, but also by their irrational use [11]. Economic inequality, uneven distribution of food in the world and climate change have led to the fact that more than 1 billion people in underdeveloped countries are undernourished, and between 500 million and 1 billion people go hungry. The crisis of values, provoked by the predominance of the principles of global evolutionism in the development paradigm, threatens all further development of mankind. The problems and challenges associated with the new technological reality deserve special attention. 3.2 Digital Economy Problems and Challenges The contours of new technological reality in the context of global issues have emerged due to globalization, liberalization and informatization as the leading features of the modern paradigm of economic development. The emergence of the main innovations of new technological reality in form of information and telecommunication technologies, digital communication networks and virtual reality put on different scales the advantages and disadvantages of the digital economy, selectively presented in Figure 4. Digitalization satellites on global scale are the Internet of Things and smart cities, open source public access platforms, cloud information technologies, dynamic capitalization of Internet business and info-business, increase in the volume of financial assets and the emergence of their new forms (digital assets), predictive software events providing, increasing the influence of "new media" and much more [12-14]. The formation of information space covering the whole world has become innovative form of globalization, which is accompanied by its inherent problems. In our opinion, the following can be attributed to the global challenges of the digital economy: Accelerated virtualization of the economy associated with the phenomenon of virtual reality. According to M. Poster, the problematization of reality, which so far only occurs in the field of modern telecommunications (games, teleconferences, etc.), casts doubt on the validity, exclusivity and conventional evidence of "ordinary" time, space and identity. Information superhighways and virtual reality, which have not yet become common cultural practices, have enormous potential for creating such a subject that exists only into interactive environment. Examples of large-scale transformation processes caused by many years of virtualization can be observed in the economy financial sector [15-17]. b) The spontaneous reduction of jobs in the labour market and disappearance of occupations that were widespread and in demand until recently: teachers, shop assistants, cashiers, postmen, tourism managers, notaries, call centre operators, packers, accountants, etc. The number of "useless people" includes not only the listed professions "from the risk zone", but also older age categories, which find it more difficult to adapt to innovative technological changes. c) Computerization of the decision-making process at different levels, leading to the "cybernation" of the subject of control through the use of supercomputers. The inability of the subject of management to make adequate decisions about the most complex processes in social and technical systems in real time has led to the management crisis. Computer models, which incorporate more than a thousand mathematical equations and huge amounts of various kinds of data, enable to predict the types of behaviour of people in various situations and, in a time frame commensurate with the time for solving problems, develop ready-made solutions. d) The gradual decrease in the ability of individuals to make decisions due to formation of stereotype to overcome the limitation of individual cognitive abilities by tools of info communication technologies. The list of global challenges of the digital economy presented by us is very general, it can be supplemented and expanded taking into account the ongoing changes. 4 Discussions Global actions in response to global challenges are foreseen in almost all spheres of human life, which are usually associated with the human welfare and well-being. The list of global actions has more than half a century history and includes the UN Conference "Man and the Environment" (1972), the World Conservation Strategy (1980), the International Commission on Environment and Development Paper (1983), UN Conference on Environment and Development (COSR-92), Earth Summit +5, Millennium Declaration - 2000, Earth Summit - 2002, RIO + 20, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), developed and adopted by the UN for the period up to 2030, and a number of other equally important international events. It should be noted that the coordination of state policies in the field of legal regulation of information space, ecology, fight against terrorism, drug trafficking and crime also contributes to the development and implementation of global actions in response to global problems and challenges. At the same time, it can be argued that the crisis state of the modern paradigm of economic development is accompanied by a conflict of archaic and newest forms of economic reality, which "explode" it from the inside (Figure 5). The emergence of the newest forms of economic reality in the context of the acceleration of historical time creates the risk of delay in global actions in response to global challenges. This is especially true of the challenges associated with the economic space digitalization. 5 Conclusion The stability of adopted paradigm of economic development in the context of global challenges is under threat, therefore, a new look at the relationship "global challenges - global actions" is needed. The global problems and challenges we have outlined in the modern economic development paradigm force us to start searching for a new biocompatible and biocentric paradigm aimed at harmoniously solving the problems of life support, which is accompanied by revision of views on consumption and fair distribution, attitude to the living environment and nature, life values and dominant needs. The economic development paradigm change presupposes the initial condition change for existence of socio-ecological-economic system, which will radically affect the subsequent evolution of the system and the entire organizational structure of society. In this case, it seems appropriate, in our opinion, to use the quality economics methodology, which is distinguished by interdisciplinary and comprehensive scientific approach [18,19]. The economy of quality has features that make it possible to correlate it with a new, synergetic, paradigm for development of modern scientific knowledge. It is an integral part of all scientific areas, focusing on the need to take into account the quality features studied in a given aspect.

