### OFF

#### Interpretation: The resolution should define the division of ground- the role of the ballot is to determine the efficacy of a topical proposal relative to the status quo or a competing option.

#### The ‘United States federal government’ is the three branches.

U.S. Legal ’16 [U.S. Legal; 2016; Organization offering legal assistance and attorney access; U.S. Legal, “United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition,” <https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/>]

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

#### The resolution is a proposition of policy – “United States” and “should” prove

Ericson 3 (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### Core antitrust laws refer to statutory laws – the increased prohibitions must be reflected IN Clayton, Sherman and FTC

Kuntz 2-23-21

(Kendall. MARYLAND CAREY SCHOOL OF LAW. Can the Courts and New Antitrust Laws Break Up Big Tech? https://www.law.umaryland.edu/Programs-and-Impact/Business-Law/JBTLOnline/Break-Up-Big-Tech/)

There are three core antitrust laws in effect today: the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act. These three antitrust laws attempt to protect market competition for the benefit of consumers. The Sherman Act outlaws monopolies and contracts that unreasonably restrain trade. The Clayton Act prohibits mergers and acquisitions that substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. Lastly, the Federal Trade Commission Act bans “unfair methods of competition” and “unfair or deceptive acts or practices.” Antitrust laws are not established to punish success, but are focused on preventing anticompetitive effects, exclusionary practices, reduced consumer choice, and hindered innovation.

#### C. Two impacts:

#### 1. Clash: Debate requires negation- affirmatives that don’t address the resolution makes irrative clash impossible because shifting away from the resolutional agent and mechanism kills negative ground by making it concessionary and allows for aff conditionality which cements the structural advantages of the affirmative through crushing limits.

#### 2. Fairness- debates about scholarship in a vacuum are myopic and breed reactionary generics – they allow the aff to cement their infinite prep advantage, because all the aff has to do is find evidence supporting an ideological orientation towards the world – this crushes clash because all of our prepared negative strategies are based on praxis, and by not defending a clear actor and mechanism we lose 90% of negative ground, and the aff still retains traditional competition standards like perms to make being neg impossible
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#### Pessimistic politics saps the utopian energy of modernity, fueling neoliberal abandonment of progressive democratic politics. This affective demobilization results in passivity and resignation.

Karlsson 14 [Rasmus, Senior lecturer in Political Science at Umea University, “Theorizing sustainability in a post-Concorde world,” *Technology in Society* 39.1, http://bit.ly/2j6e614]

Certain in their belief that “ecological losses cannot be undone through the basic tenets of modernity” ([36]:245) as in the continuation of the rationalist-scientific enterprise, political ecologists seek to halt, and ultimately reverse, the structural processes of modernity. Running directly counter to prevailing socio-economic dynamics, it is not surprising that this effort has met with limited success. But by constantly emphasizing the ecological destructive tendencies of modernity while ignoring its long-term potential, political ecologists have been surprisingly successful in eroding our confidence in that science and technology can be used, in a conscious and radical manner, to ultimately overcome these destructive tendencies. By doubting our ability to consciously govern the future, political ecologists have drained the modern project of its utopian energies, effectively creating a passivity towards the future by which short-sighted market imperatives, rather than transparent democratic decisions and long-term public investments, become the determining factors. Instead of shiny fusion reactors and space travel, we are beginning to realize that the future may well be one of oil sands, offshore drilling, and increasingly destructive resource wars. Ironically, it may thus be that it is these feelings of passivity and doubt that ultimately will help create the very future that political ecologists fear. While few would dispute the more general claim that there has been a loss of confidence in our ability to democratically decide the long-term future ([75]; p. 6; [82]; p. 1), it would certainly be incorrect to attribute all of this loss to a relative small number of political ecologists, working on the margins of social discourse. But in their role as “truth tellers”, political ecologists have been able to tap into more general sentiments of estrangement that modernity has created. Capitalizing on the ontological insecurity arising from the acceleration of change in contemporary society, political ecologists have been able to project an alternative world of permanence and belonging. While such a world would also mean a foregoing of the existential freedom and mobility that modernity has given rise to [33], it is important to remember that for most people this is not about articulating a coherent social philosophy but about giving voice to a feeling of psychological bewilderment. In a similar fashion, while most people would, on reflection, acknowledge that humanity's lot has vastly improved over the last two hundred years, there are also legitimate concerns about the growth of conspicuous consumption, the emptiness of materialism, and the deep inequalities that persist, in particular at the global level. By articulating such concerns, political ecologists speak where others remain silent, an act which in itself has generated sufficient epistemic noise and doubt, not to reverse modernity, but to put sand in its machinery. Meanwhile, economic globalization has continued unchecked, lifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty (most notably in China) but also fuelling resentment as labour markets have become ever more stratified. Instead of seeing the possibilities in new global forms of welfare capitalism, the Left has found itself helplessly watching as an ever tighter straitjacket has been sewn around its political ambitions. For the Right, the same straitjacket has been viewed as a “golden straitjacket” ([31]:104) thought to ensure prudent macroeconomic policies, monetary stability, and protect against economic interventionism. Although recent events may have shattered some of those beliefs, these “ideas still walk among us” [70] to a surprisingly high degree, largely because the Left has been unable to formulate a coherent ideological alternative. Arguably, the most important legacy of the last decades of neoliberalism has been its attack on the idea of a self-directing democratic future. Neoliberals have been particularly opposed to the idea that society should make “grand” choices or pursue different “utopian” visions of the future. Instead, neoliberals believe that the state should at a maximum provide the “framework for utopia” [64] within which individuals can then pursue their own conceptions of the good. In relation to modernity, neoliberals have sought to convey the impression that all its grand tasks have either been completed or proven impossible; that redistribution has been attempted but failed since the poor are not poor because of structural reasons but because of lacking individual ambition, and that the road to the future goes through privatization and away from the public as an acting political subject. Contrary to the historic evidence of how public scientific research has driven long run growth in modern capitalism [55], neoliberals have argued that most public investments are “inherently wasteful” ([12]:153) and have forcefully hammered home the message that financial markets alone are able to make wise allocation choices and that markets can accurately reflect all relevant sources of social risk. Again, it is easy to think that these beliefs should have been thoroughly falsified by the recent financial meltdown which, if anything, has proven that markets are particularly bad at correctly estimating systemic risks. Yet, even in these extreme times, the Left has shown a remarkable lack of political imagination and remained trapped in nostalgic dreams of its own past glories. Unable to invigorate the utopian energies of modernity yet equally unwilling to commit to their reversal, contemporary society finds itself in a state of debilitating disorientation [44]. In the West, in particularly in the United States and Great Britain, rifts in the fabric of modernity are beginning to show. Bridges in perpetual disrepair, decrepit concrete motorway interchanges, and chronically delayed trains are all products of a politics of decline. While some of these effects may be caused simply by an early entry into industrialism, they also reflect a deeper political paralysis, one that has been made worse by ever harsher demands for public austerity. Despite record levels of private wealth, we increasingly find that we can no longer afford to invest in the future. While the reactionary worldview has found itself in ascendance, the Left, tied down by postmodern quibbles, has become fundamentally uncertain about what purposes its politics should serve. In the imagery of this article, we can now more clearly see what forces that are defining the post-Concorde world. On one hand, we have the political ecological critique of modernity which has revealed the terrible ecological price that human development has exerted yet obscured its emancipatory hopes and long-term potential. On the other hand, as the neoliberal rhetoric about the inherent wastefulness of public investments has taken hold, we find the very idea of the future as a site of democratic choice to be under attack by far more powerful forces. Taken together, these otherwise unrelated ideological currents have to a large extent succeeded in destabilizing the modern project and replacing it with a sense of resignation and pessimism about the future. Although we remain haunted by fears of far-future catastrophes (it is for instance commonly acknowledged that the most devastating effects of climate change will not be felt until the end of this century), such long time horizons are not at all employed when discussing what possibilities humanity may have as we are emerging as a planetary civilization. This mismatch between problems and solutions reflects a profound uncertainty about the desired direction of change, an uncertainty which, this article suggests, may in fact be our most serious cause for concern. If it is correct to say that the post-Concorde world is characterized by a deep-felt ambivalence towards modernity, then it becomes important to spell out the implications of this ambivalence in terms of our prospects for environmental sustainability.

#### The alternative is a progressive counter-narrative of globalization and democratic investment in universal prosperity. This is the only way to prevent intensification of xenophobic violence and climate nationalism.

