## 2AC Heg Sustainable

**Heg is durable – in depth studies of major factors in international relations**

Michael **Beckley** **12 -** PhD student at Columbia University and a predoctoral fellow at Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (The Unipolar Era: Why American Power Persists and China’s Rise Is Limited, Columbia University)

The conventional wisdom in U.S. foreign policy debates is that the United States is in relative decline to China and that much of this decline is the result of globalization and the hegemonic burdens the United States bears to sustain globalization. These ideas frame the public discussion of U.S. foreign policy, influence intelligence assessments that inform decision making in the U.S. government, and shape the development of international relations theory and scholarly research agendas. The results presented in this study, however, suggest that the conventional wisdom is mistaken. Over the last 20 years, globalization and U.S. hegemonic burdens have expanded, yet the United States has risen relative to China. The United States’ hegemonic presence abroad appears to be much cheaper than past hegemonic systems and, in fact, may be net‐profitable. And globalization seems to cause wealth and innovation to cluster in areas that are already wealthy and innovative and, in particular, in the United States. Many factors, both foreign and domestic, will shape the evolution of the international balance of power, and there is no guarantee that the trends highlighted in this study will persist. At the very least, however, these trends suggest unipolarityismoredurable**,** and will likely last longer, than is typically assumed. This conclusion has important implications for international relationship scholarship and policy.

## T-Military

**We meet – carriers cause future infrastructure investment by stopping wars**

**Counter-interpretation – transportation infrastructure are DTS programs that transport military operations**

**Fairbanks 96** (D. Fairbanks, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, “DoD Transportation Engineering,” April 1996, DoD Directive 4510.11, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA306890, Sawyer)

2. Defense Transportation System. That portion of the Nation's **transportation infrastructure** that supports DoD common-user transportation needs across the range of military operations. It consists of those common-user military and commercial assets, services, and systems organic to, contracted for, or controlled by the Department of Defense. Also called DTS.

**And here’s a 2nd counter-interpretation that includes airports**

**Alshawi 09** (11/20/2009, Mustafa – chairman of the Iraq Institute for Economic Reforms, and Associate Dean of Research at the University of Salford, Concept and Background to Public Private Partnership (PPP)/Private Finance Initiative (PFI): UK Experience, p. 1)

1 Infrastructure is defined as **transportation infrastructure** (roads, bridges, airports, ports, rail lines); communications infrastructure; housing; and electricity generation and distribution. Infrastructure projects can be “mega projects” (dams, coast-to‐coast highways, mega‐ports, large power plants) or much smaller projects that can include communication franchises or limited highway spurs.

**We’re an airport**

**DOD 12**

The Today’s Military – Military Glossary Section – last updated 2012 – The Today’s Military website is produced by the United States Department of Defense. This site is not intended as a recruiting tool for any branch of the U.S. Military. Rather, it was developed as a resource for parents, educators and young adults curious about military service. http://www.todaysmilitary.com/inside/view/sailors-aboard-the-uss-nimitz

Aircraft carriers are essentially **airports at sea**, and they provide military aircraft with enough space to take off and land in international waters. Some of these aircraft carriers are bigger than others. For example, the USS Nimitz is a supercarrier and has room for 6,000 people, not to mention up to 85 aircraft. It takes a lot of Sailors to keep aircraft carriers as large as the USS Nimitz running smoothly.

**Increase means pre-existing**

**Buckley et al 06 -** attorney (Jeremiah, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al,

<http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf>)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). ¶ Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

**No aff meets their interpretation – everything can be military**

**US Code No Date** – ( 10 USC § 2644 - CONTROL OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN TIME OF WAR, http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/10/2644)#SPS

In time of war, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, may take possession and assume control of all or part of any system of transportation to transport troops, war material, and equipment, or for other purposes related to the emergency. So far as necessary, he may use the system to the exclusion of other traffic.

