# Wiki Doc R2 Northwestern

# 1NC R2 NU

### 1NC – FW

#### Interpretation – affs must defend hypothetical enactment of a United States federal government policy that substantially increases prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by at least expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws

#### Resolved means to enact a policy by law.

Words & Phrases 64. [Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition]

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or **determination by resolution or vote**; as ‘it was resolved **by the legislature**;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”**.

#### The United States federal government is the national government in DC.

Black’s Law 4. [Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, June 1, 2004, pg.716]

Federal government. 1. A **national government** that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of power in exchange for the right to participate in national politics matters – Also termed (in federal states) **central government**. 2. **the U.S. government** – Also **termed national government**. [Cases: United States -1 C.J.S. United States - - 2-3]

#### ‘Core antitrust laws’ means Sherman, Clayton, and FTC

Phaffenroth 21 [Sonia Kuester Pfaffenroth, Partner, Arnold and Porter, focuses her practice on helping clients address complex antitrust issues in the US and globally. She rejoined the firm in 2017 from the Antitrust Division of the US Department of Justice (DOJ) where she served most recently as Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil and Criminal Operations. In that role, Ms. Pfaffenroth was responsible for supervising both civil and criminal antitrust enforcement efforts, as well as the Division's work with antitrust and competition law enforcement agencies worldwide. Justin Hedge, Counsel, Arnold and Porter, and Monique N. Boyce, Sr. Associate, Arnold and Porter. “A Comparison Of Proposed Antitrust Legislation In 2021: Federal And New York State.” 7/2/21. https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/antitrust-eu-competition-/1086194/a-comparison-of-proposed-antitrust-legislation-in-2021-federal-and-new-york-state]

At the federal level, there are three core antitrust laws: (1) the Sherman Act, in which Section 1 outlaws "every contract, combination, or conspiracy in [unreasonable] restraint of trade," and Section 2 outlaws any "monopolization, attempted monopolization, or conspiracy or combination to monopolize";1 (2) the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits "unfair methods of competition" and "unfair or deceptive acts or practices";2 and (3) Section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits mergers and acquisitions where the effect "may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly."3 Criminal violations of the Sherman Act carry a maximum penalty of a $100 million fine for corporations, and a maximum penalty of 10 years in prison and a $1 million fine for individuals. A prevailing plaintiff in a civil suit can recover treble damages and attorneys' fees. But federal law currently does not provide for civil penalties when the government brings an antitrust case, only injunctive relief.

#### That’s key to predictability -- only an interp grounded in relevant legal literature gives debaters the basis to prepare negatives and affirmatives guaranteed to clash. There are a few impacts –

#### First is competitive equity – without predictable preparation and a stable stasis point, there is an aff side bias that destroys the competitive nature of the activity and participation – equity is obviously an impact because debate is a game that is key to the aff – if not, just vote neg

#### Second is information reflexivity --

#### The process of debate around a predictable governmental plan best creates the conditions for informed learning and well-rounded information gathering through a holistic research approach – the impact is information reflexivity – issues of factual evidence are difficult to resolve and require informed processes and information vetting to counter problematic premises that result in material violence like the Iraq war – only a model of debate that encourages 2nd and 3rd level argument testing, considers unintended consequences, and promotes conditional and dynamic argumentation will foster well informed decisions and self-efficacy

Leek 16. [Danielle R. Leek, Johns Hopkins University Advanced Academic Programs instructor, Director of Academic Innovation and Distance Education at Bunker Hill Community College, former executive director of the communications center and professor of communications at Grand Valley State University, “Policy debate pedagogy: a complementary strategy for civic and political engagement through service-learning,” Communication Education, 65:4, 401-405]

In policy debate, students are asked to consider whether a particular course of action should be taken, generally by state institutions such as the United States federal government, or its respective branches, such as the Supreme Court or the Congress (Snider & Schnurer, 2002). A policy debate can involve any institutional actor or agent such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, and so on. Questions of policy can address broad global issues, such as “Should the United States federal government sign a new nuclear treaty with Iran?” Or they might consider narrow rules for legal action, such as“Should the Michigan Department of Treasury require individuals to pay taxes online?” When connected to a service-learning experience, educators might set aside time for students to debate a relevant policy question. Using previous examples, students working on the health campaign might also be asked to debate the question, “Should the City of Grand Rapids provide mobile health clinics in the downtown area?” Chemistry students could debate, “Should the federal government require a universal science curriculum in all high schools?” No matter the topic, students should have the opportunity to engage multiple perspectives on the question, including speaking on the affirmative to support a new policy and on the negative in opposition to a change in the status quo. Students may be asked to work with one or more partners to research and develop materials that can be used in their speeches or in question-and-answer periods related to their arguments.

Especially for readers familiar with extracurricular policy debate competitions in high schools or college, this depiction of what policy debate entails may seem overly simplistic. Yet, even basic consideration of policy issues related to a service-learning experience can improve a student’s odds of political learning. Through policy debate, students can develop information literacy and learn how to make critical arguments of fact. This experience is politically empowering for students who will also build confidence for political engagement.

Information literacy

While there are many definitions of information literacy, the term generally is understood to mean that a student is “able to recognize when information is needed, and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the information needed” for problem-solving and decision-making (Spitzer, Eisenberg, & Lowe, 1998, p. 19). Information exists in a variety of forms, in visual data, computer graphics, sound-recordings, film, and photographs. Information is also constructed and disseminated through a wide range of sources and mediums. Therefore, “information literacy” functions as a blanket term which covers a wide range of more specific literacies. Critiques of service-learning’s knowledge-building power, such as those articulated by Eby (1998) and Colby (2008), are challenging both the emphasis the pedagogy places on information gained through experience and the limited scope of political information students are exposed to in the process.

Policy debate can augment a student’s civic and political learning by fostering extended information literacies. Snider and Schnurer (2002) identify policy debate as an especially research intensive form of oral discussion which requires extensive time and commitment to learn the dimensions of a topic. Understanding policy issues calls for contemplating a range of materials, from traditional news media publications to court proceedings, research data, and institutional propaganda. Moreover, the nature of policy debate, which involves public presentation of arguments on two competing sides of a question, motivates students to go beyond basic information to achieve a more advanced level of expertise and credibility on a topic (Dybvig & Iverson, n.d.). This type of work differs from traditional research projects where students gather only the materials needed to support their argument while neglecting contrary evidence. Instead, the “debate research process encourages a kind of holistic approach, where students need to pay attention to the critics of their argument because they will have to respond to those attacks” (Snider & Schnurer, 2002, p. 32). In today’s attention economy, cultivating a sensibility for well-rounded information gathering can also aid students in recognizing when and how the knowledge produced in their social environments can be effectively translated to specific contexts. The “cultural shift in the production of data” which has followed the emergence of Web 2.0 technologies means that all students are likely “prosumers”—that is, they consume, produce, and coproduce information online all at the same time (Scoble, 2011).

Coupling service- learning with policy debate calls on students to apply information across registers of public engagement, including their own service efforts and their own public argumentation, in and outside of their debates. Information is used in the service experience, which in turn, informs the use of information in debates, where students then produce new information through their argumentation. The process is what Bruce (2008) refers to “informed learning,” or “using information in order to learn.” When individuals move from learning how to gather materials for a task to a cognitive awareness and understanding of how the information-seeking process shapes their learning, they are engaged in informed learning. Through this process, students can come to recognize that information management and credibility is deeply disciplinary and historically contextual (Bruce & Hughes, 2010). This understanding, combined with practical experience in locating information, is a critical missing element in contemporary political engagement. Over 20 years ago, Graber (1994) argued that one of the biggest obstacles to political engagement was not apathy, but a gap between the way news media presents information during elections, and the type of information voters need and will listen to during electoral campaigns. The challenge extends beyond elections into policy-making, especially as younger generations continue to revise their notions of citizenship away from institutional politics towards more social forms of activism (Bennett, Wells, & Freelon, 2011). For students to effectively practice more expressive forms of citizenship they need experience managing the breadth of information available about issues they care about. As past research indicates a strong correlation between service-learning experience and the motivation and desire for post-graduation service, it seems likely that students who debate about policy issues related to service areas will continue their informed learning practices after they have left the classroom (Soria & Thomas-Card, 2014).

Arguing facts

In addition to building information literacies, students who combine policy debate with service-learning can practice “politically relevant skills,” which will help them have confidence for political engagement in the future. As Colby (2008) explains, this confidence should be tempered by tolerance for difference and differing opinions. On the surface, debating about institutional politics might seem counterintuitive to this goal. Politicians and the press have a credibility problem among college-aged students, and this leaves younger generations less inclined to feel obligated to the state or to look to traditional modes of policymaking for social change (Bennett et al., 2011; Manning & Edwards, 2014). This lack of faith in government and media outlets also makes political argument more difficult (Klumpp, 2006). Whereas these institutions once served as authoritative and trustworthy sources of information, the credibility of legislators and journalists has decreased over the last 40 years or so. Today, politicians and pundits are viewed as political actors interested in spectacle, power, and profit rather than truth-seeking or the common good.

While some political controversies are rooted in competing values, Klumpp (2006) explains that arguments about policy are more often based in fact. Indeed, when engaged in public arguments over questions of policy, people tend to “invoke the authority of facts to support their positions.” Likewise, “the governmental sphere has developed elaborate legal and deliberative processes in recognition of the power of facts as the basis for a decision.” Yet, while shared values are often quickly agreed upon, differences over fact are more difficult to resolve. Without credible institutions of authority that can disseminate facts, public deliberation requires more time, information-gathering, evaluation, and reasoning. The Bush administration’s decision to take military action in Iraq, for example, was presumably based on the “fact” that Saddam Hussein had acquired weapons of mass destruction. This has now become a classic example of poor policy-making grounded in faulty factual evidence.

This shortcoming is precisely why policy debate is a valuable complement to servicelearning activities. Not only can students use their developing literacies to better understand social problems, they can also learn to access a broader range of knowledge sources, thereby mitigating the absence of fact-finding from traditional institutions. Furthermore, policy advocacy gives students experience testing the reasoning underlying claims of fact. Issues of source credibility, analogic comparisons, and data analysis are three examples of the type of critical thinking skills that students may need to apply in order to engage a question of policy (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1999). While the effect may be to undermine government action in some instances, in others students will gain a better understanding of when and where institutional activities can work to make change. As students gain knowledge about the relationship between institutional structures and the communities they serve, they grow confidence in their ability to engage in future conversations about policy issues. Zwarensteyn’s (2012) research highlights these sorts of effects in high school students who engage in competitive policy debate. Zwarensteyn theorizes that even minimal increases in technical knowledge about politics can translate to significant increases in a student’s sense of self-efficacy. Many students start off feeling very insecure when it comes to their mastery of institutional politics; policy debate helps overcome that insecurity. Moreover, because training in policy debate encourages students to address issues as arguments rather than partisan positions, it encourages them to engage policy-making without the hostility and incivility that often characterizes today’s political scene. Indeed, it is precisely that perceived hostility and incivility that prompts many young people to avoid politics in the first place.

I do not mean to imply that students who debate about their service-learning experiences will draw homogenous conclusions about policies. Quite the contrary. Students who engage in service-learning still bring their personal visions and history to bear on their debates. As a result, students will often have very different opinions after engaging in a shared debate experience. More importantly, the practice of debating should operate to particularize students’ knowledge of community partners and clients, working against the destructive generalizations and power dynamics that can result when students feel privileged to serve less fortunate “others.” For civic and political engagement through service-learning to be meaningful and productive, it must do more to challenge students’ concepts of the homogenous “we” who helps “them.” Seligman (2013) argues that this civic spirit can be cultivated through the core pedagogical principle of a “shared practice,” which emphasizes the application of knowledge to purpose (p. 60). Policy debate achieves this outcome by calling on students to consider and reconsider their understanding of themselves, institutions, community, and policy every time the question “should” may arise. As Seligman writes:

… the orientation of thought to purpose (having an explanation rest at a place, a purpose) is of extreme importance. We must recognize that the orientation of thought to purpose is to recognize moving from providing a knowledge of, to providing a knowledge for. This means that in the context of encountering difference it is not sufficient to learn about (have an idea of) the other, rather it means to have ideas for certain joint purposes—for a set of “to-does.” A purpose becomes the goal towards which our explanations should be oriented. (p. 61)

Put another way, policy debate challenges students “to maintain a sense of doubt and to carry on a systematic and protracted inquiry” in the process of service-learning itself (Seligman, 2013, p. 60). This is precisely the type of complex, ongoing, reflective inquiry that John Dewey had in mind.

Political engagement through policy debate

This essay began with a discussion of the growing attention to civic engagement programs in higher education. The national trend is to accomplish higher levels of student civic responsibility during and after their time in college through service-learning experiences tied to curricular learning objectives. A challenge for service-learning scholars and teachers is to recognize a distinction between civic activities that are accomplished by helping others and political activities that require engagement with the collective institutional structures and processes that govern social life. Both are necessary for democracy to thrive. Policy debate pedagogy can help service-learning educators accomplish these dual objectives.

To call policy debate a pedagogy rather than just a style of debate is purposeful. A pedagogy is a praxis for cultivating learning in others. The pedagogy of service-learning helps students to know and engage social conditions through physical engagement with their environments and communities. Policy debate pedagogy leads students to know and engage these same social conditions while also challenging them to apply their knowledge for the purpose of political advocacy. These pedagogies are natural compliments for cultivating student learning. Therefore, future studies should explore how well service-learning combined with policy debate can resolve concerns that policy debate alone does not go far enough to invest students with political agency (Mitchell, 1998). The present analysis suggests the potential for such an outcome is likely.

Moreover, research is clear that the civic effects of service-learning as an instructional method are improved simply by increasing the amount of time spent on in-class discussion about the service work students do (Levesque-Bristol, Knapp, & Fisher, 2010). Policy debates related to students’ service can accomplish this goal and more. Policy debates can also facilitate the political learning students need to build their political efficacy and capacity for political engagement. Through informed learning about the political process—especially in the context of service practice—students develop literacies that will extend beyond the classroom. Using this knowledge in reasoned public argument about policy challenges invites students to move beyond cynical disengagement towards a productive recognition of their own potential voice in the political world.

Policy debate pedagogy brings unique elements to the process of political learning. By emphasizing the conditional and dynamic nature of political arguments and processes, debates can work to relieve students of the misconception that there is a single “right answer” for questions about policy-making and politics, especially during election time. The communication perspective on policy debates also highlights students’ collective involvement in the ever-changing field of political terms, symbols, and meanings that constitute interpretations of our social world. In fact, the historical roots of the term “communication” seem to demand that speech and debate educators call for such emphasis on political learning. “To make common,” the Latin interpretation of communicare, situates our discipline as the heart of public political affairs (Peters, 1999). Connecting policy debate to service-learning helps highlight the common purpose of these approaches in efforts to promote civic engagement in higher education.