Karlsson 16 [Rasmus, Senior lecturer in Political Science at Umea University, “The Environmental Risks of Incomplete Globalization,” *Globalizations*, http://bit.ly/2jS3RNS]

Every year, more and more people travel by airplane and are able to experience other countries and cultures first-hand. As the world gets smaller, it is becoming increasingly difficult to deny our common humanity and insist on the artificial segregation of people based on mere geographical luck. Yet, in terms of politics or ideology, there has been surprisingly little interest in even imagining a world with universal freedom of movement and shared prosperity. It is reasonable to think that this disinterest in part derives from deeply entrenched Malthusian beliefs and fears of a coming climate crisis. Malthusian discourse often portrays global climate change as ultimate evidence of irresponsibility, greed or even the “cancer stage of capitalism” (Barry, 2012:138). Such descriptions show little tolerance for learning or humility with regard to the difficulties of the task. There has never been a blueprint for how to build a prosperous planetary civilisation or for how to achieve technological maturity in a way that does not destroy the biosphere. Yet, in a world of seven billion actually existing people, the question is where to go from here? As discussed above, to try to reverse the great structural processes of modernity through intentional localisation does not only seem wholly politically unrealistic, it is also most unlikely to actually deliver greater resilience or environmental sustainability. Yet, the problem of lacking realism is just as acute for those advocating breakthrough innovation or seeking to more fully integrate the world (Karlsson, 2013). In a time of public austerity, rising xenophobia, and an almost complete absence of realistic yet transformative visions at the global level, it is not surprising that climate nationalist responses have emerged as the default policy orientation. While these responses may at best slow the rate of warming, they offer little hope for the 3.5 billion people who currently lack access to modern energy and, as such, they are likely to contribute to the creation of new patterns of climate injustice. They are also problematic in the sense that for every year that a more meaningful response is delayed, the need for CDR grows. Already now, such negative emissions technology has become more or less a necessity for achieving the two degree target according to the scenarios represented in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) database (Anderson, 2015). Whereas breakthrough energy innovation could potentially offer a source of sustained global growth as energy would become significantly cheaper, CDR is always going to come at a net cost. If CDR eventually becomes unaffordable due to prolonged political procrastination and generally inefficient mitigation policies, it is likely that the political momentum will shift towards solar radiation management (SRM) and other more risky forms of climate engineering. Instead of fearfully backing into a warming future, there is an obvious need for bold and proactive political action (Garibaldi, 2014; Karlsson, 2016). Yet, as long as mitigation is perceived as a cost and something that runs counter to broader socio-economic goals, such action is unlikely. While accelerating the transition to a high-energy planet would undoubtedly put strong upward pressure on global emissions in the short run, it would also open up a political opportunity space for effective climate action that does not exist today. In a more equal and integrated world, there would be greater financial and human resources to combat climate change. Most of all, by providing a progressive account of globalisation, there would be a meaningful counter-narrative to both nationalist and neoliberal thinking. For some time it has become obvious that the welfare state stands at a disruptive juncture. Either it can try to protect itself from the world by imposing an international apartheid system as it falters under growing migratory pressure, rising costs for retirement, and a self-inflicted energy crisis or it can confront those fears with a politics of radical engagement and accelerate the transition to a world of universal affluence with an abundance of clean energy and open borders. Doing so would require reviving the belief in the public as an active political subject and defeating both neoliberal passivity and the divisive identity politics of contemporary environmentalism. To bring back high growth rates in the mature economies would require a fundamental reconfiguration away from supply-side economics to real wage growth, broad social investments, and accelerated modernisation (rather than as today, artificially delayed urbanisation and subsidies for low-productive jobs in rural economies). Finally, by providing universal welfare services, in particular education but also health care, social trust can be strengthened and corruption reduced (Rothstein, 2011) at the same time as the economy’s long-term growth potential can be increased. Yet, despite the remarkable scientific advancements of the last centuries, or even decades, Malthusians tend to reject the very possibility of universal affluence and what they pejoratively refer to as a “techno-fix” (Huesemann & Huesemann, 2011). Instead of uncertain technological innovation they like to see deep social changes, essentially a far-reaching epistemological homogenisation by which people everywhere adopt strict regimes of frugality and simplicity. However, just as the solution to the contradictions of capitalism in the 1930’s was neither individual moral reform of the capital-owners nor a socialist revolution of society as a whole but rather the institutionalisation of welfare-capitalism and liberal democracy, it seems far wiser to accept the existence of a pluralist society with competing conceptions of the good life and rather focus on applying technology in a conscious way to overcome environmental determinism. Obviously, this is also a question of political tactics. While ecosocialist literature tends to think of capitalism in the 21st century as a mere elite project, it seems fair to say that the logic of capital accumulation has become almost universal today with widely shared material aspirations reaching from home ownership to international travel. Similarly, large groups in the OECD-economies either have retired already or will do so in the coming decades with considerable expectations in terms of retirement income. Failure to deliver on these pension expectations would probably create a state of political crisis in which the “immigrants” but also the “environment” would be easy targets. For these, and many other reasons, it is not surprising that political elites remain deeply wedded to the idea of economic growth. Yet, insufficient demand due to rising inequality and a lack of social investments have made it difficult to deliver that growth. In the best of worlds, the need for growth could hypothetically make policy-makers more willing to challenge the prevailing supply-side paradigm but also consider the benefits of accelerating globalisation (or at least keeping them away from enacting protectionist measures). While it is obvious that economic growth does not benefit everyone equally, and that it can be source of environmental destruction, the same can be said about the lack of growth. A secular stagnation or even degrowth is certainly no guarantee for environmental protection or greater equality. If anything, the rich are likely to try to isolate themselves even more from the rest of society in case they feel threatened, in particular by moving overseas. It is also not surprising that the literature on degrowth has had almost nothing to say about how such strategies would play out at the international level (including what mechanisms that would be needed to prevent other states from taking military advantage of countries pursuing degrowth) or how exactly economic growth is to be “unlearned” at the micro level. Recognising the difficulties associated with imagining degrowth as an effective way of saving the global environment is not the same as defending “status quo” or embracing neoliberalism. As discussed above, it is the rather the failure of laissez-faire thinking that has made government intervention necessary to ensure both climate stability and a world with more equal opportunities. One common objection against climate innovation is that the real problem is not about limitations of renewable energy sources but about overcoming the entrenched interests of fossil industries. Yet, the fact that large multinational corporations such as ExxonMobil have vast political influence can also be seen as one of the reasons why technological change must be disruptive and go beyond, for instance,the scenariosin the IPCC database. Only by shocking markets through breakthrough innovation does it seem possible to break with the path dependence of existing energy systems in a way that would rapidly displace fossil fuels globally. In terms of strategy, it is also likely that fossil industries will be far more successful in thwarting the deployment of existing inferior technologies than in preventing a more general acceleration of science and technology, which would span multiple fields reaching from nanotechnology to basic physics (Victor, 2011:144) that are not immediately related to energy R&D and as such not subject to the same political economic constraints. In mainstream thinking, globalisation is primarily seen as a driver of environmental destruction as it disconnects “those who make decisions that generate ecological risks” from “the ecological victims who suffer” (Christoff & Eckersley, 2013:189). While few would dispute that globalisation has indeed contributed to the displacement of environmental harms as polluting industries have moved from rich to poor countries, a number of authors including Arthur Mol have argued that globalisation also has the potential of fostering environmental reform and facilitating ecological modernisation throughout the global economy (Mol, 2003). The aim of this paper has been to take that argument further yet by suggesting that the hope of an adequate response to many global environmental risks, and climate change in particular, in fact hinges on an accelerated rate of globalisation leading to economic convergence. A more equal and richer world would not only have better resources to deal with environmental stress and the need for climate adaptation, it would also compel policy-makers to actively pursue the development of breakthrough technologies that would once and for all resolve the climate/energy/population dilemma from the supply-side (Brook et al., 2014:2). By working from the supply-side rather than the demand-side, climate politics can finally be depolarised and the current logical schism between “believers” and “sceptics” can be overcome. Yet, it would be naïve to think that all would welcome a radicalisation of the modern project and the transition to a fully integrated high-energy planet. While such a future would probably reflect widely shared public aspirations to freedom of movement, material security, and environmental protection, cultural perfectionists are likely to decry the blandness of diversity in a world of open borders, eco-socialists are likely to see any “techno-fix” as merely a way of ducking responsibility for what they consider to be necessary social reforms, and libertarians are likely to criticise the government “overreach” implicit in the very notion of taking active responsibility for the global future. Another common objection against breakthrough innovation is that time is too short for fundamentally uncertain research. Such an objection would make perfect sense if there was any faster or safer route to restoring a safe climate and protecting the world against broader Anthropocene risks. This paper has argued that there is no such route, at least as long as the interests of people outside the OECD-countries are to be taken seriously. While sustained poverty abroad may seem to temporarily reduce the urgency of action, it will also lead to further lock-in of existing yet inferior technologies and increase the long-term need for CDR/SRM. The fundamental problem here is the scale illusion by which signals of relative local progress towards perceived “sustainability” overshadow other signals of absolute global failure. Just as the example of Iceland that currently has a 100% renewable electricity supply has not taken the world as a whole any closer to fossil independence, little if anything would be achieved if a handful of the world’s richest countries succeed in their transition to a nonscalable soft energy path. Yet, unfortunately, renewable energy but also the idea of “energy savings” continue to occupy a moral high-ground in the public imagination in ways that make meaningful action extremely difficult and obscure how much energy supply, but also overall consumption rates, must increase in the coming decades to ensure that everyone in the world has a chance of achieving a dignified livelihood. Essentially, by turning the traditional environmental idea of “intentional localisation” on its head, this paper has suggested that what most of all will determine humanity’s future in the Anthropocene is to what extent it will be possible to craft a new progressive narrative of global economic convergence capable of simultaneously overcoming Malthusian determinism and neoliberal ignorance of environmental realities. As Bruno Latour has noted, humanity has to learn to “love its monsters” rather than running away in panic from science and technology out of fear for the world that it has created (Latour, 2011). Only through a more conscious and reflexive relationship to technology is there any hope for humanity to realise its axiological potential (Bostrom, 2003) while building a world in which emancipative values, pluralism, and diversity can flourish.