**Reasonability – vote aff if we’re reasonable for debate – there’s a resolutional basis and competing interpretations only create a race to the bottom**

**Oxford Dictionaries Online, No Date** (“Its”, <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/its?view=uk>)

its

Entry from World dictionary

Pronunciation:/ɪts/

possessive determiner

belonging to or associated with a thing previously mentioned or easily identified: turn the camera on its side

he chose the area for its atmosphere

**There’s no definition of transportation infrastructure – legislation is purposely vague to allow for reinterpretation of it**

**Beaudry 09** (Ryan, 2009, graduate student at British Colombia citing interview of someone involved in the DCC legislation process, “EXPLORING THE DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE FRAMEWORK FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA”, <https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/id/147609/SCARP_2011_GradProject_Beaudry.pdf>

The first interview question asked the representative to identify why the DCC legislation for transportation infrastructure is so vague, and why a term such as highway facilities and not something more specific is being used. The response was that the legislation is very old, and that during its inception it made sense (and it still does to some degree) to have it be vague in order to allow broad interpretation. It was desirable not to limit the types of transportation infrastructure projects merely to the building and paving of roads.

## 2AC Cap K

**Representations of capitalism as hegemonically dominant preclude the realization of actual social change**

**Gibson-Graham 06** – J.K., pen name shared by feminist economic geographers Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson (“The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, pg 2-5)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor.4 Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imagination.5 What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted?6 If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions.7 In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representati n. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and centering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; selfidentical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.8 The argument revisited: it is the way capitalism has been "thought" that has made it so difficult for people to imagine its supersession.9 It is therefore the ways in which capitalism is known that we wish to delegitimize and displace. The process is one of unearthing, of bringing to light images and habits of understanding that constitute "hegemonic capitalism" at the intersection of a set of representations. This we see as a first step toward theorizing capitalism without representing dominance as a natural and inevitable feature of its being. At the same time, we hope to foster conditions under which the economy might become less subject to definitional closure. If it were possible to inhabit a heterogeneous and open-ended economic space whose identity was not fixed or singular (the space potentially to be vacated by a capitalism that is necessarily and naturally hegemonic) then a vision of noncapitalist economic practices as existing and widespread might be able to be born; and in the context of such a vision, a new anticapitalist politics might emerge, a noncapitalist politics of class (whatever that may mean) might take root and flourish. A long shot perhaps but one worth pursuing.

**There is an infinite value to life - their framework causes extinction and kills value to life**

**Kateb 92, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, (George, The Inner Ocean, pg. 144)**

To sum up the lines of thought that Nietzsche starts, I suggest first that it is epistemologically impossible for humanity to arrive at an estimation of the worth of itself or of the rest of nature: it cannot pretend to see itself from the outside or to see the rest, as it were, from the inside. Second, after allowance is made for this quandary, which is occasioned by the death of God and the birth of truth, humanity, placed in a position in which it is able to extinguish human life and natural life on earth, must simply affirm existence as such. Existence must go on but not because of any particular feature or group of features. The affirmation of existence refuses to say what worth existence has, even from just a human perspective, from any human perspective whatever. It cannot say, because existence is indefinite; it is beyond evaluating; being undesigned it is unencompassable by a defined and definite judgment. (The philosopher Frederick A. Olafson speaks of "the stubbornly unconceptualizable fact of existence.") The worth of the existence passed on to the unborn is not measurable but indefinite. The judgment is minimal: no human purpose or value within existence is worth more than existence and can ever be used to justify the risk of extinction. Third, from the moral point of view, existence seems unjustifiable because of the pain and ugliness in it, and therefore the moral point of view must be chastened if it is not to block attachment to existence as such. The other minimal judgment is that whatever existence is, it is better than nothing. For the first time, in the nuclear age, humanity can fully perceive existence from the perspective of nothing, which in part is the perspective of extinction.

**All lives are equal – you should treat them equally by saving them all**

**Dworkin 77** – Professor of Law and Philosophy at New York University

(Ronald 1977, “Taking Rights Seriously” pg 274-5)

