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### 1NC – T

#### Our interpretation is that the affirmative must demonstrate the desirability of the resolution either in totality or in a particular instance to meet the necessary win condition of being topical.

#### United States federal government means the three branches of government

USA.gov 13 "USA.gov is the U.S. government's official web portal" http://www.usa.gov/Agencies/federal.shtml

U.S. Federal Government - The three branches of U.S. government—legislative, judicial, and executive—carry out governmental power and functions.

#### Increase means to make greater.

Merriam-Webster ND

“increase,” Merriam-Webster Dictionary, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/increase

transitive verb

1: to make greater : AUGMENT

2obsolete : ENRICH

#### Interpretation: The core antitrust laws are only sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act.

The Antitrust Division 07 – Law enforcement agency that enforces the U.S. antitrust laws

“Antitrust Division Statement Regarding the Release of the Antitrust Modernization Commission Report,” The Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, April 2007, https://www.justice.gov/archive/atr/public/press\_releases/2007/222344.htm

The AMC has made many specific recommendations in its report, and the Division is in the process of reviewing all of them. The Division commends the AMC for its three primary conclusions:

Free-market competition should remain the touchstone of United States' economic policy. The Commission's conclusion in this regard is a fundamental starting point for policy makers. Over a century of experience has shown that robust competition among businesses, each striving to be increasingly successful, leads to better quality products and services, lower prices, and higher levels of innovation.

The core antitrust laws—Sherman Act sections 1 and 2 and Clayton Act section 7—and their application by the courts and federal enforcement agencies are sound and appropriately safeguard the competitiveness of the U.S. economy.

New or different rules are not needed for industries in which innovation, intellectual property, and technological innovation are central features. Unlike some other areas of the law, the core antitrust laws are general in nature and have been applied to many different industries to protect free-market competition successfully over a long period of time despite changes in the economy and the increasing pace of technological advancement. One of the great benefits of the Sherman and Clayton Acts is their adaptability to new economic conditions without sacrificing their ability to protect competition.

#### “business practices” are a repeated pattern of conduct

Lucas 88 – Judge, California Supreme Court

Malcolm Millar Lucas, Cal. ex rel. Van De Kamp v. Texaco, 46 Cal. 3d 1147, Supreme Court of California, October 1988, LexisNexis

\*\* Italics in original.

The statute defines "unfair competition" to mean, as relevant here, "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent *business practice* . . . ." ( Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200, italics added.) In so doing it effectively requires what the court variously described in the leading case of Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal.3d 94 [101 Cal.Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817], as "a 'pattern' . . . of conduct" ( id. at p. 108), "ongoing . . . conduct" ( id. at p. 111), "a pattern of behavior" ( id. at p. 113), and, "a course of conduct" (ibid.).

#### Prohibit means Affirmative teams must completely ban a type of anticompetitive business practices – they don’t

Feldman 86 – Member of Procopio's Native American Law practice

Glenn M. Feldman, On Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, 1986 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 1221, Supreme Court of the United States, 1986, LexisNexis

In arguing that California's bingo laws are prohibitory rat ther than regulatory, the appeallants have simply misunderstood the fundamental distinction between "prohibition" and "regulation" of conduct. As succinctly put by the Supreme Court of Washington more than 50 years ago, after noting that the prohibition and regulation of the sale of liquor are entirely different things: "To prohibit the liquor traffic implies the putting a stop to its sale as a beverage, to end it fully, completely, and indefinitely." In contrast, regulation "implies that the sale of intoxicating liquor shall go on within the bounds of certain prescribed rules, restrictions, and limitations." Ajax v. Gregory, 32 P.2d 560, 563 (Wash. 1934). Because regulation of conduct involves prescribing limitations, regulation, by definition, necessarily involves some degree of prohibition. Blumenthal v. City of Cheyenne, 186 P.2d 556, 566 (Wyo. 1947). The two concepts, however, are analytically distinct. Therefore, when courts have been faced with statutory schemes similar to California's bingo laws, they have consistently held them to be regulatory and not prohibitory.

#### We have Two impacts

#### 1. Fairness – absent a predictable stasis, the aff can determine the scope of the debate using an infinite amount of literature bases or experiences. That makes the scope of negative research too broad and makes it too easy to be aff. Fairness outweighs any other impact because debate is a competitive activity, and a skewed debate undermines the value of the energy and research that teams put into winning the competition. It makes the debates determined by a coinflip not research.

#### 2. Clash: it’s the only educational benefit intrinsic to debate and link turns all of their offense. Everyone comes to debate for different reasons and leaves with different skills, but the process of defending against third and fourth level responses is the only way to instantiate any of the benefits of debate and develop a deeper understanding of the content.

#### That outweighs --- we’re cognitively biased to cling to preexisting beliefs, which breeds epistemic arrogance that culminates in Trumpism --- only submitting beliefs for reexamination by others and taking a risk of being wrong cultivates scrutiny.

Resnick 19

Brian Resnick, Science Writer for Vox, “Intellectual humility: the importance of knowing you might be wrong,” Vox. January 4, 2019. <https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2019/1/4/17989224/intellectual-humility-explained-psychology-replication>

\*\*\*Modified with a strikethrough – Raffi

It’s been fascinating to watch scientists struggle to make their institutions more humble. And I believe there’s an important and underappreciated virtue embedded in this process.

For the past few months, I’ve been talking to many scholars about intellectual humility, the characteristic that allows for admission of wrongness.

I’ve come to appreciate what a crucial tool it is for learning, especially in an increasingly interconnected and complicated world. As technology makes it easier [**to lie**](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/4/20/17109764/deepfake-ai-false-memory-psychology-mandela-effect) and spread false information [incredibly quickly](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/3/8/17085928/fake-news-study-mit-science), we need intellectually humble, curious people.

I’ve also realized how difficult it is to foster intellectual humility. In my reporting on this, I’ve learned there are three main challenges on the path to humility:

In order for us to acquire more intellectual humility, we all, even the smartest among us, need to better appreciate our cognitive ~~blind~~ [limitations] spots. Our minds are more imperfect and imprecise than we’d often like to admit. Our ignorance can be invisible.

Even when we overcome that immense challenge and figure out our errors, we need to remember we won’t necessarily be punished for saying, “I was wrong.” And we need to be braver about saying it. We need a culture that celebrates those words.

We’ll never achieve perfect intellectual humility. So we need to choose our convictions thoughtfully.

This is all to say: Intellectual humility isn’t easy. But damn, it’s a virtue worth striving for, and failing for, in this new year.

Intellectual humility is simply “the recognition that the things you believe in might in fact be wrong,” as [Mark Leary](http://people.duke.edu/~leary/), a social and personality psychologist at Duke University, tells me.

But don’t confuse it with overall humility or bashfulness. It’s not about being a pushover; it’s not about lacking confidence, or self-esteem. The intellectually humble don’t cave every time their thoughts are challenged.

Instead, it’s a method of thinking. It’s about entertaining the possibility that you may be wrong and being open to learning from the experience of others. Intellectual humility is about being actively curious about your blind spots. One illustration is in the ideal of the scientific method, where a scientist actively works against her own hypothesis, attempting to rule out any other alternative explanations for a phenomenon before settling on a conclusion. It’s about asking: What am I missing here?

It doesn’t require a high IQ or a particular skill set. It does, however, require making a habit of thinking about your limits, which can be painful. “It’s a process of monitoring your own confidence,” Leary says.

This idea is older than social psychology. Philosophers from the earliest days have [grappled](https://philosophynow.org/issues/53/Socratic_Humility) with the limits of human knowledge. Michel de Montaigne, the 16th-century French philosopher credited with inventing the essay, wrote that “the plague of man is boasting of his knowledge.”

Social psychologists have learned that humility is associated with other valuable character traits: People who score higher on intellectual humility questionnaires are more open to [hearing opposing views](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15298868.2017.1361861). They more readily seek out information that conflicts with their worldview. They pay [**more attention to evidence**](https://www.templeton.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Intellectual-Humility-Leary-FullLength-Final.pdf) and have a stronger self-awareness when they answer a question incorrectly.

When you ask the intellectually arrogant if they’ve heard of bogus historical events like “Hamrick’s Rebellion,” they’ll say, “Sure.” The intellectually humble are less likely to do so. Studies have found that cognitive reflection — i.e., analytic thinking — is [correlated](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/51ed234ae4b0867e2385d879/t/5b43b48b03ce6471753c78ba/1531163796071/2018+Pennycook+Rand+-+Cognition.pdf) with being better able to discern fake news stories from real ones. These studies haven’t looked at intellectual humility per se, but it’s plausible there’s an overlap.

Most important of all, the intellectually humble are more likely to admit it when they are wrong. When we admit we’re wrong, we can grow closer to the truth.

One reason I’ve been thinking about the virtue of humility recently is because our president, Donald Trump, is one of the least humble people on the planet.

It was Trump who said on the night of his nomination, “I alone can fix it,” with the “it” being our entire political system. It was Trump who once said, “[I have one of the great memories of all time](http://digg.com/2017/trump-great-memories-of-all-time).” More recently, Trump told the Associated Press, “I have a natural instinct for science,” in [dodging](http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/10/trump-i-have-a-natural-instinct-for-science.html) a question on climate change.

A frustration I feel about Trump and the era of history he represents is that his pride and his success — he is among the most powerful people on earth — seem to be related. He exemplifies how our society rewards confidence and bluster, not truthfulness.

Yet we’ve also seen some very high-profile examples lately of how overconfident leadership can be ruinous for companies. Look at what happened to Theranos, a company that promised to change the way blood samples are drawn. It was all hype, all bluster, and it collapsed. Or consider Enron’s overconfident executives, who were often hailed for [their intellectual brilliance](https://awealthofcommonsense.com/2018/05/when-intelligence-fails-miserably/) — they ran the company into the ground with risky, suspect financial decisions.

The problem with arrogance is that the truth always catches up. Trump may be president and confident in his denials of climate change, but the changes to our environment will still ruin so many things in the future.

As I’ve been reading the psychological research on intellectual humility and the character traits it correlates with, I can’t help but fume: Why can’t more people be like this?

We need more intellectual humility for two reasons. One is that our culture promotes and rewards overconfidence and arrogance (think Trump and Theranos, or the advice your career counselor gave you when going into job interviews). At the same time, when we are wrong — out of ignorance or error — and realize it, our culture doesn’t make it easy to admit it. Humbling moments too easily can turn into moments of humiliation.

So how can we promote intellectual humility for both of these conditions?

In asking that question of researchers and scholars, I’ve learned to appreciate how hard a challenge it is to foster intellectual humility.

First off, I think it’s helpful to remember how flawed the human brain can be and how prone we all are to intellectual blind spots. When you learn about how the brain actually works, how it actually perceives the world, it’s hard not to be a bit horrified, and a bit humbled.

We often can’t see — or even sense — what we don’t know. It helps to realize that it’s normal and human to be wrong.

It’s rare that a viral meme also provides a surprisingly deep lesson on the imperfect nature of the human mind. But believe it or not, the great [“Yanny or Laurel” debate](https://www.vox.com/2018/5/16/17358774/yanny-laurel-explained) of 2018 fits the bill.

For the very few of you who didn’t catch it — I hope you’re recovering nicely from that coma — here’s what happened.

An audio clip (you can hear it below) says the name “Laurel” in a robotic voice. Or does it? Some people hear the clip and immediately hear “Yanny.” And both sets of people — Team Yanny and Team Laurel — are indeed hearing the

Hearing, the perception of sound, ought to be a simple thing for our brains to do. That so many people can listen to the same clip and hear such different things should give us humbling pause. Hearing “Yanny” or “Laurel” in any given moment ultimately depends on a whole host of factors: the quality of the speakers you’re using, whether you have hearing loss, your expectations.

Here’s the deep lesson to draw from all of this: Much as we might tell ourselves our experience of the world is the truth, our reality will always be an interpretation. Light enters our eyes, sound waves enter our ears, chemicals waft into our noses, and it’s up to our brains to make a guess about what it all is.

“THE FIRST RULE OF THE DUNNING-KRUGER CLUB IS YOU DON’T KNOW YOU’RE A MEMBER OF THE DUNNING-KRUGER CLUB”

Perceptual tricks like this ([“the dress”](https://www.vox.com/2015/2/27/8119901/explain-color-dress) is another one) reveal that our perceptions are not the absolute truth, that the physical phenomena of the universe are indifferent to whether our feeble sensory organs can perceive them correctly. We’re just guessing. Yet these phenomena leave us indignant: How could it be that our perception of the world isn’t the only one?

That sense of indignation is called naive realism: the feeling that our perception of the world is the truth. “I think we sometimes confuse effortlessness with accuracy,” [Chris Chabris](http://www.chabris.com/), a psychological researcher who co-authored a book on the [challenges of human perception, tells me](https://go.redirectingat.com/?id=66960X1516588&xs=1&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.amazon.com%2FInvisible-Gorilla-How-Intuitions-Deceive%2Fdp%2F0307459667%2Fref%3Dsr_1_1%3Fie%3DUTF8%26qid%3D1545250306%26sr%3D8-1%26keywords%3Dinvisible%2Bgorilla%2Bbook). When something is so immediate and effortless to us — hearing the sound of “Yanny” — it just [feels true](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2017/10/5/16410912/illusory-truth-fake-news-las-vegas-google-facebook). (Similarly, psychologists find when a lie is repeated, it’s more likely to be [misremembered as being true](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2017/10/5/16410912/illusory-truth-fake-news-las-vegas-google-facebook), and for a similar reason: When you’re hearing something for the second or third time, your brain becomes faster to respond to it. And that fluency is confused with truth.)

Our interpretations of reality are often arbitrary, but we’re still [**stubborn**](https://jov.arvojournals.org/article.aspx?articleid=2613309) about them. Nonetheless, the same observations can lead to wildly different conclusions.

For every sense and every component of human judgment, there are illusions and ambiguities we interpret arbitrarily.

Some are gravely serious. White people often perceive black men to be bigger, taller, and more muscular (and therefore [more threatening](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/4/19/17251752/philadelphia-starbucks-arrest-racial-bias-training)) than they really are. That’s racial bias — but it’s also a socially constructed illusion. When we’re taught or learn to fear other people, our brains distort their potential threat. They seem more menacing, and we want to build walls around them. When we learn or are taught that other people [are less than human](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2017/3/7/14456154/dehumanization-psychology-explained), we’re less likely to look upon them kindly and more likely to be okay when violence is committed against them.

Not only are our interpretations of the world often arbitrary, but we’re often overconfident in them. “Our ignorance is invisible to us,” David Dunning, an expert on human blind spots, says.

You might recognize his name as half of the psychological phenomenon that bears his name: the Dunning-Kruger effect. That’s where people of low ability — let’s say, those who fail to understand logic puzzles — tend to unduly overestimate their abilities. Inexperience masquerades as expertise.

An irony of the Dunning-Kruger effect is that so many people misinterpret it, are overconfident in their understanding of it, [and get it wrong.](https://www.talyarkoni.org/blog/2010/07/07/what-the-dunning-kruger-effect-is-and-isnt/)

When people talk or write about the Dunning-Kruger effect, it’s almost always in reference to other people. “The fact is this is a phenomenon that visits all of us sooner or later,” Dunning says. We’re all overconfident in our ignorance from time to time. (Perhaps related: Some 65 percent of Americans [believe](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0200103) they’re more intelligent than average, which is wishful thinking.)

Similarly, we’re overconfident in our ability to remember. Human memory is extremely malleable, prone to small changes. When we remember, we don’t wind back our minds to a certain time and relive that exact moment, yet many [of us think](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3149610/) our memories work like a videotape.

Dunning hopes his work helps people understand that “not knowing the scope of your own ignorance is part of the human condition,” he says. “But the problem with it is we see it in other people, and we don’t see it in ourselves. The first rule of the Dunning-Kruger club is you don’t know you’re a member of the Dunning-Kruger club.”

In 2012, psychologist Will Gervais scored an honor any PhD science student would covet: a [co-authored paper](http://science.sciencemag.org/content/336/6080/493) in the journal Science, one of the top interdisciplinary scientific journals in the world. Publishing in Science doesn’t just help a researcher rise up in academic circles; it often gets them a lot of media attention too.

One of the experiments in the paper tried to see if getting people to think more rationally would make them less willing to report religious beliefs. They had people look at a picture of Rodin’s [The Thinker](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Thinker) or another statue. They thought The Thinker would nudge people to think harder, more analytically. In this more rational frame of mind, then, the participants would be less likely to endorse believing in something as faith-based and invisible as religion, and that’s what the study found. It was [catnip](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-critical-thinkers-lose-faith-god/) for science journalists: one small trick to change the way we think.

“HOW WOULD I KNOW IF I WAS WRONG?” IS ACTUALLY A REALLY, REALLY HARD QUESTION TO ANSWER

But it was a tiny, small-sample study, the exact type that is prone to yielding false positives. Several years later, another lab attempted to replicate the findings with a [much larger sample size](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0172636), and failed to find any evidence for the effect.

And while Gervais knew that the original study wasn’t rigorous, he couldn’t help but feel a twinge of discomfort.

“Intellectually, I could say the original data weren’t strong,” he says. “That’s very different from the human, personal reaction to it. Which is like, ‘Oh, shit, there’s going to be a published failure to replicate my most cited finding that’s gotten the most [media attention](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/losing-your-religion-analytic-thinking-can-undermine-belief/).’ You start worrying about stuff like, ‘Are there going to be career repercussions? Are people going to think less of my other work and stuff I’ve done?’”

Gervais’s story is familiar: Many of us fear we’ll be seen as less competent, less trustworthy, if we admit wrongness. Even when we can see our own errors — which, as outlined above, is not easy to do — we’re hesitant to admit it.

But turns out this assumption is [false](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0143723). As [Adam Fetterman](https://www.utep.edu/liberalarts/psychology/people/adam-k-fetterman.html), a social psychologist at the University of Texas El Paso, has found in a [few](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0143723) [studies](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886918305336), wrongness admission isn’t usually judged harshly. “When we do see someone admit that they are wrong, the wrongness admitter is seen as more communal, more friendly,” he says. It’s almost never the case, in his studies, “that when you admit you’re wrong, people think you are less competent.”

Sure, there might be some people who will troll you for your mistakes. There might be [a mob on Twitter that converges in order to shame you](https://www.vox.com/2016/2/29/11133822/internet-outrage-explained). Some moments of humility could be humiliating. But this fear must be vanquished if we are to become less intellectually arrogant and more intellectually humble.

Humility can’t just come from within — we need environments where it can thrive

But even if you’re motivated to be more intellectually humble, our culture doesn’t always reward it.

The field of psychology, overall, has been reckoning with a “[replication crisis](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/8/27/17761466/psychology-replication-crisis-nature-social-science)” where many classic findings in the science don’t hold up under rigorous scrutiny. Incredibly influential textbook findings in psychology — like the “[ego depletion”](https://www.vox.com/2016/3/14/11219446/psychology-replication-crisis) theory of willpower or the “[marshmallow test](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/6/6/17413000/marshmallow-test-replication-mischel-psychology)” — have been bending or breaking.

I’ve found it fascinating to watch the field of psychology deal with this. For some researchers, the reckoning has been personally unsettling. “I’m in a dark place,” Michael Inzlicht, a University of Toronto psychologist, [wrote](http://michaelinzlicht.com/getting-better/2016/2/29/reckoning-with-the-past) in a 2016 blog post after seeing the theory of ego depletion crumble before his eyes. “Have I been chasing puffs of smoke for all these years?”

“IT’S BAD TO THINK OF PROBLEMS LIKE THIS LIKE A RUBIK’S CUBE: A PUZZLE THAT HAS A NEAT AND SATISFYING SOLUTION THAT YOU CAN PUT ON YOUR DESK”

What I’ve learned from reporting on the “replication crisis” is that intellectual humility requires support from peers and institutions. And that environment is hard to build.

“What we teach undergrads is that scientists want to prove themselves wrong,” says [Simine Vazire](https://www.simine.com/), a psychologist and journal editor who often writes and speaks about replication issues. “But, ‘How would I know if I was wrong?’ is actually a really, really hard question to answer. It involves things like having critics yell at you and telling you that you did things wrong and reanalyze your data.”

And that’s not fun. Again: Even among scientists — people who ought to question everything — intellectual humility is hard. In some cases, researchers have refused to concede their original conclusions despite the [unveiling of new evidence](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/6/28/17509470/stanford-prison-experiment-zimbardo-interview). (One famous psychologist under fire recently told me [angrily](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/6/28/17509470/stanford-prison-experiment-zimbardo-interview), “I will stand by that conclusion for the rest of my life, no matter what anyone says.”)

Psychologists are human. When they reach a conclusion, it becomes hard to see things another way. Plus, the incentives for a successful career in science push researchers to publish as many positive findings as possible.

There are two solutions — among many — to make psychological science more humble, and I think we can learn from them.

One is that humility needs to be built into the standard practices of the science. And that happens through transparency. It’s becoming more commonplace for scientists to preregister — i.e., commit to — a study design before even embarking on an experiment. That way, it’s harder for them to deviate from the plan and cherry-pick results. It also makes sure all data is open and accessible to anyone who wants to conduct a reanalysis.

That “sort of builds humility into the structure of the scientific enterprise,” Chabris says. “We’re not all-knowing and all-seeing and perfect at our jobs, so we put [the data] out there for other people to check out, to improve upon it, come up with new ideas from and so on.” To be more intellectually humble, we need to be more transparent about our knowledge. We need to show others what we know and what we don’t.

And two, there needs to be more celebration of failure, and a culture that accepts it. That includes building safe places for people to admit they were wrong, like the [Loss of Confidence Project](https://lossofconfidence.com/).

But it’s clear this cultural change won’t come easily.

“In the end,” Rohrer says, after getting a lot of positive feedback on the project, “we ended up with just a handful of statements.”

We need a balance between convictions and humility

There’s a personal cost to an intellectually humble outlook. For me, at least, it’s anxiety.

When I open myself up to the vastness of my own ignorance, I can’t help but feel a sudden suffocating feeling. I have just one small mind, a tiny, leaky boat upon which to go exploring knowledge in a vast and knotty sea of which I carry no clear map.

Why is it that some people never seem to wrestle with those waters? That they stand on the shore, squint their eyes, and transform that sea into a puddle in their minds and then get awarded for their false certainty? “I don’t know if I can tell you that humility will get you farther than arrogance,” says [Tenelle Porter,](https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/profile/tenelle_porter) a University of California Davis psychologist who has [studied](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15298868.2017.1361861) intellectual humility.

Of course, following humility to an extreme end isn’t enough. You don’t need to be humble about your belief that the world is round. I just think more humility, sprinkled here and there, would be quite nice.

“It’s bad to think of problems like this like a Rubik’s cube: a puzzle that has a neat and satisfying solution that you can put on your desk,” says [Michael Lynch](https://michael-lynch.philosophy.uconn.edu/), a University of Connecticut philosophy professor. Instead, it’s a problem “you can make progress at a moment in time, and make things better. And that we can do — that we can definitely do.”

For a democracy to flourish, Lynch argues, we need a balance between convictions — our firmly held beliefs — and humility. We need convictions, because “an apathetic electorate is no electorate at all,” he says. And we need humility because we need to listen to one another. Those two things will always be in tension.

The Trump presidency suggests there’s too much conviction and not enough humility in our current culture.

“The personal question, the existential question that faces you and I and every thinking human being, is, ‘How do you maintain an open mind toward others and yet, at the same time, keep your strong moral convictions?’” Lynch says. “That’s an issue for all of us.”

To be intellectually humble doesn’t mean giving up on the ideas we love and believe in. It just means we need to be thoughtful in choosing our convictions, be open to adjusting them, seek out their flaws, and never stop being curious about why we believe what we believe.

### 1NC – Counter Advocacy

#### CP: The United States federal government should substantially increase its restrictions on anti-competitive business practices in the tech sector

#### Prefer a tailored defense of competition policy—it is compatible with broader anti-neoliberalism, but wholesale rejection is an awful idea

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

The implication of the foregoing is that the most pressing task for competition policymakers may not involve a rethinking of first principles. The principles of neoliberal competition policy may have ultimately been proven justified by an unprecedented period of economic growth, technological progress and reductions in poverty, and should presumably remain operative as long as they remain the best framework for bringing about these ends. Neither, as we have suggested, must the capitalist entrepreneur be lost in the process. The totalitarian temptation to submit to general state control of the economy-whether it be in the form of communism from below or fascism from above should be resisted so as to preserve and build upon the great prosperity Western Civilization has managed to achieve.