#### The alt confronts the history of western colonialism and economic exploitation. A global Fordian compromise ensures oppressed people around the world the resources necessary to resist exploitation and flourish.

Karlsson 09 [Rasmus, Senior lecturer in Political Science at Umea University, “A global Fordian compromise? – And what it would mean for the transition to sustainability,” *Environmental Science & Policy* 12, http://bit.ly/2kfrsg6]

Though it may be simple to refute the normative and prescriptive elements of traditional green thought, we should be careful to think that we can do the same with its empirical analysis. The environmental problems are real and should indeed warrant radical political action. But any such action must first and foremost be based on the righteous claims for a decent life expressed by the developing world. Instead of seeing these claims as a threat to sustainability, the expansion of the global economy to the world’s poor should be seen as unique historic opportunity. Along those lines I will now delineate the idea of a global Fordian compromise. I will do this in a number of steps. First I will recapitulate the circumstances of the original ‘‘Fordian compromise’’. Then I will argue that even if economic globalization has been responsible for undermining the original compromise, the same forces may now be capable of renewing its relevance. With this in mind I will turn specifically to the agricultural sector and the European Union as an empirical illustration of how a global version of the compromise could work. By the early 1930s, the industrial countries were going through a deep and worsening recession. It seems correct to say that the crisis, at least to a large part, was caused by the very success of industrialism. The use of machinery and the division of labour had lead to a dramatic increase in productive capacity worldwide. At the same time, overall demand remained low, simply because the larger population could not afford to buy the goods that were produced. Historically, it had appeared rational for capital owners to keep wages as low as possible, to try to squeeze out that little extra marginal productivity through ever harsher conditions. This was also the analysis of Marx who thought that the declining rate of profit would lead to an increasing immiseration of the proletariat. Hence, for the more anarchistically inclined, the obvious solution was to overthrow the capital owners and divide their resources among the people. The problem with that approach however, was that the capitalists, albeit rich, were relatively few and the workers amounted to millions. What ensued, and what Marx famously did not foresee, was a new kind of compromise between capital owners and workers (Gourevitch, 1986, p. 128). In different countries, this compromise of so called ‘‘welfare capitalism’’ took on different shapes (Esping-Andersen, 1990). In the U.S. it was initiated by the capital owners, most notably by Henry Ford, who realized that it would be in ~~his~~ [their] own self-interest to raise salaries and by doing so making it possible for his workers to buy what they produced in the factories. In the Scandinavian countries, the same compromise came about as industrialists and unionists agreed to a peace accord on the labour market under the condition that salaries would rapidly be increased. Whatever its manifestation, the different compromises were unified in that they gave both sides of the labour market a vested interest in the future by pointing towards the long-term benefits of co-operation. Though the full effects of this grand bargain could not be seen until the 1960s, the ‘‘Fordian compromise’’ of welfare capitalism was indisputable the engine behind one of the longest periods of economic growth ever experienced. As material conditions improved, extreme poverty became more or less eradicated in many Western countries. Especially the Scandinavian countries showed that it was possible to combine a growth oriented market economy with a strong welfare state, at least as long as the total economic product kept growing in real terms from year to year. By the 1970s however, belief in the compromise of welfare capitalism began to fade. Increasing economic globalization had meant that wage increases were only possible to the extent that they were matched by real gains in terms of productivity. As companies became more export oriented, the purchase power of the own population also became relatively less important. Beside these materialistic explanations, there was simultaneously an ideological shift to the right, a shift that left classical liberals morally corrupted by the perverse idea that their future wealth was dependent on having more poor people in their societies. A similar kind of perverse logic was also replicated onto the international level. As globalization and trade liberalization made it possible to buy electronics, textiles and other consumer goods for remarkably low prices, many people came to believe that their own good life was somehow dependent on the hard and underpaid work carried out in other parts of the world. What such a belief failed to recognize is that the global economy is not, and has never been, a zero-sum game. Though consumers in the rich countries may benefit in the short run from low salaries in the developing world, the same is not true if we look beyond the immediate present. Then their interest would be much better served if these countries were transformed into advanced industrial economies and billions of new consumers would enter the global market. If the historic experience from countries like Japan and South Korea has any bearing, this would translate into a ‘‘race to the top’’ as growing wealth would allow automation and the substitution of menial work, which would then even further increase overall productivity (and thus, overall demand). It is in particular this possibility of automation and robotization that dependency theorists have ignored when insisting that global capitalism, as a system, requires poverty to function. On a political level, protectionists have repeatedly failed to offer a compelling alternative to this progressive vision, especially for the longer run. Not only does it seem morally suspect to deny poor countries the possibilities of economic development, the effects of artificially high prices also have to be borne by the own population while the allocation of resources into uncompetitive industries means less room for overall economic growth even domestically. Nowhere is this more evident than in the agricultural sector. Though the European Union is not alone in this regard, I will here take the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union as my main empirical example to illustrate what a global Fordian compromise could look like. Initiated in the early 1960s, the CAP today represents 44% of the EU budget with a total of 60 billion USD scheduled in spending for 2008 (EU, 2008). The principal problem motivating the different subsidies and programmes of the CAP has been the high productive capacity of the European farmers. Left to their own, they would easily produce an enormous surplus of for instance grain, milk products and olive oil. In a normal economy, the effect of such a surplus would be a sharp drop in prices, forcing enough farmers out of business until the market would reach an equilibrium point where supply is matched by demand. Since the political price of such a ‘‘reset’’ (be it in votes, landscape aesthetics or food security) has been considered too high, the surplus production has instead been continuously taken away from the European market. Though it would have been possible to simply burn the surplus (as actually has been done occasionally in the U.S. Midwest), much of the European surplus has instead been exported on to the world market. However, since prices on the world market historically have been dramatically lower than prices inside the EU, this has in practical terms meant a large scale dumping of agricultural products on the world’s poor. At first, this may seem like a good thing. The European agricultural surplus has enabled for instance the urban population along the coasts of Africa to buy farm products of good quality, products that they otherwise would not have been able to