The liberal conception of equality sharply limits the extent to which ideal arguments of policy may be used to justify any constraint on liberty. Such arguments cannot be used if the idea in question is itself controversial within the community. Constraints cannot be defended, for example, directly on the ground that they contribute to a culturally sophisticated community, whether the community wants the sophistication or not, because that argument would violate the canon of the liberal conception of equality that prohibits a government from relying on the claim that certain forms of life are inherently more valuable than others. Utilitarian argument of policy, however, would seem secure from that objection. They do not suppose that any form of life is inherently more valuable than any other, but instead base· their claim, that constraints on liberty are necessary to advance some collective goal of the community, just on the fact that that goal happens to be desired more widely or more deeply than any other. Utilitarian arguments of policy, therefore, seem not to oppose but on the contrary to embody the fundamental right of equal concern and respect, because they treat the wishes of each member of the community on a par with the wishes of any other, with no bonus or discount reflecting the view that that member is more or less worthy of concern, or his views more or less worthy of respect, than any other. This appearance of egalitarianism has, I think, been the principal source of the great appeal that utilitarianism has had, as a general political philosophy, over the last century. In Chapter 9, however, I pointed out that the egalitarian character of a utilitarian argument is often an illusion. I will not repeat, but only summarize, my argument here. Utilitarian arguments fix on the fact that a particular constraint on liberty will make more people happier, or satisfy more of their preferences, depending upon whether psychological or preference utilitarianism is in play. But people's overall preference for one policy rather than another may be seen to include, on further analysis, both preference that are personal, because they state a preference for the assignment of one set of goods or opportunities to him and preferences that are external, because they state a preference for one assignment of goods or opportunities to others. But a utilitarian argument that assigns critical weight to the external preferences of members of the community will not be egalitarian in the sense under consideration. It will not respect the right of everyone to be treated with equal concern and respect.

#### Their Kritik is a form of asymmetrical warfare that seeks to undermine and collapse the United States – allows for Russian expansionism

#### Nyquist 09—BA in political science from UCI. Two years in a PhD program, in pol sci. Former high school and college prof. Regular geopolitical columnist for Financial Sense Online. Contracted with the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency (J. R., The Sequence, <http://www.financialsensearchive.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2009/0828.html>,)

In advance of any military campaign relying on tank divisions and nuclear rocket regiments, it is necessary to soften the United States through a series of clandestine and subversive moves: first, there was the use of narcotics trafficking as a weapon, which began in 1960. Prior to that, there was the infiltration of organized crime, the penetration of U.S. banks, and the introduction of the Peaceful Coexistence Struggle by Nikita Khrushchev. For those interested in the details of this, please refer to a book titled Red Cocaine, by Joseph D. Douglass. (It is based on the testimony of one of the highest-level Communsit defectors of all time, Jan Sejna.) The campaign involves the use of economic weapons, as well as educational weapons. Every civilization nourishes within itself various cults opposed to its values. That is basically what "Communism" represents. The specifics of ideology are unimportant, for what is represented is essentially anti-capitalism, anti-Christianity, anti-Western civilization. It can change its name, it rhetoric, its tactics, but the movement in opposition to civilization remains essentially the same in its determination to destroy what presently exists. Taking this into account, take a good look around and re-examine the former Cold War battlefield. Note the changes around the globe, and the changes in Washington. What do you think has been happening over the last 20 years? Robert Chandler has written a book titled Shadow World: Resurgent Russia, the Global New Left, and Radical Islam. What is valuable in Chandler's work relates to his firsthand interactions with Leftist organizers in the United States. According to Chandler, there is a vast network in America that aims to bring down the capitalist system, destroy the U.S. Constitution, and break up the federal system by getting control of the government. "The driving forces in this top network," wrote Chandler, "are the 'thought leaders' and other individuals in non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndacalists." He noted that "leadingmembers are the Washington, D.C.-based revolutionary centers -- the institute for Policy Studies ... as well as the coopted mainstream media and politicians making up the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the 'Shadow Party' hiding inside the Democratic Party...." According to Chandler, "The radical Left" is engaging in a new form of political warfare in which the Left targeted "open spaces" in the American social structure; namely, schools and universities, government, churches and community organizations. The idea was, wrote Chandler, "to transform society and replace traditional American values and institutions with neo-Marxist values." At a Marxist conference that Chandler attended, one of the agenda items was openly listed as, "The Strange Pleasures of Destruction in Capitalist America." He relates that most of the participants "were university professors." In the course of this conference, purely by accident, he ran into Zapatista Subcommandante Marcos in an underground parking garage. According to Chandler, "Orthodox communsits warned conference participants about the dangers of wandering away from the basics of Marx and Lenin...." He further explained that everyone present at the conference agreed it was necessary to "destroy the state as a part of the coming socialist revolution. There simply was no other way to achieve socialist governance in the United States than to crush the existing capitalist system." Now the sequence should be clear. If the United States is bankrupt, politically divided and internally sabotaged by the radicals of the Left who have everywhere infiltrated the system, will there be a logistical support network for maintaining our tanks, bombers and ICBMS? What seems fantastic on first-hearing is actually everyday life for those who are paying attention. Look at the world around you. There are those who have been enriching themselves as they sabotage the economy and poison the culture. They pretend to care about the poor and downtrodden. But they live in mansions, collect enormous sums from government and business, advancing the foreign policy goals of enemy dictators. The organized Left is a business with access to billions of dollars. Its tendency is to serve as a fifth column. Now imagine the collapse of the dollar. Imagine the collapse of the U.S. federal system, the Constitution, and America's domestic tranquility. How will the country defend itself from Russian missiles when our missiles no longer work because they have fallen into disrepair after an economic collapse? Here is asymetrical warfare at its best. Here is the beginning of what I call "the sequence."