This statement will no doubt be highly unsatisfactory to many critics of neoliberalism who seek more fundamental and revolutionary changes. Surely, they suggest, there must be some principled basis for critiquing the neoliberal status quo with which so many are frustrated. Indeed, there very well may be, and none of the arguments in this article should be understood to the contrary. The goal of this article has been limited to a tailored defense of neoliberal principles only as they relate to competition policy, broadly understood. It does not suggest that neoliberal monetary, trade, and fiscal policies are also sound-let alone a neoliberal social order, where all the core institutions within society are organized according to the neoliberal principles of wealthmaximization, empiricism, and the rest.129 This is to say that even if neoliberalism is a sound theory as applied to the area of competition policy, neoliberal monetary policy, for example, may be problematic and a just target for contemporary critics. Similarly, claiming that competition policy should be enforced using a consumer welfare standard does not mean that all the organs of law and civil society should be oriented to maximize wealth or consumer welfare, even if this economic inquiry is nonetheless informative. 30 It is well known that several prominent neoliberals have expanded the neoliberal policy apparatus beyond the regulation of market capitalism with which antitrust is concerned to domains typically understood to be beyond a purely utilitarian purview.' 3 ' However, whatever the merits of these broader neoliberal policy programs, the competition policy baby, so to speak, should not be thrown out with the bathwater.

Consider the charge that neoliberal policies have increased wealth inequality in the United States. Some commentators attempt to link this increased inequality with a decline in competition'3 2 and, by implication, consumer welfare competition policy. Notwithstanding the interest such theories appeared to have garnered from highly distinguished economists and policymakers, such as Nobel Laureate Joe Stiglitz,133 one might alternatively consider whether increasing wealth inequality and the resultant social strife are far more a result of policies in other areas, such as monetary policy. 134 At the same time as Chicago School antitrust policy took root, the American economy began to undergo sustained expansions in the money supply and reductions in interest rates that, at least in theory, disproportionately reward the owners of financial assets, who are more likely to be wealthy. 135

Indeed, after the financial crisis, monetary policy engaged in a truly unprecedented expansion, with the Federal Reserve lowering interest rates to zero and increasing its balance sheet from approximately $900 billion before the crisis to $4.5 trillion after, most of which constituted either troublesome mortgage-backed securities or treasury bonds. 36 The share of wealth of the world's richest people roughly doubled. 37 At the same time, however, one would seem to look in vain for any shift toward an increased laissez faire competition policy during the Obama administration. Indeed, antitrust enforcement under the Obama administration arguably increased relative to the George W. Bush administration, even if only at the margins and not in the area of monopolization. 3

#### Prospect of big tech acquisition dampens innovation

Allensworth, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School, ‘21

(Rebecca, “Antitrust’s High-Tech Exceptionalism,” 130 Yale L.J. 588)

E. Whither Innovation?

As a theoretical matter, big tech’s refusals to deal and predatory copying suppress innovation. A retailer with a new idea for a household product will be less inclined to invest in producing it if he knows Amazon can appropriate the returns. A developer with a better “app for that” will be less likely to bring it to market if she believes Apple or Facebook might someday remove it from their platforms. And if a rival search company cannot hope to keep its data private from Google, it will not invest in building a better search engine to try to take on the giant.

Whether big tech stifles innovation as an empirical matter is less clear, but there is anecdotal evidence that it does. During a recent hearing following the House Judiciary Committee’s investigation into competition abuses among high-tech firms, Representative Cicilline read a quote that he said was typical of the entrepreneurs he interviewed: “If someone came to me with an idea for a website or a web service today, I’d tell them to run. Run as far away from the web as possible.”111 Venture capital, while booming overall,112 is shy about funding projects that might compete with Big Tech. The best-case scenario for a start-up is acquisition by one of the big four—a lucrative payday, for sure, but nothing compared to what could come from actually toppling a dominant firm. This puts a ceiling on the upside, and with the ever-present risk of failure, it likely leads to under-investment in new ideas. As one funder put it, “[w]e don’t touch anything that comes too close to Facebook, Google or Amazon.”113

CONCLUSION: “ANTITRUST IS GREEDY”

The promise that we saw in high tech during its first boom—that it would change the way we work, communicate, shop, and play—has largely been realized. Few can argue with the efficiencies that digital communication and commerce have brought to our lives and markets. But, as Professor Herbert Hovenkamp has said, “antitrust is greedy.”114 It wants not only efficiency in end products, but efficiency in the competitive process that brings them about. During the dot-com era, American antitrust institutions became enthralled with the idea that encouraging the development of dynamic, innovative products required compromising our commitment to dynamic, innovative markets. That compromise contributed—in a way that is often overlooked—to the current competition crisis in big tech.

#### Tech behemoths won’t take DOD contracts. Competition incentives would encourage smaller firms to develop AI for the sole purpose of defense needs.

Foster and Arnold ’20 – Researchers at ***Georgetown’s*** Center for Security and Emerging Technology [Dakota; Visiting Researcher at Georgetown’s Center for Security and Emerging Technology, graduate student in the Department of War Studies at King’s College London, conducted research on terrorism and U.S. national security policy for the U.S. military, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Washington Institute; Zachary; Research Fellow at Georgetown’s Center for Security and Emerging Technology, where he focuses on AI investment flows and workforce trends, J.D. from Yale Law School; 2020; "Antitrust and Artificial Intelligence: How Breaking Up Big Tech Could Affect the Pentagon’s Access to AI"; Center for Security and Emerging Technology at Georgetown University; https://www.geopolitic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/CSET-Antitrust-and-Artificial-Intelligence.pdf; accessed 8-10-2021]

3. Are smaller vendors more likely to produce innovative products that meet the Pentagon’s needs?

Tech industry leaders have relatively **little incentive** to work with the Pentagon. Their companies already enjoy **broad customer bases** and financial independence from U.S. government contracts—including those **at the Pentagon**.89 DOD contracts involve **applying** AI technology in varied, complex, and **operationally demanding** environments with **low tolerance** for error. Similarly, industry has **little motivation** to take on unique DOD **data management** and privacy requirements, such as data compartmentalization, protection against deceptive or compromised data inputs, and strict **data accountability** provisions complicating **algorithm training**.90 Finally, some commercial AI advances will easily convert into Pentagon applications. Others will require significant, difficult adaption and productization.

Antitrust action could create **smaller AI firms** targeting DOD business as their “**niche**.” With the Pentagon as their **sole customer**, these firms could focus on its unique needs, tailoring broader AI innovations for the Pentagon through **productization** and **organizational adaptation**. They could follow the example of **Palantir**, which makes 50 percent of its revenue from **government contracts**,91 or Kratos (60 percent).92 In the last five years, a **number of companies** have emerged in this mold, including Anduril Labs (2017), Shield AI (2015), Descartes Labs (2014), and Uptake (2014). As smaller firms’ primary, high-value customer, the Pentagon can **dictate** their innovation objectives, ultimately yielding AI applications better suited to **defense needs**.

#### Military AI ushers in the erosion of conventional deterrence – developing it is necessary to prevent great power wars.

Brose ’19 – Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [Christian; Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; 2019; "The New Revolution in Military Affairs"; Foreign Affairs; <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2019-04-16/new-revolution-military-affairs>

Yet if ever there were a time to **get serious** about the coming revolution in **military affairs**, it is **now**. There is an emerging consensus that the United States' top **defense-planning priority** should be **contending** with **great powers** with **advanced militaries**, primarily **China**, and that **new technologies**, once intriguing but speculative, are now both **real** and **essential** to **future military advantage**. Senior military leaders and defense experts are also starting to agree, albeit belatedly, that when it comes to these threats, the United States is **falling dangerously behind**.

This reality demands more than a revolution in technology; it requires a revolution in thinking. And that thinking must focus more on how the U.S. military fights than with what it fights. The problem is not **insufficient spending** on defense; it is that the U.S. military is being countered by **rivals** with **superior strategies**. The United States, in other words, is playing a **losing game**. The question, accordingly, is not how **new technologies** can improve the U.S. military's ability to do what it already does but how they can enable it to operate in **new ways**. If American defense officials do not answer that question, there will still be a **revolution in military affairs**. But it will primarily **benefit others**.

It is still possible for the United States to adapt and succeed, but the scale of change required is enormous. The **traditional model** of U.S. **military power** is being **disrupted**, the way Blockbuster's business model was amid the rise of Amazon and Netflix. A military made up of **small numbers** of **large**, **expensive**, **heavily manned**, and **hard-to replace** systems will not **survive** on **future battlefields**, where swarms of **intelligent machines** will deliver violence at a **greater volume** and **higher velocity** than **ever before**. Success will require a **different kind of military**, one built around **large numbers** of **small**, **inexpensive**, **expendable**, and **highly autonomous** systems. The United States has the money, human capital, and technology to assemble that kind of military. The question is whether it has the imagination and the resolve.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES, OLD PROBLEMS

**Artificial intelligence** and other emerging technologies will change the way **war is fought**, but they will not change its nature. Whether it involves longbows or source code, war will always be violent, politically motivated, and composed of the same three elemental functions that new recruits learn in basic training: move, shoot, and communicate.

Movement in warfare entails hiding and seeking (attackers try to evade detection; defenders try to detect them) and penetrating and repelling (attackers try to enter opponents’ space; defenders try to deny them access). But in a world that is becoming one giant sensor, hiding and penetrating—never easy in warfare—will be far more difficult, if not impossible. The amount of data generated by networked devices, the so-called Internet of Things, is on pace to triple between 2016 and 2021. More significant, the proliferation of low-cost, commercial sensors that can detect more things more clearly over greater distances is already providing more real-time global surveillance than has existed at any time in history. This is especially true in space. In the past, the high costs of launching satellites required them to be large, expensive, and designed to orbit for decades. But as access to space gets cheaper, satellites are becoming more like mobile phones—mass-produced devices that are used for a few years and then replaced. Commercial space companies are already fielding hundreds of small, cheap satellites. Soon, there will be thousands of such satellites, providing an unblinking eye over the entire world. Stealth technology is living on borrowed time.

On top of all of that, quantum sensors—which use the bizarre properties of subatomic particles, such as their ability to be in two different places at once—will eventually be able detect disruptions in the environment, such as the displacement of air around aircraft or water around submarines. Quantum sensors will likely be the first usable application of quantum science, and this technology is still many years off. But once quantum sensors are fielded, there will be nowhere to hide.

The future of movement will also be characterized by a return of mass to the battlefield, after many decades in which the trend was moving in the opposite direction—toward an emphasis on quality over quantity—as technology is enabling more systems to get in motion and stay in motion in more places. Ubiquitous sensors will generate exponentially greater quantities of data, which in turn will drive both the development and the deployment of artificial intelligence. As machines become more autonomous, militaries will be able to field more of them in smaller sizes and at lower costs. New developments in power generation and storage and in hypersonic propulsion will allow these smaller systems to travel farther and faster than ever. Where once there was one destroyer, for example, the near future could see dozens of autonomous vessels that are similar to missile barges, ready to strike as targets emerge.

Technology will also transform how those systems remain in motion. Logistics—the ability to supply forces with food, fuel, and replacements—has traditionally been the limiting factor in war. But autonomous militaries will need less fuel and no food. Advanced manufacturing methods, such as 3-D printing, will reduce the need for vast, risky, and expensive military logistics networks by enabling the production of complicated goods at the point of demand quickly, cheaply, and easily.

In an even more profound change, space will emerge as its own domain of maneuver warfare. So far, the near impossibility of refueling spacecraft has largely limited them to orbiting the earth. But as it becomes feasible to not just refuel spacecraft midflight but also build and service satellites in space, process data in orbit, and capture resources and energy in space for use in space (for example, by using vast solar arrays or mining asteroids), space operations will become less dependent on earth. Spacecraft will be able to maneuver and fight, and the first orbital weapons could enter the battlefield. The technology to do much of this exists already.

THE MILITARIES OF TOMORROW

Technology will also radically alter how militaries shoot, both literally and figuratively. Cyberattacks, communication jamming, electronic warfare, and other attacks on a system’s software will become as important as those that target a system’s hardware, if not more so. The rate of fire, or how fast weapons can shoot, will accelerate rapidly thanks to new technologies such as lasers, high-powered microwaves, and other directed-energy weapons. But what will really increase the rate of fire are intelligent systems that will radically reduce the time between when targets can be identified and when they can be attacked. A harbinger of this much nastier future battlefield has played out in Ukraine since 2014, where Russia has shortened to mere minutes the time between when their spotter drones first detect Ukrainian forces and when their precision rocket artillery wipes those forces off the map.

The militaries of the future will also be able to shoot farther than those of today. Eventually, hypersonic munitions (weapons that travel at more than five times the speed of sound) and space-based weapons will be able to strike targets anywhere in the world nearly instantly. Militaries will be able to attack domains once assumed to be sanctuaries, such as space and logistics networks. There will be no rear areas or safe havens anymore. Swarms of autonomous systems will not only be able to find targets everywhere; they will also be able to shoot them accurately. The ability to have both quantity and quality in military systems will have devastating effects, especially as technology makes lethal payloads smaller.

Finally, the way militaries communicate will change drastically. Traditional communications networks—hub-and-spoke structures with vulnerable single points of failure—will not survive. Instead, technology will push vital communications functions to the edge of the network. Every autonomous system will be able to process and make sense of the information it gathers on its own, without relying on a command hub. This will enable the creation of radically distributed networks that are resilient and reconfigurable.

Technology is also inverting the current paradigm of command and control. Today, even a supposedly unmanned system requires dozens of people to operate it remotely, maintain it, and process the data it collects. But as systems become more autonomous, one person will be able to operate larger numbers of them single-handedly. The opening ceremonies of the 2018 Winter Olympics, in South Korea, offered a preview of this technology when 1,218 autonomous drones equipped with lights collaborated to form intricate pictures in the night sky over Pyeongchang. Now imagine similar autonomous systems being used, for example, to overwhelm an aircraft carrier and render it inoperable.

Further afield, other technologies will change military communications. Information networks based on 5G technology will be capable of moving vastly larger amounts of data at significantly faster speeds. Similarly, the same quantum science that will improve military sensors will transform communications and computing. Quantum computing—the ability to use the abnormal properties of subatomic particles to exponentially increase processing power—will make possible encryption methods that could be unbreakable, as well as give militaries the power to process volumes of data and solve classes of problems that exceed the capacity of classical computers. More incredible still, so-called brain-computer interface technology is already enabling human beings to control complicated systems, such as robotic prosthetics and even unmanned aircraft, with their neural signals. Put simply, it is becoming possible for a human operator to control multiple drones simply by thinking of what they want those systems to do.

Put together, all these technologies will displace decades-old, even centuries-old, assumptions about how militaries operate. The militaries that embrace and adapt to these technologies will dominate those that do not. In that regard, the U.S. military is in big trouble.

A LOSING GAME

Since the end of the **Cold War**, the United States' approach to **projecting military force** against regional powers has rested on a series of **assumptions** about how conflicts **will unfold**. The U.S. military assumes that its forces will be able to move **unimpeded** into forward positions and that it will be able to **commence hostilities** at a time of **its choosing**. It assumes that its forces will operate in **permissive environments**-that adversaries will be **unable to contest** its **freedom of movement** in any domain. It assumes that **any quantitative advantage** that an adversary may possess will be **overcome** by its own **superior ability** to **evade** detection, **penetrate** enemy defenses, and **strike targets**. And it assumes that U.S. forces will suffer **few losses** in combat.

These **assumptions** have led to a force built around relatively **small numbers** of **large**, **expensive**, and **hard-to-replace** systems that are optimized for moving undetected close to their targets, shooting a limited number of times but with extreme precision, and communicating with impunity. Think stealth aircraft flying right into downtown Belgrade or Baghdad. What's more, systems such as these depend on **communications**, **logistics**, and **satellite networks** that are almost **entirely defenseless**, because they were designed under the **premise** that no adversary would ever be able to **attack them.**

This military enterprise and its underlying suppositions are being called into question. For the past two decades, while the United States has focused on **fighting wars** in the **Middle East**, its competitors-especially **China**, but also **Russia**-have been dissecting its way of war and **developing** so-called anti-access/area-denial (or A2/AD) capabilities to **detect U.S. systems** in **every domain** and **overwhelm them** with large salvos of precision fire. Put simply, U.S. rivals are fielding **large quantities** of **multimillion-dollar weapons** to destroy the United States' **multibillion-dollar military** systems.

China has also begun work on **megaprojects** designed to **position it** as the **world leader** in **artificial intelligence** and other advanced technologies. This undertaking is not exclusively military in its focus, but every one of these **advanced-technology megaprojects** has **military applications** and benefits the **People's Liberation Army** under the doctrine of "**military-civil fusion**." Whereas the U.S. military still largely treats its data like engine exhaust-a **useless byproduct**-China is moving with **authoritarian zeal** to stockpile its data like **oil**, so that it can power the **autonomous** and **intelligent** military systems it sees as **critical** to **dominance** in **future warfare**.

The United States' position, **already dire**, is **rapidly deteriorating**. As a 2017 report from the rand Corporation concluded, "U.S. forces could, under plausible assumptions, lose the **next war** they are **called upon to fight**." That same year, General Joseph Dunford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, sounded the alarm in stark terms: "In **just a few years**, if we do not **change** the **trajectory**, we will **lose** our qualitative and quantitative **competitive advantage**."

The **greatest danger** for the United States is the **erosion of conventional deterrence**. If leaders in **Beijing** or **Moscow** think that they might **win a war** against the United States, they will run **greater risks** and **press their advantage**. They will take actions that steadily undermine the United States' commitments to its allies by casting doubt on whether Washington would really send its military to defend the Baltics, the Philippines, Taiwan, or even Japan or South Korea. They will try to **get their way** through **any means necessary**, from coercive diplomacy and economic extortion to meddling in the domestic affairs of other countries. And they will steadily harden their **spheres of influence**, turning them into areas ever more **hospitable** to **authoritarian ideology**, **surveillance states**, and **crony capitalism**. In other words, they will try, as the military strategist Sun-tzu recommended, to "win without fighting."

### 1NC – K

#### Aff presumes changing our social orientation is sufficient to solve existential crisis – that depoliticizes radical movements to fight climate change and inequality

Dorman 16

Peter Dorman, Faculty in the Political Economy Department at Evergreen State College, “The Climate Movement Needs to Get Radical, but What Does that Mean?,” Nonsite. May 26, 2016. http://nonsite.org/editorial/the-climate-movement-needs-to-get-radical-but-what-does-that-mean

2. The cultural turn has gone too far. Of course, the deciphering of discourses has much to recommend it; all social action takes place in a context of meanings—shared, contested or both. It’s remarkable, however, that a high profile book that claims to be about radical social change, and which has won widespread approval across the leftward half of the political spectrum, could sidestep any sustained consideration of wealth and power altogether.

Why have governments failed to act to counter the threat of catastrophic climate change? Is it solely because of faulty thinking, or could it be that there exists a gross imbalance of power in every modern capitalist country, such that business interests are firmly in control? What institutions wield this power and what methods do they use? Crucially, how can those who struggle for democratic collective action contest this power? What types of organizations can be effective? What structural changes should be prioritized to rebalance power and enable rational solutions to overriding problems like climate change? I wouldn’t fault Klein for failing to provide answers—who has? What is astonishing, however, is that the questions are never posed, not even in passing. What does it mean to espouse radical politics and never take up the issue of power?

But a second absence is even more telling. At variou–s points Klein refers to the need for a price to be placed on carbon; it clearly is not her main interest, since she devotes no space at all to the political struggle required to achieve this, but she recognizes it is an important part of the story. What’s missing, however, is any serious consideration of how much money this will be, out of whose pockets it will be extracted and to whose pockets it will be transferred. I cannot emphasize how extraordinary it is for a book to be ostensibly about capitalism but pay so little attention to money.

The reality is that carbon revenues will be immense. If even approximately sufficient global action is undertaken, the sums will be in the trillions of dollars. And despite Klein’s moral calculus, the actual, real-life operation of carbon pricing will guarantee that it is the public at large—everyone who purchases a good or service with a carbon energy component—that will pay it. This is visible in gasoline taxes today, which consumers pay at the pump; a carbon price, whether it is engineered by a tax or a cap on permits, will be the same sort of tax writ very, very large. Such a tax will be regressive, and lower income people will effectively be taxed at a higher rate.

This is potentially catastrophic on multiple levels. It is intolerable from a social justice perspective in an age of rampaging inequality. It would also be impossible to disguise from voters, making it difficult to impossible to get majority support for a stiff carbon price. Klein blithely recommends using this new source of revenue to finance green investments, but she doesn’t inquire whose money is being spent, nor does she consider that, in practice, governments will simply shift a lot of the investments they would have made anyway over to this new revenue spigot, freeing up more money for their other pet projects. The one word that sums up Klein’s attitude toward this trillion-dollar question is uninterested.

Of course, there are ways to turn around the economics of carbon pricing. The money can be returned to the public on an equal per capita basis, which would have the effect of turning an otherwise regressive transfer system into a progressive, inequality-reducing one. Given the amount of money at stake, this will require a massive political mobilization, but it is worth fighting for. To repeat, however, the purpose of bringing up this issue is not to proselytize for a different system of carbon pricing, but simply to point out the glaring incongruity of an ostensibly radical, anti-capitalist book (a rather long one at that) which ignores the single most important principle for how things work in a capitalist society: follow the money!

3. The left has adapted to powerlessness. This Changes Everything practically exudes triumphalism, especially in the final hundred pages or so. Vibrant, righteous movements are springing up everywhere, we are told, and through their proliferation they will change the world.

Except, of course, they won’t. They do not have the means to change the world to something different, only to obstruct the bits of the existing world they can get their bodies in front of. That is important to do, and it can play a crucial role in a larger movement to contest power—if that movement can come into existence. If no larger movement arises, the local fires will be put out one by one. A radical political vision cannot abjure politics, and it is politics which is missing from Klein.

Here it is necessary to step back and consider the historical context. In the English-speaking world, and to a lesser extent in other wealthy, capitalist countries, the past several decades have seen profound defeat and demobilization on the left. In no country is there a mass political party with a program to transform the existing political economic order into something else. Unions, where they have any clout at all, have been fighting a rearguard struggle to retain as many of the gains of former times as they can. Of course, there have also been substantial victories for racial, gender and other social equalities and a general drift toward less authoritarian cultural norms. But the core institutions of wealth and power are more firmly entrenched now than they have been in generations, and the left as a political force is hardly noticeable.

How have those who still identify with the left coped with this epoch of powerlessness? There are many answers, but all of them express some form of disengagement. For instance, redefining politics as the performance of moral virtue rather than the contest for power can provide consolation when political avenues appear to be blocked. Activities of this sort are evaluated according to how expressive they are—how good they make us feel—rather than any objective criterion of effectiveness in achieving concrete goals or altering the balance of political forces. This is how I would interpret Blockadia, for instance, in the absence of a broader movement that includes both direct action and political contestation: Klein can devote page after page to how righteous these activists are without any attention to whether they have had or have any prospect of having an impact on carbon emissions. Their very activism constitutes its own victory, which is convenient if the more conventional sort of victory is believed to be out of reach. (It is bad form to even bring this up: why, some will ask, am I dwelling on the negative with so much positive energy to celebrate?)

Another response is to collapse social change into personal choices over lifestyle and philosophy. If you believe that the threat of climate change can be defeated by a shift to more modest consumption habits and rejection of the false intellectual gods of globalization and economic growth, one individual at a time, then each moment of conversion constitutes its own little victory. The reader of Klein’s book, feeling a sense of unity with that consciousness and its program to downshift consumption, can experience this victory first hand. This is very gratifying, and it reinforces the message that powerlessness in conventional terms is irrelevant, since the change we are part of is at a deeper level than governments and their laws or corporations and their assets. After all, what can be more subversive than thinking new thoughts?

One of Klein’s favorite adaptations is the conflation of wishes and operative political programs. Again and again she holds up statements of intent—protect Mother Earth, treat all people equally, respect all cultures, live simple, natural, local lives—as if they were proposals whose implementation would have these outcomes. It’s all ends and no means. This is a double convenience: first it eliminates the need to be factual and analytical about programs, since announcing the goal is sufficient unto itself, and second, it evades the disconcerting problem of how to deal with the daunting political challenge of getting such programs (if they even exist) enacted and enforced. I believe the treatment of goals as if they were programs is the underlying reason for the sloppiness of this book on matters of economics and law. Klein can say we should finance a large green investment program by taxing fossil fuel profits, or we should simultaneously shrink the economy and increase the number of jobs, because in the end it doesn’t matter whether these or other recommendations could actually prove functional in the real world. The truth lies in the rightness of the demand, not the means of fulfilling it. But this too is an adaptation to powerlessness.

To close, I wish to emphasize that this critique is ultimately not directed at a single individual. On the contrary, even if we consider only this one book, it is clear that its writing was a team effort; the long acknowledgments section identifies both paid assistants and an army of internal reviewers. But what I find diagnostic is the warm reception it received from virtually every media outlet on the English-speaking left. This suggests that Klein is moving with the political tide and not against it, and that the problems that seemed obvious to me were either invisible to her reviewers or regarded as too insignificant to bring up. The view that capitalism is a style of thinking, progress is a myth, and political contestation is irrelevant to “true” social change belongs not just to this one book but to all the commentators who found nothing to criticize. That’s the real problem.