afford. But as the population of Lagos, Abidjan and other growing cities have turned to food from Europe (which has been sold according to the ‘‘Ryanair-logic’’; better to get at least something than nothing) they have also turned away from domestic producers who find themselves unable to compete. Again, if the agricultural market would have been any other normal market, these African producers would of course have turned to Europe or other industrial countries with their products. However, and here we see the true cynicism of the current regime, this is not possible since one of the core mechanisms of CAP is precisely high tariffs on agricultural products entering the union. The import tariffs are set at a level that raises the World market price up to a ‘‘target’’ price consistent with that inside the union. Though attempts to reform the CAP are nearly as old the policy itself, and moderate progress has indeed been made as in the recent ‘‘decoupling’’ of subsidies (giving farmers less of an incentive to overproduce), the overall picture remains bleak (Goodison, 2007). Unfortunately, even the recent surge in food prices has been insufficient to stimulate larger investments as long as the high import tariffs of the rich world remain intact. Deprived of any chance of entering the world economy from below, and from thereon start building a capital base of their own, the African countries have instead found themselves increasingly dependent on different forms of development aid. Obviously, such cash handouts cannot replace indigenous growth and history suggests that they may often do more harm than good (Easterly, 2006). What motivates the CAP and similar policies is the very high discount rate by which the future is weighted against the present. Even if nearly all of the world’s economists agree that it would bring tremendous benefits to every country, and especially to the developing world, if the CAP and other regimes preventing free trade were torn down, the current path dependency may seem overwhelming. Calculations suggest that global free trade could generate benefits of up to $2.4 trillion annually. Despite this, the industrial countries have been backing into every new agreement on agricultural products and other goods in which the developing world holds a competitive advantage, as mostly recently seen in the stalled talks of the Doha Development Round. Given the apparent lack of political leadership based on an alternative long-term vision, we repeatedly see well-organized concentrated interests (such as the French farmers) prevailing over broader but more diffused ones. We do not have to look further than to the shores of Europe to see the practical implications of this failure. There, every year thousands of impoverished people drown as they make their desperate attempts to enter the ‘‘free world’’. What is needed, more than anything else, is pro-active political action. We have to take seriously the environmentalists’ claim that the future matters, but employ that insight to supersede the cynical trade-off that they implicitly and silently project. Just as capital owners and workers eventually came to understand that it was in their mutual long-term interest to co-operate, so must the interests of global development and environmental protection be aligned in a manner that opens up an optimistic vision of the future. To some this may sound like the very idea of ‘‘sustainable development’’, as outlined in the so-called Brundtland report of 1987 (WCED, 1987). It is. But since then we have come to realize that in order to be successful, the scope of ecological modernization must be far greater, up to the extent that it will be able to challenge the fundamental axioms of sustainability (Karlsson, 2007). At the same time, the ‘‘low energy paths’’ of the original report have been outstripped by the overwhelming demand of billions in Asia and elsewhere. It is no longer a question (as it was then) if these parts of the world will become industrialized or not, the question is rather by what means they will industrialize. Both China and India possess abundant reserves of coal. In fact, China alone has enough coal to sustain its economic growth for a century or more (Fairley, 2007). Unless breakthrough technologies, such as nuclear fusion, are made readily available, it is most likely that these countries will start burning their coal reserves on a massive scale, rapidly undermining any effort to reduce carbon emissions. Already last year, China became the largest source of carbon emissions worldwide. These alarming trends, should if nothing else, emphasize the need for radical investment in research and development. This brings us back to the Fordian compromise and the present situation with regard to trade and development. Within the framework of forward-looking progressive politics, it should be recognized that the advanced industrial countries have a specific moral responsibility to reduce their environmental impact (Hayward, 2007). But unlike in traditional green thinking, that incurred ‘‘ecological debt’’ is not be paid through reduced economic activity or, as often has been suggested in more radical literature, by some sort of ‘‘wealth transfer’’. To play the historic parallel a bit further, that would be the equivalent of asking a capitalist in the 1930s to give out his money and join the working class in their suffering. Morally commendable as such an action certainly would have been, it would obviously be foolish to base the hope of social development on its realization. By the same token, we should not let the hope of environmental sustainability rest with environmental citizenship or some ‘‘great awakening’’ by the time a global climate catastrophe sets in. Instead, the moral responsibility consists in compelling the half-hearted liberals of Europe and elsewhere to actually live up to what they teach in the economic classes. Witnessing the raise of China, South Korea and the wider Pacific Rim, it should be beyond reasonable doubt that the liberal market economy is uniquely equipped to lift billions out of poverty. Considering the number of successful economic transformations that the advanced industrial countries themselves have gone through over the last century, it should also be clear that the path to the future should be one that embraces openness, innovation and competition. Applying this to the case of the CAP, we should see the unique chance of striking a grand bargain by which the rich countries accept to wither the storm as their markets are open to competition. Following a removal of all barriers preventing free trade, the developed economies could initiate the long overdue transfer of resources from agriculture to scientific research. At the same time, the poor countries of the world would finally be able to begin walking the long road towards modernization, a road on which they have been held back for centuries, first by colonialism and then by the collective clientelism encouraged by the international development aid establishment. In line with a global Fordian compromise, that economic development would raise the purchasing power of the poor. Part of that purchasing power would be directed towards the already rich countries, allowing them to reap the benefits of trade and put even more money into technological development and socially progressive politics. Combined, it is likely that the total amount of resources will be sufficient to open up advanced technological paths to global environmental sustainability. Further examining the bargaining situation, we see that failing to reach such a compromise would worsen international tensions, keeping the industrial countries in their oppressing role in which short-term gains are bought at the expense of long-term possibilities. Moreover, and if airy cosmopolitan arguments are insufficient to persuade us about our shared destiny, we have to remember that if poor states are allowed to fail they stand the risk of becoming breeding grounds for terror and extremism, all imposing skyrocketing costs for ‘‘security’’ on the developed world. Thus, though the analogy with the striking working class of the original compromise may not be perfect, the rich countries should have a strong incentive to listen to the warning sounds coming from the ‘‘lower decks’’.

