

## CAPITALISM INDEX

**De-development note:** this file can also be used to impact turn economic collapse. You can read the “AT: econ collapse turns” cards that argue that economic collapse is inevitable and it is better if it happens now. Then, all of the alt solves cards are why abandoning capitalism is best.

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| SHELL     |   |
| 1NC ..... | 3 |

### LINKS

|                                  |    |
|----------------------------------|----|
| link: single issue reforms.....  | 7  |
| link: renewables.....            | 10 |
| link: climate .....              | 15 |
| link: incentives .....           | 17 |
| link: biofuels.....              | 19 |
| link: biofuels/food prices ..... | 22 |
| link: wind.....                  | 23 |
| link: solar .....                | 26 |
| link: hydrogen.....              | 27 |
| link: nuclear.....               | 28 |
| link: hegemony .....             | 29 |
| link: free trade .....           | 31 |

### IMPACTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| impact: extinction .....               | 32 |
| impact: nuclear war .....              | 34 |
| impact: resource wars .....            | 35 |
| impact: war .....                      | 36 |
| impact: terrorism .....                | 37 |
| impact: oil wars .....                 | 38 |
| impact: peak oil .....                 | 41 |
| impact: genocide .....                 | 42 |
| impact: no democracy .....             | 44 |
| impact: slavery .....                  | 47 |
| impact: failed states .....            | 48 |
| impact: famine, war .....              | 49 |
| impact: starvation .....               | 50 |
| impact: racism .....                   | 51 |
| impact: poverty .....                  | 52 |
| impact: warming .....                  | 53 |
| impact: undermines morality .....      | 54 |
| impact: racism, sexism .....           | 55 |
| impact: sexism .....                   | 56 |
| impact: colonialism .....              | 57 |
| impact: colonialism = extinction ..... | 58 |

## ALTERNATIVE

|  |    |
|--|----|
| alt solves: individuals matter .....   | 59 |
| alt solves: environmental justice..... | 62 |
| alt solves: poverty.....               | 64 |
| at: alt utopian.....                   | 65 |
| at: alt too slow .....                 | 67 |
| at: movements fail .....               | 69 |
| at: permutation.....                   | 70 |
| at: capitalism inevitable.....         | 74 |
| at: cede the political.....            | 77 |
| at: role playing.....                  | 79 |
| at: doomsaying kills alternative.....  | 80 |

## AT: TURNS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| at: econ impact turns: inevitable, fast better ..... | 81  |
| at: econ collapse turns: causes shift.....           | 84  |
| at: econ collapse inevitable.....                    | 85  |
| at: nuclear war outweighs.....                       | 87  |
| at: case outweighs.....                              | 88  |
| at: advanced cap cleaner .....                       | 89  |
| at: cap raises living standards .....                | 92  |
| at: tech solves .....                                | 93  |
| at: cap lowers population.....                       | 97  |
| at: india & china prove globalization good.....      | 100 |
| at: utilitarianism.....                              | 101 |
| at: simon .....                                      | 102 |
| at: lovins .....                                     | 103 |

## AFFIRMATIVE

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| aff: alt never spills over .....                    | 104 |
| aff: capitalism inevitable .....                    | 105 |
| aff: cede the political .....                       | 107 |
| aff: cede the political, trainer specific.....      | 111 |
| aff: reforms effective .....                        | 112 |
| aff: permutation .....                              | 113 |
| aff: econ decline risks extinction .....            | 115 |
| aff: at: cap collapse inevitable .....              | 117 |
| aff: alt kills millions.....                        | 119 |
| aff: worst governments in hsitory .....             | 121 |
| aff: cap solves war .....                           | 122 |
| aff: tech saves us.....                             | 124 |
| aff: cap solves terrorism .....                     | 125 |
| aff: cap key to space, space good .....             | 126 |
| aff: cap solves famine .....                        | 127 |
| aff: cap solves north-south divide.....             | 128 |
| aff: cap solves disease .....                       | 129 |
| aff: cap key to democracy & rights.....             | 130 |
| aff: alt worse for the environment .....            | 131 |
| aff: cap solves environment.....                    | 134 |
| aff: cap lowers population growth .....             | 139 |
| aff: over-population destroys the environment ..... | 141 |
| aff: over-population causes war and genocide.....   | 143 |
| aff: globalization good.....                        | 144 |
| aff: we should not connect with nature.....         | 146 |

## 1NC

**Market incentives ignore the limits of exponential growth – the idea that regulations will solve environmental problems obscures the need to eliminate capitalism itself.**

**Foster, 01** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. "Ecology Against Capitalism" <http://www.monthlyreview.org/1001jbf.htm>)

Capitalism and its economists have generally treated ecological problems as something to be avoided rather than seriously addressed. Economic growth theorist Robert Solow wrote in the American Economic Review in May 1974, in the midst of the famous "limits to growth" debate, that, "if it is very easy to substitute other factors for natural resources, then there is in principle no 'problem.' The world can, in effect, get along without natural resources, so exhaustion is just an event, not a catastrophe." Solow, who later received the Nobel Prize in economics, was speaking hypothetically and did not actually go so far as to say that near-perfect substitutability was a reality or that natural resources were fully dispensable. But he followed up his hypothetical point by arguing that the degree of substitutability at present is so great that all worries of Doomsday ecological prophets could be put aside. Whatever minor flaws existed in the price system, leading to the failure to account for environmental costs, could be cured through the use of market incentives, with government playing a very limited role in the creation of such incentives. What had outraged orthodox economists such as Solow, when a group of MIT whiz kids first raised the issue of the limits to growth in the early 1970s, was that the argument was premised on the same kinds of mathematical computer forecasting models, pointing to exponential growth trends, that economists frequently used themselves. But in this case, the focus was on exponential increases in the demands placed on a finite environment, rather than the magic of economic expansion. If the forecasting of the limits to growth theorists was full of problems, it nonetheless highlighted the truism—conveniently ignored by capitalism and its economists—that infinite expansion within a finite environment was a contradiction in terms. It thus posed a potential catastrophic conflict between global capitalism and the global environment. Capitalist economies are geared first and foremost to the growth of profits, and hence to economic growth at virtually any cost—including the exploitation and misery of the vast majority of the world's population. This rush to grow generally means rapid absorption of energy and materials and the dumping of more and more wastes into the environment—hence widening environmental degradation. Just as significant as capitalism's emphasis on unending expansion is its short-term time horizon in determining investments. In evaluating any investment prospect, owners of capital figure on getting their investment back in a calculable period (usually quite short) and profits forever after. It is true that a longer-term perspective is commonly adopted by investors in mines, oil wells, and other natural resources. In these areas the dominant motives are obviously to secure a supply of materials for the manufacture of a final product, and to obtain a rate of return that over the long run is exceptionally high. But even in these cases the time horizon rarely exceeds ten to fifteen years—a far cry from the fifty to one hundred year (or even more) perspective needed to protect the biosphere. With respect to those environmental conditions that bear most directly on human society, economic development needs to be planned so as to include such factors as water resources and their distribution, availability of clean water, rationing and conservation of nonrenewable resources, disposal of wastes, and effects on population and the environment associated with the specific locations chosen for industrial projects. These all represent issues of sustainability, i.e., raising questions of intergenerational environmental equity, and cannot be incorporated within the short-term time horizon of nonphilanthropic capital, which needs to recoup its investment in the foreseeable future, plus secure a flow of profits to warrant the risk and to do better than alternative investment opportunities. Big investors need to pay attention to the stock market, which is a source of capital for expansion and a facilitator of mergers and acquisitions. Corporations are expected to maintain the value of their stockholder's equity and to provide regular dividends. A significant part of the wealth of top corporate executives depends on the growth in the stock market prices of the stock options they hold. Moreover, the huge bonuses received by top corporate executives are influenced not only by the growth in profits but often as well by the rise in the prices of company stock. A long-run point of view is completely irrelevant in the fluctuating stock market. The perspective in stock market "valuation" is the rate of profit gains or losses in recent years or prospects for next year's profits. Even the much-trumpeted flood of money going into the New Economy with future prospects in mind, able momentarily to overlook company losses, has already had its comeuppance. Speculative investors looking to reap rich rewards via the stock market or venture capital may have some patience for a year or so, but patience evaporates very quickly if the companies invested in keep having losses. Besides investing their own surplus funds, corporations also borrow via long-term bonds. For this, they have to make enough money to pay interest and to set aside a sinking fund for future repayment of bonds. The short-term time horizon endemic to capitalist investment decisions thus becomes a critical factor in determining its overall environmental effects. Controlling emissions of some of the worst pollutants (usually through end-of-pipe methods) can have a positive and almost immediate effect on people's lives. However, the real protection of the environment requires a view of the needs of generations to come. A good deal of environmental long-term policy for promoting sustainable development has to do with the third world. This is exactly the place where capital, based in the rich countries, requires the fastest return on its investments, often demanding that it get its initial investment back in a year or two. The time horizon that governs investment decisions in these as in other cases is not a question of "good" capitalists who are willing to give up profits for the sake of society and future generations—or "bad" capitalists who are not—but simply of how the system works. Even those industries that typically look ahead must sooner or later satisfy the demands of investors, bondholders, and banks. The foregoing defects in capitalism's relation to the environment are evident today in all areas of what we now commonly call "the environmental crisis," which encompasses problems as diverse as: global warming, destruction of the ozone layer, removal of tropical forests, elimination of coral reefs, overfishing, extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, the increasing toxicity of our environment and our food, desertification, shrinking water supplies, lack of clean water, and radioactive contamination—to name just a few. The list is very long and rapidly getting longer, and the spatial scales on which these problems manifest themselves are increasing.

## 1NC

**Renewable energy makes capitalism WORSE. The plan simply guarantees that we have the fuel to continue destroying the planet.**

**Trainer 07** – Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales (Ted, *Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain A Consumer Society*, pg. 125-126)

The core “limits to growth” claim is that the huge global problems we are facing cannot be solved in a society that is driven by obsession with high rates of production and consumption, affluent living standards, market forces, the profit motive and economic growth. The resource demand generated by this society is the direct cause of ecological destruction, Third World poverty, resource depletion, conflict and social breakdown. These problems cannot be solved unless we move to simpler lifestyles, more self-sufficient and cooperative ways, and a very different economy. Chapter 11 will detail what many see as “The Simpler Way.” Again energy depletion is only one of the alarming problems we are running into, and our limits to growth predicament would still exist even if renewable energy sources could provide all the energy we need. Indeed the more energy we get our hands on, the more enthusiastically we will dig up minerals, log forests, mine the sea floors, dam rivers, develop cities, clear land, travel, and buy.

There are two major faults built into our society causing the main problems facing the planet. The first is the obsession with affluent living standards and economic growth, i.e., the insistence on high and ever-increasing levels of production and consumption. The second fault is allowing competition within the market to be the major determinant of what is done in our society.

10.1. FAULT 1: WE ARE FAR BEYOND SUSTAINABLE LIMITS TO PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION Following are some of the most forceful limits-to-growth arguments. • Rich countries, with about one-fifth of the world’s people, are consuming about three-quarters of the world’s resource production. Our per capita consumption of assets like oil is about 15 to 20 times that of the poorest half of the world’s people. World population will probably stabilise around 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have the present Australian per capita resource consumption, then annual world production of resources would have to be eight to ten times as great as it is now. If we tried to raise present world production to that level by 2060, we would by then have completely exhausted all probably recoverable resources of one third of the basic mineral items we use. All probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, gas, tar sand oil, shale oil, and uranium (via burner reactors) would have been exhausted by 2050 (Trainer, 1985, Chapters 4 and 5). • Petroleum appears to be especially limited. As was noted at the start of Chapter 1, a number of geologists have concluded that world oil supply will probably peak by 2010 and be down to half that level by 2025–30, with big price increases soon after the peak. None of the

limits-to-growth themes is as potentially terminal in the short term for consumer society. • If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the rich-world per capita rate, we would need 3.5 times the world’s present forest area. If all 9 billion were to have a rich-world diet, which takes about 0.5 ha of land to produce, we would need 4.5 billion ha of food-producing land. But there is only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today, and this is not likely to increase. .

Recent “Footprint” analysis (Wachsmagel and Rees, 1996) estimates that it probably takes 7~ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. The US figure is close to 12 ha. So if 9 billion people were to live as we do in rich countries, we would need about 70 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 10 times all the available productive land on the planet. • As was explained in Chapter 1, the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that if the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere is to be kept to sensible levels, and carbon use was shared equally among the world’s people, then rich-world per capita carbon release would probably have to be reduced to somewhere under 5% of the present amount. These are some of the main limits to growth arguments which lead to the conclusion that there is no possibility of all people rising to anywhere near the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries. We can only live the way we do because we are taking and rapidly using up most of the scarce resources, and preventing most of the world’s people from having anything like a fair share. Therefore we cannot morally endorse our affluent way of life. We must accept the need to move to far less resource-expensive ways. Few people seem to grasp the magnitude of the required reductions.

**1NC**

**Capitalism is inevitably going to cause human extinction from a wide variety of practices that destroy the global environment. Reform is not enough. The whole system needs to be radically altered.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 66-67)

The consequences of such shortsighted attention to economic growth and profit before all else are of course enormous, since they call into question the survivability of the entire world. It is an inescapable fact that human history is at a turning point, the result of a fundamental change in the relationship between human beings and the environment. The scale at which people transform energy and materials has now reached a level that rivals elemental natural processes. Human society is adding carbon to the atmosphere at a level that is equal to about 7 percent of the natural carbon exchange of atmosphere and oceans. The carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere as a result has grown by a quarter in the last 200 years, with more than half of this increase since 1950. Human beings now use (take or transform) 25 percent of the plant mass fixed by photosynthesis over the entire earth, land and sea, and 40 percent of the photosynthetic product on land. Largely as a result of synthetic fertilizers, humanity fixed about as much nitrogen in the environment as does nature. With human activities now rivaling nature in scale, actions that in the past merely produced local environmental crises now have global implications. Moreover, environmental effects that once seemed simple and trivial, such as increases in carbon dioxide emissions, have now suddenly become threats to the stability of the fundamental ecological cycles of the planet. Destruction of the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect, annihilation of ancient and tropical forests, species extinction, reductions in genetic diversity, production of toxic and radioactive wastes, contamination of water resources, soil depletion, depletion of essential raw materials, desertification, the growth of world population spurred by rising poverty – all represent ominous trends the full impact of which, singly or in combination, is scarcely to be imagined at present. “With the appearance of a continent-sized hole in the Earth’s protective ozone layer and the threat of global warming,” Barry Commoner has written, “even droughts, floods, and heat waves may become unwitting acts of man.” The sustainability of both human civilization and global life processes depends not on the mere slowing down of these dire trends, but on their reversal. Nothing in the history of capitalism, however, suggests that the system will be up to such a task. On the contrary there is every indication that the system, left to its own devices, will gravitate toward the “let them eat pollution” stance so clearly enunciated by the chief economist of the World Bank. Fortunately for the world, however, capitalism has never been allowed to develop for long entirely in accordance with its own logic. Opposition forces always emerge – whether in the form of working class struggles for social betterment or conservation movements dedicated to overcoming environmental deprivations – that force the system to moderate its worst tendencies. And to some extent the ensuing reforms can result in lasting, beneficial constraints on the market. What the capitalist class cannot accept, however, are changes that will likely result in the destruction of the system itself. Long before reform movement threaten the accumulation process as a whole, therefore, counter-forces are set in motion by the ruling interests, and the necessary elemental changes are headed off. And there’s the rub. Where radical change is called for little is accomplished within the system and the underlying crisis intensifies over time. Today this is particularly evident in the ecological realm. For the nature of the global environmental crisis is such that the fate of the entire planet and social and ecological issues of enormous complexity are involved, all traceable to the forms of production now prevalent. **It is impossible to prevent the world’s environmental crisis from getting progressively worse unless root problems of production, distribution, technology, and growth are dealt with on a global scale.** And the more that such questions are raised, the more it becomes evidence that capitalism is unsustainable – ecologically, economically, politically, and morally – and must be superseded.

## 1NC

**Alternative text: Reject the affirmative as a means of refusing complicity with capitalism.**

**Rejecting capitalism is key to opening up new alternatives. Only complete refusal, not piecemeal reform, can prevent otherwise inevitable slavery and extinction.**

**Herod, 04** (James, [http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\\_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm](http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm), Getting Free, 4th Edition

A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we're doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can't simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It's quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

### LINK: SINGLE ISSUE REFORMS

**Single issue-reforms are destined to fail—environmental problems are too global and inter-related—only addressing capitalism can save us.**

**Foster, Clark, and York, 08** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University. Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Ecology: The Moment of Truth - An Introduction.” July 2008. <http://www.monthlyreview.org/080701foster-clark-york.php>)

The principal environmental problem for Speth then is capitalism as the “operating system” of the modern economy. “Today’s corporations have been called ‘externalizing machines.’” Indeed, “there are fundamental biases in capitalism that favor the present over the future and the private over the public.” Quoting the system’s own defenders, Robert Samuleson and William Nordhaus, in the seventeenth (2001) edition of their textbook on Macroeconomics, Speth points out that capitalism is the quintessential “Ruthless Economy,” engaged “in the relentless pursuit of profits.” Building on this critique, Speth goes on to conclude in his book that: (1) “today’s system of political economy, referred to here as modern capitalism, is destructive of the environment, and not in a minor way but in a way that profoundly threatens the planet”; (2) “the affluent societies have reached or soon will reach the point where, as Keynes put it, the economic problem has been solved...there is enough to go around”; (3) “in the more affluent societies, modern capitalism is no longer enhancing human well-being”; (4) “the international social movement for change—which refers to itself as ‘the irresistible rise of global anti-capitalism’”—is stronger than many imagine and will grow stronger; there is a coalescing of forces: peace, social justice, community, ecology, feminism—a movement of movements”; (5) “people and groups are busily planting the seeds of change through a host of alternative arrangements, and still other attractive directions for upgrading to a new operating system have been identified”; (6) “the end of the Cold War...opens the door...for the questioning of today’s capitalism.” Speth does not actually embrace socialism, which he associates, in the Cold War manner, with Soviet-type societies in their most regressive form. Thus he argues explicitly for a “nonsocialist” alternative to capitalism. Such a system would make use of markets (but not the self-regulating market society of traditional capitalism) and would promote a “New Sustainability World” or a “Social Greens World” (also called “Eco-Communism”) as depicted by the Global Scenario Group. The latter scenario has been identified with radical thinkers like William Morris (who was inspired by both Marx and Ruskin). In this sense, Speth’s arguments are not far from that of the socialist movement of the twenty-first century, which is aimed at the core values of social justice and ecological sustainability. The object is to create a future in which generations still to come will be able to utilize their creative abilities to the fullest, while having their basic needs met: a result made possible only through the rational reorganization by the associated producers of the human metabolism with nature.<sup>13</sup> Such rational reorganization of the metabolism between nature and society needs to be directed not simply at climate change but also at a whole host of other environmental problems. Some of these are addressed in the present issue: the geopolitics of peak oil (John Bellamy Foster), the production of biofuels as a liquid fuel alternative and its consequences (Fred Magdoff), the economics of climate change (Minqi Li), the science of climate change (John W. Farley), the ocean crisis (Brett Clark and Rebecca Clausen), the problem of large dams (Rohan D’Souza), and the world water crisis (Maude Barlow). Other ecological crises of great importance are not, however, dealt with here: species extinction (and loss of biological diversity in general), deforestation, desertification, soil degradation, acid rain, the proliferation of toxic wastes (including in living tissues), market-regulated biotechnology, urban congestion, population growth, and animal rights. No single issue captures the depth and breadth of what we call “the environmental problem,” which encompasses all of these ecological contradictions of our society and more. If we are facing a “moment of truth” with respect to ecology today, it has to do with the entire gamut of capitalism’s effects on natural (and human) reproduction. Any attempt to solve one of these problems (such as climate change) without addressing the others is likely to fail, since these ecological crises, although distinct in various ways, typically share common causes. In our view, only a unified vision that sees human production as not only social, but also rooted in a metabolic relation to nature, will provide the necessary basis to confront an ecological rift that is now as wide as the planet.

### LINK: SINGLE ISSUE REFORMS

**Reform within neo-liberalism makes radical politics impossible—the system itself is the problem, not specific technologies.**

**Swyngedouw, 06** (Erik, Dept of Geography, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, “Impossible “Sustainability” and the Post-Political Condition”, Forthcoming in: David Gibbs and Rob Krueger (eds.) Sustainable Development, [www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc](http://www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc))

The environment and debates over the environment and nature are not only perfect expressions of such a post-political order, but in fact, the mobilisation of environmental issues is one of the key arenas through which this post-political consensus becomes constructed, when “politics proper is progressively replaced by expert social administration” (Žižek, 2005: 117). The fact that Bush does not want to play ball on the climate change theme is indeed seen by both the political elites in Europe and by the environmentalists as a serious threat to the post-political consensus. That is why both political elites and opposition groups label him as a radical conservative. Bill Clinton, of course, embodied the post-political consensus in a much more sophisticated and articulated manner, not to speak of his unfortunate successor, Al Gore, who recently resurfaced as a newborn climate change warrior (The Independent, 22 May 2006). The post-political environmental consensus, therefore, is one that is radically reactionary, one that fore stalls the articulation of divergent, conflicting, and alternative trajectories of future socio-environmental possibilities and of human-human and human-nature articulations and assemblages. It holds on to a harmonious view of nature that can be recaptured while re-producing if not solidifying a liberal-capitalist order for which there seems to be no alternative. Much of the sustainability argument has evacuated the politics of the possible, the radical contestation of alternative future socio-environmental possibilities and socio-natural arrangements, and silences the radical antagonisms and conflicts that are constitutive of our socio-natural orders by externalising conflict. In climate change, for example, the conflict is posed as one of society versus CO<sub>2</sub>. In fact, the sustainable future desired by ‘sustainability’ pundits has no name. While alternative futures in the past were named and counted (for example, communism, socialism, anarchism, libertarianism, liberalism), the desired sustainable environmental future has no name and no process, only a state or condition. This is as exemplified by the following apocalyptic warning in which the celebrated quote from Marx’s Communist Manifesto and its invocation of the ‘the spectre of communism that is haunting the world’ (once the celebrated name of hope for liberation) is replaced by the spectre of Armageddon:

“A specter is haunting the entire world: but it is not that of communism. .... Climate change - no more, no less than nature’s payback for what we are doing to our precious planet - is day by day now revealing itself. Not only in a welter of devastating scientific data and analysis but in the repeated extreme weather conditions to which we are all, directly or indirectly, regular observers, and, increasingly, victims” (Levene, 2005).

Climate Change is of course not a politics, let only a political programme or socio-environmental project; it is pure negation, the negativity of the political; one we can all concur with, around which a consensus can be built, but which eludes conflict, evacuates the very political moment. By doing so, it does not translate Marx’s dictum for the contemporary period, but turns it into its radical travesty.

### LINK: SINGLE ISSUE REFORMS

**Single-issue movements will be co-opted by capitalism—only complete structural challenges have any hope.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 39-40)

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’

If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by

capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such.

For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hole of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade away, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naïve. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable issue, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but—precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital—can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

|                         |
|-------------------------|
| <b>LINK: RENEWABLES</b> |
|-------------------------|

**Capitalist discourse is too hegemonic—as renewables are privately owned, they will not challenge capitalism.**

**Harriss-White, 06** (Barbara, Professor of Development Studies at the University of Oxford, “Undermining Sustainbale Capitalism: The Market-Driven Politics of Renewable Energy”, Paper for the Workshop on ‘The Ecological Crisis and its Political Economy’, Oxford University, February)

Lastly the discourse of both state and business needs taking seriously – not only its cynicism but also in its indifference for the chief victims, present and future. Undemocratic modern politics cannot be understood without the opiate role of discourse. The destruction of energy policy and the timid entry of RE into politics is happening as the modes of policy formulation and implementation are themselves evolving in undemocratic ways. The discursive turn to politics both masks and distracts from the material interests involved. The dangerous de-materialisation of climate change policy serves to hide increasing total energy emissions, relentlessly polluting energy and increasing waste. Practices which obscure hegemony produce complicity with it. This discourse co-exists with the devaluation and dismissal of non economic value-based discussion. Globally institutionalised and politically rewarded, cognitive dissonance, denial and hypocrisy protect the practices of capital, workers and consumers. They also protect a new phase of commodification creating intermediaries, financiers and producers of environmental displacement services. They have long protected the privatization of control over the energy economy, and are now being employed in a new phase of commodification of all aspects of policy: the agenda, the making of regulative law, resourcing, and the mechanics of access. The state thus loses to a diffuse set of private interests the capacity to steer public debate and the privatization of the ‘public good’ of policy is naturalized and little contested.

### LINK: RENEWABLES

**The question is not whether the renewable tech they advocate is good or not in a vacuum—the issue is whether it is operating in the service of capitalism. Mainstream environmentalism has no hope of fundamentally challenging the system.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 7-8)

As Chapter 10 will make clear, the Green Movement in general is deeply flawed. It is for the most part, only light green. Most environmental gurus and agencies never go beyond seeking reforms within consumer-capitalist society. They do not consider the possibility that environmental and other major global problems cannot be solved without radical change to a very different kind of society. Chapter 10 explains why a sustainable and just society cannot be a consumer society, it cannot be driven by market forces, it must have relatively little international trade and no economic growth at all, it must be made up mostly of small local economies, and its driving values cannot be competition and acquisitiveness. Whether or not we are likely to achieve such a transition is not crucial here (... and I am quite pessimistic about achieving it). The point is that when our “limits to growth” situation is understood, a sustainable and just society cannot be conceived in any other terms. Discussion of these themes is of the utmost importance, but few if any green agencies ever even mention them. 8 *Chapter 1* The “tech-fix optimists”, who are to be found in plague proportions in the renewable energy field, are open to the same criticism. If the position underlying this book is valid, then despite the indisputably desirable technologies all these people are developing, they are working for the devil. If it is the case that a sustainable and just world cannot be achieved without transition from consumer society to a Simpler Way of some kind, then this transition is being thwarted by those who reinforce the faith that technical advances will eliminate any need to even think about such a transition.

**Explosive growth in energy demand will mean that renewables can never catch up—consumption patterns must change.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg.7-8)

Above all, consider the magnitude of the task the technical fix optimist is assuming can be performed. If we have only 3 per cent p.a. economic growth to 2060, or if by then all Third World people are going to have the material living standards we in rich and environmental damage are unsustainable, but the technical fix optimist is assuming that within 70 years we will be able to deal with levels ten times as great. Chapter 9 will explain why more energy conservation, better pollution control and countries have now, the world output will have to be about ten times what it is now. Present levels of output changing to renewable energy will not solve the problems, highly desirable though these changes are.

## LINK: RENEWABLES

**Renewable energy cannot be transformative within a capitalist economy—the need for fossil fuel backup and central management just support status quo economies.**

**Harriss-White, 06** (Barbara, Professor of Development Studies at the University of Oxford, “Undermining Sustainable Capitalism: The Market-Driven Politics of Renewable Energy”, Paper for the Workshop on ‘The Ecological Crisis and its Political Economy’, Oxford University, February)

Can renewable energy (RE) be developed under capitalist production arrangements? Historically, while a given technology has appeared in more than one kind of labour process and more than one kind of mode of production, the mode of production has always shaped the way technology is developed and nature is appropriated. To anticipate technology is, as Michael Burawoy has said, ‘like asking a feudal journeyman to anticipate capitalist atomic power. The question is not whether socialist technology is possible but whether it is necessary. That is, can socialism operate with capitalist machines, or do the machines impose constraints on relations of and in production that make socialism impossible?’ We do not have to anticipate technology, and RE is not ‘innocent machinery’. The production of the technology which is used to produce renewable energy currently takes place under capitalist production relations, using non-renewable energy. Yet two powerful arguments have been made for RE as a socially and politically transformative technology. One stresses the potential of its optimal small scale to service ‘sustainable communities’ and to decentralise and democratise energy control, from which flow claims about community cohesion and social inclusion. While it is indeed the case that wind-power technologies have developed experimentally under forms of common ownership, user-shareholding and the like, the argument is mainly being beamed at late developing countries where energy grids are defective, transmission losses are profligate, decentralised energy generation is necessary and ‘rural communities’ are believed to exist to manage it. The second argument, which stresses the social value of ‘self reliance’, can be used at any social scale. It ignores the real causes of the political instability of the major energy sources (and thus the need for supply security), and assumes a very localised conception of solidarity.

**The plan attempts to sustain a level of affluence which is impossible in a world of rising demand—renewables cannot fuel a capitalist society.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 128-29)

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that whether or not renewable energy can sustain consumer-capitalist society is not a matter of whether it can meet present energy demand. The essential question is whether it can enable constant increase int he volume of goods and services being consumed and the associated increase in energy demand. Energy demand is rising significantly, although estimates of future demand vary. ABARE’s *Energy Outlook 2000* shows that the average annual rate of growth in energy use in Australia over the decade of the 1990s was around 2.5% p. a. The *Australian Yearbook* shows that between 1982 and 1998 Australian energy use increased 50%, an arithmetical average growth rate of 3.13% p.a., and the rate has been faster in more recent years. (Graph 5.12.) However ABARE estimates that Australian energy demand will slow, reaching about 1.9% p.a. by 2040, meaning more than a doubling in annual use by then. In July 2003 Australian electricity authorities warned that blackouts are likely in coming years due to the rapid rate of increase in demand, estimated at almost 3% pa for the next five years. (ABC News, 31 July.) Robbins (2003) reports NEMMCO predicting electricity growth over the next 10 years in NSW, Queensland and Victoria as 3.1%, 3.5% and 2.6% p.a. respectively. Poldy (2005) shows that over the past 100 years Australian energy consumption has followed GDP growth closely, and he estimates that in recent years it has approximated a growth rate of 3.6% p.a. In 2004 world energy use jumped, growing at 4.3% p.a. (Catan, 2005.) Thus the commitment to growth greatly exacerbates the problem, and in turn all of the other resource supply problems, because all involve an energy component. For instance if the cost of fuel increases significantly, then so will the cost of food and minerals, and even university courses, because fuel is needed to produce them. It has been argued above that renewables are not likely to be capable of meeting present electricity and liquid fuel demand, but given the inertia built into growth trends, the demand to be met will probably be three or four times as big as it is now by mid century...and doubling every approximately 35 years thereafter. To summarise regarding Fault 1, consumer-capitalist society is obviously grossly unsustainable. We have far overshot levels of production, consumption, resource use and affluence that are sustainable for ourselves over a long period of time, let alone extended to all the world’s people. Yet our top priority is to increase them continuously, without limit. This is the basic cause of the many alarming sustainability problems now threatening our survival.

## LINK: RENEWABLES

**Renewables will not be viable in a capitalist framework—the demand for energy will simply overwhelm the technical possibilities. And, their evidence is biased—renewables advocates are trying to sell their products with overly optimistic claims.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 2-3)

Consumer-capitalist society has overshot viable levels of production and consumption by a huge amount. In effect we have to give up fossil fuels altogether. That is, we have to live almost entirely on renewables. This book argues that these very high levels of production and consumption and therefore of energy use that we have in today’s consumer-capitalist society cannot be sustained by renewable sources of energy. However the foregoing numbers only define the magnitude of the present problem. This is nothing like the magnitude of the problem set when our commitment to growth is also taken into account. As will be detailed in Chapter 10, if 9.4 billion people are to have the “living standards” we in rich countries will have by 2070 given 3% economic growth, total world economic output every year would then be 60 times as great as it is now. The question of whether we can run our society on renewable energy is therefore not about whether it can meet present demand, and this book concludes that it can- not do that, it is about whether it can meet the vastly increased demand that will be set by the pursuit of limitless increase in production and consumption. There is an overwhelmingly powerful, never questioned, assumption that all these problems can and will be solved by moving to renewable energy sources. That is, it is generally believed that sources such as the sun and the wind can replace fossil fuels, providing the quantities of energy that consumer society will need, in the forms and at the times that they are needed. Surprisingly, almost no literature has explored whether this is possible. Wildly optimistic and highly challengeable claims are often encountered. “Hydrogen is abundant. All we need is water.” “It is estimated that renewable energy has the potential of meeting the energy demand of *The Context 3* human race well into the future.” (Lewis, 2003). “... existing renewable energy resources are capable of substituting for coal-fired power stations...” (Diesendorf, 2005, p. 1). “Renewable energy and energy efficiency can deliver the power we need, without the problems.” (ACF, 2005). “...energy crops can provide ample biofuel feedstock.” (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 107). “All observers of energy seem to agree that various energy alternatives are virtually inexhaustible.” (Gordon, 1981, p. 109). “An entirely renewable and thus sustainable electricity supply is possible using existing technologies.” (Czisch, 2004). “Solar energy can replace fossil and nuclear fuels over the next 50 years thus creating a truly sustainable energy supply system.” (Blakers, 2003). Unfortunately in the task of assessing the validity of this dominant assumption we have not been helped by the people who know most about the field, the renewable energy experts. They have a strong interest in boosting the potential of their pet technology and in not drawing attention to its weaknesses, difficulties and limits. Exaggerated, misleading, questionable and demonstrably false claims are often encountered in the promotional literature. Minor technical advances which might or might not become significant in the long run are announced as miraculous solutions. Doubts regarding the potential of renewable technologies are rarely if ever heard from within these fields. This enthusiasm is understandable in view of the need to attract public support and research funding, but it means that contributions by those most familiar with these fields to the critical assessment of the potential and limits of renewables are quite rare.

## LINK: RENEWABLES

**Renewable energy will never be able to keep up with exploding demand. Capitalism must be addressed.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "Towards a Sustainable Economy", pg. 40-41)

Energy conservation measures are also unlikely to alter this picture significantly. At present considerable savings are being made as attention is given to introducing more energy-efficient technologies. This will probably continue for many years, given that our history of energy extravagance has left much fat to trim. The most common estimates seem to indicate that rich countries might eventually be able to cut their present per capita energy use by half. If 10 billion people were to rise to that total level world energy production would have to be about 5 times as great as it is today - which, as the previous discussion indicates, it is far beyond the capacity of renewable to meet. The same logic applies to better pollution control. If we cut by 33 per cent the environmental impact caused per dollar of GNP but keep economic output increasing at 3 per cent p. a., then in only 14 years total impact will be as high as it was before the cut, and in another 23 years it will be twice as high. The most important point here is that if there remains any commitment to growth in economic output, any plausible cuts in energy use will be overwhelmed in time by the increase in energy needed to produce the increasing volumes of output.

**Intermittency means renewables can't solve – fossil fuels will still be required.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 113-15)

It is likely that the renewables combined could make up a large fraction of total energy demand, maybe more than 50%, if coal or nuclear sources were also there to plug gaps and act as the big battery into which surpluses from the intermittents could be fed irregularly. The problem with this is that sensible greenhouse targets would be greatly exceeded. As Chapter 1 explained, sensible targets applied equitably across the planet would require almost complete abandonment of fossil fuels in rich countries. Fortunately there is a tendency for the winds to be at their strongest in winter when the sun is weakest, and vice versa. However in the higher northern latitudes where most Europeans and Americans live there is little solar energy in winter, and there are relative low winds in summer and autumn. Consequently in these regions solar and wind sources would have to be used as alternatives rather than combined in the sense of added, meaning significant multiplication of generating plant. In regions like Australia where there is considerable solar energy in winter the overlap would be greater. It is often claimed that the problem of the gaps left when some renewables are not producing much would be reduced by the probability that others would be producing at that time. While there are several other renewable options, there are only two major ones, sun and wind, and both can be down together for long periods. The important unknown is what would be the pattern and magnitude of the gaps left if a wide range of renewables was extensively developed, and maximum use was made of the storage options available? As has been stressed what matters here is not the average situation but the distribution; i.e., how often would aggregate supply go down how far? What we need are plots of the kind Davy and Coppin give for an aggregated wind system in south east Australia, estimating the proportions of time that supply would reach various proportions of total system peak capacity, for systems including wind, PV, solar thermal and pumped storage components. From the foregoing discussion it is likely that aggregate renewable supply would often go down a long way, because there are long periods when wind and sun are both low, and to plug these gaps using fossil fuels would be to exceed safe carbon emission limits. The other major problem in combining strategies is that two or three (very costly) alternative supply systems have to be built, and then one or two will sit more or less idle much of the time while one or two of them functions — and at times none of them will be operating and we will have to fall back on maybe almost as much coal or nuclear power as we have in renewable capacity. As the capital cost of each of the separate renewable systems is going to be quite high, the total system cost for all components, along with their grids etc., could be unaffordable.

**LINK: CLIMATE**

**The affirmative depicts nature as a machine to be better manipulated. Rhetoric about C02 being the root of climate change makes it seem as if a simple excess of a natural element is at fault—masking the economic arrangement that caused such destructive practices. Only radical questioning can prevent environmental disaster.**

**Swyngedouw, 06** (Erik, Dept of Geography, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, “Impossible “Sustainability” and the Post-Political Condition”, Forthcoming in: David Gibbs and Rob Krueger (eds.) Sustainable Development, [www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc](http://www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc))

I have not been able to find a single source that is against ‘sustainability’. Greenpeace is in favour, George Bush Jr. and Sr. are, the World Bank and its chairman (a prime war monger in Iraq) are, the pope is, my son Arno is, the rubber tappers in the Brazilian Amazon are, Bill Gates is, the labour unions are. All are presumably concerned about the long-term socio-environmental survival of (parts of) humanity; most just keep on doing business as usual. The clear and present danger posed by the environmental question is obviously not dramatic enough to be taken seriously in terms of embarking on a different socio-environmental trajectory. That is left to do some other time and certainly not before the day after tomorrow. Of course, this cacophony of voices and imaginations also points to the inability to agree on the meaning or, better, to the lack of a singular ‘Nature’. There are obviously multiple imaginations that mobilise or appropriate sustainability as radically and truthfully theirs, based on equally imaginative variations of what constitutes ‘Nature’. Environmentalists (whether activists or scientists) invariably invoke the global physical processes that threaten our existence, and insist on the need to re-engineer nature, so that it can return to a ‘sustainable’ path. Armed with their charts, formulas, models, numbers, and grant applications, to which activists usually add the inevitable pictures of scorched land, factories or cars emitting carbon fumes, dying animals and plants, suffering humans, apocalyptic rhetoric, and calls for subsidies and financial support, scientists, activists, and all manner of assorted other human and non-human actants enter the domain of the social, the public, and, most importantly, the political. Thus “natures” enter the political. A particular and symbolically enshrined nature enters the parliament of politics, but does so in a duplicitous manner. It is a treacherously deceitful Nature that enters politics, one that is packaged, numbered, calculated, coded, modelled, represented by those who claim to possess, know, understand, speak for the “real Nature”. In other words, what enters the domain of politics is the coded and symbolised versions of nature mobilised by scientists, activists, industrialists and the like. This is particularly evident in examples such as the debate over GMOs, global climate change, BSE, biodiversity loss, and other equally pressing issues. Invariably, the acting of Nature -- as scripted by the bearers of nature’s knowledge – enters the political machinery as coded language that also already posits its political and social solution and does not tolerate, in the name of Nature, dissent other than that framed by its own formulations. It is in this sense of course that the argument about climate change is exclusively formulated in terms of believers and non-believers, as a quasi-religious faith, but the weapons of the struggle in this case are matters of fact like data, models, and physico-chemical analysis. And the solutions to the question of sustainability are already pre-figured by the way in which nature is made to speak. Creeping increases in long term global temperatures, which will cause untold suffering and damage, are caused by CO<sub>2</sub> output. Hence, the solution to future climate ills resides in cutting back on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Notwithstanding the validity of the role of CO<sub>2</sub> in co-constituting the process of climate change, the problematic of the future calamities the world faces is posited primarily in terms of the physical acting of one of nature’s components, CO<sub>2</sub> as is its solution found in bringing CO<sub>2</sub> within our symbolic (socio-economic) order, futilely attempted with the Kyoto agreement or other neo-liberal market-based mechanisms. Questioning the politics of climate change in itself is already seen as an act of treachery, as an unlawful activity, banned by ‘Nature’ itself.

**LINK: CLIMATE**

**The weakness and failure of Kyoto proves that capitalism resists fundamental reform and that we must fundamentally change course.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p. 21-22)

From any rational perspective, greenhouse gas emission reductions on a level far more aggressive than what was envisioned by the Kyoto Protocol are now needed to address global warming. The IPCC Working Group I concluded in its 2001 report that “there is new and strong evidence that most of the warming observed over the last fifty years is attributable to human activities.” In place of the IPCC’s earlier estimate of an increase in temperature by 1.0-3.5 degrees C in this century, they now estimate an increase of 1.5-6.0 degrees C. If this increase (even in the middle range) comes true, the earth’s environment will be so radically changed that cataclysmic results will undoubtedly manifest themselves worldwide. [These will surely include increased desertification in arid regions and heavier rainfall and risks of floods in other regions; serious damage to crops in the tropics and eventually in temperate areas as well; rising sea levels (due to the melting of glaciers) that will submerge islands and delta regions; damage to ecosystems; and loss of both species and genetic diversity. On top of all of this, there will be increased risks to human health. As always the most exploited areas of the world and their inhabitants will prove most vulnerable.] Yet, no matter how urgent it is for life on the planet as a whole that greenhouse gas buildup in the atmosphere be stopped, the failure of the Kyoto Protocol significantly to address this problem suggests that capitalism is unable to reverse course – that is, to move from a structure of industry and accumulation that has proven to be in the long run (and in many respects in the short run as well) environmentally disastrous. When set against the get-rich-quick imperatives of capital accumulation, the biosphere scarcely weighs in the balance. The emphasis on profits to be obtained from fossil fuel consumption and from a for of development geared to the auto-industrial complex largely overrides longer-term issues associated with global warming – even if this threatens, within just a few generations, the planet itself.

## LINK: INCENTIVES

**Market incentives allow corporations to continue operating as usual—capitalism can never solve because it is cheaper to invade a foreign nation for fossil fuels than to truly switch over to renewables.**

**Klein, 07** (Naomi Klein, award-winning journalist and author of *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. “Guns Beat Green: The Market Has Spoken” 11-29-07.  
<http://www.thenation.com/doc/20071217/klein>)

The idea that capitalism can save us from climate catastrophe has powerful appeal. It gives politicians an excuse to subsidize corporations rather than regulate them, and it neatly avoids a discussion about how the core market logic of endless growth landed us here in the first place. The market, however, appears to have other ideas about how to meet the challenges of an increasingly disaster-prone world. According to Lloyd, despite all the government incentives, the really big money is turning away from clean energy technologies and banking instead on gadgets promising to seal wealthy countries and individuals into high-tech fortresses. Key growth areas in venture capitalism are private security firms selling surveillance gear and privatized emergency response. Put simply, in the world of venture capitalism, there has been a race going on between greens on the one hand and guns and garrisons on the other—and the guns are winning. According to Venture Business Research, in 2006 North American and European companies developing green technology and those focused on “homeland security” and weaponry were neck and neck in the contest for new investment: green tech received \$3.5 billion, and so did the guns and garrisons sector. But this year garrisons have suddenly leapt ahead. The greens have received \$4.2 billion, while the garrisons have nearly doubled their money, collecting \$6 billion in new investment funds. And 2007 isn’t over yet. This trend has nothing to do with real supply and demand, since the demand for clean energy technology could not be higher. With oil reaching \$100 a barrel, it is clear that we badly need green alternatives, both as consumers and as a species. The latest report from the Nobel Prize-winning UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was characterized by Time magazine as “a final warning to humanity,” while a new Oxfam report makes it clear that the recent wave of natural disasters is no fluke: over the past two decades, the number of extreme weather events has quadrupled. Conversely, 2007 has seen no major terrorist events in North America or Europe, there are hints of a US troop drawdown in Iraq and, despite the relentless propaganda, there is no imminent threat from Iran. So why is “homeland security,” not green energy, the hot new sector? Perhaps because there are two distinct business models that can respond to our climate and energy crisis. We can develop policies and technologies to get us off this disastrous course. Or we can develop policies and technologies to protect us from those we have enraged through resource wars and displaced through climate change, while simultaneously shielding ourselves from the worst of both war and weather. (The ultimate expression of this second option is Hummer’s new TV ads: the gas-guzzler is seen carrying its cargo to safety in various disaster zones, followed by the slogan “HOPE: Hummer Owners Prepared for Emergencies.” It’s a bit like the Marlboro man doing grief counseling in a cancer ward.) In short, we can choose to fix, or we can choose to fortress. Environmental activists and scientists have been yelling for the fix. The homeland security sector, on the other hand, believes the future lies in fortresses. Though 9/11 launched this new economy, many of the original counterterrorism technologies are being retrofitted as privatized emergency response during natural disasters—Blackwater pitching itself as the new Red Cross, firefighters working for insurance giants (see my last column, “Rapture Rescue 911”). By far the biggest market is the fortressing of Europe and North America—Halliburton’s contract to build detention centers for an unspecified immigration influx, Boeing’s “virtual” border fence, biometric ID cards. The primary target for these technologies is not terrorists but immigrants, an increasing number of whom have been displaced by extreme weather events like the recent floods in Tabasco, Mexico, or the cyclone in Bangladesh. As climate change creates more landlessness, the market in fortresses will increase dramatically. Of course, there is still money to be made from going green; but there is much more green—at least in the short term—to be made from selling escape and protection. As Lloyd explains, “The failure rate of security businesses is much lower than clean-tech ones and, as important, the capital investment required to build a successful security business is also much lower.” In other words, solving real problems is hard, but turning a profit from those problems is easy. Bush wants to leave our climate crisis to the ingenuity of the market. Well, the market has spoken: it will not take us off this disastrous course. In fact, the smart money is betting that we will stay on it.