#### Switching sides over a predictable stasis is the only way to adequately deliberate, combat misinformation, and avoid polarized dogmatic thinking

\*Cut shorter versions of this card for smaller arguments in the fw block

**Manin 5** [Bernard Manin, New York University Professor of Politics. “Deliberation: Why We Should Focus on Debate Rather Than Discussion.” 10/13/05. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253156537_Deliberation_why_we_should_focus_on_debate_rather_than_discussion>]

WHAT KEEPS DELIBERATING GROUPS FROM GOING TO EXTREMES?

Cass Sunstein has recently called attention to a particularly troubling phenomenon for theorists of deliberation: group polarization (Sunstein 2000, 2001, 2002).

It appears that members of a group discussing an issue end up having more extreme positions after discussion. More precisely: after discussion the median opinion in the group shifts to a more extreme position in the direction of the predeliberation tendency. A group in which the median opinion was mildly in favor of the death penalty prior to discussion will have a median opinion strongly in favor of the death penalty after discussion. A similar shift, but in the opposite direction, will occur with a mildly opposed median opinion before deliberation.

The name of the phenomenon, though standard in the literature, might be misleading. The dynamic in question could better be termed: “group extremization”. It does not lead to intra-group polarization, but to inter-group polarization, among groups whose pre-deliberation tendencies were slightly apart from each other. Such groups will drift further apart from each other after discussion. This is perhaps the origin of the term. “Polarization” might also have been used because the shift may occur in opposite directions depending on which direction was predominant prior to discussion. In the social psychology literature studying this process, the notion of “polarization’ is often contrasted with that of “averaging”. Contrary to expectation, averaging of attitudes does not occur after discussion in a group.

Group polarization deserves special notice from theorists of deliberative democracy for a variety of reasons, some of which I will mention later. However, the first motive for focusing on this phenomenon is that it has long been a subject of research in social psychology. The fact was first established in the late sixties (Moscovici and Zavalloni, 1969). Since then, it has been corroborated by numerous experiments. Indeed it has become a standard topic in social psychology, to the point of figuring in handbooks (Lindzey and Aronson, 1985, II: 396-402; Brown, 1986; 200-248). Sunstein has only brought to light a body of research that we had been neglecting. Some findings reported in recent empirical research about deliberative practices draw on studies that have not been much replicated. Group polarization, by contrast, appears to be a fairly robust and well-documented result.

While explanations of the phenomenon vary somewhat across authors, two main mechanisms seem to be driving it.

1. Social comparison. Individuals discern in the discussion an expression of what is socially desirable within the group. Intuitively we would not view discussion as expressing a social norm as we focus on the willingness to change and to listen to others. However, that is not how participants treat discussion. To them, discussion reveals what they perceive as the prevailing norm in the group. They change their initial opinion in the direction of the prevailing norm because they seek the good opinion and approval of others (Lindzey and Aronson, 1985, II: 399). A range of authors starting perhaps with Rousseau, have long noted that people tend to conform to the view that prevails in a given group (e.g. Asch, 1951, 1952, 1956; Noelle-Neumann, 1993). While not the same as conformity (Brown, 1986: 213-217), social comparison is consistent with it: people are prepared to shift to extreme positions in the direction of the prevailing tendency.3

2. The effect of persuasive argumentation. In a group that is leaning in favor of X, individuals are likely to hear more arguments in favor of X than against X. In such a group the pool of available arguments is tendentious and somewhat skewed in favor of X. People seem to respond to the sheer quantity of arguments (Burnstein et al. 1973; Burnstein and Vinokur, 1977), To be sure, cogency of arguments matters, but sheer numbers carry weight too, particularly if the arguments people hear are novel to them.

Note that this second mechanism is not necessarily irrational: if the arguments put forward in favor of X are not redundant, that is, if each person speaking in favor X articulates an argument that has not been made before, it is not irrational on the part of listeners to be moved by the greater number of reasons.4

This second mechanism should be particularly troublesome for theories of deliberation, because here, —unlike with the social comparison mechanism, which does not involve arguments—, it is the very process of advancing reasons that is driving the shift to the extreme. This is a further motive for giving particular attention to group polarization. What is undesirable in this is not that people end up with an extreme position per se. On some issues extreme positions are objectively justified. The problem lies rather in that the shift to extremes occurs systematically, regardless of the merits of the issue being discussed. One can see no reason why such systematic shifts to extreme positions, irrespective of substance, and indeed in the direction of pre-existing tendencies, would be desirable.

Given that group polarization is a well-established fact, it is puzzling that James Fishkin should not find evidence of it in his deliberative polls (Fishkin 1991, 1995). In a study analyzing in depth one of the many deliberative polls that Fishkin has been conducting in various contexts, the authors specifically investigated whether a systematic shift to the extreme occurred among the participants. The study reports the analysis of a deliberative poll conducted in Britain in 1994 on the issue of crime and tools for combating crime (Luskin et al. 2002). The authors handed a detailed questionnaire to the participants both at the outset of the process and after deliberation has taken place. They were thus able to track with precision changes in attitudes. They found that no such systematic shift to the extreme had occurred (Luskin et al. 2002: 477-478).5

The absence of polarization suggests that we take a closer look at the particular setting of the event. Fishkin’s formula is as follows: “Select a national probability sample of the citizen voting age population and question them about some policy domain(s). Send them balanced, accessible briefing materials to help inform them and get them thinking more seriously about the same subject(s). Transport them to a single site, where they can spend several days grappling with the issues, discussing them with one another in randomly assigned, moderated small groups and putting questions generated by the small group discussions to carefully balanced panels of policy experts and political leaders. At the end, question the participants again, using the same questionnaire as at the beginning.” (Luskin et al. 2002: 458.Emphasis mine) 6

Such a setting differs in a number of ways from the experimental settings in which group polarization is observed. From among such differences, Fishkin himself stresses the following:

- Anticipation of the event. People are selected some time before the event. In the meantime they begin paying more attention to the issue.

- Participants receive a “carefully balanced booklet laying out the main proposals being discussed by political leaders and the arguments being made for and against them. “ Fishkin also notes that: “By contrast information materials consumed under natural conditions are generally skewed by selective exposure.” (Luskin et al. 2002: 459. Emphasis mine).

- The random assignment to small discussion groups, following on random sampling for recruitment of participants, means that the “discussions feature a far wider variety of perspectives than most participants are likely to encounter in real life.” (Luskin et al. 2002: ibid).

- Lastly, “the opportunity to hear and question balanced panels of policy experts and politicians. Yet again the balance is important. It is much harder than in real life to “tune out’ Tories, Labour supporters or others with whom one expects to disagree.”(Luskin et al. 2002: 460. Emphasis mine)

The question then is: which of these differences in the setting accounts for the absence of a polarization phenomenon? Fishkin plans to disaggregate the effects of the various components of his deliberative poll. To my knowledge, he has not done so yet. The empirical answer is not available.

In a study of a “citizens’ jury” that took place in Australia in 2000, the authors note: “Analysis of the deliberations of a citizens’ jury on an Australian environmental issue shows jurors’ attitudes changing more in response to the ‘information’ phase of the jury proceedings, involving a large degree of ‘deliberation within’, than during the formal ‘discussion’ phase.” (Goodin and Niemeyer. 2003). The setting here was again different from that of the deliberative poll. The authors did not focus on the polarization phenomenon either. However, it is worth noting that disaggregating the effects of the various ingredients in these deliberative practices may yield important and unexpected results. Goodin’s findings should certainly alert us to the possibility that discussion in the strict sense of interactive engagement among participants might not be the most consequential component of such experiments in deliberation.

2. DIVERSITY IS NOT SUFFICIENT FOR ADEQUATE DELIBERATION

While we do not have yet conclusive empirical evidence in this matter, one element of these experiments in deliberation deserves particular attention: the presence of diverse and conflicting views among deliberators. A long tradition of liberal theorists praising the virtues of discussion have emphasized that a necessary and sufficient condition for those virtues to materialize is that participants in discussion hold diverse views and articulate a variety of perspectives, reflecting the heterogeneity of their experiences and backgrounds. That tradition ranges, to mention just a few names, from Mill, to Popper, to Sunstein, Sunstein for example, regards the choice by the American Constituents to establish a republican government in a heterogeneous country as “the Framers’ greatest contribution”. (Sunstein, 2003).

The problem with that line of thinking is that “diversity of views” and “conflicting views” get treated as roughly interchangeable notions. It is my contention that these notions are not interchangeable. Further, I shall claim that diversity of perspectives within an assembly or a larger body does not necessarily secure adequate deliberation.

I can see three main reasons why diversity of views is not a sufficient condition for good deliberation.

II.1. Converging reasons. Suppose an assembly composed of members of diverse backgrounds, experiences, training etc. Suppose further that the fear of some danger is widespread among members. That fear may not be irrational or unfounded. Let us imagine, for instance, that a serial killer is still at large or that a wave of high profile bombings has occurred. In any case suppose that members all share one objective; they all wish to achieve better security. Suppose now that a measure objectively enhancing security is proposed: say, giving new powers to the police. My claim is that under such circumstances few if any, arguments pointing to the potential downsides of that measure will be heard, in spite of the diversity of perspectives within the assembly. The pool of arguments will, then, be skewed. The mechanisms accounting for this outcome are as follows:

II.1.1. Costs of information search. Members will apply the “satisficing” principle. They will use the following guidelines. “Go no further than the good argument for giving new powers to the police. Stop the costly search for information once a good reason has been advanced in favor of a given course of action. “

II.1.2. The variety of perspectives and dispersion of social knowledge among them ensure that many arguments, each deriving from the particular perspective, experience, or background of the speaker, will be heard in support of expanding the prerogatives to the police. The set of arguments will be lopsided. In the discussion members will be piling reason upon reason to broaden the powers to the police.

II.1.3. Reluctance to search for the potential downsides of the measure, and to articulate them, for fear of being seen as an opponent of a measure objectively promoting the common goal. Note that this is not the same as sheer conformity. This is not just thinking what others think, but thinking what they think with a good reason.

II.1.4. Reluctance to undermine the adoption of the measure that objectively promotes the common goal. And yet, giving new powers to the police might have some downsides, too. If a body deliberates about the measure, it surely wants to explore whether any such downsides exist in order to weigh them against the good reasons for adopting the measure.

II.2. Confirmatory bias. There is a second reason why mere diversity of views and arguments may fail to bring about adequate deliberation. Suppose now an assembly or a larger body in which a belief or a view is prevailing at a given point. This belief or view bears on the decision to be made. In a diverse body or assembly, there are probably a number of other beliefs, each supported by argument and evidence. We would then hope, in Millian fashion, that those holding the dominant belief will give due consideration and weight to the arguments advanced by the holders of other views. However, that will probably not happen.

Social and cognitive psychologists tell us that people holding a given belief tend to interpret new information brought before them as confirming their prior belief. People do not process information in a neutral and unbiased manner. Submit the same documentary materials about the death penalty and its putative deterrent effects to two groups of subjects, one relatively favorable to the death penalty, the other mildly opposed to it, the former group will become more favorable to the death penalty, the other will become more strongly opposed to it (Lord et al. 1979). People, it turns out, systematically misperceive and misinterpret evidence that is counter to their preexisting belief. There is nothing irrational in taking prior beliefs as a starting point for interpreting new evidence. What is noteworthy, and not rational, is that people tend to misread evidence as additional support for their initial hypotheses. Such a phenomenon is known as confirmatory bias. It has been corroborated by a number of experiments.8

A subsequent experiment showed that the most effective way of countering the effects of the confirmatory bias was to give greater salience to the information that ran counter to the subjects’ priori belief (for instance, by casting into brighter light visual pieces of conflicting information). Such a strategy proved more effective in countering the confirmatory bias than instructing the subjects to give fair consideration to conflicting information (Lord et al. 1984).

Furthermore, a number of studies suggest that group settings and discussion accentuate the impact of the confirmatory bias. Groups process information in a more biased way than individuals do, preferring information that supports their prior dominant belief to an even greater extent than individual people (Schultz-Hardt et al. 2000). This in turn results from two mechanisms. First, as already noted, groups accentuate dominant tendencies among their members. If we consider the preference for supporting information a dominant bias, we should not be surprised to find that group settings accentuate this bias. There is also, however, a second mechanism at work that should particularly concern us. A body of research has revealed that groups mainly discuss and make use of information that was available to all group members before the start of the discussion. People primarily discuss “shared information”. They partly fail in gathering and discussing information that was accessible to only one or a few members before the discussion. Shared information seems more valid and stands a better chance of being mentioned, and therefore remembered, during group discussion than unshared information (Stasser and Titus, 1985; Gigone and Hastie, 1993; Stewart and Stasser, 1998). Further, information conforming to the group’s preferred alternative is more likely to enter the discussion than information opposing this alternative (Stasser and Titus, 1985; 1470). If this is so, group discussion will generate a disproportionate amount of information and arguments reinforcing the already prevailing belief.9 When we advocate deliberation, we certainly do not expect it to reinforce the pre-existing dominant belief, whatever it happened to be.

Returning, then, to our hypothetical assembly, if we wished to keep in check the force of the confirmatory bias, to which groups are particularly susceptible, we should take deliberate and affirmative measures, not just let diverse voices be heard. Conflicting arguments do not automatically get a fair hearing.

3. Balkanisation. Lastly, in a context broader than an assembly, mere diversity or heterogeneity may very well result into the self-selection of enclaves of likeminded people. In that case, conflicting views will not come into contact with each other. A variety of internally homogeneous communities will coexist, each ignoring the views of the others.

In praising critical discussion, Popper once wrote:

“[…] the discussion will be the more fruitful the more the partners’ background differ. Thus the value of a discussion depends largely upon the variety of the competing views. Had there been no Tower of Babel, we should invent it.” (Popper 1989: 352)

Leaving aside the deliberately hyperbolic element in this reference, it is odd that Popper should have interpreted in this way the episode in Genesis. After God destroyed their common language, the inhabitants of the city did not take advantage of their language-based diverse perspectives, criticizing each other and thereby improving their construction skills, they just left off building, presumably talking only to their own kin.

Be it as it may, heterogeneity in a large population does not automatically lead to communication across lines of difference. There is every reason to be concerned about this today. Research suggests that cross-cutting communication and exposure to opposing political views have declined in the U.S. over the last decades. The kind of people with whom any given individual discusses public matters is first a function of the availability of discussion partners in one’s immediate environment. Residential segregation now operates primarily to produce greater homogeneity in interpersonal relations. Residential patterns suggest increasingly spatially segregated living, even within the heterogeneous populations of large cities. Heterogeneity may lead to balkanization, not to interaction with dissimilar people. A number of studies have documented, and deplored, the fact that Americans are increasingly separated from those with political views different from their own (Calhoun, 1988; Harrison and Bennett 1995; Frey 1995; Mutz and Martin 2001).