#### Russian expansionism triggers multiple scenarios for extinction

#### Blank 09, strategic Studies Institute's expert on the Soviet bloc and the post-Soviet world since 1989; former Associate Professor of Soviet Studies at the Center for Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education, Maxwell Air Force Base; B.A. in History University of Pennsylvania, and a M.A. and Ph.D. in History from the University of Chicago, (Stephen J., “RUSSIA AND ARMS CONTROL: ARE THERE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION?”)

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation.168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need.169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author170) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances 67 in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD.171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.172

**Capitalism isn’t the root cause of war**

**Dandeker** **92, Professor of Military Sociology in the Department of War Studies at King’s College London,** in ‘92

**[Christopher , “The Causes of War and the History of Modern Sociological Theory,” Effects of War on Society, Edited by Giorgio Ausenda, Published by the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress by Boydell & Brewer Ltd, p. 44-46]**

All these arguments presuppose two specious sociological contentions: first that capitalism, as the most historically developed and dynamic form of class exploitation, is the source of modern militarism, and second, that socialism, preferably on a world scale would involve the abolition of war. The deficiencies in these views, and indeed of those associated with the industrial society thesis discussed earlier, can be revealed by drawing on Machiavellian themes which can then be set out more explicitly in the next section. Despite the fact that industrial capitalism has produced two world wars, as Aron (1954) and more recently Michael Mann (1984) have argued, there is no ’special relationship’ between capitalism and militarism—or the tendency to war—only one of historical indifference. All the pre-dispositions of ‘capitalist states’ to use warfare calculatively as a means of resolving their disputes with other states predate the formation of capitalism as an economic system. Of course, it could be argued that capitalism merely changes the form of militarism. That is to say, pre-capitalist patterns of militarism were still expressions of class relations and modern capitalism has just increased the destructive power of the industrialised means of war available to the state. But this argument will not do. Socialist societies in their use of industrialised power show that the technological potential for war is transferable and can be reproduced under non-capitalist conditions. Furthermore, the military activities of socialist states cannot be explained in terms of a [end page 44] defensive war against capitalism or even an aggressive one, as national and geopolitical power motives are arguably just as significant in the determination of state behaviour. Furthermore, imperial expansion not only predates capitalism but it is also difficult to reduce the causes of wars then and now to the interests of dominant economic classes (Mann 1984:25-46). Meanwhile, modern attempts to explain patterns of military expenditure in terms of the imperatives of capital accumulation face major difficulties. The association between economic boom and military spending has been revealed as an empirical association not an inherent connection; indeed the evidence from Germany and Japan indicates that low levels of military spending might well be associated with economic performances superior to those of societies which commit more of their GNP to defence expenditure. Furthermore, the idea that war and the threat of war are weapons of national mythology used by dominant classes to confuse the working class and weaken their natural affinity with international socialism faces the problem that, as in the case of Europe in 1914, national enthusiasms were such that truly remarkable powers would have to be attributed to ruling classes in order to make sense of them while in any case alternative explanations are at hand (Howard 1976:108-15). The problems of economic determinism in Marxist social theory are compounded by two further difficulties. The first of these concerns is its emphasis on endogenous, unfolding models of social change. The tendency is to view state behaviour in terms of the imperatives of internal class relations with warfare being regarded as the externalisation of the contradictory nature of those relations.