#### The left must become political – the alt is anti-domination, which accepts the power of the administrative state to ensure substantive economic and political equity

Rahman 18 – Associate professor of law at Brooklyn Law School and former visiting professor of law at Harvard Law School.

K. Sabeel Rahman, “Book Review: Reconstructing the Administrative State in an Era of Economic and Democratic Crisis,” *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 131, 2018, pp. 1682-1689, https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/1671-1712\_Online.pdf.

A. Privatization and the Challenge of Contesting Economic and Social Structure

The regulatory state did not simply come into being because of the complexity of modern governance; rather, in its key moments of institutional innovation and development, the rise of modern administration has always been closely tied to substantive aspirations to counteract inequalities, hierarchies, and disparities of power generated by a changing social and economic order. As Michaels writes, the socioeconomic upheavals of industrialization led an "increasingly inclusive and mobilized public" to demand "greater protection from the vagaries, deceptions, and dangers of the marketplace" (p. 41). As a result, a "State newly tasked with these weighty and extensive responsibilities (and newly attuned to the disciplining effects of a more demanding, empowered, and diverse electorate) could no longer get away with being small or amateurish" (p. 41). The outcome of these demands was a burst of institutional innovation and state formation that created the explosion of new administrative bodies, commissions, and bureaucrats in the Progressive Era, accelerating with President Roosevelt's New Deal. While Michaels is certainly right to highlight the ways in which the professionalization and proceduralization of these new administrative powers were central to their legitimation, the rise of the modern regulatory state -- and its political and normative valence -- has to be understood in context of these substantive aspirations and concerns arising from the industrial economy.

The upheavals of industrialization generated more than simple economic dislocation; they provoked a deep political crisis. 26 Late nineteenth-century thinkers, lawyers, and reformers saw industrial capitalism as a fundamental threat to existing institutions and political ideals. Industrialization produced widespread immiseration, dislocation, and precarity. 27 But it also produced very clear and threatening new forms of economic power: the power of managers over workers and the rise of new corporate titans like J.P. Morgan, the Vanderbilts, and the Rockefellers, whose corporate control over finance, rail, oil, and other foundational goods and services placed whole towns and business sectors at their mercy. 28 At the same time, political institutions themselves were already viewed as captured, corrupt, or otherwise incapable of meeting these challenges: legislative corruption was a widespread concern, and a conservative judiciary posed a threat to basic state police powers aimed at protecting workers, health, and safety -- and curbing these new forms of corporate power. 29 This context generated social movements across the country, from the Farmers' Alliance (which would become the widespread Populist movement), to the largely urban, middle-class Progressive movement, to the growing organized labor movement. 30

While these movements were themselves highly diverse and heterogeneous in their members and demands, they shared a common set of ideas: that the industrial economy was a highly unequal one shaped by new forms of domination and power, and that for economic and political liberty to survive industrialization, new institutions would have to be created to empower the public and check the excesses of industrialization. First, the problem of industrial capitalism was not just one of income inequality or maldistribution. More critically, it was a problem of economic power. 31 For antitrusters and crusaders like Louis Brandeis, a key problem was that a variety of private actors, from monopolies and trusts, to finance, to corporations more broadly, had accumulated a degree of quasi-sovereign control over the economic vitality and well-being of individuals and communities -- yet were not subject to the kinds of checks and balances and norms of public justification that would have accompanied equivalent exercises of public power. 32 This problem of economic power also appeared in Progressive Era critiques of the market system itself. On this view, as thinkers like Robert Hale and John Dewey suggested, what might appear as impersonal "market forces" that, for example, drove wages down or prices up, were in fact the cumulative result of thousands of microscale transactions and bargains, each of which took place under (legally determined) disparities of power. Law constructed markets -- and thus shaped market forces themselves. 33

Second, if the problem of capitalism was really a problem of power, then the remedy required the construction of new forms of civic capacity empowered to contest such private and market power. Thus, for Progressive Era reformers, a key challenge was the challenge of action-ability. 34 As Dewey put it in his influential book, The Public and Its Problems, the problem of the modern public was that it was too scattered, diffuse, and disorganized, incapable of asserting its interests in the face of the pressures of the industrial economy. 35 By its very nature, economic inequality in an industrializing economy could not be counteracted at an individual level; the background disparities of power were systemic and could be altered only by equally systemic changes to the background rules of the marketplace itself. Indeed, this was one of the central insights of legal realist scholars and progressive economists like John Commons, Robert Hale, Richard Ely, and others, who saw the prospects for economic equity as requiring expansive efforts to restructure the background rules of the market itself. 36 By creating new institutions like regulatory bodies, reformers made it more possible to act on these seemingly powerful and diffuse forces; by situating these bodies in a larger context of public-oriented, democratic politics, these agencies could fairly be seen as agents of the public good. Thus, private power would be made contestable and governable by democracy. 37

These are the kinds of aspirations that fueled the experimentation with the expansion of the administrative state: starting at the state and local level with the efforts by cities to municipalize private utility companies and by state governments to create railroad oversight commissions and agencies to address labor, poverty, and public health, and then reaching the federal level as the Progressive Era Administrations of Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson began to experiment with antitrust and economic regulatory oversight. 38 As Professor William Novak has convincingly argued, this proliferation of state and local regulatory experiments shaped a generation of legal scholars and policymakers, giving rise to the modern techniques of administrative governance and making the later New Deal creation of the modern administrative state possible. 39 The rise of administration, then, was inextricably related to the rise of democracy, in two related senses: first, the building of state regulatory capacity provided the democratic public as a whole with new tools through which to make a vision of socioeconomic order possible; second, these tools were at the outset oriented, at least in part, toward a substantive vision of democratic accountability and equality, not just of governmental actors, but perhaps even more importantly, of private economic actors whose unchecked private and market power posed a threat to democratic opportunity.

This relationship between democratic political agency and capacity, substantive ideals of democratic equality, and the administrative state also animated important episodes of regulatory institutional development and innovation in the mid- and late twentieth century. As the growing literature on "administrative constitutionalism" suggests, the frontline battles for economic, racial, and gender equality often involved the building and deploying of bureaucratic capacity, and internal battles between social movements and bureaucrats. 40 It was through the creation of regulatory institutions that labor rights, nondiscrimination protections, and access to federal welfare programs from Medicare to poverty assistance were made possible. Furthermore, it was through the pressures exerted on these bureaucracies by social movements that these regulatory tools were gradually repurposed toward enforcing and implementing equity- and inclusion-enhancing programs.

Consider, for example, Professor Karen Tani's recent work on the administration of welfare rights. As Tani documents, the development of a modern welfare rights regime involved a hard-fought shift away from a view of welfare as charitable support for the needy to welfare as a right that was an entitlement owed to members of the polity. 41 This shift had to be negotiated and was driven in large part by bureaucrats within the Social Security Administration, who asserted their specific vision of welfare as entitlement over the resistance of local welfare system administrators. To make the idea of welfare rights a reality, these bureaucrats experimented with implementing greater process protections for claimants. 42 These federal officers also developed new approaches to training and hiring bureaucrats, socializing them into a way of doing their day-to-day work that took as an axiom this more robust commitment to welfare as entitlement. 43 The success or failure of this effort turned not so much on the role of judicial interpretations of constitutional doctrine or presidential directives, but rather on more bureaucratic concerns: jurisdictional turf battles between local and state administrators more hostile to expanded welfare benefits and federal agencies seeking to expand access, difficulties of sourcing enough trained personnel who shared this larger mission, and the like. 44

A similar story can be told about the construction of equal access to Medicare. As Professor David Smith details in his historical account, it was the politics of regulation that constructed the reality of equal access to Medicare as a universal entitlement. 45 This outcome was neither obvious, nor predetermined. Rather, it was the contingent result of a complex interplay of bureaucratic innovation, social movement pressure, and regulatory policymaking. As Smith argues, in the early days of Medicare, there was a very real threat that the program would be administered in racially discriminatory and exclusionary ways. 46 The health system emerging in the mid-twentieth century reflected the legacy of racial exclusion and hierarchy in the Jim Crow South, marked by segregated and geographically concentrated hospital systems, and driving vastly divergent health outcomes and mortality rates between whites and African Americans. 47 Civil rights movement groups like the NAACP, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Congress of Racial Equality, made the integration of hospitals and the healthcare system a key focal point -- taking the lead from African American health professionals who drove these campaigns. 48 Pressure from civil rights leaders led to a major shift in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare leadership and culture. By December 1965, the agency issued a new internal memo that declared its mission to include the compliance with an enforcement of civil rights goals, through the administering of Medicare funding for hospital systems. 49 The agency created an Office of Equal Health Opportunity in February 1966 to enforce Title VI compliance for any hospital receiving Medicare payments. 50 This new office in turn hired teams of investigators, coordinating with civil rights groups to train them and to identify hospitals that might be violating civil rights requirements. 51

The rise of the administrative state was thus not a politically neutral endeavor. The checks and balances that legitimate administrative authority in essence make possible (but do not guarantee) the contestation of deep forms of economic and social inequality, subordination, or hierarchy. This is not to say that administrative authority is always equality or inclusion promoting -- hardly. But in a reality where background economic, social, and historical conditions already encode structural disparities of wealth, opportunity, power, and influence, eliminating regulatory agencies and tools that are potentially capable of addressing these disparities (even if they are not always deployed in these ways) precludes much of equality- or inclusion-promoting public policy from getting off the ground in the first place. The dismantling of administrative institutions, then, is similarly nonneutral. Scholars of the administrative process have long warned of the dangers of special interest capture of regulatory agencies, which would cause administrative authority to be redirected to serve some interests over others. 53 But agencies can also be captured and neutered through inaction -- through what political scientists call "drift," where highly resourced and sophisticated players are able to produce substantive policy change simply by holding existing rules in place in the face of changing external conditions. 54 Dismantling agencies altogether would be an even more extreme form of opposition to these potential uses: rather than trying to capture or simply neuter the agency, more radical efforts to deconstruct regulatory institutions cut off the very possibility by eliminating the regulatory capacity itself, a kind of complete and total capture through deconstruction.

This substantive valence of administrative power and its potential deconstruction adds an important layer to Michaels's critique of privatization. Michaels alludes to the ways in which privatization risks permanently dismantling institutional tools and capacities that are difficult to rebuild. As Michaels warns, under privatization, "we will have hollowed out the government sector to such an extent that we may well lack the capacity, infrastructure, and know-how to reclaim that which has increasingly been outsourced or marketized" (p. 12). He rightly notes that privatization emerged as a "pivot[]" strategy in the Reagan era, a "second-best" to dismantling regulatory bodies themselves (p. 97). This is a problem in particular because "the Market, at least in its pure, idealized state, is not democratic, deliberative, or juridical. . . . It is the world of Schumpeter and Coase, not Montesquieu or Madison" (p. 5). Private corporate governance, meanwhile, cannot replicate the kinds of checks and balances that the separation of powers principles require (p. 164).

Dismantling administration and returning to private ordering is therefore troubling for democracy in three senses. First, given prior background structural patterns of exclusion and disparities of wealth, power, and opportunity, a return to private economic and social ordering is by definition a return to economic inequality, social hierarchy, and exclusion. Second, the dynamics of market competition or of corporate governance cannot replicate or replace public institutions of democracy or of checks and balances. They operate fundamentally differently and are not substitutes. Third, a dismantling of regulatory institutions removes some of the most vital and effective mechanisms through which we as a democratic public seek to contest and reshape these background structural inequities and exclusions: without tools of general administrative policymaking and enforcement, these structural inequities are harder to overcome and reshape.

#### Left-wing skepticism of state power justifies proceduralism to undermine the administrative state
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Administrative law comprises a set of procedural rules that affect the pace and composition of government action. That same government action--whether it involves dispensing public benefits or regulating private conduct--allocates resources, risk, and power within the United States. The manner in which administrative law operates will thus favor some interests over others. That's not an indictment: any set of rules has the same character. Increasing the stringency of judicial review for new agency regulations, for example, will tend to aid those who have the most to lose from government action. By the same token, curbing judicial review will help those who stand to gain. There is no neutral, value-free way to calibrate the stringency of judicial review, and the point holds for administrative procedure more generally. The distribution of resources, risk, and power in the United States is partly a function of an administrative law that is supposed to be agnostic as to that distribution.

With increasing urgency over the past two decades, congressional Republicans have advanced proposals to discipline a regulatory state that, in their view, does too much and with too little care. These proposals travel under an array of names and acronyms, but they embrace a common tactic: they pile procedure on procedure in an effort to create a thicket so dense that agencies will either struggle to act or give up before they start. 1 The Regulatory Accountability Act (RAA), for example, would subject high-impact rules to an oral hearing, complete with cross-examination and a formal record; ban agencies from engaging in public outreach to advocate for their rules; stitch centralized executive oversight and rigorous cost-benefit analysis into law; impose onerous new rules on the issuance of guidance documents; and make adherence to all of these procedures subject to judicial review. 2 By tilting the scales against agency action, Republicans hope to end "job-killing regulations" and invigorate the free market. Not coincidentally, that means favoring industry over environmentalists, banks over consumer advocates, and management over labor.

The point is not that these are bad priorities. The point is that they are political priorities. Democrats understand as much. "By hamstringing the dedicated public servants charged with ensuring everything from safe infant [\*347] formula to clean drinking water to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work," writes Sam Berger, a former official in the Obama White House, "this bill would put corporate profits before people's lives and livelihoods." 3 William Funk notes that the RAA will "slow down, if not make impossible, the development of regulations that have major effects on the economy. It does not matter how many lives the regulation might save." 4 But the opposition from the left presents a puzzle. If adding new administrative procedures will so obviously advance conservative priorities, might not relaxing existing administrative constraints advance liberal ones? What if dedicated public servants are already hamstrung? What if it already does not matter how many lives a regulation might save?

Yet there is no Democratic version of the RAA, and little organized energy behind the idea that relaxing administrative procedures will be good for the environment, consumers, and workers. The game is strictly defensive: to protect administrative law, not to transform and rethink it. Actually, matters are worse than that. Some liberals are so enchanted with administrative procedures that they are calling for more. Democrats Heidi Heitkamp and Joe Manchin were Senate cosponsors of the RAA, arguing that it would make regulations "smarter." 5 Cass Sunstein also supports the bill, though not without reservation, and in so doing has thrown his support behind the imposition of the same procedures that Republicans hope will frustrate agency action. 6 Even those who are especially sensitive to the deficiencies of modern administrative law--Jon Michaels comes to mind--endorse court-centered proceduralism as part of their cure. 7

[\*348] Why aren't progressives clamoring to loosen administrative law's constraints? It's not for want of targets. Administrative law is shot through with arguably counterproductive procedural rules. In past work, for example, I have argued that the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs imposes a drag on regulation without adequate justification; 8 that the presumption in favor of judicial review of agency action, and particularly the presumption in favor of preenforcement review, should be reevaluated; 9 and that the reflexive invalidation of defective agency action is wasteful and unnecessary. 10 But the list goes on. The judicially imposed rigors of notice-and-comment rulemaking, the practice of invalidating guidance documents that are "really" legislative rules, the Information Quality Act, the logical outgrowth doctrine, nationwide injunctions against invalid rules--all could and perhaps should be reconsidered.

In today's political landscape, however, "regulatory reform" is strictly the province of Republican policymakers, so much so that the anodyne phrase has acquired an antiregulatory connotation. Republicans have a reform agenda. Democrats don't. 11 What's more, the left's hesitation is not a response to Republican control of the federal government. When Democrats held both Congress and the White House in 2009 and 2010, they didn't press to streamline or rethink administrative law.

Liberal quiescence can be traced, instead, to two stories about the administrative state that have become deeply embedded in our legal culture. Fidelity to procedures, one story runs, is essential to sustain the fragile legitimacy of a powerful and constitutionally suspect administrative state. 12 On the other story, procedures assure public accountability by shaping the decisions of an executive branch that might otherwise be beholden to factional [\*349] interests. 13 Taken together, these stories suggest we should be thankful for the procedures we have and nervous about their elimination.

But this legitimacy-and-capture narrative is overdrawn--indeed, it is largely a myth. Proceduralism has a role to play in preserving legitimacy and discouraging capture, but it advances those goals more obliquely than is commonly assumed and may exacerbate the very problems it aims to address. In building this argument, I hope to call into question the administrative lawyer's instinctive faith in procedure, to reorient discussion to the trade-offs at the heart of any system designed to structure government action, and to soften resistance to the relaxation of unduly burdensome procedural rules. Notwithstanding academic claims that the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) has attained a kind of quasi-constitutional status, 14 administrative law remains very much an object of political contestation. Any convention that Congress can't tinker with the APA is quickly eroding, if indeed any such convention ever existed. We should acknowledge that fact even if we lament its loss.

In this, I hope to bring the practice of administrative law into conversation with a line of revisionist academic work that questions the left's embrace of court-centric legalism. That work, among other things, recovers how Progressive and New Deal state-builders embraced a results-oriented, nonlegalistic approach to administrative power. They understood--more clearly than we do now--that strict procedural rules and vigorous judicial oversight could be mobilized to frustrate their efforts to curb market exploitation, protect workers, and press for a fairer distribution of resources. 15 "Substantial justice," declared President Franklin Roosevelt in vetoing a predecessor bill to the APA, "remains a higher aim for our civilization than technical legalism." 16

The left's antiproceduralist orientation shifted in the wake of Brown v Board of Education, when the fight for civil rights moved into a legalistic register--a shift that, in the revisionist telling, both narrowed the scope of the civil rights movement's ambitions and hampered its efforts to address yawning racial inequalities. 17 Progressive reformers in the 1960s and the 1970s [\*350] drew inspiration from the civil rights example, and adopted the tools of adversarial legalism (to use Robert Kagan's phrase) 18 in an effort to spur the vigorous enforcement of new environmental and consumer protection laws. 19 That legalism, which opponents of state action avidly supported, 20 is our inheritance from that era. 21

Along the way, a positive vision of the administrative state--one in which its legitimacy is measured not by the stringency of the constraints under which it labors, but by how well it advances our collective goals--has been shoved to the side. 22 [FN22] See Kessler, supra note 15, at 733 (recalling the views of progressive reformers who "believed that an autonomous administrative state was necessary to achieve a more just distribution of the nation's resources, and that the achievement of this political economic goal, along with democratic support and expert guidance, were the sufficient conditions of the state's legitimacy"). [End FN] I recognize that now may not be the most auspicious time to press the point, when liberals have seized on administrative law as a means to resist the Trump Administration. But President Trump is temporary; administrative law is not. And an administrative law oriented around fears of a pathological presidency may itself be pathological--a cure worse than the disease. A decade after a financial crisis roiled the financial markets, in a century when climate change threatens environmental catastrophe, and in an era of growing income and wealth inequality, the wisdom of allowing procedural rules to hobble federal agencies is very much open to question. Administrative law may be about good governance, but it is also about power: the power to maintain the existing state of affairs, and the power to change it. It's well past time for more skepticism about procedure.

#### Administrative state is key to solve multiple existential risks
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We face no less than four urgent crises: an ongoing pandemic1; racial injustice and its consequent civil unrest2; an economic depression approaching the pain inflicted in 1929; and the accumulating, existential threat of climate change.4 Citizens must rely on their state to tackle these burning perils.5 Yet critics both left 6 and right 7 would tear down its institutional capacity to do so. Some denounce the exercise of administrative power as illiberal, unconstitutional and obnoxious to the rule of law.8 Others impugn it as undemocratic, paternalistic, and corrupt.9 Yet without some kind of agent to carry out collective solutions, these perils may very well proceed unabated.

Pushing an anti-administravist10 agenda, libertarians continue their “long war”11 against government agencies by insisting that they are an unconstitutional fourth branch of government. For them, administration is a kind of “absolutism”12 that violates the separation of powers and defies the principle of limited government.13 They contend that agencies’ discretionary rulemaking offends the liberal commitment to the rule of law. 14 Accordingly, they would punt agencies’ responsibility for social, economic, and environmental problems to courts and legislatures. 15 Regulation would thus be placed at the mercy of an undemocratic judiciary who increasingly “weaponizes” the First Amendment in favor of big business16 – or of a Congress whose already inefficient decision-making is crippled by hyperpolarization17 and distorted by the kind of material inequalities that the welfare state is meant to ameliorate. 18

Conservatives with a more authoritarian inflection seek to recall administration from its constitutional exile by subsuming it under presidential power. 19 Such critics would lend administration some democratic credentials by bootstrapping them to the president’s electoral accountability. Yet ridding agencies of their independence by placing them under the discretion of the president grants the president personal control over agency policymaking and adjudication without the checks provided by Congress, the courts, or an independent civil service.20 It thus, arguably, solves a separation-of-powers problem by introducing a new one.21 More ominously, empowering the president with the patina of democratic legitimacy emits a strong whiff of Schmittian politics.22 The prospect of a largely unbound executive officer claiming a popular mandate to hire and fire civil servants on a whim should alarm any that followed the Trump Administration’s treatment of refugees, civil protestors, polluters, and political cronies.

Agency power likewise fares poorly in the hands of the left. 23 They blame administrative technocracy for a variety of social and political ailments: the reification of social differences and the juridification of human nature24; corruption, privatization and regulatory capture25; the depoliticization of economic issues and the subsidization of globalized financial capitalism26 and, ultimately, the constellation of conspiratorial populist politics currently threatening liberal democratic states.27 Their preferred solutions include democratizing agency decision-making28 and constraining Congress’ capacity to delegate its lawmaking function. 29 While their interventions are welcome, they may deprive government of the nimble expertise necessary to address environmental and economic crises.30 Moreover, as illustrated by the president’s extraordinary powers to shape national immigration policy despite its “notoriously complex and detailed statutory structure,” increasing the amount of formal legislation may only expand agencies’ enforcement discretion.31 Agency democratization, furthermore, risks reproducing, perhaps under the cover of ostensible public consensus, the same social, economic and political inequalities that distort Congressional lawmaking. 32

In this essay, I contend that this multi-pronged anti-administravist attack stands upon shaky conceptual foundations. Each builds atop a theory of constitutionalism that embraces a too-literal conception of popular sovereignty.33 It is a conception that posits that there is, in fact, a “people” with a sovereign “will.” It is a “will” that can be clearly identified (through elections); straightforwardly transcribed (through lawmaking); mechanically applied (by administrators) and constrained (by judges). 34 But in a country of hundreds of millions, the diverse multiplicity of citizens could never find a common will.35 It is even more impossible that it could ever be accurately expressed through the lawmaking of elected representatives.36 As a result, critics of administration often grant statutory lawmaking more democratic credentials than it deserves. 37 The non-delegation doctrine purports to prevent the delegation of something that simply may not exist.

Critics commit another mistake when they invoke a theory of constitutionalism that analytically divides functions that cannot, as either a moral or empirical matter, be disentangled. First, they incorrectly posit two separate, autonomous processes: the collective formation of ends (lawmaking) and the implementation (execution) and application (adjudication) of those ends. 38 But we cannot presume that judges and administrators can mechanically apply and enforce the law without importing into the process their own value-laden, and therefore political, judgments.39 “They who will the end will the means” is a naïve argument that occludes the power wielded by unelected actors.40 It is also a mistake to presume that the legislative branch concerns itself only with value-laden final ends, and not with the means required to execute them.41 Indeed, most of our most bitter political fights are fights conducted precisely over means: how best to grow the economy; how best to care for the sick; how best to mitigate climate change, etc. 42 As a result, the theories overemphasize and distort the purpose of separating powers.43

Critics commit yet another mistake when they divorce the constitutional functions of (1) protecting rights and limiting government power, and (2) providing the decision-making procedures necessary for democratic will-formation. 44 They isolate elections and lawmaking from the process of enforcing rights and the rule of law – as if they have nothing to do with one another. Yet quarantining rights from democracy requires reliance on an outsourced moral order external to the political system itself – a reliance inappropriate for contemporary secular polities.45 They therefore lend judges too many liberal credentials while denying any to mechanisms of popular feedback.

Rather than critiquing agencies for violating the separation of powers, for their over-reliance on unelected technocrats, or for their indifference to universalizable legal principles, I argue that administration does indeed carry constitutional liberal democratic credentials – credentials borne out by political theory’s “representative turn.”46 By understanding agencies as embedded in a system of representative democracy that aims to set the conditions by which citizens can relate to each other as political equals, we can assess the legitimacy of government agencies without any “idolatrous”47 commitments to a fictitious popular sovereign or legal formalism. I suggest that agency institutions should be measured against the notion that popular sovereignty demands not consensus and consent, but instead institutions that permit citizens to understand themselves as co-equal participants in the collective decision-making process.