## Case

### 1NC - Turn

#### Positioning within the structure of debate to be validated by the judge as a critic subverts the radical intentions of the Aff – their resistance becomes an object of surveillance and consumption

Phillips 99 – Dr. Kendall R. Phillips, Professor of Communication at Central Missouri State University, PhD in Speech Communication from Pennsylvania State University, MA in Speech Communication from Central Missouri State University, BS in Psychology and Sociology from Southwest Baptist University, “Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism: A Response to Sloop and Ono”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, Volume 32, Number 1, p. 96-101

My concern with this movement centers around an issue that Sloop and Ono seem to take as a given, namely, the role of the critic. On one hand, calling for the systematic investigation of existing marginalized discourses is a natural extension both of critical rhetoric (see McKerrow 1989, 1991) and of the general ideological turn in criticism (see Wander 1983). On the other hand, the ease of transition from criticism in the service of resistance to criticism of resistance may obscure the need to address some fundamental issues regarding the general function of rhetorical criticism in an uncertain and contentious world. Beyond licensing the critic to engage in political struggle, Sloop and Ono advocate the pursuit of covert resistant discourses. Such a move not only stretches our understanding of rhetoric and criticism, but also alters significantly the relationship between critic and out- law. Critical interrogation of dominant discursive practices in the service of political/cultural reform is supplanted in favor of positioning covert out- law communities as objects of investigation. Invited to seek out subversive discourses, the critic is positioned as the active agent of change and the out-law discourse becomes merely instrumental. Rather than academic criticism acting in service of everyday acts of resistance, everyday acts of resistance are put into the service of academic criticism. Rhetorical resistance That we are "caught within conflicting logics of justice that are culturally struggled over" (Sloop and Ono 1997, 50) and that rhetoric is employed in these struggles seems an uncontroversial statement. Despite the theoretical miasma surrounding judgment, Sloop and Ono accurately note, the material process of rendering judgments (and of disputing the logics of litigation) continues in the world of actually practiced discourse. In the materially contested world, rhetoric is utilized both by those seeking to secure the grounds of dominant judgment and by those seeking to undermine or supplant dominant cultural logics with some out-law notion of justice. The distinction between these two cultural groups, "in-law" and out- law, however, deserves some consideration prior to any discussion of the role of the critic as implied in the out-law discourse project. The discourse of the dominant or those within the bounds of superordinate logics of litigation is reminiscent of Michel De Certeau's (1984) strategic discourse. For De Certeau, strategies are utilized by those who have authority by virtue of their proper position. Strategies exploit the institutionally guaranteed background consensus by which power relations (and litigations) are maintained and advanced. In contrast, tactics are utilized by those having no proper place of authority within the discursive economy who must seek opportunities whereby the discourse of the dominant might be undermined and contested. To extend Sloop and Ono's definition, out-law discourses are those that can (and, by their analysis, do) take advantage of situations (e.g., race riots) to disrupt the regularity of dominant cultural groups. The ongoing struggle between strategically instituted cultural dominants and the "out-law always lurk[ing] in the distance" (66) is acknowledged, even celebrated, by Sloop and Ono. What their acknowledgment fails to provide, however, is a clear need for critical intervention. Indeed, quite the reverse is presented: It is the critic (particularly the left-leaning critic) who needs out-law discourse. While the struggles over justice, equality, and freedom have gone on, the left-leaning critics are those who have theoretically excluded themselves from the disputes. The study of out-law dis- courses, then, provides a means to reinvigorate the intellectual and re-institute (academic) leftist thinking into popular political struggles (53-54). Thus, Sloop and Ono's project incorporates three types of rhetoric: the rhetoric of the in-law, presumably the traditional object of critical attention; the rhetoric of the out-law, the study of which may transform our understanding of judgment as well as reinvigorate leftist democratic critiques; and the rhetoric of the critics who, having lost their political po- tency, can exploit the discourse of the out-law to promote ideological struggles. It is to this critical rhetoric that I now turn. Resistance criticism Sloop and Ono (1997) clearly state the relationship they envision between the rhetorical critic and out-law discourse: "Ultimately, we will argue that the role of critical rhetoricians is to produce 'materialist conceptions of judgment,' using out-law judgments to disrupt dominant logics of judgment" (54; emphasis added). Here the critic seeks out vernacular discourse (60), focuses on the methods and values embodied in these communities (62), listens to and evaluates the out-law community (62-63), and chooses appropriate discourses for the purpose of disrupting dominant practices (63). Essentially, it is the critic who seeks out marginalized discourses and returns them to the center for the purpose of provoking dominant cultural groups (63). Despite acknowledging the efficacy of out-law discourses, Sloop and Ono assume that the critiques generated and presented by the out-law community have only minimal effect. The irony, and indeed arrogance, of this assumption is evident when they claim: "There are cases, however, when, without the prompting of academic critics, out-law discourses serve local purposes at times and at others resonate within dominant discourses, disrupting sedimented ways of thinking, transforming dominant forms of judgment" (60; emphasis added). Sloop and Ono seem to suggest that such locally generated critiques are the exception, whereas the political efficacy of the academic critic is the rule. This seems an odd claim, given that the justification for their out-law discourse project is the lack of politically viable academic critique and the perceived potency of out-law conceptions of judgment. Their suggestion that out-law communities are in need of the academic critic contradicts not only the already disruptive nature of existing out-law discourses (the grounds for using out-law discourse), but also the impotence of contemporary critical discourse (the warrant for studying out-law discourse). By this I do not mean that the critiques and theories generated by academically instituted intellectuals have not been incorporated into subversive discourses. Just as out-law discourses inevitably mount critiques of dominant logics, so, too, the perspectives on rhetoric and criticism generated by academics are used in resistance movements. Feminist critiques of patriarchy, queer theories of homophobia, postcolonial interrogations of race have found their way into the service of resistant groups. The key distinction I wish to make is that the existence of criticism (academic or self-generated) in resistance does not necessitate Sloop and Ono's move to a criticism of resistance. What Sloop and Ono fail to offer is an adequate argument for "taking public speaking out of the streets and studying it in the classroom, for treating it less as an expression of protest" (Wander 1983, 3) and more as an object for analysis and reproduction within the political economy of the academy. Philip Wander made a similar charge against Herbert Wicheln's early critical project, and this concern should remain at the forefront of any discussion aimed at expanding the scope and function of criticism. Sloop and Ono offer numerous directives for the critic without addressing whether the critic should be examining out-law discourses in the first place. While it is too early to suggest any definitive answer to the question of criticism of resistance, some preliminary arguments as to why critics should not pursue out-law discourses can be offered: (1) Hidden out-law discourses may have good reasons to stay hidden. Sloop and Ono specifically instruct us that "the logic of the out-law must constantly be searched for, brought forth" (66) and used to disrupt dominant practices. But are we to believe that all out-law discourses are prepared to mount such a challenge to the dominant cultural logic? Or, indeed, that the members of out-law communities are prepared to be brought into the arena of public surveillance in the service of reconstituting logics of litigation? It seems highly unlikely that all divergent cultural groups have developed equally, or that all members of these groups share Sloop and Ono's "imperial impulse" (51) to promote their conceptions and practices of justice. (2) Academic critical discourse is not transparent. Here I allude to the overall problem of translation (see Foucault 1994; Lyotard 1988; Lyotard and Thebaud 1985; Zabus 1995) as an extension of the previous concern. Critical discourse cannot become the medium of commensurability for divergent language games. Are we to believe that the "use" of out-law dis- course by critics to disrupt dominant practices can fail to do violence to these diverse/divergent logics? Are out-law discourses merely tools to be exploited and discarded in the pursuit of returning leftist academic dis- course to the center? (3) Perhaps the academic translation of out-law discourse could be true to the internal logic of the out-law community. And, perhaps the re-presentation of out-law logic within the academic community will bestow a degree of legitimacy on the out-law community. Nonetheless, the effect of legitimizing out-law discourse is unknown and potentially destructive. In an effort to siphon the political energy of out-law discourse into academic practice, we may ultimately destroy the dissatisfaction that serves as a cathexis for these out-law discourses. It seems possible that academic recognition might take the place of struggle for material opportunities (see Fraser 1997). But, will academic legitimation create any material changes in the conditions of out-law communities? I mean to suggest, not that it is better to allow the out-law community to suffer for its cause, but rather that incorporating the struggle into an (admittedly) impotent academic critique does not offer a prima facie alternative. (4) Criticism of resistance denies the practical and theoretical importance of opportunity. Returning to De Certeau's notion of tactics, the crucial element of these discursive moves is their use of opportunity to disrupt the proper authority of the dominant. The kairos of intervention provides the key to undermining "in-law" discourses. But when is the "right moment in time" for the academic reproduction of out-law discourse? Mapping the points of resistance (ala Foucault and Biesecker) entails interrogating "in-law" discourses for their incongruities and contradictions, not turning the academic gaze upon those communities waiting for an opportunity. Out-laws do not lurk in the forefront (66), hoping to be exposed by academic critics; they wait for the right moment for their disruption. Rhetoricians can provide rhetorical instructions for seeking opportunities and for exploiting these opportunities (literally making the culturally weaker argument the stronger), but this does not justify interrogating (intervening in) the cultural logics of the marginalized. The concerns raised here are not designed to dismiss Sloop and Ono's provocative essay. The divergent critical logic they outline deserves careful consideration within the critical community, and it is my hope that the concerns I raise may help to further problematize the relationship between resistance and rhetorical criticism. Rhetorical criticism As I have suggested, my purpose is to use the provocative nature of Sloop and Ono's project to extend disputes regarding the ends of rhetorical criticism. Diverging perspectives on the ends of criticism have been categorized by Barbara Warnick (1992) as falling along four general lines: artist, analyst, audience, and advocate. Leah Ceccarelli (1997) discerns similar categories around the aesthetic, epistemic, and political ends of rhetorical criticism. The out-law discourse project presents clear ties to the notion of critic as advocate. For Sloop and Ono, the critic is an interested party, discerning (and at times disputing) the underlying values and forces contained within a discourse. Additionally, however, the out-law discourse critic is an analyst focusing on the hidden, aberrant texts of the out-law and "rendering] an incoherent or esoteric text comprehensible" (Warnick 1992, 233). Now, I am not suggesting that a critic must serve only one function or that the roles of advocate and analyst are mutually exclusive; rather, these entanglings of power (political ends) and knowledge (epistemic ends) are inevitable. My concern is that we not neglect the complexity of these entanglements. Turning covert out-law discourses into objects of our analyses runs the risk of subjecting them both to the gaze of the dominant and to the power relations of the academy. As the works of Michel Foucault (especially 1979, 1980) aptly illustrate, practices presented as extending such noble goals as emancipation and humanity may endow institutions of confinement and objectification. Any justification for studying out-law dis- course because doing so may extend our political usefulness in the pursuit of emancipatory goals must not obscure the already existing power relations authorizing such studies. Our attempts to extend our domains of knowledge and expertise (authority) must not be pursued unreflexively.

### 1NC- AT - Ontology

#### Antiblackness as ontological is self-refuting performative contradiction that only legitimizes white institutions as sites of ontological legitimacy. It’s historically proven that political commitment is transformative – even its failures set the conditions for future successes.