## LINK: INCENTIVES

**Incentives sustain capitalism. They are premised on the assumption that markets and capitalism are the best way to save the planet.**

**Cox, 04** (Stan Cox, crop geneticist and writer. "From Here to Economy" 4-23-04.

<http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2004/04/23/cox-economy/>)

Hawken says that public policy and technology can push each other in the right direction: "For example, running cars on hydrogen is about five times the expense as gasoline. But if the car gets five times the efficiency per BTU, then there is no real cost difference. If you go to factor 10, then society is actually saving money by converting to hydrogen as a primary fuel source for transport. And we can begin to draw down [carbon dioxide] levels." Kovel counters that Hawken's ecologically enlightened capitalists would be as powerless as the more traditional of their breed to control the system's destructiveness, no matter what incentives they're given. Every year, he points out, larger quantities of wealth roam the planet in search of profitable investments. In his book, Kovel uses the image of a universal force field to describe private capital's penchant for spawning destructive growth. If "force field" sounds a bit too sci-fi, think of capital in terms of the "gopher game" at the arcade: No matter how many gophers you send back into their holes with a whack on the head, more will pop out of other holes. John Bellamy Foster is associate professor at the University of Oregon, coeditor of the socialist magazine Monthly

Review, and author of Ecology Against Capitalism and Marx's Ecology. He maintains that any mix of subsidies, taxation, regulation, and efficiency sufficient to harness private capital for ecological ends would find itself in constant conflict with the capitalist economy's primary goal: growth. In discussing global warming -- the one ecological crisis that looms above all others -- Foster says, "Emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases by automobiles cannot be reduced to an acceptable level unless values other than money are brought decisively to the fore." In America, he says, the sheer economic bulk of automobile production, road and bridge construction, tourism, shipping of goods, and the suburban-commuter lifestyle means that only a thoroughgoing reconstruction of the economy can cut emissions to an acceptable level. For example, we aren't seeing a wholesale conversion to energy-efficient mass transit simply because it could never generate as much wealth for the capitalist class as does the personal automobile. Foster's point is illustrated by an anecdote in Keith Bradsher's recent book High and Mighty: SUVs, the World's Most Dangerous Vehicles and How They Got That Way. A promise by the Ford Motor Company back in 2000 to reduce the CO2 emissions and improve the gas mileage of its SUVs by 25 percent within five years caused agony among other automakers. They liked their SUVs the way they were -- cheap to make and profitable to sell -- and had no desire to compete in the environmental arena. Their fears vanished when a scandal over the high rollover rate of Explorer SUVs riding on Firestone tires sapped Ford's resources and attention and helped derail its plan for big, "green" vehicles. But at the height of Ford's environmental enthusiasm, one top executive repeatedly pointed out that improving the fuel efficiency of their SUVs would generate waves of good press that, in turn, would easily repay the company's efforts with increased sales. So, had the strategy succeeded, it might actually have increased overall emissions by putting more SUVs on the road.

## LINK: BIOFUELS

**Biofuels can't solve – projected crop yields are exaggerated and cannot sustain capitalism.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 73)

The plantation question should be seen in terms of what areas are likely to achieve what yields per year, via procedures that are sustainable over very large areas in the long term. High yields from biomass plantations are often reported or predicted, but these typically refer to experimental or unusual sites using good land. Experimental sites tend to involve the most favourable conditions, and very large-scale biomass plantations would have to use mostly land that is well below ideal. In fact proposals often envisage use of degraded land. Some predicted yields seem to be quite unrealistic for very large areas.

**There is not enough arable land to come even close to meeting fuel needs with biomass.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 75-76)

Estimates of world biomass potential are rather unsatisfactory. Often they vary greatly, some are quite implausible, and assumptions are not clear. Especially important is the fact that most crop, pasture and forest are already heavily used or overused and the proportion of annual biomass growth that could be taken for non-energy purposes is not deducted. Fulton (2005) lists 11 estimates from six studies, ranging around 400 EJ (with one at 1,301 EJ). Berndes, Hoogwijk and van den Broek (2003) review 17 studies of global total biomass yield potential. Unfortunately these differ greatly in assumptions and conclusions, and some seem to involve quite implausible growth rate assumptions (e.g., 46–99 t/ha which they say are not supported). However inspection of the core plot of estimates indicates that potential world aggregate yield would be approximately equivalent to a total yield of 10,500 million tonnes, which is 210 EJ of primary energy. If this was all converted to ethanol the gross yield would be 85 EJ (see below). FAO (n.d.) gives the current world primary energy consumption as 410 EJ. Obviously the amount of this annual biomass growth available for energy production would be far below 210 EJ, firstly because much of it is already going into crop, pasture, timber and fuel use. Secondly it would not be economic to harvest for commercial biomass the low yield areas represented by the right-hand tail of the graph, which might cut off one third of the total area. Much of this harvest is by Third World people to whom it is "economic" to collect from areas producing at yields well below those that would meet the costs of industrialised biomass production systems. As population goes from 6 to 9 billion, demand for food producing land will significantly reduce the area available for biomass production. As Ravilius (2005) says, "... the earth is rapidly running out of fertile land." The 210 EJ figure is about the same as that arrived at if one assumes 3.5 billion ha of world forest growing at an average of 3 t/ha. Adding grassland growth might increase the total by 20%. Obviously conversion to liquid fuels, gas or electricity would greatly reduce delivered quantities of energy. It would seem therefore that if we simply take the total global biomass growth available for energy production we can see that it would not enable production of anywhere near present global liquid plus gas use (discussed further below). The proportion of this growth that could be harvested for energy production would be small, and from this the energy costs of fuel production would have to be deducted. In other words, from these general global figures it seems clear that there is no possibility of world biomass production meeting more than a quite small proportion of present world liquid plus gas fuel demand.

## LINK: BIOFUELS

**Even if new technologies doubled the productive capacity of biofuels, they would be able to meet about 15% of the global demand.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 88-89)

Even if all the ethanol produced went to the 1.5 billion people living in rich countries they would have to get by on about 15% of their present consumption. These kinds of figures rule out the possibility of densely populated rich-world countries with little land such as the UK importing their liquid fuels from the Third World. If we assume that 500 million ha could be found globally and harvested at 7 t/ha/y, then the world average per capita amount of liquid fuel this area would provide 9 billion people (assuming ethanol at 7 GJ/t) would be under 3 GJ per year, a mere 2% of Australia's present oil plus gas consumption. In "Footprint" terms it would take about 2.61 ha of productive land to provide each Australian with 128 GJ/y of liquid and gaseous fuel from biomass via ethanol. Of course to this must be added the productive land providing food, water, settlement area and energy that is not liquid or gas. However the average per capita amount of productive land available for a world of 9 billion people will be no more than 0.8 ha. Another way of making the magnitude evident is to take the average world forest growth rate of about 3 t/ha, and the approximately 4 billion ha of forest on the planet, meaning that total growth p.a. is about 12 billion tonnes. The gross energy content of this would be about 240 EJ which is about 60% of world energy use today. These figures also make it clear that technical advances cannot solve the problem. Even if the figure Lovins, et al. give in their Technical Annex for future production is achieved, c. 15 GJ/t, and even if technical advance doubled the biomass yield from the 7 t/ha assumed here, there would still be no possibility of providing all 9~ billion people expected with anywhere near the present rich-world per capita consumption of liquid and gas fuel. More than 5 billion ha would have to be found for plantations. Liquid and Gaseous Fuels Derived From Biomass 89 The foregoing numbers would seem to give overwhelming support for the conclusion that there is no possibility of providing present per capita liquid fuel consumption from biomass, let alone coping with growing demand, or enabling all the world's present population to rise to rich-world rates of consumption. The situation is much more clear-cut than for electricity. (Note 15 refers to relevant comments from other sources.) The significance of this conclusion for thinking about the global predicament and social change could not be exaggerated.

**Biofuels sustain capitalism – this results in environmental destruction, Third World exploitation, and extinction.**

**Revolution, 07** (US Communist Party newspaper. "Capitalism and the Consequences of Biofuels." 3-27-07. <http://rwor.org/a/083-special/biofuels-en.html>)

Regardless of the debate over the sustainability of biofuels, in today's world the use of biofuels has led to horrific consequences for the people of the world and the environment. A key feature of imperialism is the division of the world between a handful of rich imperialist countries and the rest of the world. Eighty percent of the world's resources are absorbed by the advanced capitalist countries, which make up 15 percent of the world's population. Imperialism has produced a wasteful and destructive pattern of economic activity and industrial development. This division of the world has meant, and will almost certainly continue to mean, that the growing of crops for fuel—mostly for export to Europe, Japan and the United States—is being done on large-scale plantations in the third world. In order to make room for these plantations ancient forests are being cut down, threatening extinction for many species. Reduction of greenhouse gases is lost when carbon-capturing forests are cut down to make way for biofuel crops.

worsening the problem of global warming. In Malaysia, the production of palm oil for biodiesel is a major industry. According to a recent report by Friends of the Earth, "Between 1985 and 2000 the development of oil-palm plantations was responsible for an estimated 87 per cent of deforestation in Malaysia." In Sumatra and Borneo, some 4 million hectares of forest have been converted to palm farms. Now a further 6 million hectares are scheduled for clearance in Malaysia, and 16.5 million in Indonesia. In the Guardian newspaper George Monbiot writes: "Almost all the remaining forest is at risk. Even the famous Tanjung Puting national park in Kalimantan is being ripped apart by oil planters. The orangutan is likely to become extinct in the wild. Sumatran rhinos, tigers, gibbons, tapirs, proboscis monkeys and thousands of other species could go the same way. Thousands of indigenous people have been evicted from their lands, and some 500 Indonesians have been tortured when they tried to resist. The forest fires which every so often smother the region in smog are mostly started by the palm growers. The entire region is being turned into a gigantic vegetable oil field." (Guardian,

12/6/2005) And in an editorial in the Berkeley Daily Planet, UC Berkeley Professor Miguel Altieri and Eric Holt-Gimenez of the group Food First wrote: "Hundreds of thousands of small-scale peasant farmers are being displaced by soybeans expansion. Many more stand to lose their land under the biofuels stampede.

### LINK: BIOFUELS

**Biomass will never meet the demands of capitalism-arable land will shrink, growing conditions will deteriorate, and other demands on land will increase.**

Trainer, 07 (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 88-89)

There are several reasons why the prospects for biomass production are likely to become more difficult in future. Firstly within developed countries there is the constant pressure to increase land devoted to agricultural purposes and the ceaseless quest to increase export earnings. Expansion of cropland mostly comes through forest clearing. The above discussion of Switchgrass potential in the US noted that the land would mostly have to come from the present agricultural area. Especially important will be several negative feedback effects of the increasing scarcity of petroleum. For instance if there is less fuel available and at higher cost, then irrigation, transport, fertilizers and pesticides will become more scarce and costly, making biomass production more costly and difficult. Agriculture will therefore tend to become more labour and land intensive, and agricultural produce of all forms will tend to become more costly. Change from the high "quality" of energy that oil is (e.g., easily "mined", moved, stored, used, processed) to more difficult forms such as coal will mean increased energy consumption, because more energy will have to go into producing, mining, moving etc. There will also tend to be a shift from energy-intensive building materials such as kiln-fired brick, aluminium, steel and plastics to timber, again increasing pressure on biomass fuel sources. Resource scarcity pressure will stimulate development of bioreactors to produce a wide range of plastics, chemicals and materials. Looming water shortages and the impact of the greenhouse problem will significantly reduce biomass production (although more carbon in the atmosphere will tend to increase it). Drought is expected to increase in many regions. The water resources of the Australian Murray-Darling river system could be cut by 25%. As world population rises by 50% there will be a large increase in demand for land within the Third World to produce food. Forest will be cleared as poor people seek more land for subsistence, already a major destructive force in the Amazon and southern Asia. The last of the accessible Third World rainforest timber will soon have been shipped to rich-world hardware stores, increasing the pressure to put more land into timber plantations. Conventional neo-liberal economic "development" is stripping people from subsistence ways and accelerating the rate at which they are moving to cities, where per capita energy and resource consumption is much higher. However the proportion of meat in Western diets could be reduced considerably, freeing much land for the production of biomass. Against this, as people become more affluent they demand more meat, and conventional development is rapidly increasing the purchasing power of Third World middle classes. Global pressures, especially from the fast growth of China and India, are now causing rising energy and materials prices, and this will invalidate all the assumptions made in this and previous chapters to arrive at cost estimates. There are therefore several reasons why the global prospects for very large-scale biomass production are waning. Available areas are likely to shrink, growing conditions are likely to deteriorate and other demands on land will increase.

### LINK: BIOFUELS/FOOD PRICES

**Their food price advantage is rooted in the inability of capitalism to provide for the poor—no adjustment of biofuel production can solve without challenging the system.**

**Adewale, 08** (Peloula Adewale, Democratic Socialist Movement of Nigeria. Writing for The Committee For A Workers' International. "Total Failure of Capitalism"  
<http://socialistworld.net/eng/2008/04/28worlda.html>)

That the greatest harvest in history can only breed high food prices shows there is a fundamental problem. The problem is that of capitalist production for profit. It has also revealed capitalism as a vicious cycle of crises. In search for alternative, renewable and greener source of energy, particularly in the face of soaring crude oil price, the world capitalism resorted to biofuels, or agrofuels as some experts prefer to call them.

This has been at the great expense of food security. Though, the increasing demand for meat in India, China and elsewhere has shifted more grains to be used for feedstock for livestock, a dominant reason for the spiralling food prices is the use of grains for biofuels. Also related is the high crude oil price, which has had knock-on effects on fertiliser price and cost of food production and distribution. But this factor as the reason for rise in food price is of much lower scale than biofuels. While the world cereal production has increased, the crops that are used to make biofuels like maize constitute the highest portion. The "Crop Prospects and Food Situation" December 2007 reported bumper harvest of maize in the United States which contributed to a better overall coarse grain harvest at the World level than was expected in the year. In the United States and Europe, more and more maize crops have been turned into ethanol used as biofuel. The United States, the world's largest maize exporter, now uses more of its maize for ethanol than it sells abroad. According to the IMF, the corn ethanol production in the US accounted for, at least, half the rise in World corn demand in each past three years. According to a study, half of the US corn harvest, which accounts for some 40% of global production, will be diverted to ethanol production by the end of 2008. There are incentives for production of crops for ethanol in the US and Europe. As the New York Times April 10 Editorial reveals, the US provides a subsidy of 51 cents a gallon to ethanol blenders and slaps a tariff of 54 cents a gallon on imports. In the European Union, most countries exempt biofuels from some gas taxes and slap an average tariff equal to more than 70 cents a gallon of imported ethanol. The US government's policy on ethanol subsidies is put at \$6bn a year. As a result of huge profits associated with high demand of corn, most farmers have been attracted to its production at the expense of other food crops by planting maize on land previously meant for wheat, rice and soyabean. With less land available for their cultivation, there is short supply of these food crops and their prices go up accordingly. Ethanol production has also led to rising cost of livestock and poultry, which are fed with corn derivatives. Capitalism is a production for profit and not for basic needs of humanity.

Meanwhile, biofuels have not been able to solve the energy crisis and does not have potential to achieve it. Ethanol consumes much more energy to make than it puts out. Besides, it has less energy per unit than the gasoline/petrol. Yet, the world capitalism has stuck to it at great expense of basic food requirement of humanity. According to the World Bank, the grain needed to fill up an SUV would feed a person for a year! Even the argument of greener energy to reduce global warming hardly holds water; corn ethanol only delivers a small reduction in greenhouse gasses compared with petrol. The soaring food prices, further triggered by heinous and parasitic activities of capitalist speculators on commodity markets, have created another scary chapter in the growing crisis of world capitalism, which is already grappling with a serious financial market crisis. Some economic analysts have already seen another Great Depression lurking in the shadow. At present the developing countries are the worst hit of the food prices. But the IMF has warned that if food prices continued to rise sharply the problem could lead to trade imbalances that may eventually affect developed nations. In many developing countries, workers and poor masses have taken to streets protesting food price rise. As the crisis hit harder, more working people will be drawn to streets, raising question on capacity of capitalism to offer basic needs like foods, jobs, decent housing for the poor. Some protests will threaten elements in government as it has ousted the prime minister and collapsed government of Haiti. But any change within confines of capitalism cannot offer fundamental solution. A Guinean told IRIN (April 1, 2008) after the government cancelled fuel subsidies even in the face of growing anger against rising food prices, "We thought it was [President] Conté who was at the root of our problems and that with the appointment of [Prime Minister] Kouyaté, everything would settle. But unfortunately we realise that neither of them can deliver happiness". The government of Guinea (Conakry) said it had to end the subsidies as one of the conditions imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) if it is to receive IMF funding in future. More and more working people will find out that nobody can deliver happiness for poor masses under capitalism.

## LINK: WIND

**Wind power cannot meet more than 15% of current energy demands and it requires non-renewable backup. It is not an alternative to capitalism.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 111-12)

In Europe, the US and Australia, and surely many other regions, the quantity of wind energy that could potentially be harvested is quite large, e.g., comparable to electricity demand, but not likely to be so abundant as to enable transport energy to also be derived from this source. Much more important than sheer quantity are the limits set by the variability of the wind. In most regions most wind comes in winter, and at any time of the year wind strengths vary greatly and for considerable periods there might be little or no wind. This might limit the contribution of wind to 15% of demand or less, but possibly 20% or more in favourable regions. A windmill at an ideal site will generate 33% or more of its rated peak capacity but in Germany and Denmark the variability problem has cut system capacity to well below this figure, indeed to around half of it. Connecting wind farms across very large areas helps to reduce the variability in system aggregate input, but does not overcome it. Large regional calms can last for days. In Germany the average capacity figure for the more windy half of the year has been recorded at around a mere 11%, although the European annual figure has been closer to 25%. At present wind provides a very small fraction of national demand even in the countries that have built most capacity, e.g., around 5% in Germany and Denmark (where more is produced, but exported), and this capacity would have been built at the best sites available. If this fraction was increased to say 50% it is likely that most of the mills would have to be located at sites where capacities would be well below the 35% usually assumed, and total system capacity would surely be well under 25%. Most of the world's people do not live in the favourable wind conditions of Western Europe. The problem is not obviously overcome by linking many mills in a large system over a wide area. Davy and Coppin's findings regarding the probable variability within a very large integrated Australian wind system 1500 km across are sobering. For a considerable fraction of the time much backup fossil fuel or nuclear power would have to be drawn on. Another implication of variability is that if a large amount of wind-generating capacity is built, then almost as much additional coal or nuclear capacity might have to be built for use when the winds are down. In addition grids have to be reinforced to enable large surpluses from one region to be moved to others. In other words we might need capacity equal to two (or three if solar is included) separate and expensive systems with one or two sitting idle most of the time. The usually claimed cost of wind energy is misleading. It refers to peak as distinct from average capacity, it does not include storage costs, or the costs of connecting the farm to the grid, and, most important of all, it does not include the cost of building the backup coal or nuclear plant needed when the winds are low. It does not seem viable to use vast numbers of windmills to store large quantities of energy as compressed air, pumped water or hydrogen for use later, especially in the calmer summer months. Nor can coal be used to plug the gaps in wind power supply without exceeding safe greenhouse limits. It is difficult therefore to see how wind could be a major component in a global energy system running entirely on renewables unless some way is found for storing large quantities of energy, or we could be sure that a sufficient amount of some other renewable source would always be available when the wind input is low.

## LINK: WIND

**Intermittency makes wind power impractical as even a partial energy source.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 21-22)

Renewable energy sources can fit well into national supply systems while they are only meeting a small fraction of demand, because it is easy to make small adjustments to the non-renewable sources as the output from the renewables fluctuates. There is then no need to provide for storing large amounts of the renewable energy for use later in calm periods. But the concern in this book is with whether renewables could meet the total energy demand. For wind, great difficulties are set here by its variability; sometimes there are gales and sometimes there is no wind at all. "There are times when the wind is calm everywhere." (Hayden, 2004, p. 150). Thus the foregoing discussion of the sheer quantity of energy derivable over a period might tell us little about the actual contribution wind could make. The question is, given the variability, how much can be conveniently "integrated" into the power supply system and with what costs and consequences. One consequence is that the costly renewable components of the system will be largely or totally idle some of the time, and therefore that a number of separate systems each capable of meeting demand could be needed. Another is that it is difficult to increase or decrease output from other generating sources, as required to adjust their output to the fluctuations in the intermittent source. Except for the limited hydro sources, and to a lesser extent gas, these adjustments cannot be made quickly. In the past it has been commonly assumed that in good wind regions wind might be able to supply 20% or more of electrical energy provided by the system before a penetration problem arises. A number of studies and reports conclude that this is likely to be too optimistic and that problems can arise under 10% wind penetration of the electricity supply system. Kelly and Weinberg (1993) say Europe is not a good location for intermittent energy sources and the limit would probably be 18% of power demand. Spanish authorities have recently stated 17% as the limit (*Windpower Monthly*, Dec., 2003, Feb. 2004, p., 36). Grubb and Meyer (1993, p. 205) say most studies before the early 1990s conclude that production can only reach 5–15% of demand before difficulties arise, and they note that in Denmark penalties become prohibitive at 10% penetration. The UKERC report (2006) says that there need be no problems with 20% penetration of the UK electricity supply system. (See critical comment below.) However most impressive are the recent reports on Germany and Denmark (below) which discuss the significant integration difficulties that have arisen in systems supplying only about 5% of national electricity demand. It might seem that Denmark had not run into these problems until its wind electrical output reached 18% of its consumption. This often quoted figure is misleading because most of the output is exported and the amount that can be taken into the Danish grid is closer to 4%. Consequently much energy has to be dumped at certain times, and much has to be sold at low prices. (*Country Guardian*, 2002). These problems are said to have arisen regarding 34–45% of the wind power generated in Denmark in 2000. Denmark sometimes has to give away up to 40% of its surplus power (Ferguson, 2004, Sharman, 2005a, p. 7). Duguid, et al. (2004) say, "A couple 22 *Chapter 2* of years ago we even had to pay Sweden to take it." "Germany...is approaching the same threshold...it's buying balance power on the market...at up to 20 times the wholesale cost – and selling surplus power very cheaply." Denmark's extensive development of wind energy has been facilitated firstly by the fact that its neighbours have made much less investment in wind and have therefore been able to buy Denmark's surplus when it was available. In a renewable energy world there would be less scope for this. Secondly the region has much hydro-power power and this can be switched on and off quickly to accommodate fluctuations in wind power. Third, Denmark is a very small country, with 5.4 million people, so the quantity of surplus wind it needs to export to large neighbours is a relatively small amount for them to accommodate. One important factor here is the period of time in advance in which a wind generating company has to commit to delivering an amount of power, or face penalties; the "gate". The shorter this is the less likely wind energy will not be wasted because of over-cautious predictions. The UK gate is now 1 hour but when it was 4.5 hours some 15% of energy that could have been generated might not have been forwarded (Ferguson, 2003, p. 3). The period can be short in good wind regions, but in Germany where winds are not ideal it is many hours and it could be that the gate problem cannot easily be overcome there precisely because it is partly due to having to make use of poorer winds.

These introductory summary comments indicate that the variability or integration problem sets fairly savage limits on the contribution wind can make, especially when the question is whether wind can be a major element in a wholly renewable system.

## LINK: WIND

**Wind power requires power plants as backup energy sources – this increases fossil fuel usage because plants run on constant standby.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 32-33)

To the uninitiated the more windmills we built the less fossil fuel plant we would need, but this is largely mistaken, especially where the proportion of wind energy in an electricity supply system is relatively high. There are two factors here. “Capacity credit” refers to the amount of coal, gas or nuclear plant that no longer needs to be generating all the time. “Backup capacity” refers to the amount of plant that must be kept available for use if the winds fall. If we think of this issue in terms of how much coal or nuclear capacity can be eliminated by adding another windmill to the system, at first the curve rises steeply but it levels out remarkably quickly. An estimate for Holland states the surprising conclusion that adding mills more or less ceases reducing the need for coal or nuclear capacity when wind contribution has risen to only 1.8% of national electricity generating capacity (*European Wind Energy Atlas*, 1991, p. 23). The 2005 E.On Netz report quotes two independent studies concluding that capacity credit was 8% “...in macro planning terms, effectively zero.” (Constable, 2005. See Fig. 7 in the Report). The report also stresses that as the contribution of wind to supply increases, capacity credit falls (Fig. 2). The UKERC report also makes this point. The DENA Grid Study proposes increasing the German wind supply system to 36GW and states that this would enable retiring 2 GW of fossil-fuel generating plant. (For critical comment on the study see Note 4.) Hayden (2003, p. 123) says, “There are times when the wind is down everywhere...the utilities must maintain full reserve to handle the situation when the wind does not blow. In other words wind turbines do not add meaningful capacity to a system.” In his revised edition he says, “Wind turbines...do not allow a utility to get rid of so much as one power plant.” (2004, p. 154). From the other evidence being reviewed here this would appear to be an over-statement of the situation, but not that far out. Davy and Coppin (2003, p. 11) give remarkably low figures for the “reliably available capacity” that there would be in a wind system spread across South East Australia, i.e., wind capacity likely to be available with a 95% certainty. For NSW during the best half of the day 4.6% of installed peak capacity could be predicted to be available with 95% certainty. For the worst half of the day it is 0.5%, and 1.3% overall. For all three southeast states, extending across some 1,500 km, the combined figure is 9.5%. Coppin notes that in autumn the figures would be lower still. Similarly the very large-scale proposal Czisch and Ernst put forward includes the estimate that to provide 30% of European demand would require also building about as much conventional backup plant. (They say it would have to be equal to 26% of the peak wind plant, but even assuming 33% capacity, the peak capacity of the backup plant would be about equal to the wind energy generated.) Milborrow (2004) says that if wind provided 20% of power demand, backup capacity would “only” have to equal 10% of demand. That is not trivial. It means that for every two units of wind energy generated, sufficient coal-fired plant to provide one unit must also be built. Sharman’s report on Denmark (2005a) emphasises that for each windmill built, additional coal, gas or nuclear plant of almost the same capacity must be built to meet the demand when the windmills cannot contribute. The 2004 E.On Netz report says (p. 3), “...traditional power station capacity must be maintained...at a total level of more than 80% of the installed wind capacity.” This is a remarkable figure, meaning that if 1 MW of wind capacity is built it will deliver on average 0.16 MW, but another 0.8 MW of coal-fired plant must also be built to stand idle much of the time. The 2004 E.On Netz report on the German experience states that wind cannot reduce the need for conventional generating plant more than 20%. In fact they had to build euros 100 million worth of new coal-powered plant to be able to cope with the times when their new windmills were not operating (p. 9). So in general the more windmills we build, the more coal-fired, gas or nuclear plant we must also build. This problem does not occur in a supply system in which wind is a negligible contributor. Wind supplies only about 1% of US electricity and therefore when winds are low there is no difficulty replacing wind’s contribution from other sources. Danish mills only provide the quantity of electricity that about 68,000 people use, and the need for backup there is also reduced by the ability to store and to export to larger countries. In other words, in general windmills are built in addition to conventional plant, not instead of it, and their virtue is in avoiding use of coal or gas fuel, not in avoiding building coal or gas plant. As Constable (2005) says, “Wind is not an alternative, it is a supplement.” In addition, because some coal-fired plant must be kept “spinning”, i.e., warm but idling and ready to “ramp up” when the wind drops, carbon is being released and the small amount of power the plant is generating is at low efficiency. Ferguson (2005a) argues that building windmills would actually result in more coal or gas plant being built and fossil fuel being used than would have been the case had they not been built.

**LINK: SOLAR**

**Solar can never keep up with the energy demands of a capitalist world.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 57)

The major advantage of solar thermal plant is that energy storage can be fairly easily provided, at least for a day. However the near future capital cost of solar thermal electricity plant per delivered kW even in good sites seems to be more than seven times that of coal-fired plant plus fuel, and the technology seems not to be very effective in winter even in the best latitudes. In the middle latitudes, e.g., as close as 34degrees to the equator, solar thermal technologies seem quite capable of making a significant summer contribution, but not a significant winter contribution. From the somewhat limited information reviewed it is difficult to see how they could perform a major role in a wholly renewable energy world except in summer. A winter contribution in the regions where most people in developed countries live would seem to depend on the more expensive dishes, and therefore would involve a storage problem and long transmission distances.

(Most people live in tropical regions but clouds make solar technologies less than ideal there in late summer; Kaneff, 1992, p. 33.) Again it is important to note that these conclusions have not taken fully into account parasitic losses, energy costs, transmission losses and the cost of backup systems. If correct these conclusions probably would not worry most solar thermal enthusiasts because they see this technology as making a valuable partial contribution to future electricity supply, from favourable regions and mostly in summer. But our concern is whether they could be important contributors to a wholly renewable world electricity supply sustaining consumer-capitalist society, and this does not seem to be the case.

### LINK: HYDROGEN

**A hydrogen economy is impossible – it's too inefficient.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 93)

Even if there was no doubt that the required quantity of hydrogen could be produced, a hydrogen economy would probably be prohibited by the physical nature of hydrogen. Because it is a very light and small atom, a large volume is needed to carry much energy, and it easily leaks through joints, valves and seals.  
Consequently converting energy to hydrogen, storing and transporting it involve formidable difficulties, energy losses, infrastructure requirements, and costs. These multiply the number of windmills etc. that a system would need to cover the losses.

**Hydrogen can never meet the expanding energy demands of a capitalist society.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 98)

The hydrogen economy vision often assumes such vast quantities of hydrogen will be derived from sun and wind that it will be possible to replace oil and gas, as well as meeting electricity demand. The impossibility of this vision is fairly easily demonstrated. Australian electricity consumption is about 700 PJ and liquid fuel for transport consumption is about 1200 PJ/y. If use of hydrogen for transport loses 75% (or 50%) of the electricity generated, we would need to produce about 4800 PJ (or 2400 PJ) in the form of hydrogen. To fuel transport we would need enough windmills to meet 7 (or 3.5) times our electricity demand, i.e., in addition to meeting electricity demand. Chapters 2 to 4 showed that renewable sources are not likely to meet present electricity demand, let alone several times it.

**LINK: NUCLEAR**

**There is simply not enough uranium for nuclear power to meet the needs of a capitalist society.**  
**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 119)

Leeuwin and Smith (2003, 2005) have analysed global Uranium resources and energy costs, finding that there is far too little Uranium at a sufficient grade to sustain a nuclear era for more than a few years. Even this richer fuel enables an energy return ratio of only about 5, meaning that in its 35 year lifetime a reactor would be producing net energy for about 28 years. (See also Mortimer, 1991.) If the world's present electricity demand was met by nuclear reactors, the high-grade ores, over 0.2% uranium oxide, would be used up within about twelve years. Larger quantities of Uranium exist in low grade ores, e.g., 0.01–0.02% concentration, but Leeuwen and Smith conclude that extracting these would require more energy than they would provide.

**Nuclear power is too expensive and dangerous to be used globally.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 120)

A largely nuclear era would involve a huge number of reactors. To provide 9 billion people with present rich world energy consumption per capita would require 100,000 reactors each of 1000 MW (many more when conversion to liquid fuels is taken into account). Thus we would have about 500 times the present scale of accidents, waste, safety violations, etc. To provide 9~billion people with the energy we in rich countries will be using in 2070 if the current rate of growth in energy demand continued would multiply these numbers by perhaps 5. If the 100,000 reactors were all breeders with 4 tonnes of Plutonium in the core of each, the amount in the French Superphenix breeder, about half to a million tonnes of it would be continually recycling through reactors and reprocessing plants. We would have to bury about 4,000 old reactors every year.

## LINK: HEGEMONY

**Hegemony is a means of spreading global capitalism.**

**Ferguson '04** (Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University, 2004, "Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire, pg. 10)

To the majority of Americans, it would appear, there is not contradiction between the ends of global democratization and the means of American military power. As defined by their president, the democratizing mission of the United States is both altruistic and distinct from the ambitions of past empires, which (so it is generally assumed) aimed to impose their own rule on foreign peoples. The difficulty is that President Bush's ideal of freedom as a universal desideratum rather closely resembles the Victorian ideal of "civilization." "Freedom" means, on close inspection, the American model of democracy and capitalism; when Americans speak of "nation building" they actually mean "state replicating," in the sense that they want to build political and economic institutions that are fundamentally similar, though not identical, to their own. They may not aspire to rule, but they do aspire to have others rule themselves in the American way. Yet the very act of imposing "freedom" simultaneously subverts it. Just as the Victorians seemed hypocrites when they spread "civilization" with the Maxim gun, so there is something fishy about those who would democratize Fallujah with the Abrams tank. President Bush's distinction between conquest and liberation would have been entirely familiar to the liberal imperialists of the early 1900s, who likewise saw Britain's far-flung legions as agents of emancipation (not least in the Middle East during and after WWI.)

**Hegemony causes the wars they seek to prevent—capitalism drives the need to grab resources at any cost and ensures escalating wars.**

**Mészáros, 07** (Professor Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory, University of Sussex. "The Only Viable Economy" <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm>)

In our time, by contrast, we have to face up to the reality -- and the lethal dangers -- arising from global hegemonic imperialism, with the United States as its overwhelmingly dominant power.<sup>7</sup> In contrast to even Hitler, the United States as the single hegemon is quite unwilling to share global domination with any rival. And that is not simply on account of political/military contingencies. The problems are much deeper. They assert themselves through the ever-aggravating contradictions of the capital system's deepening structural crisis. U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism is an -- ultimately futile -- attempt to devise a solution to that crisis through the most brutal and violent rule over the rest of the world, enforced with or without the help of slavishly "willing allies," now through a succession of genocidal wars. Ever since the 1970s the United States has been sinking ever deeper into catastrophic indebtedness. The fantasy solution publicly proclaimed by several U.S. presidents was "to grow out of it." And the result: the diametrical opposite, in the form of astronomical and still growing indebtedness. Accordingly, the United States must grab to itself, by any means at its disposal, including the most violent military aggression, whenever required for this purpose, everything it can, through the transfer of the fruits of capitalist growth -- thanks to the global socioeconomic and political/military domination of the United States -- from everywhere in the world. Could then any sane person imagine, no matter how well armored by his or her callous contempt for "the shibboleth of equality," that U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism would take seriously even for a moment the panacea of "no growth"? Only the worst kind of bad faith could suggest such ideas, no matter how pretentiously packaged in the hypocritical concern over "the Predicament of Mankind." For a variety of reasons there can be no question about the importance of growth both in the present and in the future. But to say so must go with a proper examination of the concept of growth not only as we know it up to the present, but also as we can envisage its sustainability in the future. Our siding with the need for growth cannot be in favor of unqualified growth. The tendentiously avoided real question is: what kind of growth is both feasible today, in contrast to dangerously wasteful and even crippling capitalist growth visible all around us? For growth must be also positively sustainable in the future on a long-term basis.

### LINK: HEGEMONY

**Hegemony is not a tool of peace—it is the extension of brutal economic imperialism. Backlash in the form of nuclear proliferation is an inevitable consequence of capitalism.**

**Foster '05** (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, September, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>).

The unprecedeted dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration's refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled "Apocalypse Soon" in the May-June 2005 issue of *Foreign Policy*: "The United States has never endorsed the policy of 'no first use,' not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so." The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world's total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world's growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability.

Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela's Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the "nuclear club." Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society.

|                         |
|-------------------------|
| <b>LINK: FREE TRADE</b> |
|-------------------------|

**Free trade will just expand the ability of capitalism to utterly destroy ecosystems.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism”  
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm> 6/6/2006).

Combined with a human population explosion, the growth of highly industrialized cultures driven by capitalism’s ceaseless quest for raw materials, new markets, cheap labor and higher profits, we are witnessing the systematic and wanton destruction of the biosphere in exchange for capital. Free trade is not what the name would seem to imply. Free trade has nothing to do with freedom for people or the promotion of democracy. It is in fact the capacity for multinational corporations to do business without restrictions of any kind.

## IMPACT: EXTINCTION

**Capitalism is the root cause of global environmental destruction—we need to change the system or face planetary extinction.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm> 6/6/2006).

As a result of human overpopulation, and capitalism’s inherent greed, virtually all of the world’s great ecosystems are in decline or collapse. The earth’s ability to replenish herself and to sustain her immense biological diversity (biological capital) is being diminished. So we are living in the midst of one of the planet’s great extinction episodes and it is human induced. Every plant and animal that exists has an impact on the planet. It is therefore imperative that we live gently and with minimal environmental impact, lest we impair the earth’s ability to sustain life. The concept of the private ownership of nature simply does not produce a sound and responsible land ethic.

**It is try or die for the alternative—capitalism will annihilate the planet.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm> 6/6/2006).

Wherever the extractive industries have gone they have left polluted waters and depauperate landscapes, and exhausted and impoverished workers in their wake. The company owners get rich while the workers continue to live in abject poverty and are still dying in the mines. This is the legacy of capitalism, as witnessed by a historical record that is beyond dispute. It is there for the entire world to see, as if etched in granite. You can see it in the face of the miners and the impoverished remnant forest, in the toxic waste left behind in Butte, Montana, where the water in the aftermath of copper mining has the acidity of battery acid. It makes no moral, ecological or economic sense whatsoever for us to continue down this path of self-deception and self-annihilation. As we have seen, capitalism produces only a few winners, and leaves death and devastation in its wake. Either we rebel or die.

## IMPACT: EXTINCTION

### **Capitalism is the greatest threat to human survival.**

**MacUaid, 07** (Liam, “Savage Capitalism—The Ecosocialist Alternative,” August, <http://liammacuaid.files.wordpress.com/2007/08/savage-capitalism.pdf>)

All this has happened not only because of the general priorities of any form of capitalism, but because of the present phase of ‘savage capitalism’, stalking the earth with all sense of social responsibility abandoned, increasing amounts of surveillance, violence, war and torture, and aimed at short term profits squeezed from the labour of the poor, rather than the development of social solidarity, peace and the possibility for most people to live a happy life. It is now obvious that this morbid phase of capitalism has brought upon humanity the biggest ever threat to its existence – the threat of environmental catastrophe. The overall threat to humanity and the planet we sum up here under four headings – environmental catastrophe, imperialist war and the crushing of the third world, savage capitalism in everyday life and the surveillance- security lockdown state. They are all linked; they all are part of a single system of power and exploitation. ‘Neoliberalism’, with the added ingredient of US-style neoconservatism, has degenerated into a new and more barbarous phase – ‘savage capitalism’. This new phase of capitalism forces an inevitable conclusion – only by a total transformation in politics and production, in other words a transformation of our social relations, can a sustainable future for humanity be established. We are facing the biggest crisis of human civilisation ever. No previous crisis has ever posed the existence human civilisation so directly.

### **Capitalism makes ecological destruction inevitable.**

**McGarr, 2000** (Paul, socialist historian, political activist, and author, “Why Green is Red: Marxism and the Threat to the Environment,” International Socialism Journal, Autumn 2000, <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj88/mcgarr.htm>)

The aim of this article has been to argue that environmental destruction can only be fully understood as one part of a wider social crisis. That has been true in previous class societies, and it flows from the way that ruling classes lock society into specific ways of organising production which eventually eat into the very material and environmental basis they depend on. The same pattern is true, with some important specific characteristics, under capitalism. Only today with a global system the threat of crisis and environmental destruction is global too. I have tried to show how two of the most important environmental threats we face today, global warming and GMOs, flow from the logic of capitalism. The problem is not industry or science, but the organisation of production under the control of a minority which lives by the creed of profit before all else. This dogma threatens environmental and social catastrophe on a scale previous generations could not have imagined, and could even threaten the viability of civilisation itself. The answer to this terrible threat is to build on the spirit of the revolts against capitalism and its institutions that have erupted so wonderfully over the last year. Such revolts have, and must, involve a diverse range of social groups and movements. But to go from protest and revolt into a social revolution that ends the threat of human and environmental disaster demands that the class on whose labour the whole system depends is at the centre of the fight. The future of society, and the environment, depends on whether such a fight, one in which the global working class, alongside peasants, students and many more, wrests control of society and production from those who control it now. If we do not succeed in doing that the future is bleak indeed. If we do then we have the chance to reorganise production, using the fruits of a scientific understanding of the world of which we are part, and so build a world whose beauty we can enjoy today and safeguard for future generations.

## IMPACT: NUCLEAR WAR

**Capitalism threatens mass nuclear annihilation.**

**Webb, 04** (Sam Webb, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. "War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush." 4-20-04. <http://www.pww.org/article/view/4967/1/207/O/>)

Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty. Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind's ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation.

**Capitalism has inherent tendencies towards militarism and war, only anti-capitalist movements can solve.**

**Webb, 04** (Sam Webb, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. "War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush." 4-20-04. <http://www.pww.org/article/view/4967/1/207/O/>)

In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn't mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level. In the 20th century, the world community escaped a nuclear Armageddon, but will we be so lucky in this century? No one knows for sure. What will improve our chances immeasurably is the skill with which socialist and left forces link the immediate struggles for peace in the election arena and elsewhere with the longer-term task of transcending capitalism and constructing a socialist society, in which the drive to accumulate capital and maximize profits and, in turn, the tendency to aggression, militarism and war, is completely absent.

## IMPACT: RESOURCE WARS

**Growth inevitably causes global resource wars.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability", pg. 162)

Peaceful world order in which all can feel secure is totally impossible if there is a determination to pursue affluence and growth. Everyone wants peace and security, but what the peace movement has almost entirely overlooked is the fact that if everyone continues to pursue higher material living standards and GNP then in the long run there can be no other outcome than more and more conflict of various kinds. This is simply because there is no possibility of people living as affluently as the few in rich countries do now, let alone living at the levels we insist on growing to as the years go by. There is a gigantic struggle going on over the distribution of resources, and this can only become more intense in future years. Following are some of the types of conflict and violence that inevitably result. First there is the vicious class conflict that occurs when desperate peasants finally try to hit back at their exploiters and are met with state violence.

About 3 per cent of Third World people own about 80 per cent of Third World land. They leave much of it idle, and grow crops like carnations for American supermarkets on the rest. Cattle are air freighted into Haiti, fattened up and air-freighted out to hamburger outlets, while the infant death rate in Haiti is over twenty times the rate in the rich countries. When people eventually rebel against conditions like this they usually encounter brutal repression from state forces operating on behalf of tiny, wealthy and powerful ruling elites. Perhaps 15,000 Guatemalans were killed by agents of the state between 1970 and 1975. And where do these regimes obtain their guns? Mostly from us, the rich nations. The overdeveloped countries, east and west, have gone to a great deal of effort to support numerous brutal and greedy regimes in the Third World. Many of these would have been swept away long ago had it not been for the economic assistance, the military equipment and the training given to them by the rich countries.