**Capitalism is progressive, self-correcting, and wealth-generating – ensures sustainability**

**Goklany 07**-Julia Simon Fellow @ the Political Economy Research Center [Indur, Reason.com, “Now for the Good News,” 3/23/2007, <http://reason.com/archives/2007/03/23/now-for-the-good-news>]

Environmentalists and globalization foes are united in their fear that greater population and consumption of energy, materials, and chemicals accompanying economic growth, technological change and free trade—the mainstays of globalization—degrade human and environmental well-being. Indeed, the 20th century saw the United States’ population multiply by four, income by seven, carbon dioxide emissions by nine, use of materials by 27, and use of chemicals by more than 100. Yet life expectancy increased from 47 years to 77 years. Onset of major disease such as cancer, heart, and respiratory disease has been postponed between eight and eleven years in the past century. Heart disease and cancer rates have been in rapid decline over the last two decades, and total cancer deaths have actually declined the last two years, despite increases in population. Among the very young, infant mortality has declined from 100 deaths per 1,000 births in 1913 to just seven per 1,000 today. These improvements haven’t been restricted to the United States. It’s a global phenomenon. Worldwide, life expectancy has more than doubled, from 31 years in 1900 to 67 years today. India’s and China’s infant mortalities exceeded 190 per 1,000 births in the early 1950s; today they are 62 and 26, respectively. In the developing world, the proportion of the population suffering from chronic hunger declined from 37 percent to 17 percent between 1970 and 2001 despite a 83 percent increase in population. Globally average annual incomes in real dollars have tripled since 1950. Consequently, the proportion of the planet's developing-world population living in absolute poverty has halved since 1981, from 40 percent to 20 percent. Child labor in low income countries declined from 30 percent to 18 percent between 1960 and 2003. Equally important, the world is more literate and better educated than ever. People are freer politically, economically, and socially to pursue their well-being as they see fit. More people choose their own rulers, and have freedom of expression. They are more likely to live under rule of law, and less likely to be arbitrarily deprived of life, limb, and property. Social and professional mobility have also never been greater. It’s easier than ever for people across the world to transcend the bonds of caste, place, gender, and other accidents of birth. People today work fewer hours and have more money and better health to enjoy their leisure time than their ancestors. Man’s environmental record is more complex. The early stages of development can indeed cause some environmental deterioration as societies pursue first-order problems affecting human well-being. These include hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, and lack of education, basic public health services, safe water, sanitation, mobility, and ready sources of energy. Because greater wealth alleviates these problems while providing basic creature comforts, individuals and societies initially focus on economic development, often neglecting other aspects of environmental quality. In time, however, they recognize that environmental deterioration reduces their quality of life. Accordingly, they put more of their recently acquired wealth and human capital into developing and implementing cleaner technologies. This brings about an environmental transition via the twin forces of economic development and technological progress, which begin to provide solutions to environmental problems instead of creating those problems. All of which is why we today find that the richest countries are also the cleanest. And while many developing countries have yet to get past the “green ceiling,” they are nevertheless ahead of where today’s developed countries used to be when they were equally wealthy. The point of transition from "industrial period" to "environmental conscious" continues to fall. For example, the US introduced unleaded gasoline only after its GDP per capita exceeded $16,000. India and China did the same before they reached $3,000 per capita. This progress is a testament to the power of globalization and the transfer of ideas and knowledge (that lead is harmful, for example). It's also testament to the importance of trade in transferring technology from developed to developing countries—in this case, the technology needed to remove lead from gasoline. This hints at the answer to the question of why some parts of the world have been left behind while the rest of the world has thrived. Why have improvements in well-being stalled in areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world? The proximate cause of improvements in well-being is a “cycle of progress” composed of the mutually reinforcing forces of economic development and technological progress. But that cycle itself is propelled by a web of essential institutions, particularly property rights, free markets, and rule of law. Other important institutions would include science- and technology-based problem-solving founded on skepticism and experimentation; receptiveness to new technologies and ideas; and freer trade in goods, services—most importantly in knowledge and ideas. In short, free and open societies prosper. Isolation, intolerance, and hostility to the free exchange of knowledge, technology, people, and goods breed stagnation or regression.