Gordon 20 [Lewis, Prof of Philosophy and Africana Studies at the University of Connecticut, Visiting Euro philosophy Prof at Toulouse University, Nelson Mandela Visiting Prof in Political and International Studies at Rhodes University, former Director of the Institute for the Study of Race and Social Thought at Temple University, founder of the Center for Afro-Jewish Studies, *Freedom, Justice, and Decolonization*, p.75-82]

The first is that “an antiblack world” is not identical with “the world is anti-black.” The latter is an antiblack racist project. It is not the historical achievement of such. Its limitations emerge from a basic fact. Black people and other opponents of such an enterprise fought, and continue to fight, against it. The same argument applies to the argument about social death. Such an achievement would have rendered even those authors’ and the reflections I am offering here stillborn. The basic premises of the antiblack world and social death arguments are, then, locked in performative contradictions. They fail at the moment they are articulated. Yet, they have rhetorical force. This is evident through the continued growth of its proponents, literature, and forums devoted to it, in which all lay claim to stillborn status. In Bad Faith and Antiblack Racism, I argued that there are forms of antiblack racism that are also offered under the guise of love. I was writing about whites who exoticize blacks while offering themselves as white sources of black salvation. It was a response to those who regard racism exclusively as acts of demonization. There are also racist forms of valorization. Analyzed in terms of bad faith, where one lies to oneself in an attempt to flee displeasing truths for pleasing falsehoods, exoticists romanticize blacks while affirming white normativity and themselves as principals of reality. These ironic, performative contradictions are features of all forms of racism, where one group is elevated to a godlike status and another is pushed below or outside that of human despite both claiming to be human. Antiblack racism offers whites self–other relations (necessary for ethics) with each other but not so for groups forced in a “zone of nonbeing” below or outside them. Although to be outside is not necessarily to be below, it is so in a system of hierarchy in which above is also interpreted as being within. There is asymmetry where whites and any designated racially superior groups stand as others who look downward to those who are not their others or their analogs. Antiblack racism is, thus, not a problem of blacks being “others.” It is a problem of their not-being-analogical-selves-and-not-even-being-others. Fanon, in Black Skin, White Masks, reminds us that Blacks among each other live in a world of selves and others. It is in attempted relations with whites under circumstances where whites control the conditions that these problems of dehumanization and subordination occur. Reason in such contexts, as he observes, has a bad habit of walking out when Blacks enter. What are Blacks to do? As reason cannot be forced to recognize Blacks because that would be “violence,” they must ironically reason reasonably with such forms of unreasonable reason. Contradictions loom. Racism is, given these arguments, a project of imposing nonrelations as the model of dealing with people designated “black.”12 In The Damned of the Earth, Fanon goes further and argues that colonialism is an attempt to impose a Manichean structure of contraries instead of a dialectical one of ongoing, human negotiations of contradictions. The former segregates the groups; the latter is produced from interaction. The police, he observes, is the primary mediator between the two models, as their role is the use of force/violence to maintain the contraries instead of the human, discursive one of politics and civility requiring the elimination of separation through the interactive, and ultimately intimate, dynamics of communication. Such societies draw legitimacy from Black nonexistence or invisibility. Black appearance, in other words, would be a violation of those systems. Think of the continued blight of police, extra-judicial killings of blacks and Blacks in those countries.13 The ongoing model of fascist white rule as the daily condition of blacks is to prevent the emergence of Blacks. An immediate observation of many postcolonies is that antiblack attitudes, practices, and institutions are not exclusively white. Black antiblack dispositions make this clear. In addition to black antiblackness taking the form of white hatred of black people, there is also the adoption of black exoticism. Where this exists, blacks simultaneously receive avowed black love alongside black rejection of agency. Many problems follow. The absence of agency bars maturation, which would reinforce the racial logic of blacks as in effect wards of whites. Without agency, ethics, liberation, maturation, politics, and responsibility could not be possible. This is because blacks would not actually be able to do anything outside of the sphere of white approbation and commands. Afropessimism endorses the previous set of observations, but this agreement is supported by a hidden premise of white agency versus black and Black incapacity. They make much of Fanon’s remark that “the Black has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white.”14 Fanon’s rhetorical flare led many unfortunate souls to misread this remark. As he had already argued that racism is a socially produced phenomenon, his point was that those who produced it take it to be ontological. In other words, such people—in this case whites—do not take seriously that blacks have any ontological resistance to white points of view. Fanon was not arguing that blacks are ontologically beings, or even nonbeings, of that kind. If this were so, he would not have pointed out, in numerous sections of that book, black and Black experiences with each other. The whole point of the chapter in which that remark is made, “The Lived-Experience of the Black,” is to explore blacks’ and Blacks’ points of view. This is a patent rejection of an ontological status while pointing to the presumed ontological status of a skewed perspective. Proponents of Afropessimism might respond that their position on white agency and black incapacity comes from Fanon’s famous remark that though whites created le Nègre—the French term for, depending on the context, “negro,” “nigger,” and “black”—it was les Nègres who created Négritude.15 Whites clearly did not create Afropessimism, which Black liberationists should, in agreement, celebrate. We should avoid the fallacy of confusing the source with the outcome. History is not short of bad ideas from good or well-intentioned people. If intrinsically good, each person of African descent would become ethically and epistemologically a switching of the Manichean contraries, which means in effect only changing the players instead of the racist game. We come, then, to the crux of the matter. If the goal of Afropessimism is Afropessimism, its achievement would be attitudinal and, in the language of old, stoic—in short, a symptom of antiblack society. At this point, there are several observations that follow. The first is a diagnosis of the implications of Afropessimism as a symptom. The second pertains to the epistemological implications of Afropessimism. The third is whether a disposition counts as a political act and, if so, is it sufficient for its avowed aims. There are more, but for the sake of brevity, I will simply focus on these.16 An ironic dimension of pessimism is that it is the other side of optimism. Oddly enough, both are connected to nihilism, which is, as Nietzsche showed, a decline of values during periods of social decay.17 It emerges when people no longer want to be responsible for their actions. The same problem surfaces in movements. When one such as the Black Liberation movement is suffering from decay, nihilism is symptomatic. Familiar tropes follow. Optimists expect intervention from beyond. Pessimists declare that relief is not forthcoming. Neither takes responsibility for what is valued. The valuing is what leads to the second, epistemic point. The presumption that what is at stake is what can be known to determine what can be done is the problem. If such knowledge were possible, the debate would be about who is reading the evidence correctly. Such judgment would be a priori—that is, prior to events actually occurring. The future, unlike transcendental conditions such as language, signs, and reality, is ex post facto; it is yet to come. Facing the future, the question is not what will be or how do we know what will be but instead the realization that whatever is done will be that on which the future will depend. Rejecting optimism and pessimism, there is a supervening alternative, as we have seen throughout the reflections offered throughout this book—namely, political commitment. The appeal to political commitment is not only in stream with what French existentialists call l’intellectuel engagé (the committed intellectual) but also in what reaches back through the history and existential situation of enslaved, racialized ancestors. Many were, in truth, an existential paradox of commitment to action without guarantees. The slave revolts, micro and macro acts of resistance, escapes, and returns to help others do the same, the cultivated instability of plantations and other forms of enslavement, and countless other actions, were waged against a gauntlet of forces designed to eliminate any hope of success. The claim of colonialists and enslavers was that the future belonged to them, not to the enslaved and the indigenous. Such people were, in colonial eyes, incapable of ontological resistance. A result of more than 500 years of “conquest” and 300 years of enslavement was also a (white) rewriting of history in which African and First Nations’ agency was, at least at the level of scholarship, practically erased. Yet there was resistance even in that realm, as Africana and First Nation intellectual history and scholarship attest; what, after all, are Africana, Black, and Indigenous Studies? What, after all, are those many sites of intellectual production and activism outside of hegemonic academies? Such actions set the course for different kinds of struggle today. Such reflections occasion meditations on the concept of failure. Afropessimism, the existential critique suggests, suffers from a failure in their analysis of failure. Consider Fanon’s notion of constructive failure, where what does not initially work transforms conditions for something new to emerge. To understand this argument, one must rethink the philosophical anthropology at the heart of a specific line of Euromodern thought on what it means to be human. Atomistic and individual-substance-based, this model, articulated by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and many others, is of a nonrelational being that thinks, acts, and moves along a course in which continued movement depends on not colliding with others. Under that model, the human being is a thing that enters into a system that facilitates or obstructs its movement. Under this model, the human being is actually a being. An alternative model, shared by many groups across southern Africa, Asia, South America, and even parts of Continental Europe, is a relational version of the human being as part of a larger system of meaning. Actions, from that perspective, are not about whether “I” succeed but instead about “our” unending story across time. Under this model, no human being is a being simpliciter or being-in-her-or-himself-or-themselves. As relational, it means that each human being is a constant negotiation of ongoing efforts to build relationships with others, which means no one actually enters a situation without establishing new situations of action and meaning. Instead of entering a game, their participation requires a different kind of project— especially where the “game” was premised on their exclusion. Thus, where the system or game repels initial participation, such repulsion is a shift in the grammar of how the system functions, especially its dependence on obsequious subjects. Shifted and shifting energy afford alternatives. Kinds cannot be known before the actions that birthed them. Participation, understood in these terms, is never in games but acts of changing them. Abstract as this sounds, it has much historical support. For example, Evelyn Simien, in her insightful political study Historic Firsts, examines the new set of relations established in the United States by Shirley Chisholm’s and Jesse Jackson’s U.S. presidential campaigns.18 There would have been no President Barack Obama without such important predecessors affecting the demographics of voter participation. Simien intentionally focused on the most mainstream example of political life to illustrate this point. Though no exemplar of radicalism or revolution, Obama’s “success” came from Chisholm and Jackson’s (and many others’) so-called “failure.” Despite the appalling reactionary response of a right-wing majority in the 114th Congress during the second term of Obama’s presidency and the election of Donald Trump, whose obsession with erasing Obama’s legacy exemplified a form of psychoanalytical little man’s trauma, the historic fact remains that Obama took the helm of a mismanaged executive branch and gave it a level of dignity and intelligence matched by few of its white exemplars. His successors claim for a restored greatness only reveals the joke that is, in fact, any project on which the term “supremacy” is built: the naked racism and mediocrity that followed—there is an amusing photograph of a Klansman holding up a sign declaring his race’s “superior jeans!”