## IMPACT: WAR

**The capitalist drive for resources will ensure that wars grow bigger and more intense over time.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 886)

The crisis we face, then, is not simply a political crisis, but the general structural crisis of the capitalistic institutions of social control in their entirety. Here the main point is that the institutions of capitalism are inherently violent and aggressive: they are built on the fundamental premise of ‘war if the “normal” methods of expansion fail.’ (Besides, he periodic destruction—by whatever means, including the most violent ones—of over-produced capital, is an inherent necessity of the ‘normal’ functioning of this system: the vital condition of its recovery from crisis and depression.) The blind ‘natural law’ of the market mechanism carries with it that the grave social problems necessarily associated with capital production and concentration are never solved, only postponed, and indeed—since postponement cannot work indefinitely—transferred to the military plane. Thus, the ‘sense’ of the hierarchically structured institutions of capitalism is given in its ultimate reference to the violent ‘fighting out’ of the issues, in the international arena, for the socioeconomic units—following the inner logic of their development—grow bigger and bigger, and their problems and contradictions increasingly more intense and grave. Growth and expansion are immanent necessities of the capitalist system of production and when the local limits are reached there is no way out except by violently readjusting the prevailing relation of forces.

**The root cause of warfare is resource scarcity generated by capitalist growth.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, pg. 33-4)

The basic factor here is that capitalism inescapably involves expansion. Capitalists only invest if they can make more money than they invest. They typically expect to make at least 10 per cent profit. Some of this must go into repairing old plant, but there is a constant increase in the amount of money available for investment. In fact, capitalism's greatest long-term problem is to find enough profitable areas for investing the constantly accumulating volumes of capital. It is a system in which this problem regularly gives rise to slumps and recessions. For long periods this problem might be solved without generating armed conflicts, but from time to time it does lead towards war because capitalists looking for new ventures tend to get in each others' way. They find themselves competing with businesses from other countries for access to resources and markets, and they are always ready to call upon their governments to help them protect against or overcome the competition. This is not to say that only economic factors cause international conflict, but there is an extensive literature on the central role of economic factors, especially where a rising power threatens to over-take the dominant one. A glance at modern history shows that there has always been a struggle between the biggest states to grab most of the wealth and prestige and power and to disadvantage others. The main source of conflict and war in the world is the ceaseless quest for greater wealth and power. We have no chance of achieving a peaceful world until nations stop being greedy and work out how to live without constantly striving to grow richer. Yet the supreme commitment in our economy is to rapid and ceaseless growth it is possible that for a long time to come the transnational corporations from the rich countries can go on securing most of the world's resources and markets without clashing and drawing their governments into armed conflict. But the tendency for this to happen must increase as resources and markets become more scarce. The only satisfactory way to remove this dangerous tendency is by shifting to an economic system which permits us to live comfortably without constantly striving for economic growth. We must understand that the problem of world peace is part of the problem of global economic justice. So long as we refuse to bring about a fairer distribution of the world's wealth, which means de-development on the part of the rich and over-developed countries, we can only expect continued and accelerating conflict and violence.

## IMPACT: TERRORISM

**Terrorism is inevitable in a capitalist world.**

**Foster and Clark '04** (Foster, John Bellamy and Clark, Brett 12/04 Monthly Review: Empire Of Barbarism)

As Business Week declared "A new age of barbarism is upon us." But it is a mistake to attribute such barbarism simply or in the main to social forces and nations in the periphery. Just as Marx came to invert the historical treatment of barbarism as he condemned the colonial systems of his day, we need to recognize the barbarism of the strong and their culpability in creating this new age. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the voice of the new barbarism, recently stated: "At some point the Iraqis will get tired of getting killed" (USA Today, September 16, 2004). Presumably he was referring to Iraqis killed by suicide bombers. Nevertheless, his statement remains inhuman in its implications in the context of the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq. Once declared there is no end to "The Global War on Terror," which ought to be called the Global War of Terror. Only the transcendence of capitalism, in the direction of socialism, offers the possibility to escape from the current state of barbarism that is paving the way to new global holocausts and a worsening ecological collapse. Daniel Singer wrote at the end of his Whose Millennium? "Socialism may be a historical possibility, or even necessary to eliminate the evils of capitalism, but this does not mean that it will inevitably take its place." We should heed his warning. The choice that we confront and that we will ultimately decide through our struggles is whether "socialism" or "the ruins of imperialistic barbarism" is to be the future of humankind.

**Capitalism breeds the extreme poverty and inequality that is the root cause of terrorism.**

**Slater, 06** (Philip, A.B. and Ph. D. from Harvard and taught sociology at Harvard, Brandeis, and UCSC, "The Root Causes of Terrorism and Why No One Wants to End Them", October 25<sup>th</sup>, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/philip-slater/the-root-causes-of-terror\\_b\\_32466.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/philip-slater/the-root-causes-of-terror_b_32466.html))

The people who do most to foment terrorism are not the fundamentalist imams and ayatollahs, who only exploit the hopelessness around them. The people who do the most are those who create that hopelessness in the first place--the oil monarchies, for example. For of all capitalist enterprises, the extractive industries are probably the most deserving of the abuse heaped on them over the years. The possessors of the earth's treasures believe, apparently, that the luck, wealth, or political corruption that allowed them to own land containing such riches is a sign of divine favor, while the poverty of those around them indicates celestial disgust. Terrorists are people who have lost hope--hope for the possibility of peacefully creating a better world. They may be middle-class and educated, as many terrorist leaders are, but their despair is one of empathy for the plight of their people as a whole. The root causes of terrorism are pathological inequalities in wealth--not just in Saudi Arabia but all over the Third World. Even in our own country Republican policies have in recent decades created inequalities so extreme that while a few have literally more money than they can possibly use, the vast majority are struggling to get by. A society that impoverishes most of its population in order to enrich a few neurotically greedy individuals is a sick society. As Jared Diamond has shown, societies in which a few plunder the environment at the expense of the many are headed for collapse. Fundamentalist religions and radical ideologies are the common refuge of people without hope. Christianity has played this role for centuries. The rich encourage the poor to accept the misery of this world as a passport to heaven, despite the fact that according to Jesus they don't have a prayer of getting in themselves. This isn't really surprising. The rich wouldn't be caught dead in a place where they let poor people in. Islamic fundamentalism is the latest drug being offered the poor and desperate. It has the added appeal that you can not only get into heaven but also take vengeance at the same time. Terrorism will never end until caps are placed on inequality.

## IMPACT: OIL WARS

**Imperialistic wars for oil are rooted in capitalism. Unless the aff completely phases out oil, our insatiable energy demand will demand future interventions.**

**Foster, 05** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Peak Oil and Energy Imperialism” <http://www.monthlyreview.org/080707foster.php>)

The tightening oil situation has prompted the rapid on the ground growth of U.S. energy imperialism, beyond the continuing Iraq and Afghan wars. The security of Saudi Arabia remains an overriding focus. Washington’s plans for a massive expansion of investment and production in Saudi Arabia, which according to the U.S. Department of Energy needs to double its oil output by 2030, depends on the feudal kingdom remaining in place. Meanwhile, there is rising social tension, emanating from the vastly unequal distribution of the country’s oil revenues. Ninety percent of private sector jobs go to foreigners. The sexes are entirely segregated. The repressive structure of the society conceals massive popular resentment. Any destabilization of the society would likely prompt U.S. military intervention. As James Howard Kunstler has written in *The Long Emergency*, “a desperate superpower might feel it has no choice except to attempt to control the largest remaining oil fields on the planet at any cost”—particularly if faced by growing rivalry from other states. The United States has sought to counter the possibility of an energy alliance between Russia, China, Iran, and Central Asian oil states by expanding its military bases in Afghanistan and Central Asia, notably its Manas air base in Kyrgyzstan on the border of oil-rich Kazakhstan. Threats of U.S. “preemptive” military intervention directed at Iran meanwhile have been continuous, based on its alleged attempts to acquire nuclear weapons through the aggressive pursuit of nuclear energy, and its “interference” in Iraq. Iran’s pursuit of nuclear power, as a 2007 study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences has confirmed, is due to an oil export decline rate of 10–12 percent, arising from the growth of domestic energy demand plus a high rate of oil field depletion and a lack of investment growth in expanded capacity. This led to Iran’s recent inability to meet its OPEC oil export quota. The current trend points to the likelihood of Iranian petroleum exports falling to zero by 2014–15. From the standpoint of Western energy and national security analysts, Iran’s government and its national oil corporation have adopted the monopolistic policy of underinvesting in oil, deliberating slowing its production in expectation of continually rising prices, thereby holding back on the lifeblood of the world economy.<sup>36</sup> During the last few years the U.S. military has dramatically increased its bases and operations in Africa, particularly in the Gulf of Guinea. The United States expects to get 20 percent of its oil imports from Africa by 2010, and 25 percent by 2015. The U.S. military set up a separate Africa Command in 2007 to govern all U.S. military operations in Africa (outside Egypt). Washington sees itself as in direct competition with Beijing over African oil—a competition that it perceives not simply in economic but also military-strategic terms.<sup>37</sup> U.S. ruling interests also have increased their threats directed at Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other Latin American states, accusing them of “resource nationalism” and presenting them as dangers to U.S. national security. Washington has made one attempt after another to unseat Venezuela’s democratically elected president Hugo Chávez and to overthrow Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution, with the clear object of regime change. This has included stepping up its massive military intervention in Colombia and backing the Colombian military and its intrusions into neighboring countries. In 2006 the U.S. Southern Command conducted an internal study, declaring that Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and conceivably even Mexico (which was then facing elections with a possible populist outcome) offered serious dangers to U.S. energy security. “Pending any favorable changes to the investment climate,” it declared, “the prospects for long-term energy production in Venezuela, Ecuador and Mexico are currently at risk.” The military threat was obvious.<sup>38</sup> All of this is in accord with the history of capitalism, and the response of declining hegemons to global forces largely outside their control. The new energy imperialism of the United States is already leading to expanding wars, which could become truly global, as Washington attempts to safeguard the existing capitalist economy and to stave off its own hegemonic decline. As Simmons has warned, “If we don’t create a solution to the enormous potential gap between our inherent demand for energy and the availability of energy we will have the nastiest and last war we’ll ever fight. I mean a literal war.”<sup>39</sup> In January 2008 Carlos Pascual, vice president of the Brookings Institution and former director of the Bush administration’s Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization, released an analysis of “The Geopolitics of Energy” that highlighted U.S. capitalism’s de facto dependence on oil production in “Saudi Arabia, Russia, Iran, Iraq, Venezuela, Nigeria, and Kazakhstan”—all posing major security threats.

## IMPACT: OIL WARS

**The capitalist race for oil is generating massive resource wars and arms races—the effects will be worse than a terrorist attack.**

**Kurlantzick, 08** – Visiting Scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Joshua, “Rearming the world: Why nations are suddenly locked in an arms race unseen since the early days of the Cold War”, Boston Globe, April 27,

[http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2008/04/27/rearming\\_the\\_world/?page=4](http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2008/04/27/rearming_the_world/?page=4))

With much less fanfare than the early days of the Cold War, the world is entering a new arms race, and with it, a dangerous new web of military relationships. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, which tracks international armed forces spending, between 1997 and 2006 global military expenditures jumped by nearly 40 percent. Driven mainly by anxiety over oil and natural resources, countries are building their arsenals of conventional weapons at a rate not seen in decades, beefing up their armies and navies, and forging potential new alliances that could divide up the world in unpredictable ways. Much of this new arms spending is concentrated among the world's biggest consumers of resources, which are trying to protect their access to energy, and the biggest producers of resources, which are taking advantage of their new wealth to build up their defenses at a rate that would have been unthinkable for a developing country until recently. This power shift comes with enormous implications for the United States and its Western allies. With more military power in the hands of authoritarian and sometimes unstable states, the arms race creates a growing possibility for real state-to-state conflict - a prospect that would dwarf even a major terror attack in its power to disrupt the world's stability. It also will force the West to change, to make its own plans to shore up resources, and to get used to a world arsenal it can no longer dominate.

For much of the past six decades, the world hung in a kind of armed equilibrium, with major powers unchallenged in their military and economic preeminence. During the Cold War, it was ideology that occupied the foreground for strategic thinkers; and even more recently, the idea of a power struggle driven by resources seemed remote. But this situation has changed dramatically in just the past decade. As easily accessible global stocks of oil dwindle, the world supply of oil and gas has been concentrated in a smaller and smaller number of hands over just the past decade. Some 80 percent of all reserves now are concentrated in fewer than 10 nations. The biggest consumers desperately want to protect their secure flows of oil and gas from this handful of key suppliers, while simultaneously preventing their rivals from inking deals with resource-rich nations. The result, in some cases, is alliances between consumers and producers; in others, it is new and unexpected links. Middle East specialist Flynt Leverett calls some of these new relationships the emerging "Axis of Oil," an informal alliance between oil producers like Venezuela, Kazakhstan, Iran, and Russia, which are increasing state control over their petroleum, and powerful authoritarian developing nations desperately short of resources. The biggest of these nations is China, which will surpass the United States in its petroleum use within the next two decades. And, fittingly, it is China that is driving a great deal of the current arms race. It has been increasing its defense budget by roughly 20 percent annually, and begun transforming the People's Liberation Army, historically an overpoliticized, untrained force, into a leaner, truly modern fighting machine. "The pace and scope of China's military expansion are startling," says John Tkacik, a China analyst at the Heritage Foundation, a think tank in Washington. Meanwhile, China has also been inking big military deals with new allies across the globe. In 2004, China signed a deal with Iran in which it will spend as much as \$100 billion on future supplies of Iranian petroleum, and Iran has become one of China's biggest arms clients. To keep strong links with Sudan, which sends roughly half of all its oil to China, Beijing has provided weapons to the Khartoum regime, despite international pressure in the wake of the Darfur genocide. Over the past decade, China has been building other types of alliances as well - training other countries' army officers, for instance, with the kind of education programs once dominated by the Pentagon. In the Philippines, where the military historically had deep ties to America and where China has inked a joint offshore oil exploration deal, one top defense official says many of his leading officers now head to China for short courses. "This is now considered relatively prestigious, to go to China," agrees Philippine defense analyst Rommel Banlaoi. "That wouldn't have been true a few years ago." In oil-rich Venezuela, China has been training defense satellite technicians, elite forces, and other military personnel. China has also helped Hugo Chavez revamp his oil infrastructure, and Venezuela's president has vowed to roughly triple his shipments to Beijing in the coming years. In Central Asia, Chinese oil companies, aided by large loan and aid packages from Chinese state-linked banks, have helped leading petroleum producers in that region orient new pipelines toward China. And with Central Asian nations that themselves possess aging, post-Soviet armed forces, China has become a major military player. China is only one of the drivers in the new global arms race. Playing off its role as both energy supplier and, in some cases, consumer, Russia has increased its arms sales to border nations in the Caspian region in order to further its energy links. In Central Asia, the Kremlin has stepped up training for local militaries, and in Indonesia, one of the world's largest gas producers, then-Russian President Vladimir Putin last summer signed a deal to sell some \$6 billion in new weapons. Under Putin, the Kremlin also vowed to rebuild its navy. "It's clear that a new arms race is unfolding in the world," Putin declared just before leaving office. India has been building its arsenal, too, launching a massive ballistic missile program. Singapore has vastly upgraded its forces, and in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia recently bought billions of dollars' worth of new fighter jets from Europe, new spending nearly matched by some of the other Gulf states. In part to counter the efforts of Russia and China, Washington and other leading industrialized powers are building their own military links - and again, these have little to do with ideological agreement. With Australia, Singapore, Japan, and India - three democracies and one essentially authoritarian state - Washington has started holding joint military exercises, including a vast war game last summer at virtually the same time as Peace Mission 2007. On a recent visit to India by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, another top defense official told reporters that the Pentagon was building ties to India "as a hedge" against China. In the Caspian region, the United States is building its own military-energy ties. Over the past decade, it has boosted defense links to nations like Azerbaijan and Georgia critical to petroleum pipelines serving America, while simultaneously offering public White House meetings to Caspian leaders - even to Azeri President Ilham Aliyev, accused of massive fraud in the past election. Across oil-rich Central Asia, the Pentagon has negotiated deals to allow US forces to operate out of bases in many Central Asian states, and is now cultivating Turkmenistan - a major gas producer where, since the death of its long-ruling autocratic leader, the nation has taken some tentative steps to re-engage with the West. In the Middle East, the United States is also building a new alliance to contain Iran's influence. Over the past year, the Bush administration aggressively pressured Congress to allow Washington to sell some \$20 billion worth of arms to Saudi Arabia in order to build up a bulwark against Iran. In many ways, these new deals echo the old "Great Game," the competition among Western powers for influence in Central Asia. But today the situation is far more complex: With so much money in the hands of resource-rich countries, the line is now much fuzzier between major powers and the developing nations whose resources they are sparring over. It is also risky. Although this new arms race might produce nothing more than bigger toys for the Pentagon and the People's Liberation Army, many defense and energy experts think this is unlikely. The buildup could push opponents toward damaging standoffs, as in the Cold War, and even escalate into real clashes. In some arenas, the new alliances already seem to be sparking conflict. With China's more sophisticated submarine fleet increasingly moving into seas claimed by Japan, and Japan's own self-defense forces becoming more aggressive, Japan publicly exposed Chinese sub incursions, leading to perhaps the worst downturn in Beijing-Tokyo relations in recent memory.

## IMPACT: OIL WARS

**Energy wars will be worst conflicts in human history.**

**Simmons 08** (Matthew Simmons, Head of Simmons and CO, energy investment firm, February 2008,  
[http://www.goodmagazine.com/section/Features/the\\_accidental\\_environmentalist/](http://www.goodmagazine.com/section/Features/the_accidental_environmentalist/))

No, no. I'm purely driven by the sense that if we don't create a solution to the enormous potential gap between our inherent demand for energy and the availability of energy, we will have the nastiest and last war we'll ever fight. I mean a literal war. Like the Middle East versus the United States? Or the U.S. versus Canada. The U.S. and China. Or Europe and Russia. If energy weren't very important then it wouldn't matter that you have a need for 100 and a supply of 70. But since energy is the one thing that makes our entire global economy work ... when you start having that sort of mismatch, the bullies get to the front of the line and take it first. The urgency of this blows away this sort of vague worry about global warming: I don't know anybody who thinks that's an issue that will affect our lives in the next 15 or 20 years. If we don't solve this in 10 years, it's too late.

## IMPACT: PEAK OIL

**Capitalism is the root cause of the peak oil crisis and global warming.**

**Foster, 05** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. "Peak Oil and Energy Imperialism" <http://www.monthlyreview.org/080707foster.php>)

The supreme irony of the peak oil crisis of course is that the world is rapidly proceeding down the path of climate change from the burning of fossil fuels, threatening within a matter of decades human civilization and life on the planet. Unless carbon dioxide emissions from the consumption of such fuels are drastically reduced, a global catastrophe awaits. For environmentalists peak oil is therefore not a tragedy in itself since the crucial challenge facing humanity at present is weaning the world from excessive dependence on fossil fuels. The breaking of the solar energy budget that hydrocarbons allowed has generated a biospheric rift, which if not rapidly addressed will close off the future.<sup>43</sup> Yet, heavy levels of fossil fuel, and particularly petroleum, consumption are built into the structure of the present world capitalist economy. The immediate response of the system to the end of easy oil has been therefore to turn to a new energy imperialism—a strategy of maximum extraction by any means possible: with the object of placating what Rachel Carson once called "the gods of profit and production."<sup>44</sup> This, however, presents the threat of multiple global conflagrations: global warming, peak oil, rapidly rising world hunger (resulting in part from growing biofuel production), and nuclear war—all in order to secure a system geared to growing inequality. In the face of the immense perils now facing life on the planet, the world desperately needs to take a new direction; toward communal well-being and global justice: a socialism for the planet. The immense danger now facing the human species, it should be understood, is not due principally to the constraints of the natural environment, whether geological or climatic, but arises from a deranged social system wheeling out of control, and more specifically, U.S. imperialism. This is the challenge of our time.

## IMPACT: GENOCIDE

**Capitalism reduces all of humanity to their ability to produce monetary value—making genocide inevitable.**

Kovel 02 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, p. 140-141)

The precondition of an ecologically rational attitude toward nature is the recognition that nature far surpasses us and has its own intrinsic value, irreducible to our practice. Thus we achieve differentiation from nature. It is in this light that we would approach the question of transforming practice ecologically — or, as we now recognize to be the same thing, dialectically. The monster that now bestrides the world was born of the conjugation of value and dominated labour. From the former arose the quantification of reality, and, with this, the loss of the differentiated recognition essential for ecosystemic integrity; from the latter emerged a kind of selfhood that could swim in these icy waters. From this standpoint one might call capitalism a ‘regime of the ego’, meaning that under its auspices a kind of estranged self emerges as the mode of capital’s reproduction. This self is not merely prideful the ordinary connotation of ‘egotistical’ — more fully, it is the ensemble of those relations that embody the domination of nature from one side, and, from the other, ensure the reproduction of capital. This ego is the latest version of the purified male principle, emerging aeons after the initial gendered domination became absorbed and rationalized as profitability and self-maximization (allowing suitable ‘power-women’ to join the dance). It is a pure culture of splitting and non-recognition: of itself, of the otherness of nature and of the nature of others. In terms of the preceding discussion, it is the elevation of the merely individual and isolated mind-as-ego into a reigning principle. ‘Capital produces egotistic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accompanied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

## IMPACT: GENOCIDE

**Capitalism reduces human beings to mere economic value and therefore enables genocide.**

**Internationalist Perspective, 2000** ("Capitalism and Genocide", Issue #36, Spring 2000,  
<http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html>)

The real domination of capital is characterized by the penetration of the law of value into every segment of social existence. As Georg Lukács put it in his History and Class Consciousness, this means that the commodity ceases to be "one form among many regulating the metabolism of human society," to become its "universal structuring principle." From its original locus at the point of production, in the capitalist factory, which is the hallmark of the formal domination of capital, the law of value has systematically spread its tentacles to incorporate not just the production of commodities, but their circulation and consumption. Moreover, the law of value also penetrates and then comes to preside over the spheres of the political and ideological, including science and technology themselves. This latter occurs not just through the transformation of the fruits of technology and science into commodities, not just through the transformation of technological and scientific research itself (and the institutions in which it takes place) into commodities, but also, and especially, through what Lukács designates as the infiltration of thought itself by the purely technical, the very quantification of rationality, the instrumentalization of reason; and, I would argue, the reduction of all beings (including human beings) to mere objects of manipulation and control. As Lukács could clearly see even in the age of Taylorism, "this rational mechanisation extends right into the worker's 'soul'." In short, it affects not only his outward behavior, but her very internal, psychological, makeup. The phenomenon of reification, inherent in the commodity-form, and its tendential penetration into the whole of social existence, which Lukács was one of the first to analyze, is a hallmark of the real domination of capital: "Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people." Reification, the seeming transformation of social relations into relations between things, has as one of its outcomes what the German-Jewish thinker H.G. Adler designated as "the administered man" [Der verwaltete Mensch]. For Adler, when human beings are administered, they are treated as things, thereby clearing the way for their removal or elimination by genocide. The outcome of such a process can be seen in the bureaucratic administration of the Final Solution, in which the organization of genocide was the responsibility of desk killers like Adolf Eichmann who could zealously administer a system of mass murder while displaying no particular hatred for his victims, no great ideological passion for his project, and no sense that those who went to the gas chambers were human beings and not things. The features of the desk killer, in the person of Eichmann, have been clearly delineated by Hannah Arendt. He is the high-level functionary in a vast bureaucratic organization who does his killing from behind a desk, from which he rationally plans and organizes mass murder; treating it as simply a technical task, no different than the problem of transporting scrap metal. The desk killer is the quintessential bureaucrat functioning according to the imperatives of the death-world. As a human type, the desk killer, that embodiment of the triumph of instrumental reason, has become a vital part of the state apparatus of late capitalism.

## IMPACT: NO DEMOCRACY

**Capitalism means that the needs of private enterprise will be positioned above the people—making democracy increasingly impossible.**

Kovel 02 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, p. 74-76)

Global capitalism exists along a continuum extending from the good grey Alan Greenspan and his Federal Reserve Bank to the most vicious Russian mobster and Colombian drug lord. All are mandated by the great force field and under its spell.

In a recent stunning article, the French commentator Christian de Brie describes 'a coherent system closely linked to the expansion of modern capitalism and based on an association of three partners: governments, transnational corporations and mafias ... [in which] financial crime is first and foremost a market, thriving and structured, ruled by supply and demand'. Each partner needs the other, even if the need must be vigorously denied. In short, an honest look at the system takes us light years from the glowing promises of neoliberalism. Contrary to the official imagery, the actual corporate culture breeds a swarm of pathogens: restrictive practices, cartels, abuse of dominant position, dumping, forced sales, insider dealing and speculation, takeovers and dismembering of competitors, fraudulent balance sheets, rigging of accounts and transfer prices, the use of offshore subsidiaries and shell companies to avoid and evade tax, embezzlement of public funds, bogus contracts, corruption and backhanders, unjust enrichment and abuse of corporate assets, surveillance and spying, blackmail and betrayal, disregard for regulations on employment rights and trade union freedoms, health and safety, social security, pollution and the environment. Not to mention what goes on in the world's growing number of free zones, including those in Europe and in France, where the ordinary rule of law does not apply, especially in social, tax and financial matters. An incredible plunder, the full extent of which will never be known' arises, conditioned on one side by state connivance, and on the other by seepage into the underworld. Throughout the planet, but especially in the South, 'workers have to contend with thugs hired by the bosses, blackleg trade unions, strike-breakers, private police and death squads'. There is a hidden synergy, in sum, between the shady practices of corporate capital and the organized criminality of gangsterdom: banks and big business are keen to get their hands on the proceeds —laundered — of organised crime. Apart from the traditional activities of drugs, racketeering, kidnappings, gambling, procuring (women and children), smuggling (alcohol, tobacco, medicines), armed robbery, counterfeiting and bogus invoicing, tax evasion and misappropriation of public funds, new markets are also flourishing. These include smuggling illegal labour and refugees, computer piracy, trafficking in works of art and antiquities, in stolen cars and parts, in protected species and human organs, forgery trafficking in arms toxic waste and nuclear products, etc.

Occasionally a sign of this appears in some scandal over campaign contributions, in the washing ashore of illegal immigrants from China, or of a submarine purchased by the Russian mafia from disaffected naval officers. There will never be a complete reckoning of the iceberg beneath this tip, although its magnitude can be estimated as an annual 'gross

criminal product' of one trillion dollars.<sup>30</sup> Setting aside the moral implications, the presence of this vast shadowland signifies capitalism's fundamental uncontrollability, and therefore its inability to overcome its crises of ecology and democracy. From this standpoint, the ecological crisis is the effect of globalization viewed from the standpoint of ecosystems, as great waves of capital batter against and erode ecological defences. Similarly, democracy, and not government, is the great victim of globalization. As global capital works its way, the popular will is increasingly disregarded in the effort to squeeze ever more capital out of the system. In the process, the instruments of global capital begin to take on political functions, breaking down local jurisdictions and constituting themselves as a kind of world governing body. But the regime lacks what normal states, even despotic ones, require, namely, some means of legitimization. In the post-aristocratic, post-theocratic world of modernity, democratic advances, even the pseudo-democracy that passes for normal these days, are the necessary glue that holds societies together. Capital's inability to furnish this as it moves toward its realization in the global society has made its operation increasingly look like a global coup d'état. This is the great political contradiction of our time, and drives the present surge of resistance.

## IMPACT: NO DEMOCRACY

**Capitalism makes real democracy impossible. Economic elites are given greater freedom to exploit the rest of the population.**

**Crawford, 04** (Gordon – The European Union and Democracy Promotion in Africa: The Case of Ghana)  
February 04 <<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/polis/research/pdf/wp10crawford.pdf>>

The third explanation again questions the motives and intent of EU democracy promotion, but points to the perceived interrelationship between economic and political liberalization. This argument suggests that multilateral and bilateral development agencies, as the arms of Western governments extending into developing countries, are less interested in democracy and good governance in Africa as an end in itself, but more as a means to ongoing economic liberalization and the continued dominance of neoliberalism (Abrahamsen 2001, Barya 1993). It is claimed that Western governments are promoting a limited form of democracy that is not only compatible with economic liberalization, but constitutes the political dimension of the neo-liberal development model. The continued hegemony of neo-liberalism in its hold over development policy is generally acknowledged, including within such initiatives as NEPAD (Owusu 2003). Over the past two decades most attention has been placed on the economic aspects of neo-liberalism, notably structural adjustment programmes. But critics remind us that neoliberalism is both an economic and political theory. Ronaldo Munck (1994: 35, in Sklair), notes that, “The neo-liberal conception of freedom virtually equates political democracy and the ‘free’ market”, while Adrian Leftwich (1994: 368) comments that “neo-liberalism is not only an economic theory but a political one as well”. The accuracy of such statements is confirmed by looking at the work of Milton Friedmann, the guru of contemporary neo-liberalism, who wrote in *Capitalism and Freedom* that: “Historical evidence speaks with a single voice on the relation between political freedom and a free market. I know of no example in time or place of a society that has been marked by a large measure of political freedom and that has not also used something comparable to a free market to organize the bulk of economic activity” (Friedmann 1962: 9). Similarly, in declaring the ‘end of history’, Francis Fukuyama (1992: 125) stated that “there is an unquestionable relationship between economic development and liberal democracy, which one can observe simply by looking around the world”. Thus the development model advocated by such (neo ) liberal theorists and, it is claimed, by Western governments emphasizes “democratic politics and a slim, efficient and accountable public bureaucracy [as] not simply desirable but *necessary* for a thriving free market economy, and vice versa” (Leftwich 1994: 368-69). Thus, this form of democracy is less interested in strengthening popular control over public decision-making and removing an elite monopoly (Beetham et al. 2002: 13), but is more oriented to challenging the power of the state, with democratic politics perceived as a means to: a) limit state power and its sphere of decision-making, including its ability to intervene in the economy and regulate capital; and b) bring residual state power under formal democratic control, through elections for instance, as a safeguard against any tendencies towards the arbitrary exercise of that power. The democratic state is conceived as having a very limited role, in which the economic sphere, comprising the market, private property and macroeconomic policy, is “insulated from control by the *demos*” (Pierson 1993: 179).<sup>23</sup> It is a conception of liberal democracy where the tension and struggle between its liberal and democratic components, to limit or extend the spheres of democratic control (Beetham 1993: 56-8), has been emphatically won by the former.

## IMPACT: NO DEMOCRACY

**Capitalism enables elites to dominate politics—it does not foster real democracy.**

**Reich, 07** (Robert B., former Harvard University professor, “How capitalism is killing democracy,” *Foreign Policy*, September-October, accessed online using General OneFile, 07-17-08)

It was supposed to be a match made in heaven. Capitalism and democracy, we've long been told, are the twin ideological pillars capable of bringing unprecedented prosperity and freedom to the world. In recent decades, the duo has shared a common ascent. By almost any measure, global capitalism is triumphant. Most nations around the world are today part of a single, integrated, and turbocharged global market. Democracy has enjoyed a similar renaissance. Three decades ago, a third of the world's nations held free elections; today, nearly two thirds do. Conventional wisdom holds that where either capitalism or democracy flourishes, the other must soon follow. Yet today, their fortunes are beginning to diverge.

Capitalism, long sold as the yin to democracy's yang, is thriving, while democracy is struggling to keep up. China, poised to become the world's third largest capitalist nation this year after the United States and Japan, has embraced market freedom, but not political freedom. Many economically successful nations—from Russia to Mexico—are democracies in name only. They are encumbered by the same problems that have hobbled American democracy in recent years, allowing corporations and elites buoyed by runaway economic success to undermine the government's capacity to respond to citizens' concerns.

Of course, democracy means much more than the process of free and fair elections. It is a system for accomplishing what can only be achieved by citizens joining together to further the common good. But though free markets have brought unprecedented prosperity to many, they have been accompanied by widening inequalities of income and wealth, heightened job insecurity, and environmental hazards such as global warming.

**Capitalism encourages rule by economic elites, not democracy.**

**Reich, 07** (Robert B., former Harvard University professor, “How capitalism is killing democracy,” *Foreign Policy*, September-October, accessed online using General OneFile, 07-17-08)

Why has capitalism succeeded while democracy has steadily weakened? Democracy has become enfeebled largely because companies, in intensifying competition for global consumers and investors, have invested ever greater sums in lobbying, public relations, and even bribes and kickbacks, seeking laws that give them a competitive advantage over their rivals. The result is an arms race for political influence that is drowning out the voices of average citizens.

In the United States, for example, the fights that preoccupy Congress, those that consume weeks or months of congressional staff time, are typically contests between competing companies or industries. While corporations are increasingly writing their own rules, they are also being entrusted with a kind of social responsibility or morality. Politicians praise companies for acting “responsibly” or condemn them for not doing so. Yet the purpose of capitalism is to get great deals for consumers and investors. Corporate executives are not authorized by anyone—least of all by their investors—to balance profits against the public good. Nor do they have any expertise in making such moral calculations. Democracy is supposed to represent the public in drawing such lines. And the message that companies are moral beings with social responsibilities diverts public attention from the task of establishing such laws and rules in the first place. It is much the same with what passes for corporate charity.

Under today's intensely competitive form of global capitalism, companies donate money to good causes only to the extent the donation has public-relations value, thereby boosting the bottom line. But shareholders do not invest in firms expecting the money to be used for charitable purposes. They invest to earn high returns. Shareholders who wish to be charitable would, presumably, make donations to charities of their own choosing in amounts they decide for themselves. The larger danger is that these conspicuous displays of

corporate beneficence hoodwink the public into believing corporations have charitable impulses that can be relied on in a pinch. By pretending that the economic success corporations enjoy saddles them with particular social duties only serves to distract the public from democracy's responsibility to set the rules of the game and thereby protect the common good.

The only way for the citizens in us to trump the consumers in us is through laws and rules that make our purchases and investments social choices as well as personal ones. A change in labor laws making it easier for employees to organize and negotiate better terms, for example, might increase the price of products and services. My inner consumer won't like that very much, but the citizen in me might think it a fair price to pay. A small transfer tax on sales of stock, to slow the movement of capital ever so slightly, might give communities a bit more time to adapt to changing circumstances. The return on my retirement fund might go down by a small fraction, but the citizen in me thinks it worth the price. Extended unemployment insurance combined with wage insurance and job training could ease the pain for workers caught in the downdrafts of globalization. Let us be clear: The purpose of democracy is to accomplish ends we cannot achieve as individuals. But democracy cannot fulfill this role when companies use politics to advance or maintain their competitive standing, or when they appear to take on social responsibilities that they have no real capacity or authority to fulfill. That leaves societies unable to address the tradeoffs between economic growth and social problems such as job insecurity, widening inequality, and climate change. As a result, consumer and investor interests almost invariably trump common concerns.

## IMPACT: SLAVERY

**Corporate dominated governments will allow elites to create a neo-feudal system of exploitation.**  
**Moore, 96** (Richard K., political scientist, "The Fateful Dance of Capitalism & Democracy," September-October, *New Dawn*, <http://quaylargo.com/rkm/ND/sep96FatefulDance.shtml>, Accessed 07-14-08)

The fact is that the modern nation state is the most effective democratic institution mankind has been able to come up with since outgrowing the small-scale city-state. With all its defects and corruptions, this gift from the Enlightenment -the national republic -is the only effective channel the people have to power-sharing with the elites. If the strong nation-state withers away, we will not be assured -enter an era of freedom and prosperity, with the "shackles of wasteful governments off our backs". No indeed. If you want to see the future -in which weak nations must deal as-best-they-can with mega-corporations -then look at the Third World. The last thing you see in Third-World countries is freedom and prosperity. What you in fact see are governments which increasingly specialize in two functions: suppressing the population, on the one hand, while on the other hand they negotiate with the international financial community and corporate investors. When all nations have been whittled down and made weak, then the world will have become essentially a patchwork of plantation-states. We'll have a neo-feudal system where the corporate elite act as a kind of global royalty, extracting tribute from all the little competing nation-fiefdoms. There is a brief window of opportunity -while modern democracies continue to survive -in which the people can wake up and peacefully seize control of their governments. After those governments have been devolved/downsized, it will be too late. And with modern weaponry under the command of the elite, there will be no possibility of the people arising anew in revolution. If the people in any of the little fiefdoms try it, they'll be dealt with as Iraq has been in the Gulf War and its aftermath. It won't be nice to mess with Earth Inc! Preservation of strong national sovereignty in the modern democracies is the rock-bottom foundation needed by the people -without it democracy will without doubt disappear from the world.

## IMPACT: FAILED STATES

**Imperialistic capitalism enables elite domination at the expense of political stability—making failed states inevitable.**

**Bond 03** (Patrick, author of Against Global Apartheid, Unsustainable South Africa, and Fanon's Warning and teaches at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, "Cultivating African Anti-Capitalism" Z Magazine Online February, Volume 16 Number 2, <<http://zmagsite.zmag.org/Feb2003/bondprint0203.html>>)

As predicted, especially by Frantz Fanon, terrible disappointments accompanied virtually all the transitions from colonialism to neocolonialism in Africa. This is crucial to point out at a time when blame-the-victim analysis of what the Economist magazine has termed “the hopeless continent” is rampant. Africa’s worst socio-economic problems are better considered as deep-rooted manifestations of a peripheral capitalism manipulated at will by imperialist powers, accompanied by the rise of complicit local ruling elites. Three sets of closely-related problems can be identified, associated with what Fanon described as “false decolonization.” First, colonialism’s artificial borders, racism and ideological control, ethnic divide-and-rule strategies, land acquisition, labor control, suppression of competition from indigenous sources, military conflict (independence struggles), and replacement by African nationalism together guaranteed a future of distorted economics and failed states. Second, for women, pre-colonial patrilineal systems evolved into colonial forms of inequality (e.g., minority status and legal guardianship), which often persisted and evolved as post-colonial forms of structured oppression (e.g., market-related brideprice). Third, political continuities from past to present include unreformed state structures, international political and cultural relations with colonial powers, and especially class alliances involving compradorism (local sell-outs working in league with international oppressors).

## IMPACT: FAMINE, WAR

**Capitalism is the root cause of war, famine and ecological collapse.**

**McGarr, 2000** (Paul, socialist historian, political activist, and author, "Why Green is Red: Marxism and the Threat to the Environment," International Socialism Journal, Autumn 2000, <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj88/mcgarr.htm>)

Unlike previous societies capitalism is not simply based on preserving the old ways of producing. It is based on preserving the essential class relationship of exploitation at the heart of production. But the competitive drive for profit at the heart of the system means there is a built in pressure to constantly innovate and expand production. This explains why capitalism is the most dynamic and revolutionary form of society in human history up until now. It has produced the most immense strides forward in production, knowledge, communication and much more. For the first time in human history there is no reason other than the class organisation of society, why all the world's people cannot enjoy the fruits of their progress, and live healthy and fulfilled lives. Marx and Engels wrote 150 years ago, 'The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce 100 years has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together...what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?'<sup>226</sup> A century and a half later such progress has been amplified a thousandfold. And yet, the very organisation of society produces alongside such immense progress almost unimaginable horror--economic and social crisis, famine, war and the threat of barbarism on a scale which no 'earlier century' could have had 'even a presentiment of'. The 20th century saw giant leaps forward in human understanding and ability to create a decent world, but also two world wars, the Holocaust and Hiroshima and, today, famine amid plenty and the threat of global climate disaster. Marx and Engels captured the picture in a famous metaphor: 'Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world who he has called up by his spells'.<sup>227</sup> They argued that the repeated crises capitalism produced as a result had a peculiar feature, one that will ring true for many in the world today: In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but of the previously created productive forces are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity--the epidemic of overproduction. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism... And why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce.<sup>228</sup> Such crises are built into the logic of a system based on the relentless competitive drive for profit. They are the particular form in capitalist society in which the relations of production, the exploitation of the labour of the majority by a ruling class competing among themselves to accumulate and to profit, become a block on the very production it has developed and is based on. Instead of using the development of knowledge to produce in such a way as to satisfy the needs of society and ensure its further development we get repeated crises, and the attendant horror of war, famine and the rest. Part of this horror is, as in previous societies, that this organisation of production also threatens the material basis of all production, the environment. Yet, as Engels pointed out, this environmental threat happens in ways particular to capitalism too.

## IMPACT: STARVATION

**Famine is the result of capitalist agriculture—the elite can buy exotic foods year round while poor farmers starve.**

**Meszaros 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, 1995, Beyond Capital, p. 175-176. Section—Second)

In the same way, on another plane, the advancement of the powers of agricultural production did not bring with it the eradication of famine and malnutrition. For doing so would, again, contradict the imperative of 'rational' capital expansion. 'Sentimental' considerations concerning the health — and even the mere survival — of human beings cannot possibly be allowed to disturb or disrupt the 'market-oriented' system's 'hard-headed decision making processes'. The spontaneous rhythm and recalcitrance of nature are no longer credible excuses for justifying the living conditions of countless millions who had to perish in misery in the last few decades, and so continue to perish today. The priorities that must be pursued, in the interest of capital-expansion and accumulation are fatefully biased against those who are condemned to famine and malnutrition, mostly in the 'Third World' countries. But it is by no means simply the case that the rest of the world population has nothing to fear in this regard in the future. The productive and distributive practices of the capital system in the field of agriculture — from the irresponsible but highly profitable use of chemicals which accumulate as poisonous residues in the soil to the destruction of water tables, and to large scale interference with global weather cycles in vital regions of the planet, by exploiting and destroying the resources of rain forests, etc. — do not promise much good to come for anybody. Thanks to science and technology in their alienated subservience to profitable global marketing strategies, in our times exotic fruits are made available all year round for those, that is, who can afford to buy them, and not for those who produce them under the rule of a handful of transnational corporations. But all this happens against the background of the highly irresponsible productive practices we all watch powerless. The costs involved are nothing short of endangering — in the interest of short-sighted profit maximization only — tomorrow's potato harvests and rice crops for all. Besides, already today the 'advanced productive practices' pursued endanger even the meagre staple food of those who are compelled to labour for 'exportable cash crops', and have to go hungry for the sake of maintaining the health of a crippling 'globalized' economy.

## IMPACT: RACISM

**Material inequalities between races demonstrate that the root cause of racism is capitalism.**

**Young 06** (Chair @ NYU; Robert, "Putting Materialism Back into the Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race", redcritique.org )

In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression.

**Racism cannot be addressed without uprooting capitalism first. Any other approach just masks the material inequalities produced by the economic base.**

**Young 06** (Chair @ NYU; Robert, "Putting Materialism Back into the Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race", redcritique.org )

In this regard, postmodernists collude with the humanists in legitimating the sanctity of the local. Both participate in narrowing cultural intelligibility to questions of (racial) discourse or the (black) subject and, in doing so, they provide ideological immunity for capitalism. It is now very difficult to even raise the issue of class, particularly if you raise the issue outside of the logic of supplementarity—today's ruling intellectual logic which provides a theoretical analog to contemporary neo-liberal political structures. In one of the few recent texts to explore the centrality of class, bell hooks' *Where We Stand*, we are, once again, still left with a reaffirmation of capitalism. For instance, hooks argues for changes within capitalism: "I identify with democratic socialism, with a vision of participatory economics within capitalism that aims to challenge and change class hierarchy" (156). Capitalism produces class hierarchy and, therefore, as long as capitalism remains, class hierarchy and antagonism will remain. Hence, the solution requires a transformation of class society. However, hooks mystifies capitalism as a transhistorical system and thus she can assert that the "poor may be with us always" (129). Under this view, politics becomes a matter of "bearing witness" to the crimes of capitalism, but rather than struggle for its replacement, hooks call for strategies of "self-actualization" and redistributing resources to the poor. She calls for the very same thing—collectivity—that capitalism cannot provide because social resources are privatized under capitalism. Consequently, Hooks' program for "self-esteem" is an attempt to put a human face on capitalism. Whether one considers the recent work by African-American humanists, or discourse theorists, or even left-liberal intellectuals, these various groups—despite their intellectual differences—form a ruling coalition and one thing is clear: capitalism set the limit for political change, as there is no alternative to the rule of capital. In contrast to much of contemporary race theory, a transformative theory of race highlights the political economy of race in the interests of an emancipatory political project.

Wahneema Lubiano once wrote that "the idea of race and the operation of racism are the best friends that the economic and political elite have in the United States" (vii). Race mystifies the structure of exploitation and masks the severe inequalities within global capitalism. I am afraid that, at this point, many contemporary race theorists, in their systematic erasure of materialism, have become close (ideological) allies with the economic and political elites, who deny even the existence of classes. A transformative race theory pulls back into focus the struggle against exploitation and sets a new social priority "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Marx 31).