Residential segregation is not, however, the sole factor in the emergence of such a landscape characterized by diversity cum homogeneity. Sociologists and psychologists have long noted that people exercise selectivity in the views they expose themselves to. Many studies in media research have explored the phenomenon known as “selective exposure” (i.e. the propensity to expose oneself selectively to media messages consonant with one’s own views). After decades of research media scholars came to the conclusion that selective exposure was not, on close analysis, well corroborated. However, the phenomenon seems well established in the domain of interpersonal interactions; people tend to select politically like-minded discussion partners (Frey 1986; Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995). The mechanism accounting for this is pretty straightforward: encountering disagreement in face-to-face interactions generates psychic discomfort. Here casual introspection may add some vividness to scientific findings.

If selectivity is less prevalent and robust in the domain of media exposure than in personal interactions, we could perhaps place hopes in the media, as Mutz and Martin (2002) do. Indeed these authors find that individuals are exposed to far more dissimilar political views via news media than through interpersonal political discussions. However, another recent trend keeps us from overestimating the potential of the media: the trend towards highly specialized rather than mass channels (Turow 1997). This trend is sometimes referred to as: “narrowcasting”. We could say, borrowing the formulation from E. Katz, the media scholar; “And deliver us from segmentation” (Katz 1996).

Lastly, Internet news sources and specialized websites offer an increasing potential for tailoring news to one’s own views, and for forming communities of likeminded people in a wider context of diversity.

Thus, diversity and heterogeneity do not necessarily lead to communication across lines of difference. When we advocate deliberation, we have in mind something other than the conversations of like-minded people, reinforcing their prior beliefs, and insulated from opposing views. Let us return, then to the concept of deliberation.

3. ADEQUATE DELIBERATION REQUIRES CONSIDERATION OF REASONS FOR AND AGAINST COURSES OF ACTION

Consider three definitions of deliberation. Not that definitions count as arguments, but because the following definitions may point to solution of our problem. At any rate the following definitions highlight a characteristic of deliberation that goes beyond the mere articulation of reasons or arguments in support of actions to be taken.

“Deliberation [sumbouleuein] consists in arguing for or against something [to men protropè to dè apotropè].” (Aristotle, Rhetoric, I, 2,) Deliberation: 1. “The action of deliberating, or weighing a thing in the mind; careful consideration with a view to decision”. 2. “The consideration and discussion of the reasons for and against a measure by a number of councilors (e.g. in a legislative assembly)” (Oxford English Dictionary)

“Deliberation is nothing else but a weighing, as it were in scales, the conveniencies, and inconveniencies of the fact we are attempting.” (Hobbes, De Cive, XIII, 16)

Note that these definitions cover both deliberation within the individual mind, as in definition 1 from the O.E.D., and collective deliberation, as in Aristotle and in definition 2 from the O.E.D. However, the O.E.D. supplies the citation from the De Cive under definition 1. Whether individual or collective, then, deliberation would seem to imply consideration of reasons for as well as reasons against a given course of action.

Indeed we say that we deliberate, whether individually or collectively, when we engage in a distinctive mode of mental activity, more specifically in a distinctive mode of reasoning. We deliberate about a given course of action when we suspect that there might be reasons against it as well as reasons for it. If we did not think that there might be, at least potentially, reasons for not doing X alongside reasons for doing it, we would use reason in a different way. We would seek to prove, or at least to establish, that X is the right course of action by supplying solid argument(s) for it. We would not actively seek counterarguments. It is the seeking and the weighing of pros and cons that distinguishes deliberation from other forms of reasoning.

Such a distinction is not merely a matter of semantics. We observe that under some circumstances we actually engage in a kind of reasoning that involves such seeking and weighing of pros and cons. We do not always reason in this way. Whatever name we wish to give to this mode, we can hardly deny that it exists, and that it is distinct from other forms of reasoning.

The first distinctive trait of this mode of reasoning, –which we usually denote as “deliberation”–, consists in its bifurcated character. We do not use such bifurcated reasoning when we search for the solution to a mathematical set; then we do not seek counter arguments or counter-solutions. The second distinctive trait is the one that the metaphor of “weighing as in scales” tries to capture. One could say that economic, or utilitarian, reasoning, too operates in a bifurcated way by searching for the costs and benefits of actions. However, the cost and benefits analysis differs from “weighing” considerations. In a cost and benefits analysis, we do not need actually to “weigh” the two sides of the equation. These are already weighed for us by the common metric in which they are measured. Once we have identified the costs and benefits, all we need to do is to compute them. Again it seems hard to deny that there exists a distinctive kind of mental activity, one that we usually denote as the weighing of reasons, which differs from computing already given weights.

So much, then, for the descriptive analysis of that peculiar mode of thinking that we commonly term “deliberation”. What about its value? If there are actions such as reasons for and against them might exist, then it seems obvious that we will do better by considering both sides of any such action. Note in particular that we will do better by considering reasons for and against each of the contemplated alternatives than by considering reasons for each of the alternatives.

Think of the following situation: a given country is affected by widespread unemployment. Two policies are proposed: establishing training programs for the unemployed, and creating jobs in the public sector. By hearing reasons for either of the alternatives participants in deliberation may not learn anything about the downsides of the other. This is because these two policies are alternatives by virtue of some extrinsic factor (the budget constraint).

Diversity of views is not a sufficient condition for deliberation because it may fail to bring into contact opposing views. It is the opposition of views and reasons that is necessary for deliberation, not just their diversity.

Note that the epistemic merits of deliberation operate along lines different from those of the classical information pooling mechanism, as mentioned by Aristotle and Condorcet.

“This is the reason why the many are better judges of music and the writings of poets; some appreciate one part, some another; and all together appreciate all” (Aristotle, Politics, III, 11).

The mechanism driving the Condorcet Jury Theorem is roughly of the same kind: pooling individual probabilities of finding the truth. The epistemic value of deliberation rests on an entirely different mechanism. It should be noted that in his famous argument about the wisdom of the many, Aristotle does not employ the notion of deliberation (sumbouleuein). In fact, when we collectively deliberate, advancing arguments for or against a given action, we are likely to suppress some of the information we have. We suppress the part that is not in line with our position in the discussion. After reviewing and weighing for ourselves the reasons for and against a given action, we come to a conclusion. We then take a position. However, when we speak in public in the course of deliberation, we share only the part of information that supports our position. Suffice it to mention the experience of deliberation in recruitment committees.

The epistemic merit of collective deliberation rests on mutual criticism. This is a further reason for giving pride of place to pros and cons in a sound conception of deliberation.

Athenian democrats might have sensed that diversity of voices was not sufficient in cases where adequate deliberation was advisable. Consider the institution of graphè para nomon. This institution amounted to a second hearing for some decrees passed by the Assembly. This second hearing, which was intended to be more thorough and thoughtful than the first one differed in many ways from the proceedings of the Ekklèsia. One such difference was that before the People’s Court the procedure was necessarily adversarial, with one side speaking for the decree and the other side against it. The key point, however, is that the adversarial procedure could not possibly be based on considerations of fairness. Plaintiff and defendant were legal fictions. The plaintiff did not claim that he had suffered any damage at the hands of the defendant. In the absence of considerations of fairness, we may conjecture that the adversarial proceedings were required during that second hearing on grounds of their superior epistemic merits.

To be sure, when Mill extolled the merits of discussion, he had in mind critical discussion. He praised conflicting arguments, the articulation of pros and cons, and the “hearing of both sides” in innumerable passages. However, he mentioned diversity of opinion and conflicting views almost interchangeably, as if the former necessarily implied the latter. He did not think that the articulation of pros and cons needed deliberate encouragement. Nor did he propose any arrangement aiming to bring into contact diverse self-selected groups of like-minded people. Still less did he offer advice on how to counter people’s propensity to find confirmation of their existing beliefs. In a diverse society, he thought, conflicting opinions would spontaneously arise. They would confront each other, if only given a chance. This is why he famously wrote:

The most intolerant of churches, the Roman Catholic Church, even at a canonization of a saint, admits, and patiently listens to a ‘devil’s advocate’. (Emphasis mine) However, such an interpretation of the role of the advocatus diaboli is surely a mistake: the presence of a devil’s advocate is required precisely because no one may spontaneously take the other side.

4. CONCLUSIONS; FOCUSING ON PUBLIC DEBATE RATHER THAN CONVERSATION

In light of the foregoing analysis, I would make a case for the following propositions:

\* As theorists of deliberation, we should shift our attention from the “conversation model” of deliberation to the “oratory model”. (Remer 2000). We need to retrieve and study a long tradition of theorizing going from Aristotle, to Cicero, to Quintilian, to Perelman, -the theorist who most recently rejuvenated that tradition. The conversation model has enjoyed undue prominence over the last decade. To borrow a formula from M. Schudson, I would say: “Conversation is not the soul of democracy” (Schudson 1997)

\* On a practical level, adversarial debates on issues of public concern need to be actively promoted, as one cannot expect them to arise spontaneously in a diverse society with freedom of speech. Note that the two dimensions –the adversarial character, and the focus on common issues– need active promoting.

\* Such debates would not serve as substitutes for interactive discussion, but as a supplement to it, indeed as a stimulation and prelude to discussion.

\* Debate format –in which speakers address an audience that merely listens to them– is a more promising set-up for exposure to conflicting positions than interactive personal engagement amongst holders of opposing views, as people tend to avoid face-to-face disagreement.

\* Citizens’ organizations, foundations, debating societies or other voluntary groups should organize these debates. Such voluntary groups would gradually establish their civic reputation and commitment to public interest. In any event, these debates should be left to private –although not for profit– initiative. In that way we would not face the problems that proved fatal to the “fairness doctrine”: inextricable litigation over what counted as an opposing view and failure of the F.C.C. to provide a consistent doctrine on the matter (Simmons 1978). In this, I disagree with Sunstein (2001).

\* One could raise the following objection: Exposure to conflicting views cannot be mandated therefore organizing such debates is futile. To which I would respond: from the fact that such exposure cannot be mandated, it does not follow that it is pointless to facilitate it. Availability of contact with conflicting views matters, as we mentioned earlier (Mutz 2001).

\* Who should be the speakers? People who advocate a given policy or position for its own merits, not for reasons extrinsic to that policy. Speakers may advocate a policy that favors their interest, but on the condition that such interest is inherent in that policy, and not deriving from extrinsic connections, such as career advancement, or promotion of objectives unrelated to the policy in question. This might be termed the principle of “relevant interest”. A complete disconnection from irrelevant interests –i.e. interests not related to the substance of the advocated policy– is probably hard to achieve. The guiding principle stands, however: the disconnection from irrelevant interests should be maximized. One key implication of this is: the jobs and careers of speakers should not be on the line in such debates.

#### You should also filter their impacts through predictable testability and model comparison -- debate inherently judges relative truth value by whether or not it gets answered -- a combination of a less predictable case neg, the burden of rejoinder, and them starting a speech ahead will always inflate the value of their impacts, which makes non-arbitrarily weighing whether they should have read the 1ac in the first place impossible within the structure of a debate round so even if we lose framework, vote neg on presumption. They also create a moral hazard that leads to affs only about individual self-care so even if you think this aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not, so assume the worst possible affirmative when weighing our impacts.

## Case

### 1NC – Case

#### Neolib is resilient – global resistance proves

Igor Guardiancich 17, Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science and Public Management of the University of Southern Denmark, 3/3/2017, “Absorb, Coopt and Recast: Global Neoliberalism’s Resilience through Local Translation”, http://www.euvisions.eu/neoliberalisms-resilience-translation/

One powerful message permeating the book, and which gives a forceful explanation to Colin Crouch’s punchy title is that: “rather than a mass-produced, slightly shrunk, and off-the-rack ideological suit, neoliberalism is a bespoke outfit made from a dynamic fabric that absorbs local color” (5). Even under a full-out attack against some of its basic assumptions, such as the one unleashed in the immediate wake of the global financial crisis, neoliberalism proved resilient beyond its many architects’ wildest dreams. Its capacity to absorb, coopt and recast selected ideas of oppositional social forces has been the most valuable asset guaranteeing its survival. Again, the comparison of the responses to the crisis in Spain and Romania show such adaptability in full.¶ The socialist government of José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero tried to salvage the social-democratic legacies of the Spanish economy by engineering a Keynesian rescue package. Only later, when the disaster of the cajas became apparent and the emergency intensified, did conservative PM Mariano Rajoy embrace more deregulation in the labour market (inspired by the Hartz IV reform) and extensive cuts in the public sector under the strong external pressure of the European Central Bank and of international financial markets.¶ In Romania, local policymakers further radicalized in the aftermath of the Lehman Brothers’ crisis, thereby outbidding the IMF on austerity and structural reforms. Instead of shielding lower-income groups, the opposite strategy of upward redistribution was chosen. By heroically withstanding the external attempts at moderation, the Romanian economy retained an unenviable mix of libertarian achievements (flat-tax rates), experimental neoliberalism (privatized pensions) and mainstream neoliberal orthodoxy (sound finance, labour market deregulation, social policy targeting, privatization of all public companies). Pure laissez-faire ideas such as the replacement of the welfare state by a voluntary, private, Christian charity system were not unheard of.¶ Hence, through an insightful analysis of the ideational underpinnings of its local interpretations, this book shows us that, despite the challenges, neoliberalism is alive and kicking. Ban guides us through half a century of policymaking in Spain and Romania, and embeds his analysis within the related nuances of contemporary liberal economic thought. The research is a valuable addition to a growing literature on the origin of current ideational frames and comfortably sits alongside contemporary classics, such as Mark Blyth’s Austerity: The History of a Dangerous Idea.