#### Reducing warming prevents extinction

Wallace-Wells 19 (David Wallace-Wells is a National Fellow with the New America Foundation and is a deputy editor of New York Magazine, “The Cautious Case for Climate Optimism Believing in a comfortable future for our planet probably means some giant carbon-sucking machines,” New York Magazine, February 4, 2019, http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/02/book-excerpt-the-uninhabitable-earth-david-wallace-wells.html)

It’s not too late. In fact, it never will be. Whatever you may have read over the past year — as extreme weather brought a global heat wave and unprecedented wildfires burned through 1.6 million California acres and newspaper headlines declared, “Climate Change Is Here” — global warming is not binary. It is not a matter of “yes” or “no,” not a question of “fucked” or “not.” Instead, it is a problem that gets worse over time the longer we produce greenhouse gas, and can be made better if we choose to stop. Which means that no matter how hot it gets, no matter how fully climate change transforms the planet and the way we live on it, it will always be the case that the next decade could contain more warming, and more suffering, or less warming and less suffering. Just how much is up to us, and always will be. A century and a half after the greenhouse effect was first identified, and a few decades since climate denial and misinformation began muddying our sense of what scientists do know, we are left with a set of predictions that can appear falsifiable — about global temperatures and sea-level rise and even hurricane frequency and wildfire volume. And there are, it is true, feedback loops in the climate system that we do not yet perfectly understand and dynamic processes that remain mysterious. But to the extent that we live today under clouds of uncertainty about the future of climate change, those clouds are, overwhelmingly, not projections of collective ignorance about the natural world but of blindness about the human one, and they can be dispersed by human action. The question of how bad things will get is not, actually, a test of the science; it is a bet on human activity. How much will we do to forestall disaster and how quickly? These are the disconcerting, contradictory lessons of global warming, which counsels both human humility and human grandiosity, each drawn from the same perception of peril. There’s a name for those who hold the fate of the world in their hands, as we do — gods. But for the moment, at least, many of us seem inclined to run from that responsibility rather than embrace it. Or even admit we see it, though it sits in front of us as plainly as a steering wheel. That climate change is all-enveloping means that it targets us all and that we must all share in the responsibility so we do not all share in the suffering — at least not share in so suffocatingly much of it. Since I first began writing about climate a few years ago, I’ve been asked often whether I see any reason for optimism. The thing is, I am optimistic. But optimism is always a matter of perspective, and mine is this: No one wants to believe disaster is coming, but those who look, do. At about two degrees Celsius of warming, just one degree north of where we are today, some of the planet’s ice sheets are expected to begin their collapse, eventually bringing, over centuries, perhaps as much as 50 feet of sea-level rise. In the meantime, major cities in the equatorial band of the planet will become unlivable. There will be, it has been estimated, 32 times as many extreme heat waves in India, and even in the northern latitudes, heat waves will kill thousands each summer. Given only conventional methods of decarbonization (replacing dirty-energy sources like coal and oil with clean ones like wind and solar), this is probably our best-case scenario. It is also what is called — so often nowadays the phrase numbs the lips — “catastrophic warming.” A representative from the Marshall Islands spoke for many of the world’s island nations when he used another word to describe the meaning of two degrees: genocide. You do not need to contemplate worst-case scenarios to be alarmed; this best-case scenario is alarming enough. Two degrees would be terrible, but it’s better than three, at which point Southern Europe would be in permanent drought, African droughts would last five years on average, and the areas burned annually by wildfires in the United States could quadruple, or worse, from last year’s million-plus acres. And three degrees is much better than four, at which point six natural disasters could strike a single community simultaneously; the number of climate refugees, already in the millions, could grow tenfold, or 20-fold, or more; and, globally, damages from warming could reach $600 trillion — about double all the wealth that exists in the world today. We are on track for more warming still — just above four degrees by 2100, the U.N. estimates. So if optimism is always a matter of perspective, the possibility of four degrees shapes mine.