## IMPACT: POVERTY

**Abandoning capitalism is the only way that poorer peoples can survive.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability", pg.5)

The Third World problem has many causes but it is primarily due to the way the global economy distributes wealth, the overconsumption of the rich countries and the disastrously mistaken conception of development that has been pursued. Development has been defined essentially as an increase in business turnover, i.e., as indiscriminate economic growth. This inevitably results in the allocation of the lion's share to the rich few, inappropriate development, the neglect of the urgent needs of the poor majority, and in the application of most Third World productive capacity to the interests of the rich. There cannot be satisfactory, appropriate development in the Third World unless the rich countries move down to much lower per capita resource use, allow drastic redistribution of world wealth, and enable most Third World land, labour and capital to produce what Third World people need. In other words, 'The rich must live more simply so that the poor may simply live.'

**Capitalism is structurally incapable of addressing poverty—the argument that free markets help the poor is a self-serving myth.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. xiii)

The attempt at divorcing effects from their causes goes hand in hand with the equally fallacious practice of claiming the status of a rule for the exception. This is how it can be pretended that the misery and chronic underdevelopment that necessarily arise from the neo-colonial domination and exploitation of the overwhelming majority of humankind by a mere handful of capitalistically developed countries—hardly more than the G7—do not matter at all. For, as the self-serving legend goes, thanks to the (never realized) ‘modernization’ of the rest of the world, the population of every country will one fine day enjoy the great benefits of the ‘free enterprise system.’ The fact that the rapacious exploitation of the human and material resources of our planet for the benefit of a few capitalist countries happens to be a non-generalizable condition is wantonly disregarded. Instead, the universal viability of emulating the development of the ‘advanced capitalist’ countries is predicated, ignoring that neither the advantages of the imperialist past, or the immense profits derived on a continuing basis from keeping the ‘Third World’ in a structural dependency can be ‘universally diffused,’ so as to produce the anticipated happy results through ‘modernization’ and ‘free-marketization.’ Not to mention the fact that even if the history of imperialism could be re-written if a sense diametrically opposed to the way it actually unfolded, coupled with the fictitious reversal of the existing power relations of domination and dependency in favour of the underdeveloped countries, the general adoption of the rapacious utilization of our plant’s limited resources—enormously damaging already, although at present practiced only by the privileged tiny minority—would make the whole system instantly collapse.

**Arguing that growth helps the poor ignores that it helps rich countries MUCH more.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 77)

In opposition to the defenders of unlimited economic growth, I would argue that it is they who are the real elitists. They argue in favor of economic growth as the only policy to improve absolutely but not relatively (which would hurt the rich's comparative standing), the gains of the poor. This is predicated upon the omission or even suppression of the alternative policy of redistribution. An alternative policy, of course, would harm the elite members (probably in both absolute and relative senses). Furthermore, the social policy of solving the problem of poverty through economic growth actually helps the rich increase their advantages as indicated by distribution data in both advanced and developing industrial countries.

## IMPACT: WARMING

**Capitalism is the root cause of global warming. The effects of warming will be devastating poverty and further oppression of women.**

**Angus, 07** (Ian, Professor of Humanities at Simon Fraser University, “Savage Capitalism—the Ecosocialist Alternative (Summary),” Climate and Capitalism, August 27, <http://climateandcapitalism.com/?p=175>)

Global warming is already underway. The real issue is whether and how we can manage and minimize its impact. If capitalism continues, the impact of global warming will be similar to the impact of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, where the poor were the main victims and the rich used the catastrophe to improve their own situation. Capitalism always rations resources in short supply towards the rich. Its weapons are military repression and the market – both are brutal killers. Environmental crisis will make security, health, food, water and adequate housing in extremely short supply – and the poor will go the wall unless they fight back. That's why we shall see increasingly that class struggles in the third world and beyond will take the form of struggles to get and to defend basic resources like food, food and housing. Privatisation will be deepened to make all resources difficult to obtain by the poor – and always available to the rich. For the rich, everything is cheap.” “... it will be particularly women and children who pay the price. Children because they are more vulnerable to disease, and less able to defend themselves from violence; and women because they have the main responsibility for childcare and child raising in nearly all poor societies – urban and rural, third world and first world. In the third world, it will be overwhelmingly women who have to try to find water, firewood and food for families. Climate catastrophe is not only a class question, it is also a gender question.” “A world of environmental catastrophe opens up the danger of massively increased militarism, repression and war. Ecological collapse may be survived by the rich minority, but it will devastate the poor. The fight against it is a vital part of the class struggle for socialism.”

## IMPACT: UNDERMINES MORALITY

**Their morality impacts make no sense in a capitalist world—moral questions will inevitably be subordinated to capitalism.**

**Trainer, 96** (Ted, University of New South Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, Jon Carpenter Oxford Publishing, pages 79-80)

The need for a moral economy Clearly, a major problem with our economic theory and practice is that they leave little place for morality. Many extremely important decisions affecting people's welfare are made without reference to what would be morally acceptable. They are made solely on the basis of what will make most money. It has been argued above that there are many other, usually much more important factors, such as what things humans need, what developments would build better communities and political systems, what would preserve cultural uniqueness, and especially what would maximise ecological sustainability. Decisions which maximise returns to owners of capital often have adverse effects in several or all of these areas, yet in our economy this factor is allowed to determine what is done. No other economic system humans have ever developed has functioned in this way. All previous economies ensured that 'moral' factors, such as social customs setting a 'just price', were the main determinants of economic activity. Market forces and the profit motive were typically given little or no role. Our present economic system and the theory which underlies it obscure the great misery they cause. They deceive us into accepting grossly inhuman consequences. Several sections of this book explain how our economic system is the main factor producing the hunger and deprivation suffered by hundreds of millions of people. Yet this causal connection is not well understood, because we have been led to believe that the market system is natural, efficient and desirable, and that it 'rewards factors of production in proportion to their contributions'. This prevailing ideology leads most people to believe that we are not exploiting the Third World and we are not causing hunger; we are only trading with them, investing and doing normal business. As Bookchin says, '... our present economy is grossly immoral... The economists have literally "demoralised" us and turned us into moral cretins'. Similarly, economic theory claims that when an item becomes scarce its price rises automatically, as if this is a law of nature independent of human will. In fact, the price rises only because individual sellers eager to maximise their income put it up as quickly as they can. Our economic theory obscures the fact that it is not scarcity but human greed which makes prices rise. Above all, economic theory leads us to think that the supremely important goal is to 'get the economy going', to stimulate growth. The fact that this siphons wealth to the rich, deprives the poor, develops the wrong industries and in the Third World starve millions is obscured.

## IMPACT: RACISM, SEXISM

**Capitalism is co-productive with other forms of oppression; sexism and racism can only be addressed within an alternative economy.**

**Dyer-Witheford, 99** (Nick, Professor — University of Western Ontario, *Cyber-Marx* p. 9-12)

The major source of practical, brutally effective reductionism and totalization at work on the planet today is not Marxism, but the world market, now enabled by computer networks, satellite broadcasts, just-in-time production, and high-tech weaponry. This is a system based on the imposition of universal commodification, including, centrally, the buying and selling of human life-time. Its tendency is to subordinate all activity to the law of value – the socially imposed law of exchange. It relates a monological master-narrative in which only money talks. Such a system operates by process of massive reduction – Marx called it “abstraction” – that perceives and processes the world solely as an array of economic factors. Under this classificatory grid – this “classing” of the world – human subjects figure only as so much labor power and consumption capacity, and their natural surroundings as so much raw material. This reductionism – the reductionism of capital – has today a totalizing grip on the planet. Other dominations, too, are reductive – sexism reduces women to objects for men, racism negates the humanity of people of color. But neither patriarchy nor racism has succeeded in knitting the planet together into an integrated, coordinated system of interdependencies. This is what capital is doing today, as, with the aid of new technologies, it globally maps the availability of female labor, ethno-markets, migrancy flows, human gene pools, and entire animal, plant, and insect species onto its coordinates of value. In doing so, it is subsuming every other form of oppression to its logic.

**Capitalism is inimical to race and gender equality—oppression will continue anywhere that it is deemed profitable.**

**Dyer-Witheford, 99** (Nick, Professor — University of Western Ontario, *Cyber-Marx* p. 9-12)

Patriarchal and racist logics are older than capital, mobilize fears and hatreds beyond its utilitarian economic understanding, and are virulently active today. But they are now compelled to manifest themselves within and mediated through capital’s larger, overarching structure of domination: as market-racism, commodity-sexism. Class-capital’s classification of its human resources – does tend to assert itself as definitive of social power. It is “privileged” in all senses of the word! not because of any essential, ontological priority of economics over gender, ethnic, or ecological relations, but because of society’s subordination to a system that compels key issues of sexuality, race, and nature to revolve around a hub of profit. Looked at in this way, the conventional division between “old” class politics and “new” social movements seems profoundly mistaken. Capital is a system inimical not only to movements for higher wages, more free times, or better working conditions – classic labor movement objectives – but also to movements for equality-in-difference, peace, and the preservation of nature. This is not because it creates racism, sexism, militarism, or ecological despoliation, phenomena whose existence handsomely predates its appearance, but rather because it treats them only as opportunities for or impediments to accumulation. Because capital’s a priori is profit (its own expanded replication), its logic in regard to the emancipation of women, racial justice, or the preservation of the environment is purely instrumental. The prevention of male violence toward women, the saving of rain forests, or the eradication of racism is a matter of bottom line calculus: tolerated or even benignly supported when costless, enthusiastically supported when profitable, but ruthlessly opposed as soon as they demand any substantial diversion of social surplus. Hence capitalism is antithetical to any movements for whom these goals are affirmed as fundamental, indispensable values. In this respect, the 1980s and 1990s have been perversely illuminating. Any belief that the advent of the new social movements marked a transition from the “old” struggle over social surplus must crumble away in the face of neoliberalism’s doctrinaire reaffirmation of the market, attack on the welfare state, and unconstrained expansions of commodity exchange. Over this period virtually every objective of social movements – wilderness preservation, equal pay for women, funding for day-care, battered-women’s shelters, or AIDS education – has had to be fought for, often lost, in the teeth of governmental and corporate insistence on the primacy of austerity, restraint, cutbacks required by global competition, and the reestablishment of wavering profit rates. Insofar as there have been victories, cracks in the reductive logic of capital, it is usually only because movements have been prepared to challenge the overriding priorities of corporate growth in the name of other, differing visions of societal good.

## IMPACT: SEXISM

### **Capitalism views women as property so it encourages sexist violence.**

**Goodman, 05** (Donna, co-chair of the Mid-Hudson National People's Campaign, "Sexism's logical outcome:

capitalism breeds violence against women," *Socialism and Liberation*, July,  
<http://socialismandliberation.org/mag/index.php?aid=408>, Accessed 07-16-08)

Despite the many advances made by women over decades of struggle, violence against women remains pervasive worldwide. This violence cuts across culture, class, education, income, ethnicity and age. It may take the form of domestic abuse or murder. It may take the form of female infanticide, genital mutilation, dowry burning, sexual assault, kidnapping, murder, forced suicide of widows, honor killing, or rape within marriage. It takes place in the United States as well as in exploited countries like India or Mexico. But in every case, violence against women is a vestige of women's historic status as property—a product of the division of society into exploited and exploiting classes. It is a symptom of their continued subordinate status in class society. Global capitalism, far from solving the historic inequality of women, has incorporated violence against women into its business practices and its imperialist military strategies.

Worldwide, one out of three women has been beaten, forced into sex or abused in her lifetime. Up to 70 percent of female murder victims are killed by their male partners. In the most oppressed countries, structural adjustment programs are forcing governments to privatize resources and eliminate social services. This has lead to increased inequality and an accompanying upsurge of violence against women. For example, in the transnational sweatshops doing business under free trade agreements like NAFTA, young women working for slave wages are routinely abused at work. In a dramatic case, more than 300 girls and women have been killed since 1993 in Juarez, Mexico. Most were workers in the

"maquiladora" factories in the free trade zone on the U.S.-Mexico border. The formerly socialist countries in Eastern Europe have seen capitalism destroy their economic safety nets and shatter their many gains in gender equality. Sexist violence has been a dramatic result. War causes massive suffering to women. Civilian casualties of today's wars far outnumber those of armed combatants, and 80 percent of those are women and children. Women and girls are routinely the target of sexual violence, especially rape.

### **The subordination of women is rooted in class inequality.**

**Goodman, 05** (Donna, co-chair of the Mid-Hudson National People's Campaign, "Sexism's logical outcome:

capitalism breeds violence against women," *Socialism and Liberation*, July,  
<http://socialismandliberation.org/mag/index.php?aid=408>, Accessed 07-16-08)

But in a world economy dominated by capitalism—production for private profit—special oppression against women has an economic basis. Having whole groups of people subject to terror and insecurity in their personal lives erodes the possibilities for organizing for better living conditions—and, consequently, lower rates of profit. So every legal gain made by women under capitalism is under constant attack. For every success, there is a setback. For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development now requires detailed information on battered women to be collected from domestic violence shelters that receive HUD funding. This information is computerized and available to other government agencies. Over 40,000 women each year use shelters financed by HUD. The Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2005, now in the Senate, will spend \$1.6 billion to "promote marriage" and force poor women to accept low-wage, dead-end jobs, leaving their children in inadequate childcare. The government is already spending over \$100 million on marriage promotion, taking funds from other social programs. These "marriage promotion" laws do nothing to provide the foundation for providing families with adequate wages, health care or childcare. Rather, they provide incentives for women to enter into relationships that may be abusive or unstable. Anti-imperialism and the struggle against sexism The sheer magnitude of the problem of violence against women around the world, including in the most advanced capitalist countries, shows that it is not a random or an individual crime. It is a tool of oppression that keeps women subordinate. Ideologically, sexist violence in the United States—the most advanced capitalist state in the world—is a symbol of the glorification of war, violence and the male "hero" that pervades U.S. culture. Imperialist expansion and war have intensified the exploitation and suffering of women here and in other countries. The women's movement has won important reforms in the political, economic and social spheres. Every victory was won because women and their allies took to the streets and lit a fire under legislatures, courts and police. The causes of women's oppression are rooted in class society. The ongoing struggle for women's equality and freedom from violence is an international one, integral to the struggle against imperialism and war. The renewal of activism in response to the Iraq war and capitalist globalization presents an excellent opportunity to unite in fighting women's oppression, capitalist exploitation and militarism.

## IMPACT: COLONIALISM

**Capitalism is inherently violent and imperialistic. Their refusal to question to system drives the wars they are trying to prevent.**

**Callicinos, 03** (Alex, BA and DPhil from the University of Oxford, and was Professor of Politics at the University of York before being appointed Professor of European Studies at King's College London, "An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto", p.51-53)

The view, put forward by Third Way ideologues such as Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck, that globalization was transforming the liberal democratic state into 'the state without enemies' now seems simply ludicrous in the light of George W. Bush's proclamation of a global state of war on 20 September 2001: 'Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other that we have ever seen ... Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.v" One of globalization's more vulgar boosters, the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman, proved much more realistic than Beck and Giddens when he declared in a much-quoted passage: The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. Marxist ring about it; moreover, it implies that American military might serves to maintain capitalist property relations irrespective of where they are located, or of the nationality of the capitalists who benefit from them. Such at any rate is the view expressed by Michael Hardt and Toni Negri in one of the influential texts of the anti-capitalist movement, Empire. For Hardt and Negri, imperialism has been supplanted by Empire, a novel form of capitalist domination that 'establishes no territorial centre of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries and barriers ... In this smooth space of Empire, there is no place of power - it is everywhere and nowhere.v" Consequently, according to Negri, it is no longer possible to talk about 'American imperialism'. Quite simply there exist groups, elites that control the keys of exploitation and thus the keys to the war machine, and who attempt to impose themselves at the world level. Naturally, this process is highly contradictory and will necessarily be so for a long time to come. For the moment, it is above all the North American bosses who exercise this domination. Immediately behind them, there are the Europeans, the Russians, the Chinese: they are there to support them, or to undermine them, or even to be ready to take over a change of leadership - but this change remains superficial since at the basis what is still and always at work is capital, collective capital. 66 Though formulated in Marxist language, Hardt's and Negri's analysis bears a striking resemblance to more mainstream theories of political globalization. According to such theories, the post-Cold War era has seen the emergence of forms of 'global governance' that transcend national interests, even those of the strongest state." Contemporary perceptions of US power indeed seem to oscillate between the frustration and fear expressed at evidence of American 'unilateralism', especially since the younger Bush entered the White House, and the belief that this power is progressively becoming the agent of an imperial structure, whether that structure be conceptualized as the emerging forms of 'cosmopolitan democracy' or as the global domination of 'collective capital'. The great difficulty for the theorists of global governance is that the world distribution of political and military power both is highly unequal and closely corresponds to the also grossly unequal distribution of economic power. Indeed, neo-liberal ideologues are increasingly willing openly to acknowledge the necessity of a unilateral assertion of Western power vis-a-vis the rest of the world, in other words, of imperialism.

**Capitalism drives militaristic imperialism.**

**Foster '05** (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, September, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>).

Even as a massive antiglobalization movement was emerging, notably with the protests in Seattle in November 1999, the U.S. establishment was moving energetically toward an imperialism for the twenty-first century; one that would promote neoliberal globalization, while resting on U.S. world dominance. "The hidden hand of the market," Thomas Friedman, the Pulitzer-prize-winning foreign policy columnist for the *New York Times*, opined, "will never work without a hidden fist—McDonald's cannot flourish without a McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps" (*New York Times Magazine*, March 28, 1999). The "hidden fist," however, was only partly hidden, and was to become even less so in the ensuing years. To be sure, the shift toward a more openly militaristic imperialism occurred only gradually, in stages. For most of the 1990s the U.S. ruling class and national security establishment had waged a debate behind the scenes on what to do now that the Soviet Union's disappearance had left the United States as the sole superpower. Naturally, there was never any doubt about what was to be the main economic thrust of the global empire ruled over by the United States. The 1990s saw the strengthening of neoliberal globalization: the removal of barriers to capital throughout the world in ways that directly enhanced the power of the rich capitalist countries of the center of the world economy vis-à-vis the poor countries of the periphery. A key development was the introduction of the World Trade Organization to accompany the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as organizations enforcing the monopoly capitalist rules of the game. From the standpoint of most of the world, a more exploitative economic imperialism had raised its ugly head.

## IMPACT: COLONIALISM = EXTINCTION

**The logic of colonialist sacrifice makes extinction inevitable.**

**Santos, 03** Professor of Sociology at the School of Economics, University of Coimbra (Portugal), Distinguished Legal Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School, Director of the Center for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra, [Boaventura de Sousa, “Collective Suicide?” *Bad Subjects*, Issue 63, April, <http://www.ces.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php>]

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the suppression of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

## ALT SOLVES: INDIVIDUALS MATTER

**Individual transformations matter—capitalism depends upon personal acquiesce and so radical social change is possible with individual refusals.**

**Roszak 92** (Theodore, History Professor @ CSU, The Voice of the Earth, pgs. 316-317)

The powers that run the urban-industrial world are well advised to see the personalistic style of the times as threatening. No well-oiled, efficient system can coexist with such a riot of personal improvisations. Self-discovery is the death of the industrial megamachine in the same way that democracy was the death of feudalism.

But the disintegration we see impending is a creative disintegration, one that opens a generous place for difference and diversity. Political equality was the beginning of this historical current; personal uniqueness is its destination. And both—the demand for equality, the demand for uniqueness—began inside, in the depths of the private psyche before either became a revolutionary movement in the world. Long before there was a political cause, there were people secretly hurting, needing, wanting. For the first time in human history, every odd and outcast member of our race will be able to step forward without shame and tell his or her story. If we are a culture of narcissists, we seem to find everybody's narcissism as fascinating as our own. Images of the outlandish and bizarre fill the media of modern times. The daily audience participation and talk shows on television probe every kink and twist of human nature. Pausing at the checkout counter of the supermarket, I come upon a small library of tawdry newspapers, each vying with the other to lay a more grotesque freak show before its readers. Yet even these exercises in tasteless sensationalism tell us something important. They reveal how very interested in one another we have become, how we crave to learn of the oddness and eccentricity of people everywhere. Simple animal curiosity may finally come to our rescue; there may be a saving wisdom hidden in this fascination with everyman's and everywoman's story. We will need all these personal histories to do even minimal justice to whatever the rerum natura is. Ecologically speaking, the music of the spheres is neither a solo nor a massed chorus carrying a single melody, but a jazz improvisation where each player has a rift. There is something more we can learn from basic ecology besides the value of variety. The urban revolution was the beginning of the interval of disequilibrium in whose latter days we now live. By human standards, the five thousand years of that interval may seem enormously long; but in the Gaian chronicles of the planet it is a minor, recent fluctuation still playing out its full implications. Now we begin to see with benefit of historical perspective how very ruthless this experiment has been in the regimentation of mental and physical energy. In the industrial period, machines of metal and chemical fuels have taken the place of muscle and animal metabolism, but the massification of people that began with the pharaoh's work-gang continues in the form of the assembly line, the white collar office force, the consumer market, the conscript army. Industrialism demands massification for its extraordinary power over nature: mass production, mass media, mass marketing. Our complex global economy is built upon millions of small, private acts of psychological surrender, the willingness of people to acquiesce in playing their assigned parts as cogs in the great social machine that encompasses all other machines. They must shape themselves to the prefabricated identities that make efficient coordination possible. If Gaia is to moderate the planet-punishing thrust of world industrialism, that capacity for self-enslavement must be broken. And the rock on which it founders is self-discovery, your conviction and mine that we are each a remarkable, unrepeatable event in the universe, a life shaped around an idea that happens only once and never again. The ecological ego is born of a narcissism that boldly asserts love and fascination with the self, not as a competitive agent, but as a freely created being demanding attention, recognition, respect.

## ALT SOLVES: INDIVIDUALS MATTER

**Rejecting capitalism is the first step—a refusal to believe in the system can topple empires.**

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele. Author, columnist, and political activist. "Manifesto for a New World Order." p. 249)

It costs nothing to agree that something should be done; indeed people like us have been accepting this proposition for decades, and waiting for someone else to act on it. Constitutional change will begin only when we reach the more dangerous conclusion that 'I must act'.

There have been many occasions over the past few years on which we have won the argument and lost the war. The campaigners who have exposed the injustices of the current global system often succeed in generating a widespread demand for change, and just as often discover that this demand has no outlet. Our opinions, in these circumstances, count for nothing until we act upon them. Until we present a direct constitutional challenge to its survival, or, through such measures as a threatened conditional default, alter the circumstances in which it operates, those who maintain the dictatorship of vested interests will read what we write and listen to what we say without the slightest sense of danger. In 16-19, after recoiling from the satisfaction he felt upon completing one of his revolutionary pamphlets, Gerrard Winstanley noted 'my mind was not at rest, because nothing was acted, and ... words and writings were all nothing, and must die, for action is the life of all, and if thou dost not act, thou dost nothing'. This manifesto, and all the publications like it, is worthless unless it provokes people to action. There are several reasons why we do not act. In most cases, the personal risk involved in the early stages of struggle outweighs the potential material benefit. Those who catalyse revolution are seldom the people who profit from it. In this struggle, most of us are not yet directly confronting armed force (though this may well change as we become effective), so the risks to which we expose ourselves and our families are, as yet, slighter than those encountered by other revolutionaries. Nor, of course, are the potential benefits of resistance as obvious, for those activists who live in the rich world, as the benefits of overthrowing Nazi occupation or deposing an indigenous tyrant, or breaking away from a formally constituted empire. While most of the people of the poor world have an acute need to change the circumstances which govern the way they live, the problems the protesters in rich nations contest belong to the second order of concern: we are not confronted by imminent starvation or death through waterborne disease, but by distant wars, economic instability, climate change and the exhaustion of resources; issues which seldom present immediate threats to our survival. But while the proposals in this manifesto offer little by way of material self-advancement to activists in the rich world, there is, in collective revolutionary action, something which appears to be missing from almost every other enterprise in modern secular life. It arises, I think, from the , intensity of the relationships forged in a collective purpose concentrated by adversity. It is the exultation which

Christians call 'joy', but which, in the dry discourse of secular politics, has no recognized equivalent. It is the drug for which, once sampled, you will pay any price. All those with agency are confronted by a choice. We can use that agency to secure comfortable existence. We can for ourselves a safe and use our life, that one unrepeatable product of four billion years of serendipity and evolution, to earn a little more, to save a little more, to win the approval of our bosses and the envy of our neighbours. We can place upon our walls those tombstones which the living erect to themselves: the framed certificates of their acceptance into what Erich Fromm has called the 'necrophilia' world of wealth and power. We can, quite rationally, subordinate our desire for liberty to our desire for security. Or we can use our agency to change the world, and, in changing it, to change ourselves.

We will die and be forgotten with no less certainty than those who sought to fend off death by enhancing their material presence on the earth, but we will live before we die through the extremes of feeling which comfort would deny us. I do not presume to lecture those who have little agency -among them the majority who live in the poor world on how to manage their lives. Over the past five years in many of the countries of the poor world -though this is seldom reported in the West - people have tried to change their circumstances through explosive demonstrations of grief, anger and hope. I have sought, with this manifesto, simply to enhance that hope, by demonstrating that there may be viable alternatives to the systems that subjugate them. But for most of the people of the rich world, and the more prosperous people of the poor world, revolution offers the possibility of freedom from the constraints we impose upon ourselves. Freedom is the ability to act upon our beliefs. It expands, therefore, with the scope of the action we are prepared to contemplate. If we know that we will never act, we have no freedom: we will, for the rest of our lives, do as we are told. Almost everyone has some sense that other people should be treated as she would wish to be. Almost everyone, in other words, has a notion of justice, and for most people this notion, however formulated, sits somewhere close to the heart of their system of beliefs. If we do not act upon this sense of justice, we do not act upon one of our primary beliefs, and our freedom is restricted accordingly. To be truly free, in other words, we must be prepared to contemplate revolution. Another reason why we do not act is that, from the days of our birth, we are immersed in the political situation into which we are born, and as a result we cannot imagine our way through it; we cannot envisage that it will ever come to an end. This is why imagination is the first qualification of the revolutionary.

A revolutionary is someone who recognizes the contingency of power. What sustains coercive power is not force of arms, or even capital, but belief. When people cease to believe -to believe in it as they would believe in a god, in its omnipotence, its unassailability and its validity -and when they act upon that belief, an empire can collapse, almost overnight. Those who possess power will surrender it only when they see that the costs -physical or psychological -of retaining it are higher than the costs of losing it. There have been many occasions on which rulers possessed the means of suppressing revolt -the necessary tanks and planes or cannons and cavalry divisions -but chose not to deploy them, because they perceived that the personal effort of retaining power outweighed the effort of relinquishing it. One of the surprises of history is the tendency of some of the most inflexible rulers suddenly to give up, for no evident material reason. They give up because they are tired, so tired that they can no longer sustain the burning purpose required to retain power. They are tired because they have had to struggle against the disbelief of their people, to reassert, through a supreme psychological effort, the validity of their power.

## ALT SOLVES: INDIVIDUALS MATTER

**Individual resistance is revolutionary—the existing order only has power as long as we support it.**

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele.

Author, columnist, and political activist. “Manifesto for a New World Order.” p. 260)

All political systems are ephemeral, and we can expect any new means of governance we design to collapse eventually and be succeeded by others, perhaps even to age as rapidly as the deceased systems of the past century or so.

But there is also a possibility that, rather than merely replacing one set of institutions with another, we might call forth something else, something much bigger, more menacing and more persistent: the metaphysical mutation which transforms the way in which human beings perceive themselves, and which nothing but another metaphysical mutation can halt. This transformation will not bring oppression to an end, or alter any of the basic human instincts which make us the flawed and dangerous creatures we are, but, if it occurs, it will establish a framework of perception which permits us to cooperate in resolving our common problems. None of these upheavals will happen spontaneously. The existing institutions cannot reform themselves. Their power relies upon the injustice of the arrangements which gave rise to them, and to tackle that injustice would be to accept their own dissolution. Governments will not act on our behalf until we force them to do so. The political classes from which most governing parties are drawn have no interest in this revolution. This shift, in other words, depends not on an amorphous them, but on a specific you. It depends on your preparedness to abandon your attachment to the old world and start thinking like a citizen of the new; to exchange your security for liberty, your comfort for elation. It depends on your willingness to act.

**Personal rejection is critical to moving away from capitalism—the system is only inevitable if we treat it as such.**

**Holloway, 05** (John, Ph.D in Political Science from the University of Edinburgh, “Can we change the World without taking power”, A debate between Holloway and Alex Callinicos, August 16<sup>th</sup>, <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>)

I don't know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot. The starting point: for all of us, I think: is uncertainty, not knowing, a common search for a way forward. Because it becomes more and more clear that capitalism is a catastrophe for humanity. A radical change in the organisation of society, that is, revolution, is more urgent than ever. And this revolution can only be world revolution if it is to be effective. But it is unlikely that world revolution can be achieved in one single blow. This means that the only way in which we can conceive of revolution is as interstitial revolution, as a revolution that takes place in the interstices of capitalism, a revolution that occupies spaces in the world while capitalism still exists. The question is how we conceive of these interstices, whether we think of them as states or in other ways. In thinking about this, we have to start from where we are, from the many rebellions and insubordinations that have brought us to Porto Alegre. The world is full of such rebellions, of people saying NO to capitalism: NO, we shall not live our lives according to the dictates of capitalism, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable and not what capital tells us to do.

Sometimes we just see capitalism as an all-encompassing system of domination and forget that such rebellions exist everywhere. At times they are so small that even those involved do not perceive them as refusals, but often they are collective projects searching for an alternative way forward and sometimes they are as big as the Lacandon Jungle or the Argentinazo of three years ago or the revolt in Bolivia just over a year ago. All of these insubordinations are characterised by a drive towards self-determination, an impulse that says, ‘No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.’ These refusals can be seen as fissures, as cracks in the system of capitalist domination. Capitalism is not (in the first place) an economic system, but a system of command. Capitalists, through money, command us, telling us what to do. To refuse to obey is to break the command of capital.

## ALT SOLVES: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

**The alternative is key to achieving environmental justice. The poor can only survive in a sustainable world.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 87-89)

Rejecting the higher immorality, this new ecological conscience says that being green is about having enough, not always more. This does not however mean the abandonment of those populations at the bottom of the world system – for whom genuine economic development, insofar as it benefits the poorest segments of society, remains essential. Indeed, as Tom Athanasiou has remarked in his *Divided Planet*, “History will judge Greens by whether they stand with the world’s poor.” Ecology and social justice, as the environmental justice movement of recent years has taught us, cannot be separated. What genuine hope there is for the continuing development of a collective ecological conscience under these circumstances derives ironically from the very globalizing trend of the system and the “acceleration of history” that it has brought with it. Since 1950 the world economy has grown by a factor of five, from \$4 trillion to \$20 trillion. Despite the fact that only 8 percent of the world’s population have cars, carbon dioxide emissions, primarily from automobiles, have grown to a level that threatens the stability of the world’s climate. Under these circumstances it is obvious to more and more people throughout the world that the entire planet has become vulnerable to the expansion of the most threatening biosphere culture of all, one that now has reached a scale that rivals the basic biochemical cycles of the planet. The manifestations of this are all around us with the advent of such planetary ecological threats as destruction of the ozone layer, global warming, rapid extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, impending food and water shortages, the proliferation of toxic wastes, and the decline of ecosystems throughout the earth. The ecological consciousness that this crisis has generated is not merely confined to the global level, however, but is giving rise to an ever more fervent commitment on the part of radical environmentalists to struggle on the behalf of individual ecosystems and the communities attached to them – in opposition to the current world economy, with its “sea of utilitarian brutality” (William Morris).

### ALT SOLVES: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

**The alternative is the best means to achieve social justice—the end of capitalism is key to equality.**  
**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 131-132)

The direct route to the creation of a mass environmental movement is one that seeks to break the seemingly intractable conflict between jobs and environmental protection (a conflict symbolized nowadays by owls versus jobs) by placing ecological conversion – the planning of new ways of working with nature while fulfilling social needs – at the very core of each and every ecological struggle. This necessarily means moving away from the attitude that environmentalism can somehow stand above and beyond the class struggle. A shift toward a broad movement for ecological conversion and the creation of a sustainable society also means that the partnership between the state and the capitalist class, which has always formed the most important linchpin of the capitalist system, must be loosened by degrees, as part of an overall social and environmental revolution. This partnership must be replaced, in the process of a radical transformation of the society, by a new partnership between democratized state power and popular power.

## ALT SOLVES: POVERTY

**Abandoning capitalism is the only way to alleviate the worst effects of poverty—human needs can all be met if consumption at the top is dramatically decreased.**

Mészáros, 07 (Professor Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory, University of Sussex. "The Only Viable Economy" <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm>)

That is where the incorrigible divorce of capitalistic growth from human need and use -- indeed its potentially most devastating and destructive counter-position to human need -- betrays itself. Once the fetishistic mystifications and arbitrary postulates at the root of the categorically decreed false identity of growth and productivity are peeled away, it becomes abundantly clear that the kind of growth postulated and at the same time automatically exempted from all critical scrutiny is in no way inherently connected with sustainable objectives corresponding to human need. The only connection that must be asserted and defended at all cost in capital's social metabolic universe is the false identity of -- aprioristically presupposed -- capital expansion and circularly corresponding (but in truth likewise aprioristically presupposed) "growth," whatever might be the consequences imposed on nature and humankind by even the most destructive type of growth. For capital's real concern can only be its own ever enlarged expansion, even if that brings with it the destruction of humanity. In this vision even the most lethal cancerous growth must preserve its conceptual primacy over (against) human need and use, if human need by any chance happens to be mentioned at all. The characteristically self-serving false alternative of "growth or no growth" is evident even if we only consider what would be the unavoidable impact of the postulated "no growth" on the grave conditions of inequality and suffering in capital's social order. It would mean the permanent condemnation of humanity's overwhelming majority to the inhuman conditions which they are now forced to endure. For they are now in a literal sense forced to endure them, by their thousands of millions, when there could be created a real alternative to it. Under conditions, that is, when it would be quite feasible to rectify at least the worst effects of global deprivation: by putting to humanly commendable and rewarding use the attained potential of productivity, in a world of now criminally wasted material and human resources.

## AT: ALT UTOPIAN

**A sustainable economy cannot be created within capitalism. Their appeals to being “realistic” demand that we turn away from an unworkable system.**

**Revolution, 07** (US Communist Party newspaper. “Capitalism and the Consequences of Biofuels.” 3-27-07. <http://rwor.org/a/083-special/biofuels-en.html>)

Capitalism cannot deal with the environment in a sustainable and economically rational way for three basic reasons: First, its logic is “expand-or-die”: to cheapen cost and to expand in order to wage the competitive battle and gain market share. Companies like BP are locked in fierce competition with other companies. An article in the business section of the New York Times writes, “For investors in alternatives to oil and gas, the driving force has been the belief that whoever develops the next great energy sources will enjoy the spoils that will make the gains from creating the next Amazon.com or Google seem puny by comparison.” (3/16/2007) Second, the horizons of capitalism tend to be short term. They seek to maximize returns quickly. They don’t think about the consequences in 10, 20, 30 years. In the development of biofuels this means that they do not pay attention to long-term effects like soil depletion, water usage, and cutting down ancient forests, or even increasing global warming. Third, capitalist production is by its nature private. The economy is broken up into competing units of capitalist control and ownership over the means of production. And each unit is fundamentally concerned with itself and its expansion and its profit. The economy, the constructed and natural environment, and society cannot be dealt with as a social whole under capitalism. In the article “Capitalism, the Environment, and Ecology Under Socialism” in Revolution #52 (6/25/2006) Raymond Lotta wrote, “So capitalism is incapable of addressing environmental issues outside its framework of private ownership and production for profit, and its blind logic of expansion. And on a world scale, we see the effects. But socialism can address environmental issues in a sustainable, rational, and socially just way: because ownership of the means of production is socialized as expressed through the proletarian state and this makes it possible to consciously plan development; and because economic calculation is radically different.” The debate over these issues—how the world has gotten to the point where the very survival of our species and the planet is being called into question, and what must be done to change this—is too often ruled out of order. In the name of realism, opponents of the system too often end up in debate over how to work within a system that is itself the problem. The debate over these issues needs to be pried open as a crucial part of the struggle to save the planet.

**Claiming that the alternative is not real world is ridiculous in the face of the devastating consequences of capitalism. They are asking you to accept all of our impacts in the name of “common sense.”**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. xiv)

The self-serving slogan of ‘there is no alternative’ is often coupled with an equally tendentious clause of self-justification which proclaims that ‘in the real world’ there can be no alternative to the advocated course of action (or inaction). This proposition is supposed to be a self-evident truth, automatically exempting all those who continue to assert it from inconveniencing themselves with the burden of proof. Yet, the moment we ask the question, what sort of ‘real world’ are they talking about, it becomes clear that it is an utterly fictitious one. For the structural defects and explosive antagonisms of the world in which we actually happen to live are apologetically denied or blindly disregarded by those who expect us to believe that in the ‘real world’ there is no alternative to the meek acceptance of the conditions necessary for the trouble-free functioning of the global-capital system. In the name of reason, common sense, and ‘real politics’ we are invited to resign ourselves to the existing state of affairs, no matter how destructive its antagonisms. For within the parameters of the established order—eternalized as the rational framework of the fundamentally unalterable ‘real world,’ with ‘human nature’ and its corresponding ideal reproductive instrumentalities: the ‘market mechanism,’ etc.—no solutions can be envisaged to the ubiquitous contradictions. Thus we are expected to pretend to ourselves that classes and class contradictions no longer exist or no longer matter. Accordingly, the only viable course of action in the thus postulated ‘real world’ is supposed to be to ignore, or to ‘explain away’ the evidence of structural instability provided by our own eyes, wishfully sweeping under an imaginary carpet the chronic problems and crisis symptoms of growing severity with which our social order confronts us every day.

### AT: ALT UTOPIAN

**They might win that the alternative would be difficult but that does not alter the fact that it is necessary—no half measures work.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "Towards a Sustainable Economy", pg. 163)

Many would regard the account given in this chapter as attractive but quite unrealistic, because people in general would not be willing to make the changes involved. It might therefore be said that what we need are far less radical proposals which we would have more chance of getting people to accept. It is important to be clear about the argument here. This book has explained that whether we like it or not, we cannot define a sustainable society other than in terms of the principles discussed in this chapter. We will either make it to a society based on simpler lifestyles, a high level of self-sufficiency, cooperation, and a zero growth economy - or we will not achieve a sustainable society. Whether or not it is unrealistic to ask people in general at this point in time to endorse such a society is not the focal issue. The crucial point is that we have no choice about these matters; either we manage to go down the path this chapter advocates, or we will not achieve a sustainable society. It is not being assumed here that we will take this path. There are very good reasons for thinking that we will not have the collective sense to do so.

**The affirmative is utopian—their faith in capitalism will drive us to extinction.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 165)

The reader might (prematurely) conclude at this point that any limits-to-growth theorist who predicts the death of industrial civilization and prescribes the establishment of a transindustrial society is guilty of utopian naivete. On the contrary, advocates of limits-based, postindustrial social transformation would reply (as I think Milbrath would) that it is those members of the faithful who accept the gospel of industrialism and its dependence upon the continuation of both unlimited economic growth and the postindustrial status quo, who are utopian. Their naivete will become increasingly evident as the limits to growth get closer and the dangers to society increase; when the apocalyptic consequences of growth-addiction begin to materialize and the flawed normative foundations of postindustrialism are exposed. Time is running out, as some popular media have begun to suggest with regard to several environmental threats recently made prominent: global warming, stratospheric ozone depletion, acid rain, deforestation, ocean pollution, and so on.

## AT: ALT TOO SLOW

**Every move away from capitalism decreases the chances of global extinction.**

**Foster 08** (John Foster PhD at New York University professor of Sociology and Marxist Theory at The University of Oregon. “Capitalism versus the planet” <http://www.greenleft.org.au/2008/747/38655>)

Is humanity going to pull through this environmental crisis? If it is, what are the changes that are necessary? Well, I think there are a couple of ways you could answer that question — one way would be that as Noam Chomsky has answered it, it's a question of optimism or pessimism, and in some way that's a psychological issue. The really important thing is not what we think the chances are, but what we're going to do. So if you think that there's a 1% chance that we're not going to destroy the planet, and practically speaking, all living species, what matters is not that you think there's only a 1% chance, but whether you're on the side of the 1% or not. So what matters is what we do. Certainly there are ways that we can get out of this crisis. I do think that under capitalist system, if the logic of capital is predominant — that our society has as its primary motivation the accumulation of capital and profits at the expense of nearly everything else — the chances of the world getting out of this alive are very, very dim. But it's within the power of humanity to pull us away from the logic of capital. This invites the question of a social system which is something quite different. We won't get there all at once, but every radical thrust away from it gives us more of a chance, so we need to prioritize human needs and decrease human waste. We have to prioritise human access to water, food and those basic things that human beings really need. And we have to move away from those goods and processes and commodities that exist only so that corporations can make a profit. Eventually, we have to politically transform our system and transform our production. The reason we have to transform production is because that is the human relation to nature, its metabolism with nature. The only way we can deal with the ecological problem is to change the way in which we relate to nature through our production, and that is precisely what the existing system won't allow us to address.

## AT: ALT TOO SLOW

**Even if the alternative cannot accomplish a complete transition, each step matters.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability", pg.110)

Although there are some very important political reasons why it will be difficult to change to the sort of economy required (at present many powerful people, corporations, governments and consumers do not want to change), there is nothing to prevent us from starting to build the alternative economy right now. If we can gradually get more alternative ways going we will create more opportunities for people to opt out of the high-income and high-consumption mainstream economy. This would increasingly bring us closer to the point in time when there was sufficient awareness and support to enable the really big and difficult structural changes to be made.

**Capitalism does not have to be dismantled in one bold move. The alternative is more realistic when it is thought of as fragmented, individual resistance that will add up to transformation.**

**Gibson-Graham, 96** (J.K., Katherine Gibson = professor of human geography at Australian National University and Julie Graham = professor of geography at University of Massachusetts, The End of Capital (As We Knew It), pg. 263-265)

The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can't the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could begin to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see or theorize as consequential in so-called capitalist social formations. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there's no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there's no possibility of anything else. If capitalism is large, other things appear small and inconsequential. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conditions under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes a "realistic" present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian future goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change. In the absence of Capitalism, I might suggest a different object of socialist politics. Perhaps we might be able to focus some of our transformative energies on the exploitation and surplus distribution that go on around us in so many forms and in which we participate in various ways. In the household, in the so-called workplace, in the community, surplus labor is produced, appropriated, and distributed every day by ourselves and others. Marx made these processes visible but they have been obscured by the discourse of Capitalism, with its vision of two great classes locked in millennial struggle. Compelling and powerful though it might be, this discourse does not allow for a variety of forms of exploitation and distribution or for the diversity of class positions and consciousness that such processes might participate in creating. If we can divorce our ideas of class from systemic social conceptions, and simultaneously divorce our ideas of class transformation from projects of systemic transformation, we may be able to envision local and proximate socialism.

## AT: MOVEMENTS FAIL

**Social movements against capitalism can succeed—they are growing and uniting.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 40-41. )

Ultimately the defense of the environment therefore requires a break with the tyranny of the bottom line and a long revolution (it is hoped not too long given the acceleration of history associated with ecological change) in which other, more diverse values not connected to the bottom line of the money-driven economy have a chance of coming to the fore. What is needed is a system of production organized democratically in accordance with the needs of the direct producers and reflecting an emphasis on the fulfillment of the totality of human needs (extending beyond the Hobbesian individual). These have to be understood as connected to the sustainability of nature, i.e., the conditions of life as we know them. Production can be said to be nonalienating only if it promotes the welfare of all, and only if it fulfills the human need for a sustainable, and in that sense nonexploitative, relation to nature. Since environmental costs under capitalism tend to be externalized while the benefits of avaricious disregard of environmental necessity feed the wealth of the few, environmental depredations lead to struggles for environmental justice. The struggle for material welfare among the great mass of the population, which was once understood mainly in economic terms, is increasingly taking on a wider, more holistic environmental context. Hence, it is the struggle for environmental justice – the struggle over the interrelationship of race, class, gender, and imperial oppression and the depredation of the environment – that is likely to be the defining feature of the twenty-first century. The universalization of a capitalism that knows no bounds is unifying all that seek to exist in defiance of the system. Historic struggles for social justice are becoming united, as never before, with struggles for the preservation of the earth. The solution to the environmental problem, our own struggles will teach us, lies beyond the bottom line. It is here that the main resources for hope in the twenty-first century are to be found.