#### No mindset shift

Matthew **Lockwood 11**, previously Associate Director for Climate, Transport and Energy at the Institute for Public Policy Research, “The Limits to Environmentalism”, March 25, <http://politicalclimate.net/2011/03/25/the-limits-to-environmentalism-4/>

This brings us neatly finally to the third problem with PWG: politics. Jackson does have some discussion of the need for our old favourite “political will” towards the end of the book, and there are some examples of concrete ideas (e.g. shorter working week, ban advertising aimed at children), but there is basically no political strategy. Indeed, the argument is framed in terms of the need for “social and economic change” and “governance”, but not politics at all. The key question is how we are supposed to get from where we are to where he wants us to be. Jackson acknowledges that **at the moment, many people want growth (or more precisely, economic stability) and so demand it of politicians, who then have a political incentive to deliver it**. The quandary (not really acknowledged) is which strategy to adopt in this situation. Do you first reshape the economy to deliver economic stability without growth (e.g. by a shorter working week), which then demonstrates to people socially and politically that growth isn’t necessary for a good life, or do you first have to bring about major social change, moving people away from consumerism, as a precondition for transforming the economy and making the end of growth politically feasible? The discussion in chapter 11 of the book sort of implies that Jackson is thinking in terms of the latter route, but it actually has no strategy. He lays out (some quite conventional, even dare I say it, already proposed by economists) policies like carbon taxation and the aforementioned shorter working week but there is nothing on political narrative. The closest we get to a strategy for social transformation is banning advertising aimed at children (also a theme of Tom Crompton’s) and policies to drive greater durability of products. A counterview might be that all these changes are needed, and it doesn’t matter so much what happens first, that they all reinforce each other etc etc. But I don’t think that’s enough. The political party in the UK that comes closest to offering the Jackson vision is the Green Party. They got 1% of the popular vote in the 2010 general election, and one MP. **What stronger evidence can there be that the vision on its own is not enough?** A final point takes us back to equity (see previous post), but this time within rich countries. Certainly within the US and the UK, a large group of people in the low-to-middle part of the income distribution have seen their real incomes stagnate or fall over the last decade, as the rich have got richer. Telling this “squeezed middle” that economic growth is to end is not going to go down well unless there is a credible strategy for redistribution. That’s why a good initial step for a more sustainable economy might be a set of good old-fashioned social democratic policies on tax and spend. Prosperity without Growth raises some very important questions, and Tim Jackson shows how tight a squeeze we are in. But the book leaves some even more crucial questions hanging. Of course ending economic growth in rich countries would make a solution to ecological limits a bit easier, but **this would play only a small role**. In the absence of radical technological change, only serious “de-growth”, what Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows call “planned economic recession” would be sufficient to bring about the cut in emissions needed. With rapid growth in poor countries this conclusion is even stronger. So what we should be focusing on is achieving that technological change. Yes, it hasn’t materialised so far, but nor have the policies for low carbon innovation we need to produce it – like Gandhi’s Western civilisation, the low carbon revolution would be a good idea. And yes, getting those policies in place will require political effort. **But that effort will be as nothing compared with the political challenge of replacing capitalism with a new steady state system** either lacking innovation or with a disappearing working week. Perhaps the most fundamental, indeed philosophical issue here is that, despite the fact that Jackson has made a good effort to make an argument about limits into an argument about quality of life, his underlying message is (pace Obama): “No, we can’t”. But beyond the environmentalist camp, **this message will not work**. In the face of the biggest collective challenge that humanity has faced, we need a narrative that has the human potential to solve problems, and overcome apparently unbeatable odds, at its heart.

#### Infrapolitics are a disaster – they assume a transformative potential from small moments of resistance that simply does not exist.

Reed 16 (Adolph, Jr., Prof. of Political Science @ Penn., “Splendors and Miseries of the Antiracist “Left”” *Nonsite*, http://nonsite.org/editorial/splendors-and-miseries-of-the-antiracist-left-2)

More than a decade and a half ago I criticized similar formulations of a notion of “infrapolitics,” understood as the domain of pre-political acts of everyday “resistance” undertaken by subordinated populations, which was then all the rage in cultural studies programs. Proponents of the political importance of this domain insisted that, because insurgent movements emerge within such cultures of quotidian resistance, a) examining them could help in understanding the processes through which insurgencies develop and/or b) they therefore ought to be considered as expressions of an insurgent politics themselves. Several factors accounted for the popularity of that version of the argument, which mainly had to do to with the political economy of academic life, including the self-propulsion of academic trendiness and the atrophy of the left outside the academy, which encouraged flights into fantasy for the sake of optimism. The infrapolitics idea also resonated with the substantive but generally unadmitted group essentialism underlying claims that esoteric, insider knowledge is necessary to decipher the “hidden transcripts” of the subordinate populations; put more bluntly, elevating infrapolitics to the domain on which the oppressed express their politics most authentically increased its interpreters’ academic capital.8

I discussed those factors in my critique. However, the point in that argument most pertinent for evaluating Birch and Heideman’s confidence that the contradictions they acknowledge in BLM should be seen only as growing pains of a “new movement” is the following:

At best, those who romanticize “everyday resistance” or “cultural politics” read the evolution of political movements teleologically; they presume that those conditions necessarily, or even typically, lead to political action. They don’t. Not any more than the presence of carbon and water necessarily leads to the evolution of Homo sapiens. Think about it: infrapolitics is ubiquitous, developed political movements are rare.9

#### Government action is key—reform can pursue genuine equality - defeatist attitudes ensure that the world stays the same and cede politics.

Eddie S. GLAUDE Jr., Professor of African American Studies and Religion at Princeton and a PhD in Religion from Princeton, 16 [*Democracy in Black: How Race Still Enslaves*, p. 185-197]

CHANGE HOW WE VIEW GOVERNMENT For more than three decades, we have been bludgeoned with an idea of government that has little to no concern for the public good. Big government is bad, we are told. It is inefficient, and its bloated bureaucracies are prone to corruption. Even Democrats, especially since Bill Clinton, have taken up this view. For example, Obama says, "We don't need big government; we need smart government." For some on the right, big government is bad because it aims to distribute wealth to those who are lazy and undeserving. "Big government" is just a shorthand for dreaded entitlement programs-all too often coded language for race. In this view, "big government" is the primary agent of enforcing racial equality, taking hard-earned stuff from white Americans and giving it to undeserving others. Government cannot do such a thing, they argue, without infringing on the rights of white Americans. And even government-mandated redistribution will not solve the problem. As Barry Goldwater put the point in 1964, "No matter how we try, we cannot pass a law that will make you like me or me like you. The key to racial and religious tolerance lies not in laws alone but, ultimately, in the hearts of men." From this perspective, government plays no role in changing our racial habits. Why would we want to make it bigger? But Goldwater failed to realize that governmental indifference can harden hearts, and government action can create conditions that soften them. People's attitudes aren't static or untouchable. They are molded by the quality of interactions with others, and one of the great powers of government involves shaping those interactions-not determining them in any concrete sense, but defining the parameters within which people come to know each other and live together. Today, for example, most Americans don't believe women should be confined to the home raising children, or subjected to crude advances and sexist remarks by men. The women's-rights movement put pressure on the government, which in turn passed laws that helped change some of our beliefs about women. Similarly, the relative progress of the 1960s did not happen merely by using the blunt instruments of the law. Change emerged from the ways those laws, with grassroots pressure, created new patterns of interactions, and ultimately new habits. Neither Obama's election to the presidency nor my appointment as a Princeton professor would have happened were it not for these new patterns and habits. None of this happens overnight. It takes time and increasing vigilance to protect and secure change. I was talking with a dose friend and he mentioned a basic fact: that we were only fifteen years removed from the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 when Ronald Reagan was elected president and Republicans began to dismantle the gains of the black freedom struggle. Civil rights legislation and the policies of the Great Society had just started to reshape our interactions when they started to be rolled back. We barely had a chance to imagine America anew-to pursue what full employment might look like, to let the abolition of the death penalty settle in, to question seriously the morality of putting people in prison cells, and to enact policies that would undo what the 1968 Kerner Commission described as "two Americas"­ before the attack on "big government" or, more precisely, the attack on racial equality was launched. The objective was to shrink the size of government ("to starve the beast") and to limit its domestic responsibilities to ensuring economic efficiency and national defense. Democrats eventually buckled, and this is the view of government, no matter who is in office, that we have today. It has become a kind of touchstone of faith among most Americans that government is wasteful and should be limited in its role-that it shouldn't intrude on our lives. Politicians aren't the only ones who hold this view. Many Americans do, too. Now we can't even imagine serious talk of things like full employment or the abolition of prisons. We have to change our view of government, especially when it comes to racial matters. Government policy ensured the vote for African Americans and dismantled legal segregation. Policy established a social safety net for the poor and elderly; it put in place the conditions for the growth of our cities. All of this didn't happen simply because of individual will or thanks to some abstract idea of America. It was tied up with our demands and expectations. Goldwater was wrong. So was Reagan. And, in many ways, so is Obama. Our racial habits are shaped by the kind of society in which we live, and our government plays a big role in shaping that society. As young children, our community offers us a way of seeing the world; it lets us know what is valuable and sacred, and what stands as virtuous behavior and what does not. When Michael Brown's body was left in the street for more than four hours, it sent a dear message about the value of black lives. When everything in our society says that we should be less concerned about black folk, that they are dangerous, that no specific policies can address their misery, we say to our children and to everyone else that these people are "less than"-that they fall outside of our moral concern. We say, without using the word, that they are niggers. One way to change that view is to enact policies that suggest otherwise. Or, to put it another way, to change our view of government, we must change our demands of government. For example, for the past fifty years African American unemployment has been twice that of white unemployment. The 2013 unemployment rate for African Americans stood at 13.1 percent, the highest annual black unemployment rate in more than seventy years. Social scientists do not generally agree on the causes of this trend. Some attribute it to the fact that African Americans are typically the "last hired and first fired." Others point to changes in the nature of the economy; still others point to overt racial discrimination in the labor market. No matter how we account for the numbers, the fact remains that most Americans see double-digit black unemployment as "normal." However, a large-scale, comprehensive jobs agenda with a living wage designed to put Americans, and explicitly African Americans, to work would go a long way toward uprooting the racial habits that inform such a view. It would counter the nonsense that currently stands as a reason for long-term black unemployment in public debate: black folk are lazy and don't want to work. If we hold the view that government plays a crucial role in ensuring the public good-if we believe that all Americans, no matter their race or class, can be vital contributors to our beloved community-then we reject the idea that some populations are disposable, that some people can languish in the shadows while the rest of us dance in the light. The question ''Am I my brother's or my sister's keeper?" is not just a question for the individual or a mantra to motivate the private sector. It is a question answered in the social arrangements that aim to secure the goods and values we most cherish as a community. In other words, we need an idea of government that reflects the value of all Americans, not just white Americans or a few people with a lot of money. We need government seriously committed to racial justice. As a nation, we can never pat ourselves on the back about racial matters. We have too much blood on our hands. Remembering that fact-our inheritance, as Wendell Berry said-does not amount to beating ourselves over the head, or wallowing in guilt, or trading in race cards. Remembering our national sins serves as a check and balance against national hubris. We're reminded of what we are capable of, and our eyes are trained to see that ugliness when it rears its head. But when we disremember-when we forget about the horrors of lynching, lose sight of how African Americans were locked into a dual labor market because of explicit racism, or ignore how we exported our racism around the world-we free ourselves from any sense of accountability. Concern for others and a sense of responsibility for the whole no longer matter. Cruelty and indifference become our calling cards. We have to isolate those areas in which long-standing trends of racial inequality short-circuit the life chances of African Americans. In addition to a jobs agenda, we need a comprehensive government response to the problems of public education and mass incarceration. And I do mean a government response. Private interests have overrun both areas, as privatization drives school reform (and the education of our children is lost in the boisterous battles between teachers' unions and private interests) and as big business makes enormous profits from the warehousing of black and brown people in prisons. Let's be clear: private interests or market-based strategies will not solve the problems we face as a country or bring about the kind of society we need. We have to push for massive government investment in early childhood education and in shifting the center of gravity of our society from punishment to restorative justice. We can begin to enact the latter reform by putting an end to the practice of jailing children. Full stop. We didn't jail children in the past. We don't need to now. In sum, government can help us go a long way toward uprooting racial habits with policies that support jobs with a living wage, which would help wipe out the historic double-digit gap between white and black unemployment; take an expansive approach to early childhood education, which social science research consistently says profoundly affects the life chances of black children; and dismantle the prison-industrial complex. We can no longer believe that disproportionately locking up black men and women constitutes an answer to social ills. This view of government cannot be dismissed as a naive pipe dream, because political considerations relentlessly attack our political imaginations and limit us to the status quo. We are told before we even open our mouths that this particular view won't work or that it will never see the light of day. We've heard enough of that around single payer health care reform and other progressive policies over the Obama years. Such defeatist attitudes conspire to limit our imaginations and make sure that the world stays as it is. But those of us who don't give a damn about the rules of the current political game must courageously organize, advocate, and insist on the moral and political significance of a more robust role for government. We have to change the terms of political debate. Something dramatic has to happen. American democracy has to be remade. John Dewey, the American philosopher, understood this: The very idea of democracy, the meaning of democracy, must be continually explored afresh; it has to be constantly discovered and rediscovered, remade and reorganized; while the political and economic and social institutions in which it is embodied have to be remade and reorganized to meet the changes that are going on in the development of new needs on the part of human beings and new resources for satisfying these needs. Dewey saw American democracy as an unfinished project. He knew that the aims and purposes of this country were not fixed forever in the founding documents, but the particular challenges of our moment required imaginative leaps on behalf of democracy itself. Otherwise, undemocratic forces might prevail; tyranny in the form of the almighty dollar and the relentless pursuit of it might overtake any commitment to the idea of the public good; and bad habits might diminish our moral imaginations. The remaking of America will not happen inside the Beltway. Too many there have too much invested in the status quo. A more robust idea of government will not emerge from the current political parties. Both are beholden to big money. Substantive change will have to come from us. Or, as the great civil rights leader Ella Baker said, "we are the leaders we've been looking for"-a model of leadership that scares the hell out of the Reverena Sharpton. We will have to challenge the status quo in the streets and at the ballot box. In short, it will take a full-blown democratic awakening to enact this revolution. On February 7, 2014, I flew to Raleigh, North Carolina, to join with tens of thousands of other like-minded people to protest the draconian laws passed by the North Carolina state legislature. Since 2010, while many people-especially black people-were still reeling from the 2008 recession/depression, Republicans eliminated Medicaid coverage for half a million North Carolinians, passed a voter-ID law designed to disenfranchise primarily African American voters, transferred $90 million from public schools to voucher schools and cut pre-K for 30,000 children, passed a law requiring women about to have an abortion to listen to the heartbeat of the fetus, repealed the earned income tax credit for 900,000 people, and constitutionally banned gay marriage. North Carolina Republicans had declared war. They represented clear examples of those who hold a view of government that hardens hearts and reinforces racial habits. I watched from afar as the Forward Together moral movement took shape in response. People from all across North Carolina organized and mobilized to take back the state from extremists. The state NAACP, with its charismatic leader, Reverend William Barber II, built a movement from the ground up to challenge what they took to be an allout assault on the moral and social fabric of the state. The movement was not simply a reaction to Tea Party Republicans. "We started this when the Democrats were in power," Barber said. "We put out the word. The state had not complied with the Leandro decision [a 1994 publiceducation-equity lawsuit]. We still had not given public employees collective bargaining rights. We didn't have a racial justice act." But the actions of the North Carolina GOP intensified the group's efforts. More than 900 people who engaged in nonviolent civil disobedience to protest the Republican agenda were arrested during the 2013 legislative session. Reverend Barber put out a call across the country for a massive march in February to launch the 2014 Forward Together campaign. Eighty thousand to 100,000 people answered. It was the largest mass demonstration in the South since the Selma march in 1965. I arrived early. It was cold, and clouds blocked the sun as organizers began to set up. A few people worked on their signs. One sign read PROTECT ALL N.C. CITIZENS with different examples of vulnerable groups written underneath (the mentally ill, the unemployed, teachers, the elderly, students, prisoners, the uninsured, minorities). I was struck from the beginning by the cross-section of people there. Old and young, straight and gay, black, white, and Latino all began to gather. I asked a few of them why they were marching. Leslie Boyd, a white woman from Asheville, North Carolina, told me about her son, Michael Danforth. He had suffered from a birth defect that made it next to impossible for him to get health insurance. He died in the hospital, and ever since, she has dedicated her life to health care activism. She started a small nonprofit called Western North Carolina Health Advocates, through which she met Reverend Barber. He asked her to join the movement. The cold weather drove me into the nearby McDonald's, where several people sipped coffee while they waited for the march to begin. I struck up a conversation with Martin Marshall from Atlanta, Georgia, and Ron Gray from Rock Hill, South Carolina. Martin told me a story about his childhood experiences with racism, about the wall that divided his white community from the black community, and how racism was still alive today. "Voter restrictions and access to health care " were · the reasons he was marching. Ron was less talkative. He said, "I will give you the short form: injustice. I am here because it is the right place to be." Sitting next to Martin and Ron was an older white couple, Bill and Betsy Crittendon from Chapel Hill, North Carolina. They were members of an interracial choir called the United Voices of Praise. They had been involved in interracial social issues for a number of years and found the "regressive policies that have come about in this state [to be] just awful, absolutely awful. They have completely reversed the course of this state." Mrs. Crittendon wasn't too optimistic that the march would change the minds of state legislators, but she and her husband understood the long-term significance of the march and the Forward Together movement. "People need to see and hear what this is all about .... Every step along the way is a building step [to clear] the way for justice issues." These were people from different walks of life who understood the common ground of suffering in this country. For them, that understanding did not require anyone to leave the particulars of their suffering at the door. Anti-racism remained a part of their advocacy whether they struggled for universal health care or a living wage. They joined with others to urge a fundamental change in North Carolina and the country that could help break down racial habits. Reverend Barber thinks of their efforts in this way: [It's] about showing people the intersectionality of their lives; the intersectionality of their moving together . ... We have a phrase: we is the most important word in the justice vocabulary. The issue is not what I can do, but what we can do when we stand together, fight together, pray together, and work together, and we feel movement together. As I finished the conversations in McDonald's, I looked outside. Busload after busload of people had begun to arrive. Before the march began, speakers rallied the crowd. The topics were wide-ranging, from LGBT concerns, the state of public education, issues of immigration and the status of undocumented workers, to racist voter-ID laws. It was an in-the-flesh performance of a multiracial, multi-issue coalition. And whenever someone shouted, "Forward together," the crowd replied, "Not one step back." Initially, to an outsider looking in, the moment resembled the traditional theater of contemporary American protest. A march serves as a moment of catharsis. People gather, tensions are released, folks go back to business as usual, and the men (and it is typically always men) who lead the march leverage the spotlight for personal gain. But a brief glance beneath the surface of this particular gathering revealed something much more expansive. The march was just the tip of an organizing iceberg. Reverend Barber declared, "The Moral March inaugurates a fresh year of grassroots empowerment, voter education, litigation, and nonviolent direct action." In other words, this march wasn't a culmination but a catalyst: it dramatized an organizing effort (which preceded the gathering) that encompassed the courtroom, the ballot box, and the streets. For Barber, the work of democracy doesn't happen through marches or backroom deals but through concerted efforts "to change the context in which power operates." Of course, voting matters. But democracy is about the commitment to get one's hands dirty, and that work is often selfless and thankless. At the heart of those efforts is a more robust conception of government-a belief that government has the capacity to transform lives through focused legislation-and an insistence that we shift the center of moral gravity in North Carolina and in the nation. Five demands guide this insistence: (1) secure pro-labor, anti-poverty policies that ensure economic sustainability; (2) provide well-funded, quality public education to all; (3) stand up for the health of every North Carolinian by promoting health care access and environmental justice across all the state's communities; (4) address the continuing inequalities in the criminal justice system and ensure equality under the law for every person, regardless of race, class, creed, documentation, or sexual preference; and (5) protect and expand voting rights for people of color, immigrants, the elderly, and students to safeguard fair democratic representation. Each demand carries with it an expectation of the role of government in safeguarding the public good and an affirmation of the dignity and standing of all Americans. If we were to embrace these demands as policy, we would be well on our way to a revolution of value. As we marched from historic Shaw University, the place where the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was founded in April 1960, to the state capitol, Americans from all walks of life expressed a radically egalitarian vision of this country. This vision did not require African Americans to leave their experiences at the door. Alongside demands for marriage equality, cries for support of public education, and calls for a more robust commitment to labor, marchers embraced the call for an anti-racist politics. As Reverend Barber said, "Some people wanted us to emphasize poverty instead of race. But you have to speak the truth. [Race] can be the Achilles' heel of the movement or lend itself to your moral positioning." We have to confront white supremacy, or what Barber calls "the corruption of the spirit and the conscience," as a fundamental contradiction of American democracy, or face the consequences of our silence. As the march concluded, I stood amazed at the power of ordinary people. Thousands of people had come together, for a moment, to declare their commitment to a radical vision of democracy. This is what has been missing in contemporary American politics. Reverend Barber's inspiring remarks struck a chord that reached back to the nineteenthcentury abolitionists, black and white, who decided to become traitors in the name of American democracy. They turned their backs on the slave regime. Barber called us to do the same with the political extremists of our times. We need the kind of language that's not left or right or conservative or liberal, but moral, fusion language that says look: it's extreme and immoral to suppress the right to vote. It's extreme and immoral to deny Medicaid for millions of poor people. . .. It's extreme and immoral to raise taxes on the working poor by cutting earned income taxes and to raise taxes on the poor and middle class in order to cut taxes for the wealthy. It's extreme and immoral to use power to cut off poor people's water in Detroit. That's immoral! What we need to cut off is that kind of abusive power! It's extreme and immoral to re-segregate our schools and underfund our public schools. It's extreme and immoral for people who came from immigrants to now have a mean amnesia and cry out against immigrants and the rights of children . ... That's not just bad policy, it's against the common good and a disregard for human rights. It's a refusal to lean toward the angels of our better selves . ... In policy and politics in America, we face two choices. One is the low road to political destruction, and the other is the pathway to higher ground. Barber finished speaking-preaching, really. The crowd joined hands to sing "We Shall Overcome." The voices were full of emotion and faith, not the sound of trepidation heard in the voices of those who sang the song after Reagan's speech in the Rose Garden. For much of the march, the day had been cloudy and cold. But as he spoke, the sun finally broke through. "The sun has come out," Reverend Barber started to shout. "The sun has come out. We are on our way to higher ground. Even the universe blesses this day. Even the universe says yes to justice, yes to equality, yes to higher ground." Marchers shouted. In front of me stood a white Episcopalian preacher in tears. I wiped my own eyes. This is the kind of social movement that will transform our idea of government. It insists on the dignity and standing of black people and other marginalized groups, and it argues for a dramatic change in what we as Americans care" most about. To be sure, the Forward Together moral movement isn't the only form of struggle we need. (In some ways, Reverend Barber represents the long-standing tradition of the charismatic preacher as leader, although he happens to be aware of the pitfalls of the model of leadership even as he exemplifies it.) It represents just one example of what a democratic awakening must do if we are to change the terms of political debate in this country: it must enact a different way of thinking about government and its relation to the most vulnerable among us.