#### [3] Corona sent shockwaves throughout the global economy and makes collapse inevitable—we need a new system to ensure survival – it’s try or die

Tooze, 20

(Adam, history professor and director of the European Institute at Columbia University "The Normal Economy Is Never Coming Back," April 9 <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/09/unemployment-coronavirus-pandemic-normal-economy-is-never-coming-back/> NL)

As the coronavirus lockdown began, the first impulse was to search for historical analogies—1914, 1929, 1941? As the weeks have ground on, what has come ever more to the fore is the historical novelty of the shock that we are living through. The economy is currently in something akin to free fall. If it were to continue to contract at its current pace, 12 months from now GDP would be [one-third lower](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-goldman/goldman-sachs-slashes-us-gdp-estimate-further-idUSKBN21I235) than at the beginning of 2020. That is a rate of shrinkage four times faster than during the Great Depression of the 1930s. There has never been a crash landing like this before. There is something new under the sun. And it is horrifying. As recently as five weeks ago, at the beginning of March, U.S. unemployment was at record lows. By the end of March, it had surged to somewhere around 13 percent. That is the highest number recorded since World War II. We don’t know the precise figure because our system of unemployment registration was not built to track an increase at this speed. On successive Thursdays, the number of those making initial filings for unemployment insurance has surged first to 3.3 million, then 6.6 million, and now by another 6.6 million. At the current rate, as the economist Justin Wolfers [pointed out](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/03/upshot/coronavirus-jobless-rate-great-depression.html) in the New York Times, U.S. unemployment is rising at nearly 0.5 percent per day. It is no longer unimaginable that the overall unemployment rate could reach 30 percent by the summer. Thursday’s news confirms that the Western economies face a far deeper and more savage economic shock than they have ever previously experienced. Regular business cycles generally start with the more volatile sectors of the economy—real estate and construction, for instance, or heavy engineering that depends on business investment—or sectors that are subject to global competition, such as the motor vehicles industry. In total, those sectors employ less than a quarter of the workforce. The concentrated downturn in those sectors transmits to the rest of the economy as a muffled shock. The coronavirus lockdown directly affects services—retail, real estate, education, entertainment, restaurants—where 80 percent of Americans work today. Thus the result is immediate and catastrophic. In sectors like retail, which has recently come under fierce pressure from online competition, the temporary lockdown may prove to be terminal. In many cases, the stores that shut down in early March will not reopen. The jobs will be permanently lost. Millions of Americans and their families are facing catastrophe. The shock is not confined to the United States. Many European economies cushion the effects of a downturn by subsidizing short-time working. This will moderate the surge in unemployment. But the collapse in economic activity cannot be disguised. The north of Italy is not just a luxurious tourist destination. It [accounts](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-31/nightmare-haunting-euro-s-founders-may-now-be-reality-with-italy) for 50 percent of Italian GDP. Germany’s GDP is predicted to fall by more than that of the United States, dragged down by its dependence on exports. The latest set of [forecasts](https://www.ft.com/content/b427db58-77e6-11ea-af44-daa3def9ae03) from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development are apocalyptic across the board. Hardest hit of all may be Japan, even though the virus has had a moderate impact there. In rich countries, we can at least attempt to make estimates of the damage. China was the first to initiate shutdowns on Jan. 23. The latest official figures show China’s unemployment at 6.2 percent, the highest number since records began in the 1990s, when the Chinese Communist Party reluctantly admitted joblessness was not a problem confined to the capitalist world. But that figure is clearly a gross understatement of the crisis in China. Unofficially, perhaps as many as [205 million migrant workers](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3078251/coronavirus-chinas-unemployment-crisis-mounts-nobody-knows) were furloughed, more than a quarter of the Chinese workforce. How one goes about counting the damage to the Indian economy from Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s abrupt 21-day shutdown is anyone’s guess. Of India’s workforce of 471 million, only 19 percent are covered by social security, two-thirds have no formal employment contract, and at least [100 million](https://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/coronavirus-lockdown-headed-home-as-migrants-have-no-room-to-isolate-120032501678_1.html) are migrant workers. Many of them have been sent in headlong flight back to their villages. There has been nothing like it since partition in 1947. The economic fallout from these immense human dramas defies calculation. We are left with the humdrum but no less remarkable statistic that this year, for the first time since reasonably reliable records of GDP began to be computed after World War II, the emerging market economies will contract. An entire model of global economic development has been brought skidding to a halt. An