**Capitalism solves the environment**

**Nordhaus & Shellenberger 07-**[Break Through: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility, Ted & Michael, Managing Directors of American Environics, A social values research and strategy firm 15-17]

The politics we propose breaks with several widely accepted, largely unconscious distinctions, such as those between humans and nature, the community and the individual, and the government and the market. Few things have hampered environmentalism more than its longstanding position that limits to growth are the remedy for ecological crises. We argue for an explicitly pro-growth agenda that defines the kind of prosperity we believe is necessary to improve the quality of human life and to overcome ecological crises. One of the places where this politics of possibility takes concrete form is at the intersection of investment and innovation. There is simply no way we can achieve an 80 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions without creating breakthrough technologies that do not pollute. This is not just our opinion but also that of the United Nations International Panel on Climate Change, of Nicholas Stern, the former chief economist of the World Bank, and of top energy experts worldwide. Unfortunately, as a result of twenty years of cuts in funding research and development in energy, we are still a long way from even beginning to create these breakthroughs. The transition to a clean-energy economy should be modeled not on pollution control efforts, like the one on acid rain, but rather on past investments in infrastructure, such as railroads and highways, as well as on research and development - microchips, medi cines, and the Internet, among other areas. This innovation-centered framework makes sense not only for the long-term expansion of individual freedom, possibility, and choice that characterize modern democratic nations, but also for the cultural peculiarities of the United States. In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that "in the United States, there is no limit to the inventiveness of man to discover ways of increasing wealth and to satisfy the public's needs." Rather than *limiting* the aspirations of Americans, we believe that we should harness them in order to, in Tocqueville's words, "make new discoveries to increase the general prosperity, which, when made, they pass eagerly to the mass of people." The good news is that, at the very moment when we find ourselves facing new problems, from global warming to postmaterialist insecurity, new social and economic forces are emerging to overcome them. The new high-tech businesses and the new creative class may become a political force for a new, postindustrial social contract and a new clean-energy economy. One inspiring model for overcoming adversity can be found in the formation, after World War II, of what would later become the European Union. It was in the postwar years that the United States, France, Britain, and West Germany invested billions in the European Coal and Steel Community, which existed to rebuild war-torn nations and repair relations between former enemies, and which grew to become the greatest economic power the world has ever seen. Today's European Union wouldn't exist had it not been for a massive, shared global investment in energy. It's not hard to imagine what a similar approach to clean energy might do for countries like the United States, China, and India. But environmentalism has also saddled us with the albatross we call the politics of limits, which seeks to constrain human ambition, aspiration, and power rather than unleash and direct them.

**Transition from capitalism causes transition wars**
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There are several different issues that I’m thinking of when I use the term “sustainable.” One is that it is hard to imagine that a break with capitalism will emerge throughout the world all at once. This presents a very serious problem of sustainability, since history has shown, I believe, that socialism in one country is indeed impossible. What can be done to defend the break with capitalism in the meantime, against both the inevitable attempt at counter-revolution and capitalism’s totalizing tendency, its tendency to swallow up and incorporate everything within itself? I do not know. I do not know anyone who knows. But I do know that this is a question that needs to be thought through with extreme care – and now. It cannot be put off until “after the revolution.” To assume that there will be time, at that point, to think it through or time to work it out through experimentation, is wishful thinking at best. It is quite hard to believe that there will be any time at all before the counter-revolution and the tentacles of the capitalist system go to work. In referring to “sustainability,” I also have several economic problems in mind that must be confronted. If the emergent new society does not “deliver the goods,” and if it does not move towards elimination of alienated labor and reduction of working time, there will be no popular mandate for it – and indeed, no reason for its continued existence. At this point, it could be kept alive only through force, through suppression of mass opposition, so it would turn into its opposite.