#### Subverting norms is worse – it presents a mirage of progress that conflates intellectual flattery with progressive politics and

Ruti 15 [Mari, professor of Critical Theory at the University of Toronto, *Between Levinas and Lacan: Self, Other, Ethics*, Bloomsbury Publishing, pg. 180-184]

In Chapter 2, I pointed out that Butler's attempt to have it both ways—to denounce the Enlightenment while simultaneously using its resources—leads to conceptual contradictions that cannot easily be resolved. The matter is worth revisiting here in greater detail because it highlights my major disagreement with Butler, namely that her wholesale vilification of autonomy reaches the kinds of hyperbolic ideological heights that cannot be theoretically defended. Indeed, it is in part the predictability of Butler's stance on this issue that explains why I have been so critical of her in this book: that I always know ahead of time how the argument is going to go—autonomy, sovereignty, rationality, normative limits bad; antinormativity, no matter how far-fetched, good—makes me feel the same way I do when I am grading yet another graduate student paper that undertakes the task of "deconstructing" the humanist subject. In the latter instance, it takes all the pedagogical willpower I can conjure up to not write in the margin, "Didn't we already do this circa 1975?" In Butler's case, I suppose I would like some explanation for why the monotonous disparagement of autonomy and related concepts is so important to her.

"This question is worth asking because the problematic of the subject—the question of the proper way to theorize the relationship between autonomy and subjection, agency and abjection, accountability and social determination—has been one of the most divisive issues of contemporary theory. I have already outlined my own position, which is that either-or solutions to this problematic are too one-dimensional, that if human beings are not entirely autonomous, they are not entirely subjected either, which is why we need to theorize both poles of the dichotomy simultaneously. This, refreshingly, is what Allen tries to do, which is one reason I have found her arguments so convincing. Allen explains that her goal "is to offer an analysis of power in all its depth and complexity, including an analysis of subjection that explicates how power works at the intrasubjective level to shape and constitute our very subjectivity, and an account of autonomy that captures the constituted subject's capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation, its capacity to be self-constituting" (PS 2-3). Without an account of subjection, Allen adds, critical theory cannot grasp "the real-world relations of power and subordination along lines of gender, race, and sexuality that it must illuminate if it is to be truly critical"; but without a satisfactory account of autonomy, critical theory "cannot envision possible paths of social transformation" {PS 3). This is why it is important to understand how we can be constituted by power yet capable of constituting ourselves, how we can be limited by our social context yet capable of critical reflection and self-transformation beyond this context.

Undoubtedly even our capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation is socially constituted, so that it would be possible to posit—with Zizek—that this capacity merely renders our subordination more livable. In Zizek's skeptical reading (and this is a possibility I touched on in Chapter 4), what the system wants is precisely that we rebel against it—that we strive for the kind of self transformation that gives us the illusion of being able to distance ourselves from it—because, in the final analysis, our attempts to defy its power merely consolidate this power; as Zizek maintains, in one of his more Foucaultian moments, power thrives on our action of disidentification because it "can reproduce itself only through some form of self-distance, by relying on the obscene disavowed rules and practices that are in conflict with its public norms."2 Yet it is also the case—as Zizek himself repeatedly stresses—that without the capacity for critical reflection and self-transformation our relationship to the big Other would be one of utter subjection.

#### It’s key to CCS – link-turns every impact.

Graciela ‘16 (/16 – Professor of Economics and of Statistics at Columbia University and Visiting Professor at Stanford University, and was the architect of the Kyoto Protocol carbon market (being interviewed by Marcus Rolle, freelance journalist specializing in environmental issues and global affairs, “Reversing Climate Change: Interview with Graciela Chichilnisky,” http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/01/09/2016/reversing-climate-change-interview-graciela-chichilnisky)//cmr

GC: Green capitalism is a new economic system that values the natural resources on which human survival depends. It fosters a harmonious relationship with our planet, its resources and the many species it harbors. It is a new type of market economics that addresses both equity and efficiency. Using carbon negative technology™ it helps reduce carbon in the atmosphere while fostering economic development in rich and developing nations, for example in the U S., EU, China and India. How does this work? In a nutshell Green Capitalism requires the creation of global limits or property rights nation by nation for the use of the atmosphere, the bodies of water and the planet’s biodiversity, and the creation of new markets to trade these rights from which new economic values and a new concept of economic progress emerges updating GDP as is now generally agreed is needed. Green Capitalism is needed now to help avert climate change and achieve the goals of the 2015 UN Paris Agreement, which are very ambitious and universally supported but have no way to be realized within the Agreement itself. The Carbon Market and its CDM play critical roles in the foundation of Green Capitalism, creating values to redefine GDP. These are needed to remain within the world’s “CO2 budget” and avoid catastrophic climate change. As I see it, the building blocks for Green Capitalism are then as follows; (1) Global limits nation by nation in the use of the planet’s atmosphere, its water bodies and biodiversity - these are global public goods. (2) New global markets to trade these limits, based on equity and efficiency. These markets are relatives of the Carbon Market and the SO2 market. The new market create new measures of economic values and update the concept of GDP. (3) Efficient use of Carbon Negative Technologies to avert catastrophic climate change by providing a smooth transition to clean energy and ensuring economic prosperity in rich and poor nations. These building blocks have immediate practical implications in reversing climate change and can assist the ambitious aims of Paris COP21 become a reality. MR: What is the greatest advantage of the new generation technologies that can capture CO2 from the air? GC: These technologies build carbon negative power plants, such as Global Thermostat, that clean the atmosphere of CO2 while producing electricity. Global Thermostat is a firm that is commercializing a technology that takes CO2 out of air and uses mostly low cost residual heat rather than electricity to drive the capture process, making the entire process of capturing CO2 from the atmosphere very inexpensive. There is enough residua heat in a coal power plant that it can be used to capture twice as much CO2 as the plant emits, thus transforming the power plant into a “carbon sink.” For example, a 400 MW coal plant that emits 1 million tons of CO2 per year can become a carbon sink absorbing a net amount of 1 million tons of CO2 instead. Carbon capture from air can be done anywhere and at any time, and so inexpensively that the CO2 can be sold for industrial or commercial uses such as plastics, food and beverages, greenhouses, bio-fertilizers, building materials and even enhanced oil recovery, all examples of large global markets and profitable opportunities. Carbon capture is powered mostly by low (85°C) residual heat that is inexpensive, and any source will do. In particular, renewable (solar) technology can power the process of carbon capture. This can help advance solar technology and make it more cost-efficient. This means more energy, more jobs, and it also means economic growth in developing nations, all of this while cleaning the CO2 in the atmosphere. Carbon negative technologies can literally transform the world economy. MR: One final question. You distinguish between long-run and short-run strategies in the effort to reverse climate change. Would carbon negative technologies be part of a short-run strategy? GC: Long-run strategies are quite different from strategies for the short-run. Often long-run strategies do not work in the short run and different policies and economic incentives are needed. In the long run the best climate change policy is to replace fossil fuel sources of energy that by themselves cause 45% of the global emissions, and to plant trees to restore if possible the natural sources and sinks of CO2. But the fossil fuel power plant infrastructure is about 87% of the power plant infrastructure and about $45-55 trillion globally. This infrastructure cannot be replaced quickly, certainly not in the short time period in which we need to take action to avert catastrophic climate change. The issue is that CO2 once emitted remains hundreds of years in the atmosphere and we have emitted so much that unless we actually remove the CO2 that is already there, we cannot remain long within the carbon budget, which is the concentration of CO2 beyond which we fear catastrophic climate change. In the short run, therefore, we face significant time pressure. The IPCC indicates in its 2014 5th Assessment Report that we must actually remove the carbon that is already in the atmosphere and do so in massive quantities, this century (p. 191 of 5th Assessment Report). This is what I called a carbon negative approach, which works for the short run. Renewable energy is the long run solution. Renewable energy is too slow for a short run resolution since replacing a $45-55 trillion power plant infrastructure with renewable plants could take decades. We need action sooner than that. For the short run we need carbon negative technologies that capture more carbon than what is emitted. Trees do that and they must be conserved to help preserve biodiversity. Biochar does that. But trees and other natural sinks are too slow for what we need today. Therefore, negative carbon is needed now as part of a blueprint for transformation. It must be part of the blueprint for Sustainable Development and its short term manifestation that I call Green Capitalism, while in the long run renewable sources of energy suffice, including Wind, Biofuels, Nuclear, Geothermal, and Hydroelectric energy. These are in limited supply and cannot replace fossil fuels. Global energy today is roughly divided as follows: 87% is fossil, namely natural gas, coal, oil; 10% is nuclear, geothermal, and hydroelectric, and less than 1% is solar power — photovoltaic and solar thermal. Nuclear fuel is scarce and nuclear technology is generally considered dangerous as tragically experienced by the Fukushima Daichi nuclear disaster in Japan, and it seems unrealistic to seek a solution in the nuclear direction. Only solar energy can be a long term solution: Less than 1% of the solar energy we receive on earth can be transformed into 10 times the fossil fuel energy used in the world today. Yet we need a short-term strategy that accelerates long run renewable energy, or we will defeat long-term goals. In the short term as the IPCC validates, we need carbon negative technology, carbon removals. The short run is the next 20 or 30 years. There is no time in this period of time to transform the entire fossil infrastructure — it costs $45-55 trillion (IEA) to replace and it is slow to build. We need to directly reduce carbon in the atmosphere now. We cannot use traditional methods to remove CO2 from smokestacks (called often Carbon Capture and Sequestration, CSS) because they are not carbon negative as is required. CSS works but does not suffice because it only captures what power plants currently emit. Any level of emissions adds to the stable and high concentration we have today and CO2 remains in the atmosphere for years. We need to remove the CO2 that is already in the atmosphere, namely air capture of CO2 also called carbon removals. The solution is to combine air capture of CO2 with storage of CO2 into stable materials such as biochar, cement, polymers, and carbon fibers that replace a number of other construction materials such as metals. The most recent BMW automobile model uses only carbon fibers rather than metals. It is also possible to combine CO2 to produce renewable gasoline, namely gasoline produced from air and water. CO2 can be separated from air and hydrogen separated from water, and their combination is a well-known industrial process to produce gasoline. Is this therefore too expensive? There are new technologies using algae that make synthetic fuel commercially feasible at competitive rates. Other policies would involve combining air capture with solar thermal electricity using the residual solar thermal heat to drive the carbon capture process. This can make a solar plant more productive and efficient so it can out-compete coal as a source of energy. In summary, the blueprint offered here is a private/public approach, based on new industrial technology and financial markets, self-funded and using profitable greenmarkets, with securities that utilize carbon credits as the “underlying” asset, based on the KP CDM, as well as new markets for biodiversity and water providing abundant clean energy to stave off impending and actual energy crisis in developing nations, fostering mutually beneficial cooperation for industrial and developing nations. The blueprint proposed provides the two sides of the coin, equity and efficiency, and can assign a critical role for women as stewards for human survival and sustainable development. My vision is a carbon negative economy that represents green capitalism in resolving the Global Climate negotiations and the North–South Divide. Carbon negative power plants and capture of CO2 from air and ensure a clean atmosphere together innovation and more jobs and exports: the more you produce and create jobs the cleaner becomes the atmosphere. In practice, Green Capitalism means economic growth that is harmonious with the Earth resources.