entire model of global economic development has been brought skidding to a halt. This collapse is not the result of a financial crisis. It is not even the direct result of the pandemic. The collapse is the result of a deliberate policy choice, which is itself a radical novelty. It is easier, it turns out, to stop an economy than it is to stimulate it. But the efforts that are being made to cushion the effects are themselves historically unprecedented. In the United States, the congressional stimulus package agreed within days of the shutdown is by far the largest in U.S. peacetime history. Across the world, there has been a move to open the purse strings. Fiscally conservative Germany has declared an emergency and removed its limits on public debt. Altogether, we are witnessing the largest combined fiscal effort launched since World War II. Its effects will make themselves felt in weeks and months to come. It is already clear that the first round may not be enough. An even more urgent task is to prevent the slowdown from turning into an immense financial crisis. It is commonly said that the U.S. Federal Reserve under Chairman Jerome Powell is following the 2008 playbook. This is true. Day by day, it spawns new programs to support every corner of the financial market. But what is different is the scale of the Fed’s interventions. To counter the epic shock of the shutdown, it has mobilized an immense wave of liquidity. In late March, the Fed was buying assets at a rate of $90 billion per day. This is more per day than Ben Bernanke’s Fed purchased most months. Every single second, the Fed was swapping almost a million dollars’ worth of Treasurys and mortgage-backed securities for cash. On the morning of April 9, at the same moment that the latest horrifying unemployment number was released, the Fed announced that it was launching an additional $2.3 trillion in asset purchases. This huge and immediate counterbalancing action has so far prevented an immediate global financial meltdown, but we now face a protracted period in which falling consumption and investment drive further contraction. Seventy-three percent of American households report having [suffered](https://www.ft.com/content/7a7233a3-160a-41be-8d63-40f64e041e57) a loss of income in March. For many, that loss is catastrophic, tipping them into acute need, default, and bankruptcy. Delinquencies on consumer debt will no doubt surge, leading to sustained damage to the financial system. Discretionary expenditure will be deferred. Petrol consumption in Europe has [fallen](https://www.ft.com/content/4c59fd16-6020-4798-b8f1-5df686bbd97a) by 88 percent. The market for automobiles is stone dead. Auto manufacturers across Europe and Asia are sitting on giant lots of unsold vehicles. The longer we sustain the lockdown, the deeper the scarring to the economy and the slower the recovery. In China, regular economic activity is inching back. But given the risk of second- and third-wave outbreaks, no one has any idea how far and fast the resumption of normal life can safely go. It seems likely, barring a dramatic medical breakthrough, that movement restrictions will need to stay in place to manage the unevenness of containment. A protracted and halting recovery seems far more likely at this point than a vigorous V-shaped bounce back. And even once current production and employment have restarted, we will be dealing with the financial hangover for years to come. The argument over fiscal policy is rarely engaged in the heat of the moment. In a crisis, it is easy to agree to spend money. But that fight is coming. We are engaged in the largest-ever surge in public debt in peacetime. Right now we are parking that debt on the balance sheet of central banks. Those central banks can also hold the interest rate low, which means that the debt service will not be exorbitant. But that defers the question of what to do with them. To the conventional mind debt must be eventually repaid through surpluses History suggests, however, there are also more radical alternatives. One would be a burst of inflation, though how that would be engineered given prevailing economic conditions is not obvious. Another would be a debt jubilee, a polite name for a public default (which would not be as drastic as it sounds if it affects the debts held on the account of the central bank). Some have [suggested](https://voxeu.org/article/fight-covid-pandemic-policymakers-must-move-fast-and-break-taboos#.Xos1vsVFjSp.twitter) it would be simpler for the central banks to cut out the business of buying debt issued by the government and instead simply to credit governments with a gigantic cash balance. And on 9 April that is exactly what the Bank of England [announced](https://www.ft.com/content/664c575b-0f54-44e5-ab78-2fd30ef213cb) it would be doing. For all intents and purposes, this means the central bank is simply printing money. That this is even being considered, and under a conservative government, is a measure of how extreme the situation is. It is also symptomatic that, rather than howls of outrage and immediate panic selling, the Bank of England’s decision has so far produced little more than a shrug from financial markets. They are under few illusions about the acrobatics that all the central banks are performing. This resigned attitude is helpful from the point of view of crisis-fighting. But do not expect the calm to last. When the lid comes off, politics will resume and so will the arguments about “debt burdens” and “sustainability.” When the lid comes off, politics will resume and so will the arguments about “debt burdens” and “sustainability.” And given the scale of the liabilities that have already been accumulated, we should expect it to get ugly.