### Case

#### Competition in the private sector is key to drive down costs in space exploration – spurs innovation
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There’s no shortage of hype surrounding the commercial space industry. But while tech leaders promise us moon bases and settlements on Mars, the space economy has thus far remained distinctly local — at least in a cosmic sense. Last year, however, we crossed an important threshold: For the first time in human history, humans accessed space via a vehicle built and owned not by any government, but by a private corporation with its sights set on affordable space settlement. It was the first significant step towards building an economy both in space and for space. The implications — for business, policy, and society at large — are hard to overstate.

In 2019, [95%](https://brycetech.com/reports) of the estimated $366 billion in revenue earned in the space sector was from the space-for-earth economy: that is, goods or services produced in space for use on earth. The space-for-earth economy includes telecommunications and internet infrastructure, earth observation capabilities, national security satellites, and more. This economy is booming, and though [research shows](https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/716037-PDF-ENG) that it faces the challenges of overcrowding and monopolization that tend to arise whenever companies compete for a scarce natural resource, [projections for its future](https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/720027-PDF-ENG) are optimistic. Decreasing costs for launch and space hardware in general have enticed new entrants into this market, and companies in a variety of industries have already begun leveraging satellite technology and access to space to drive innovation and efficiency in their earthbound products and services.

In contrast, the space-for-space economy — that is, goods and services produced in space for use in space, such as mining the Moon or asteroids for material with which to construct in-space habitats or supply refueling depots — has struggled to get off the ground. As far back as the 1970s, [research](https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19780004167) commissioned by NASA predicted the rise of a space-based economy that would supply the demands of hundreds, thousands, even millions of humans living in space, dwarfing the space-for-earth economy (and, eventually, the entire terrestrial economy as well). The realization of such a vision would change how all of us do business, live our lives, and govern our societies — but to date, we’ve never even had more than [13 people](https://www.space.com/6503-population-space-historic-high-13.html) in space at one time, leaving that dream as little more than science fiction.

Today, however, there is reason to think that we may finally be reaching the first stages of a true space-for-space economy. SpaceX’s [recent achievements](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-s-spacex-crew-1-astronauts-headed-to-international-space-station/) (in cooperation with NASA), as well as upcoming efforts by [Boeing](https://www.nasa.gov/feature/boeing-s-starliner-makes-progress-ahead-of-flight-test-with-astronauts), [Blue Origin](https://www.blueorigin.com/news/nasa-selects-blue-origin-national-team-to-return-humans-to-the-moon), and [Virgin Galactic](https://spacenews.com/virgin-galactic-prepares-to-transition-to-operations) to put people in space sustainably and at scale, mark the opening of a new chapter of spaceflight led by private firms. These firms have both the intention and capability to bring private citizens to space as passengers, tourists, and — eventually — settlers, opening the door for businesses to start meeting the demand those people create over the next several decades with an array of space-for-space goods and services.

Welcome to the (Commercial) Space Age

In our [recent research](https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/jep.32.2.173_Space,%20the%20Final%20Economic%20Frontier_413bf24d-42e6-4cea-8cc5-a0d2f6fc6a70.pdf), we examined how the model of centralized, government-directed human space activity born in the 1960s has, over the last two decades, made way for a new model, in which public initiatives in space increasingly share the stage with private priorities. Centralized, government-led space programs will inevitably focus on space-for-earth activities that are in the public interest, such as national security, basic science, and national pride. This is only natural, as expenditures for these programs must be justified by demonstrating benefits for citizens — and the citizens these governments represent are (nearly) all on earth.

In contrast to governments, the private sector is eager to put people in space to pursue their own personal interests, not the state’s — and then supply the demand they create. This is the vision driving SpaceX, which in its first twenty years has entirely upended the rocket launch industry, securing 60% of the global commercial launch market and building ever-larger spacecraft designed to ferry passengers not just to the International Space Station (ISS), but also to its own promised [settlement on Mars](https://www.spacex.com/media/making_life_multiplanetary_transcript_2017.pdf).

Today, the space-for-space market is limited to supplying the people who are already in space: that is, the handful of astronauts employed by NASA and other government programs. While SpaceX has grand visions of supporting large numbers of private space travelers, their current space-for-space activities have all been in response to demand from government customers (i.e., NASA). But as decreasing launch costs enable companies like SpaceX to leverage economies of scale and put more people into space, growing private sector demand (that is, tourists and settlers, rather than government employees) could turn these proof-of-concept initiatives into a sustainable, large-scale industry.

This model — of selling to NASA with the hopes of eventually creating and expanding into a larger private market — is exemplified by SpaceX, but the company is by no means the only player taking this approach. For instance, while SpaceX is focused on space-for-space transportation, another key component of this burgeoning industry will be manufacturing.

[Made In Space, Inc.](https://madeinspace.us/capabilities-and-technology/archinaut/) has been at the forefront of manufacturing “in space, for space” since 2014, when it 3D-printed a wrench onboard the ISS. Today, the company is exploring other products, such as high-quality fiber-optic cable, that terrestrial customers may be willing to pay to have manufactured in zero-gravity. But the company also recently received a [$74 million contract](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-funds-demo-of-3d-printed-spacecraft-parts-made-assembled-in-orbit) to 3D-print large metal beams in space for use on NASA spacecraft, and future private sector spacecraft will certainly have similar manufacturing needs which Made In Space hopes to be well-positioned to fulfill. Just as SpaceX has begun by supplying NASA but hopes to eventually serve a much larger, private-sector market, Made In Space’s current work with NASA could be the first step along a path towards supporting a variety of private-sector manufacturing applications for which the costs of manufacturing on earth and transporting into space would be prohibitive.

Another major area of space-for-space investment is in building and operating space infrastructure such as habitats, laboratories, and factories. Axiom Space, a current leader in this field, recently [announced](https://www.theverge.com/2021/1/26/22250327/space-tourists-axiom-private-crew-iss-price) that it would be flying the “first fully private commercial mission to space” in 2022 onboard SpaceX’s Crew Dragon Capsule. Axiom was also [awarded](https://spacenews.com/nasa-selects-axiom-space-to-build-commercial-space-station-module/) a contract for exclusive access to a module of the ISS, facilitating its plans to develop modules for commercial activity on the station (and eventually, beyond it).

This infrastructure is likely to spur investment in a wide array of complementary services to supply the demand of the people living and working within it. For example, in February 2020, Maxar Technologies was awarded a [$142 million contract](https://www.builtincolorado.com/2020/02/03/maxar-technologies-142m-nasa-contract) from NASA to develop a robotic construction tool that would be assembled in space for use on low-Earth orbit spacecraft. Private sector spacecraft or settlements will no doubt have need for a variety of similar construction and repair tools.

#### A slew of black swans make extinction inevitable. Moral hedging necessitates space habituation
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Space or bust: Why we must reach for the stars

Why should we pursue space colonization in the first place? Don’t we have more pressing problems today, on Earth?

Yes, we do have many problems on Earth today, and we should try to solve them. But space colonization is just that: A strategy for dealing with certain problems. An the problems that space colonization would be dealing with are, arguably, among the greatest problems of them all: Existential risks; risks that might lead to the extinction of humankind [1]. Currently, all of our proverbial existential eggs are in the same basket. If a natural existential risk strikes (for example, a large asteroid colliding with Earth) or if a man-made existential risk results in a catastrophic outcome (for example, runaway global warming [2, 3]), all of humankind is at risk because humankind is currently limited to planet Earth. If, however, there are self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth, then the probability of an irreversibly catastrophic outcome for all of humankind is drastically reduced.

Investing in space colonization today could therefore have immense future benefits. Using resources today in order to make space colonization possible in the medium-term future is not a waste, but a very profitable investment. If humankind stays limited to Earth and if we go extinct as a consequence of doing so, then we will all the billions of life years and billions of humans who might have come to exist — and who would have experienced happiness and contributed to humankind’s continued epistemic and moral progress.

#### Aff causes transition wars – dooms solvency

#### Wainer and Bienenfeld 19 – Kit Wainer is a member of the United Federation of Teachers and is active in the opposition caucus, the Movement of Rank and File Educators. Mel Bienenfeld is a longtime socialist activist and recently retired president of a higher-education teachers local union.

(Kate Griffiths, 7-21-2019, "Problems with an Electoral Road to Socialism in the United States," New Politics, <https://newpol.org/issue_post/problems-with-an-electoral-road-to-socialism-in-the-united-states/>)

Governors control the National Guard and state police. Local governments control local police forces, although the Constitution allows states full discretion to limit the autonomy of localities. While the president may federalize the guard for a period of time, **it is easy to imagine guard generals refusing to obey presidential authority when asked to enforce decisions the courts have ruled unconstitutional**. Of course a president can send the army into states, thus violating the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, but it is similarly easy to envision generals refusing to execute orders on solid constitutional grounds, or the officer corps dividing amongst itself, in that scenario. In short **there would be no way** of overcoming state recalcitrance **to implement socialist legislation without destroying the legitimacy of the constitutional order.**

In fact, not only can **state authorities** resist**, they can also repress**. Partial socialist victories in the electoral arena would inevitably yield a **fractured state,** with critical parts still in the hands of pro-capitalist officials. The latter would be constitutionally authorized to arrest and terrorize mass movement activists who threaten their rule. They have, after all, done so numerous times in U.S. history. Even today, federal and state authorities are far more likely to arrest someone for the crime of being an immigrant or person of color than for marching with an armed fascist gang threatening the annihilation of the Jews. **Mass movements that are not prepared to physically confront and defeat armed authorities would stand little chance.**

Bureaucracy, the Regulatory Process, and Unelected Authority

While the legislative and executive branches make law and the judicial branch reviews laws, unelected regulatory bodies determine how they are actually interpreted and implemented. Currently, these bodies are staffed by skilled bureaucrats through a combination of patronage, political favoritism, and civil service promotion. Regulatory agencies are typically staffed by and managed by the industries they are designed to regulate. Even lower-level bureaucratic posts often enable employees to audition for far more lucrative private-sector employment. This creates enormous incentives to defer to corporate prerogative, even if the elected authorities have a different agenda. And these regulatory agencies decide what the law means in day-to-day situations that lawmakers can never predict when writing bills.

Bureaucratic and regulatory agencies govern at the local, state, and federal levels. They set zoning policies that largely determine whether housing is affordable and safe for working-class habitation. Their rules indirectly affect how much of their lives working people spend commuting to and from work because where tall buildings are built often determines which neighborhoods are clogged with traffic. As with regulatory agencies, building departments are typically instruments of real estate developers, even if they do protect occupants’ safety to some extent. Unelected bodies, such as public authorities in New York and New Jersey, typically control public transportation and critical infrastructure, and an army of bureaucrats runs the education systems all over the United States. All of these bureaucratic agencies are susceptible to intense pressure from highly paid lobbyists. Conditions of housing, transportation, public health, and education are some of the most powerful forces shaping workers’ daily lives, and it is difficult to imagine how working people would maintain confidence in and enthusiasm for a workers’ government that could not demonstrably improve those aspects of their lives. It is also difficult to see how a government could make significant headway in those areas without breaking apart the relevant bureaucracies and busting up the private-sector lobbying firms that influence them. In short, the very precondition for sustained radical electoral success would require the demolition of most regulatory organizations and their replacement with democratic and accountable bodies.

Unelected bureaucracy also reigns in the area of foreign policy. While major decisions such as going to or avoiding war, or negotiating trade agreements, are in the hands of elected officials, many of the day-to-day details of foreign relations are decided and implemented by career officials who are similarly subjected to substantial corporate lobbying and use foreign service careers as springboards into highly paid private-sector employment. The State Department routinely approves international trade licenses, contacts foreign bureaucrats on behalf of U.S. firms, and utilizes personal relationships with international counterparts to smooth those processes. In a world in which several major capitalist states still rule and the U.S. state is fractured, these bureaucrats could become key links between global and domestic counter-revolution.

While bureaucracy takes different forms in different countries, career civil servants staff the state apparatus in most capitalist states today. They tend to be ideologically committed to the survival of the state. Their career ambitions also depend on the patronage of higher ups in each department and alliances with private capitalists who hold the key to their promotion both inside and outside the public sector.

Can bureaucracy be subordinated to a workers’ government? Yes. In fact the soviet state had no choice but to rely on sectors of the tsarist bureaucracy both to win the civil war and for government administration in the 1920s. In a scenario in which the capitalist class has been fully defeated, disempowered bureaucrats might well decide, one by one, that cooperation with the new workers’ regime represents the only hope for maintaining their careers. However, the “democratic,” or, more accurately, the electoral, road to socialism leads inevitably along a different path. It does not deliver a sudden, decisive defeat to the state or to the ruling class. Quite the contrary, it leads to what might be termed “dual power,” in which socialists rule over substantial sectors of the government but capitalist politicians dominate others and much of the capitalist state bureaucracy remains intact. The police, fearing that their careers are in jeopardy, would likely continue to repress mass movements and fight at all costs to preserve their positions. These institutions of the capitalist state would also have powerful allies in the judiciary, not to mention support from capitalists around the world. Under that scenario it is highly unlikely that the administrative bureaucracies would place themselves at the service of workers’ regimes who have far less to offer them and from whom they have far less to fear.

Throughout U.S. history the labor movement and other **radical reform movements have had to contend with ferocious and violent counterattacks**. After World War I, socialists, anarchists, and labor activists of various stripes faced intense state repression. The **survival o**f U.S. **capitalism was not in question** at this time. **Yet, the federal government responded with mass arrests**, deportations, frame-ups, **and violence.** After World War II, federal and state governments effectively repressed the radical wings of the labor movement with witch hunts and blacklists, while tolerating rampant racist violence. It is important to note that **the Communist Party** **not only**, at this point, **could not have threatened revolution, its orientation was heavily electoral**. But the mere prospect of a more militant labor movement and a radical electoral alternative was something both Democrats and Republicans were determined to repress. In the 1960s the FBI’s Cointelpro program targeted movement activists and even murdered Black Panther leader Fred Hampton.

A workers movement in the United States must prepare for severe state repression or it will succumb to it. At times this may involve operating clandestinely. It may also require active self-defense against legal authorities or fascist paramilitaries. Most importantly, preparation means educating a generation of socialist and labor activists about how and why the state protects capitalist profitability both through its own constitutional mechanisms and often with repressive measures that violate its own legality.

#### The “imminent collapse unless alt” narrative is wrong—enough time to address existential risk without discarding capitalism

Wade, Professor of Global Political Economy at the Department of International Development, London School of Economics, ‘21

(Robert H., “What is the Harm in Forecasting Catastrophe due to Man-Made Global Warming?” July 22, <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/22/07/2021/what-harm-forecasting-catastrophe-due-man-made-global-warming>)

When parts of western Germany, Belgium and Netherlands have just experienced catastrophic floods and the Pacific northwest has recently broken heat records, it is counter-intuitive to challenge the prevailing pessimism about global warming – captured for example by the Financial Times columnist Martin Wolf who says, “Given this signal failure [to vaccinate against Covid in line with the global interest], it is impossible to imagine we will do much more than fiddle while the planet burns.”

The danger of this mindset is that it encourages inflation of the threat-language far beyond the credible science, so that the future cannot be discussed except in terms of a choice between “disaster”, “catastrophe”, “planetary extinction” on the one hand or impossibly fast reforms to how humanity lives, works and governs, on the other.

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions. What could be called the “mainstream view” of climate change goes much further, onto uncertain epistemological ground: (3) man-made global warming is the main cause of all kinds of disagreeable events – including extreme weather, rising seas, and much more; (4) humanity faces impending catastrophe unless we undertake far-reaching changes to how we live, work and govern in order to cut CO2 emissions and dematerialize economies (“net zero by 2050”).

This essay identifies some of the weaknesses in the evidence presented in support of the mainstream view, including weaknesses in the claim that 97% of climate scientists believe in anthropogenic global warming, in the claim that global temperatures will rise much faster than they have been rising, and in the (implicit) claim that the horrifying worst-case scenario presented by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change represents the likely scenario to 2100 in the absence of radical actions starting now. It identifies the incentive mechanisms that produce the exaggerations and sustain wide credence in them. At the end it considers the question: does highlighting the doomsday exaggerations serve to reduce the political and public pressures for necessary ameliorative action, in a world where powerful fossil lobbies seek to block or delay such action for reasons independent of “evidence”? To what extent must mass publics be “panicked” in order to induce enough collective political, business and family action to substantially slow the growth of greenhouse gas emissions?

Policy Recommendations

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions.

But too much policy discussion about global warming is polarized and locked into a “syndrome of exaggeration”. The mainstream view talks of coming disaster, catastrophe, even extinction, short of urgent and massive action on a global scale. But it is easy to question the empirical basis of this forecast – not least the long history of repeated wild exaggerations of disaster relative to what later transpired. In response an active but small “sceptical” community exaggerates its scepticism. The two sides make a syndrome in that the behaviour of each confirms the negative expectations of the other.

What is now strangely urgent is to calm down the present climate hysteria so that safety-first resource allocation and consumption decisions can be made without “climate” being the touchstone of the very future of humanity, the current idol of the ancient human longing for Salvation in anxious times, the pathway for all the ingredients of a better world.

The essay suggests changes in the budget and mandate of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; more action by learned societies in calling to account the wild exaggerators; beefing up the Loss and Damage pillar of the Paris Agreement; boosting investment in “clean coal” technologies as well as renewables, and linking coal-power retirement to the coming on stream of attractive alternatives; creating central planning capacity at national and international levels (eg in multilateral development banks) to integrate investment decisions in energy, transport, buildings, industry and agriculture; and last but not least, respecting the principle of free speech while maintaining the standards of civil discourse.

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions. Many go on to say that (3) global warming is the cause of all kinds of disagreeable events – including extreme weather, rising seas, and much more; and that (4) humanity faces impending catastrophe short of far-reaching changes to how we live, work and govern in order to cut CO2 emissions and dematerialize economies. This could now be described – with only a little exaggeration – as the mainstream view.

The Impending Catastrophe

Here are examples of people and organizations claiming that catastrophe for humanity and the biosphere lies ahead if the people of developed and developing countries alike do not make radical changes soon.

The New York Times reported after the G7 Summit in June 2021 that “Mr Biden was once again part of a unanimous consensus that the world needs to take drastic action to prevent a climate disaster”. The report explains that “… the world needs to urgently cut emissions if it has any chance of keeping average global temperatures from rising above 1.5C compared with preindustrial levels. That’s the threshold beyond which experts say the planet will experience catastrophic, irreversible damage.”

US climate envoy John Kerry delivered a dire warning on 12 May 2021 on “the mounting costs … of global warming and of a more volatile climate”. 2020’s tally of “22 hurricanes, floods, droughts and wildfires shattered the previous annual record of 16 such events, and that was set only 4 years ago…. You don’t have to be a scientist to begin to feel that we’re looking at a trend line.”

Christiana Figueres, former executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and pivotal figure in the Paris Agreement, declared in 2020, “It is only over the next 10 years from here to 2030 that we can influence what is going to happen. The scary thing is that after 2030 it basically doesn’t really matter what humans do. We will be in danger of those tipping points having a domino effect on each other and we will lose total control.” (1)

Some more examples:

Kevin Drun, 2019: “[The Green New Deal] would only change the dates for planetary suicide by a decade or so. It’s nowhere near enough even if we do it ”.

Professor Frank Fenner, microbiologist, ANU, 2010: “We’re going to become extinct. Whatever we do now is too late”

John Davies, geophysicist, senior researcher at the Cold Climate Housing Research Center, 2014: “With business as usual life on earth is largely doomed”.

James Hansen, former Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, testifying at a Congressional hearing on global warming in 2008: “We’re toast if we don’t get on to a very different path. This is the last chance” to avoid mass extinctions, ecosystem collapse and dramatic sea level rises. “We [scientists] see a tipping point occurring right before our eyes. The Arctic is the first tipping point and it’s occurring exactly the way we said it would.” In five to 10 years [by 2013-2018], the Arctic will be free of ice in the summer.

James Hansen, testimony at Congressional hearing, 1988: “world's leading climate expert [Hansen] predicts lower Manhattan underwater by 2018”

Dr Michael Mann, Penn State: “We’re talking about literally giving up on our coastal cities of the world and moving inland”

United Nations Environment Programme, 2005: “Fifty million climate refugees by 2010.” (2)

United Nations Environment Programme, 2011: “60 million environmental refugees by 2020”

The Guardian carried a front-page story in 2004 headlined, “Now the Pentagon tells Bush: climate change will destroy us”. The by-line reads: “Secret report warns of rioting and nuclear war. Britain will be ‘Siberian’ in less than 20 years. Threat to the world is greater than terrorism”. The text continues, “A secret report, suppressed by US defence chiefs…, warns that major European cities will be sunk beneath rising seas as Britain is plunged into a ‘Siberian’ climate by 2020. Nuclear conflict, mega-droughts, famine and widespread rioting will erupt across the world.” (Emphases added).

Remember that in the 1960s and 1970s many experts forecast an immanent Ice Age. For example, 1970: “Ice age by 2000”. 1971: “New Ice Age coming by 2020 or 2030.” 1976: “Scientific consensus planet cooling famines imminent”. 1978: “No end in sight to 30 year cooling trend”.

The Climate Change Consensus

The diagnoses and prescriptions in the above statements express an underlying consensus.

Human actions (mainly burning fossil fuels and changing land use) are causing rising concentration of atmospheric CO2 (and other greenhouse gases, GHG),

Rises in man-made GHG are causing rising global temperatures in atmosphere and seas, and

This temperature rise poses not just a serious threat to humanity and the whole biosphere, but an existential threat.

In other words, the existence of humans and many other species is at stake if we do not succeed in drastically cutting CO2 emissions as the way to reduce the atmospheric concentration of GHG and thereby slow or reverse the rise in global temperature. In the oft used phrase, humanity faces an “existential crisis” induced by climate change caused by human actions. Implied but not normally stated, there are no benefits from higher concentrations of CO2 or higher temperature to be weighed against costs. Also implied but not normally stated, we must act to stop climate change regardless of cost, because the costs might include deep disruption of human civilization or even extinction.

We have to think of avoiding climate change as the global equivalent of avoiding explosions at nuclear power plants (Chernobyl, Fukushima). We invest heavily in safety-first measures in order to reduce the probability of a nuclear explosion to a very low level because the costs of a nuclear explosion are so huge. The same logic applies at the level of climate, in terms of the costs of average temperature rising by more than ~ 1.5 C from “pre-industrial”.

This is the Anthropogenic Global Warming Consensus, or Climate Change Consensus (CCC) for short. I use “consensus” in the same sense as “the Washington Consensus” about best policy for developing countries, the phrase coined by John Williamson in 1990.

The CCC is now well anchored into international agreements (such as the Paris Declaration), national policy, and increasingly corporate strategy too. The periodic Assessment Reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reaffirm it, particularly in the Summary for Policymakers. Financial Times journalist Pilita Clark observed, “The world has rarely seen any environmental idea take off like the push to cut greenhouse gas emissions to net zero. A fringe concept six years ago, it has gone mainstream so quickly that more than 60 percent of countries now have some sort of net zero goal, along with investors managing nearly $37tn and at least 20 percent of the 2,000 largest publicly listed companies. The International Energy Agency [IEA] warns in a striking net zero report today that all new oil, gas and coal projects and exploration must stop if global warming is to stay below 1.5C.”

Scientific support comes from the fact that 97% of climate scientists agree that man-made greenhouse gases have been responsible for “most” of the warming of the Earth’s average temperature over the second half of the twentieth century. The 3% who are sceptical are not highly regarded scientists and some are in the pay of fossil fuel interests.

In the face of this scientific, interstate, and corporate agreement about the necessity of a global Big Push to cut CO2 emissions fast, developing countries and China carry a heavy responsibility, because they are the major source of global CO2 emissions, mainly from their consumption of fossil fuels. They must quickly follow the developed countries in investing on a massive scale in sources of renewable energy, whose prices are falling fast. Developed countries will offer large-scale financing and technical assistance for them to make the switch – in the developed countries’ self-interest.

It is true that developed countries put up most of the stock of greenhouse gases now in the atmosphere as they used fossil fuels to power their ascent to the top of the global hierarchy of income and wealth over the past two centuries. But that gives developing countries, even though they remain well down the income hierarchy, no justification for saying that they therefore have the right to carbon space for powering their economic development – because continuing to use relatively accessible, cheap and reliable fossil-fuel energy to power their growth pushes all humanity and the biosphere towards ruin.

Do Virtually all Climate Scientists Agree with the CCC?

It is widely cited that “97% of climate scientists agree warming is man-made”; or more exactly, “97% of science papers taking a position on climate change say it is man-made”. The conclusion is frequently amped up to “a 97% consensus that ‘humans are causing a global warming crisis’”.