#### It’s sustainable.

Radelet ’16 (Steven; February 2016; Ph.D. and M.P.P. from Harvard University, B.A. from Central Michigan University, Distinguished Professor of the Practice of Development, and is Director of the Global Human Development Program at Georgetown University, former Professor of Government and Economics at Harvard University, former economic advisor to President Sirleaf of Liberia; Foreign Affairs, “Prosperity Rising,” https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2015-12-14/prosperity-rising)

Since the early 1990s, daily life in poor countries has been changing profoundly for the better: **one billion people** have escaped extreme poverty, average **incomes have doubled**, infant death **rates have plummeted**, millions more girls have enrolled in school, **chronic hunger** has been cut almost in half, deaths from malaria and other diseases have declined dramatically, **democracy has spread** far and wide, and the incidence of war—even with Syria and other conflicts—has fallen by half. This unprecedented progress goes way beyond China and India and has touched hundreds of millions of people in dozens of developing countries across the globe, from Mongolia to Mozambique, Bangladesh to Brazil. Yet few people are aware of these achievements, even though, in aggregate, they rank among the **most important in human history**. In 2013, the Swedish survey organization Novus Group International asked Americans how they thought the share of the world’s population living in extreme poverty had changed over the last two decades. Sixty-six percent of respondents said that they thought it had doubled, and another 29 percent said that it hadn’t changed. Only five percent knew (or guessed) the truth: that the share of people living in extreme **poverty had fallen by half**. Perhaps that ignorance explains why Washington has done so little to take advantage of these promising trends, giving only tepid support to nascent democracies, making limited investments in economic development and in new health and agricultural technologies, and failing to take the lead in building more **effective international institutions**. Whatever the reason, many developing countries are now responding to what they perceive as the United States’ indifference by looking elsewhere—especially toward China—for deeper engagement and advice on how to keep growing. At the same time, climate change, the slowdown in global growth, and rising tensions in the Middle East and beyond have begun to **threaten further progress**. As a result, the United States now risks missing out on a **historic chance** to strengthen its global leadership and help create a safer, more prosperous, and more democratic world—just at the moment when it could help the most. ONE GIANT LEAP Global poverty is falling faster today than at any time in human history. In 1993, about two billion people were trapped in extreme poverty (defined by the World Bank as living on less than $1.90 per day); by 2012, that number had dropped to less than one billion. The industrialization of China is a big part of the story, of course, but even excluding that country, the number of extreme poor has fallen by more than 400 million. Since the 1980s, **more than 60 countries** have reduced the number of their citizens who are impoverished, even as their overall populations have grown. This decline in poverty has gone hand in hand with much **faster economic growth**. Between 1977 and 1994, the growth in per capita GDP across the developing countries averaged zero; since 1995, that figure has shot up to three percent. Again, the change is widespread: between 1977 and 1994, only 21 developing countries (out of 109 with populations greater than one million) exceeded two percent annual per capita growth, but between 1995 and 2013, 71 such countries did so. And going backward has become much less common: in the earlier period, more than 50 developing countries recorded negative growth, but in the later one, just ten did. The **improvements in health** have been even bigger. In 1960, 22 percent of children in developing countries died before their fifth birthday, but by 2013, only five percent did. Diarrhea killed five million children a year in 1990 but claimed fewer than one million in 2014. **Half as many people** now **die** from malaria as did in 2000, and deaths from tuberculosis and AIDS have both dropped by a third. The share of people living with chronic hunger has fallen by almost half since the mid-1990s. **Life expectancy** at birth in developing countries has **lengthened by** nearly **one-third**, from 50 years in 1960 to 65 years today. These improvements in health have left no country untouched, even the worst-governed ones. Consider this: the rate of child death has declined in every single country (at least those where data are available) since 1980. Meanwhile, far more children are enrolling in and completing school. In the late 1980s, only 72 percent of all primary-school-age children attended school; now, the figure exceeds 87 percent. Girls in developing countries have enjoyed the biggest gains. In 1980, only half of them finished primary school, whereas four out of five do so today. These leaps in education are beginning to translate into better-skilled workers. Then there is the shift to democracy. Prior to the 1980s, most developing countries were run by left- or right-wing dictators. Coups and countercoups, violence and assassinations, human rights abuses—all formed part of regular political life. But starting in the 1980s, dictators began to fall, a process that accelerated after the Cold War. In 1983, only 17 of 109 developing countries qualified as democracies, based on data from Freedom House and the Center for Systemic Peace; by 2013, the number had **more than tripled**, to 56 (and that’s not counting the many more developing countries with populations of less than one million). As those numbers suggest, power today is far more likely to be transferred through the ballot box than through violence, and elections in most countries have become fairer and more transparent. Twenty years ago, few Indonesians could have imagined that a furniture maker from central Java would beat one of Suharto’s relatives in a free and fair election, as Joko Widodo did in 2014. Nor would many have predicted that Nigeria, then still under military rule, would in 2015 mark its first peaceful transfer of power between parties, or that Myanmar (also called Burma) would hold its most successful democratic election the same year. Across the developing world, individual freedoms and rights are honored to a much greater degree, human rights **abuses are rarer**, and legislative bodies have more power. Yes, many of these new democracies have problems. And yes, the march toward democracy has slowed since 2005—and even reversed in some countries, such as Thailand and Venezuela. But in many more—from Brazil to Mongolia to Senegal—democracy has deepened. Never before in history have so many **developing countries been so democratic**. As states have become wealthier and more democratic, **conflict and violence** within them have declined. Those who think otherwise should remember that as recently as the 1980s and early 1990s, much of the world was aflame, from Central America to Southeast Asia to West Africa. There were half as many civil wars in the last decade as there were in the 1980s, and the number of people killed in armed conflicts has **fallen by three-quarters**. Three major forces sparked this great surge in development progress. First, the end of the Cold War brought an end to the superpowers’ support for some of the world’s nastiest dictators and reduced the frequency of conflict. As ideas about economic and political governance began to change, developing countries introduced more market-based economic systems and more democracy. Second, globalization created vast new opportunities for economic growth. Increased flows of trade, investment, information, and technology created more jobs and improved living standards. Third, new and more effective leaders—in politics, business, religion, and civil society—began to forge deep change. Where courageous figures, such as Nelson Mandela in South Africa, stepped forward, countries progressed; where old-style dictators, such as Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe, remained in power, countries languished. This **incredibly wide-ranging progress** should not obscure the considerable work that remains: progress has not reached everyone, everywhere. One billion people still live in extreme poverty, six million children die every year from preventable diseases, too few girls get the education they deserve, and too many people suffer under dictatorships. Countries such as Haiti, North Korea, Uzbekistan, and Zimbabwe lag far behind. But the fact remains that an **enormous transformation** is under way—one that has already substantially improved the lives of hundreds of millions of people. WIN-WIN The United States should welcome and encourage this progress. For starters, broad-based development **enhances global security**. It is not true that poverty necessarily breeds terrorism, as some argue—after all, most poor people are not terrorists, and many terrorists are not poor. But it is true that poor states tend to be weak states unable to prevent **terrorist and criminal networks** from operating on their soil. Sustained development strengthens government institutions and reduces the need for outside intervention. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates put it, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.” Development also builds states’ capacities to fight pandemic disease. Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone were overwhelmed by Ebola in 2014 largely because they all had weak health systems. The same was true in many of the countries hit hardest by the HIV/AIDS epidemic decades ago. As poor countries grow wealthier, however, they become better equipped to **fight diseases** that can spread quickly beyond their borders. A more prosperous developing world also benefits the U.S. economy. The spread of economic growth creates **new markets** for American businesses not just in China but also in Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, and beyond. Developing countries are buying more and more aircraft, automobiles, semiconductors, medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, consultancy services, and entertainment. Although the growth in trade with developing countries has slowed during the last year, their economies will no doubt remain major market opportunities for U.S. companies. In 1990, such states accounted for one-third of the global economy; today, their share is half, and they purchase more than half of U.S. exports. In 2011, Walmart spent $2.4 billion to acquire a controlling share of a holding company that operates more than 350 retail stores in South Africa and 11 other African countries, signaling a level of interest in African consumers that would have been unimaginable two decades ago. To be sure, emerging markets also create competition for U.S. businesses and hardship for American workers who lose their jobs as a result. But they also create many new jobs, as American firms expand abroad and as companies in the developing world send more capital to the West. Moreover, developing countries are increasingly coming up with their own **innovations** and **technologies**, in medicine, agriculture, energy, and more. The United States should respond to this growing competition not with protectionism but by strengthening its own capacities: rebuilding its **infrastructure, improving** its **educational** system, and investing in new technologies. Finally, development helps spread and deepen the values that Americans hold dear: openness, economic opportunity, democracy, and freedom. These values tend to go hand in hand with growing prosperity: as incomes rise, citizens demand greater freedoms. History suggests that even governments that do not welcome these ideas eventually embrace them or are replaced by those that do. And as more developing countries achieve progress under market-based economic systems and democracy, other countries seek to **emulate the model**. The United States and Europe have a strong self-interest in encouraging this process, since it will enhance global stability and add to the number of like-minded partners that can help address future challenges. SUSTAINING THE SURGE What makes all this progress especially impressive is that it has continued despite a number of major shocks that in an earlier age could well have stopped it: the outbreak of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the 1980s, the Asian financial crisis in 1997–98, the 9/11 attacks, the global food crisis of 2007–8, and the global financial crisis of 2008. In each case, pundits predicted that the disaster of the day would set back progress. Yet in each case, the gains continued. There are good reasons to believe they can continue well into the future. The forces that sparked these **changes were fundamental**, not transitory. Governments have learned from their mistakes and gotten much better at managing inevitable downturns. Global integration has made critical technologies available to more and more people. **State institutions** have become more effective, with improved (if imperfect) legal systems, clearer property rights, and greater respect for individual liberties. Democratic rules and norms governing the transfer of political power, free speech, and accountability have become more deeply entrenched. Civil society groups are more active. These deep-seated changes have put enormous additional gains well within reach. If **economic growth proceeds** along the lines of most projections over the next two decades, some 700 million more people will escape extreme poverty. Per capita incomes in poor countries will double again, **millions of** childhood **deaths** will be avoided, **tens of millions** of children will get the education they deserve, hunger will decline, and basic rights and freedoms will spread further. At least, that’s what should happen—but none of these future gains is guaranteed. Growth has slowed markedly since 2008 in emerging economies such as Brazil and China and throughout the developing world. Russia, Thailand, and Venezuela have turned less democratic, and South Africa and Turkey seem to be headed in that direction as well. The Middle East has seen the return of conflict and **authoritarian rule**. China’s aggressive actions in the South China Sea could **spark a major conflict** that could kill tens of thousands of people and devastate the region’s economies. Outbreaks of SARS and the H1N1 and Ebola viruses underscore humanity’s vulnerability to disease, and many doctors worry that growing resistance to antibiotics could reverse some of the hard-fought gains in health. Meanwhile, global population is on track to exceed nine billion by 2050, and the combination of more people, higher incomes, and warmer climates will place enormous strains on the world’s supplies of fresh water, food, and energy. Although there are ample grounds for pessimism, the doomsayers continue to **underestimate humanity’s growing ability** to cooperate in the face of new challenges. In the eighteenth century, when Thomas Malthus looked at population growth and foresaw catastrophic famine, he failed to appreciate the advances in agriculture, health, and governance that human ingenuity could create. The same was true for those that predicted a population disaster in Asia in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, the problems facing developing countries are plain to see, while the new ideas and innovations that will overcome them are harder to picture. Continued progress isn’t automatic or guaranteed. But with smart choices, it is within reach. LEADING BY EXAMPLE Most of the key choices will be made in developing countries themselves. Sustaining progress will require leaders there to reduce their countries’ dependence on natural resources, make their economies more inclusive, invest more in health and education, expand opportunities for women, and strengthen democracy and the rule of law. Yet the future of development will also **depend on the** actions of the **world’s leading countries**, since poorer countries can prosper only in a strong global system. The United States must do its part by regaining its economic leadership through major investments in infrastructure, education, and technological advances in health, agriculture, and alternative fuels. It must act to fix its long-term budget problems by improving the solvency of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and strengthen the financial system through better regulation. The country must also do a much better job of leading by **example on democracy**. Deep political polarization, the lack of substantive debate, the unwillingness to compromise, misguided foreign policy adventurism, and the Great Recession have made liberal democracy look unattractive and ineffective. That malaise matters, because many developing countries are now engaged in a battle of ideas over which economic and political model they should follow. On the one side stands the model that has prevailed in the West since World War II: market capitalism coupled with **liberal democracy**. On the other is the model practiced by China, Vietnam, Ethiopia, and, increasingly, Russia, among others: state capitalism coupled with authoritarian rule. And there’s yet one more option, with a smaller but more dangerous following: religious fundamentalism, as promulgated by Iran and Saudi Arabia and groups such as the Islamic State (or ISIS) and Boko Haram in Nigeria. As the Western countries struggle and China continues to rise, authoritarian capitalism is becoming more appealing. Consider Beijing’s ties to Africa. China purchased $26 billion in imports from the continent in 2013; the United States purchased $9 billion. Chinese investment in Africa has been growing by 50 percent per year since 2000, whereas U.S. investment is growing by 14 percent per year. Make no mistake: many Africans still prefer to follow the American model and view China with suspicion. But those attitudes are beginning to shift, and Beijing’s apparent ability to get things done will only enhance China’s appeal, especially if Washington seems to talk big but deliver little. THE NEXT SURGE FORWARD Aside from the broader task of getting their own houses in order, the United States and other Western powers should also assert leadership in several specific areas to **keep the progress going**. The first is climate change, which presents one of the greatest threats to poverty reduction. Most of the world’s poor countries had little to do with creating the problem, yet they will bear the brunt of the damage. Rising sea levels, changing rainfall patterns, higher temperatures, and dwindling water supplies will derail progress, will undermine global food production, and could engender major conflict. Developing countries have an important role to play in curbing emissions, but they will not switch to low-carbon fuels and other clean technologies if their developed-world counterparts do not. Washington has taken important first steps to reduce power-plant emissions and raise automotive fuel-efficiency standards, but there is a very long way to go. Second, leading countries—especially the United States—should invest more in **technological innovation**. Much of the credit for recent improvements in living standards goes to vaccines, medicines, high-yielding seed varieties, cell phones, and the Internet. These new technologies (alongside old ones such as electricity and paved roads) have not yet reached everywhere, so simply making them more widely available would do wonders. But sustaining progress for the next several decades will also require **significant investments** in new vaccines, more powerful drugs, drought- and heat-resistant seeds, desalination techniques, and clean energy.