#### That outweighs

#### Risk calculus – climate change can’t fit within conventional risk management and is ignored by social values – guarantees extinction and ruins the economy in the process

Dunlop 17 [Ian Dunlop chaired the Australian Coal Association in 1987-88, chaired the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading from 1998-2000 and was CEO of the Australian Institute of Company Directors from 1997-2001. He has a particular interest in the interaction of corporate governance, corporate responsibility and sustainability. An engineer by qualification, he holds an MA (Mechanical Sciences) degree from the University of Cambridge, he is a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, and the Energy Institute (UK), and a Member of the Society of Petroleum Engineers of AIME (USA). He also chairs the Australian National Wildlife Collection Foundation. David Spratt is a Research Director for Breakthrough and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action (Scribe 2008). His recent reports include Recount: It’s time to “Do the math” again; Climate Reality Check and Antarctic Tipping Points for a Multi-metre Sea-level Rise. A Failure of Imagination on Climate Risks. July 26, 2017. www.resilience.org/stories/2017-07-26/a-failure-of-imagination-on-climate-risks/]

Climate change is an existential risk that could abruptly end human civilisation because of a catastrophic “failure of imagination” by global leaders to understand and act on the science and evidence before them.

At the London School of Economics in 2008, Queen Elizabeth questioned: “Why did no one foresee the timing, extent and severity of the Global Financial Crisis?” The British Academy answered a year later: “A psychology of denial gripped the financial and corporate world… [it was] the failure of the collective imagination of many bright people… to understand the risks to the system as a whole”.

A “failure of imagination” has also been identified as one of the reasons for the breakdown in US intelligence around the 9/11 attacks in 2001.

A similar failure is occurring with climate change today.

The problem is widespread at the senior levels of government and global corporations. A 2016 report, Thinking the unthinkable, based on interviews with top leaders around the world, found that:

“A proliferation of ‘unthinkable’ events… has revealed a new fragility at the highest levels of corporate and public service leaderships. Their ability to spot, identify and handle unexpected, non-normative events is… perilously inadequate at critical moments… Remarkably, there remains a deep reluctance, or what might be called ‘executive myopia’, to see and contemplate even the possibility that ‘unthinkables’ might happen, let alone how to handle them.

Such failures are manifested in two ways in climate policy. At the political, bureaucratic and business level in underplaying the high-end risks and in failing to recognise that the existential risk of climate change is totally different from other risk categories. And at the research level in underestimating the rate of climate change impact and costs, along with an under-emphasis on, and poor communication of, those high-end risks.

Existential risk

An existential risk is an adverse outcome that would either annihilate intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential. For example, a big meteor impact, large-scale nuclear war, or sea levels 70 metres higher than today.

Existential risks are not amenable to the reactive (learn from failure) approach of conventional risk management, and we cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, or social attitudes developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Because the consequences are so severe — perhaps the end of human global civilisation as we know it — researchers say that “even for an honest, truth-seeking, and well-intentioned investigator it is difficult to think and act rationally in regard to… existential risks”.

Yet the evidence is clear that climate change already poses an existential risk to global economic and societal stability and to human civilisation that requires an emergency response. Temperature rises that are now in prospect could reduce the global human population by 80% or 90%. But this conversation is taboo, and the few who speak out are admonished as being overly alarmist.

Prof. Kevin Anderson considers that “a 4°C future [relative to pre-industrial levels] is incompatible with an organized global community, is likely to be beyond ‘adaptation’, is devastating to the majority of ecosystems, and has a high probability of not being stable”. He says: “If you have got a population of nine billion by 2050 and you hit 4°C, 5°C or 6°C, you might have half a billion people surviving”. Asked at a 2011 conference in Melbourne about the difference between a 2°C world and a 4°C world, Prof. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber replied in two words: “Human civilisation”.