Note that this last statement – with “crisis” – is not the same as the previous two, but all three statements tend to be conflated, so that people agreeing with “most recent warming is man-made” tend to be scored as agreeing that global warming is a crisis, which commonly gets inflated into agreeing that it is an existential crisis or the existential crisis.

Note that these statements of “consensus” do not specify the time period.

Note also that “high consensus” in science is only a weak criterion of “truth” in science – but the 97% figure is often deployed as evidence of the “truth” that warming is man-made. Of course, it is worth knowing to what extent there are “widely accepted truths” in any field. But problems come when the “fact” of consensus is established in a clearly tendentious way.

A standard source of the claim that 97% of climate scientists agree that global warming is man-made is the study by John Cook et al. (2013). The study rated about 12,000 abstracts of peer-reviewed papers published between 1991 and 2011. The rating was done by 12 volunteers, each abstract was rated by two people, making 24,000 ratings. The ratings were in three categories: (1) implicit or explicit endorsement of human-caused global warming; (2) no opinion; (3) implicit or explicit rejection or minimization of the human influence. About 4,000 abstracts took a position on the cause of global warming, 97.1% of which endorsed human-caused global warming.

Notice that this should not be, but commonly is translated as “97% of climate scientists endorse …”. Notice too that the abstracts were not rated as to whether they stressed greenhouse gases or man-made changes in land use and land cover; the implicit assumption is, man-made greenhouse gases are the cause of warming. Finally, notice that the abstracts were not rated as to whether they endorsed the idea of a global warming crisis or catastrophe; only as to whether they endorsed the idea of human causes of global warming.

A Wikipedia essay describes the study as “a landmark climate research paper [which] found that 97.1% of climate scientists supported the hypothesis of anthropogenic global warming (AGW). As of March 2021, the paper has received at least 1,270,076 downloads.”

There is an obvious question. Does “endorsement of human-caused global warming” mean warming caused 100% by human actions, or 75%, or 50%, or 25%? Any of these may be consistent with “climate change is man-made”. By leaving the degree of causation by humans open, thumbs can be put on the scales to yield the conclusion that virtually all well-qualified scientists believe that global warming of the past several decades is caused almost entirely by human action (would not be occurring in the absence of that action).

Professor Mike Hulme, professor of Human Geography at the University of Cambridge, concludes: “The ‘97% consensus’ article is poorly conceived, poorly designed and poorly executed.” Analysis by David Legates et al (2015) found that only 0.3% of the sampled papers “endorsed the standard definition of consensus: that most warming since 1950 is anthropogenic”. Research physicist Nicola Scafetta: “Cook et al (2013) is based on a straw man argument because it does not correctly define the IPCC AGW [anthropogenic global warming ] theory, which is NOT that human emissions have contributed 50%+ of the global warming since 1900 but that almost 90-100% of the observed global warming was induced by human emission”. (3)

It is testimony to the apocalyptic emotion behind people’s response to “climate change” and “global warming” that the Cook et al. paper, and others with similar methods, have commanded such credence in the face of evident flaws – notably (1) in fudging the distinction between agreeing that human actions have some role in global warming and agreeing that human actions explain most global warming; (2) in not asking whether – extent to which -- the scientists’ papers identified global warming as a problem, a crisis, an existential crisis, over what time period. (4)

By keeping it vague what the “consensus” agrees on, authors and users of the studies have given the impression that endorsement of “humans are causing global warming” means endorsement that “humans’ enhancement of the greenhouse effect will be dangerous enough to be ‘catastrophic’”, and therefore also means endorsement of the imperative for urgent, radical action on a global scale by governments, firms and families.

It is testimony to the pervasive anxiety of the zeitgeist that such surveys are routinely cited as demonstrating a near-unanimous scientific consensus in favor of radical, far-reaching climate policy (including for energy, food and materials), when the surveys do not even ask the question as to whether the respondent considers that (a) the anthropogenic component of recent warming is dangerous, and (b) dangerous enough to require a global climate policy. The surveys are almost valueless scientifically, but valuable politically.

Upward Bias in Temperature Forecasting Models

The prospect of a coming catastrophe for humanity and the biosphere rests heavily on outputs of climate forecasting models. But as David Legates and co-authors argue, these models “exhibit a strong exaggeration in their results even when narrowly adopting atmospheric carbon dioxide as the sole driver of climate responses…. [General circulation models, such as those of the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] have consistently overestimated the climate sensitivity to rising atmospheric carbon dioxide.”

Ross McKitrick (2020) begins his assessment, “Two new peer-reviewed papers from independent teams confirm that climate models overstate atmospheric warming, and the problem [of overstatement] has gotten worse over time, not better”. One of the papers (by McKitrick and John Christy) examined 38 models, the other, 48 models, used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the various US “National Assessments”, the EPA’s “Endangerment Finding”, and more.

McKitrick continues, “Both papers looked at ‘hindcasts’, which are reconstructions of recent historical temperatures in response to observed greenhouse gas emissions and other changes (eg aerosols and solar forcing). Across the two papers it emerges that the models overshoot historical warming from the near-surface through the upper troposphere, in the tropics and globally.” The study based on 48 models for 1998 to 2014 found that they warm on average 4 to 5 times faster than the observations.

McKitrick concludes, “modelling the climate is incredibly difficult, and no one faults the scientific community for finding it a tough problem to solve. But we are all living with the consequences of climate modelers stubbornly using generation after generation of models that exhibit too much surface and tropospheric warming, in addition to running grossly exaggerated forcing scenarios (eg RCP8.5).

“[W]hen the models get the tropical troposphere wrong, it drives potential errors in many other features of the model atmosphere. Even if the original problem was confined to excess warming in the tropical mid-troposphere, it has now expanded into a more pervasive warm bias throughout the global troposphere.

“If the discrepancies in the troposphere were evenly split across models between excess warming and cooling we could chalk it up to noise and uncertainty. But that is not the case: it’s all excess warming…. That’s bias, not uncertainty, and until the modelling community finds a way to fix it, the economics and policy making community are justified in assuming future warming projects are overstated, potentially by a great deal….”

The strong upward bias in temperature forecasts relative to observations compromise the models’ forecasting impacts on ecosystems, including agriculture, by exaggerating the probability of catastrophic effects.

The IPCC makes projections of future global temperatures to the end of century based on various models. They range from a low of 1.4 C to a high of 5.6 C over pre-industrial temperature (roughly 1900). The wide range makes them almost meaningless. The IPCC explains that the wide range results from uncertainty about the magnitude of the feedback between warming and increased rates of evaporation – and David Seckler adds, also about the effects of evaporation on clouds and precipitation. (5)

It is astonishing to learn that the climate models miss a critical component of the climate system -- the hydrological cycle, and specifically clouds, which the IPCC calls the “wild card” in the climate system.

The IPCC’s Worst Case Scenario is commonly used as the Business as Usual without a Radical Policy Action’ Scenario

The IPCC’s Assessment Report 5 (AR5), published in 2014, presented a range of forecasts of global climate out to 2050 and 2100, based on different assumptions about radiative forcing (a measure of how much of the sun’s energy the atmosphere traps). The most extreme – the worst case – was called Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5. It assumes ominous reversals in several basic, long-standing trends, all heading in the extremely wrong direction to 2100:

high population growth to reach more than 12 billion people

slow technology development

coal consumption increases by 500 % between 2005 and 2100 (no account taken of supply constraints)

slow GDP growth

fast rise in world poverty

high energy use

high GHG emissions.

temperature forecast: 5 C rise between 2005 and 2100.

RCP 8.5’s vision is horrifying, as worst-case scenarios should be.

A whole wave of literature, in peer-reviewed journals as well as in media, even by IPCC authors, has since presented this worst-case as either “the most likely case” or “the baseline case – business as usual without policy action”. This misleading assumption provoked a recent paper in Nature subtitled: “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome” (see also, Chrobak, 2020).

The Politics: How has the CCC become so Dominant

How can we understand the present dominance of the CCC in public and political opinion around the world, despite repeated evidence -- over decades -- of wildly exaggerated forecasts of doom when compared against measured outcomes, and despite the real uncertainties (“known unknowns”) in knowledge about basic mechanisms?

We can identify several mutually reinforcing reasons.

1. The public demand for negatively-inflected news, especially on climate

News that fits the CCC plays into a more general logic of “If it bleeds, it leads”, meaning that the media tend to deliver negativity – about climate, health, almost anything – because readers and viewers want negatively-inflected stories. Recent research finds that across all types of articles the most popular stories have high negative content. Surprisingly, politics matters little: there is no difference between conservative and liberal outlets in propensity to deliver negativity. Rather, the difference is between media outlets by size and influence: the bigger and more influential the media brand, the stronger the bias towards the negative – showing how good they are at delivering what people want. According to Matthew Yglesias, several recent research studies find that “the kind of stories people like to consume are compulsive rather than satisfying …. You’re clicking and sharing stories about terrible things and raising alarms and listening to the alarms that are being raised by others, and it all feels very compelling precisely because it’s gloomy and alarming …. People like to get mad, then share the content so that peers can share their outrage.”

Climate lends itself well to this negativity bias. Richard Betts, then the head of climate impacts at the Met Office, explained the demand for negative climate stories (BBC News Channel, 11 January 2010, emphasis added ):

“The focus on climate change is now so huge that everybody seems to need to have some link to climate change if they are to attract attention and funding. Hence the increasing tendency to link everything to climate change – whether scientifically proven or not …. I have quite literally had journalists phone me up during an unusually warm spell of weather and ask ‘is this a result of global warming?’ When I say ‘no, not really, it is just weather’, they’ve thanked me very much and then phoned somebody else, and kept trying until they got someone to say yes it was. Talking up of the problem then gives easy ammunition to those who wish to discredit the science.”

Holman Jenkins, in The Wall St Journal (2018), describes the other side of the exaggeration incentive: “Over the past 15 or 20 years the climate beat has been handed over to reporter-activists who’ve decided that climate science is impenetrable but at least nobody ever got fired for exaggerating the risks of climate change.”

Climate scientist Judith Curry identifies a similar logic in the frequent conflation of extreme weather events and “global warming”. “In 2005 [following Hurricane Katrina] the public found it very hard to care about 1 degree or even 4 degrees of warming – heck, the temperatures varied by that much on a day-to-day basis.… However, arguments that a relatively small amount of global warming (order 1 C) could result in more intense hurricanes, well that got their attention…. The activists now had a new weapon in their arsenal – attributing extreme weather events to manmade climate change. The ‘will to act’ seemed tied to alarmism about extreme weather events. Which provides a key political role for unsupported ‘storylines’ about extreme weather events.” The “heat dome” over the Pacific northwest of the US and Canada in June 2021 was generally treated as yet more evidence of “climate change. You would not know it from the coverage, but in Washington and Oregon, the number of days per decade with temperature above 99 F shows no upward trend from 1911-20 to 2011-20. For example, the number of days above 99 F in 1971-80 was more than in 2011-20. Across the US the 1930s was arguably the hottest decade on record; the time of the deadly “Dust Bowl”, summer 1936, was the hottest summer on record between 1895 and 2020.

An attempt to push the distinction between “weather” and “climate” is unwelcome in this context, because it weakens the motivating, mobilising force of “climate” as the boundless enemy that could destroy humanity, like the Biblical Flood. The Climate Apocalypse is imminent, is the motivational message (also see Adler, 2019).

This is the deeper story behind the wild exaggerations of the forecasts and the continued high credibility of those who make them. The exaggerations express the apocalyptic thinking about climate now sweeping the world, including the financial and corporate world. They express a story of humans damaging Nature, and Nature destroying humans in return. These stories themselves express ancient de-creation stories of humans misbehaving in the eyes of God, and God punishing them. The Biblical flood occurred because God decided the people had become wicked, had stopped respecting God and Nature, so He resolved to wipe life off the face of the earth, saving only a breeding pair of each species in order to recreate the world in His image. Much the same story appeared in Sumerian culture long before the Bible, and later in the Quran, expressing a desperate human wish for Salvation.

In our more secular age, apocalyptic theology can rely on Nature in place of God -- Nature invested with God-like powers of punishment and reward.

2. The “political” science of the IPCC

The IPCC was established to provide a properly scientific center of gravity for discussions about climate, and issue regular balanced assessments of the state of scientific climate knowledge. But there are at least two basic problems with the IPCC process. One is that the mandate of the IPCC says that it is “to assess … the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation” (emphasis added). (6) The mandate does not mention to assess the interaction between human and natural causes. It is as though natural causes do not exist. The IPCC’s whole body of work consequently is slanted towards exaggerating human causes of given climate changes, marginalizing the role of natural causes interacting with human causes. Which among other effects leads it to give undue weight to “mitigating” climate change (by changing human actions) relative to “adapting” to climate changes partly induced by natural forces.

The common justification given by IPCC defenders is: natural causes operate only very slowly; the climate is changing fast; therefore the climate changes must be driven by humans, and humans can change their behaviour fast – when forced and sufficiently motivated to do so ( using all the techniques of Machiavelli). This justification underplays the point that some natural causes – eg the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation – do change fairly quickly, over decades, with far reaching effects (eg Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation and its impacts on the Greenland ice sheet).

The second IPCC problem is that this bias to doomsday forecasts – therefore to urgent and far-reaching action -- is intensified in the process of translating from the technical reports to the summaries for policy makers. The translation – done mostly by non-scientists -- tends to downplay uncertainties and up-play certainties in an alarming, even catastrophizing direction. Hence the tendency to treat worst-case scenarios as likely scenarios. Recall the subtitle to the Nature paper, “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome” (2020).

3. Logic of decision-making and logic of mobilization

The tendency to treat worst-case scenarios as likely scenarios “in the absence of radical changes to how we live, work and govern” can be understood in terms of the distinction between the logic of decision-making and the logic of mobilization or action. To make the best decision about what to do, one needs to explore a range of possible alternative courses of action, weigh up the pros and cons of each, then decide which is best. But having exposed many people to a range of options, there may be action-sapping disagreement as to which is best. To get a great mass of people to move all in one direction one needs to present them with only two alternatives, one of which is crazy, and pretend to be entirely confident of the two outcomes. (7) If they can be convinced that there are only two alternatives and one is crazy, they will follow.

The Climate Change Consensus expresses the logic of mobilization. It presents two alternatives. “Do nothing (or little)”, which leads to catastrophe, extinction, the planet becomes ungovernable, coastal cities must be abandoned, lower Manhattan will be underwater by 2018. Or else, quickly decarbonize the world economy and push towards a broader dematerialization of lifeways. No prizes for guessing which wins. This is how you mobilize people on a vast scale to do what you think must be done. Or as a US senator from the West once put it, “Managing politicians is like herding wild horses. To get them running in the same direction you have to stampede them.” (8)

4. Left and right politics

While the demand for negatively-inflected news cuts across the political spectrum, political ideology certainly shapes people’s beliefs about climate. Climate change “scepticism” is almost a talisman of the center-right and right, and is strongly promoted by fossil fuel interests. Climate “alarmism” is more pronounced on the center-left and left of the ideological spectrum. It is promoted as a sacred unifying mission by a great global phalanx of left-green civic action organizations (Extinction Rebellion is prominent).

A Guardian article describes the right-wing “sceptical” tactic. “Vested interests have long realized [that people-at-large trust climate scientists on the subject of global warming] and have engaged in a campaign to misinform the public about the scientific consensus. For example, a memo from communications strategist Frank Luntz leaked in 2002 advised Republicans, ‘Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate’. This campaign has been successful… The media has assisted in this public misconception, with most climate stories ‘balanced’ with a ‘sceptic’ perspective. However, this results in making the 2-3% seem like 50%... As a result, people believe scientists are still split about what’s causing global warming, and therefore there is not nearly enough public support or motivation to solve the problem.”

Both sides accuse the other of abusing “the science”. Both sides generate expansive pressures to describe more and more trends, issue more and more prescriptions, without ambiguity and shading, and judge more and more of the other’s claims pre-emptively. Individual issues (eg extreme weather) are not discussed in terms of their own evidence but are packaged together in ideological visions, the better to establish clear moral battle lines, disagreement being moral heresy.

This is the playing out of a larger process of polarization common when scientific disagreements become public. As described by sociologist of science Robert K. Merton, each group then responds to stereotyped versions of the other. “They see in the other’s work primarily what the hostile stereotype has alerted them to see, and then promptly mistake the part for the whole. In this process, each group … becomes less and less motivated to study the work of the other, since there is manifestly little point in doing so. They scan the out-group’s writings just enough to find ammunition for new fusillades.” (9)

The result is a “syndrome of exaggeration”: each side exaggerates evidence in its favour and downplays evidence against, which justifies the other in exaggerating evidence in its favour and downplaying evidence against; and back again. It is a syndrome in that the behaviour of each side confirms the negative expectations of the other. They often go at each other ad hominem, like adolescent school boys, including people who regard themselves as serious scientists. In the digital era members of both sides are able to quickly find one another and the enemy. (10)

Yet to talk of “two sides” is misleading, because the side championing the CCC is by far the dominant. Recall the Financial Times journalist Pilita Clark: “The world has rarely seen any environmental idea take off like the push to cut greenhouse gas emissions to net zero.” For political leaders and increasingly business leaders, being seen to give high value to protecting the public against all the ills attributed to “climate change” – including by pledging big changes to be made long after they leave office -- is a way to show foresight, statesmanship, leading on the front foot. Many right-wing politicians and business leaders now wish to present themselves as fighters against climate change, even as they continue to support fossil-fuel industries.

5. Finance and business interests

There are now powerful industrial interest groups promoting climate alarmism for profit-seeking reasons, including those invested in the switch from fossil fuels to renewables and those invested in the switch from combustion to electrical engines. The CEO of the electric vehicle car company Lucid (a former Tesla engineer) said recently that the transition to an EV world will happen faster than anyone expects, driven by the environmental imperative. He said, “The environment is in crisis. The world needs millions of electric cars tomorrow”. He did not suggest where all the electricity will come from.

Many big players in finance see opportunities for speculative profits by playing up climate dangers. Goldman-Sachs in 2005 authored the firm’s environmental policy, which said “voluntary action alone cannot solve the climate change problem”, from a firm that has consistently opposed government regulation. It and other financial firms supported what Matt Taibbi called “a new commodities bubble disguised as an ‘environmental plan’” – a carbon credit market in the form of cap-and-trade. Coal plants, utilities, natural gas distributors and some other industries are assigned carbon emission limits. To exceed the limits they must buy credits from those who emit less than their limit. As of 2010, the volume of the market in the US was estimated as $1 trillion annually. Goldman and the others were making themselves central actors in the market. The best thing about it is that the emission limits keep being lowered, implying that the price is guaranteed to keep rising, to the benefit of the intermediaries.

On top of all this, the whole “sustainable investing” movement provides opportunities for big profits at the intersection of the already thick alphabet soup of sustainability disclosure regulations (TCFD, SASB, GRI, CDSB among others, in the case of the EU) and the lack of meaningful, reliable data. “At the moment, the risk is that it is ‘garbage in, garbage out’”, says the head of sustainable finance at S&P Global Ratings.

So the fact that the financial sector is “worried” about climate change could be taken to be part of the problem, underlining the need for public authorities to take charge and frame parameters within which private operations produce public benefits. (11)

Conclusion

I have argued that the “plausible” risks of climate change are commonly exaggerated within the climate community. Recall for example, Christiana Figueres, 2020, “The scary thing is that after 2030 it basically doesn’t really matter what humans do”; Kevin Drum, 2019, “[The Green New Deal] would only change the dates for planetary suicide by a decade or so”; Frank Fenner, 2010, “We’re going to become extinct. Whatever we do now is too late.” Many more in the same doomsday vein.

We have seen that the standard global warming models have a powerful built-in bias to exaggerate the rate of future temperature rise, as seen in (most of) them “hindcasting” temperature rises several times faster than actually observed. We have seen that forecasters commonly take “worst-case scenarios” as “likely scenarios in the absence of radical action” (eg reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2050), to the point where Nature recently published a paper sub-titled, “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome”.

The dismaying thing is that scientists and advocates have been making catastrophising global warming forecasts of this kind for decades past, normally dated some 10 to 30 years into the future. The due date comes without catastrophe, but never a retrospective holding to account. Rather, on to the next catastrophising forecast another 10 to 30 years ahead. Scientists-writers-activists know the catastrophe forecasts get the attention, the clicks, the research funding. We saw the exaggeration mechanism spelled out by Richard Betts of the BBC, Holman Jenkins of the Wall St Journal, and climate scientist Judith Curry.

The built-in exaggeration of the costs of climate change blunts the parallel with nuclear power plants. We know with high certainty the costs of nuclear explosions. We know the costs of global temperature going above 1.5 C above “pre-industrial” much less certainly, and we can see the mechanisms by which the likely costs are being systematically exaggerated.

On the other hand, there is abundant evidence that even without the doomsday exaggerations the plausible risks of climate change could be very serious, in particular because of the inherent political economy difficulty of getting needed global or regional cooperation when political action is mostly at the level of sovereign nation states (see the G20).

Coal power generation is the single biggest source of GHG emissions, and emissions from coal consumption will probably not fall fast, whatever the promises. First, coal is cheap, accessible and generates reliable power for many developing countries; in Asia, coal alone generates 40 percent of energy consumption, much higher than the world average of 29 percent. (12) Second, developing countries, including China, assert a strong claim on carbon space to power their economic development. They see it partly as a matter of fundamental justice, since developed countries emitted most of the CO2 that is already in the atmosphere and seas as the necessary condition for them becoming developed. Developed countries promise finance and technical assistance on a massive scale to accelerate the energy transition in developing countries – and have a long track record of leaving promises as promises. (See the global distribution of Covid vaccines. See the results of vaunted “voting reform” in the World Bank, leaving the US with 17% and China with 6%.) What is more, the Japanese government plans up to 22 new coal power plants, as it closes nuclear plants in the wake of Fukushima.

Then comes a question: does drawing attention to the doomsday exaggerations of the CCC – “disaster”, “catastrophe”, “extinction”, “fiddling while the planet burns” - serve to reduce the political and public pressures for necessary ameliorative action, in a world where powerful fossil lobbies seek to block or delay such action for reasons independent of “evidence”? Should “Third Way” essays like this one not be published, because “give them (deniers, sceptics) an inch and they will take a mile”? To what extent must mass publics be “panicked” in order to induce enough collective political and business action – national, international – to substantially slow the growth of GHG emissions? If we can sustain emission- and temperature-curbing action only by holding up the certainty of disaster, catastrophe, extinction, then better to let the doomsday exaggerations continue as the necessary condition for that ameliorative action. What is the harm, when the alternative is ruin for humanity and the biosphere?

The danger is that the repeated wild exaggerations produce a public backlash, a discrediting, and a strengthening of the many “deniers” who see “leftists, governments, and the United Nations” as the source of malevolence in the world. A more accurate accounting of the evidence would (hopefully) produce a more calibrated and sustained public and business response.

What to do? (13)

The IPCC should allocate some 10% of its budget to a Red Team, dedicated to independent scrutiny of its evidence and conclusions (especially the Summary for Policymakers). (14) The IPCC should revise its mandate to require it explicitly to focus on interactions between natural forces and human actions, as it is now almost required not to, biassing its assessment of the state of scientific knowledge towards “man-made global warming” as an almost separate system.

Learned societies should more actively seek to understand and publicize the reasons for repeated large-scale discrepancies between “hindcasts” and “forecasts” on the one hand and actual observations on the other, discrepancies strongly biased towards “disaster”.

It is particularly important that the knee-jerk attribution of extreme weather events to global warming be challenged with reference to evidence. Judith Curry explained – quoted earlier -- why CCC advocates have a powerful incentive to attribute cases of extreme weather to global warming, tout court. She has recently written, “Apart from the reduced frequency of the coldest temperatures, the signal of global warming in the statistics of extreme weather events remains much smaller than that from natural climate variability, and is expected to remain so at least until the second half of the 21rst century.” She goes on to amplify a point made earlier about the limits of the climate models used for the IPCC assessment reports: they are driven mainly by predictions of future GHG emissions. They do not include predictions of natural climate variability arising from solar output, volcanic eruptions or evolution of large-scale multi-decadal ocean circulations. They do a particularly poor job of simulating regional and decadal-scale climate variability. (15)

Participants on both sides have to learn the art of respecting the principle of free speech while maintaining the standards of civil discourse.

While I have stressed the CCC’s support for urgent and radical changes to the way we live, work and govern, some CCC champions argue that the world economy could continue on a largely unchanged growth trajectory provided that we switch fast from fossil fuels to renewables. Indeed, this switch is beginning to happen fast, with coal and nuclear energy production unable to compete without subsidies in areas where natural gas, wind and solar resources are readily available.

But to say that life can continue as before provided we substitute renewables for fossil fuels obscures the huge difficulties for many developing countries of getting out of fossil fuels while growing fast enough to reduce the income gap with developed countries.