#### Neoliberal globalization is key to solve war – best empirical evidence proves – reversing economic interdependence between the US and China guarantees conflict

Drezner 16

(Daniel W., professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “Five Known Unknowns about the Next Generation Global Political Economy,” Brookings Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2016/05/future-global-political-economy-drezner/ios-drezner-web.pdf>)

Multiple scholars have observed a secular decline in interstate violence in recent decades.105 The Kantian triad of more democracies, stronger multilateral institutions, and greater levels of cross-border trade is well known. In recent years, international relations theorists have stressed that commercial interdependence is a bigger driver of this phenomenon than previously thought.106 The liberal logic is straightforward. The benefits of cross-border exchange and economic interdependence act as a powerful brake on the utility of violence in international politics. The global supply chain and “just in time” delivery systems have further imbricated national economies into the international system. This creates incentives for governments to preserve an open economy even during times of crisis. The more that a country’s economy was enmeshed in the global supply chain, for example, the less likely it was to raise tariffs after the 2008 financial crisis.107 Similarly, global financiers are strongly interested in minimizing political risk; historically, the financial sector has staunchly opposed initiating the use of force in world politics.108 Even militarily powerful actors must be wary of alienating global capital. Globalization therefore creates powerful pressures on governments not to close off their economies through protectionism or military aggression. Interdependence can also tamp down conflicts that would otherwise be likely to break out during a great power transition. Of the 15 times a rising power has emerged to challenge a ruling power between 1500 and 2000, war broke out 11 times.109 Despite these odds, China’s recent rise to great power status has elevated tensions without leading to anything approaching war. It could be argued that the Sino-American economic relationship is so deep that it has tamped down the great power conflict that would otherwise have been in full bloom over the past two decades. Instead, both China and the United States have taken pains to talk about the need for a new kind of great power relationship. Interdependence can help to reduce the likelihood of an extreme event—such as a great power war—from taking place. Will this be true for the next generation economy as well? The two other legs of the Kantian triad—democratization and multilateralism—are facing their own problems in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis.110 Economic openness survived the negative shock of the 2008 financial crisis, which suggests that the logic of commercial liberalism will continue to hold with equal force going forward. But some international relations scholars doubt the power of globalization’s pacifying effects, arguing that interdependence is not a powerful constraint.111 Other analysts go further, arguing that globalization exacerbates financial volatility—which in turn can lead to political instability and violence.112 A different counterargument is that the continued growth of interdependence will stall out. Since 2008, for example, the growth in global trade flows has been muted, and global capital flows are still considerably smaller than they were in the pre-crisis era. In trade, this reflects a pre-crisis trend. Between 1950 and 2000, trade grew, on average, more than twice as fast as global economic output. In the 2000s, however, trade only grew about 30 percent more than output.113 In 2012 and 2013, trade grew less than economic output. The McKinsey Global Institute estimates that global flows as a percentage of output have fallen from 53 percent in 2007 to 39 percent in 2014.114 While the stock of interdependence remains high, the flow has slowed to a trickle. The Financial Times has suggested that the global economy has hit “peak trade.”115 If economic growth continues to outstrip trade, then the level of interdependence will slowly decline, thereby weakening the liberal constraint on great power conflicts. And there are several reasons to posit why interdependence might stall out. One possibility is due to innovations reducing the need for traded goods. For example, in the last decade, higher energy prices in the United States triggered investments into conservation, alternative forms of energy, and unconventional sources of hydrocarbons. All of these steps reduced the U.S. demand for imported energy. A future in which compact fusion engines are developed would further reduce the need for imported energy even more.116 A more radical possibility is the development of technologies that reduce the need for physical trade across borders. Digital manufacturing will cause the relocation of production facilities closer to end-user markets, shortening the global supply chain.117 An even more radical discontinuity would come from the wholesale diffusion of 3-D printing. The ability of a single printer to produce multiple component parts of a larger manufactured good eliminates the need for a global supply chain. As Richard Baldwin notes, “Supply chain unbundling is driven by a fundamental trade-off between the gains from specialization and the costs of dispersal. This would be seriously undermined by radical advances in the direction of mass customization and 3D printing by sophisticated machines…To put it sharply, transmission of data would substitute for transportation of goods.”118 As 3-D printing technology improves, the need for large economies to import anything other than raw materials concomitantly declines.119 Geopolitical ambitions could reduce economic interdependence even further.120 Russia and China have territorial and quasi-territorial ambitions beyond their recognized borders, and the United States has attempted to counter what it sees as revisionist behavior by both countries. In a low-growth world, it is possible that leaders of either country would choose to prioritize their nationalist ambitions over economic growth. More generally, it could be that the expectation of future gains from interdependence—rather than existing levels of interdependence—constrains great power bellicosity.121 If great powers expect that the future benefits of international trade and investment will wane, then commercial constraints on revisionist behavior will lessen. All else equal, this increases the likelihood of great power conflict going forward. There have been other drivers of the decades-long reduction in militarized interstate disputes. Nuclear deterrence has helped curb violent conflict among the great powers. Multilateral peacekeeping missions mitigate small country conflicts. Even if there is a decline in interdependence, it is possible that the “Long Peace” will endure. Furthermore, it is impossible to predict the degree to which either innovations or geopolitics will lessen the need for international trade. Even technological optimists acknowledge that the future diffusion of 3D printing is unclear. Advocates of networked manufacturing insist that economic openness is a prerequisite for the process to continue.122 And the degree of geopolitical revisionism among great powers might be endogenous—that is to say, preexisting levels of globalization might constrain revisionist impulses, rather than such impulses weakening the globalized economy. If great powers resort to revisionist foreign policies, however, then the global economy will start to resemble the Cold War era of economic blocs and strategic embargoes—one in which trade and investment follow the flag rather than follow the rate of return. The increased American use of targeted financial sanctions, for example, has already generated grumblings from peer competitors about finding ways to diversify away from reliance upon the dollar.123 In 2015, China introduced its own international payment and settlements system, in part, to diversify away from reliance upon the dollar.124 The correlation of economic flows with geopolitical alliances would not just have a profound effect on cross-border flows; it would likely lead to the fragmentation of global economic governance. Just as significantly, great power governments would reverse post-Cold War trends and choose to allocate more scarce resources towards their militaries.

# 2NC

### 2NC – FW

#### This is the a random definition – interpreting as a formal vote is the only reasonable definition for competitive debate—

Parcher 1 (Jeff, Former Debate Coach at Georgetown, “Jeff P--Is the resolution a question?,” 2-26-11, <http://cedadebate.org/pipermail/mailman/2001-February/031021.html>, accessed 2-8-13 //Bosley)

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. **American Heritage Dictionary:** Resolve: 1. To **make a firm decision about**. 2. **To decide or express by formal vote**. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. **Any other conclusion is utterly** inconcievable. Why? Context. **The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating**. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. **Resolved comes from the adoption of** resolutions by legislative bodies**. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.** (5) **The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view.** One affirms a resolution. Affirmative and negative are the equivalents of 'yes' or 'no' **- which, of course, are answers to a question**. =

#### Only substance after the colon matters

Webster’s 0 (Guide to Grammar and Writing)

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go one…**If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence**, beginning the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### But a rehighlight proves monopolies sustain whiteness – means breaking them up is good

Sam Mckenzie Jr. 19 [1-17-2019 Medium How the Business of Whiteness Is the Ultimate Antitrust Violation [https://sammckenziejr.medium.com/how-the-business-of-whiteness-is-the-ultimate-antitrust-violation-3d5ec1f28ae5 Accessed 7-28-2021](https://sammckenziejr.medium.com/how-the-business-of-whiteness-is-the-ultimate-antitrust-violation-3d5ec1f28ae5%20Accessed%207-28-2021)] CSUF JmB Summer 2k21

The other day, I listened to my Alexa device echo back the attorney general confirmation hearing for William Barr. I heard a senator lob preschool questions at William Barr about tech companies and antitrust regulations. Based on the senator’s leading questions, the senator believes antitrust laws are necessary to prevent companies from becoming too powerful and eliminating competition. Apparently, that’s bad for business owners, and it’s bad for the public. As I heard the questions and answers, my face balled up and I thought, “Isn’t that what white supremacy does in America?” The answer is yes and here are a few ways it happens: Deals with white suppliers Anticompetitive deals between companies and suppliers, that reduce or end competition, can increase monopolies. In the past, America’s immigration laws created white and wanton deals with countries to maintain white majorities in America. Those racist compacts allowed millions of white Europeans to come to a racist America while excluding other nations. As America’s white majority declines, it’s no surprise the current battle with immigration is about the market share of whiteness in America with certain countries as the preferred suppliers. The mergers of whiteness Mergers by large corporations can create a monopoly too. In the past, as whiteness merged with European immigrants, the united state of whiteness benefited by eliminating competition from Black people and people of color. White racism enacted against Black people made it easier for new European immigrants to enter the workforce and the middle and upper classes of society. White America exists — in its fixed and rigged position — because white America instituted, reinforced, expanded, and reiterated white supremacy through slavery, discriminatory laws, the Homestead Act, the G.I. Bill, the New Deal, and a bad host of other inhospitable policies and practices. White supremacy has unjustly enriched white people — even poor whites relative to their counterparts — based on the merger of whiteness. The cost of the merger of whiteness to Black people from stolen income and opportunities must be many trillions of dollars. Price discrimination against Black people Price discrimination involves charging different prices to different consumers. With price discrimination, the value of a service changes depending on the buyer, and it can be illegal. If you’re Black in America, you are more likely to die earlier, go to jail, suffer greater health disparities, make less money, and be the target of discrimination and hate crimes. The unnecessary, disproportionate, and discriminatory price of life that Black people pay in America is exorbitant because of white supremacy. Barriers to entry for Black people When companies create barriers to enter the market, they can violate antitrust laws. The barriers make it impossible or unduly difficult for other companies to start and compete. Today, the structural barriers of whiteness make it harder for Black and Brown people to compete and achieve at every level. Those barriers include the need for multiple college degrees that do not pay off themselves. Those barriers include hand-me-down wealth that automatically passes ill-gotten gains and material privilege to generations of white people. Those barriers also include social and professional networks engineered and serviced by white supremacy that white employees use to get their white friends a job. Remedies and Regulation The word “trust” can refer to property or big business. Way back in the 90s, legal scholar Cheryl Harris described whiteness as property with all the benefits and entitlements of property ownership held by white people. If whiteness is property, as Harris said, then whiteness is a monopoly

— that’s inherently discriminatory in a white-supremacist society — and it violates the principles of antitrust laws too. Strangely, the same Justice Department that investigates and prosecutes antitrust violations supposedly does the same with cases of discrimination. The antitrust laws aren’t perfect; officials can underutilize and misuse them. For example, the Trump administration and his Republican accomplices want to misuse antitrust laws to punish companies they think silence “conservative voices.” Meanwhile, white supremacy — as a conglomerate of cruelty with workers and workings — is the biggest antitrust violation in American history that continues to silence voices. The principle of fair competition within antitrust laws should apply everywhere. If the Justice Department had eyes on every industry of white supremacy, as it does on antitrust violations, that would be better. To overhaul the state of the union, the disparate impact principle has to be retroactive, and it must forever reign over every part of American life with militant enforcement. The stimulated economy of white supremacy roars like a well-oiled machine. America is not a meritocracy; a white monopoly runs America. The business of whiteness has to stop passing go and running the board. Jail it, and its outcomes for life. In its place, set free the business of humanity that all Americans can trust.

#### There are many TVA’s that prove antitrust laws can combat racial injustice—for example, expand the scope of the Clayton Act to consider racially disparate outcomes as anticompetitive effects or reverse SCOTUS rulings that vertical restraints were presumptively lawful under the Sherman Act

Kritter 21 [Dani Kritter, California Law Review, "Antitrust as Antiracist", March 2021, https://www.californialawreview.org/antitrust-as-antiracist/]

The federal antitrust laws—three statutes enacted over a century ago—are in the spotlight. The year 2020 brought a new reckoning with corporate power and a resurgent interest in using antitrust law as a force for populist change. The “hipster antitrust” movement argues that the focus of antitrust policy should not be limited to market power and consumer welfare. Rather, antitrust can and should be a remedy for a suite of societal ills, from workers’ rights to campaign finance and income inequality.