## AT: PERMUTATION

**Capitalism is inherently driven by profits, not social welfare. We need to radically change course, not attempt to reform it.**

**Sweezy, 04** (Paul M. Sweezy, Marxist economist and founder of Monthly Review magazine. "Capitalism and the Environment." October 2004. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1132/is\\_5\\_56/ai\\_n6338575](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_5_56/ai_n6338575))

Since there is no way to increase the capacity of the environment to bear the burdens placed on it, it follows that the adjustment must come entirely from the other side of the equation. And since the disequilibrium has already reached dangerous proportions, it also follows that what is essential for success is a reversal, not merely a slowing down, of the underlying trends of the last few centuries. We have seen that at the heart of these trends is an economic system driven by the energy and inventiveness of entities--individuals, partnerships, in the last hundred years corporations--out to advance their own economic interests with little thought and less concern for the effects on either society as a whole or the natural environment which it draws on for the essentials of its existence. Already a century and a half ago Marx and Engels, in a memorable passage from the Communist Manifesto, paid a remarkable tribute to the energy and achievements of the then young capitalist mode of production: The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man's machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground--what earlier century had even a presentiment that such forces slumbered in the lap of social labor? Actually, when this was written in 1847 the rule of the bourgeoisie extended to only a small part of the earth's surface, and the new sciences and technologies harnessing the forces of nature to human purposes were still in their infancy. Since then capitalism has spread to become a truly global system, and the development and application of science and technology to industry and agriculture have progressed beyond anyone's wildest dreams a hundred and fifty years ago. Despite all the dramatic changes, however, the system remains in essence what it was at its birth, a juggernaut driven by the concentrated energy of individuals and small groups single-mindedly pursuing their own interests, checked only by their mutual competition, and controlled in the short run by the impersonal forces of the market and in the longer run, when the market fails, by devastating crises. Implicit in the very concept of this system are interlocked and enormously powerful drives to both creation and destruction. On the plus side, the creative drive relates to what humankind can get out of nature for its own uses; on the negative side, the destructive drive bears most heavily on nature's capacity to respond to the demands placed on it. \* Sooner or later, of course, these two drives are contradictory and incompatible. And since, as argued above, the adjustment must come from the side of the demands imposed on nature rather than from the side of nature's capacity to respond to these demands, we have to ask whether there is anything about capitalism as it has developed over recent centuries to cause us to believe that the system could curb its destructive drive and at the same time transform its creative drive into a benign environmental force.

The answer, unfortunately, is that there is absolutely nothing in the historic record to encourage such a belief. The purpose of capitalist enterprise has always been to maximize profit, never to serve social ends.

Mainstream economic theory since Adam Smith has insisted that by directly maximizing profit the capitalist (or entrepreneur) is indirectly serving the community. All the capitalists together, maximizing their individual profits, produce what the community needs while keeping each other in check by their mutual competition. All this is true, but it is far from being the whole story. Capitalists do not confine their activities to producing the food, clothing, shelter, and amenities society needs for its existence and reproduction. In their single-minded pursuit of profit, in which none can refuse to join on pain of elimination, capitalists are driven to accumulate ever more capital, and this becomes both their subjective goal and the motor force of the entire economic system. It is this obsession with capital accumulation that distinguishes capitalism from the simple system for satisfying human needs it is portrayed as in mainstream economic theory. And a system driven by capital accumulation is one that never stands still, one that is forever changing, adopting new and discarding old methods of production and distribution, opening up new territories, subjecting to its purposes societies too weak to protect themselves. Caught up in this process of restless innovation and expansion, the system rides roughshod over even its own beneficiaries if they get in its way or fall by the roadside. As far as the natural environment is concerned, capitalism perceives it not as something to be cherished and enjoyed but as a means to the paramount ends of profit-making and still more capital accumulation. Such is the inner nature, the essential drive of the economic system that has generated the present environmental crisis.

## AT: PERMUTATION

**It is impossible to sufficiently reform capitalism—we must change course.**

**Foster, Clark, and York, 08** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University. Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Ecology: The Moment of Truth - An Introduction.” July 2008. <http://www.monthlyreview.org/080701foster-clark-york.php>)

According to environmentalist Lester Brown in his Plan B 3.0, “We are crossing natural thresholds that we cannot see and violating deadlines that we do not recognize. Nature is the time keeper, but we cannot see the clock....We are in a race between tipping points in the earth’s natural systems and those in the world’s political systems. Which will tip first?”<sup>6</sup> As the clock continues to tick and little is accomplished it is obvious that the changes to be made have to be all the more sudden and massive to stave off ultimate disaster. This raises the question of more revolutionary social change as an ecological as well as social necessity. Yet, if revolutionary solutions are increasingly required to address the ecological problem, this is precisely what the existing social system is guaranteed not to deliver. Today’s environmentalism is aimed principally at those measures necessary to lessen the impact of the economy on the planet’s ecology without challenging the economic system that in its very workings produces the immense environmental problems we now face. What we call “the environmental problem” is in the end primarily a problem of political economy. Even the boldest establishment economic attempts to address climate change fall far short of what is required to protect the earth—since the “bottom line” that constrains all such plans under capitalism is the necessity of continued, rapid growth in production and profits.

**Compromise will only mask imperialistic capitalism—all out struggle is the only hope.**

**Hardt and Negri 2000** (Michael, PhD In Comparative Literature from U Washington and Antonio, Professor @ U of Paris, “Empire”)

Even though their critiques of imperialism and capitalist expansion are often presented in strictly quantitative, economic terms, the stakes for Marxist theorists are primarily political. This does not mean that the economic calculations (and the critiques of them) should not be taken seriously; it means, rather, that the economic relationships must be considered as they are really articulated in the historical and social context, as part of political relations of rule and domination.[17] The most important political stake for these authors in the question of economic expansion is to demonstrate the ineluctable relationship between capitalism and imperialism. If capitalism and imperialism are essentially related, the logic goes, then any struggle against imperialism (and the wars, misery, impoverishment, and enslavement that follow from it) must also be a direct struggle against capitalism. Any political strategy aimed at reforming the contemporary configuration of capitalism to make it nonimperialist is vain and naive because the core of capitalist reproduction and accumulation necessarily implies imperialist expansion. Capital cannot behave otherwise-this is its nature. The evils of imperialism cannot be confronted except by destroying capitalism itself.

## AT: PERMUTATION

**Only turning away from the state can solve. Leftist movements will otherwise be co-opted back within capitalist structures.**

**Holloway, 05** (John, Ph.D in Political Science from the University of Edinburgh, “Can we change the World without taking power”, A debate between Holloway and Alex Callinicos, August 16<sup>th</sup>, <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>)

The question for us, then, is how do we multiply and expand these refusals, these cracks in the texture of domination? There are two ways of thinking about this. The first says that these movements, these many insubordinations, lack maturity and effectiveness unless they are focused, unless they are channelled towards a goal. For them to be effective, they must be channelled towards the conquest of state power: either through elections or through the overthrowing of the existing state and the establishment of a new, revolutionary state. The organisational form for channelling all these insubordinations towards that aim is the party. The question of taking state power is not so much a question of future intentions as of present organisation. How should we organise ourselves in the present? Should we join a party, an organisational form that focuses our discontent on the winning of state power? Or should we organise in some other way? The second way of thinking about the expansion and multiplication of insubordinations is to say, 'No, they should not be all harnessed together in the form of a party, they should flourish freely, go whatever way the struggle takes them.' This does not mean that there should be no coordination, but it should be a much looser coordination. Above all, the principal point of reference is not the state but the society that we want to create. The principal argument against the first conception is that it leads us in the wrong direction. The state is not a thing, it is not a neutral object: it is a form of social relations, a form of organisation, a way of doing things which has been developed over several centuries for the purpose of maintaining or developing the rule of capital. If we focus our struggles on the state, or if we take the state as our principal point of reference, we have to understand that the state pulls us in a certain direction. Above all, it seeks to impose upon us a separation of our struggles from society, to convert our struggle into a struggle on behalf of, in the name of. It separates leaders from the masses, the representatives from the represented; it draws us into a different way of talking, a different way of thinking. It pulls us into a process of reconciliation with reality, and that reality is the reality of capitalism, a form of social organisation that is based on exploitation and injustice, on killing and destruction. It also draws us into a spatial definition of how we do things, a spatial definition which makes a clear distinction between the state's territory and the world outside, and a clear distinction between citizens and foreigners. It draws us into a spatial definition of struggle that has no hope of matching the global movement of capital. There is one key concept in the history of the state-centred left, and that concept is betrayal. Time and time again the leaders have betrayed the movement, and not necessarily because they are bad people, but just because the state as a form of organisation separates the leaders from the movement and draws them into a process of reconciliation with capital. Betrayal is already given in the state as an organisational form. Can we resist this? Yes, of course we can, and it is something that happens all the time. We can refuse to let the state identify leaders or permanent representatives of the movement, we can refuse to let delegates negotiate in secret with the representatives of the state. But this means understanding that our forms of organisation are very different from those of the state, that there is no symmetry between them.

### AT: PERMUTATION

**Half measures have no hope—we need to cut consumption by about 90% to create a sustainable world.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 127)

The reason why we have an environment problem is simply because there is far too much producing and consuming going on. (For a detailed argument see Trainer, 1998.) Our way of life involves the consumption of huge amounts of materials. More than 20 tonnes of new resources are used by each American every year. To produce one tonne of materials can involve processing 15 tonnes of water, earth or air. (For gold the multiple is 350,000 to 1.) All this must be taken from nature and most of it is immediately dumped back as waste and pollution. One of the most serious environmental problems is the extinction of plant and animal species. This is due to the destruction of habitats. Remember our footprint; if all 9 billion people soon to live on earth were to have rich-world “living standards”, humans would have to use about ten times all the productive land on the planet. Clearly our resource-intensive lifestyles, which require so much land and so many resources, are the basic cause of the loss of habitats and the extinction of species. Most green and sustainability rhetoric totally fails to grasp the significance of this magnitude, proceeding as if it is possible to make manufacturing and lifestyles and the economy sustainable without any need to reduce the volume of production and consumption, “living standards”, or the GDP. It ignores the glaring fact that perhaps 90% cuts in resource use are required and these cannot possibly be made without phasing out most industrial activity, trade, travel and commerce...without, in other words, extreme and historically unprecedented social change.

## AT: CAPITALISM INEVITABLE

**Their representation of capitalism as an unalterable reality is precisely what creates its inevitability—the first step is to remember that economies are localized, historically dependent social formations that can be changed.**

**Gibson-Graham, 06** (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Graham is Professor of Geography, Associate Department Head for Geography, B.A., Smith College, Ph.D., Clark University, 1984 , Gibson has a BSc (Hons) (Sydney), MA, PhD (Clark), (Pen Name is J.K. Gibson-Graham), „A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-54)

Why has Economy become an everyday term that denotes a force to be reckoned with existing outside of politics and society-a force that constitutes the ultimate arbiter of possibility? How is it that waged labor, the commodity market, and capitalist enterprise have come to be seen as the only "normal" forms of work, exchange, and business organization? When was it that capitalism assumed discursive dominance, becoming the only present form of economy and all that could be imagined as existing in the proximate future? And why do we have little to say these days about an expansive and generative politics of noncapitalist construction ?! We are convinced that the answers to these questions are connected to the almost total naturalization of "the economy" that has taken place in public discourse over recent decades, coinciding with the demise of socialism as an actually existing "alternative" and growing alarm that, with globalization, the autonomy of national economies, and therefore their manageability, is being undermined, This shift from an understanding of the economy as something that can be transformed, or at least managed (by people, the state, the IMF), to something that governs society has involved a hegemonic move by which representations of economy have slipped from their locations in discourse and landed "on the ground," in the "real," not just separate from but outside of society. In these postmodern times, the economy is denied the discursive mandate given to other social spheres and the consequences for the viability of any political project of economic innovation are dire. If we are to enact new economies, we need to imagine "the economy" differently-as something that is created in specific geographical contexts and in historically path-dependent ways, but this is not an easy or straightforward project. As Timothy Mitchell argues, we are up against an already existing eco-nomic object materialized in socio-technical networks of calculation that have, since the 1930s, produced the economy as a "singular and self-evident totality" (forthcoming). The economic landscape has been molded according to the imaginary functionings of a "self-contained and dynamic mechanism" known as "the economy," and this representation is difficult to dislodge.

**Capitalism isn't inevitable—that is just an excuse to do nothing.**

**Martin, 01** (Brian, associate professor in Science, Technology & Society at the University of Wollongong, Australia, *Nonviolence versus Capitalism*,

<http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/01nvc/nvcall.html#ch7fns>, Accessed 07-14-08)

Actually, it is absurd to say that capitalism is inevitable. This is really just an excuse for doing nothing to examine and promote improvements and alternatives. The way society is organised is due to the actions of people, and these actions can change. History shows a tremendous range of possibilities for human patterns of interaction. Furthermore, technological development is creating new options for the structuring of work, communication and interaction. Considering that capitalism is only a few hundred years old and continues to change, and that there is nothing approaching agreement that the current system is ideal, the assumption of inevitability is very weak indeed. Defenders of capitalism assume that there are only two basic options: either capitalism or some sort of system based on authoritarian government, either state socialism or some other sort of dictatorship. (Capitalism is assumed to go hand in hand with representative government, but this ignores those countries with capitalist economies and authoritarian politics, including fascism and military dictatorship.) But of course there are more than these two options.

## AT: CAPITALISM INEVITABLE

**Capitalism is not inevitable—it can only be imposed and maintained through patterns of violence that could be changed.**

**Kovel 02** (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, *The Enemy of Nature*, p. 115-16)

For example, it is a commonly held opinion that capitalism is an innate and therefore inevitable outcome for the human species. If this is the case, then the necessary path of human evolution travels from the Olduvai Gorge to the New York Stock Exchange, and to think of a world beyond capital is mere baying at the moon. It only takes a brief reflection to demolish the received understanding. Capital is certainly a potentiality for human nature, but, despite all the efforts of ideologues to argue for its natural inevitability, no more than this. For if capital were natural, why has it only occupied the last 500 years of a record that goes back for hundreds of thousands? More to the point, why did it have to be imposed through violence wherever it set down its rule? And most importantly, why does it have to be continually maintained through violence, and continuously re-imposed on each generation through an enormous apparatus of indoctrination? Why not just let children be the way they want to be and trust that they will turn into capitalists and workers for capitalists — the way we let baby chicks be, knowing that they will reliably grow into chickens if provided with food, water and shelter? Those who believe that capital is innate should also be willing to do without police, or the industries of culture, and if they are not, then their arguments are hypocritical. But this only sharpens the questions of what capital is, why the path to it was chosen, and why people would submit to an economy and think so much of wealth in the first place? These are highly practical concerns. It is widely recognized, for example, that habits of consumption in the industrial societies will have to be drastically altered if a sustainable world is to be achieved. This means, however that the very pattern of human needs will have to be changed, which means in turn that the basic way in which we inhabit nature will have to be changed. We know that capital forcibly indoctrinates people to resist these changes, but only a poor and superficial analysis would stop here and say nothing further about how this works and how it came about. Capital's efficient causation of the ecological crisis establishes it as the enemy of nature. But the roots of the enmity still await exploration.

**Capitalism is as inevitable as we make it—breaking its hegemonic domination by denying its extra discursive “reality” is the first step.**

**Gibson-Graham, 06** (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Graham is Professor of Geography, Associate Department Head for Geography, B.A., Smith College, Ph.D., Clark University, 1984 , Gibson has a BSc (Hons) (Sydney), MA, PhD (Clark), (Pen Name is J.K. Gibson-Graham), „A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-56)

Politics involves the continual struggle to fix meaning, to close the totality and stem the infinite processes of signification within language. Hegemony entails the persuasive ex-pansion of a discourse into widely shared values, norms, and perceptions such that meaning appears to be fixed, even naturalized (Torfing 1999,89, 302).<sup>5</sup> The fixings attempted by hegemonic politics include techniques of negotiating equivalence and difference appropriate to the task of strong theorizing. Condensation is a kind of conflation that fuses "a variety of significations and meanings into a single unity," thereby concentrating meaning by eliminating difference (Torfing 1999, 98). Displacement extends and transfers "the signification of meaning of one particular moment to another moment," producing contiguity and equivalence between what had been quite different meanings (98). Ultimately the partial fixings of meaning achieved through condensation and displacement establish nodal points, or dense knots of definite meaning that sustain the hegemonic discourse and the subjects it interpellates (303) . This theory of politics helps us to see the way in which a certain discourse of the economy (as real, as capitalist) has become hegemonic, and how alternative and different understandings of economy have been enrolled into the hegemonic project or outlawed as a threat to the hegemonic discourse. The representation of the capitalist economy as extradiscursive, as the ultimate real and natural form of economy, has gained additional ideological force since the demise of capitalism's "other." This is not to say that with the "disappearance" of communism and so-cialism social antagonisms that constitute the unity of neoliberal global capitalist discourse (and thus its hegemony) have been eliminated. The locus of antagonism has simply shifted and is now made up of multiple threats to the "free market," such as remnant public sector involvement in the economy, "democratic welfare statism" (Torfing 1999,299), and the insistent "failures" of development-spaces where abject poverty and social disintegration have increased during the "age of development" and now harbor "terrorist threats" to wealthy nations. In its current hegemonic articulation as neoliberal global capitalism, capitalocentric discourse has now colonized the entire economic landscape and its universalizing claims seem to have been realized. A distinctive social imaginary—a heady mix of freedom, individual wealth, unfettered consumption, and well-being trickled down to all-convenes a series of myths that constitute the (illusory) fullness and positivity of "capitalist" society, masking the social antagonisms on which this presence is posited. We have come to accept that "the economy" establishes the bottom line for action and "it" makes us perform in certain ways. This ideological fantasy has become safe and even enjoyable, directing and limiting politics to certain channels, blinding us without realizing it to the possibility of other options.

### AT: CAPITALISM INEVITABLE

**The argument that there is no alternative to capitalism is both false and designed to keep elites in power.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. xiii)

To many people the present state of affairs seems to be fundamentally unalterable, corresponding to Hegel's characterization of thinking and acting as right and proper—or 'rational' in his sense—only in submission to the requirements of 'universal permanent capital.' Moreover, this impression of fateful unalterability seems to be reinforced by the fact that one of the most often repeated political slogans offered by our decision makers as the justification of their actions is: 'there is no alternative.' Such wisdom continues to be uttered without any concern for how bleak it would be if this proposition were really true. It is much easier to resign oneself to the finality of the predicament asserted in this blindly deterministic political slogan of our times—without even attempting to assess, let alone question, its grievous implications—than to devise the necessary challenge to it. Curiously, however, the politicians who never tire of repeating that there is no alternative to the existing order of affairs do not hesitate to describe at the same time their own trade as 'the art of the possible.' They refuse to notice the latent contradiction between the traditional self-justification of politics, as the socially beneficial 'art of the possible,' and the uncritically advocated resignation to the rule of capital to which, in their view—claimed to be the only rationally tenable view in 'the real world'—there cannot be an alternative. For what on earth could be the meaning of politics as the 'pursuit of the socially commendable possible' if the viability of any alternative to the imperatives of the ruling order is apriori excluded as worse than hopeless because impossible? To be sure, the fact that so many decision makers—in the East and West alike—embrace the idea that there can be no alternative to the prevailing determinations cannot be considered simply a corrigible personal aberration of those who advocate it. On the contrary, this bleak idea emanates from the present stage of development of the global capital system as such, with all its paralyzing interdependencies and objectively narrowing margins of action. For in the ascending phase of development of commodity society a whole range of meaningful alternatives could be contemplated (and successfully implemented) in the interest of profitable capital accumulation and expansion by the dominant (as a rule also empire-building) capitalist countries.

## AT: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Their “cede the political” argument would only make sense if it were possible to survive in a capitalist world. Reform contributes to the illusion that only quick fixes are needed. We need to admit that rejecting capitalism is our only hope.**

**Duchrow, 95** (Ulrich Duchrow, professor of systematic theology at the University of Heidelberg specialising in ecumenical theology and theology-economy issues. “Alternatives to Global Capitalism,” p. 230-234)

If one affirms life and life-bringing economic systems, then one must reject economic systems and structures which bring about death. One objection often raised in this respect says that total dissent would mean losing all political credibility, and that the political possibilities of relative improvement can no longer be seized when one rejects certain basic elements of the capitalist economy. This argument presupposes that the changes in the world economic system that are necessary for survival can be achieved with the existing political institutions. Only when the fundamental, death-inducing mechanisms have been recognised and eliminated can a political strategy be formulated which may be able to help avoid the predictable catastrophes. It is not the desire to constantly criticise but the necessity avoid illusion when dealing with life-sustaining alternatives for life which compels us to specify what must be rejected, so that the best can be achieved from this basis. Exactly what is it that has to be rejected on principle in the present global system, and to which we have to find alternatives for life's sake? It is the mechanisms which, uncontrolled and unimpeded, gear economic activity to the accumulation of money by those who already have it, with the aid of the absolute principle of competition in the global market. Nature and people are, accordingly, subordinated to this end, as far as possible. In concrete terms, the mechanisms referred to are: the transnational money markets, in so far as they can and do escape national and international institutions, provided they tolerate or favor the pure capitalist market; and also the ideological instruments connected with science, the media, schools, universities and churches, which orient people towards achieving this goal or whose potential for resistance to the deadly wealth accumulation market is not used. But because the money mechanism only functions with the inclusion of the commodity-money relationship, all people, provided they have the money and are consumers with purchasing power, are actively caught up in the machinery of wealth accumulation (incidentally, so are those without much purchasing power, in so far as they – understandably – strive for a share in consumption rather than seeking alternatives to the commodity-money system). That means, however, that although the totalitarian character of the money-oriented system originates from the power of the world market, the market can only exercise this power because so many players, right down to individual human beings, facilitate its operation. Rejection in this case is, therefore, not an attitude adopted with external reference only to identifiable players in the world market. It involves a fundamental change at all levels, including that of the individual. Before we examine this dimension of rejection more closely, we should consider once more the need for it. From a social point of view, the totalitarian character of the deregulated and competitive world market, centred around wealth accumulation, is leading to dramatic levels of pauperisation and exclusion of more and more people, not only in the South but increasingly in the East and also in the West. Today we have reached a point where at least two thirds of the world's population are either dying of hunger or living on or below the poverty line. These people are subsequently excluded from the formal economy. From an environmental point of view, our planet and the basic conditions for life will be destroyed if the transformation of nature into commodities-money for the purpose of wealth accumulation continues to accelerate. It is, therefore, imperative that the focus of the economy be shifted from money accumulation to the people's needs. A mere 'taming' of the system is not sufficient, although this must be considered when reflecting upon the question of relative political opinions. The only satisfactory solution can be one that takes into account the lives of not just a few privileged Northerners or even of all people alive today but also of future generations, and ensures that they have the renewable natural resources necessary for survival and procreation. Such a solution would result in the elimination of the money-accumulation economy and its associated structures. This must be recognised before embarking upon any attempt to find concrete alternatives and new regulatory instruments. Any other starting point would be potentially dangerous because it would only create illusions. E. Altvatet was right when he said that anybody who maintains that within the framework of a capitalist economy, the environmental catastrophe can be held at bay in the long run is either opportunistic or naive. The same conclusion was also reached by R. Kurz and L. Mayer, who have been quoted already, and, indirectly – As a result of what started with the "cut-throat competition" between the northern Italian city-states, the whole of humanity is degenerating into a mass of competing individuals, who no longer accept their mutual limitations and dependence, instead striving endlessly for profit and success without considering the rising tide of violence and the effects on the weak. Competitiveness for unlimited money accumulation is the objective and subjective basic structure, the "god" of our market society, which determines the whole. Accordingly, the core of what we must reject is the absolute value attributed to competition and the total absence of limits set on the cancerous growth of capital. The liberation must, therefore, be comprehensive, just as the 'spirit' of capitalism is comprehensive. In other words, the spiritual side is not one of many dimensions but decisive for the whole.

## AT: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Their cede the political argument is empirically denied—moderate left environmental movements have failed—capitalism itself must be confronted.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 39-40)

In the last few decades, by contrast, protest movements—notably the various shades of environmentalism—emerged from a very different social setting, even with far from socialist value orientation. These movements attempted to gain a foothold in the field of politics in several capitalist countries through the agency of reform-oriented Green parties. They appealed to individuals concerned about the ongoing environmental destruction, leaving undefined the underlying socioeconomic causes, as well as their class connotations. This they did precisely in order to broaden their own electoral appeal, in the hope of successfully intervening in the reform process for the purpose of reversing the identified dangerous trends. The fact that within a relatively short space of time all such parties became marginalized, despite their spectacular initial successes almost everywhere, underlines that the causes manifesting in environmental destruction are much more deep-seated than it was assumed by the leaders of these programmatically non-class oriented reform movements, including the people who imagined that they could institute a viable alternative to the socialist project by inviting its adherents to move 'From Red to Green.' No matter how important—indeed literally vital—as a 'single issue' around which varieties of the Green movement tried to articulate their reform programmes, so as to make an inroad into the power structure and decision making processes of the established order, the incontestable imperative of environmental protection turned out to be quite intractable on account of the corresponding prevailing production processes. The capital system proved to be unreformable even under its most obviously destructive aspect. Today the difficulty is not only that the dangers inseparable from the ongoing development are much greater than ever before, inasmuch as the global capital system had reached its contradictory zenith of maturation and saturation. The dangers now extend over the whole planet, and consequently the urgency of doing something about them before it is too late happens to be particularly acute.

**So-called liberal movements are equally dangerous if they buy into the self-annihilating logic of capitalism—we have a moral obligation to reject capitalism at all costs.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. "Scared Ecology and Capitalism" <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm> 6/6/2006).

Capitalists come in all sizes and shapes, some of them Republican, some Democrats; some conservative, some liberal. Future generations, whether human beings or polar bears, means nothing to them. They cannot see the world in its incomprehensible biological complexity, but only in terms of dollars and cents and profit margins. The world's largest financial institutions are run by glutinous robber barons that have hijacked most of the world's governments and set us on an irreversible course of self-destruction. They are literally consuming the earth, exploiting the world's poor and altering complex ecological processes that provide habitat, a livable climate, clean air, potable water and abundant food for perhaps 30 million or more species. These are processes that have evolved over eons of time. They are a gift, a right of birth that belongs equally to all beings, not just to those who can convert them into private wealth. Only the most maniacal and perverted thinkers could conceive of the idea of private ownership of the earth's life processes. Monsanto and DuPont do not have a legitimate claim to the world's genetic library. Any economic system that adversely affects the planet's ability to sustain life is not only wrong; it is criminally insane and must be subverted at all cost.

### AT: ROLE PLAYING

**Learning traditional policy making will accomplish nothing—government is dominated by capitalists.**

**Herod, 04** (James, “Getting Free,” University of Massachusetts Boston,  
[http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\\_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm](http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm))

We can't destroy capitalism by running for office. It hasn't been done and it won't be done, even though numerous governments have been in socialist hands in Europe, sometimes for decades. It won't be done because governments don't have the last say, they don't control society. Capitalists do. The government doesn't control capitalists; capitalists control the government. Modern government (i.e., the nation-state system) is an invention of capitalists. It is their tool and they know how to use it and keep it from being turned against them. Although building worker-controlled political parties, and then using those parties to win elections and get control of governments, and then using those governments to establish socialism, seemed like a plausible enough strategy when it was initiated in the mid-nineteenth century, it's way past time for us to recognize and admit that it simply hasn't worked. Capitalism goes rolling on no matter who controls the government.

## AT: DOOMSAYING KILLS ALTERNATIVE

**Inclusion of an alternative makes our critique fundamentally hopeful—not paralyzing.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 15)

We must be careful not to have the limits-to-growth critiques of industrial values exist in isolation with their fearful and depressing message only. They must be combined with discussions of alternative social orders and proposals for the design and transformation processes by which these alternative societies might be realized; in short, an account of how social transformation of advanced industrial society may occur. I shall attempt to begin to do this in part 4 and thereby provide insight to and appreciation of the following crucial encouraging fact: the end of the industrial civilization does not necessarily mean the end of human civilization in toto. The concern by supporters that the limits-to-growth attack might be viewed so cataclysmically as to induce inaction either because of shock or despair is illustrated by a story told by William Sloane Coffin about a Harvard scientist flying over the lake country in northern Alabama using technical instruments in an experiment measuring fish population. When the scientist discovered two fishermen out on the lake that he had just determined had no fish, he thought he would inform them of his recent finding as a friendly gesture. They were outraged, instantly, and told the scientist in rich Southern expletives where he could take his plane and his instruments and what he could do with them, whereupon they baited their lines once again and kept on fishing. The scientist flew off, much puzzled. "I expected their disappointment," he said later, "but not their anger."<sup>33</sup> Similarly, as students of industrial society knowledgeable of the requirements for social action and change, we need to be cognizant of the possible reactions of both the public and policymakers in advanced industrial societies, no matter how accurate we consider the claims about the crisis of industrial culture to be; as Krauthammer noted, the law of diminishing returns applied to repeated apocalyptic accounts might set in. Happily, this will not mean ignoring aspects of the crisis for fear of such overkill. There is a socially significant, encouraging element to the most gloomy analysis of the threats to postindustrial society in the recognition that the death of industrial civilization need not mean the end of the world. Formulations of the industrial crisis should be as accurate as possible and should reflect the social implications and consequences of this crisis.

**AT: ECON IMPACT TURNS: INEVITABLE, FAST BETTER**

**Immediate economic collapse is the only way to save humanity—otherwise capitalism will utterly destroy the planet.**

**Barry 08** [Dr. Glen, president and founder of Ecological Internet, Economic Collapse and Global Ecology, 1/14, Counter Currents, <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>]

Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon. A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

### AT: ECON IMPACT TURNS: INEVITABLE, FAST BETTER

**Seeking endless growth on a finite planet is impossible—capitalism will inevitably collapse. The faster we change course, the better our chances will be to survive.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm> 6/6/2006).

Any economic system based upon greed rather than the public good and the ruthless exploitation of nature is not only wrong, it is a prescription for disaster. Capitalism not only embodies this self destructive ideology, it depends upon endless growth (the ideology of the cancer cell) for its continuation. Endless growth, regardless how well it is managed, is an ecological impossibility on a finite planet. Thus the perceived success of capitalism is short-lived at best. Because it is based upon a cycle of voracious consumption and waste, capitalism will inevitably collapse. This is not idle speculation or wishful thinking on my part; it is a mathematical certainty based upon the most elementary precepts of ecological science. Meanwhile, the ecological consequences of unbridled capitalism will be dire. The collapse of the world's great ecosystems, driven by capital's insatiable lust for material wealth, is already well under way and is almost certainly irreversible. To continue down this path will surely make things orders of magnitudes worse than if we change direction and begin to live responsibly and sustainably.

**Environmental reform will only delay the inevitable decline of capitalism and intensify the crisis—rejection of the system now is the only hope.**

**Sweezy, 04** (Paul M. Sweezy, Marxist economist and founder of Monthly Review magazine. “Capitalism and the Environment.” October 2004. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1132/is\\_5\\_56/ai\\_n6338575](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_5_56/ai_n6338575))

And during the present century conservation movements have emerged in all the leading capitalist countries and have succeeded in imposing certain limits on the more destructive depredations of uncontrolled capital. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that without constraints of this kind arising within the system, capitalism by now would have destroyed both its environment and itself. Not surprisingly, such constraints, while sometimes interfering with the operations of individual capitalists, never go so far as to threaten the system as a whole. Long before that point is reached, the capitalist class, including the state which it controls, mobilizes its defenses to repulse environmental-protection measures perceived as dangerously extreme. Thus despite the development of a growing environmental consciousness and the movements to which it has given rise in the last century, the environmental crisis continues to deepen. There is nothing in the record or on the horizon that could lead us to believe the situation will significantly change in the foreseeable future. If this conclusion is accepted--and it is hard to see how anyone who has studied the history of our time can refuse, at the very least, to take it seriously--it follows that what has to be done to resolve the environmental crisis, hence also to insure that humanity has a future, is to replace capitalism with a social order based on an economy devoted not to maximizing private profit and accumulating ever more capital but rather to meeting real human needs and restoring the environment to a sustainably healthy condition. This, in a nutshell, is the meaning of revolutionary change today. Lesser measures of reform, no matter how desirable in themselves, could at best slow down the fatal process of decline and fall that is already so far advanced.

## AT: ECON IMPACT TURNS: INEVITABLE, FAST BETTER

**Economic collapse is inevitable—we need to accomplish it quickly to move to a sustainable society before it is too late to avoid extinction.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repolitization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 35-36)

Despite the fact that industrial civilization has brought so much dissatisfaction and danger to human survival, most of its inhabitants and policy makers deny the existence of an industrial crisis in the fundamental normative sense discussed earlier, wherein the admission of such a crisis would entail a change in basic values, such as limitless economic growth. Instead, we continue to avidly maintain industrialism's central value tenets including, of course, unlimited economic growth. This is demonstrated by the continuation of the universal policy objective of economic growth by policymakers in virtually all existing social orders as well as transnational public support for the social value of economic growth by most of the world's populace. "Grow or die" seems to be the watchword of industrial values setting up a grim alternative to limitless growth that both leads to industrial pessimism and (disappointment- and disillusionment avoiding) denial of the challenge presented by the limits-to-growth position. Those who refuse to admit that industrialism is currently undergoing a crisis and who defend the industrial values advocate the progrowth view. They have generated the large number of writings in rejoinder to industrial civilization's deprecators within the economic growth debate, thereby avoiding the radical implications of the disturbing reassessment of industrial preferences and priorities. By denying the existence of the crisis and the resulting disappointment, they negate the need for any normative reassessment of the industrial social order's present so-called advanced stage. "Disappointment [Hirschman writes] frequently will have to pass a certain threshold before it is consciously avowed—but then, just because of the earlier delaying actions, it may well be experienced 'with a vengeance.'"<sup>11</sup> This assertion is important for our discussion in two respects. First, it may explain the paralyzing and overwhelming despair of terminal pessimism associated with the industrial crisis. Second, it may explain the limits-to-growth advocates' urgent (and sometimes understandably extreme) efforts to achieve a greater public awareness about the nature and severity of the industrial crisis. These advocates fear that we might easily reach the threshold limit where public recognition of the existing limits to growth would be too late to spur the necessary value reassessments and social changes: the damage incurred would then be irreversible. In that event, disabling despair for the entire human species and all of the planet's living creatures would be appropriate because it would indeed be too late to do anything useful about our misguided priorities; "the fatal plunge into the abyss" would be at hand. We would be left with Woody Allen's unhappy choice between hopelessness and extinction. Hopefully—and all social inquiry, especially political philosophy, may be considered to be an optimistic enterprise presupposing that the diagnosis of social ills will have some beneficial social impact—the current industrial crisis will rouse people and policymakers from their disappointment-denying deceptions and delays in acting before it is too late. Moreover, it may inspire political philosophical examination and transformation of the values and thereby along with the other components of social transformation (like social movements) fundamentally change the way of life of industrial society.

## AT: ECON COLLAPSE TURNS: CAUSES SHIFT

**Economic collapse causes a transition to a new social order.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 171-172)

Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that the end or death of industrial civilization will not necessarily bring the apocalyptic termination of life on earth! It will mean the end of the world, but only one world; it could mean merely the end of a particular (and defective) social order! For people who have absorbed its worldview uncritically and completely, and furthermore, who have adjusted successfully to the resulting social structure and values, the impending loss of a civilization does appear to be terrifying. They will experience the death of the only desirable-and for the industrial elite, self-serving-world they know as a totally destructive, and therefore traumatic, phenomenon rather than what it actually is: the passing of a specific, elite-benefiting world that indeed can and should be transformed. When the flaws of a social order are understood, and its fantastic elements and promises (like industrialism's unlimited economic growth) are recognized and appreciated for what they are-impossible dreams preserving the ruling group's control and benefits-they should be cast aside. The loss of social fantasies causes immediate despair but the mourning period, for their death should be temporary and surmountable. As both Slater and Harman emphasize, such despair is both appropriate and necessary to the achievement of social and individual transformation.

**Crisis is necessary to create a mindset shift and move away from capitalism.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 194-195)

Let us recapitulate. Limits-to-growth theorists have argued-though not in sufficient clarity or evidential detail-that growth-addicted, advanced industrial society is not sustainable. One nonphysical reason that we can now understand is that increasing numbers of the citizens of such societies experience deep feelings of disappointment or relative deprivation when their expectations are always rising-competitively-and are not, cannot, be satisfied; both because of physical and conceptual limits, the latter referring to the exclusive nature of competitive industrial goods and values. This produces more and more postindustrial persons open to the transformational message and willing to take appropriate political action; members of the powerful elite are included so that this psychological/normative change can have social structural implications. While it is true that disappointment, discontent and insecurity by themselves are not sufficient to transform post-industrial society, they can provide the essential background conditions, once mobilized and organized, to help form an effective social movement for societal transformation. Importantly, these conditions can assist in the formation of the instrument for social change by shaping its goals (as with the new anti-industrial social movements, the most prominent of which is tied to the environment and stopping its further deterioration). Moreover, as a result of disappointment, Wildean tragedy, and value erosion, the postindustrial elite (the current members of the beneficiary class within the dominant, postindustrial social paradigm and structure) might come to a realization unique in history. The elite, postindustrial consciousness may be shocked into change by increasingly conspicuous limits to growth as well as by the profoundly challenging nature of the limits-to-growth literature: the futility, insecurity, and disaster looming in our foreseeable future (unlike the predicted long-range disaster of our sun burning up in several billion years), and a future filled with the preoccupation of seeking to maintain their relative advantages and ceaselessly fend off all of the others seeking to replace them. The enjoyment of the elite's present success seems short-lived, unstable, and increasingly inadequate relative to both the concern and effort expended in attaining such "success" in the first place, and the rising costs of maintaining their celebrated position on top. If both the temporary postindustrial elite (or the successful competitors in the contests that constitute most of the postindustrial social order) as well as the lower- and middle-class members can be made to realize that the value structure of this civilization is erroneous in several respects making it unworthy and impossible (even if preferred), then the social transformation of such a society will not be the highly unlikely prospect claimed by the social-change pessimists and defenders of the status quo.

## AT: ECON COLLAPSE INEVITABLE

**The collapse of capitalism is inevitable—enormous resource gaps have rendered the entire system unstable.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 37-8)

Things have significantly changed in the last few decades, as compared to the expansionary past. The displacement of capital's inner contradictions could work with relative ease during the phase of the system's historical ascendancy. It was possible to deal under such conditions with many problems by sweeping them under the carpet of unfulfilled promises, like modernization in the 'Third World' and ever greater prosperity and social advancement in the 'metropolitan' countries, predicated on the expectation of producing an endlessly growing cake. However, the consummation of capital's historical ascendancy radically alters the situation. It is then not only no longer possible to make plausible new sets of vacuous promises but the old promises too must be wiped out of memory, and some real gains of the working classes in the privileged capitalist countries must be 'rolled back' in the interest of the survival of the ruling socioeconomic and political order. This is where we stand today. The triumphalist celebrations of a few years ago now sound very hollow indeed. The slanted development of the last century brought no solutions on the model of 'mobile property's civilized victory' (Marx), in that it simply multiplied the privileges of the few and the misery of the many. However, a radically new condition has emerged in the course of the last few decades, gravely affecting the prospects of development in the future. For what is particularly grave today from the point of view of the capital system is that even the privileges of the few cannot be sustained any longer on the backs of the many, in sharp contrast to the past. As a result, the system as a whole is being rendered quite unstable, even if it will take some time before the full implications of this systemic instability transpire, calling for structural remedies in place of manipulative postponement. Thus Marx's alternative perspective is coming into its own only in our own times. Not so long ago the accumulated problems could be ignored or minimized by indulging in self-complacent talk about more or less easily manageable 'dysfunctions.' However, when even the privileges of the small minority are unsustainable despite the ever-intensified exploitation of the overwhelming majority, such talk must sound problematical even to its formerly most uncritical practitioners. In fact, the same people who still yesterday wanted us to be satisfied with their explanatory discourse on merely 'technical difficulties' and 'temporary dysfunctions,' recently started to talk about 'shared problems' and the need for a 'common effort' for solving them, within the confines of the established order, confessing at times their bewilderment as to what seems to be happening everywhere. What baffles them more than anything else is that the collapse of the Soviet system not only removed their favourite self-justifying alibi but, to make things worse, failed to deliver the hoped for beneficial results to their own side. For the expected revitalization of the Western capital system through its 'victory' over the East, and the concomitant 'natural' and happy marketization of the postrevolutionary part of the world stubbornly failed to materialize. The ideologists of 'advanced capitalism liked to think of the Soviet system as the diametrical opposite of their own. They had to be awakened to the disconcerting truth that it was only the obverse side of the same coin. It is a sobering fact that the carpet which could sufficiently hide for far too long even the gravest problems swept under it is becoming very difficult to walk on. Indeed, it is a matter of great importance that the wantonly ignored problems affecting the very survival of humanity must now be faced under circumstances when the capital system as a whole had entered its structural crisis.

## AT: ECON COLLAPSE INEVITABLE

**Population growth will ensure that capitalism is utterly impossible to sustain.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 125)

The foregoing argument has been that the present levels of production and consumption are grossly unsustainable. They are far too high to be kept going for long or to be extended to all people. Yet we are determined to increase present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and without any end in sight. Our supreme national goal is economic growth. It is not just that people want more and more income, wealth, property and possessions, without any amount in view with which they will be satisfied. The core problem is that we have an economic system which needs and cannot function without constant growth in production and consumption. For instance as technology advances fewer workers are needed, so unless consumption rises all the time the unemployment problem increases. More importantly, new money comes into existence as debt which is created when banks make loans, and this has to be repaid with interest. This absurd process cannot continue unless there is constant growth in production and earnings to enable repayment of the ever increasing debt. Above all, capital is constantly accumulating in the hands of corporations and banks, which are then determined to find or create more opportunities for investing it. Few people seem to recognise the absurdly impossible consequences of unlimited economic growth. If we have a 3% p.a. increase in output, by 2070 our economy will be producing eight times as much every year. (For 4% growth the multiple is 16.) If by then all the expected 9 billion people have risen to the living standards we in rich countries would have then given 3% p.a. growth, the total world economic output will be more than 60 times as great as it is today! Yet the present level is unsustainable.