We must give high priority to investments in “clean coal” technologies, such as carbon capture, storage and use, to make the dirtier coal cleaner in existing and new coal-power plants; and link coal-power retirement to the coming on-stream of attractive alternatives. The multilateral development banks have recently or will soon announce bans on coal power. The G7 leaders meeting in mid 2021 promised to stop using government funds to finance new international coal power plants by the end of 2021. China’s Belt and Road Initiative should increase its pressure on host countries to cut back on dirty coal and boost clean coal and renewables.

A high and immediate priority is to build a robust financing and technical assistance mechanism for help from developed to developing countries. The Paris Agreement instituted a Mitigation pillar and an Adaptation pillar. Intense debate took place around the third, Loss and Damage, the name of a mechanism to compensate for the destruction that Mitigation and Adaptation cannot prevent. Developed countries by and large have sought to marginalize the Loss and Damage pillar, as they have long sought to marginalize Special and Differential Treatment for developing countries in trade and investment agreements. “Finance is something that really rich countries, particularly the US, have made sure that there is no progress and not even discussion on”, remarked Harjeet Singh, senior advisor at Climate Action Network International. (16)

My “forecast” is that in the next two to three decades to midcentury we will make rapid progress in scientific knowledge about weather and climate, helped by longer and more accurate satellite and ocean records and by a new generation of climate models that operate at one to ten kilometers scale (as distinct from the current models’ 50 kilometer scale). We will probably continue to make rapid progress in decoupling GHG from GDP growth, with a combination of state direction-setting and private innovation focused on transformations in energy, transport, buildings, industry and agriculture, using incentives like research and development subsidies and tax credits for technology investment, and penalties for carbon-intensive activities. (17) In transport, this entails coordination across urban planning decisions, public transport investment, future of remote working, infrastructures for electric charging and hydrogen loading. (18) Transformations in these systems are already underway, and the prospect of vast new green investments, supported and under-written by the state, will intensify them. These green investments will open productive investment opportunities previously limited by stagnant wages and rising debt, which have driven investment into increasingly speculative ventures. If by two or three decades ahead it looks as though the second half of this century could well experience globally extreme climate and ocean events, we will be much more knowledgeable about what to do than we are today. (19)

#### U.S. is dematerializing resource usage – market forces incentivize a switch away from resource-intensive practices
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Easing Pollution, Not Exporting It

In some important areas, however, a very different pattern emerged after 1970: Growth continued, but environmental harm decreased. This decoupling occurred first with pollution, and first in the rich world. In the US, for example, aggregate levels of six common air pollutants have declined by 77 percent, even as gross domestic product increased by 285 percent and population by 60 percent. In the UK, annual tonnage of particulate emissions dropped by more than 75 percent between 1970 and 2016, and of the main polluting chemicals by about 85 percent. Similar gains are common across the highest-income countries.

How were these reductions achieved? The two possibilities are cleanup and offshoring. Either rich countries figured out how to reduce their “air pollution per dollar” so much that overall pollution went down even as their economies grew, or they sent so much of their dirty production overseas that the air at home got cleaner. The first of these paths reduces the total burden of human-caused pollution; the second just rearranges it.

The evidence is overwhelming that rich countries cleaned up their air pollution much more than they outsourced it. For one, a great deal of air pollution comes from highway vehicles and power plants, and rich countries haven’t outsourced driving and generating electricity to low-income ones. In fact, high-income countries haven't even offshored most of their industry. The US and UK both manufacture more than they did 50 years ago (at least until the Covid-19 pandemic sharply reduced output), and Germany has been a net exporter since 2000 while continuing to drive down air pollution. The rest of the world has been exporting its manufacturing pollution to Germany (to use degrowthers’ phrasing), yet Germans are breathing cleaner air than they were 20 years ago.

Rich countries have reduced their air pollution not by embracing degrowth or offshoring, but instead by enacting and enforcing smart regulation. As economists Joseph Shapiro and Reed Walker concluded in a 2018 study about the US, “changes in environmental regulation, rather than changes in productivity and trade, account for most of the emissions reductions.” Research about the cleanup of US waters also concludes that well-designed and enforced regulations have successfully reduced pollution.

It is true that the US and other rich countries now import lots of products from China and other nations with higher pollution levels. But if there were no international trade at all, and rich countries had to rely exclusively on their domestic industries to make everything they consume, they’d still have much cleaner air and water than they did 50 years ago. As a 2004 Advances in Economic Analysis and Policy study summarized: “We find no evidence that domestic production of pollution-intensive goods in the US is being replaced by imports from overseas.”

The rich world’s success at decoupling growth from pollution is an inconvenient fact for degrowthers. Even more inconvenient is China's recent success at doing the same. China’s export-led, manufacturing-heavy economy has been growing at meteoric rates, but between 2013 and 2017 air pollution in densely populated areas declined by more than 30 percent. Here again the government mandated and monitored pollution declines and so decoupled growth from an important category of environmental harm.

Prosperity Bends the Curve

China's progress with air pollution is heartening, but it's not surprising to most economists. It's a clear example of the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) in action. Named for the economist Simon Kuznets, EKC posits a relationship between a country's affluence and the condition of its environment. As GDP per capita rises from an initial low level, so too does environmental damage; but as affluence continues to increase, the harms level off and then start to decline. The EKC is clearly visible in the pollution histories of today's rich countries, and it's now taking shape in China and elsewhere.

Also consider air pollution death rates around the world. As the invaluable website Our World in Data puts it, “Rates have typically fallen across high-income countries: almost everywhere in Europe, but also in Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Israel and South Korea and other countries. But rates have also fallen across upper-middle income countries too, including China and Brazil. In low and lower-middle income countries, rates have increased over this period.”

The EKC is a direct refutation of a core idea of degrowth: that environmental harms must always rise as populations and economies do. It's not surprising that today's degrowth advocates rarely discuss the large reductions in air and water pollution that have accompanied higher prosperity in so many places around the world. Instead, degrowthers now focus heavily on one kind of pollution: greenhouse gas emissions.

The claims made are familiar ones: that any apparent reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in rich countries are due to offshoring rather than actual decarbonization. Thanks to the Global Carbon Project, we can see if this is the case. GCP has calculated “consumption-based emissions” for many countries going back to 1990, taking into account imports and exports, yielding the greenhouse gas emissions embodied in all the goods and services consumed in each country each year.

For several of the world's richest countries, including Germany, Italy, France, the UK, and the US, graphs of consumption-based carbon emissions follow the familiar EKC. The US, for example, has 22reduced its total (not per capita) consumption-based CO2 emissions by more than 13 percent since 2007.

These reductions are not mainly due to enhanced regulation. Instead, they've come about because of a combination of tech progress and market forces. Solar and wind power have become much cheaper in recent years and have displaced coal for electricity generation. Natural gas, which when burned emits fewer greenhouse gases per unit of energy than does coal (even after taking methane leakage into account), has also become much cheaper and more abundant in the US as a result of the fracking revolution.

To ensure that these greenhouse gas declines continue to spread and accelerate, we should apply the lessons we've learned from previous pollution reduction success. In particular, we should make it expensive to emit carbon, then watch the emitters work hard to reduce this expense. The best way to do this is with a carbon dividend, which is a tax on carbon emissions where the revenues are not kept by the government but instead are rebated to people as a dividend. William Nordhaus won the 2018 Nobel Prize in economics in part for his work on the carbon dividend, and an open letter advocating its implementation in the US has been signed by more than 3,500 economists. It's an idea whose time has come.

How We Learned to Lighten Up

Tech progress and price pressure aren't just leading to the demise of coal. They're also causing us to exploit the planet less in many other important ways, even as growth continues. In other words, EKCs are not just about pollution any more.

A good place to start examining this broad phenomenon of getting more from less is US agriculture, where we have decades of data on both outputs—crop tonnage—and the key inputs of cropland, water, and fertilizer. Domestic crop tonnage has risen steadily over the years and in 2015 was more than 55 percent higher than in 1980. Over that same period, though, total water used for irrigation declined by 18 percent, total cropland by more than 7 percent. That is, over that 35-year period, US crop agriculture increased its output by more than half while giving an area of land larger than Indiana back to nature and eventually using a Lake Champlain less water each year. This was not accomplished by increasing fertilizer use; total US fertilizer consumption in 2014 (the most recent year for which data are available) was within 2 percent of its 1980 level.

The three main fertilizers of nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus (NKP) are an interesting case study. Their total US consumption (once other uses in addition to agriculture are taken into account) has declined by 23 percent since 1980, according to the United States Geological Survey. Yet some within the degrowth movement find ways to argue that these declines are also an illusion. These materials thus serve to clearly illustrate the differences in methodology, evidence, and worldview between ecomodernists like myself and degrowthers.

The USGS tracks annual domestic production, imports, and exports of NKP and uses these figures to calculate “apparent consumption” each year. Consumption of each of the three resources has declined by 16 percent or more from their peaks, which occurred no later than 1998. This seems like a clear and convincing example of dematerialization—getting more output from fewer material inputs.

As I argue in my book More From Less, dematerialization doesn’t happen for any complicated or idiosyncratic reason. It happens because resources cost money that companies would rather not spend, and tech progress keeps opening up new ways to produce more output (like crops) while spending less on material inputs (like fertilizers). Modern digital technologies are so good at helping producers get more from less that they're now allowing the US and other technologically sophisticated countries to use less in total of important materials like NKP.

Forest products provide another clear example of dematerialization in the US. Total annual domestic consumption of paper and paperboard peaked in 1999, and of timber in 2002. Both totals have since declined by more than 20 percent. Could these be mirages caused by offshoring that’s not properly captured? That’s highly unlikely, as the country is now onshoring more than it’s offshoring. The US has been a net exporter of forest products since 2009 and is now the world’s largest exporter of these materials.

Is the US economy also dematerializing its use of metals? Probably, but it’s hard to say for sure. The USGS tallies do show dematerialization in steel, aluminum, copper, and other important metals. But these figures don’t include the metals contained in imports of finished goods like cars and computers. America is a net importer of manufactured goods, so it could be that we’re using more metal year after year, but that much of this consumption is “hidden” from official statistics because of imports of heavy, complex products. However, my estimates indicate that this is extremely unlikely and that the country is in fact now reducing its overall consumption of metals.

#### Capitalism is key to massive improvements in living standards, poverty, and environmental sustainability – any other system shuts that down and worsens environmental and social problems
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Premise 1. Development and the past. Over the course of recorded human history, the majority of historical increases in health, wellbeing, and justice have occurred in the last two centuries, largely as a result of societies adopting or moving toward capitalism. Capitalism is a relevant cause of these improvements, in the sense that they could not have happened to such a degree if it were not for capitalism and would not have happened to the same degree under any alternative noncapitalist approach to structuring society. The argument in support of this premise relies on observed relationships across societies and centuries between indicators of degree of capitalism, wealth, investments in public goods, and outcomes for health, wellbeing, and justice, together with econometric analysis in support of the conclusion that the best explanation of these correlations and the underlying mechanism is that large increases in health, wellbeing, and justice are largely driven by increasing investments in public goods. The scale of increased wealth necessary to maximize these investments requires capitalism. Thus, as capitalist societies have become dramatically wealthier over the past hundred years (and wealthier than societies with alternative systems), this has allowed larger investments in public goods, which simply has not been possible in a sustained way in societies without the greater wealth that capitalism makes possible. Important investments in public goods include investments in basic medical knowledge, in health and nutrition programs, and in the institutional capacity and know-how to regulate society and capitalism itself. As a result, capitalism is a primary driver of positive outcomes in health and wellbeing (such as increased life expectancy, lowered child and maternal mortality, adequate calories per day, minimized infectious disease rates, a lower percentage and number of people in poverty, and more reported happiness);5 and in justice (such as reduced deaths from war and homicide; higher rankings in human rights indices; the reduced prevalence of racist, sexist, homophobic opinions in surveys; and higher literacy rates).6 These quantifiable positive consequences of global capitalism dramatically outweigh the negative consequences (such as deaths from pollution in the course of development), with the result that the net benefits from capitalism in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice have been greater than they would have been under any known noncapitalist approach to structuring society.7

Premise 2. Economics, ethics, and policy. Although capitalism has often been ill-regulated and therefore failed to maximize net benefits for health, wellbeing, and justice, it can become well-regulated so that it maximizes these societal goals, by including mechanisms identified by economists and other policy experts that do the following:

• optimally8 regulate negative effects such as pollution and monopoly power, and invest in public goods such as education, basic healthcare, and fundamental research including biomedical knowledge (more generally, policies that correct the failures of free markets that economists have long recognized will arise from “externalities” in the absence of regulation);9

• ensure equity and distributive justice (for example, via wealth redistribution);10

• ensure basic rights, justice, and the rule of law independent of the market (for example, by an independent judiciary, bill of rights, property rights, and redistribution and other legislation to correct historical injustices due to colonialism, racism, and correct current and historical distortions that have prevented markets from being fair);11 and

• ensure that there is no alternative way of structuring society that is more efficient or better promotes the equity, justice, and fairness goals outlined above (by allowing free exchange given the regulations mentioned).12

To summarize the implication of the first two premises, well-regulated capitalism is essential to best achieving our ethical goals—which is true even though capitalism has certainly not always been well regulated historically. Society can still do much better and remove the large deficits in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice that exist under the current inferior and imperfect versions of capitalism.

Premise 3. Development and the future. If the global spread of capitalism is allowed to continue, desperate poverty can be essentially eliminated in our lifetimes. Furthermore, this can be accomplished faster and in a more just way via well-regulated global capitalism than by any alternatives. If we instead opt for less capitalism, less growth, and less globalization, then desperate poverty will continue to exist for a significant portion of the world’s population into the further future, and the world will be a worse and less equitable place than it would have been with more capitalism. For example, in a world with less capitalism, there would be more overpopulation, food insecurity, air pollution, ill health, injustice, and other problems. In part, this is because of the factors identified by premise 1, which connect a turn away from capitalism with a turn away from continuing improvements in health, wellbeing, and justice, especially for the developing world. In addition, fertility declines are also a consequence of increased wealth, and the size of the population is a primary determinant of food demand and other environmental stressors.13 Finally, as discussed at length in the next section of the essay, capitalism can be naturally combined with optimal environmental regulations.14 Even bracketing anything like optimal regulation, it remains true that sufficiently wealthy nations reduce environmental degradation as they become wealthier, whereas developing nations that are nearing peak degradation will remain stuck at the worst levels of degradation if we stall growth, rather than allowing them to transition to less and less degradation in the future via capitalism and economic growth.15 In contrast, well-regulated capitalism is a key part of the best way of coping with these problems, as well as a key part of dealing with climate change, global food production, and other specific challenges, as argued at length in the next section. Here it is important to stress that we should favor wellregulated capitalism that includes correct investments in public goods over other capitalist systems such as the neoliberalism of the recent past that promoted inadequately regulated capitalism with inadequate concern for externalities, equity, and background distortions and injustices.16

#### Empiricism good – doesn’t require transcendental faith in the power of science or reason
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Dennis C. Rasmussen, “Ch. 3: The Age of the Limits of Reason,” *The Pragmatic Enlightenment: Recovering the Liberalism of Hume, Smith, Montesquieu, and Voltaire*, Cambridge University Press 2014, pp. 135-139.

In 1932, the year that Ernst Cassirer effectively launched modern Enlightenment studies with his sympathetic examination of the period, another book appeared that did much to revive the main Romantic criticism of the Enlightenment: Carl Becker’s The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers. 1 Becker’s thesis, in a nutshell, was that in their attempt to conquer religious fanaticism and superstition the thinkers of the Enlightenment in fact embraced a new faith, one every bit as unquestioning and absolute as the Christian faith of the medieval world: a faith in reason and science, which they thought would offer a sort of terrestrial “grace” to true believers.2 Two years later, Preserved Smith echoed Becker’s thesis, proclaiming that “the Enlightenment resembled a new religion, of which Reason was God, Newton’s Principia the Bible, and Voltaire the prophet.... The chief article in the creed of the new religion was faith in Reason, as the omnipotent and autonomous arbiter of all things.”3 Once again, Becker and Smith were far from the first or the last to make such a claim: if the idea that the Enlightenment promoted a kind of hegemonic moral and political universalism is the dominant complaint among contemporary political theorists and philosophers, the idea that it had an overweening confidence in reason has probably been the most persistent complaint, from the time of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Edmund Burke to that of Leo Strauss and Michel Foucault. Indeed, the idea that the Enlightenment had an unreasonable faith in reason has now become a well-worn cliché.

This claim takes several different forms. Those who associate the Enlightenment with Descartes tend to assume that the thinkers of this period were rationalists in the sense that they sought to deduce a system of incontrovertible knowledge through the use of abstract or a priori reason, starting from self-evident first principles. This conception of the Enlightenment has, however, been thoroughly discredited by scholars of the period: the great majority of Enlightenment thinkers were empiricists who advocated relying on experience and experiment rather than rationalists who sought to rely exclusively on deduction and a priori first principles. (To use the terms made famous by d’Alembert, they adopted the “systematic spirit” rather than the “spirit of system.”)4 Hence, Peter Gay rightly proclaims that the Enlightenment was “not an Age of Reason, but a Revolt against Rationalism.”5 What is more, we will see in this chapter that Hume, Smith, Montesquieu, and Voltaire could all be described as skeptical empiricists, given that they continually stressed the limits and fallibility of human understanding. Certainly they thought that some form of reason is useful in some areas – they were philosophers, after all – but their conceptions of reason were far humbler than those of the great rationalist thinkers of the seventeenth century such as Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibniz, and even those of some earlier empiricists such as Hobbes and Locke.

The very fact that most Enlightenment thinkers were committed empiricists, however, has given rise to an alternative form of the claim that they had an overconfidence in reason, namely, the allegation that they had a boundless, naive faith in the ability of science and the scientific method to penetrate the secrets of nature and to produce continual progress in all realms of human life.6 This version of the claim is more credible than the first, but it too is misleading in important respects. Like almost all Enlightenment thinkers, the four figures who are the focus of this book were confident that the scientific or experimental method is the most reliable way to attain useful knowledge – the best way to compensate for the limitations of the human mind. They did not, however, believe that modern science or its tools were infallible; on the contrary, they explicitly denied that it could provide conclusive or complete knowledge of the natural world. Likewise, these thinkers expected that science could and would do a great deal to promote human well-being, both by producing technological advances and by providing a kind of antidote to religious fanaticism. However, they did not believe that it could solve all problems or guarantee inevitable and endless progress. There was a strong dose of skepticism or realism in almost all of their thinking, and thus they accepted that certain ills will always be with us and that almost no improvements are pure and unmixed.

The connection that many Enlightenment thinkers drew between the spread of science and the undermining of religious fanaticism points toward a third form of the claim that they had a blind faith in reason: the widespread contention that the thinkers of this period were excessively dismissive of, or hostile toward, religion.7 Even the Enlightenment’s friends often acknowledge (or celebrate) this aspect of the period, as when Gay writes that “while the variations among the philosophes are far from negligible, they only orchestrate a single passion that bound the little flock together, the passion to cure the spiritual malady that is religion, the germ of ignorance, barbarity, hypocrisy, filth, and the basest self-hatred.”8 Perhaps more than any other critique of the Enlightenment covered in this book, this claim contains a good deal of truth with respect to Hume, Smith, Montesquieu, and Voltaire. These four thinkers all rejected the claims of revealed religion, they all believed that it is entirely possible for people to be moral without believing in God, and they all devoted great amounts of intellectual energy to condemning religious fanaticism and intolerance. On the other hand, it must be admitted that they had quite good reasons for criticizing the forms that religion often took in their time, such as the official state persecution of Protestants, the regime of ecclesiastical privilege and censorship, and the seemingly ceaseless confessional strife of eighteenth-century France, not to mention the catastrophic Wars of Religion of the previous century. Moreover, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Smith, and perhaps even Hume believed that a properly moderated or “liberalized” form of religion could not only avoid most of these ills but also provide certain positive benefits. Even Hume did not think that reason could conclusively disprove the claims of revealed religion, or that reason was all-powerful or sufficient unto itself. On the contrary, as with the other three thinkers, his skepticism regarding religion was simply a manifestation of his general skepticism regarding any claims of absolute certainty.

In all of these ways, the pragmatic Enlightenment was decidedly a limits-of-reason movement – hence my reversal of the traditional moniker of this period in the title of this chapter. Whereas the previous two chapters proceeded thinker by thinker, the present one is instead divided into three sections, each devoted to one of the three forms of the claim that the Enlightenment had a blind faith in reason just mentioned.9 The first section shows that Hume, Smith, Montesquieu, and Voltaire were skeptical empiricists rather than dogmatic rationalists; the second section argues that their embrace of natural science did not blind them to its theoretical and practical limits; and the final section explores their ambivalent, but basically moderate, attitudes toward religion.
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#### State actions to expand the scope of antitrust laws don’t mandate a particular strategy of engagement or relationship to the law, but they do allow aff teams to center the experiences of people of color in anti-monopoly activism and combat capitalism
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Fans of literature and movies will recognize a popular character in American storytelling: the villain turned hero. The villain-turned-hero storyline is attractive because it allows for the villain’s influential power to be redirected away from causing harm and toward healing pain. In our fight to rein in monopoly power, the government—particularly the federal government—could be our stories’ reformed hero. Grassroots leaders of color are uniquely positioned to convert government power, which has largely been complicit in the expansion of monopoly power, into a force for good that reins in the devastation caused by corporate monopolies.

Similar to organizers, our government has a distinct role to play to directly challenge monopoly power. This is especially true of the federal government. The federal government has the constitutional authority to set the rules that govern our entire economy, including the rules that govern monopolies. In fact, the federal government is the entity with the greatest amount of money and authority to match monopoly power. Through what can and should be democractic systems of government, it is also the principal entity, directly accountable to workers, consumers, and communities instead of shareholders and CEOs. The question, then, is not if our government can curb monopoly power, but if it is willing to fulfill its responsibility to do so.

As discussed in the introduction, the federal government took strong and decisive action against monopoly power in the late 19th and early 20th century. During this time, Congress passed the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) was formed in 1914, and the federal courts took decisive action to break up the massive monopolies that dominated critical industries, such as railroad and oil industries. However, in the second half of the 20th century, the federal government (and thus the federal courts) not only rolled back its actions against monopoly power, but it actually empowered corporate monopolies to grow larger and more powerful.

Below are the government actors who have the greatest power to influence the scale of monopoly power.

United States Congress

Congress holds what could be the most sweeping power to curb the debilitating influence of monopoly power in our lives. Members of Congress are intended to be directly accountable to voters and are elected to represent our interests in economic and societal matters. Three laws serve as the foundation for current federal authority over monopoly power.99

• The Sherman Act of 1890: outlawed corporate monopolies and gave the federal government the authority to punish corporations and individuals that create a monopoly.

• The Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914: established the FTC in order to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive business practices and to promote market competition (more on the FTC later in this section).

• The Clayton Act of 1914: outlawed corporate actions not covered under the Sherman Act, such as monopolies created through mergers and acquisitions, and discriminatory pricing, services, and allowances when dealing with merchants.100

Additionally, the House and Senate Judiciary committees provide critical oversight of anti-monopoly enforcement. In October of 2020, the House Judiciary Committee concluded hearings and issued a report on the growing monopoly power of Big Tech.101 The report found that Big Tech firms are operating as corporate monopolies, and it recommended options for congressional action to rein in their monopoly power (including breaking them up into smaller companies and blocking future mergers and acquisitions).

Federal Trade Commission

The FTC was created by Congress and President Woodrow Wilson in 1914. The FTC’s mission is to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, or fraudulent practices, and to promote competition by curbing corporate monopoly power. The FTC carries out this mission through its enforcement and investigative powers and can take action against monopoly power by:

• Blocking corporate mergers and acquisitions;

• Issuing criminal and civil penalties (fines and prison) against corporations and individuals that violate US law;102 and

• Issuing rules that implement the authority granted to the FTC by Congress (including the Sherman Act, the FTC Act and the Clayton Act).