—reveal the folly and terror of white megalomania. Beyond presidential electoral politics, there are numerous examples of how prior, radical so-called “failures” transformed relationships that facilitated other kinds of outcome. The trail goes back to the Haitian Revolution, which offered a vision of Black sovereignty that garnered the full force of Euromodern colonial and racist alliances to stall, and back to every act of resistance from Nat Turner’s Rebellion in the USA, Sharpe’s in Jamaica, or Tula’s in Curaçao, and so many other efforts for social transformation to come.19 In existential terms, then, many ancestors of the African diaspora embodied what Kierkegaard calls an existential paradox. All the evidence around them suggested failure and the futility of hope. They first had to make a movement of infinite resignation—that is, resigning themselves to their situation. Yet they must simultaneously act against that resignation. Kierkegaard, as we have seen, called this seemingly contradictory phenomenon “faith,” but that concept relates more to a relationship with a transcendent, absolute being, which could only be established by a “leap,” as there are no mediations or bridge to the Absolute whose distant is, as Kierkegaard put it, absolutely absolute. Ironically, if Afropessimism appeals to transcendent intervention, it would collapse into faith. If the Afropessimist’s argument rejects transcendent intervention and focuses on committed political action, of taking responsibility for a future that offers no guarantees, then the movement from infinite resignation becomes existential political action. At this point, the crucial meditation would be on politics and political action. An attitude of infinite resignation to the world without the leap of committed action would simply be pessimistic or nihilistic. Similarly, an attitude of hope or optimism about the future would lack infinite resignation. We see here the underlying failure of the two approaches. Yet ironically, there is a form of failure at failing in the pessimistic turn versus the optimistic one, since if focused exclusively on resignation as the goal, then the “act” of resignation would have been achieved, which, paradoxically, would be a success; it would be a successful failing of failure. For politics to emerge, there are two missing elements in inward pessimistic resignation to consider. The first is that politics is a social phenomenon, which means it requires the expanding options of a social world. It must transcend the self. Turning away from the social world, though a statement about politics, is not in and of itself political. As we have seen, the ancients from whom much Western political theory or philosophy claimed affinity had a disparaging term for an individual resigned from political life—namely, idiōtēs, a private person, one not concerned with public affairs, in English: an idiot. I mention “Western political theory” because that is the hegemonic intellectual context of Afropessimism; I have not come across Afropessimistic writings on thought outside of that framework. We do not have to end our etymological journey in ancient Greek. Recall that extending our linguistic archaeology back a few thousand years we could examine the Middle Kingdom (2000 BCE–1700 BCE) of Kmt’s Mdw Ntr word idi (deaf). The presumption, later taken on by the ancient Athenians and other Greek-speaking peoples, was that a lack of hearing entailed isolation, at least in terms of audio speech. The contemporary inward resignation of seeking a form of purity from the loathsome historical reality of racial oppression, in this reading, retreats ultimately into a form of moralism (private, normative satisfaction) instead of public responsibility born of and borne by action. The nonbeing to which Afropessimists refer is also a form of inaudibility. The second is the importance of power. Politics makes no sense without it. As we have seen throughout our earlier reflections on power, Eurocentric etymology points to the Latin word potis as its source, from which came the word “potent” as in an omnipotent god. If we again look back farther, we will notice the Middle Kingdom Mdw Ntr word pHty, which refers to godlike strength. Yet for those ancient Northeast Africans, even the gods’ abilities came from a source. In the Coffin Texts, HqAw or heka activates the ka (sometimes, as we have seen, translated as soul, spirit, womb, or “magic”), which makes reality.20 All this amounts to a straightforward thesis on power as the ability with the means to make things happen. There is an alchemical quality of power. The human world, premised on symbolic communication, brings many forms of meaning into being, and those new meanings afford relationships that build institutions through a world of culture, a phenomenon that Freud, we should recall, rightly described as “a prosthetic god.” It is godlike because it addresses what humanity historically sought from the gods—protection from the elements, physical maledictions, and social forms of misery. Such power clearly can be abused. It is where those enabling capacities (empowerment) are pushed to the wayside in the hording of social resources into propping up some people as gods that the legitimating practices of cultural cum political institutions decline and stimulate pessimism and nihilism. The institutions in Abya Yala and in Northern countries, such as the United States and Canada, very rarely attempt to establish positive relations to blacks, and Blacks the subtext of Afropessimism and this entire meditation. The discussion points to a demand for political commitment. Politics is manifested under different names throughout the history of our species, but the one occasioning the word “politics” is, as we have seen, from the Greek pólis, which refers to ancient Hellenic city-states. It identifies specific kinds of activities conducted inside the city-state, where order necessitated the resolution of conflicts through rules of discourse the violation of which could lead to (civil) war, a breaking down of relations into those appropriate for “outsiders.” Returning to the Fanonian observation of selves and others, it is clear that imposed limitations on certain groups amount to impeding or blocking the option and activities of politics. Yet, as a problem occurring within the polity, the problem short of war becomes a political one. Returning to Afropessimistic challenges, the question becomes this. If the problem of antiblack racism is conceded as political—where antiblack institutions of power have, as their project, the impeding of Black power, which in effect requires barring Black access to political institutions—then antiblack societies are ultimately threats also to politics defined as the human negotiation of the expansion of human capabilities or, more to the point, appearance, speech, and freedom. Antipolitics is one of the reasons why societies in which antiblack racism is hegemonic are also those in which racial moralizing dominates; moralizing stops at individuals at the expense of addressing institutions the transformation of which would make immoral individuals irrelevant. As a political problem, it demands a political solution. It is not accidental that blacks continue to be the continued exemplars of unrealized freedom and against whom violence is waged against appearance and speech. As so many from Ida B. Wells-Barnett to Angela Y. Davis, Michelle Alexander, Angela J. Davis, Noël Cazenave have shown the expansion of privatization and incarceration is squarely placed in a structure of states and civil societies premised on the limitations of freedom (Blacks)—ironically, as seen in countries such as South Africa and the United States, in the name of freedom. 21 That power is a facilitating or enabling phenomenon, a functional element of the human world, a viable response must be the establishment of relations that reach beyond the singularity of the body. I bring this up because proponents of Afropessimism might object to this analysis because of its appeal to a human world. If that world is abrogated, the site of struggle becomes that which is patently not human. It is not accidental that popular race discourse refers today to “black bodies” instead of “black people,” for instance. As the human world is discursive, social, and relational, this abandonment amounts to an appeal to the nonrelational, the incommunicability of radicalized singularity, and appeals to the body and its very limited reach, if not isolation. At that point, it is perhaps the psychologist, psychiatrist, or psychoanalyst who would be helpful, as turning radically inward offers the promise of despair, narcissistic delusions of divine power, and, as Fanon also observed, madness.22 Even if that slippery slope were rejected, the performative contradiction of attempting to communicate such singularity or absence thereof requires, at least for consistency, the appropriate course of action: silence. The remaining question for Afropessimism, especially those who are primarily academics, becomes this: Why write? It is a question for which, in both existential and political terms, I do not see how an answer could be given from an Afropessimistic perspective without the unfortunate revelation of cynicism. The marketability of Afropessimists in predominantly white institutions—perhaps as an exotic phenomenon that affirms white standpoints as ontological sites of legitimacy—is no doubt in the immediate and paradoxical satisfaction in dissatisfaction it offers. Indeed, if Afropessimists were correct, their only solace would be in black institutions, but that, too, would pose a problem since the argument is that such institutions lack agency because, as black, they are absent. This is not to say that critical black and Black thinkers should not do their work in predominantly white spaces. It is simply that the argument of the impossibility of their doing so makes their location in such places patently contradictory. We are at this point on familiar terrain. As with ancient logical paradoxes denying the viability of time and motion, the best option, after a moment of immobilized reflection, is, eventually, to move on, even where the pause is itself significant as an encomium of thought.