## AT: NUCLEAR WAR OUTWEIGHS

**Capitalism has put us on a path of extinction from environmental collapse—nuclear war does not outweigh and we have a moral obligation to reject the system.**

**Sweezy, 04** (Paul M. Sweezy, Marxist economist and founder of Monthly Review magazine. “Capitalism and the Environment.” October 2004. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m1132/is\\_5\\_56/ai\\_n6338575](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_5_56/ai_n6338575))

It is obvious that humankind has arrived at a crucial turning point in its long history. Nuclear war could terminate the whole human enterprise. But even if this catastrophic ending can be avoided, it is by no means certain that the essential conditions for the survival and development of civilized society as we know it today will continue to exist. We live in and from a material environment consisting of land, water, and air which, historically, has always been considered to be and treated as infinitely durable and usable. This does not mean indestructible. History records many instances of the destruction (i.e., rendering unusable for human purposes) of parts of the environment by either natural processes or human agency. As far as the natural processes are concerned, they have been operating since long before there was human life and will presumably continue to operate long after, and there is no reason to assume any unusual change in the foreseeable future. When it comes to destruction by human agency, however, things are different. Small-scale destruction of parts of the environment have occurred throughout history, and on occasion the scale has grown to quite impressive proportions (e.g., through desertification). But even the largest of these destructive processes have remained small compared to the size of the environment as a whole. Tribes or even more complex societies have been wiped out or forced to move to new locations, but these were always local, not global, disasters. And throughout the ages—in fact, right up to the time of people now alive—it was always taken for granted that this would continue to be the case. The reason was a belief, perhaps rarely thought through or articulated, that the means possessed by human beings were too puny to be a threat to the sheer magnitude and recuperative powers inherent in the environment. All this began to change with the explosion of the first A-bomb in August 1944. At first the new bomb was perceived as essentially an improvement on already existing weapons, but an interrelated chain of events gradually led to a radical alteration of people's consciousness. The Soviets got the bomb much sooner than had been expected, thus shattering the notion that the new force could somehow be monopolized and controlled. Then came the H-bomb with its vastly greater destructive potential; and this in turn was followed by the escalating arms race between the superpowers which, despite much talk and a few largely symbolic treaties, continues to this day. It is now commonplace that each superpower has the capability to wipe out its rival several times over, and ongoing research into the consequences of all-out nuclear war has demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that the catastrophe could not be confined to the belligerents but would inexorably spread, in such ghastly forms as radioactive poisoning and nuclear winter, to the entire globe. Thus in the incredibly short time of less than half a century, humankind has gone from blissful confidence in the security of its habitat to the certainty that its own survival, as well as the capacity of its natural environment to sustain life as we have known it, could be cut short in an instantaneous paroxysm of nuclear violence. The full implications of this unprecedented change in human consciousness will obviously not become clear for a long time to come. But it is already evident that sensitivity to threats to the human habitat has spread rapidly from its origins in the overwhelming destructive power of nuclear weapons to encompass a variety of ecological processes and trends, most of which have been known and even studied for a century or more, but which have been increasingly seen in a new light since the beginning of the nuclear age. Once you know for certain that human agency can render the planet unfit for human habitation, you can hardly help asking whether nuclear weapons are the only possible source of such a catastrophe. Viewed from this angle, much that used to be regarded as merely the unavoidable negative side of progress is now seen to be part of a looming threat to the continuation of life on earth. It is hard to imagine a more fundamental change in perception and truly astonishing to reflect on how rapidly it has come about. Within the framework of this perception, there are of course different positions. At one extreme are those who believe the danger is much exaggerated—perhaps a reflection of the pessimistic spirit of the time, itself largely a product of the nuclear scare. Let the nuclear arms race be brought under control, which now seems increasingly possible, and environmental deterioration will be seen in its true dimensions, not as a prelude to doomsday but as a series of problems that have been created by human agency and can be dealt with in the same way. At the other extreme are those who argue that things have really gotten much worse in the last half century and that we are now close enough to the point of no return to warrant the most gloomy forebodings. The way the arguments pro and con are presented, these two positions often appear to be polar opposites. But this is an illusion: They actually have a common basis in the belief that if present trends continue to operate, it is only a matter of time until the human species irredeemably fouls its own nest. Against this background it seems clear that everyone who shares the belief in the fatal implications of current trends has a moral obligation on the one hand to try to understand the processes that underlie these trends, and on the other to draw appropriate conclusions about what has to be done to reverse them before it is too late.

### AT: CASE OUTWEIGHS

**Calls for reform to stave off apocalypse are just the flip side of the same coin that argues that environmental issues are overblown. Both positions assume that there is a nature to be known and controlled. Not only is nature far less predictable than they assume and it is essential that we question the root cause of capitalism.**

**Swyngedouw, 06** (Erik, Dept of Geography, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, "Impossible "Sustainability" and the Post-Political Condition", Forthcoming in: David Gibbs and Rob Krueger (eds.) Sustainable Development, [www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc](http://www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/Sustainabilitypaper.doc))

The inability to take 'natures' seriously is dramatically illustrated by the controversy over the degree to which disturbing environmental change is actually taking place and the risks or dangers associated with it. Lomborg's *The Sceptical Environmentalist* captures one side of this controversy in all its phantasmagorical perversity (Lomborg, 1998), while climate change doomsday pundits represent the other. Both sides of the debate argue from an imaginary position of the presumed existence of a dynamic balance and equilibrium, the point of 'good' nature, but one side claims that the world is veering off the correct path, while the other side (Lomborg and other sceptics) argues that we are still pretty much on nature's course. With our gaze firmly fixed on capturing an imaginary 'idealised' Nature, the controversy further solidifies our conviction of the possibility of a harmonious, balanced, and fundamentally benign ONE Nature if we would just get our interaction with it right, an argument blindly (and stubbornly) fixed on the question of where Nature's rightful point of benign existence resides. This futile debate, circling around an assumedly centred, known, and singular Nature, certainly permits -- in fact invites -- imagining ecological catastrophe at some distant point (global burning (or freezing) through climate change, resource depletion, death by overpopulation). Indeed, imagining catastrophe and fantasising about the final ecological Armageddon seems considerably easier for most environmentalists than envisaging relatively small changes in the socio-political and cultural-economic organisation of local and global life here and now. Or put differently, the world's premature ending in a climatic Armageddon seems easier to imagine (and sell to the public) than a transformation of (or end to) the neo-liberal capitalist order that keeps on practicing expanding energy use and widening and deepening its ecological footprint. It is this sort of considerations that led Slavoj Žižek controversially to state that "nature does not exist". Of course, he does not imply that there are no such "things" as quarks or other subatomic particles, black holes, tsunamis, sunshine, trees, or HIV viruses. Even less would he decry the radical effects of CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases on the climate or the lethal consequences of water contamination for the world's poor. On the contrary, they are very real, many posing serious environmental problems, occasionally threatening entire populations (AIDS, for example), but he insists that the Nature we see and work with is necessarily radically imagined, scripted, symbolically charged; and is radically distant from the natures that are there, which are complex, chaotic, often unpredictable, often radically contingent, risky, patterned in endlessly complex ways, ordered along 'strange' attractors. In other words, there is no balanced, dynamic equilibrium based nature out there that needs or requires salvation in name of either Nature itself or of an equally imagined universal human survival. 'Nature' simply does not exist. There is nothing foundational in nature that needs, demands, or requires sustaining. The debate and controversies over nature and what do with it, in contrast, signals rather our political inability to engage in directly political and social argument and strategies about re-arranging the social co-ordinates of everyday life and the arrangements of socio-metabolic organisation (something usually called capitalism) that we inhabit. In other words, imagining a benign and 'sustainable' Nature avoids asking the politically sensitive, but vital, question as to what kind of socio-environmental arrangements do we wish to produce, how can this be achieved, and what sort of natures do we wish to inhabit.

## AT: ADVANCED CAP CLEANER

**Advanced capitalism is not actually cleaner—some easy to remove pollutants have been addressed but the total quantity of waste put into the environment continues to increase.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p. 22-23)

This harsh conclusion regarding capitalism's inherent anti-environmental character, drawn from the case of global warming, stands in stark contrast to the views of those who in recent years have advanced the notion that capitalism is not a threat to but rather contains within itself to the solution to global environmental problems. Among mainstream environmental economists the idea that there is a natural trend toward a "dematerialization hypothesis suggests that capitalism is moving toward a "weightless society." Increased energy efficiency and the growth of the New Economy in the advanced capitalist economies are supposedly "decoupling" economic growth from the use of energy and materials and from waste flows into the environment, reducing the environmental impact of each additional monetary increment of GDP. In this view, nothing really need be done to decrease the effects of economic expansion on the environment, because constant capitalist innovation and the wonders of the market are already solving the problem. At best public policy needs simply to accelerate the trend toward dematerialization and to ensure that the environment is "integrated within a more knowledge-driven, innovative economy" (Charles Leadbeater, *The Weightless Society*, p. 177). As stated in the World Bank's World Development Report 1992 (written on the theme of "Development and the Environment"), "in many cases [in the OECD] economic growth is being 'delinked' from pollution as environmentally non-damaging practices are incorporated into the capital stock" (p.40). This hypothesis is often portrayed in terms of an "environmental Kuznets curve," an inverted U-shaped curve, applicable to advanced capitalist economies, which are said to be decreasing their physical inputs per unit of GDP after having reached a peak in this respect in the mid to late twentieth century. In reality, however, such "decoupling" has mainly occurred with respect to those pollutants that are easily addressed through end-of-the-pipe solutions. Although there have been reductions in the ratio of material outflow (measured in tons) to GDP, waste flows per capita in the rich countries have nonetheless risen measurably. Moreover, the "throughput" (or quantity used) of materials and energy and the material output dumped into the environment have continued to increase appreciably in absolute terms – as shown by the study *The Weight of Nations: Material Outflows from Industrial Economies* (World Resources Institute, 200), covering the cases of Austria, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands and the United States. "Actual dematerialization," that report stresses, "has not been achieved" (p.19). Fossil fuel combustion is the dominant activity of modern industrial economies and is the single largest contributor to material outflows to the air and on land" (p. 41). The atmosphere remains the main dumping ground for the waste outflows of industrial countries. Carbon dioxide emissions, which by themselves represent eighty percent of weight of Domestic Processed Output (DPO) of industrialized countries, rose in all countries studied except Germany (an exception due, as we have seen, to the effects of reunification and the reduction of high-carbon coal production). "We have learned," *The Weight of Nations* emphasizes, "that efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth".

## AT: ADVANCED CAP CLEANER

**Advanced capitalism is utterly impossible to continue on a global scale—we do not have the resources to keep up with demand.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 125)

Following are some of the most forceful limits-to-growth arguments. • Rich countries, with about one-fifth of the world's people, are consuming about three-quarters of the world's resource production. Our per capita consumption of assets like oil is about 15 to 20 times that of the poorest half of the world's 126 Chapter 10 people. World population will probably stabilise around 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have the present Australian per capita resource consumption, then annual world production of resources would have to be eight to ten times as great as it is now. If we tried to raise present world production to that level by 2060, we would by then have completely exhausted all probably recoverable resources of one third of the basic mineral items we use. All probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, gas, tar sand oil, shale oil, and uranium (via burner reactors) would have been exhausted by 2050 (Trainer, 1985, Chapters 4 and 5). • Petroleum appears to be especially limited. As was noted at the start of Chapter 1, a number of geologists have concluded that world oil supply will probably peak by 2010 and be down to half that level by 2025–30, with big price increases soon after the peak. None of the limits-to-growth themes is as potentially terminal in the short term for consumer society. • If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the rich-world per capita rate, we would need 3.5 times the world's present forest area. If all 9 billion were to have a rich-world diet, which takes about 0.5 ha of land to produce, we would need 4.5 billion ha of food-producing land. But there is only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today, and this is not likely to increase. • Recent “Footprint” analysis (Wachernagel and Rees, 1996) estimates that it probably takes 7 ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. The US figure is close to 12 ha. So if 9 billion people were to live as we do in rich countries, we would need about 70 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 10 times all the available productive land on the planet. • As was explained in Chapter 1, the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that if the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere is to be kept to sensible levels, and carbon use was shared equally among the world's people, then rich-world per capita carbon release would probably have to be reduced to somewhere under 5% of the present amount. These are some of the main limits to growth arguments which lead to the conclusion that there is no possibility of all people rising to anywhere near the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries.

### AT: ADVANCED CAP CLEANER

**Advanced capitalism is not cleaner—the production of toxic chemicals in the wealthiest nations denies their argument.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 93)

I want to concentrate here on the energy efficiency part of this. The issue of the materials used and the production technology are much more intractable problems under the current regime of accumulation. One of the reasons for this is that current productive processes often involve toxins of the worst imaginable kind. For example, we know that the proliferation of synthetic chemicals, many of which are extraordinarily harmful – carcinogenic and teratogenic – is associated with the growth of the petrochemical industry and agribusiness, producing products such as plastics and pesticides. (This was the central message of Barry Commoner's *Closing Circles*.) Yet attempts to overcome this dependence on toxic production create a degree of resistance from the vested interests of the capitalist order that only a revolutionary movement could surmount. In contrast, straightforward improvement in energy efficiency have always been emphasized by capital itself, and fall theoretically within the domain of what the system is said to be able to accomplish – even what it prides itself in.

## AT: CAP RAISES LIVING STANDARDS

**Arguments that capitalism can improve living standards are blind to the environmental catastrophe the system is generating. Uncompromising criticism is key.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p. 24-25)

“The modern world,” Rachel Carson observed in 1963, “worships the gods of speed and quantity, and of the quick and easy profit, and out of this idolatry monstrous evils have arises.” The reduction of nature to factory – like forms of organization in the interest of rapid economic returns, she argued, lies behind our worst ecological problems (*Lost Woods*, pp. 194-95). Such realities are, however, denied by the vested interests who continue to argue that it is possible to continue as before only on a larger scale, with economics (narrowly conceived) rather than ecology having the last word on the environment in which we live. The depth of the ecological and social crisis of contemporary civilization, the need for a radical reorganization of production in order to create a more sustainable and just world, is invariably downplayed by the ruling elements of society, who regularly portray those convinced of the necessity of meaningful ecological and social change as so many “Cassandra” who are blind to the real improvements in the quality of life that everywhere surround us. Industry too fosters such an attitude of complacency, while at the same time assiduously advertising itself as socially responsible and environmentally benign. Science, which all too often is prey to corporate influence, is frequently turned against its own precepts and used to defend the indefensible – for example, through risk management analysis. It was in defiance of such distortions within the reigning ideology, reaching down into science itself, that Rachel Carson felt compelled to ask, in her 1962 Women’s National Press Club Speech: “Is industry becoming a screen through which fats must be filtered, so that hard, uncomfortable truths are kept back and only the harmless morsels allowed to filter through? I know that many thoughtful scientists are deeply disturbed that their organizations are becoming fronts for industry. More than one scientist has raised a disturbing question – whether a spirit of Lysenkoism may be developing in America today – the philosophy that perverted and destroyed the science of genetics in Russia and even infiltrated all of that nation’s agricultural sciences. But here the tailoring, the screening of basic truth, is done, not to suit a party line, but to accommodate to the short-term gain, to serve the gods of profit and production (*Lost Woods*, p. 210).” We are constantly invited by those dutifully serving “the gods of profit and production” to turn our attention elsewhere, to downgrade our concerns, and to view the very economic system that has caused the present global degradation of the environment as the solution to the problems it has generated. Hence, to write realistically about the conflict between ecology and capitalism requires, at the present time, a form of intellectual resistance – a ruthless critique of the existing mode of production and the ideology used to support its environmental depredations. We are faced with a stark choice: either reject “the gods of profit” as holding out the solution to our ecological problems, and look instead to a more harmonious coevolution of nature and human society, as an essential element in building a more just and egalitarian social order – or face the natural consequences, an ecological and social crisis that will rapidly spin out of control, with irreversible and devastating consequences for human beings and for those numerous other species with which we are linked.

## AT: TECH SOLVES

**Sustainability is no longer an option—we have overshot our ecological limits so much that new technologies cannot save us. We need to question capitalism itself.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism*, p 79-80)

However, the emerging world consensus on the necessity for sustainable development hides more fundamental disagreements. In the view of the dominant interests of society, sustainable development, despite its environmental associations, remains primarily an economic concept serving narrow economic ends. As British economist David Pearce, the author of the British Government's Pearce Report, *Blueprint for a Green Economy*, has stated, "sustainable development . . . [is] fairly simply defined. It is continuously rising, or at least non-declining consumption per capita, or GNP, or whatever the agreed indicator of development is. And this is how sustainable development has come to be interpreted by most economists addressing the issue. Sustainable development, in these terms, is essentially the same thing as sustained economic growth. This is often made more compatible with ecological considerations by insisting that environmental costs need to be internalized by the market, ensuring that losses in "natural capital," for example, be accounted for in any computation of growth or development." Also the need to preserve certain forms of "critical natural capital," such as tropical rainforest ecosystems, is sometimes incorporated into this dominant economic approach to sustainable development. Nevertheless, the emphasis throughout remains on sustaining development. In contrast, for those who are concerned primarily with sustaining the earth and creating livable, sustainable communities, rather than with sustaining development or expanding profits, the conflict between economic growth and the environment is much more likely to be emphasized. This alternative view starts out by recognizing that most economic activity demands raw materials and energy from the planet and generates waste that the planet must absorb. The environmental consequences of economic growth cannot therefore be avoided (though they might be lessened). A 3 percent annual average rate of growth in world output would mean that world production would double every 23 years; in a single century, it would increase 16 times. Yet, even now there are signs that the world economy is overshooting certain critical ecological thresholds. It is highly unlikely therefore that the planet could long sustain exponential growth of this kind, involving doublings of economic output every quarter century, without experiencing worldwide ecological catastrophe. There is no technological fix that will allow unlimited economic within a limited biosphere.

**Tech cannot solve—if more nations had Western tech, environmental problems would be even worse.**  
**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability", pg.3)

The way of life in the 'developed' countries is extremely expensive in terms of per capita resource and energy consumption. Every year each American consumes on average 20 tones of new materials, including energy equal to 12 tones of coal. If all the people likely to be living on earth late next century were to consume energy at such a rate, world energy production would have to be fourteen times its present level, and all potentially recoverable (as distinct from currently known) energy resources (excluding breeder and fusion reactors) would be exhausted in about eighteen years. (Trainer 1985: Chapters 3 and 4). It is argued in Chapter 9 that alternative energy sources such as the sun and the wind are not capable of yielding the quantities of energy the world consumes now, let alone fourteen times as much. Nor can nuclear reactors do the trick since they only provide electricity, which at present makes up a mere 15 per cent of rich-world energy use. Just to provide the present world population with rich-world diets would require eight times the present world cropland (which is likely to decrease) or more than the world's entire land area (Rees 1992: 129). In other words it would be impossible for all people to rise to anywhere near the 'living standards' that the rich countries have now. Heroic 'technical-fix' optimism is required before one can stave off the conclusion that countries like the USA, the UK and Australia are the overdeveloped countries and the rest are the never-to-be-developed countries. A just world order cannot be achieved unless we in rich countries move to far lower per capita resource consumption, and cease demanding constantly rising levels of consumption.

### AT: TECH SOLVES

**Tech optimists vastly over estimate our ability to keep up with explosive demand for an affluent lifestyle.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, "Towards a Sustainable Economy", pg. 43-44)

Economists usually believe that we need not worry about resource scarcity because as supplies dwindle prices will rise, giving the incentive for more to be discovered, or for poorer ores to be processed, or for substitutes to be used. It is true that over some periods of time these mechanisms actually increased the quantities of resources available for use, despite the fact that increasing quantities were being used up. But this argument fails to recognize that there are limits to these I mechanisms which are set by the biophysical nature of the planet. There is a finite amount of oil in the ground, in venous forms; of, zinc in ore deposits of differing grades; and of farm land of differing quality. Yes: as some of these categories are exhausted it is possible to move on to exploit more difficult categories, but don't conclude that economics is creating resources that were not there before. What is happening is that more of the finite options are being used up. Yes: when conventional oil has gone, price increases might make it attractive to start using shale oil- but that is limited too. It is probable that technical advances will generate new options in some fields for a long time yet. But overall such options are clearly running out, most seriously in biological and ecological realms. Is it plausible that given the present intense level of scarcity, price rises plus technical advance can sustain 8 or 16 times as much output seventy years from now, and double that level every twenty years thereafter?

## AT: TECH SOLVES

**New technologies and regulations cannot save us from the energy crisis—capitalism will ensure over production and consumption. Turning away from capitalism is the only hope.**

**Foster, 2000** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Capitalism’s Environmental Crisis – Is Technology the Answer?” December 2000. Monthly Review Vol. 52, No.7 <http://www.monthlyreview.org/1200jbf.htm>)

Still, it would be wrong to see this as a mere technological problem or one of fuel efficiency, since the technologies that would allow us to avoid such a rapid buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere have long existed. If we take transport, for example, there have long been modern means of transportation, particularly public transit, that would vastly reduce carbon-dioxide emissions compared to a transport system built around the private automobile, and that would actually be more efficient in terms of the free and rapid movement of people as well. Instead, the drive to accumulate capital pushed the advanced capitalist countries down the road of maximum dependence on the automobile, as the most efficient way of generating profits. The growth of the “automobile-industrialization complex,” which includes not simply automobiles themselves but the glass, rubber, and steel industries, the petroleum industry, the users of highways for profit (such as trucking firms), the makers of highways, and the real-estate interests tied to the urban-suburban structure—constitute the axis around which accumulation in the twentieth century largely turned (Sweezy, “Cars and Cities.” Monthly Review, vol. 23, no. 11, April 1972). In Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy’s Monopoly Capital, which was heavily influenced by Schumpeter’s business cycle theory (in addition to the theories of Marx, Veblen, Keynes, and Kalecki), the authors argued that as a historical system, capitalism has always been dependent on epoch-making innovations. These are the kinds of innovations that alter the entire structure of production and the geography of production—a massive scale and around which the bulk of investment comes to cluster. For Baran and Sweezy, three epoch-making innovations had come into play in the history of capitalism—the steam engine, the railroad, and the automobile. What distinguished the automobile in this respect is that it served as an epoch-making innovation twice—in two stages of automobileization. The first was the expansion of automobile production in the period up through the 1920s, including the beginning of the building of highways. The second was the massive buildup symbolized by the construction of the interstate highway system, the destruction of rival forms of public transit, and the accelerated rate of suburbanization that occurred immediately after the Second World War. It is not too much to say that the dominance of the automobile was associated with an entire regime of production and consumption, which has underpinned and still underpins accumulation in the advanced capitalist states.\* It is this automobile-industrial complex that is at the heart of our dependence on petroleum today and that accounts for the largest portion of carbon-dioxide emissions. At the time of the Gulf War with Iraq, President Bush told the population of the United States that the purpose of the war was to defend “our way of life.” Everyone knew what this meant: petroleum. Jevons had called coal the “general agent” on which the entire British industrial system depended and the economical use of (or cheapness) of coal as what allowed industry to thrive. Today petroleum plays an equally dominant role in our industrial system. The capitalist class is divided when it comes to reductions in carbon-dioxide emissions to slow down the rate of global warming. A significant part of the ruling class in the United States is willing to contemplate more efficient technology, not so much through a greatly expanded system of public transport, but rather through cars with greater gas mileage or perhaps even a shift to cars using more benign forms of energy. Efficiency in the use of energy, as long as it does not change the basic structure of production, is generally acceptable to capital as something that would ultimately spur production and increase the scale of accumulation (leading to the Jevons Paradox). But a very large and powerful segment of capital in the United States is not willing to accept even this, because greater gas mileage points generally to smaller engines and smaller cars. Auto producers today, more than ever, are making the bulk of their profits from the production of large vehicles, with the growth in the market for sports utility vehicles and minivans. Henry Ford II’s well-known adage that “minicars make mini profits,” is still the governing principle. As for the petroleum interests, their vested interest in promoting the demand for oil is obvious. Viewed from this standpoint, it is scarcely surprising that there were virtually no votes to ratify the Kyoto Protocol within the US Senate. At every point, meanwhile, capitalists and their acolytes have blocked the implementation of solar power alternatives, some of which are entirely feasible at this stage.

Corporations have sought to take over solar power from the grassroots movement, not in order to promote it, but in order to hold it in abeyance. Under capitalism, it is those energy sources that generate the most profits for capital—of which solar power is certainly not one—that are promoted, not those most beneficial to humanity and the earth. This story has been told by Daniel M. Berman and John T. O’Connor in Who Owns the Sun? None of this, of course, should surprise us. Thorstein Veblen, who might, along with Rudolf Hilferding, be considered one of the originators of the theory of monopoly capitalism, emphasized the fact that capitalism, although it promoted a certain narrow kind of bottom-line efficiency, nonetheless represented a system of prodigious waste from any rational-planning perspective such as that of the engineer. He characterized the oil industry as one of “clamorous waste and mishandling” that led inevitably to “big business and monopoly control” (Absentee Ownership, 200-201). For Veblen, the whole industrial system under monopoly capitalism (or, as he called it, the system of “absentee ownership”) was permeated by reckless and useless consumption of human and natural resources, associated with the dominance of pecuniary goals over rational production. “The distinction between workmanship and salesmanship,” he observed, “has progressively been blurred...until it will doubtless hold true now that the shop-cost of many articles produced for the market is mainly chargeable to the production of saleable appearances” (Ibid., 300). The sales effort has so penetrated into production itself that the use value criteria for commodities has been undermined and transformed by the needs of exchange value in quite radical ways. From this it is a small step to the Galbraithian “dependence effect”—that what we consume is dependent on the nature of production, rather than the reverse, as assumed in the “consumer sovereignty” hypothesis of neoclassical economics (Galbraith, The Affluent Society, chapter 11). Control over production, coupled with the force of modern marketing, has given capital the power to manufacture “needs” (i.e., desires) along with products. In fact, “product development” in the giant corporation is usually seen as a subdivision of marketing. Journalists never tire of pointing to the love of the automobile in the United States. But such “love” is more often than not a kind of desperation in the face of extremely narrow options. The ways in which cars, roads, public transports systems (often notable by their absence), urban centers, suburbs, and malls have been constructed mean that people often have virtually no choice but to drive if they are to work and live. Under these circumstances the car (or minivan), which consumers seem to crave, also becomes a kind of prison, made more tolerable (if only barely) by the introduction of cell phones and other gadgets. Meanwhile the social costs pile up. “Capitalism,” as K. William Kapp declared in The Social Costs of Private Enterprise, “must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs, ‘unpaid’ in so far as a substantial portion of the actual costs of production remain unaccounted for in entrepreneurial outlays; instead they are shifted to, and ultimately borne by, third persons or by the community as a whole (231). In such a system, it makes no sense to see possibilities for sustainable development as limited to whether or not we can develop more technological efficiency within the current framework of production—as though our entire system of production, with all of its irrationality, waste, and exploitation has been “grandfathered” in. Rather, our hopes have to be pinned on transforming the system itself. This means not simply altering a particular “mode of regulation” of the system, as Marxist regulation theorists say, but in transcending the existing regime of accumulation in its essential aspects. It is not technology that constitutes the problem but the socioeconomic system itself.

## AT: TECH SOLVES

**Faith that new technologies can make capitalism sustainable overlooks the fundamental need to cut consumption by about 90%. Moving away from capitalism is critical.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. "Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society" p. 116-17)

Along with the powerful but unexamined general assumption that renewable energy can save consumer-capitalist society, there is the equally taken-for-granted assumption that technical advances and greater conservation effort can greatly reduce the need for energy. These assumptions are core elements in the basic "technical fix" view which shores up the conviction that no change from consumer-capitalist society is needed. It is not difficult to show how seriously mistaken this general position is. The magnitude of the problems, the overshoot, is far too great. There is no doubt that the potential for energy saving is large, both in terms of wasteful practices and the potential for developing much more energy-efficient devices. A common claim is that energy use can be cut by 50%, by eliminating waste and designing more efficient machines and ways. This is plausible. Amory Lovins has argued that a "Factor Four" reduction is achievable, i.e., halving resource and environmental loads while doubling GDP.<sup>4</sup> Most of Lovins' (valuable) arguments and cases indicate 50–75% reductions. For instance the hybrid car could cut petrol consumption in half and Lovins' discusses future possibilities which might halve that again. So why can't we solve the problem if we just keep up this effort? We should note firstly that not everyone agrees with Lovins regarding the scale of the possible reductions. The Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics (2006) offers an estimate of the overall probable conservation achievement by 2050 which is much lower than the expectation often encouraged by tech-fix optimists offering theoretical analyses of what might be done. It estimates that we are on a path to a total global carbon emission rate p.a. in 2050 that is an alarming 2.6 times as high as it is now, and that conservation effort will reduce the resulting 15 GT figure by only 23%. (In Chapter 1 the safe emission limit seemed to be around 1 GT/yr.) Optimists point to the much lower energy use rates in Europe and Japan than in Australia and the US, but those countries are far smaller and have much higher population densities, meaning shorter travel and transport and that public transport is more economically viable. Easily overlooked is the fact that we are in an era when the easiest conservation gains are being made. We are "picking the low hanging fruit". US oil intensity fell in the 1985–2005 period at half the rate that it fell in the previous 15 years (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 43). Gains in aircraft flight distances per litre of fuel are falling, because the easiest gains have been made (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 80). Another point enthusiasts about conservation and technical advance easily overlook is the "Jeavons" or "rebound" effect. Often technical advances enable savings in energy and therefore reductions in the price, which promptly leads to greater consumption. This has to be understood in relation to the fundamental imperative in a consumer-capitalist society, to maximise output, wealth, consumption and GDP all the time. Any firm that finds its energy costs cut by better technology will immediately increase production of cheaper goods, or pass the saving to customers who will have more money to spend on something else. If we find we can travel for half the cost, we are likely to double our travelling. The costs of savings also have to be accounted. Often there is a significant net gain, as with insulating a house. However, although very light cars use less energy the materials they are made from are energy intensive to produce. In fact Mateja (2000) reports that mainly because of their sophisticated electrical systems, hybrid vehicles take 30% more energy than the average car to produce, and in some cases five times as much. The popular Prius takes 142% more energy than the average car. Newman (2006) says "...over the lifetime of a vehicle...hybrids actually consume a lot more energy than even big SUVs." He reports the Prius lifetime energy cost per mile at 1.4 times that of the US car fleet average. Also the full balance sheet needs to be filled out. For instance energy used in US corn production fell 15% between 1959 and 1970, but that was only energy used on the farm. When all inputs were taken into account energy use actually rose 3% (Heinberg, 2003, p. 162). Some seemingly notable energy reducing achievements of corporations have simply been due to either getting out of production of energy-intensive lines, or transferring these to sub-contractors in the Third World where energy use is booming and there is less pressure to minimise energy or environmental costs. If the magnitude of our overshoot were not so great, these often remarkable conservation and efficiency efforts might be capable of solving the problem, but we have to make perhaps 90% reductions. Let us assume that energy use and other resource and environmental impacts must only be halved (...although solving the greenhouse problem would require a far bigger reduction.) Now as has been explained, if by 2070 we have 9 billion people on the "living standards" we in Australia would have by then given 3% growth, total world economic output would be 60 times as great as at present. How plausible is it that by then we can also reduce impacts by 50%, meaning a Factor 120 reduction in the rate of impact per unit of GDP, not a Factor 4 reduction? Clearly system change is needed. The problems cannot be solved by more conservation effort on the part of individuals and firms within consumer-capitalist society. They are being caused by an overshoot that is far too big for that, and they are being caused by some of the fundamental structures of this society. Consequently much of what is said under the heading of "sustainability" is nonsense and much of the effort being made to "save the planet" is a waste of time. Most irritating are the "What you can do in your own home" campaigners. "Buy biodegradable wash up liquid, use a low-flow shower head, recycle your bottles, buy a smaller car, etc." Such efforts can make no more than a negligible difference to household impact, when we need something like a 90% reduction in national consumption. Nothing remotely like this is possible within a consumer-capitalist society committed to affluent lifestyles and limitless economic growth. It is only possible through dramatically reducing the volume of production and consumption and therefore by changing from such a society to one that is about frugal but adequate "living standards", as little production and consumption as possible and a stable economy.

### AT: CAP LOWERS POPULATION

**Economic growth creates a sense of optimism that leads to increased fertility.**

**Abernethy, 94** (Virginia, Virginia School of Medicine, The Atlantic Monthly, “Optimism and Overpopulation”)

Economic expansion, especially if it is introduced from outside the society and is also broad-based, encourages the belief that formerly recognized limits can be discounted, that everyone can look forward to prosperity, and, as in recent instances, that the West can be counted upon to provide assistance, rescue, and an escape valve for excess population. The perception of new opportunity, whether due to technological advance, expanded trade, political change, foreign aid, moving to a richer land, or the disappearance of competitors (who move away or die), encourages larger family size. Families eagerly fill any apparently larger niche, and the extra births and consequent population growth often overshoot actual opportunity.

**Talk about a “population crisis” is only an excuse by capitalists to preserve their system of socioeconomic domination.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. 875)

‘The God that failed’ in the image of technological omnipotence is now revarnished and shown around again under the umbrella of universal ‘ecological concern.’ Ten years ago ecology could be safely ignored or dismissed as totally irrelevant. Today it must be grotesquely misrepresented and one-sidedly exaggerated so that people—sufficiently impressed by the cataclysmic tone of ecological sermons—can be successfully diverted from burning social and political problems. Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans (especially Latin Americans) should not multiply at pleasure—not even at God’s pleasure, if they are Roman Catholics—for lack of restraint might result in ‘intolerable ecological strains.’ That is, in plain words, it might even endanger the prevailing social relation of forces, the rule of capital. Similarly, people should forget all about the astronomical expenditure on armaments and accept sizeable cuts in their standard of living, in order to meet the costs of ‘environmental rehabilitation:’ that is, in plain words, the cost of keeping the established system of expanding waste-production well-oiled.

**AT: CAP LOWERS POPULATION**

**Development raises expectations for those in the third world, spurring population growth.**

**Abernethy, 94** (Virginia, Virginia School of Medicine, The Atlantic Monthly, “Optimism and Overpopulation”)

In sum, it is true, if awkward, that efforts to alleviate poverty often spur population growth, as does leaving open the door to immigration. Subsidies, windfalls, and the prospect of economic opportunity remove the immediacy of needing to conserve. The mantras of democracy, redistribution, and economic development raise expectations and fertility rates, fostering population growth and thereby steepening a downward environmental and economic spiral.

**Economic growth leads to decreased infant mortality, increasing population growth.**

**Tobias, 98** (Michael, assistant professor of Environmental Studies at Dartmouth, “Population and the Biosphere at the End of the Millennium,” p. 179)

Life expectancy in Kenya has attained virtually the highest level in all of Africa – fifty-nine – up from a mere thirty-five in 1948 – and the infant mortality rate (IMR) is less than seventy per thousand, as compared with 262 in 1962. But these figures are also bound to slip downward as the economic crisis continues to worsen. Already, the IMR appears to be going up in the slums and poorest provinces.

### AT: CAP LOWERS POPULATION

**Economic growth will not solve overpopulation—global models are rarely relevant to local conditions.**

**Abernethy, 94** (Virginia, Virginia School of Medicine, The Atlantic Monthly, “Optimism and Overpopulation”)

The idea that economic development is the key to curbing world population growth rests on assumptions and assertions that have influenced international aid policy for some fifty years. These assumptions do not stand up to historical or anthropological scrutiny, however, and the policies they have spawned have contributed to runaway population growth. The human capacity for adaptive response evolved in face-to-face interactions. Humanity's strong suit is quick response to environmental cues -- a response more likely to be appropriate when the relevant environment is immediate and local. The mind's horizon is here and now. Our ancestors evolved and had to succeed in small groups that moved around relatively small territories. They had to succeed one day at a time -- or not be anyone's ancestors. So, unsurprisingly, signals that come from the local environment are powerfully motivating.

**Economic development not key to fertility—women's rights are a stronger factor.**

**Abrams, 96** (Laura, Associate Professor, Northwestern School of Law of Lewis & Clark College – 1996, Cornell International Law Journal, “Reservations About Women: Population Policy and Reproductive Rights”, 29 Cornell Int'l L.J. 1)

In the last decade, numerous studies have shown that, while reduction of birth rates presents complex economic, social, and political issues, the most consistent factor in reducing birth rates is meaningful change in the legal and social status of women.<sup>58</sup> In particular, education of and economic participation by women are the key factors affecting reproductive behavior.<sup>59</sup> Women who can only find status and security in society through children will continue to have many children no matter how many birth control pills are distributed.<sup>60</sup> As far back as the early 1970s, a U.N. commissioned study of over seventy countries concluded that there is a strong correlation between women's status and reproductive behavior: "The exercise of the right to determine the number and spacing of children can have a direct impact on the woman's exercise of her economic rights."<sup>61</sup> Employment opportunities increase status and necessarily decrease the desire to gain status from having children.

## **AT: INDIA & CHINA PROVE GLOBALIZATION GOOD**

**India and China laid the foundation for economic expansion behind high barriers—their most powerful examples are not really a result of globalization.**

**Wade, 04** (Robert Hunter, professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science, “Is Globalization Reducing Poverty and Inequality?”)

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/DESTIN/pdf/Isglobreducing.pdf>)

Certainly many countries – including China and India – have benefited from their more intensive engagement in international trade and investment over the past one of two decades. But this is not to say that their improved performance is largely due to their more intensive external integration. They began to open their own markets after building up industrial capacity and fast growth behind high barriers. In addition, throughout their period of so-called openness they have maintained protection and other market restrictions that would earn them a bad report card from the World Bank and IMF were they not growing fast. China began its fast growth with a high degree of equality of assets and income, brought about in distinctly nonglobalized conditions and unlikely to have been achieved in an open economy and democratic polity. Their experience – and that of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan earlier – shows that countries do not have to adopt liberal trade policies in order to reap large benefits from trade. They all experienced relatively fast growth behind protective barriers; a significant part of their growth came from replacing imports of consumption goods with domestic production; and more and more of their rapidly growing imports consisted of capital goods and intermediate goods. As they became richer they tended to liberalize their trade – providing the basis for the misunderstanding that trade liberalization drove their growth. For all the Bank study’s qualifications (such as “We label the top third ‘more globalized’ without in any sense implying that they adopted pro-trade policies. The rise in trade may have been due to other policies or even to pure chance”), it concludes that trade liberalization has been the driving force of the increase in developing countries’ trade. “The result of this trade liberalization in the developing world has been a large increase in both imports and exports,” it says. On this shaky basis the Bank rests its case that developing countries must push hard toward near-free trade as a core ingredient of their development strategy, the better to enhance competition in efficient, rent-free markets. Even when the Bank or other development agencies articulate the softer principle – trade liberalization is the necessary direction of change but countries may do it at different speeds – all the attention remains focused on the liberalization part, none on how to make protective regimes more effective. In short, the Bank’s arguments about the benign effects of globalization on growth, poverty and income distribution does not survive scrutiny at either end. And a recent cross-country study of the relationship between openness and income distribution strikes another blow.

## AT: UTILITARIANISM

**Utilitarianism means you vote neg – structurally impossible to achieve greatest happiness for the greatest number under capitalism.**

**Meszaros 95** (*Beyond Capital*, [www.marxists.org/archive/meszaros/works/beyond-capital/ch03-2.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/meszaros/works/beyond-capital/ch03-2.htm))  
A great deal has been written about the so-called ‘naturalistic fallacy’ … in the long run’.

A great deal has been written about the so-called ‘naturalistic fallacy’ concerning ‘pleasure’ and the ‘desirable’ in utilitarian discourse. However, the real fallacy of utilitarian philosophy – fully embraced in one form or another by the representatives of marginal utility theory – is to talk about ‘the greatest happiness of the greatest number’ in capitalist society. For the suggestion that anything even remotely approaching the greatest happiness of the greatest number of human beings can be achieved under the rule of capital, without even examining let alone radically changing the established power relations, constitutes a **monumental vacuous assumption**, whatever the subjective intentions of the major utilitarian philosophers behind it. Marginal utility theory, instead of acting in this respect as a corrective to Bentham and Mill, makes everything worse by asserting not only that it is possible to maximise every individual’s utility within the established framework of production and distribution, but also that the desired maximisation is actually being accomplished in the ‘normal’ processes of self-equilibrating capitalist economy.

## AT: SIMON

**Simon fails to evaluate the ecological consequences of resource use.**

**Trainer, '01** (F.E., author, "Natural Capitalism Cannot Overcome Resource Limits," *Minnesotans for Sustainability*, [http://www.mnforsustain.org/trainer\\_fe\\_simon\\_lovins\\_critique.htm](http://www.mnforsustain.org/trainer_fe_simon_lovins_critique.htm), Accessed 07-17-08)

Simon's core logic is simply to analyse solely in terms of previous dollar cost trends. "Historical trends are the best basis for predicting the trends of future costs." (1981, p. 27.) Both Simon's main books examine data on resource, energy, land etc. costs and find that in virtually all cases costs have fallen continuously, meaning that they have been becoming less scarce. This is taken to be a sufficient case for the claim that scarcities will not be encountered in the future. The insufficiency of this general approach would seem to require little demonstration. Firstly the evaluation of some of the most urgent limits to growth concerns does not directly involve dollar cost calculations, most obviously regarding whether or not the greenhouse problem or the loss of biodiversity are becoming critical, or whether our ecological footprint is unsustainable. More importantly, often the concern is that there might be good reasons for believing that the future will be radically different from the past. This is especially so with respect to petroleum supply (see below.) In general the appropriate considerations are to do with our understanding of the systems in question and with whether or not these involve factors likely to make the future unpleasantly unlike the past. In many areas there are good reasons to think the future will indeed be quite different from the past, and in general Simon [fails] flails to deal adequately with these considerations.

**AT: LOVINS**

**Resources are finite – Lovins et. al don't assume the energy costs of service based economies.**

**Trainer, '01** (F.E., author, "Natural Capitalism Cannot Overcome Resource Limits," *Minnesotans for Sustainability*, [http://www.mnforsustain.org/trainer\\_fe\\_simon\\_lovins\\_critique.htm](http://www.mnforsustain.org/trainer_fe_simon_lovins_critique.htm), Accessed 07-17-08)

Understandably Hawken, Lovins and Lovins focus their case on those industries and instances where the most spectacular gains can be made. These tend to be in manufacturing, transport, lighting and space heating. However 70-80% of rich world national economic activity is within the service sector and the prospects for reductions in resource use here are less abundant. Certainly there is scope for significant reduction in lighting and space heating but consider the production and maintenance of short life-time business machinery and the associated rate of scrapping of integrated materials in items such as computer circuits, the provision of inks and toners, paper (given that the computerised office has not led to large reductions in paper use), lifts, catering and cleaning and the considerable energy costs associated with the need for frequent servicing of high tech office equipment. Even purely knowledge-based services such as auditing, economic analysis, insurance, banking, legal services and consulting bring with them a large cost in offices, equipment and especially travel, both to work each day and to overseas conferences and consultations. It should therefore not be surprising that services actually account for 27% of the energy used in the Australian economy, despite its heavy reliance on agriculture, mining and transport. (Common, 1995.) Care needs to be taken regarding full accounting here; for example much energy in the service sector is electrical, so the primary energy going into electricity generation should be tallied.)

## AFF: ALT NEVER SPILLS OVER

**Radical environmental models come off as an imperialistic threat to the economic survival of poorer nations. Reform is the best solution.**

**Roszak, 92** (Theodore Roszak, professor emeritus of history at California State University. "The Voice of the Earth," p. 28)

Sad to say, Third World distrust of the industrial superpowers has begun to spread beyond governments and corporations to become broadcast hostility toward Western ecologists generally. In 1991, the World Resources Institute along with other environmental groups spoke out against plans by the Chinese government to increase the nation's use of coal. The director of science at Greenpeace joined in on the condemnation, describing China's decision as possibly "the final deadly puff of greenhouse gasses" that would irreversibly alter the world's climate. He may have been right, but two Indian economists were quick to respond to the criticism as "environmental colonialism." Metaphorically referring to the planet's CO<sub>2</sub> "sinks" (the oceans and the forests) as a sort of global recycling bank, they correctly observed that the rich Western nations (especially the "filthy five" that include the United States) are vastly "overdrawn." Not so the Third World nations: they have "credits" to their carbon dioxide accounts. "These nations should be lauded for keeping the world in balance because of their parsimonious consumption despite the Western rape and pillage of the world's resources." Similarly, Ramachandra Guha, an Indian critic of the Western Deep Ecology movement, believes the goals of "the conservation elite" – biodiversity, steady state economic policy, wilderness preservation – amount to little more than a new imperialism. Trace out the full economic implications of measures like game preserves for endangered species, and they entail "a direct transfer of resources from the poor to the rich." In the underdeveloped nations, sheer survival is the paramount order of the day; equity and social justice head the economic agenda. In these conditions of privation, it makes little moral sense to speak of nature having "an intrinsic right to exist." "Deep Ecology," Gulta charges, "runs parallel to the consumer society without seriously questioning its ecological and socio-political basis." The best contributor the industrial nations can make to world environmental policies is to attend to their own overconsumption and curtail their military spending. Beyond that, let the Third World set its own economic priorities.

**The alternative is hopeless--ideological changes will never spill over and even if they do, ideas alone are inadequate to change society.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 11-12)

Many eco-radicals hope that a massive ideological campaign can transform popular perceptions, leading both to a fundamental change in lifestyles and to large-scale social reconstruction. Such a view is highly credulous. The notion that continued intellectual hectoring will eventually result in a mass conversion to environmental monasticism (Roszak 1979:2891-marked by vows of poverty and nonprocreation-is difficult to accept. While radical views have come to dominate many environmental circles, their effect on the populace at large has been minimal. Despite the greening of European politics that recently gave stalwarts considerable hope, the more recent green plunge suggests that even the European electorate lacks commitment to environmental radicalism. In the United States several decades of preaching the same ecoradical gospel have had little appreciable effect; the public remains, as before, wedded to consumer culture and creature comforts. The stubborn hope that nonetheless continues to inform green extremism stems from a pervasive philosophical error in radical environmentalism. As David Pepper (1989) shows, most eco-radical thought is mired in idealism: in this case the belief that the roots of the ecological crisis lie ultimately in ideas about nature and humanity. As Dobson (1990:37) puts it: "Central to the theoretical canon of Green politics is the belief that our social, political, and economic problems are substantially caused by our intellectual relationship with the world" (see also Milbrath 1989:338). If only such ideas would change, many aver, all would be well. Such a belief has inspired the writing of eloquent jeremiads; it is less conducive to designing concrete strategies for effective social and economic change. It is certainly not my belief that ideas are insignificant or that attempting to change others' opinions is a futile endeavor. If that were true I would hardly feel compelled to write a polemic work of this kind. But I am also convinced that changing ideas alone is insufficient. Widespread ideological conversion, even if it were to occur, would hardly be adequate for genuine social transformation. Specific policies must still be formulated, and specific political plans must be devised if those policies are ever to be realized.