The FTC is headed by five commissioners, who are nominated by the president and confirmed by the Senate, and each commissioner serves a seven-year term. No more than three commissioners can be of the same political party (typically meaning a three-to-two majority for the president’s party). The president chooses one commissioner to serve as chair of the FTC.103 For over 100 years, the FTC has taken action to rein in corporate monopoly power in a variety of industries, including in oil and gas, telecommunications, and health care. In 1958, for example, the FTC took action against five pharmaceutical companies for fixing the price of a popularly prescribed antibiotic, an action that disrupted a powerful drug monopoly.104 In December of 2020, the FTC joined 48 states and US territories in a lawsuit against Facebook for antitrust violations, setting the stage for a future breakup of the company.105

Department of Justice

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has the longest history of enforcing the nation’s antitrust laws. The agency is empowered to bring lawsuits against corporations for violations of the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and other federal laws. It performs this mission through its Antitrust Division. The DOJ’s greatest authority is to break up corporations that are operating with anticompetitive monopoly power. Consequential in establishing this authority was the successful break up of the Northern Securities railroad trust in 1904, a monopoly financed by J.P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller.106 For nearly 120 years, the DOJ has taken action against monopolies in the railroad, oil, electric, telecommunications, and many other industries. In the 1990s, the DOJ took action to break up Microsoft due to the anticompetitive nature of its Windows operating system, and it moved against Verizon for refusing to open its wireless network to other wireless companies. 107

Other Federal Agencies

A number of other federal agencies also carry the responsibility of regulating and curbing the anticompetitive nature of corporate monopolies. These agencies are largely responsible for regulating very specific industries. Below, we provide a brief summary.

• Monopolies in the financial service industry are regulated by the Treasury Department (Office of Comptroller of the Currency and Federal Depository Insurance Agency), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), and the Federal Reserve (the Fed).

• Monopolies in the pharmaceuticals industry are regulated by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) through the Federal Drug Administration (FDA).

• Monopolies in the agricultural industry are regulated by the Department of Agriculture.

• Monopolies in the energy utility industry are regulated by the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

• Monopolies in the telecommunications industry (e.g., wired and wireless phones, broadcast media, and broadband cable) are regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Federal Courts

The federal courts, the Supreme Court in particular, have had a significant impact on the strength of US antitrust laws; all actions taken by the FTC and DOJ are subject to judicial review and constitutional due process. Over time, the actions taken by the court have significantly lessened the strength of the federal government to enforce antitrust laws. Coupled with the lack of action by contemporary congresses, the courts have paved the way for monopolies to flourish. Here is a timeline of key judicial decisions:

• 1886 Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad: his court case established the “personhood” of a corporation. Though the case did not deal with this directly, a note from the presiding justice’s clerk has been used to establish this guiding judicial precedent.

• 1904 Northern Securities Co. v. United States: As mentioned earlier, this case broke up a major railroad monopoly through a Supreme Court decision. It was a major victory establishing the federal government’s authority to break up large corporate monopolies.

• 1911 Standard Oil v. United States: The US successfully broke up the Standard Oil monopoly by establishing that the corporation was guilty of fixing prices and collusion. However, even in defeat, corporate institutions gained a long-term victory. For the first time, the Supreme Court established that monopoly on its own was not illegal, but rather the courts (not the executive or legislative branches) had a right to determine which monopolies are “good” or “bad,” a decision that has served as judicial precedent to justify the existence of monopolies.

• 1984 Breakup of the Bell System: The breakup of the “Bell System” controlled by AT&T proved to be the last big break up of a large monopoly. The case was settled out of court when AT&T and the DOJ entered a consent decree agreeing to break it up into eight different companies, known as the “Baby Bells.” However, the monopoly friendly DOJ under President Reagan allowed four of the eight companies to rejoin AT&T in the 1980s. Today, almost all of the “baby bells” have rejoined AT&T, and it is now twice the size it was before the company was broken up.108

• 2004 Verizon Communications v. Trinko: This Supreme Court case was brought because Verizon refused to share its cellular network with its competitor AT&T. The plaintiff in the case (not the DOJ) alleged that the act amounted to exclusionary conduct that restricted competition. In a unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court found that Verizon's “monopoly power” was “an important element of the free market system” and incentivized innovation. This established a (flawed) conservative argument that private monopoly power is actually good for consumers.109

State Oversight

Because companies in the US are incorporated by state governments, these governments also have powerful authority to regulate monopolies. This power harkens back to the founding of the country and the initial powers held by the former colonies. In the early years, states incorporated businesses selectively and issued tightly constructed corporate charters that outlined corporate responsibilities to advance the public good. At the time, shareholder profit was viewed as a means to the end of contributing to the public good, not the number one priority as it is treated today.

State attorneys general (AGs) are responsible for the enforcement of antitrust laws at the state level. Additionally, as elected officials, they have a direct line of accountability to voters. State AGs can bring state antitrust cases, join DOJ and FTC antitrust actions, and join class-action antitrust suits with other states and individuals. State AGs also have the power to protect consumers against fraud, abuse, corruption, and deceptive business practices, which are often used by state AGs to rein in monopoly power when antitrust laws fall short.

---

The web of anti-monopoly government oversight and regulations is currently a massive cluster of complexity, which is intentional. The system works in monopolists’ favor because of their runaway economic and political power, which they’ve used to afford the best and most expensive lawyers, lobbyists, and accountants to navigate the labyrinth of laws, regulations, and court precedent that govern antitrust enforcement. Ultimately, the built-by-design complexity bends the arc of the law to their benefits. Further, the complexity divides the power of the government among smaller entities (e.g., state government and industry-based federal agencies), which gives monopolies greater advantage in wielding their monopoly power. Additionally, the complexity makes it difficult for workers, consumers, and communities to navigate the systems so they can impose their own power to curb monopoly power.

Our government is capable of becoming the people’s hero again, and the public needs—and we demand—its protection against corporate monopolies. In the next section, we discuss solutions to tame the beast that is monopoly power.

SECTION 5 Taming the Beast: Solutions to Curb Monopoly Power

The scale and reach of problematic corporate concentration are far and wide. As a result, advocates, researchers and regulators take many approaches to taming concentration. We’ll note that there are too many efforts and approaches for us to catalog in one paper, and we acknowledge there is a great deal of activity that we leave out.110 For simplicity, we’ve categorized efforts that we think will be of interest to activist of color:

• Strengthen and enforce existing laws;

• Enhance worker power;

• Break up big corporations;

• Challenge private concentration through public competition; and

• Establish new agencies and authorities.

Admittedly, many of these approaches are necessary and would be best executed in concert.

Strengthen and Enforce Existing Laws

The last section illustrated the myriad ways in which the federal government regulates companies across industries. Our current regulations are mostly meant to protect consumer interests and are enforced by the DOJ, the FTC, other federal agencies, and by direct private lawsuits.111 And in too many cases, courts are reluctant to rule in favor of the government and its enforcers for fear of setting legal precedent.

We need legislation to lower the burden of proof required to challenge anticompetitive mergers and to expand the definition of harm to go beyond consumers and include the other oppressive impacts of monopoly power on consumers, workers, communities, our democracy, and the planet. An increase in funding for enforcement agencies is also needed to keep pace with the rise in monopolization and to study the impacts of anti-monopoly action or inaction.112

While anti-monopoly efforts could be more effective at protecting consumers, we especially need better ways to protect workers, small businesses, and local economies. Key questions, that are not being asked enough now, should be top of mind for researchers and advocates who work with or for the DOJ and the FTC to consider how labor markets are impacted by mergers and what level of market power any merger will create. Will fewer jobs exist? Will workers be less able to move from job to job? Notably, advocates are calling for laws that make non-compete and no-poaching agreements illegal outright.113

Enhance Worker Power

Corporate aggression toward worker voice goes beyond union busting to the blatant opposition of new formations of worker organizing, including worker centers and other systems and institutions that have helped workers push for changes outside the traditional forms of collective bargaining. Although the traditional labor movement, much like many large American institutions, has historically been exclusionary toward Black people and other people of color, when people of color have been able to organize and gain collective power, it has led to higher wages, better working conditions, and access to critical health benefits.

Minimum wage laws and worker organizing (including but not limited to union membership) can help increase wages and bargaining power for Black workers.114 Notably, research has found that the decline of unionization that has happened over the last few decades has had a vastly negative impact on Black workers.115 For Black women working in private sectors, the wage gap in comparison to white women would be an estimated 30 percent less if it weren’t for declining union membership since 1979. Declining union membership, and the shrinking of public sector employment more generally, has widened the Black-white pay gap.116 Declines in union membership since 1970 have cost Black workers about $50 a week, or $2,600 annually for a full-time worker.117

New forms of worker organizing have effects that go beyond collective bargaining. For instance, worker centers and other coalitions have supported non-union workers throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. In Southern California, for example, coalitions have helped unions establish health and safety committees.118 Amazon workers and groups who organize them partnered with attorneys general and lawmakers in New York and California to bring light to dangerous working conditions that Amazon was concealing from the public early on.119

Advocates and policymakers have suggested national solutions to enhance the growth of worker power. The Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, introduced by Rep. Bobby Scott (D-VA) and passed by the House of Representatives in 2020, would institute a menu of policy reforms supported by the modern labor movement, including repealing state right-to-work laws, protecting workers’ right to organize and shielding them from corporate retaliation, and punishing businesses that violate the law. Sectoral bargaining120 is another solution that has been advanced by labor activists. This idea would allow workers in an entire industry to organize and collectively bargain wages, benefits, and workplace conditions across an entire industry, not just a single workplace. The idea is that millions of workers in an entire sector would hold more collective power than a few thousand workers negotiating with a single firm. We’ve seen the wisdom of this idea in the Fight for $15 movement that has successfully pressured fast food and retail companies, either voluntarily or through legislation, to increase their minimum wage to $15 per hour.

Because corporate power brokers have actively and successfully colluded with antiworker politicians to block workers (of color, especially) from forming unions, many workers of color have sought solutions beyond unionization to hold corporate monopolies accountable to providing livable wages, safe and healthy working conditions, and robust benefits. Solutions like those identified above should be explored to ensure that the rights of workers who are unable to unionize are protected from unchecked monopoly power.

Break Up Big Corporations

Of the few examples of the federal government breaking up corporations for violating anti-monopoly laws, the smaller companies that were created eventually re-merged into larger companies (e.g., Standard Oil andExxon; AT&T and Verizon). For advocates looking to break up Big Tech companies, the lesson is clear: To ensure that these companies do not reunite after they’re broken up, our advocacy must be strategic, multifaceted, and continue beyond the initial victory. Advocates are calling for “structural separation” legislation that forbids companies from owning adjacent lines of business that benefit from their dominant platforms (e.g.,)railroad companies owning the goods they are shipping). Breaking up Amazon, for example, would mean breaking up its online marketplace and retail, cloud, and logistics divisions as distinct companies.121 This means disbanding Whole Foods and Zappos from Amazon too.122

The Athena Coalition is currently the strongest grassroots-led group working to break up any tech platform. Through its coalition, over 50 organizations nationwide are working to break up the power of Amazon by organizing workers for better pay and working conditions, consumers and small businesses to support federal action, and communities to end Amazon's environmental racism and racist government subsidization.123

Challenge Private Concentration Through Public Competition

Over the course of our national history, the federal government has deemed some services so essential that it creates government monopolies to ensure that all people receive an equitable level of service. As noted earlier, these services include the USPS, public K–12 education, and public utilities, which the government has deemed as necessary to the public good.

Some have suggested that banking is just the type of essential service that should be guaranteed to all, and these advocates have proposed the creation of a public monopoly to challenge banking monopolies.124 Reps. Rashida Tlaib (D-MI) and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) introduced the Public Banking Act to give the Fed authority and funding to encourage cities and states to create public banks.125 Through these public banks, all people, especially people of color who are disproportionately underbanked,126 would have guaranteed access to banking services and lines of credit. Not only does it provide competition to challenge big banks, it also provides an alternative to federal COVID-19 relief that is lining the pockets of Wall Street banks.

Establish New Agencies and Authorities

Some in the anti-monopoly movement have advocated for the creation of new authorities and agencies to curb monopoly power. And there is recent precedent to support this position: In response to the banking mismanagement that caused the housing crisis and Great Recession, the Obama administration created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau in 2008. The CFPB has returned over $12 billion in relief for consumers.

New federal agencies can boster and reinvigorate regulatory authority that’s become lax and ineffective. For example, some have proposed creating a Digital Platform Agency127 to oversee Big Tech companies. Critics of this approach say that creating a new agency does not go far enough on regulation and could be subject to corporate influence and/or capture. Proponents, however, argue that the Big Tech sector is different enough from other commodities that it needs a dedicated agency.128 In either case, this idea warrants discussion and raises a question of whether we should also consider giving more anti-monopoly authority (and necessary funding) to existing federal agencies (such as the FDA, Treasury, FTC, and USDA). At minimum, we must ensure that federal agencies have the authority to protect workers, consumers, and communities of color against exploitation by corporate monopolies. It should not be disregarded that this may require creating new agencies and regulatory powers.

SECTION 6 Recommendations for Future Action

As illustrated in section 3, the federal government has many laws and regulations to rein in corporate concentration. Some advocates work to ensure that current regulations are being enforced; other advocates work to identify new regulations and even agencies to respond to the ways that corporate concentration has dominated our economy.

We believe that the movement—within research and advocacy spaces especially—should embolden grassroot leaders of color to deliver antiracist policy solutions aimed specifically to curtail monopoly power. Below, we provide considerations for future action that are not policies or regulations or campaigns in and of themselves, but ideas that could transform the anti-monopoly movement in ways that require it to reimagine itself and approach the work through a racial justice lens.

Develop More In-Depth, Intentional Research

Part of the impetus for writing this document is that Liberation in a Generation believes that the power to change our economic systems rests with the organizers of color who are (re)building the political strength of communities of color. The research and advocacy to limit monopoly power needs to better quantify, center, and reflect the ways that people of color are being harmed. This means conducting research that centers the impact of monopoly power on people of color (as workers, consumers, community members, and participants in our democracy). The research and advocacy need to be relevant to the organizers who are indeed experiencing and fighting many of these forces on the ground, and it should inform solutions that they develop, nurture, and advance through activism. The research and advocacy must use less jargon and abstraction, focusing less on markets, firms, or efficiencies, and it should talk more about the impact of corporate decisions on people, their lives, and their futures. The tent of advocates working on anti-monopoly needs to widen as well. Bringing in the people most impacted is essential to shaping and accomplishing the path forward.

Draw Connections Between Monopoly Power and Current Movement Priorities

As discussed earlier in this paper monopoly power has enormous impact on other movement priorities led by leaders of color, such as environmental justice, worker justice, housing justice, police and prison abolition, closing the racial wealth gap, and demcratic disenfranchisement. Anti-monopoly policy can be a powerful tool to accomplish existing movement priorities, including the Green New Deal, a Homes Guarantee, a federal jobs guarantee, and Medicare for All. In order to fully utilize it as a tool, anti-monopoly advocates must support—mainly in the background—grassroots leaders of color in integrating anti-monopoly policy and advocacy strategies into the existing campaigns they are leading. By following their lead, and by working together to curb corporate power, we as a collective progressive movement can accomplish an array of movement priorities and move the US closer to liberation for people of color.

Build Solutions That Are Antiracist and Center People of Color as Beneficiaries

It’s not enough to speak virtuously about racial equity and economic justice; we have to intentionally center people of color in the development of policy change. To the previous point, advocates and researchers who evaluate solutions to corporate concentration should include a measure of impacts on Black, Latinx, Indigenous, Asian, and Pacific Islander people. As consumers, entrepreneurs, and residents, we are the ones most vulnerable to the inequities, the forced scarcity, and price gouging inflicted by corporate concentration, among other problems. History has shown us that race-neutral approaches only exacerbate that vulnerability by entrenching current systems—systems that are inherently racist. We know that “race-neutral” policies assume whiteness as the norm and thus serve and preserve white supremacy. So, advancing anti-monopoly policy that is antiracist and centers people of color must be the standard that we all follow moving forward.

Think Bigger and Bolder Than Existing Regulations and Agencies

Large segments of the current anti-monopoly legal and regulatory infrastructure are corrupted beyond repair. Further, these systems are complicit in the economic oppression of people of color. The goals of the anti-monopoly movement should be to completely dismantle our systems of oppression and replace them with government systems that deliver economic liberation. Our regulatory structure is complicated, spread across many agencies, and lacking enforcement power. The complexity of our nation’s anti-monopoly laws, regulations, and oversight have been designed to advantage monopolists with unlimited resources to navigate the labyrinth of our anti-monopoly laws.

Racial oppression thrives in this environment and the antimonopoly movement must resist the urge to settle for small marginal victories that allow this oppression to continue. Breaking up Amazon or Facebook will be a hollow victory if they are able to reform years later and continue to harm Black and brown workers, consumers, and small businesses. The path forward should be to join grassroots leaders of color to create new, bold and transformative solutions (e.g., new agencies and new authorities) that will ensure that federal and state governments advance the economic well-being of people of color and not that of the monopolists that oppresses them.

Tell a New Visionary Story About the Role of Corporations

We need a story that is visionary and that repositions corporations as beholden to serving the public interest, re-examining the purpose of corporations and developing mechanisms that evaluate, even redefine, that purpose. Currently, companies’ driving purpose is to create wealth for their shareholders, and this ideology is to the detriment of people of color. We must integrate solutions that challenge our current approach to corporate governance, incorporation, and tax policy that reinforce economic systems of oppression that allow monopolies exploit to harm people of color.

### Case

#### Emissions leveled off in 2019 despite growth in the global economy AND the most developed economies all made significant reductions in emissions

**Dellinger 20** – Tech reporter @ Mic; former Forbes contributor

(AJ Dellinger, 2-14-2020, "Global emissions didn't increase in 2019. That's progress, but it's not enough," Mic, https://www.mic.com/p/global-greenhouse-gas-emissions-leveled-off-in-2019-but-we-still-need-more-progress-21801502)

With the amount of new and dire information about the state of the climate and the future of the planet, sometimes no news feels just as good as good news — or in this case, no change is good change. According to the International Energy Agency, human-made greenhouse gas emissions reached 33 gigatons in 2019. That's almost identical to the amount of emissions humans were responsible for in 2018.

While the actual amount of emissions didn't start to come down last year, there is at least one indicator to suggest our emissions problem might be taking a small step in the right direction: emissions leveled off despite growth in the global economy of 2.9 percent, which would usually equate to more new emissions. That is in part because while developing countries largely rely on cheap fossil fuels like coal and natural gas, advanced economies have successfully started to lower their carbon emissions. The United States, despite having a climate change denier holding the highest office in the land, managed to record the largest drop in total carbon emissions, cutting back on 4.8 gigatons between 2018 and 2019. The European Union saw the largest change by percentage, cutting out five percent of all emissions — 2.9 gigatons in total — during the same time period. Japan also saw significant change, dropping 4.3 percent.

The fact that some of the largest advanced economies of the world are managing to make progress should be taken as a positive sign, even if emissions haven't started to teeter off globally. This bright spot is driven primarily by one thing: ditching coal. According to an analysis provided by the International Energy Agency, global carbon emissions from coal use dropped by nearly 200 million tons — about a 1.3 percent decline from 2018 levels. In advanced economies, reliance on coal saw a noteworthy decline of nearly 15 percent. That includes a 15 percent drop in coal usage in the United States, where President Trump has done everything in his power to prop up the dying industry — including pushing the nonsensical concept of "clean coal," rolling back environmental protections for coal plants that limit pollution, opening up federal lands for coal mining projects and straight up ignoring the health risks associated with working in coal mines. The country has largely moved away from coal anyway — in part because it simply has become too expensive to justify using and in part because, despite the federal government's promotion of the fossil fuel, many major cities across the country have simply banned or phased out the carbon-emitting substance.

#### Cap makes revolution terminally unsustainable – insurgents need to get back to work but capitalist counter-reaction is persistent and violent

**Wainer and Bienenfeld 19** – Kit Wainer is a member of the United Federation of Teachers and is active in the opposition caucus, the Movement of Rank and File Educators. Mel Bienenfeld is a longtime socialist activist and recently retired president of a higher-education teachers local union.

(Kate Griffiths, 7-21-2019, "Problems with an Electoral Road to Socialism in the United States," New Politics, https://newpol.org/issue\_post/problems-with-an-electoral-road-to-socialism-in-the-united-states/)

Could an Electoral Transition Succeed?

Hypothetically, yes. But to imagine **a successful socialist transition** that does not entail a decisive defeat of the capitalist state and repression of capitalist political institutions assumes implausible preconditions. First, because it is impossible to win all levers of governmental power in one election, we would have to imagine several wave elections over a multiyear period. Second, this would require mass working-class mobilizations involving large demonstrations and strikes that don’t ebb over multiple years. These would be necessary to maintain intense pressure on nonsocialist politicians and career bureaucrats and sustain electoral armies to reelect socialist (or at least working-class) majorities at the federal and state levels. Activists in these movements would have to be willing to continue to mobilize, despite the enormous sacrifices of time, energy, and attention to their personal lives, for a socialist cause that would yield few tangible benefits for the first several years.

The problem with these suppositions is that historically, working-class struggle is episodic but capitalist reaction is continuous. Ultimately, the electoral road—even one that combines electoral victories with mass strikes and protests—depends on a type of working-class mobilization that is wildly out of sync with the actual patterns of workers movements since the nineteenth century. Workers have been able to organize to win substantial gains from employers and the state in most of the world at one point or another. However, these struggles have always been episodic. They sometimes win tangible victories at the high point of mass struggle or in the aftermath. They often change cultural values as well. But then they inevitably recede. There are good reasons for this. First, under capitalism workers do not own the means of production. Rather they depend upon their ability to work for employers in order to pay their bills. Consequently, they cannot strike continuously. Second, although for socialists mass movements are exciting, for most participants that excitement is combined with enormous sacrifice. Workers who organize surrender precious hours after stressful work days. They have to forgo time with their children and often need to choose between attending meetings or rallies and working the second jobs they need to pay for their housing, health care, or children’s education. Understandably, when meaningful victory appears remote it is difficult to get people to become activists even at a minimal level. When a movement grows, the passion and possibility of success attract larger numbers. But eventually, commitment levels are difficult to maintain and the lure of normal lives chips away at the movement’s base.

Capitalist counter-reaction, by contrast, is persistent. Even if ruling classes suffer partial defeats and have to make temporary concessions, their struggle to maintain their dominance and expand their advantages proceeds. U.S. workers, for example, mobilized in multiple waves between the Civil War and the late twentieth century. Strikes and militant organizing crested in the late nineteenth century, again after World War I, again in the mid-1930s, and again after World War II. These waves yielded partial victories: legalization of unions, limits on the work day, and workplace safety legislation, to name a few. Yet employers’ counterattacks, particularly since the 1970s, have been persistent, frequently violent, and have whittled away most of those gains. The vast majority of workers today are not unionized. Consequently, they enjoy no real workplace protections. Bureaucratic regulatory agencies rarely protect workers, even if the laws say they should. And most workers need to work more than forty hours just to survive. Employers’ struggles are not episodic for very practical reasons. While workers’ struggle requires independent organization, demands personal sacrifice, and often runs counter to dominant ideological and cultural assumptions, capitalist and bureaucratic counter-reaction is relatively cost-free. Capitalists do not need to surrender family time in order to squeeze employees. They do it at work when they shape the pace of production and negotiate contracts. Government bureaucrats similarly give up no free time to assist employers. They are on the clock when they interpret and enforce regulatory regimes in line with a pro-business agenda. For business owners and state officials, anti-worker reaction is their day job. And they can keep doing it, day after day, year after year, regardless of their levels of enthusiasm.

#### Socialist organizers agree – the surveillance state will dunk on grassroot movements

**Wainer and Bienenfeld 19** – Kit Wainer is a member of the United Federation of Teachers and is active in the opposition caucus, the Movement of Rank and File Educators. Mel Bienenfeld is a longtime socialist activist and recently retired president of a higher-education teachers local union.

(Kate Griffiths, 7-21-2019, "Problems with an Electoral Road to Socialism in the United States," New Politics, https://newpol.org/issue\_post/problems-with-an-electoral-road-to-socialism-in-the-united-states/)

Moments of the potential collapse of a large social system are very rare, and the ultimate collapse itself can only happen once. (In this sense, a movement of workers councils aiming to take state power is of course an “unlikely possibility.”) Such crises undermine the legitimacy of the system and make revolutionary alternatives seem more attractive. It is in this context that we have to contemplate the behavior of the state apparatus and the legitimacy of the existing state institutions in the eyes of the working class.

Capitalist Democracy in the Face of Class Struggle

One does not need to look very deeply into United States history to observe how willing are ruling elites to resort to severe limitations on democracy to maintain their dominance. Even such a moderate change as the 2018 election of a Democratic, more labor-friendly, governor in Wisconsin led the Republican legislature to pass a measure during Governor Scott Walker’s lame-duck session limiting the powers of the incoming governor in order to safeguard Walker’s “right-to-work” legislation. The North Carolina legislature’s September 11, 2019, “stealth override” of a Democratic governor’s budget veto provides another illustration of the limitations on electoral democracy. Political movements for reforms much more threatening than those involved in these two states are likely to be met with even more blatant anti-democratic measures.

In times of crisis the repressive functions of the state apparatus come to the fore. These can be supplemented by the “soft” power of the FBI, National Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security, and (internationally) the CIA. In a period when the rule of the dominant class is explicitly threatened, all of these will be used against the movements advocating socialism, not excluding their electoral arms.