#### Timeframe – only immediate, drastic reductions solve – there’s no cost to too much dedev, but falling short guarantees extinction – vote neg if there’s any risk the aff prolongs emissions

Roberts 10/8/18 [David Roberts, climate expert and energy politics reporter for Vox…but I swear Callahan wrote this. What genuine, no-bullshit ambition on climate change would look like. October 8, 2018. https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/5/7/17306008/climate-change-global-warming-scenarios-ambition]

In the end, perhaps the most important conclusion in the Nature Climate Change paper is the simplest and the one that we already knew: “a rapid transformation in energy consumption and land use is needed in all scenarios.”

At this point, whether it’s possible to hit various targets is almost beside the point. All the science and modeling are saying the same thing, which is that humanity faces serious danger and needs to reduce carbon emissions to zero as quickly as possible.

The chances of us getting our collective shit together and accomplishing what these scenarios describe are ... slim. There are so many vested interests and so much public aversion to rapid change, so many governments to be coordinated, so many economic and technology trends that must fall just the right way. It’s daunting.

Conversely, the chances of us overdoing it — trying too hard, spending too much money, reducing emissions too much or too fast — are effectively nil.

So the only rule of climate policy that really matters is: go as hard and fast as possible, forever and ever, amen.

#### Only a crash solves catastrophic climate change and forces a mindset shift – that outweighs recession, but they’re structurally inevitable in the long term from financial volatility and warming

Holthaus 12/27/18 [Eric Holthaus is a meteorologist and columnist for Grist, covering climate science, policy, and solutions. He has previously written for the Wall Street Journal, Slate, and a variety of other publications. What the stock market crash means for the climate. December 27, 2018. https://grist.org/article/what-the-stock-market-crash-means-for-the-climate/]

Let’s talk about the stock market. Pretty terrifying, huh? The big Christmas Eve dip plunged the U.S. markets into “bear” territory — with declines of over 20 percent in the past three months alone. The day after Christmas followed with the largest rally in market history, half of which evaporated at one point on Thursday, but then entirely came back by the afternoon. That’s a lot of volatility in a time when the future is pretty volatile already — that’s right, I’m talking about the climate.

For those of us with more of a planetary perspective, what are we supposed to make of this financial rollercoaster?

Politicians have long presented the economy and the environment as competing issues. And on the surface, the vast majority of people in the world don’t care about the stock market. Nearly half the people in the world live on less than $5.50 per day, and it’s them who’ll bear the brunt of climate change. When asked, they care much more about climate change than the economy.

There’s evidence that an economic downturn could be good for the planet. The rare times the world has successfully temporarily stabilized or decreased annual emissions were during economic recessions like 1990-93 and 2008-09.

Recessions can force a rethink of the status quo; they demand efficiency and innovation. In short, during a recession, the economy must figure out how to do more with less. That’s exactly the challenge we face now that the science is absolutely clear that radical change is our only hope to stop climate change before irreversible tipping points kick in.

But while our capitalistic, growth-based economy is still closely tied to fossil-fuel use and a sustained downturn would likely reduce emissions, the whole truth is not so simple. Economic hardship doesn’t just hurt the rich, who are (by far!) the world’s biggest carbon emitters. Economic downturns hit hard in places with large inequality like Miami and Puerto Rico, which are also slated to bear some of the biggest burdens of climate change.

Not only would another recession impact unemployment, it could result in a shift in priority away from long-term challenges (like climate change) and onto short-term survival. And because governments have a bad habit of choosing austerity as a tool for cutting spending, it’s likely the rich will try to pass off the burden of their mistakes on the backs of the working class.

It’s impossible to know whether a future economic downturn in the U.S. would result in a widening gap between rich and poor, popular revolt (as we recently saw with France’s yellow vests), or something else entirely. But according to the Trump administration’s own climate reports, there is a strong possibility of long-term global warming-related GDP shrinkage. Even though many people (including me) have argued that the human costs of climate change are more important than the monetary ones, that doesn’t mean environmentalists can afford to ignore a possible market downturn. Those hurricanes are going to keep on coming, and someone has to pay the bills.

Climate change is much more terrifying than a potential recession. Still, we SHOULD care about the volatility of the stock market and a looming recession — at the very least, it should make us pay attention to the fragility of our current system and provide excuses for rethinking the way things work.