## AFF: CAPITALISM INEVITABLE

**Capitalism is utterly inevitable—the left only looks crazy when they focus on Marxism over practical reforms.**

**Wilson, 2000** – Author of many books including ‘The Myth of Political Correctness’ – 2000 (John K. Wilson, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People” p. 7- 10)

Socialism is dead. Kaput. Stick a fork in Lenin's corpse. Take the Fidel posters off the wall. Welcome to the twenty-first century. Wake up and smell the capitalism. I have no particular hostility to socialism. But nothing can kill a good idea in America so quickly as sticking the "socialist" label on it. The reality in America is that socialism is about as successful as Marxist footwear (and have you ever seen a sickle and hammer on anybody's shoes?). Allow your position to be defined as socialist even if it isn't (remember Clinton's capitalist health care plan?), and the idea is doomed. Instead of fighting to repair the tattered remnants of socialism as a marketing slogan, the left needs to address the core issues of social justice. You can form the word socialist from the letters in social justice, but it sounds better if you don't. At least 90 percent of America opposes socialism, and 90 percent of America thinks "social justice" might be a good idea. Why alienate so many people with a word? Even the true believers hawking copies of the Revolutionary Socialist Worker must realize by now that the word socialist doesn't have a lot of drawing power. In the movie Bulworth, Warren Beatty declares: "Let me hear that dirty word: socialism!" Socialism isn't really a dirty word, however; if it were, socialism might have a little underground appeal as a forbidden topic. Instead, socialism is a forgotten word, part of an archaic vocabulary and a dead language that is no longer spoken in America. Even Michael Harrington, the founder of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), didn't use the word socialism in his influential book on poverty, *The Other America*. The best reason for the left to abandon socialism is not PR but honesty. Most of the self-described "socialists" remaining in America don't qualify as real socialists in any technical sense. If you look at the DSA (whose prominent members include Harvard professor Cornel West and former Time columnist Barbara Ehrenreich), most of the policies they urge—a living wage, universal health care, environmental protection, reduced spending on the Pentagon, and an end to corporate welfare—have nothing to do with socialism in the specific sense of government ownership of the means of production. Rather, the DSA program is really nothing more than what a liberal political party ought to push for, if we had one in America. Europeans, to whom the hysteria over socialism must seem rather strange, would never consider abandoning socialism as a legitimate political ideology. But in America, socialism simply isn't taken seriously by the mainstream. Therefore, if socialists want to be taken seriously, they need to pursue socialist goals using nonsocialist rhetoric. Whenever someone tries to attack an idea as "socialist" (or, better yet, "communist"), there's an easy answer: Some people think everything done by a government, from Social Security to Medicare to public schools to public libraries, is socialism. The rest of us just think it's a good idea. (Whenever possible, throw public libraries into an argument, whether it's about good government programs or NEA funding. Nobody with any sense is opposed to public libraries. They are by far the most popular government institutions.) If an argument turns into a debate over socialism, simply define socialism as the total government ownership of all factories and natural resources—which, since we don't have it and no one is really arguing for this to happen, makes socialism a rather pointless debate. Of course, socialists will always argue among themselves about socialism and continue their internal debates. But when it comes to influencing public policy, abstract discussions about socialism are worse than useless, for they alienate the progressive potential of the American people. It's only by pursuing specific progressive policies on nonsocialist terms that socialists have any hope in the long term of convincing the public that socialism isn't (or shouldn't be) a long-dead ideology.

## AFF: CAPITALISM INEVITABLE

**The question of reform of capitalism versus revolution is irrelevant—revolution is never going happen so reform is the only hope.**

**Wilson, 2000** (John K, coordinator of the Independent Press Association's Campus Journalism Project, *How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People*, page 123)

The left often finds itself stuck in a debate between revolution and reform. To self-described revolutionaries, any attempt to reform the system is a liberal compromise that only delays the creation of a socialist utopia. The vision of workers casting off their chains and embracing the overthrow of capitalism is pure fantasy. No one actually knows what it means to overthrow capitalism, and it clearly isn't going to happen, anyway. Reforming American capitalism is not a halfhearted effort at modest change; it is a fundamental attack on the reigning ideology of "free market" capitalism. Progressive reforms, taken seriously, are revolutionary in every important sense. Reforms such as the New Deal were truly revolutionary for their time, and American capitalism has been saved from its own flaws by these progressive reforms. The problem is that these progressive reforms have not been carried far enough, in part because the revolutionary left has too often failed to support the progressives' reformist agenda. The only leftist revolution in America will come from an accumulation of progressive policies, and so the question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant.

## AFF: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Apocalyptic predictions about the ills of capitalism will not motivate activism—practical reforms are the only hope for the left.**

**Wilson, 2000** – Editor and Publisher of Illinois Academe – 2000 (John K. Wilson, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People” p. 14- 15)

Leftists also need to abandon their tendency to make apocalyptic predictions. It's always tempting to predict that environmental destruction is imminent or the stock market is ready to crash in the coming second Great Depression. Arguments that the U.S. economy is in terrible shape fly in the face of reality. It's hard to claim that a middle-class American family with two cars, a big-screen TV, and a computer is oppressed. While the poor in America fell behind during the Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton era and the middle class did not receive its share of the wealth produced during this time, the economy itself is in excellent shape. Instead, the problem is the redistribution of wealth to the very rich under the resurgence of "free market" capitalism. Instead of warning that the economy will collapse without progressive policies, the left should emphasize that the progressive aspects of American capitalism have created the current success of the American economy after decades of heavy government investment in human capital. But the cutbacks in investment for education and the growing disparity between the haves and the have-nots are threatening the economy's future success.

**Capitalism is inevitable and can be turned into a force for liberation as long as progressives focus on practical reforms.**

**Wilson, 2000** – Editor and Publisher of Illinois Academe – 2000 (John K. Wilson, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People” p. 12- 14)

Progressive capitalism is not a contradiction in terms, for progressives support capitalism in many ways. Even nonprofit organizations and cooperatives are not antithetical to capitalism and the market; these groups simply use capitalism for aims different from the single-minded pursuit of profits. But the rules of supply and demand, the expenses and revenues, the idea of entrepreneurship and innovation, and the need to adapt to the market are essential. Any progressive magazine or institution that tries to defy the rules of capitalism won't be around for very long and certainly won't have the resources to mount a serious advocacy of progressive ideas. One of the most effective tactics of the environmental movement was encouraging consumers to consider environmental values when making capitalist choices about what products to buy. Today, a manufacturer who ignores environmental issues puts its profits at risk because so many people are looking for environmentally friendly products and packaging. Crusades against Coca-Cola for its massive output of non-recycled plastic bottles in America or against companies supporting foreign dictatorships are part of the continuing battle to force companies to pay attention to consumer demands. Of course, consumer protests and boycotts are only one part of making “capitalism for everyone.” Many progressive groups are now buying stock in companies precisely to raise these issues at stockholder meetings and pressure the companies to adopt environmentally and socially responsible policies. Unfortunately, the legal system is structured against progressive ideas. In 2000, Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream was forced to sell out to a big corporation that might ignore its commitment to many progressive causes. The company didn't want to sell, but the law demanded that the company's duty to stockholders was to consider only the money involved. Imagine what would happen if our capitalist laws were designed to promote progressive ideas instead of impeding them. Instead of allowing a shareholder lawsuit against any company acting in a morally, socially, and environmentally conscious way, American laws should encourage these goals. The claim by some leftists that capitalism is inherently irresponsible or evil doesn't make sense. Capitalism is simply a system of markets. What makes capitalism so destructive isn't the basic foundation but the institutions that have been created in the worship of the “free market.” Unfortunately, progressives spend most of their time attacking capitalism rather than taking credit for all the reforms that led to America's economic growth. If Americans were convinced that social programs and investment in people (rather than corporate welfare and investment in weaponry) helped create the current economic growth, they would be far more willing to pursue additional progressive policies.

## AFF: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Capitalism is inevitable—talking about revolution just makes the left look foolish and cedes the political sphere to the right.**

**Wilson, 2000** (John K, coordinator of the Independent Press Association's Campus Journalism Project, *How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People*, pages 14-17)

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

**Radicalism alienates progressive allies.**

**Wilson, 2000** (John K, coordinator of the Independent Press Association's Campus Journalism Project, *How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People*, pages 29-30)

Democracy didn't fail the left; it simply hasn't been tried yet. Progressives should be skeptical of abandoning the public and imagining that they can take power by following in the footsteps of the right, that is, by using money and influence peddling to try to get their way. As many gays who dumped large amounts of money into Democratic coffers learned, progressive policies cannot win in a corrupt system. It's difficult for progressives to write and speak to a broad audience when it's nearly impossible for most of them to reach anyone other than fellow leftists. Because writers and speakers adapt their message to a particular audience, it was only natural for progressives to seek out a rhetoric comfortable for other progressives, even if it wasn't the most persuasive message to send out to a larger group. Such rhetoric, however, has made it even harder for progressives to seek out a mainstream audience and create a convincing message for the wider public. Instead, the left has descended into more and more internal bickering about its ideological goals, all the while losing the real war for the hearts and minds of Americans.

## AFF: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Environmental pragmatism is the only way to connect with the public.**

Lewis 94 (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 18-19)

Finally, where radical greens often emphasize philosophical (or even spiritual) purity, this work stresses pragmatic gains. Since the anarchic utopianism that marks the dominant strains of radical environmentalism stands little chance of gaining public acceptance, much less of creating a feasible alternative economy, an emphasis on the purity of ideals can lead only to the frustration of goals. I would suggest that a pragmatic approach stands a much better chance of accomplishing our shared ends. The prospect of humankind someday coexisting easily with the earth's other inhabitants—a vision entertained by Arcadian and Promethean environmentalists alike—can best be achieved through gradual steps that remain on the track of technological progress.

**Broad coalitions are key to environmental sustainability—radicalism ensures failure.**

Lewis 94 (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 22-23)

If we are to preserve the earth, environmentalists must forge the broadest possible coalition. Major changes need to be made in public policy, changes that will require massive public support. That support can only be obtained by appealing to a centrist coalition. Yet at present, the large center ground of American voters, those who find merit in appeals both to economic efficiency and to social justice and environmental protection, is largely without an articulated platform. Party stalwarts, let alone radicals, often regard moderates with contempt, viewing them as ideological weaklings unwilling to take a stand. I would argue the opposite. If we are to take seriously the task of devising a sustainable future, it is essential to admit that worthwhile ideas may be found on both sides of this overdrawn political divide.

**Moderate leftism is the only way to convince large numbers of people to save the environment.**

Lewis 94 (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 25-26)

I will continue to argue, however, that a liberal-moderate stance offers the best hope for breaking the ideological impasse that currently paralyzes American society. Radical change is necessary, but I believe that it can come about only through concerted efforts to effect compromise and to seek broad-based conciliation. Unfortunately, the emergence of the social consensus needed to effect change appears unlikely. Ours seems to be an age of contention and separation, of sharpening ideological cleavages and widening socioeconomic divisions. Nor do many people seem adequately concerned over this state of affairs. Many conservatives are happy to see a growing rift between the rich and the poor, justifying it in the name of international competitiveness. And many radical leftists, for their part, revel in a culture of diversity in which it is assumed that people from different class or racial backgrounds are virtually unable to communicate, let alone agree. As long as such conditions prevail, ecological and economic catastrophe grows ever more likely.

## AFF: CEDE THE POLITICAL

**Moderate reforms that attract broad support are the only way to save the environment.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 250-251)

In conclusion, environmentalism's challenge must be more than to criticize society and imagine a blissful alternative. On the contrary, the movement must devise realistic plans and concrete strategies for avoiding ecological collapse and for reconstructing an ecologically sustainable economic order. To do so will entail working with, not against, society at large. The best hope I see is through a new alliance of moderates from both the left and the right-a coalition in which moderate conservatives continue to insist on efficiency and prudence, and where liberals forward an agenda aimed at social progress and environmental protection, but in which both contingents are willing to compromise in the interests at a common nation and, ultimately, a common humanity. The environmental reforms necessary to ensure planetary survival will require the forging of such a broad-ranging political consensus- By thwarting Its development, eco-radicalism undermines our best chance at salvaging the earth-offering instead only the peace of mind that comes from knowing that one's own ideology is ecologically and politically pure. It is time for the environmental movement to recognize such thinking for the fantasy that it is. We must first relinquish our hopes for utopia if we really wish to save the earth. Promethean Environmentalism is not simply a watered down, compromised form of the radical doctrine. Although its concrete proposals and its philosophical positions are consistently at odds with those of eco-radicalism (see the appendix), its ultimate purpose is in fact the same: to return the surface of the earth to life, to life in all its abundance, diversity, and evolutionary potential. Prometheans maintain, however, that for the foreseeable future we must actively manage the planet to ensure the survival of as much biological diversity as possible.

**Radical environmentalism causes public backlash that destroys the movement.**

**Lewis, 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Pages 6-7)

The most direct way in which eco-extremists threaten the environment is simply by fueling the anti-environmental counter-movement. When green radicals like Christopher Manes (1990) call for the total destruction of civilization, many begin to listen to the voices of reaction. Indeed, the mere linking of environmental initiatives to radical groups such as Earth First! often severely dampens what would otherwise be widespread public support (see Gabriel 1990:64) As radicalism deepens within the environmental movement , the oppositional anti-ecological forces accordingly gain strength. The Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, a think tank for the so-called wise use movement has for example, recently published a manifesto calling for such outrages as the opening of all national parks to mineral production, the logging of all old-growth forests, and the gutting of the endangered species act. This group's ideologies contend that certain environmental philosophies represent nothing less than mental illness, a theory anonymously propounded in the "intellectual ammunition department" of their *Wise Use Memo* (Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, 1990:2) Even more worrisome is the fact that a former high-ranking CIA agent is now spreading rumors that environmental scientists are presently attempting to concoct a virus that could destroy humankind (See "Tale of a Plot to Rid Earth of Humankind," San Francisco Examiner, April 14, 1991: A-2). My fear is that if green extremism captures the environmental movement's upper hand, the public would be much less likely to recognize such a claim as paranoid fantasy, while a handful of eco-radicals would be happy to destroy humanity, such individuals also reject science and thus would never be able to act on such convictions.

**AFF: CEDE THE POLITICAL, TRAINER SPECIFIC**

**Trainer admits his argument would destroy mainstream environmentalism – any reason why this is good is a disad to the alternative.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 7-8)

Obviously this book's message is not a pleasant one for people in the Green Movement and I am acutely aware of the damage it would do to the general environmental cause if it were taken seriously. Environmental activists have great difficulty getting the public in general to respond to environmental issues, even when they pose no significant challenges to the lifestyles and systems of consumer society. Almost all environmental activists seem to be oblivious to the contradiction built into their thinking. They are in effect saying, “Please help us save the planet by calling for a switch to the use of renewable energy sources — which can sustain consumer society and will pose no threat to our obsession with affluent lifestyles and economic growth.” Even getting people to attend to such unthreatening messages is very difficult. So how much more difficult would it be to get people to listen to the claim that to save the environment we have to cut consumption by perhaps 90%, and give up fossil fuels – and renewables cannot substitute for them? Given that I have been part of the Green Movement for decades, I realise that green goals could be significantly undermined if the theme of this book became widely discussed, let alone generally accepted. The most immediate effect would be a surge in support for nuclear energy (despite the case against it given in Chapter 9).

## AFF: REFORMS EFFECTIVE

**The EPAs track record proves that capitalism can be reformed.**

**Walberg and Bast, '03** (Herbert J. Walberg, distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution, and Joseph L. Bast, president of the Heartland Institute, *Education and Capitalism: How Overcoming Our Fear of Markets and Economics Can Improve America's Schools*, "Chapter Five: Nine Myths About Capitalism,"

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/2995211.html>, Accessed 07-17-08)

In the United States, the environment is unequivocally becoming cleaner and safer. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), total air pollution emissions in the United States fell 34 percent between 1970 and 1990.<sup>40</sup> Particulate-matter emissions fell by 60 percent, sulfur oxides by 25 percent, carbon monoxide by 40 percent, and lead by 96 percent. Between 1987–1992 and 1994–1999, the number of bad-air days (when air quality failed to meet federal standards) fell 82 percent in Newark, 54 percent in Los Angeles, 78 percent in Chicago, and 69 percent in Milwaukee.<sup>41</sup> Total emissions of air pollutants tracked by the EPA are forecast to fall by 22 percent between 1997 and 2015 (assuming there are no new air-quality regulations) thanks to reductions in tailpipe emissions for most types of vehicles (already down 96 percent or more since 1978) and cleaner fuels. According to the EPA, water quality also has improved, and in some cases dramatically so.<sup>42</sup> Sports fishing has returned to all five of the Great Lakes, the number of fishing advisories has fallen, and a debate has started concerning the scientific basis of many of the remaining advisories. According to the Council on Environmental Quality, levels of PCBs, DDT, and other toxins in the Great Lakes fell dramatically during the 1970s and continued to fall (at a slower rate) during the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>43</sup> The number of wooded acres in the United States has grown by 20 percent in the past twenty years. The average annual wood growth in the United States today is three times what it was in 1920.<sup>44</sup> In Vermont, for example, the area covered by forests has increased from 35 percent a hundred years ago to about 76 percent today.<sup>45</sup> In the four states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York, there are 26 million more acres of forest today than there were at the turn of the century.<sup>46</sup> As a result of this re-greening of America, wildlife is enjoying a big comeback. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, breeding populations of bald eagles in the lower 48 states have doubled every six or seven years since the late 1970s. In 1994, there were more than 4,000 active nests, five times the number reported in 1974.<sup>47</sup>

## AFF: PERMUTATION

**Radical socialism still requires fuel—renewables will be the energy needed by the alternative.**

**The Socialist, 03** (The Socialist Party, “Global Warming: How Capitalism puts our planet at risk”, Pete Dickenson, <http://www.socialistparty.org.uk/2003/323/index.html?id=pp6.htm>)

The main advantage to the environment of a socialist society though would be its ability to plan and implement, consistently over a long period, the measures needed to reduce and then completely eliminate greenhouse gases. This would involve putting in the investment needed to switch to renewable energy sources, such as wind, wave and solar power and to develop new technologies such as hydrogen cells, which could play an important role.

**The permutation solves best—renewables will inevitably be part of the world of the alternative.**

**Bjonne, 04** (Roar Ramesh Bjonne, co-founder of Center for Sustainable Villages, freelance writer. “The End of Fossil Fuel: Crisis and Opportunity”

[http://www.sentientimes.com/04/feb\\_mar\\_04/fossile\\_fuel.htm](http://www.sentientimes.com/04/feb_mar_04/fossile_fuel.htm))

The energy problem is not just a problem of energy; it is a problem endemic to our wasteful way of life, to corporate capitalism, to our reductionist and materialist worldview, to our lack of an ecological ethics, and, most importantly, lack of political leaders guided by perennial ethics and wisdom. For some renewable energy experts, though, the goal is simple: create an abundance of cheap and clean energy from renewable sources to replace fossil fuel. Jeremy Rifkin claims that the hydrogen economy is the answer, and that it is “within sight.” Hydrogen, he writes, is abundant, it will soon be cheap to produce, and it will, by its very nature, decentralize and democratize the energy web and help shape a whole new society formed around bioregions. Paul Hawken and Amory Lovins, authors of Natural Capitalism, claims we need a new industrial revolution based on more energy efficient products, the elimination of waste, and on investing in natural capital. For others, the changes needed are much more complex and far-reaching: produce cheap and clean energy, yes, but, more importantly, to reorganize our whole economy and dramatically change our lifestyle and our worldview.

Trainer, an advocate of this school of thought, claims there is no scientific, quick fix to this global problem. He promotes a dramatically new economy based on The Simpler Way: less luxury consumption, self-sufficient regions, local economic independence and cooperatives. Otherwise, we are likely to end up with a hybrid system of haves and have-nots: a few rich countries and corporations will own and profit from the renewable energy grid, while the poor are still poor and polluted, fighting over the dirty crumbs from the fossil fuel age. P.R. Sarkar’s PROUT (Progressive Utilization Theory) outlines such an emerging economy in more detail: a three-tiered, decentralized structure, global political cooperation, a guaranteed minimum living standard and a maximum income, an economy driven not by profit but by production for human needs, dynamic balance between economic output and environmental needs, maximum utilization of resources (closed loop industries, “cradle to cradle” industrial designs), international barter trade, and much more. In addition, Sarkar extends the spiritual perspective of traditional peoples, and the world’s mystical traditions, by maintaining that we all belong to Nature. Moreover, that Nature and the Pure Consciousness that created Her are inseparable. Thus, he declares, the Earth is the common inheritance of all: people, plants and animals. Energy, water, soil, sun light, therefore, does not belong to anyone—especially not to the rich, nor to the corporations. Thus a fundamental tenet of the new energy economy, according to Sarkar’s principles, is that these resources must be respectfully shared and appropriately utilized by all.

The ideas promoted by Rifkin, Sarkar, Trainer, Hawken and Lovins, although very different, are quite complimentary. We need a new environmental ethics; hydrogen must undoubtedly be part of the new economy; industrial innovation and investing in natural capital is important in order to keep the biosphere in tact; a simpler lifestyle is vital in order to reduce consumption and waste; a three-tiered restructuring of the economy is a radical new way to balance the ingenuity of individual enterprise with cooperation and collective human needs; finally, all this must be balanced with the welfare of nature. An alternative energy society will thus consist of both high and low technology, both personal lifestyle/worldview changes as well as radical structural changes to the economy: non-polluting hydrogen cars and public transportation, walking and bicycling to work and for shopping, computer and machine parts that are 100 percent recyclable, locally produced food (even in urban areas), energy efficient houses made of local raw materials (wood, straw, sand, clay, glass) that produce more renewable energy than they use, a cooperative economy with less working hours, a dramatic reduction in consumerism, frugality and self-sufficiency, and more time for recreation, family, friends, spirituality, and fun.

## AFF: PERMUTATION

**Revolution will never happen over night—progressive policies need to be built upon over time.**  
**Wilson, 2000** (John K, coordinator of the Independent Press Association's Campus Journalism Project, *How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People*, pages 121-123)

Progressives need to be pragmatic in order to be powerful. However, pragmatism shouldn't be confused with Clintonian centrism and the abandonment of all substance. Pragmatists have principles, too. The difference between a pragmatic progressive and a foolish one is the willingness to pick the right fights and fight in the right way to accomplish these same goals. The current failure of progressivism in America is due to the structure of American politics and media, not because of a wrong turn that the movement took somewhere along the way. What the left needs is not a "better" ideology but a tactical adaptation to the obstacles it faces in the contemporary political scene. A pragmatic progressivism does not sacrifice its ideals but simply communicates them better to the larger public. The words we use shape how people respond to our ideas. It's tempting to offer the standard advice that progressives should present their ideas in the most palatable form. But palatable to whom? The media managers and pedestrian pundits who are the intellectual gatekeepers won't accept these ideas. By the time progressives transform their ideas into the political baby food necessary for inclusion in current debates, it barely seems to be worth the effort. Leftists need to seize the dominant political rhetoric, even though it may be conservative in its goals, and turn it in a progressive direction. Progressives need to use the antitax ideology to demand tax cuts for the poor.

Progressives need to use the antigovernment and antiwelfare ideology to demand the end of corporate welfare. Progressives need to translate every important issue into the language that is permissible in the mainstream. Something will inevitably be lost in the translation. But the political soul underlying these progressive ideas can be preserved and brought to the public's attention. The left does not need to abandon its progressive views in order to be popular. The left only needs to abandon some of its failed strategies and become as savvy as the conservatives are at manipulating the press and the politicians. The language of progressives needs to become more mainstream, but the ideas must remain radical. In an age of soulless politicians and spineless ideologies, the left has the virtue of integrity. Until progressives become less self-satisfied with the knowledge that they're right and more determined to convince everyone else of this fact, opportunities for political change will not be forthcoming. Progressives have also been hampered by a revolutionary instinct among some leftist groups. According to some left wingers, incremental progress is worthless—that is, nothing short of a radical change in government will mean anything to them. Indeed, for the most radical left wingers, liberal reforms are a threat to the movement, since they reduce the desire for more extreme changes. What the revolutionaries fail to realize is that progressive achievements can build on one another. If anything approaching a political revolution actually happens in America, it will be due to a succession of popular, effective, progressive reforms.

**The permutation solves—historical examples prove that incremental reforms can be built into revolutions.**

**Dixon, No Date** (Accessed 9 July 2008, Chris, Activist and founding member of Direct Action Network , "Reflections on Privilege, Reformism, and Activism"  
[http://www.geocities.com/kk\\_abacus/ioaa/dixon2.html](http://www.geocities.com/kk_abacus/ioaa/dixon2.html))

To bolster his critique of 'reformism,' for instance, he critically cites one of the examples in my essay: demanding authentic we need revolutionary strategy that links diverse, everyday struggles and demands to long-term radical objectives, without sacrificing either. Of course, this isn't to say that every so-called 'progressive' ballot initiative or organizing campaign is necessarily radical or strategic. Reforms are not all created equal. But some can fundamentally shake systems of power, leading to enlarged gains and greater space for further advances. Andre Gorz, in his seminal book Strategy for Labor, refers to these as "non-reformist" or "structural" reforms. He contends, "a struggle for non-reformist reforms--for anti-capitalist reforms--is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be." Look to history for examples: the end of slavery, the eight-hour workday, desegregation. All were born from long, hard struggles, and none were endpoints. Yet they all struck at the foundations of power (in these cases, the state, white supremacy, and capitalism), and in the process, they created new prospects for revolutionary change. Now consider contemporary struggles: amnesty for undocumented immigrants, socialized health care, expansive environmental protections, indigenous sovereignty. These and many more are arguably non-reformist reforms as well. None will single-handedly dismantle capitalism or other systems of power, but each has the potential to escalate struggles and sharpen social contradictions. And we shouldn't misinterpret these efforts as simply meliorative incrementalism, making 'adjustments' to a fundamentally flawed system.

## AFF: ECON DECLINE RISKS EXTINCTION

### Economic decline risks extinction.

**Bearden, 2000** [Tom, Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army, June 24, <http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3aa9f7f22e23.htm>]

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China—whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States—attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

### Economic collapse causes extinction.

**Zey, 98** (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 33-34)

As we have seen, history attest to the fact that any society that maintains the belief in progress will have a better chance of achieving its goals than a society without it. As other nation's have come to understand the effect of such a concept on the West's success, they, too, have internalized the concept of progress and made it their own! The Imperative of Growth Having reached its current lofty point of development, the species will not choose to regress. The fact that the species is forging its way en masse into the Macroindustrial Era proves our need to grow is almost a genetically based predisposition. The species innately understands there can be no turning back on the road of progress. However, no outside force guarantees the continued progress of the human species, nor does anything mandate that the human species must even continue to exist. In fact, history is littered with races and civilizations that have disappeared without a trace. So, too, could the human species. There is no guarantee that the human species will survive even if we posit, as many have, a special purpose to the species' existence. Therefore, the species innately comprehends that it must engage in purposive actions in order to maintain its level of growth and progress. Humanity's future is conditioned by what I call the Imperative of Growth, a principle I will herewith describe along with its several corollaries. The Imperative of Growth states that in order to survive, any nation, indeed, the human race, must grow, both materially and intellectually. The Macroindustrial era represents growth in the areas of both technology and human development, a natural stage in the evolution of the species' continued extension of its control over itself and its environment. Although 5 billion strong, our continued existence depends on our ability to continue the progress we have been making at higher and higher levels. Systems, whether organizations, societies, or cells, have three basic directions in which to move. They can grow, decline, or temporarily reside in the state of equilibrium. These are the choices. Choosing any alternative to growth, for instance, stabilization of production/consumption through zero-growth policies, could have alarmingly pernicious side effects, including extinction.

**AFF: ECON DECLINE RISKS EXTINCTION**

**Continued economic growth is key to human survival.**

**Zey, 98** [Michael, executive director of the Expansionary Institute and professor at Montclair State University School of Business, Seizing the Future, p.34]

However, no outside force guarantees the continued progress of the human species, nor does anything mandate that the human species must even continue to exist. In fact, history is littered with races and civilizations that have disappeared without a trace. So, too, could the human species. There is no guarantee that the human species will survive even if we posit, as many have, a special purpose to the species' existence. Therefore, the species innately comprehends that it must engage in purposive actions in order to maintain its level of growth and progress. Humanity's future is conditioned by what I call the Imperative of Growth, a principle I will herewith describe along with its several corollaries. The Imperative of Growth states that in order to survive, any nation, indeed, the human race, must grow, both materially and intellectually. The Macroindustrial Era represents growth in the areas of both technology and human development, a natural stage in the evolution of the species' continued extension of its control over itself and its environment. Although 5 billion strong, our continued existence depends on our ability to continue the progress we have been making at higher and higher levels. Systems, whether organizations, societies, or cells, have three basic directions in which to move. They can grow, decline, or temporarily reside in a state of equilibrium. These are the choices. Choosing any alternative to growth, for instance, stabilization of production/consumption through zero-growth policies, could have alarmingly pernicious side effects, including extinction.

### AFF: AT: CAP COLLAPSE INEVITABLE

**Market innovation will outpace scarcity—their authors incorrectly assume that demand and supply are static.**

**Norberg, 03** (Johan Norberg, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “In Defense of Global Capitalism”, p. 223)

It is a mistake, then, to believe that growth automatically ruins the environment. And claims that we would need this or that number of planets for the whole world to attain a Western standard of consumption—those “ecological footprint” calculations—are equally untruthful. Such a claim is usually made by environmentalists, and it is concerned, not so much with emissions and pollution, as with resources running out if everyone were to live as we do in the affluent world. Clearly, certain of the raw materials we use today, in present day quantities, would not suffice for the whole world if everyone consumed the same things. But that information is just about as interesting as if a prosperous Stone Age man were to say that, if everyone attained his level of consumption, there would not be enough stone, salt, and furs to go around. Raw material consumption is not static. With more and more people achieving a high level of prosperity, we start looking for ways of using other raw materials. Humanity is constantly improving technology so as to get at raw materials that were previously inaccessible, and we are attaining a level of prosperity that makes this possible. New innovations make it possible for old raw materials to be put to better use and for garbage to be turned into new raw materials. A century and a half ago, oil was just something black and sticky that people preferred not to step in and definitely did not want to find beneath their land. But our interest in finding better energy sources led to methods being devised for using oil, and today it is one of our prime resources. Sand has never been all that exciting or precious, but today it is a vital raw material in the most powerful technology of our age, the computer. In the form of silicon—which makes up a quarter of the earth's crust—it is a key component in computer chips. There is a simple market mechanism that averts shortages. If a certain raw material comes to be in short supply, its price goes up. This makes everyone more interested in economizing on that resource, in finding more of it, in reusing it, and in trying to find substitutes for it.

**AFF: AT: CAP COLLPASE INEVITABLE**

**Capitalism is sustainable—consumerism may have an upper limit but efficiency gains will be critical to saving the environment.**

Lewis 94 (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Pages 10-11)

While the global economy certainly cannot grow indefinitely in volume by pouring out an ever mounting cavalcade of consumer disposables, it can continue to expand in value by producing better goods and services ever more efficiently. As I shall argue repeatedly throughout this work, economic growth of this type is absolutely essential. Only a strongly expanding economic base can generate the capital necessary to retool our economy into one that does not consume the earth in feeding itself. Ecological sanity will be expensive, and if we cannot pay the price we may well perish. This proposition is even more vital in regard to the Third World; only steady economic expansion can break the linkages so often found in poor nations between rural desperation and land degradation. Genuine development, in turn, requires both certain forms of industrialization as well as participation in the global economy.

## AFF: ALT KILLS MILLIONS

**Socialism is inherently totalitarian—transitioning now would kill millions.**

**Rockwell, 08** [Llewellyn, president of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism, 5/17, <http://mises.org/story/2982>]

Whatever the specifics of the case in question, socialism always means overriding the free decisions of individuals and replacing that capacity for decision making with an overarching plan by the state. Taken far enough, this mode of thought won't just spell an end to opulent lunches. It will mean the end of what we all know as civilization itself. It would plunge us back to a primitive state of existence, living off hunting and gathering in a world with little art, music, leisure, or charity. Nor is any form of socialism capable of providing for the needs of the world's six billion people, so the population would shrink dramatically and quickly and in a manner that would make every human horror ever known seem mild by comparison. Nor is it possible to divorce socialism from totalitarianism, because if you are serious about ending private ownership of the means of production, you have to be serious about ending freedom and creativity too. You will have to make the whole of society, or what is left of it, into a prison. In short, the wish for socialism is a wish for unparalleled human evil. If we really understood this, no one would express casual support for it in polite company. It would be like saying, you know, there is really something to be said for malaria and typhoid and dropping atom bombs on millions of innocents.

**De-development would require a massive human die-off.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 25-26)

No one acquainted with the rudiments of medical history could deny that health has vastly improved since the industrial revolution. Most of the credit for such amelioration belongs precisely to the medical, dietary, and sanitary advances associated with the transition to industrialism. One has only to examine average longevity, which stood in the United States at a miserable forty-seven years as recently as 1900, to grasp the magnitude of progress over this period. If we go back to medieval Europe, socio-ecological idyll of many eco-radicals, we find that in some villages average life spans were as low as seventeen to eighteen years (Cohen 1989: 1241). By other indices as well, the health standards of most pre-industrial regimes were atrocious. Again, consider medieval and early modern Europe. As Braudel (1981:91) relates, the ancient regime was characterized by "very high infant mortality, famine, chronic under-nourishment, and formidable epidemics." Moreover, non-elite Europeans were contaminated by a wide variety of toxins on a regular basis. Few even experienced the delights of breathing clean air, for the atmospheres of their own dwellings were horribly polluted. It is difficult ... to comprehend," writes Norman Pounds (1989:1871) "how fetid and offensive must have been the air about most cottages and homes." Indeed, indoor air pollution has long been (as it perhaps still is) a greater contributor to respiratory illness than industrial airborne waste. But the most severe toxic pollution problem of the pre-modern world was associated with natural poisons produced by molds infecting the food supply. "Everyone suffered from food that was tainted," Pounds reminds us, "and the number who died of food-poisoning must have been immense (1089:213). Especially pronounced where rye was the staple food poison produced by the ergot and Fusarium molds massively suppressed immune systems, reduced fertility levels, brought on delusions and sometimes mass insanity, and reduced blood circulation to such an extent that gangrene in the lower extremities was commonplace (Matossian 1989:1). Even where the food supply was safe, poor nutrition resulted in widespread immunological stress. Infectious diseases were rife, and periodic plagues would decimate most populations in a cruel manner. Water supplies, especially in towns, were so contaminated by human waste as to become deadly in their own right. Skin and venereal diseases were often rife and difficult, if not impossible, to cure. Other scourges abounded, including those such as leprosy that have been virtually eliminated by modern medicines and sanitary techniques. Individuals deformed by genetic inheritance or accident typically led short and brutal lives. And every time a woman went into labor she faced a very high risk of dying. This cursory review of the horrors of pre-industrial European life may seem a pointless exercise in overkill; all of this is, or at least used to be, common knowledge. But it is important to recall in detail the kind of social environment many eco-radicals would seek to recreate. And were we to adhere strictly to the tenets of bioregionalism, even the levels of prosperity achieved in the medieval world would be difficult if not impossible to maintain without first experiencing a truly massive human die off.

## AFF: ALT KILLS MILLIONS

**Radical environmentalism justifies killing billions of people in the name of curbing pollution.**

**Reisman, 07** [George, professor emeritus of economics at Pepperdine University, The Arithmetic of Environmentalist Devastation, <http://www.mises.org/story/2591>]

The public embrace of a movement as dreadfully destructive as environmentalism brings to mind the rush to embrace Hitler and the Nazi Party in the Germany of 1932 and 1933, once their victory at the polls seemed to become inevitable, and then once they actually came to power. However the views of serious people, who hold their views first-hand, based on their own, independent judgment, do not change merely because the views of others have changed. Nazism was a catastrophe. Environmentalism has the potential to be an even greater catastrophe—a far greater catastrophe than Nazism: one that will result in the deaths of billions rather than millions. This is because it is the diametric opposite of economic liberalism on a global scale. In contrast to liberalism and its doctrine of the harmony of the rightly understood self-interests of all men, environmentalism alleges the most profound conflict of interests among people. It implies that there is a major economic benefit to be obtained through the death of billions of fellow human beings, that, indeed, the well-being and prosperity of the survivors depends on the extermination of those billions. Thus, for example, from the depraved perspective of environmentalism, if global carbon dioxide emissions equal to 25 percent of present emissions were to disappear, because those responsible for them ceased to exist, there would be no need for the global cutback in emissions urged by the Stern Review, and thus no need for any diminution in economic well-being on the part of the survivors (provided, of course, their number did not increase). If still more emissions could be eliminated by the elimination of still more people, there would be room for actual economic improvement among the survivors, according to environmentalism. Obviously, the magnitude of mass murder that is invited is the greater, the greater is the alleged need to curb carbon dioxide emissions.

## AFF: WORST GOVERNMENTS IN HISTORY

**Leftist revolutions have produced some of the worst human suffering in history.**

**Peretz, 03** (Martin, Former Assistant Professor at Harvard, Editor-in Chief of The New Republic, "Manque", The New Republic, February 3, lexis)

What is the grand "progressive" vision for which the French left fights, which the Zionists and Jews are insidiously holding back? In the grand conflicts of the last century, there was always a left-wing structure of Manichaeanism. On the one side: imperialism and capitalism. On the other: a compelling and revolutionary dream. The dreams turned out to be nightmares. But they were dreams, nonetheless. Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Castro, Che, the Viet Cong, the Sandinistas, always a man and a movement saying they aimed to build a better world, which they actually tried to describe. In the end, of course, the better world did not arrive: In its place were death camps, mass deportations, forced famines, massacres, reeducation programs, prisons of the body, and greater prisons of the soul.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES WAR

**Studies prove that globalization and capitalism lessen the frequency and intensity of war.**

**Griswold, 05** (Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at Cato, "Peace on earth? Try free trade among men", <http://www.freetrade.org/node/282>)

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital.

**Capitalism encourages international cooperation that fosters peace.**

**Bandow, 05** (Doug, Senior Fellow at Cato, "Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace", [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=5193](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5193))

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets. The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism. But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets. An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanuel Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems. Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends. Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, "liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight." In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels." Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences. Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.

**AFF: CAP SOLVES WAR**

**History demonstrates that growth is key to peace, combating disease, and environmental sustainability.**

Silk, 96 [Leonard, Professor at Pace University, Making Capitalism Work, p. 27-28]

Theoretically there was no reason why this had to be so. In a rational world, the improved prospects for peace should have led to greater spending on consumer goods and productivity raising investment. But that happens only when workers can be shifted to new jobs--and financial resources reallocated to create those jobs. In the absence of sufficient shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there were strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons--conventional as well as dual-use nuclear technology--wherever buyers could be found. Without a revival of national economies and of the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons would continue, creating more Iraqs, Cambodias, Yugoslavias, and Somalias-or worse. Like the Great Depression, the economic slump of the early 1990s fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic, and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship was not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravated all of them, and in turn they fed back upon economic development. They also undermined efforts to deal with such global programs as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS, and other plagues. Economic growth would not solve all those problems. But growth--and growth alone--creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more open economies and societies.

## AFF: TECH SAVES US

**New technologies will result in an eco-friendly food supply.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 146-147)

As advances in biotechnology make agriculture more efficient, large tracts of land can be progressively returned to nature. Similarly, intensive greenhouse cultivation, relying on high-tech glass construction, advanced atmospheric chemical control, and perhaps even the use of molecular antifungal agents, could increase food supplies while at the same time tremendously diminishing the extent of land needed for food production (Drexler and Peterson 1991:175). Yet some American politicians appear to rule out such possibilities beforehand, assuming that increasing production will only translate into larger commodity gluts (Sagoff 1991:353). Certainly the biotechnology revolution will require a difficult set of adjustments, for American farmers, but only an anti-environmentalist would automatically rule out the possibility of reducing the extent of land monopolized by agriculture. Agricultural gluts represent political, not technological, failure. Advanced techniques in food science, especially those concerned with enzyme production and protein synthesis, may also offer substantial environmental benefits. Especially desirable is the development of palatable, vegetable based meat substitutes. If soy burgers become indistinguishable from, and less expensive than, the genuine product, we could expect widespread cutbacks in meat consumption, allowing us to liberate vast tracts of land from agricultural production. Such environmental benefits would, however, be impossible to realize if consumers were to take at face value the eco-radical tenet that artificial products are to be avoided in all instances.

**Growth creates cleaner technologies that are the best hope for the environment.**

**Zey, 98** [Michael, executive director of the Expansionary Institute and professor at Montclair State University School of Business, Seizing the Future, p.36-37]

Third, growth itself contains the solutions to the problems it produces. Supporting this principle is the World Bank's 1992 report "Development and the Environment," which blatantly states that growth is a powerful antidote to a number of ills plaguing Third World countries, including the pollution that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, the resulting prosperity also facilitates the developments of technologies that lead to cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about \$4000 in 1993 dollars, it produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it can afford technology like catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as Eastern Europe can be traced to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure environmental safety "we need a sound economy on a global basis." So the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth. The World Bank estimated that every dollar invested in developing countries will grow to \$100 in fifty years. As that happens, these countries can take all the necessary steps to invest in pollution-free cars, catalytic converters, and other pollution-free technologies, such as the cleanest of all energy sources, nuclear power.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES TERRORISM

**Free markets solve the poverty that is the root cause of terrorism.**

**Griswold, 04** (Daniel T., associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, "Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy," *Cato Institute*, January 6, <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-026es.html>, Accessed 07-17-08)

Nowhere is the connection between trade and democracy more important than in the Middle East and the broader Muslim world. Democracy, full respect for human rights, and open markets are all relatively rare in that part of the world. According to Freedom House, the Middle East and Muslim-majority countries in general suffer “a democracy gap”: Although three-quarters of non-Muslim countries around the world are democracies, only one-quarter of Muslim countries freely elect their leaders.<sup>21</sup> Among countries with Muslim majorities, only two—Mali and Senegal—are classified by Freedom House as “Free,” respecting the full civil and political liberties of their citizens. More than half of the countries in the world rated as “Not Free” in 2002 were majority Muslim.<sup>22</sup> At the same time, the Middle East is one of the most economically closed and least integrated regions of the world. Average tariff barriers in the Arab Middle East are among the highest in the world, and as a consequence the region suffers from chronically declining shares of global trade and investment. The resulting political and economic stagnation, in turn, breeds frustration and hopelessness that can make young people especially vulnerable to recruitment by terrorists and religious extremists. As an auxiliary to the war on terrorism, Congress and the administration should open the U.S. market to farm and manufactured products from qualified Middle Eastern and other Muslim countries. Meanwhile, the administration should negotiate, and Congress should approve, comprehensive free trade agreements with willing Middle Eastern and other Muslim countries, such as the existing agreement with Jordan and those already in the pipeline with Morocco and Bahrain. An economically open and dynamic Middle East would create opportunity for young people entering the workforce and expand the economically independent middle class, thus encouraging democracy and discouraging terrorism.

**Economic liberalization stops terrorism.**

**Lindsey, 03** (Brink, director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, "The Trade Front Combating Terrorism with Open Markets," *The Cato Institute*, August 5, <http://www.freetrade.org/node/39>, Accessed 07-17-08)

Now, in the midst of a struggle against terrorism that will likely continue for many years, the national security dimension of trade policy is once again plainly visible. It has become painfully clear that Americans live in a dangerous world—and that the primary danger at present emanates from the economic and political failures of the Muslim world. Those failures breed the despair on which violent Islamist extremism feeds; no comprehensive campaign against terrorism can leave them unaddressed. Promoting economic and political reform throughout the Muslim world has become an urgent priority for U.S. foreign policy—and trade liberalization, while no panacea, is an important part of the equation.