The year 2020 also marked an awakening to racial injustice in America. The deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery sparked nationwide outrage and demands to reform institutions built on systemic racism. Yet the recent plans for antitrust reform—which primarily focus on monopolies in tech—ignore the fact that the antitrust status quo perpetuates racial injustice.

But it doesn’t have to be this way. This blog identifies consolidation in healthcare and vertical restraints in franchising as two examples of how lax antitrust enforcement has disproportionately harmed people of color. It also argues that by dusting off existing antitrust tools, antitrust enforcement can be antiracist.

Background: The Antitrust Toolbox

Congress enacted the federal antitrust laws to check the power of massive corporations run amuck. These laws—the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act, and the Clayton Act—were originally designed to control corporate power, protect individual economic freedom, and ensure a fair and equal society.

But beginning in the 1970s when Robert Bork published the still-influential “Antitrust Paradox,” courts slowly narrowed the focus of antitrust law to protecting consumer welfare. Today, antitrust enforcement prioritizes preventing the anticompetitive acquisition, exercise, or maintenance of market power that threatens consumer welfare and competition—a much narrower goal than its populist origins.

Dusting Off the Tools

Recent years have seen bipartisan interest in reining in powerful corporations with more aggressive antitrust enforcement. One of the few agency voices calling for an antiracist approach to antitrust is Rebecca Slaughter, the acting chair of the FTC. Slaughter has recently spoken out about using antitrust enforcement to “right the wrongs of systemic racism.” She challenges what she views to be a faulty premise of antitrust law: “that antitrust can and should be value-neutral, and therefore social justice problems like racism do not have a role in antitrust enforcement.”

Slaughter argues that antitrust has never been and never will be value-neutral. Antitrust addresses market structures, and racism is entrenched in the historic and current market structures in the United States. When agencies make decisions about how to deploy antitrust tools, they can choose whether to reinforce these structural inequities or to dismantle them.

Healthcare and franchising are two examples of how a shift in antitrust enforcement from “value-neutral” to antiracist can break down market structures that perpetuate racial injustice.

Honing in on Healthcare Monopolies

Consolidation in the healthcare industry is a driving force behind the sky-high cost of medical care and pharmaceutical drugs. Due to a wave of healthcare mergers, most hospital markets in the United States are dominated by a single corporate entity. The lack of competition means the dominant hospital is free to exercise market power by raising prices and restricting output. Recent studies of prices for hospital and outpatient treatment report that healthcare mergers have resulted in large networks charging private insurers 2.5 to 3 times more than Medicare rates for the same patient care. These rising costs lead to higher insurance premiums paid by employers and individuals.

Artificially inflated healthcare costs disproportionately burden people of color and create a barrier to accessing quality care. Black families spend a greater share of their household income on health care premiums and out-of-pocket costs than the average American family. And of the thirty million uninsured individuals in the United States, half are people of color. The COVID-19 pandemic has put this health inequity in sharp focus: racial and ethnic minority groups are more likely to contract the virus, get severely ill, and die from coronavirus infections.

What can antitrust do? First, antitrust merger review can be antiracist. Mergers between competitors are scrutinized under Section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits mergers that may substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. When determining whether a merger lessens competition, the FTC, Department of Justice (DOJ), and courts consider the likelihood of anticompetitive effects. An antiracist application of the Clayton Act would consider racially disparate outcomes like health care costs, insurance premiums, and the quality of care provided as anticompetitive effects.

Business practices that perpetuate systemic racism are anticompetitive because they exclude people of color from full participation in the market. And this exclusion is expensive: a study by Citigroup estimates that discrimination cost the U.S. economy $16 trillion since 2000. Moreover, there is precedent for applying a broad conception of anticompetitive effects in merger review. In Brown Shoe Co. Inc. v. United States, the Supreme Court held that a meager 7.2 percent combined market share of two merging shoe manufacturers was unhealthy market concentration under the Clayton Act. Chief Justice Earl Warren acknowledged that concentration in the shoe industry might offer some efficiencies and lower prices for consumers, but “the protection of viable, small, locally owned businesses” was a priority. Therefore, agencies can and should argue that mergers that reinforce racial inequity substantially lessen competition.

Second, antitrust enforcement actions can hone in on industries like healthcare where the anticompetitive effects are acutely felt by people of color. As California attorney general from 2011 to 2017, Vice President Kamala Harris prioritized taking on healthcare prices through antitrust. Her investigation laid the groundwork for California’s suit against Sutter Health for using its market power to raise prices and extort better deals from insurers, which resulted in a $575 million settlement. The DOJ and FTC should follow in California and Vice President Harris’s footsteps and crack down on healthcare, utilizing an antiracist approach.

Achieving Fairer Franchising

Franchising—a business form where a firm owning a brand outsources the delivery of goods or services to a separate firm or individual in exchange for a royalty off of gross sales—is a dominant mode of industrial organization in the United States. Because buying into a franchise bypasses the necessity of acquiring capital and working industry connections to get a business off the ground, economists have long lauded franchising as a straightforward path to economic independence. Franchising has become an important source of income and opportunity for minorities and immigrants. And in occupations like the restaurant industry, franchised businesses employ a significant share of workers of color.

Yet franchise contracts empower franchisors (the parent company) to hold franchisees (the individual business owners) and their employees in a vice-like grip. Under most franchise contracts, the parent company limits the franchisee’s ability to make decisions regarding prices, customers, and suppliers. Because the contract deprives franchisees of discretion over virtually every aspect of the business except for wages and hours, underpaying and overworking employees becomes the only way to maximize profits. Franchisors exacerbate this dynamic with “no-poach” clauses that prevent franchise operators from hiring employees of another operator within the same franchise business. No-poach clauses suppress wages because franchisees cannot compete for employees with better pay and working conditions.

At the same time that franchisors make it nearly impossible for franchisees and employees to prosper, they force franchisees to bear the risk if the venture fails. By using contract terms to reduce what franchisees can earn outside the franchise relationship relative to within it, parent companies induce their franchisees to work even harder than the value of the franchise contract warrants. Most franchise contracts include noncompete agreements, forum selection clauses that highly favor the franchisor, and a right of first refusal to any sale of the franchisee’s business. And most require franchisors to sign personal guarantees, which gives the franchisor a right to claim the franchisee’s personal assets in the event of bankruptcy or litigation.

Antitrust law labels these contractual limitations as “vertical restraints:” restrictions on competition agreed to by firms at different levels of the distribution process. Vertical restraints empower large corporations to control workers and reduce labor costs without taking on the traditional legal responsibilities for that control. And this control can be implemented on a discriminatory basis. In September 2020, fifty Black former franchisees sued McDonald’s for forcing them to operate in “economically depressed” communities and “dangerous locations” where profits were lower.

A shift in antitrust law is largely to blame for the proliferation of vertical restraints. Vertical restraints were once considered per se illegal restraints of trade under the Sherman Act. But in a series of decisions beginning with Continental Television v. GTE Sylvania in 1977 and culminating in Leegin Creative Leather Products v. PSKS in 1997, the Supreme Court held that vertical restraints were presumptively lawful and thus subject to a more searching and defendant-friendly rule of reason analysis. Since that shift, antitrust enforcement has largely stayed away from challenging restrictive franchise contracts.

An antiracist approach to antitrust would not shy away from challenging these exploitative business models. First, federal agencies could follow in the steps of states like Washington that investigated the use of restrictive no-poach clauses as per se illegal restraints of trade. The pressure created by Washington’s investigations led seven major fast-food chains to agree to end no-poach deals. An investigation by the FTC or DOJ into no-poach clauses and other anticompetitive vertical restraints common in franchising could have even more impact, given their national scope. Second, franchising demonstrates that antitrust reform should not narrowly focus on big tech monopolies. Instead, antitrust reform should include industries like franchising, where large corporations restrict the economic freedom of minority business owners and employees. Scrutinizing the use of vertical restraints in franchising is just as essential to preventing abuses of market power and would remedy a structural inequality that disproportionately harms people of color.

Conclusion

Antitrust enforcement is not a replacement for more aggressive reforms, and by nature can only address one transaction or firm at a time. Moreover, it is limited to fines rather than sweeping conduct remedies. But antitrust enforcement can put a dent in the structural problems driving the health care affordability crisis and the extortion of franchisees. And in doing so, it can leverage the power of the federal government to be actively race-conscious and to take actions to end racial inequities. Backed by the push to reform antitrust, the demands to dismantle structural racism, and a new Democratic administration, an antiracist approach to antitrust could dust off the toolbox and begin to dismantle the “value-neutral” antitrust status quo.

#### Should implies fiat

OED No Date

[Oxford English Dictionary, https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/should]

MODAL VERB should 1Used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone's actions. ‘he should have been careful’ More example sentences Synonyms 1.1Indicating a desirable or expected state. ‘by now students should be able to read with a large degree of independence’ More example sentencesSynonyms 1.2Used to give or ask advice or suggestions. ‘you should go back to bed’ More example sentences 1.3I shouldUsed to give advice. ‘I should hold out if I were you’ More example sentences 2Used to indicate what is probable. ‘$348 million should be enough to buy him out’ More example sentences 3formal (expressing the conditional mood) referring to a possible event or situation. ‘if you should change your mind, I'll be at the hotel’

# 1NR

### 1NR – Case

#### Warming leads to extinction

Kareiva 18, Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al. (Peter, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” *Futures*, 102)

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### Only growth solves warming fast enough – markets force sustainability.

Fedrizzi 15 [Rick Fedrizzi, CEO, US Green Building Council, 11-30-2015, "Capitalism is the solution to climate change," CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2015/11/30/capitalism-is-the-solution-to-climate-change-commentary.html]

Environmentalists around the world are pinning their hopes on the international climate talks happening now. But conference rooms in Paris are not where the action on climate change really is. Rather, it's in boardrooms around the world. Companies large and small are taking steps to protect the environment, while increasing their profits. They're motivated not by consensus or conservation, but by cold hard cash. It's true that industry has contributed enormously to climate change and environmental degradation. Business interests have long opposed sustainable practices they believed would negatively impact profits. And the environmental community has held fast to this dynamic, holding up industry and capitalism as the enemy for decades. But the truth is that capitalism is the only force strong enough and capable of acting quickly enough to address climate change before the damage becomes irreversible. I've seen the kind of positive effect business can have on our environment when driven by profit and economic growth — and in one of the world's largest, dirtiest industries no less: real estate. In 1993, I co-founded the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), a non-profit organization dedicated to sustainability in our built environment. USGBC created a voluntary rating system — Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, or LEED — which allows buildings to earn credits for their sustainable features, including energy and water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, and recycled materials. LEED has had a dramatic impact on profits and the planet. In just 15 short years, 14 billion square feet of real estate have been LEED registered and certified in more than 150 countries, including some of the most iconic buildings in the world, from the Chrysler Building in Manhattan, which reduced energy use by 21 percent, to Lincoln Financial Field, home of the Philadelphia Eagles, which has reduced its energy consumption by the equivalent of removing 41,000 cars per year from the road. Thanks to LEED, as legendary environmentalist Paul Hawken put it, "USGBC may have had a greater impact than any other single organization in the world on materials saved, toxins eliminated, greenhouse gases avoided, and human health enhanced." But the benefits are more than just environmental — they're economic. From hospitals to schools to skyscrapers to factories, communities and companies that have invested in LEED see energy savings, cost savings, and a significant return on their investment. And green buildings haven't only been profitable for building owners, but also for the American economy at large. Green construction added $167.4 billion to the U.S. GDP from 2011 to 2014, according to a new 2015 Green Building Economic Impact Study. This year, the green building sector will employ more than 2.3 million Americans, and by 2018, it is expected to nearly double in size. Of course, real estate isn't the only industry where economic and environmental benefits align. Today, the power of sustainability to drive profits is being quietly embraced throughout the global economy, and major companies are reaping the benefits. Take United Technologies, the manufacturing powerhouse that ranks 45th on the Fortune 500 list. Between 2006 and 2014, UTC reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent, and water use by 33 percent. Over those same eight years, its stock price more than doubled. Unilever, one of the world's largest consumer-goods companies, has reduced emissions by 37 percent since 2008, and its efforts have saved the company more than 400 million euros (US$422 million). GE's Ecomagination program has boosted its top line by $200 billion over the past decade, growing at four times the rate of the company at large. Last year, Siemens' Environmental Portfolio not only eliminated 428 million tons of CO2 emissions for its customers, but also brought in €33 billion. The list goes on and on. As Patagonia's CEO Yvon Chouinard says: "Every time we've made a decision that's right for the planet, it's made us more money." The private sector has long been seen as the enemy of environmentalism, and for good reason. But times have changed. Today, a select number of enlightened corporations are wasting less, earning more, and proving just how profitable sustainability can be. There's no reason to keep waiting for an elusive climate agreement. Instead, let's take action to advance market-driven solutions that have the potential — and the ability — to save the planet. It's time for environmentalists and business leaders to leverage the profit motive to achieve our common goal: a sustainable, profitable future.

#### Moral uncertainty proves extinction outweighs – if you aren’t 100% sure their arg is true, keep future generations alive to figure things out

Bostrom 12 [Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority. 2012. www.existential-risk.org/concept.html]

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.

Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### Academia isn’t a singular monolith – believing it is makes negative aspects inevitable and makes it impossible to engage in targeted, ethical resistance.

Heath et al. 13 – (2013, Mary Heath, Associate Professor at Flinders Law School, and Peter Burdon, Associate Professor at the Adelaide Law School, “Academic Resistance to the Neoliberal University,” 23 Legal Educ. Rev. 379, SSRN)

Academics who identify as activists need a clear conception of who or what they are resisting. Put simply, not everything that occurs in universities is neoliberal or undesirable. The university consists of a complex assemblage of structures, values and practices. Like other social institutions, it has evolved over time with reference to the projects of individuals, political groups and other social institutions. Sometimes these forces are place-specific and sometimes they are national (or even international). Projects can also have lives of their own and are reproduced in unpredictable ways as they come together to constitute a particular institution.86 As the outcomes of our efforts and those of others become apparent, further critique and action may be called for, and our strategies and analyses of resistance may require revision.

For these reasons, we suggest that academic activists conceptualise the university as a set of practices that are historically contingent and capable of transformation. This perspective is important, first, because it brings into view the potential for alternatives to the prevailing state of legal education. In contrast, the construction of neoliberalism as ‘necessary and inevitable’ forestalls the possibility of resistance 87 and makes critique appear foolish.88 Second, it means that resistance can also be nuanced and directed at particular structures, practices or values rather than at the university or the tertiary system as a whole. This has obvious implications for the prospects of successful action and for our sense of agency as activists.

The flip side to this conceptualisation is also important. Desirable changes in legal education as well as in Australian universities have taken place during the last few decades as neoliberal practices have also become more and more embedded. As academic activists we need to choose forms of resistance that we believe are ethical and meaningful. We are in no way obliged to oppose every form of change. We might instead choose virtuous compliance with changes we think are desirable,89 or support goals we believe are desirable while opposing forms of implementation we believe are not.