#### Err neg---planetary boundaries are *already* being crossed and decoupling is impossible

Riccardo Mastini 18, PhD student in ecological economics and political ecology in the Institute of Environmental Science and Technology at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, 6/1/18, “Work in a World Without Growth,” https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/work-in-a-world-without-growth/

A fixation with growth in economics has seen GDP increase in proportion to environmental damage. As planetary limits draw ever closer and are even being surpassed, such a model cannot be sustained. Riccardo Mastini explains how a job guarantee could open up the way to a sustainable economic model.¶ Since the dawn of capitalism, market economies have placed a high emphasis on labour productivity. Continuous improvements in technology geared towards productivity increases lead to more output being produced for a given amount of labour. But crucially these advances also mean that fewer people are needed to produce the same amount of goods and services each year. As long as the economy expands fast enough to offset increases in labour productivity there is no problem. But if the economy does not grow, people lose their jobs.¶ Economic growth has been necessary within this system just to prevent mass unemployment. Communities and the politicians that represent them celebrate the construction of a new factory not so much for the increase in supply of some needed product, but because of the jobs it creates. In advanced economies, the shortage of employment has become more pressing than the shortage of products. Basically, we produce goods and services mostly to keep people employed rather than to cater for their needs.¶ But what if economic growth were to slow down and, eventually, come to a halt in the near future? More than half a century of ‘growth propaganda’ supporting the dogma that pursuing never-ending growth is plausible and desirable may make this new prospect shocking for some. However, there is now overwhelming evidence that decoupling GDP growth from increases in natural resource and energy use is impossible. And our plundering of Earth’s bounty has already reached unsustainable levels with the overshot of several planetary boundaries.¶ It is, therefore, time for a bold public debate about whether it is desirable to continue our relentless pursuit of economic growth, with the associated dire consequences for the health of the planet, simply to keep people employed. Adopting an economic policy proposal known as the job guarantee could ensure full employment while our society transitions towards an economy that no longer grows. All this, without sacrificing the goods and services needed for just and sustainable prosperity.¶ The need for planned economic degrowth¶ The idea of ‘degrowth’ takes aim at the irreconcilable contradiction between the growth imperative of capitalism and sustainability on a finite planet. Degrowth is defined as an equitable downscaling of production and consumption that will reduce society’s extraction of energy and raw materials and generation of waste. More broadly, degrowth means the abolition of economic growth as a social objective. Instead, degrowth implies a new direction for society, one in which we live and work differently from today by giving priority to a sustainable level of wellbeing for all citizens rather than to maximising wealth.

#### Slow Chinese growth doesn’t cause war

Levi et al 16 [Council on Foreign Relations’ Maurice R. Greenberg Center for Geoeconomic Studies and Asia Studies program workshop on the potential economic and geopolitical fallout of China’s slowing growth, led by Michael Levi, Director of the Maurice R. Greenberg Center for Geoeconomic Studies, PhD war studies, and Elizabeth Economy, C.V. Starr senior fellow and director for Asia studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, published widely on both Chinese domestic and foreign policy, PhD, “Insights from a CFR Workshop: Economic and Geopolitical Fallout From China’s Slowing Growth”, 2/25/16, http://www.cfr.org/china/economic-geopolitical-fallout-chinas-slowing-growth/p37554]//DBI

...But Beijing Is Unlikely to Wage War if the Economy Crashes∂ By the same token, analysts should probably discard the notion that a crash of the domestic economy would provoke a Chinese military adventure abroad in order to distract Chinese people from upheaval at home. This “wag the dog” scenario may gain currency with screenplay writers and conspiracy buffs, but it is not borne out by history. Although it is true that strife-torn countries often get embroiled in external wars, it is rarely because their leaders set out to generate a diversionary activity for their restive populace.∂ Indeed, most workshop participants argued that if China were beset by an acute internal crisis, the Communist Party would almost certainly refocus its energy and resources inward. The leadership and its security apparatus, including components of the military, would have their hands full protecting against social instability, tamping down the activities of Uighur and Tibetan separatists, and maintaining the cohesiveness of the party itself. To launch a foreign war in an atmosphere of domestic public grievance would be particularly dangerous for Beijing. If China sustained a defeat at the hands of the Japanese or U.S. navy, the leadership would compound its reputation for economic mismanagement with one for military ineptitude—a potentially lethal cocktail for the ruling party.