## AFF: CAP KEY TO SPACE, SPACE GOOD

### Growth key to space exploration.

Zey, 98 (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 20)

Nothing typifies the changes wrought in the Macroindustrial Era more than humanity's extension into and domination of both the inner and outer reaches of physical space. In its quest to improve both the species and the universe, humanity has begun to challenge and conquer outer space. Even now countries are planning joint missions to Mars and the moon to establish permanent space colonies. Robotic spacecraft missions are probing deeper into the outer regions of the Solar System and beyond. This penetration of outer space, the increased liberation of humanity from its home planet, will be a major landmark of the emerging Macroindustrial Era. However, the extension of humankind's spatial influence is not exclusively relegated to interplanetary travel. This process includes exploring and controlling the inner reaches of space.

### Space expansion facilitates cooperation that solves war.

Zey, 98 (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 89-90)

As we will see, the exigencies of space exploration will compel nations to achieve a high level of cooperation. Because space projects need talent, resources, and knowledge from a variety of cultures, the entire space enterprise seems to be the one area of human endeavor that genuinely requires continual international coordination. The technological advances necessary for space exploration and colonization are just too daunting for any single nation to undertake alone, and Russia, the United States, and Europe have already admitted as much. It is curious just how cordial and accommodating presidents, prime ministers, and premiers can be when they conference over space matters. Those in power, examining closely the need for space exploration, realize they must suppress inclinations to subvert or antagonize the other participating parties to ensure the success of space projects.

### Space key to solve overpopulation.

Zey, 98 (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 90)

Zero population growth proponents consistently fret that a rampant population increase will eventually lead to global overcrowding. Although this does not appear to be an immediate danger, they contend, eventually the species will have to confront the possibility that we will simply run out of room for comfortable habitation. The exploration and colonization of other spheres potentially offers limitless possibilities for the numerical growth of the human species. Ironically, as the species begins to migrate and establish settlements, the complaint may arise that we simply have too few people to populate these new worlds and staff the jobs in interstellar cities.

### AFF: CAP SOLVES FAMINE

**Growth key to solve famine – expands land usage.**

**Zey, 98** (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 161)

The green revolution itself demonstrates the extent to which the human species has expanded its control over nature and its products. Miraculously, these great increases in the world food supply in recent decades have brought humanity to the point where only 2 percent of the world's population suffers from hunger. According to the U.N., the number of malnourished people in poor countries has dropped by 150 million over two decades, and much of the remaining hunger and malnutrition results more from wars and capricious governmental policies than agricultural shortfalls. As the Macroindustrial Era evolves, the species will completely eliminate the scarcity of food. Farmers have barely scratched the surface of the available food-raising resources: Some experts claim that scientists are using less than half of the Earth's arable land and only a minute part of the water supply to irrigate dryer land. That dry crop land, about one-fourth of the globe's total acreage, ultimately will be made arable by macroengineering irrigation projects.

### AFF: CAP SOLVES NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE

**Growth key to solve North-South divide.**

**Zey, 98** (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 23-24)

One of the defining characteristics of the Macroindustrial Era will be the expansion of the scope of both production and consumption to global proportions. The benefits of the Macroindustrial Era will not be limited to the West or the North, but will expand to all regions, making terms like the Third World or the industrialized sector obsolete. These countries will be equal contributors to the progress of the species. This will occur not because sentiments of benevolence overwhelm the current group of “haves,” but because the current Third World countries will become part of the global economic group as producers, workers, and consumers. The developing countries realize that in order to participate permanently in the emerging prosperity they must develop the skills that this Era requires. They can then exchange these skills on the world market for money and goods, thereby building their own base of wealth. They are well on their way to accomplishing this goal.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES DISEASE

### Growth solves disease.

**Zey, 98** (Michael G. Professor of management in the School of Business Administration at Montclair State University and executive director of the Expansionary Institute. Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era. Second Edition. Page 120)

In this chapter we will encounter medical and technological breakthroughs – genetic therapy, superdrugs, fetal surgery, and cell and molecular repair – that are helping society extend the life span and improve the quality of our physical existence. The advances are as striking as any of the Macroindustrial Era, and their implications are revolutionary. Genetics and the Assault on Disease Increasingly, we are discovering that our medical fate lies in our genes. Once we achieve the ability to diagnose medical problems at the genetic level and replace faulty genes with healthy ones, we will eradicate a great number of diseases before they ever start. The onset of what has been labeled the “genetic age” of medical research will revolutionize medicine and help us increase life expectancy and minimize human suffering.

## AFF: CAP KEY TO DEMOCRACY & RIGHTS

**Free trade spreads democracy and human rights.**

**Griswold, 04** (Daniel T., associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, "Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy," *Cato Institute*, January 6, <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-026es.html>, Accessed 07-17-08)

In the aftermath of September 11, the foreign policy dimension of trade has reasserted itself. Expanding trade, especially with and among less developed countries, is once again being recognized as a tool for encouraging democracy and respect for human rights in regions and countries of the world where those commodities have been the exception rather than the rule. Political scientists have long noted the connection between economic development, political reform, and democracy. Increased trade and economic integration promote civil and political freedoms directly by opening a society to new technology, communications, and democratic ideas. Economic liberalization provides a counterweight to governmental power and creates space for civil society. And by promoting faster growth, trade promotes political freedom indirectly by creating an economically independent and politically aware middle class. The reality of the world today broadly reflects those theoretical links between trade, free markets, and political and civil freedom. As trade and globalization have spread to more and more countries in the past 30 years, so too have democracy and political and civil freedoms. In particular, the most economically open countries today are more than three times as likely to enjoy full political and civil freedoms as those that are relatively closed.

**Recent decades prove that free trade increase freedoms – prefer history to vague theory.**

**Griswold, 04** (Daniel T., associate director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, "Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy," *Cato Institute*, January 6, <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-026es.html>, Accessed 07-17-08)

The reality of the world today broadly reflects those theoretical links between trade, free markets, and political and civil freedom. As trade and globalization have spread to more and more countries in the last 30 years, so too have democracy and political and civil freedoms. In particular, people who live in countries that are relatively open to trade are much more likely to live in democracies and enjoy full civil and political freedoms than those who live in countries relatively closed to trade. Nations that have followed a path of trade reform in recent decades by progressively opening themselves to the global economy are significantly more likely to have expanded their citizens' political and civil freedoms. The recent trend toward globalization has been accompanied by a trend toward greater political and civil liberty around the world. In the past 30 years, cross-border flows of trade, investment, and currency have increased dramatically, and far faster than output itself. Trade barriers have fallen unilaterally and through multilateral and regional trade agreements in Latin America; the former Soviet bloc nations; East Asia, including China; and more developed nations as well. During that same period, political and civil liberties have been spreading around the world.

## AFF: ALT WORSE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

**The inherent pluralism of capitalism is the only way to have environmental movements. The alternative will re-create governments that have been much worse for the environment.**

**Roszak, 92** (Theodore Roszak, professor emeritus of history at California State University. "The Voice of the Earth," p. 34)

As destructive as the market economics have been in their treatment of the environment, we now know that the social economies have an even worse history. Glasnost has revealed a blasted landscape stretching from the Danube to the Bering Sea. As far as we know, no one spoke out against the devastation; few knew it was taking place. It is not that socialism inherently more anti-environmental than capitalism; rather its political organization has been far more effective in beating down all forms of resistance to centralized power. Left-wing politics, born to a hard, exclusive, and angry focus on issues of social justice, never encouraged the creation of an environmental agenda; worse still, the dictatorial methods of its leaders never allowed others freedom to take up the cause. A society like Stalin's Russia, willing to exterminate its own people by the million, was hardly apt to fret for the well-being of the nation's lakes and forests. In contrast, the capitalist West has provided sufficient pluralistic space to allow an environmental movement to must effective resistance. In a world of harsh political realities and imperfect choices, this is no small virtue. Making use of that pluralism to open a searching, worldwide reappraisal of urban-industrial values is one of the great environmental benefits we stand to gain from the end of the cold war. If the Earth can be said to have an interest in our ideological contretemps, this is it.

**Dismantling capitalism would increase pollution because the efficiencies of economies of scale would be lost.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 7)

More frightening, and more immediate, is the specter of a few radicals actually opposing necessary environmental reforms. Such individuals conclude that "reform environmentalism" is "worse than useless because by correcting short-term symptoms it postpones the necessary reconstruction of the entire human relationship with the natural world" (Nash 1989: I 50). From here it is a short step to argue that reform would only forestall an ecological apocalypse-which some evidently believe is a necessary precondition for the construction of an environmentally benign social order. The insanity of pushing the planet even closer to destruction in order to save it in the future should be readily apparent. While such are the fantasies only of the most moonstruck extremists, even moderate radicals (if one may be permitted the oxymoron) espouse an ideology that would preclude the development of an ecologically sustainable economy. Most environmentalists, for instance, aver that a sustainable economy must be based on solar power. Yet the radicals' agenda calling for total decentralization, deurbanization, economic autarky, a ban on most forms of high technology, and the complete dismantling of capitalism would not only prevent future improvements in solar power but would actually destroy the gains that have already been made.

While most radical greens embrace "appropriate technologies" (just as anti-environmentalists denounce "pollution"), their programs would, if enacted, undercut the foundations of all technological research and development. Appropriate technology, in fact, often turns out to mean little more than well-engineered medieval apparatuses: we may expect crude mechanical power from the wind, but certainly not electricity from the sun. Equally important, the systematic dismantling of large economic organizations in favor of small ones would likely result in a substantial increase in pollution, since few small-scale firms are able to devise, or afford, adequate pollution abatement equipment.

## AFF: ALT WORSE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

**Multiple nations prove that socialism is far worse for the environment than capitalism, especially in terms of energy consumption.**

Lewis 94 (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 146-147)

The easiest defense of capitalism is to simply contrast it with existing and recently existing examples of Marxian socialism. As is now abundantly clear, Marxism's record is dismal on almost every score, be it economic, social, or environmental. These failures cannot be dismissed as errant quirks; Marxian regimes have come to power in numerous countries, and everywhere the results have been disheartening. From impoverished African States like Mozambique, Ethiopia, Guinea, Madagascar, and the Congo to highly industrialized, once-prosperous European countries like the former East Germany and Czechoslovakia, all Marxist experiments have ended in disaster. Chapter six will address the failings of Marxism in the third world; the present discussion is concerned with the formerly communist industrial states of Eastern Europe. For convenience sake, the analysis focuses on the conditions that pertained before the democratic revolutions of the late 1980s and early 1990s. Radical greens admit that environmental conditions in Eastern Europe are as bad as those found in the west. But since admissions are far from adequate; by almost every measure, the communist environment is more severely degraded than the capitalist environment. Only with the recent downfall of Marxian regimes has the ecological debacle of the east come to light. As our knowledge increases, the environmental conditions of Eastern Europe are revealed as ever more horrific. And when one considers the poor performances of the economies that have wreaked such destruction the comparison between capitalism and communism becomes one-sided indeed. Although the general state of environmental devastation in Eastern Europe is now well known, a few specific examples are still in order. It is quite possible that the world's most industrially devastated landscape is that of Poland's Silesia, an area in which the soil is so lead-impregnated as to render farm products virtually poisonous. Nor are conditions much better in other Polish regions. Many Polish rivers are so filthy that their waters cannot even be used for industrial purposes. As Fischoff I 199 I: 13! reports, "by U.S. and European standards, the country has virtually no potable water." In Poland's industrial belt, air pollution, especially sulfur dioxide contamination, far exceeds anything found in the West. Many buildings in Cracow are simply melting away in an acid bath.

Devastation of similar magnitude may be found in many regions within the former Soviet Union. Latvia, for example, is burdened by many poorly regulated and constantly oozing toxic waste pits, and its Baltic shores are heavily contaminated with bacteria, heavy metals, and even chunks of phosphorus (in 1988 the Soviet army dropped 400 bombs containing 20 tons of phosphorus into the Baltic Sea [Burgelis n.d.:7]). The transformation of the once-rich Aral Sea into a shrunken, almost lifeless sump is now a virtual international emblem of the powers at human destructiveness (Kotlyakov 1991). Everywhere one looks the same stories recounting one ecological disaster after another. Equally telling are comparative figures on energy use. One of the principle reasons for Eastern Europe's environmental catastrophe is its appallingly inefficient use of energy. As *The Economist* (February 17, 1990) reports: "On average, the six countries of Eastern Europe...use more than twice as much energy per dollar of national income as even the more industrialized countries of western Europe. Poland, with some counts a GDP smaller than Belgium's, uses nearly three times as much energy, Hungary, whose GDP is supposedly only a fifth of Spain's, uses more than a third as much energy." Here one can appreciate the environmental consequences of an economy that has approached the vaunted steady-state; lacking economic vitality, the East has been found to retain an antiquated, inefficient, and highly polluting set of industrial plants. Factories have remained in operation that would have been shuttered decades ago in the West. The Dismal environmental conditions of the communist world stem from the political and economic structures implicit in Marxism and not, as academic Marxist apologists would have it, from either historical contingencies or the structural power of the capitalist world system.

## AFF: ALT WORSE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

**Socialism has produced terrible environmental results—both in the Soviet Union and on a smaller scale in the United States.**

**Rothbard, 78** [Murray, academic vice president of the Ludwig von Mises Institute and distinguished professor at UNLV, For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto, <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newliberty12.asp>]

There is, first of all, this stark empirical fact: Government ownership, even socialism, has proved to be no solution to the problem of pollution. Even the most starry-eyed proponents of government planning concede that the poisoning of Lake Baikal in the Soviet Union is a monument to heedless industrial pollution of a valuable natural resource. But there is far more to the problem than that. Note, for example, the two crucial areas in which pollution has become an important problem: the air and the waterways, particularly the rivers. But these are precisely two of the vital areas in society in which private property has not been permitted to function. First, the rivers. The rivers, and the oceans too, are generally owned by the government; private property, certainly complete private property, has not been permitted in the water. In essence, then, government owns the rivers. But government ownership is not true ownership, because the government officials, while able to control the resource cannot themselves reap their capital value on the market. Government officials cannot sell the rivers or sell stock in them. Hence, they have no economic incentive to preserve the purity and value of the rivers. Rivers are, then, in the economic sense, "unowned"; therefore government officials have permitted their corruption and pollution. Anyone has been able to dump polluting garbage and wastes in the waters. But consider what would happen if private firms were able to own the rivers and the lakes. If a private firm owned Lake Erie, for example, then anyone dumping garbage in the lake would be promptly sued in the courts for their aggression against private property and would be forced by the courts to pay damages and to cease and desist from any further aggression. Thus, only private property rights will insure an end to pollution-invasion of resources. Only because the rivers are unowned is there no owner to rise up and defend his precious resource from attack. If, in contrast, anyone should dump garbage or pollutants into a lake which is privately owned (as are many smaller lakes), he would not be permitted to do so for very long? the owner would come roaring to its defense.<sup>15</sup> Professor Dolan writes: With a General Motors owning the Mississippi River, you can be sure that stiff effluent charges would be assessed on industries and municipalities along its banks, and that the water would be kept clean enough to maximize revenues from leases granted to firms seeking rights to drinking water, recreation, and commercial fishing.<sup>16</sup> If government as owner has allowed the pollution of the rivers, government has also been the single major active polluter, especially in its role as municipal sewage disposer.

**Capitalism facilitates environmental protection – Soviet Russia proves.**

**Walberg and Bast, '03** (Herbert J. Walberg, distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution, and Joseph L. Bast, president of the Heartland Institute, *Education and Capitalism: How Overcoming Our Fear of Markets and Economics Can Improve America's Schools*, "Chapter Five: Nine Myths About Capitalism,"

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/2995211.html>, Accessed 07-17-08)

The record clearly shows environmental conditions are improving in every capitalist country in the world and deteriorating only in noncapitalist countries.<sup>36</sup> Environmental conditions in the former Soviet Union prior to that communist nation's collapse, for example, were devastating and getting worse.<sup>37</sup> Untreated sewage was routinely dumped in the country's rivers, workers were exposed to high levels of toxic chemicals in their workplaces, and air quality was so poor in many major cities that children suffered asthma and other breathing disorders at epidemic levels. Some environmentalists say it is unfair to compare environmental progress in a very affluent nation, such as the United States, to conditions in very poor nations, such as those in Africa. But it was the latter's rejection of capitalism that made those countries poor in the first place. Moreover, comparing the United States to developed countries with mixed or socialist economies also reveals a considerable gap on a wide range of environmental indicators. Comparing urban air quality and water quality in the largest rivers in the United States, France, Germany, and England, for example, reveals better conditions in the United States.<sup>38</sup> Emerging capitalist countries experience rising levels of pollution attributable to rapid industrialization, but history reveals this to be a transitional period followed by declining emissions and rising environmental quality.<sup>39</sup> There is no evidence, prior to its economic collapse, that conditions in the former Soviet Union were improving or ever would improve. There is no evidence today that many of the nations of Africa are creating the institutions necessary to stop the destruction of their natural resources or lower the alarming mortality and morbidity rates of their people.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES ENVIRONMENT

**Capitalism is key to environmental sustainability—wealth generates environmental protections.**  
**Taylor, 03** (Jerry, Director of natural resource studies at Cato, “Happy Earth Day? Thank Capitalism”, [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3073](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3073))

Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities, after all, are luxury goods. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between \$3,500 and \$15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammeled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it. Meanwhile, capitalism rewards efficiency and punishes waste. Profit-hungry companies found ingenious ways to reduce the natural resource inputs necessary to produce all kinds of goods, which in turn reduced environmental demands on the land and the amount of waste that flowed through smokestacks and water pipes. As we learned to do more and more with a given unit of resources, the waste involved (which manifests itself in the form of pollution) shrank. This trend was magnified by the shift away from manufacturing to service industries, which characterizes wealthy, growing economies. The latter are far less pollution-intensive than the former. But the former are necessary prerequisites for the latter. Property rights -- a necessary prerequisite for free market economies -- also provide strong incentives to invest in resource health. Without them, no one cares about future returns because no one can be sure they'll be around to reap the gains. Property rights are also important means by which private desires for resource conservation and preservation can be realized.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES ENVIRONMENT

**Only the wealth of capitalism can save the environment.**

**Goldberg, 2000** (Johan, editor-at-large of National Review Online, “Witness Earth Day,” *National Review Online*, April 24,

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NGM0YjAzNGYyMzg0NjhkZDVmNzE0ZWI2NjIyZDE4N2Q>, Accessed 07-17-08)

First, the environment is getting better. The air is cleaner, the water too. Species extinctions are declining and we haven't lost any really cute animals in a very long time. There are more trees in the US than there were in the 1920s. Vital resources are all getting cheaper. Food is abundant — despite the fact that people like Paul Ehrlich predicted that most surviving Americans would be eating human-foot stew by now. Capitalism is the fastest route to a clean environment. Remember: Rich people pass child-labor laws, Clean Air Acts, Clean Water Acts, Endangered Species Acts — because they can afford to. It is a fact that a person faced with the choice of not killing a rhino versus feeding his family will almost always choose feeding his family. Liberals believe that laws can trump necessity. This is very rarely the case. That's why America passed anti-child labor laws only after we got prosperous enough to be able to afford to send our kids to school rather than work.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES ENVIRONMENT

**Economic growth, free trade, and globalization are key to environmental protections—wealthier nations can afford regulations.**

**Norberg, 03** (Johan Norberg, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “In Defense of Global Capitalism”, p. 224)

Although multinational corporations and free trade are proving good for development and human rights in the Third World, there still remains the objection that globalization harms the environment. Factories in the Western world, the argument runs, will relocate to poorer countries with no environmental legislation, where they can pollute with impunity. The West has to follow suit and lower its own environmental standards in order to stay in business. That is a dismal thesis, with the implication that when people obtain better opportunities, resources, and technology, they use them to abuse nature. Does there really have to be a conflict between development and the environment? The notion that there has to be a conflict runs into the same problem as the whole idea of a race to the bottom: it doesn't tally with reality. There is no exodus of industry to countries with poor environmental standards, and there is no downward pressure on the level of global environmental protection. Instead, the bulk of American and European investments goes to countries with environmental regulations similar to their own. There has been much talk of American factories moving to Mexico since NAFTA was signed. Less well known, however, is that since free trade was introduced Mexico has tightened up its environmental regulations, following a long history of complete nonchalance about environmental issues. This tightening up is part of a global trend. All over the world, economic progress and growth are moving hand in hand with intensified environmental protection. Four researchers who studied these connections found “a very strong, positive association between our [environmental] indicators and the level of economic development.” A country that is very poor is too preoccupied with lifting itself out of poverty to bother about the environment at all. Countries usually begin protecting their natural resources when they can afford to do so. When they grow richer, they start to regulate effluent emissions, and when they have still more resources they also begin regulating air quality. A number of factors cause environment protection to increase with wealth and development. Environmental quality is unlikely to be a top priority for people who barely know where their next meal is coming from. Abating misery and subduing the pangs of hunger takes precedence over conservation. When our standard of living rises we start attaching importance to the environment and obtaining resources to improve it. Such was the case earlier in western Europe, and so it is in the developing countries today. Progress of this kind, however, requires that people live in democracies where they are able and allowed to mobilize opinion; otherwise, their preferences will have no impact. Environmental destruction is worst in dictatorships. But it is the fact of prosperity no less than a sense of responsibility that makes environmental protection easier in a wealthy society. A wealthier country can afford to tackle environmental problems; it can develop environmentally friendly technologies—wastewater and exhaust emission control, for example—and begin to rectify past mistakes.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES ENVIRONMENT

**Capitalism encourages conservation and efficiency that are the best way to protect the environment.**

**The worst environmental disasters in history were in non capitalist states.**

**Norberg, 03** (Johan Norberg, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, "In Defense of Global Capitalism", p. 235)

Very often, environmental improvements are due to the very capitalism so often blamed for the problems. The introduction of private property creates owners with long-term interests. Landowners must see to it that there is good soil or forest there tomorrow as well, because otherwise they will have no income later on, whether they continue using the land or intend to sell it. If the property is collective or government-owned, no one has any such long-term interest. On the contrary, everyone then has an interest in using up the resources quickly before someone else does. It was because they were common lands that the rain forests of the Amazon began to be rapidly exploited in the 1960s and 1970s and are still being rapidly exploited today. Only about a 10th of forests are recognized by the governments as privately owned, even though in practice Indians possess and inhabit large parts of them. It is the absence of definite fishing rights that causes (heavily subsidized) fishing fleets to try to vacuum the oceans of fish before someone else does. No wonder, then, that the most large-scale destruction of environment in history has occurred in the communist dictatorships, where all ownership was collective. A few years ago, a satellite image was taken of the borders of the Sahara, where the desert was spreading. Everywhere, the land was parched yellow, after nomads had overexploited the common lands and then moved on. But in the midst of this desert environment could be seen a small patch of green. This proved to be an area of privately owned land where the owners of the farm prevented overexploitation and engaged in cattle farming that was profitable in the long term. Trade and freight are sometimes criticized for destroying the environment, but the problem can be rectified with more efficient transport and purification techniques, as well as emissions fees to make the cost of pollution visible through pricing. The biggest environmental problems are associated with production and consumption, and there trade can make a positive contribution, even aside from the general effect it has on growth. Trade leads to a country's resources being used as efficiently as possible. Goods are produced in the places where production entails least expense and least wear and tear on the environment. That is why the amount of raw materials needed to make a given product keeps diminishing as productive efficiency improves. With modern production processes, 97 percent less metal is needed for a soft drink can than 30 years ago, partly because of the use of lighter aluminum. A car today contains only half as much metal as a car of 30 years ago.

## AFF: CAP SOLVES ENVIRONMENT

**Economic growth combined with environmental regulations are the only way to transition to renewables and address other environmental crises.**

**The Economist, 08** [How green is their growth, 1/24,  
[http://www.economist.com/world/international/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=10566738](http://www.economist.com/world/international/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10566738)]

Some new light has been cast by a team of researchers led by Daniel Esty of Yale University, who delivered their conclusions this week to the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. What they presented was the latest annual Environmental Sustainability Index, which grades the "environmental health" of 150 countries—using many indicators, from population stress and eco-system health to social and institutional capacity. This year's report focuses on the link between the state of the environment and human health. In a nutshell, what the new report (also sponsored by the European Commission and Columbia University) suggests is that poor countries have been quite right to challenge the sort of green orthodoxy which rejects the very idea of economic growth. Indeed, the single biggest variable in determining a country's ranking is income per head. But that doesn't imply that economic growth automatically leads to an improvement in the environment. The team's finding is that growth does offer solutions to the sorts of environmental woes (local air pollution, for example) that directly kill humans. This matters, because about a quarter of all deaths in the world have some link to environmental factors. Most of the victims are poor people who are already vulnerable because of bad living conditions, lack of access to medicine, and malnutrition (see article). Among the killers (especially of children) in which the environment plays a role are diarrhoea, respiratory infections and malaria. These diseases reinforce a vicious circle of poverty and hopelessness by depressing production.

According to the World Bank, the economic burden on society caused by bad environmental health amounts to between 2% and 5% of GDP. Mr Esty's analysis suggests that as poor countries get richer, they usually invest heavily in environmental improvements, such as cleaning up water supplies and improving sanitation, that boost human health. (Their economies may also shift gear, from making steel or chemicals to turning out computer chips.) But the link between growth and environmentally benign outcomes is much less clear, the study suggests, when it comes to the sort of pollution that fouls up nature (such as acid rain, which poisons lakes and forests) as opposed to directly killing human beings. The key to addressing that sort of pollution, Mr Esty argues, is not just money but good governance. A closer look at the rankings makes this relationship clearer. Of course it is no surprise that Switzerland fares better than Niger. But why is the poor Dominican Republic much healthier and greener than nearby Haiti? Or Costa Rica so far ahead of Nicaragua, whose nature and resources are broadly similar? And why is wealthy Belgium the sick man of western Europe, with an environmental record worse than that of many developing countries? A mixture of factors related to good government—accurate data, transparent administration, lack of corruption, checks and balances—all show a clear statistical relationship with environmental performance. Among countries of comparable income, Mr Esty concludes, tough regulations and above all, enforcement are the key factors in keeping things green. All this may be a helpful way of looking at pollution in the classic sense, but there is another factor that may upset all previous calculations about the relationship between growth and the state of the earth: climate change. Greenhouse emissions do not poison people, or lakes or woods, in the direct or obvious way that noxious chemicals do. But at least in the medium term, they clearly alter the earth in ways that harm the welfare of the poor. Paul Epstein of the Harvard Medical School says the impact both on nature and directly on humanity of global warming will swamp all other environmental factors. As alterations in the climate lead to mass migrations, epidemics will spread; as temperate zones warm up, tropical diseases like malaria will surge; storms will overwhelm sewer systems; heat waves will push ozone levels up. He may be right, but here too economic growth, coupled with good governance, may yet prove to be a source of solutions rather than problems. At the moment, perhaps 2 billion people have no formal access to modern energy—they make do with cow dung, agricultural residue and other solid fuels which are far from healthy. Unless foresight and intelligence are applied to the satisfaction of these people's needs, they may embrace the filthiest and most carbon-emitting forms of fossil-fuel energy as soon as they get the chance. A mixture of economic growth and transparent governance may offer the only chance of avoiding that disaster.

## AFF: CAP LOWERS POPULATION GROWTH

**History proves that advanced capitalism lowers population growth.**

**Richman, 95** (Sheldon is Senior Editor @ Cato Institute, The International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Act (S. 1029), July 20, <http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-ps720.html>, accessed 7/16/07)

The population controllers will credit that to their efforts (while complaining that not enough is being done). But there is a simpler explanation: as economies develop and people become better off materially, they have fewer children. That phenomenon, known as the demographic transition, is well established in demography. It explains what happened in the West, where today the fertility rate is 2.0 or lower--below replacement rate. The demographic transition makes perfect sense. In preindustrial, agricultural economies, children provide farm labor and social security (sons care for their elderly parents); children are wealth. In a developed economy, parents invest resources (for education and the like) in their children; they are an expense. As societies become Westernized, and as modern consumer goods and services become available, people find sources of satisfaction other than children. So they have fewer kids. A falling infant-mortality rate also reduces a society's fertility rate. Thus, a low fertility rate, writes Peter Bauer, is an effect, not a cause, of development.

**Economic growth increases female employment—this decreases birth rates.**

**Norville et al, 02** (Claire Norville, Rocio Gomez, Robert L. Brown, researchers at the University of Waterloo, "Some Causes of Fertility Rates Movements," [http://www.stats.uwaterloo.ca/stats\\_navigation/IIPR/2003Reports/03-02.pdf](http://www.stats.uwaterloo.ca/stats_navigation/IIPR/2003Reports/03-02.pdf))

John Ermisch's theory explains that the main cause of fertility movements is the increasing demand for female workers. The factors which can permanently influence a female's decision to work include: her husband's expected future earnings, her earning potential and changes in preferences in the household. Usually, female labor force participation is interrupted for short intervals during which they bear children. So, Ermisch's theory distinguished two groups of women: "workers" and "non-workers". The opportunity cost of having children is high. A child would demand more of the couples' time and lower the family's present income due to the loss of the wife's earnings. When the number of females in the labor force increases, fertility tends to decrease during times of economic growth. Ermisch explains in his theory that as more females choose to work most of their lives, the average age at first birth increases and the intervals between births decreases.

## AFF: CAP LOWERS POPULATION GROWTH

### Multiple countries prove that economic growth lowers birth rates.

**Dandapani, 03** (Vijay, guest contributor to Rediff (an Indian news agency), "Economic Growth is the Best Contraceptive," December 16, <http://www.rediff.com/money/2003/dec/16guest.htm>)

Rather than revive discredited 'Malthusianisms,' policy-makers in India ought to consider how economic growth in countries such as Thailand, Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan and South Korea among others has resulted in a dramatic lowering of the fertility bar, from very high levels in the 1950s and 1960s. Most of that was achieved with an emphatic focus on economic growth. The late development economist, Peter Bauer, an ardent advocate of the idea that aid in any form represented overwhelming condescension towards the Third World, went against the orthodoxy of his times by stressing that over-population was not the cause for poverty. He rightly noted that sub-Saharan Africa's population density was a tenth of Japan's. North Korea, a sparsely populated country, has a fertility rate of 1% that falls well below the replacement level. Its GDP growth rate is best left unmentioned. Instead of participating in discredited and possibly coercive population control incentives, a focus on global competitiveness is far more likely to achieve the much sought-after replacement fertility levels.

### Lack of economic development causes overpopulation.

**Khounsary, No Date** (Ali, PhD, US Department of Energy, "Overpopulation Reasons," <http://www.newton.dep.anl.gov/askasci/gen99/gen99814.htm>)

Perhaps one can say that the reason for what is termed "overpopulation" is lack of suitable economic opportunities, a condition that leads families to (perhaps correctly) consider having more children as a way to enhance their chances of survival. Some view the attempts at forceful control of the population in poorer areas, especially when proposed or sponsored by the affluent who now and in the past have benefit from that cheap labor, as disingenuous. Since we know that the balanced population growth in the wealthy nations was not the result of forceful population control but correlated well with economic prosperity, we may infer that the same could be true elsewhere. What we can do is to help (or as some would say pay our share) by providing reasonable economic vehicles to start up the economic growth that can lead to the emergence of an educated and productive populace who will find it in their interest to have fewer but more educated children.

### Economic development increased fertility in African nations.

**Abernethy, 94** (Virginia, Virginia School of Medicine, The Atlantic Monthly, "Optimism and Overpopulation")

The populations of Algeria, Zimbabwe, and Rwanda grew rapidly around the time colonial powers left. Algeria, for example, achieved independence in 1962, and thirty years later 70 percent of its population was under thirty years of age. Zimbabwe gained independence in 1980, and soon achieved one of the highest population-growth rates in the world; the growth was encouraged by the Health Minister, who attacked family planning as a "white colonialist plot" to limit black power. Because of their effect on family size, development programs entailing large transfers of technology and funds to the Third World have been especially pernicious. This kind of aid is inappropriate because it sends the signal that wealth and opportunity can grow without effort and without limit. That rapid population growth ensues should surprise no one. Africa, which in recent decades has received three times as much foreign aid per capita as any other continent, now also has the highest fertility rates. During the 1950s and 1960s the African fertility rate rose -- to almost seven children per woman -- at the same time that infant mortality was dramatically reduced, health-care availability grew, literacy for women and men became more widespread, and economic optimism pervaded more and more sectors of society.

**AFF: OVER-POPULATION DESTROYS THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Population growth is the root cause of environmental destruction.**

**Sachs, 05** (Jeffrey, professor of Economics at Columbia University, Environment News, “The Case of Slowing Population Growth,” 1/14/05,  
<http://www.namibian.com.na/2005/January/columns/058D10F68F.html>)

Land, water, energy, and biodiversity all seem to be under greater stress than ever, and population growth appears to be a major source of that stress. Adding another 2.5 billion people to the planet will put enormous strains not only on societies with rising populations, but on the entire planet. Higher energy use is already changing the world's climate in dangerous ways. Furthermore, the strains of increased global populations, combined with income growth, are leading to rapid deforestation, depletion of fisheries, land degradation, and the loss of habitat and extinction of a vast number of animal and plant species. But this unprecedented growth has also put tremendous pressures on the planet.

## AFF: OVER-POPULATION DESTROYS THE ENVIRONMENT

**The global environment is being destroyed by poverty and overpopulation—it is the key to all environmental issues.**

**Babor, 99** (Diana D.M., LL.M. in International Environmental Law and International Human Rights , Connecticut Journal of International Law, "Population Growth and Reproductive Rights in International Human Rights Law," Summer 1999, Lexis)

No goal is more crucial to healing the global environment than stabilizing human population. Deforestation, soil degradation, species loss, reduced biodiversity, desertification, tropical forest destruction; climate change, stratospheric ozone depletion and acidification; freshwater depletion, coral reef destruction, coastal zone threats and overfishing; unprecedented waste production, chemical and pesticide damage, toxic contamination, loss of habitat and species mutation, are some descriptions of the known consequences of increased industrial production and global population expansion over the last century. While each adversely affects the delicate balance of the biosphere, both the scale of damage and its long-term consequences have yet to be fully fathomed. That existing human populations are causing environmental degradation which will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs must be underscored by the fact that forthcoming generations will be far more numerous than at any previous time in history. To assure that an ecologically-balanced environment is available for all generations, global population stabilization is as essential a long-term objective as achieving sustainable consumption is vital in the short-term. [¶84] This article will explore how reproductive rights evolved in the context of approaches undertaken toward the problem of overpopulation. In addition to demographics, it is also the relationship between people and resources, how resources are consumed and how wealth and opportunity are distributed, which together describe any given population. 2 Consequently, a vision which allows for concerted local and global cooperation is critical if resource demands, let alone basic needs, are to be met. Furthermore, the attainment of these objectives needs to be pursued with a minimum impact on carrying capacities, 3 both in the coming decades and in the distant future. As the limitations of the Earth to support both those whose resources are scarce and those who over-consume become clearer, there is a growing understanding that the planet has a finite capacity not only to sustain humanity's unrelenting exploitation but also to recover from the damage inflicted. While we may perceive nature as having a strong renewal capacity, the time required without human interference to accomplish such restoration continues to be impeded by the globalization of cash [¶85] economies and an unsustainable expansion in the scale of consumption. Development itself remains to be comprehensively defined in international agreements, as do the natural limits of "progress." Development which improves the prospects of those in need and ensures that local carrying capacities are not exceeded has been a vital strategy in overpopulated, underdeveloped states. Inasmuch as the poor consume the least of the world's resources, day-to-day survival often results in permanent environmental destruction which in turn leads to even greater poverty.

### Population growth causes massive species extinction.

**McKee, 01** (Jeffrey, associate professor of anthropology at the Ohio State University, *Saving the Environment*, January 21).

There may be a way to awaken the apathetic (or blissfully ignorant) public. It certainly catches my students' attention when I note that the two profound trends of human population growth and biodiversity loss are inextricably intertwined. But in inexplicably. Quite simply, we take up space to live, work, and grow our food. That leaves less room and resources for other species. We may or may not be outstripping our own resources yet, but in the process we are subsuming the resources needed by other living beings. We are living not so much on borrowed time as borrowed land and water. To be sure, arcane graphs of human population growth and species extinction don't seem to have the visual impact of, say, an asteroid hitting the earth and knocking out 70% of living species—as happened in the last mass extinction. But the effect of population growth is no less real.

## AFF: OVER-POPULATION CAUSES WAR AND GENOCIDE

**Empirically population growth causes wars and genocide.**

**Geyer, 98** (Georgie Anne Geyer, journalist and columnist, Universal Features Syndicate, "Malthusian Truths About Today's World" May 22 [http://npg.org/projects/malthus/geyer\\_story.htm](http://npg.org/projects/malthus/geyer_story.htm))

Every country where bloody internecine civil wars have occurred in recent years had a huge population preceding the conflict." Could he be right? I went to U.N. population data. Rwanda, from 2.1 million in 1950 to 8 million today; Haiti, from 3.3 million then to 7.5 million today; Algeria, from 8.8 million to 30.2 million; Afghanistan, 9 million to 24.8 million; Zaire or Congo, 12.2 to 49 million; Nicaragua, 1.1 million to 4.8 million; Tajikistan, 1.5 million to 6.1 million; El Salvador, 2 million to 5.8 million; Ethiopia, 18.4 million to 58.4 million today. I was flabbergasted. "You must understand," Kaplan went on, "that in these conflicts the underlying causes come first and the beginning comes last. Take the civil war in Algeria. It all started with the '92 elections (when the military rescinded them because the Islamic fundamentalists were winning.) But actually that 'beginning' was the end of a long culmination of events in the '60s when Algeria began to show one of the highest population growth rates in the world. That brought hordes of children into the cities where infrastructures were collapsing, and soon unemployed young men were roaming around with nothing to do. "1992 was merely the spark." In short, to cite two other examples, it is no accident that before the Rwandan genocide of 1995-96, Rwandan women were giving birth an average of eight times. It is also no accident that, in Haiti during these last years of implosion and civil war, Haitian women were giving birth an average of six times. These high population rates do not actually cause the slaughters, of course, but they exacerbate all the other problems and remove the possibilities of easier or quicker solutions. They also throw people too closely together and swiftly involve them in a fight for food and water and make genocide an acceptable alternative.

## AFF: GLOBALIZATION GOOD

**Economic inequalities do not prove that globalization is bad—even unequal growth is positive for all nations.**

**Bate, 04** (Roger, Resident Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, September 1<sup>st</sup>, “Who Does Globalization Hurt?”, [http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.21115,filter.all/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.21115,filter.all/pub_detail.asp))

Like many of the pressure groups that oppose corporations and economic liberalisation on apparently moral grounds (companies and markets allegedly promote greed), the ILO report wants policy changes to ensure that globalisation becomes “a positive force for all people and all countries” as it believes that at the moment it benefits the elite of the rich world. In particular, the ILO wants reform at the World Trade Organisation to protect the poor. The report draws its conclusions mainly from the alleged increase in inequality between rich and poor countries. Of course, inequality measures are largely pointless, irrelevant and also misleading. If relatively rich Britain grew 20% over five years and relatively poor Indonesia grew 12% in the same period, there would be an increase in inequality, but both countries would be better off than if they both grew 10%. Yet the ILO and all the pressure groups they support imply that the reason that countries like Indonesia grow slower than countries like Britain is because Britain is part of the elite and distorts the world trade environment in its favour (“the process of globalisation is generating unbalanced outcomes, both within and between countries”).

**Globalization is positive for poor nations—the countries that have fared poorly suffer from bad governance.**

**Bate, 04** (Roger, Resident Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, September 1<sup>st</sup>, “Who Does Globalization Hurt?”, [http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.21115,filter.all/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.21115,filter.all/pub_detail.asp))

The belief that the rich and powerful countries prevent the poor countries from performing has a long and undistinguished history but no intellectual support. Indeed, the report acknowledges that many problems have nothing to do with international trade or globalisation at all. Cuba under Fidel Castro, Venezuela under Hugo Chavez, Iraq under Saddam Hussein, North Korea under Kim Jong-il, Zimbabwe under Robert Mugabe and myriad countries (adding up to the 23 imploding nations identified by the report) have all failed because they are "dysfunctional states torn apart by civil strife, authoritarian governments of various hues and states with democratic but severe inadequacies in terms of the policies and institutions required to support a well-functioning market economy", says the report. The report fails to explain why China, in opening up to globalisation, has developed so rapidly in the past 25 years. It takes Wolf to explain that China and the other successful economies all shared "a move towards the market economy, one in which private property rights, free enterprise and competition increasingly took the place of state ownership, planning and protection. They chose, however haltingly, the path of economic liberalisation and international integration." Perhaps even more importantly, Wolf says that "there are no examples of countries that have risen in the ranks of global living standards while being less open to trade and capital in the 1990s than in the 1960s".

## AFF: GLOBALIZATION GOOD

**Globalization is good for poorer nations—the most open countries are successfully battling poverty and have the best working conditions.**

**Bhagwati, 2000** (Jagdish, Economist and professor at Columbia University, “Globalization Already has a Human Face”, [http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.14914/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.14914/pub_detail.asp))

Self-sufficiency policies, as practiced by India for more than three decades, produced abysmal growth rates, handicapping the creation of jobs that would have pulled up the poor into gainful employment. Both India and China, when they have experienced rapid growth, have managed to dent poverty in a sustainable fashion. That rapid growth has been associated with globalization. Rapid growth also generates tax revenues for schools to be built, and much else done for the poor. Without such revenues, liberal talk comes cheap. Equally at variance with facts is the frequent charge that multinationals "exploit" foreign workers. Economists working on multinationals typically confront the phenomenon known as the "wage premium"—the fact that multinationals usually pay more than the going local wage. In my experience both skilled and unskilled workers in poor countries aspire to be employed by multinationals. Indiscriminate condemnation of multinationals is misplaced. Media reports suggest that much of this criticism in the United States today comes from unions, which oppose the outward flow of investment by multinationals. They seek to advance their agendas through an energetic and well-financed recruitment of young activists.

**Globalization reduces poverty and raises environmental standards.**

**CATO Institute, 08** (“The Benefits of Globalization”, <http://www.freetrade.org/issues/globalization.html>)

Globalization describes the ongoing global trend toward the freer flow of trade and investment across borders and the resulting integration of the international economy. Because it expands economic freedom and spurs competition, globalization raises the productivity and living standards of people in countries that open themselves to the global marketplace. For less developed countries, globalization offers access to foreign capital, global export markets, and advanced technology while breaking the monopoly of inefficient and protected domestic producers. Faster growth, in turn, promotes poverty reduction, democratization, and higher labor and environmental standards. While globalization may confront government officials with more difficult choices, the result for their citizens is greater individual freedom. In this sense, globalization acts as a check on governmental power that makes it more difficult for governments to abuse the freedom and property of their citizens.

## AFF: WE SHOULD NOT CONNECT WITH NATURE

**Deep ecologists are wrong—nature is better off separate from humanity, not more deeply connected. Separation is also the best way to spur renewables.**

**Lewis 94** (Martin, lecturer in international history and interim director of the program in International Relations at Stanford University, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Page 16)

The Promethean perspective adopted here advocates a form of environmental protection that green extremists would consider utterly heretical. Where they seek to reconnect humanity with nature, I counter that human society should strive to separate itself as much as possible from the natural world, a notion that has aptly been labeled "decoupling" by the geographer Simmons (1989:384). To advocate decoupling is to reject both the instrumentalist claim—that nature should be used merely for human ends—and the green counterargument—that humanity is, or should be, just another species in nature. Decoupling processes have already averted ecological devastation too many times. European forests, for example, avoided destruction when early modern smelters substituted coal for charcoal (see Perlin 1989). This process should continue as composites replace steel and as coal begins to yield to solar power—with nature breathing easier everywhere as a result. But one must wonder whether self-proclaimed deep ecologists affirming their communion with nature through shamanistic rituals will supply the world with solar technologies. I suspect rather that such delivery will come, if at all, from high-tech corporations—firms operating in a social, economic, and technical milieu almost wholly removed from the intricate webs of the natural world.