#### Counter-revolutionaries would splinter the resistance

**Wainer and Bienenfeld 19** – Kit Wainer is a member of the United Federation of Teachers and is active in the opposition caucus, the Movement of Rank and File Educators. Mel Bienenfeld is a longtime socialist activist and recently retired president of a higher-education teachers local union.

(Kate Griffiths, 7-21-2019, "Problems with an Electoral Road to Socialism in the United States," New Politics, https://newpol.org/issue\_post/problems-with-an-electoral-road-to-socialism-in-the-united-states/)

Any program of democratizing the existing state would of necessity involve purging its bureaucracies. Such a move would not be perceived as—and in actuality would not be—a mere replacement of one group of officials by another. It would entail a fierce battle on all fronts—in the courts and in the streets. Its success would not be achievable via the actions of the workers’ legislature or executive alone.

Further, the historical conditions we are discussing will involve the need for immediate solutions to critical problems. Workers will expect their government to encroach widely on capitalist property rights in order to produce meaningful reforms. They will need to check the power of the repressive apparatus mobilized against them and begin taking the measures necessary to pull society out of the depths of its crisis. Then they will have to impose their own repressive force against the capitalists and other counter-revolutionaries fighting to prevent the success of the revolution and overturn its gains.

It is likely that institutions like workers councils will arise in a period of intense struggle. Among the roles they will play will be to defend workers’ social movements against the force of the state and to defend democratic rights. Blanc suggests, reasonably, that workers may need to defend an elected government against a coup. Yet, this alone would be a revolutionary step and likely provoke violent reaction. A parliamentary regime presiding over the current constitutional order would not be in a position to continue the revolution. For better or worse, only if and when workers councils are able to cohere a force with both the physical power and firm intent to break through legal and constitutional limits in order to complete the revolution can the transition to socialism be carried out.
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#### Deterrence solves, but we need a clear, credible edge in hard power

Dowd 15

Alan Dowd, senior fellow with the Sagamore Institute Center for America's Purpose, Providence Magazine, December 31, 2015, “Shield & Sword: The Case for Military Deterrence”, https://providencemag.com/2015/12/shield-sword-the-case-for-military-deterrence/

Surely, the same principle applies in the realm of nations. Our world teems with violent regimes and vicious men. And something precious—our notion of peace, sovereignty, liberty, civilization itself—sits exposed to all that danger. In a world where might makes right, the only thing that keeps the peace, defends our sovereignty and liberty, and upholds civilization is the willingness to use our resources to keep the dangers at bay. Yet too many policymakers disregard the wisdom of military deterrence, and too many people of faith forget that the aim of deterrence is, by definition, to prevent wars, not start them.

Some people of faith oppose the threat of military force, let alone the use of military force, because of Christ’s message of peace. This is understandable in the abstract, but we must keep in mind two truths.

First, governments are held to a different standard than individuals, and hence are expected to do certain things individuals aren’t expected to do—and arguably shouldn’t do certain things individuals should do. For example, a government that turned the other cheek when attacked would be conquered by its foes, leaving countless innocents defenseless. A government that put away the sword—that neglected its defenses—would invite aggression, thus jeopardizing its people.

Second, all uses of force are not the same. The sheriff who uses force to apprehend a murderer is decidedly different from the criminal who uses force to commit a murder. The policemen posted outside a sporting event to deter violence are decidedly different from those who plot violence. Moral relativism is anything but a virtue.

Some lament the fact that we live in such a violent world, but that’s precisely the point. Because we live in a violent world, governments must take steps to deter those who can be deterred—and neutralize those who cannot. In this regard, it pays to recall that Jesus had sterner words for scholars and scribes than He did for soldiers. In fact, when a centurion asked Jesus for help, He didn’t admonish the military commander to put down his sword. Instead, He commended him for his faith.[i] “Even in the Gospels,” soldier-scholar Ralph Peters reminds us, “it is assumed that soldiers are, however regrettably, necessary.”[ii] They are necessary not only for waging war but, preferably, for maintaining peace.

It’s a paradoxical truth that military readiness can keep the peace. The Romans had a phrase for it: Si vis pacem, para bellum. “If you wish for peace, prepare for war.” President George Washington put it more genteelly: “There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet an enemy.” Or, in the same way, “We infinitely desire peace,” President Theodore Roosevelt declared. “And the surest way of obtaining it is to show that we are not afraid of war.” After the West gambled civilization’s very existence in the 1920s and 1930s on hopes that war could somehow be outlawed, the men who crafted the blueprint for waging the Cold War returned to peace through strength. Winston Churchill proposed “defense through deterrents.” President Harry Truman called NATO “an integrated international force whose object is to maintain peace through strength…we devoutly pray that our present course of action will succeed and maintain peace without war.”[iii] President Dwight Eisenhower explained, “Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk its own destruction.” President John Kennedy vowed to “strengthen our military power to the point where no aggressor will dare attack.” And President Ronald Reagan steered the Cold War to a peaceful end by noting, “None of the four wars in my lifetime came about because we were too strong.” Reagan also argued, “Our military strength is a prerequisite for peace.”[iv]

Even so, arms alone aren’t enough to deter war. After all, the great powers were armed to the teeth in 1914. But since they weren’t clear about their intentions and treaty commitments, a small crisis on the fringes of Europe mushroomed into a global war. Neither is clarity alone enough to deter war. After all, President Woodrow Wilson’s admonitions to the Kaiser were clear, but America lacked the military strength at the onset of war to make those words matter and thus deter German aggression. In other words, America was unable to deter. “The purpose of a deterrence force is to create a set of conditions that would cause an adversary to conclude that the cost of any particular act against the United States of America or her allies is far higher than the potential benefit of that ac**t**,” explains Gen. Kevin Chilton, former commander of U.S. Strategic Command. It is a “cost-benefit calculus.”[v] So, given the anemic state of America’s military before 1917, the Kaiser calculated that the benefits of attacking U.S. ships and trying to lure Mexico into an alliance outweighed the costs. That proved to be a grave miscalculation.

In order for the adversary not to miscalculate, a few factors must hold.

First, consequences must be clear, which was not the case on the eve of World War I. Critics of deterrence often cite World War I to argue that arms races trigger wars. But if it were that simple, then a) there wouldn’t have been a World War II, since the Allies allowed their arsenals to atrophy after 1918, and b) there would have been a World War III, since Washington and Moscow engaged in an unprecedented arms race. The reality is that miscalculation lit the fuse of World War I. The antidote, as alluded to above, is strength plus clarity.

A second important factor to avoid miscalculation: The adversary must be rational, which means it can grasp and fear consequences. Fear is an essential ingredient of deterrence. It pays to recall that deterrence comes from the Latin dēterreō: “to frighten off.”[vi] Of course, as Churchill conceded, “The deterrent does not cover the case of lunatics.”[vii] Mass-murderers masquerading as holy men and death-wish dictators may be immune from deterrence. (The secondary benefit of the peace-through-strength model is that it equips those who embrace it with the capacity to defeat these sorts of enemies rapidly and return to the status quo ante.)

Third, the consequences of military confrontation must be credible and tangible, which was the case during most of the Cold War. Not only did Washington and Moscow construct vast military arsenals to deter one another; they were clear about their treaty commitments and about the consequences of any threat to those commitments. Recall how Eisenhower answered Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev’s boast about the Red Army’s overwhelming conventional advantage in Germany: “If you attack us in Germany,” the steely American commander-in-chief fired back, “there will be nothing conventional about our response.”[viii] Eisenhower’s words were unambiguously clear, and unlike Wilson, he wielded the military strength to give them credibility.

Discussing military deterrence in the context of Christianity may seem incongruent to some readers. But for a pair of reasons it is not.

First, deterrence is not just a matter of GDPs and geopolitics. In fact, scripture often uses the language of deterrence and preparedness. For example, in the first chapter of Numbers the Lord directs Moses and Aaron to count “all the men in Israel who are twenty years old or more and able to serve in the army.” This ancient selective-service system is a form of military readiness. Similarly, I Chronicles 27 provides detail about the Israelites’ massive standing army: twelve divisions of 24,000 men each. II Chronicles 17 explains the military preparations made by King Jehoshaphat of Judah, a king highly revered for his piety, who built forts, maintained armories in strategically located cities “with large supplies” and fielded an army of more than a million men “armed for battle.” Not surprisingly, “the fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands surrounding Judah, so that they did not go to war against Jehoshaphat.” In the New Testament, Paul writes in Romans 13 that “Rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong…Rulers do not bear the sword for no reason.” Again, this is the language of deterrence. Those who follow the law within a country and who respect codes of conduct between countries have nothing to fear. Those who don’t have much to fear. Likewise, to explain the importance of calculating the costs of following Him, Jesus asks in Luke 14, “What king would go to war against another king without first sitting down to consider whether his 10,000 soldiers could go up against the 20,000 coming against him? And if he didn’t think he could win, he would send a representative to discuss terms of peace while his enemy was still a long way off.” In a sense, both kings are wise—one because he recognizes that he’s outnumbered; the other because he makes sure that he’s not. Put another way, both kings subscribe to peace through strength. Again, as with the Centurion earlier, Jesus could have rebuked the martial character of these kings, but he did not. This is not just description but commendation. We ignore their example at our peril.

Secondly, it is not incongruent if we understand military deterrence as a means to prevent great-power war—the kind that kills by the millions, the kind humanity has not endured for seven decades. We know we will not experience the biblical notion of peace—of shalom, peace with harmony and justice—until Christ returns to make all things new. In the interim, in a broken world, the alternatives to peace through strength leave much to be desired: peace through hope, peace through violence, or peace through submission. But these options are inadequate.

The sheer destructiveness and totality of great-power war testify that crossing our fingers and hoping for peace is not a Christian option. Wishful thinking, romanticizing reality, is the surest way to invite what Churchill called “temptations to a trial of strength.”

Moreover, the likelihood that the next great-power war would involve multiple nuclear-weapons states means that it could end civilization. Therefore, a posture that leaves peer adversaries doubting the West’s capabilities and resolve—thus inviting miscalculation—is not only unsound, but immoral and inhumane—unchristian. “Deterrence of war is more humanitarian than anything,” Gen. Park Yong Ok, a longtime South Korean military official, argues. “If we fail to deter war, a tremendous number of civilians will be killed.”[ix]

Peace through violence has been tried throughout history. Pharaoh, Caesar and Genghis Khan, Lenin, Hitler, Stalin and Mao, all attained a kind of peace by employing brutal forms of violence. However, this is not the kind of “peace” under which God’s crowning creation can flourish; neither would the world long tolerate such a scorched-earth “peace.” This option, too, the Christian rejects.

Finally, the civilized world could bring about peace simply by not resisting the enemies of civilization—by not blunting the Islamic State’s blitzkrieg of Iraq; by not defending the 38th Parallel; by not standing up to Beijing’s land-grab in the South China Sea or Moscow’s bullying of the Baltics or al-Qaeda’s death creed; by not having armies or, for that matter, police. As Reagan said, “There’s only one guaranteed way you can have peace—and you can have it in the next second—surrender.”[x]

The world has tried these alternatives to peace through strength, and the outcomes have been disastrous.

After World War I, Western powers disarmed and convinced themselves they had waged the war to end all wars. By 1938, as Churchill concluded after Munich, the Allies had been “reduced…from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it.”[xi] Like predators in the wilderness, the Axis powers sensed weakness and attacked.

In October 1945—not three months after the Missouri steamed into Tokyo Bay—Gen. George Marshall decried the “disintegration not only of the Armed Forces, but apparently…all conception of world responsibility,” warily asking, “Are we already, at this early date, inviting that same international disrespect that prevailed before this war?”[xii] Stalin answered Marshall’s question by gobbling up half of Europe, blockading Berlin, and arming Kim Il-Sung in patient preparation for the invasion of South Korea.[xiii] The U.S. military had taken up positions in Korea in 1945, but withdrew all combat forces in 1949.[xiv] Then, in 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that Japan, Alaska and the Philippines fell within America’s “defensive perimeter.”[xv] Korea didn’t. Stalin noticed. Without a U.S. deterrent in place, Stalin gave Kim a green light to invade. Washington then reversed course and rushed American forces back into Korea, and the Korean peninsula plunged into one of the most ferocious wars in history. The cost of miscalculation in Washington and Moscow: 38,000 Americans, 103,250 South Korean troops, 316,000 North Korean troops, 422,000 Chinese troops and 2 million civilian casualties.[xvi] The North Korean tyranny— now under command of Kim’s grandson—still dreams of conquering South Korea. The difference between 2015 and 1950 is that tens of thousands of battle-ready U.S. and ROK troops are stationed on the border. They’ve been there every day since 1953.

The lesson of history is that waging war is far more costly than maintaining a military capable of deterring war. As Washington observed, “Timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it.” Just compare military allocations, as a percentage of GDP, during times of war and times of peace:

In the eight years before entering World War I, the United States devoted an average of 0.7 percent of GDP to defense; during the war, U.S. defense spending spiked to 16.1 percent of GDP. In the decade before entering World War II, the United States spent an average of 1.1 percent of GDP on defense; during the war, the U.S. diverted an average of 27 percent of GDP to the military annually.

During the Cold War, Washington spent an average of 7 percent of GDP on defense to deter Moscow; it worked.

Yet it seems we have forgotten those hard-learned lessons. In his book The World America Made, Robert Kagan explains how “America’s most important role has been to dampen and deter the normal tendencies of other great powers to compete and jostle with one another in ways that historically have led to war.” This role has depended on America’s military might. “There is no better recipe for great-power peace,” Kagan concludes, “than certainty about who holds the upper hand.”[xvii]

#### Chinese weapons Unintended escalation is especially likely with Chinese autonomous weapons

Vincent 19– Senior Reporter at The Verge

James Vincent, 2-6-2019, "China is worried an AI arms race could lead to accidental war," The Verge, https://www.theverge.com/2019/2/6/18213476/china-us-ai-arms-race-artificial-intelligence-automated-warfare-military-conflict

Experts and politicians in China are worried that a rush to integrate artificial intelligence into weapons and military equipment could accidentally lead to war between nations.

According to a new report published by US national security think tank Center for a New American Security (CNAS), Chinese officials increasingly see an “arms race” dynamic in AI as a threat to global peace. As countries scramble to reap the benefits of artificial intelligence in various domains, including the military, the fear is that international norms shaping how countries communicate will become outdated, leading to confusion and potential conflict.

“The specific scenario described to me [by one anonymous Chinese official] is unintentional escalation related to the use of a drone,” Gregory C. Allen, an adjunct senior fellow at CNAS and author of the new report, tells The Verge.

As Allen explains, the operation of drones both large and small has become increasingly automated in recent years. In the US, drones are capable of basic autopilot, performing simple tasks like flying in a circle around a target. But China is being “more aggressive about introducing greater levels of autonomy closer to lethal use of force,” he says. One example is the Blowfish A2 drone, which China exports internationally and which, says Allen, is advertised as being capable of “full autonomy all the way up to targeted strikes.”

Because drones are controlled remotely, militaries tend to be more cavalier about their use. With no risk of human casualties, they’re more willing to shoot them down, but also deploy them into contested airspaces in the first place. This attitude can also be seen in cyberwarfare, where countries will intrude in ways they wouldn’t necessarily risk if humans were involved.

“The point made to me was that it’s not clear how either side will interpret certain behaviors [involving autonomous equipment],” says Allen. “The side sending out an autonomous drone will think it’s not a big deal because there’s no casualty risk, while the other side could shoot it down for the same reason. But there’s no agreed framework on what message is being sent by either sides’ behavior.”

The risks in such a scenario become greater when factoring in advanced autonomy. If a drone or robot fires a warning shot at enemy troops, for example, how will that action be interpreted? Will the troops understand it as an automated response, or will they think it’s the decision of a human commander? How would they know in either case?

In essence, says Allen, countries around the world have yet to define “the norms of armed conflict” for autonomous systems. And the longer that continues, the greater the risk for “unintentional escalation.”

“I think that’s a real and legitimate threat,” says Allen.

The rest of the CNAS report, titled “Understanding China’s AI Strategy: Clues to Chinese Strategic Thinking on Artificial Intelligence and National Security,” notes a number of other high-level concerns and attitudes in China’s government-led AI strategy.

Chinese officials recognize, for example, that it and America are the only two viable AI superpowers. Both countries have the talent, the funding, and the bustling tech sectors needed to push this technology further, though each nation also has its own particular strengths and weaknesses. China has access to more data, for example, and has the potential to leapfrog Western technology. (Many Chinese citizens went from having no phone to a mobile phone, without getting a landline in between, for example). America, meanwhile, has a significant lead in the development of chip technology — a vital component in processing the huge datasets that power AI applications.

CNAS’s report notes that China is particularly keen to close this important gap. Chinese firms like Baidu, Alibaba, and Huawei have established new projects to develop AI accelerator hardware; government money is pouring into these initiatives; and the industry is trying other methods to get a hold of foreign expertise. These include the recent proposed acquisition of US chip designer Qualcomm by Singapore firm Broadcom, which was blocked by President Trump on national security grounds.

While a certain amount of competition between China and the US is to be expected, Allen says cooperation is also needed — especially when it comes to these military questions.

He notes that while Chinese officials he spoke to had a good grasp of contemporary US thinking on issues like autonomous warfare, American officials tend to be less well-briefed about their Chinese counterparts, partly because many Chinese policy documents are never translated into English. Without properly understanding different nations’ strategies in these domains, says Allen, the chances of misunderstanding and conflict increase.

### Case

#### Multiple independent impacts – first, food. Even unsuccessful colonization develops revolutionary crop yield tech that averts food shortages

Szocik, 17 - PhD in philosophy (Jagiellonian University, Faculty of Philosophy 2013), now is a Professor at the Polish University of Computer Science

Konrad Szocik, “War or peace? The possible scenarios of colonising Mars,” Space Policy. April 11, 2017

Chris Carberry and Joe Webster enumerate some additional reasons for preparing the manned mission to Mars. One of them is a possible great contribution to development of science. This development contains not only direct development of technology and medicine but also will be stimulated by an opportunity for direct human exploration of Mars. It seems that the idea of improving science and knowledge can work as an important reason for preparing such a mission. Thus, the idea of Mars colonisation can be treated as a purpose of development of the world science, especially for developing technologies that can provide safe transport and survival in the outer space. The new knowledge that humanity can get during Mars mission, can provide significant contribution to the field of the evolution of the planets. It can be assumed that this knowledge could improve our knowledge about the Earth by looking for some parallels between the evolution of Mars and of Earth [7].

Mars is the only cosmic object that can be the subject of such mission. The current technological facilities provide journey only to Moon that has worse parameters in comparison with Mars to establish a human colony. Mars is thus the only place on which it could be possible to establish a new developmental line in the human history.

It seems that it is possible to find among possible benefits the two following questions. One of them is just partially mentioned an inspiration for intensive scientific development. It can be assumed that for the global intensive development of science a useful policy could provide one superior goal that could connect efforts of various scientists from the whole world. Common work on the future manned mission, on establishing human colony, and on all other challenges needed for increasing the level of security and eliminating all possible threats, can provide such goal. It is no doubt that many scientific achievements that will be prepared for the purpose of that mission, can be applied to particular fields of the mundane life. Ones of such fields are medicine and food production. It is very likely that some discoveries in medicine can be applied for medical treatment on Earth. Perhaps something more important are research that are focused on the production of food on Mars. Such solutions could work on Earth to avoid a food deficiency and to enable the food production in regions that are threatened by erosion.

**Absence of that causes nuke war**

**FDI 12**, Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers & Potential Conflict Points,” <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html>

There is a **growing appreciation** that the conflicts in the next century will **most likely** be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, **Germany’s World War Two** efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be **significantly greater** as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…**if people are hungry, especially in cities**, **the state is not stable** – **riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.”** This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then **wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.”** He continues: “An **increasingly credible scenario for World War 3** is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a **festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts**.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the [IPRI] International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. **Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans** experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the [CSIS] US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the [OPRI] Oslo Peace Research Institute, **all identify** famine as a potential **trigger for** conflicts and possibly even **nuclear war**.

#### Next, overpopulation. It causes extinction, and space habituation solves it.
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Jaime Ramos, “Should we be looking to the stars or at cities? Practical approaches to the phenomenon of overpopulation,” Smart City Lab. April 1, 2019. <https://www.smartcitylab.com/blog/urban-environment/should-we-be-looking-to-the-stars-or-at-cities-practical-approaches-to-the-phenomenon-of-overpopulation/>

Historically, overpopulation has been seen as a major threat to humanity in some fields of knowledge, including the areas of philosophy or fiction. Not surprisingly, one of the greatest science fiction authors of all times, Isaac Asimov, provided us with a good metaphor decades ago to help us visualise the issue: What happens when 20 people live in the same apartment and there are only two bathrooms?

Shifts would have to be established and this would lead to distrust regarding the time spent by each person using the service, etc. The freedom of being able to use such an essential object would be very limited. That is what Asimov called the [bathroom metaphor](https://youtu.be/qkaobW8UNXo), to warn, somewhat crudely, about possible problems of overpopulation and uncontrolled birth rates in many places across the world.

The phenomenon of overpopulation exists but, does it really pose a threat to survival and lifestyle conditions on Earth? What can humanity do to alleviate the effects and to ensure Human Rights are not adversely affected?

These questions have already led to irreconcilable differences among experts. While some believe that possible solutions lie in our power, others look to the sky in search of an escape route. The fact is, never before had the subject of colonising other worlds been discussed so seriously as in the latter part of this decade.

Overpopulation figures

The United Nations indicates that the world population [is projected to reach 9 billion in 2050](https://web.archive.org/web/20160125014702/http:/www.un.org/esa/population/publications/sixbillion/sixbilpart1.pdf). This would mean doubling the number of inhabitants on the planet in just 70 years. In the distribution between continents, Asia would accumulate 5.3 billion, Africa 1.8 billion, Latin America and the Caribbean 809 million, the United States and Canada 392 million and Europe 628 million.

Major cities would bear the brunt of this increase. [68% of the population will live in cities by 2050.](https://www.smartcitylab.com/urban-environment/smart-city-in-data-infographic/) The large-scale analysis of these types of data has been a concern over the last two centuries and even during the pre-industrial era, with Thomas Malthus’ predictions on population growth and his famous work An Essay on the Principle of Population. His demographic theory predicted the extinction of humanity by 1880.

This type of alarmism has continued throughout history. In spite of everything, the requirements caused by the exponential growth of the population should not be underestimated, bearing in mind Asimov and his bathroom metaphor.

Solutions to the phenomenon of overpopulation

Population growth and [large urban concentrations](https://www.smartcitylab.com/inclusive-sharing/the-cost-of-high-density/) will have an impact on countless aspects. The threats exist and they are already associated with: population impoverishment, more unequal societies and greater risks for sustainability. By the same token, smart cities are proving to have real solutions to these problems.

These can be found in numerous technology disciplines, such as advanced data processing. Enhanced management of data through Big Data favours the exchange of knowledge and fosters more efficient and viable services and infrastructures from an economic point of view. This collection of data forms the basis of projects such as the EU Framework Programme. One of its main initiatives is the installation of 20,000 sensors in four cities in Europe.

Sustainability and reducing contaminating emissions, so in vogue in recent years, is another example of how the increased population requires changes in city transport systems. Just 20 years ago, it was impossible to imagine that cars would be removed from city centres or that private transport would be based on electric, shared and autonomous vehicles.

These are concepts that are becoming a reality with an eye already on the next step, [urban air transport](https://www.smartcitylab.com/mobility/the-taxis-of-the-future-will-fly/). These are just a few examples that prove the incredible adaptation of cities to accept the great challenges that come with high population growth.

The bathroom metaphor relates perfectly to the phenomenon of [co-living](https://www.smartcitylab.com/co-living-or-shared-houses-a-smart-solution-for-cities/) and the essence of sharing. Will it be a mandatory option given living costs or will it be chosen with economic freedom? The physical boundaries of cities are unmovable, but efficient management of resources still has a great deal to offer.

The stars, our destiny?

The utopian dream of conquering space appears to establish the opposite. That is, a whole host of resources need to be used in order to achieve the benefits of alleviating the negative effects of overpopulation in the very long term. Despite this, many great technology gurus of our time champion looking to the stars. In fact, some believe it may be the only solution when the time comes and we cannot afford the maintenance costs of those broken items in our bathroom.

This is the case of Jeff Bezos. The creator of Amazon is, today, the richest person in the world. His net worth of $150 billion corroborates this. He believes, along with others, that [in order to save Earth, we need to conquer other planets](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2018-07-26/amazon-s-jeff-bezos-wants-to-send-you-to-space-too). A self-confessed science fiction enthusiast, he has provided all the mechanisms available thanks to his economic empire, creating [Blue Origin](https://www.blueorigin.com/).