#### Government action works – defeatist attitudes ensure that the world stays the same.

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

But Goldwater failed to realize that governmental indifference can harden hearts, and government action can create conditions that soften them. People's attitudes aren't static or untouchable. They are molded by the quality of interactions with others, and one of the great powers of government involves shaping those interactions-not determining them in any concrete sense, but defining the parameters within which people come to know each other and live together. Today, for example, most Americans don't believe women should be confined to the home raising children, or subjected to crude advances and sexist remarks by men. The women's-rights movement put pressure on the government, which in turn passed laws that helped change some of our beliefs about women. Similarly, the relative progress of the 1960s did not happen merely by using the blunt instruments of the law. Change emerged from the ways those laws, with grassroots pressure, created new patterns of interactions, and ultimately new habits. Neither Obama's election to the presidency nor my appointment as a Princeton professor would have happened were it not for these new patterns and habits. None of this happens overnight. It takes time and increasing vigilance to protect and secure change. I was talking with a dose friend and he mentioned a basic fact: that we were only fifteen years removed from the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 when Ronald Reagan was elected president and Republicans began to dismantle the gains of the black freedom struggle. Civil rights legislation and the policies of the Great Society had just started to reshape our interactions when they started to be rolled back. We barely had a chance to imagine America anew-to pursue what full employment might look like, to let the abolition of the death penalty settle in, to question seriously the morality of putting people in prison cells, and to enact policies that would undo what the 1968 Kerner Commission described as "two Americas"­ before the attack on "big government" or, more precisely, the attack on racial equality was launched. The objective was to shrink the size of government ("to starve the beast") and to limit its domestic responsibilities to ensuring economic efficiency and national defense. Democrats eventually buckled, and this is the view of government, no matter who is in office, that we have today. It has become a kind of touchstone of faith among most Americans that government is wasteful and should be limited in its role-that it shouldn't intrude on our lives. Politicians aren't the only ones who hold this view. Many Americans do, too. Now we can't even imagine serious talk of things like full employment or the abolition of prisons. We have to change our view of government, especially when it comes to racial matters. Government policy ensured the vote for African Americans and dismantled legal segregation. Policy established a social safety net for the poor and elderly; it put in place the conditions for the growth of our cities. All of this didn't happen simply because of individual will or thanks to some abstract idea of America. It was tied up with our demands and expectations. Goldwater was wrong. So was Reagan. And, in many ways, so is Obama. Our racial habits are shaped by the kind of society in which we live, and our government plays a big role in shaping that society. As young children, our community offers us a way of seeing the world; it lets us know what is valuable and sacred, and what stands as virtuous behavior and what does not. When Michael Brown's body was left in the street for more than four hours, it sent a dear message about the value of black lives. When everything in our society says that we should be less concerned about black folk, that they are dangerous, that no specific policies can address their misery, we say to our children and to everyone else that these people are "less than"-that they fall outside of our moral concern. We say, without using the word, that they are niggers. One way to change that view is to enact policies that suggest otherwise. Or, to put it another way, to change our view of government, we must change our demands of government. For example, for the past fifty years African American unemployment has been twice that of white unemployment. The 2013 unemployment rate for African Americans stood at 13.1 percent, the highest annual black unemployment rate in more than seventy years. Social scientists do not generally agree on the causes of this trend. Some attribute it to the fact that African Americans are typically the "last hired and first fired." Others point to changes in the nature of the economy; still others point to overt racial discrimination in the labor market. No matter how we account for the numbers, the fact remains that most Americans see double-digit black unemployment as "normal." However, a large-scale, comprehensive jobs agenda with a living wage designed to put Americans, and explicitly African Americans, to work would go a long way toward uprooting the racial habits that inform such a view. It would counter the nonsense that currently stands as a reason for long-term black unemployment in public debate: black folk are lazy and don't want to work. If we hold the view that government plays a crucial role in ensuring the public good-if we believe that all Americans, no matter their race or class, can be vital contributors to our beloved community-then we reject the idea that some populations are disposable, that some people can languish in the shadows while the rest of us dance in the light. The question ''Am I my brother's or my sister's keeper?" is not just a question for the individual or a mantra to motivate the private sector. It is a question answered in the social arrangements that aim to secure the goods and values we most cherish as a community. In other words, we need an idea of government that reflects the value of all Americans, not just white Americans or a few people with a lot of money. We need government seriously committed to racial justice. As a nation, we can never pat ourselves on the back about racial matters. We have too much blood on our hands. Remembering that fact-our inheritance, as Wendell Berry said-does not amount to beating ourselves over the head, or wallowing in guilt, or trading in race cards. Remembering our national sins serves as a check and balance against national hubris. We're reminded of what we are capable of, and our eyes are trained to see that ugliness when it rears its head. But when we disremember-when we forget about the horrors of lynching, lose sight of how African Americans were locked into a dual labor market because of explicit racism, or ignore how we exported our racism around the world-we free ourselves from any sense of accountability. Concern for others and a sense of responsibility for the whole no longer matter. Cruelty and indifference become our calling cards. We have to isolate those areas in which long-standing trends of racial inequality short-circuit the life chances of African Americans. In addition to a jobs agenda, we need a comprehensive government response to the problems of public education and mass incarceration. And I do mean a government response. Private interests have overrun both areas, as privatization drives school reform (and the education of our children is lost in the boisterous battles between teachers' unions and private interests) and as big business makes enormous profits from the warehousing of black and brown people in prisons. Let's be clear: private interests or market-based strategies will not solve the problems we face as a country or bring about the kind of society we need. We have to push for massive government investment in early childhood education and in shifting the center of gravity of our society from punishment to restorative justice. We can begin to enact the latter reform by putting an end to the practice of jailing children. Full stop. We didn't jail children in the past. We don't need to now. In sum, government can help us go a long way toward uprooting racial habits with policies that support jobs with a living wage, which would help wipe out the historic double-digit gap between white and black unemployment; take an expansive approach to early childhood education, which social science research consistently says profoundly affects the life chances of black children; and dismantle the prison-industrial complex. We can no longer believe that disproportionately locking up black men and women constitutes an answer to social ills. This view of government cannot be dismissed as a naive pipe dream, because political considerations relentlessly attack our political imaginations and limit us to the status quo. We are told before we even open our mouths that this particular view won't work or that it will never see the light of day. We've heard enough of that around single payer health care reform and other progressive policies over the Obama years. Such defeatist attitudes conspire to limit our imaginations and make sure that the world stays as it is. But those of us who don't give a damn about the rules of the current political game must courageously organize, advocate, and insist on the moral and political significance of a more robust role for government. We have to change the terms of political debate. Something dramatic has to happen. American democracy has to be remade. John Dewey, the American philosopher, understood this: The very idea of democracy, the meaning of democracy, must be continually explored afresh; it has to be constantly discovered and rediscovered, remade and reorganized; while the political and economic and social institutions in which it is embodied have to be remade and reorganized to meet the changes that are going on in the development of new needs on the part of human beings and new resources for satisfying these needs. Dewey saw American democracy as an unfinished project. He knew that the aims and purposes of this country were not fixed forever in the founding documents, but the particular challenges of our moment required imaginative leaps on behalf of democracy itself. Otherwise, undemocratic forces might prevail; tyranny in the form of the almighty dollar and the relentless pursuit of it might overtake any commitment to the idea of the public good; and bad habits might diminish our moral imaginations. The remaking of America will not happen inside the Beltway. Too many there have too much invested in the status quo. A more robust idea of government will not emerge from the current political parties. Both are beholden to big money. Substantive change will have to come from us. Or, as the great civil rights leader Ella Baker said, "we are the leaders we've been looking for"-a model of leadership that scares the hell out of the Reverena Sharpton. We will have to challenge the status quo in the streets and at the ballot box. In short, it will take a full-blown democratic awakening to enact this revolution.

### 1NC- AT – transition wars

#### Democracy will not devolve into transition wars- it is resilient amidst breakdowns

Daniel Treisman 18, UCLA political science professor, 6-7-2018, “Is Democracy in Danger? A Quick Look at Data,” online pdf

Available measures suggest the proportion of democratic countries in the world today is at or near an all-time high. The few indicators that show some backsliding indicate only a return to the level of the 1990s, a time when liberal democracy was widely considered triumphant. The rate of increase has slowed. But this follows the stunning surge of democracy’s “third wave.” The rate of failures among existing democracies is close to that predicted by their levels of economic development, income growth, and past democratic experience. Moreover, whereas previous waves have been followed within 10-15 years by a significant fall in the proportion of democracies, that has not occurred this time, at least so far. Neither the rate of democratic breakdowns nor that of quality deteriorations in existing democracies is historically high. Previous literature and the survival models presented here confirm that high economic development, positive economic growth, and extensive democratic experience are associated with much lower odds of democratic breakdown. Based on such estimated relationships, the hazard of a breakdown in the US today appears extremely low. While some data suggest a weakening of commitment to democracy among parts of the US public—which is worrying in itself—it is hard to find any systematic evidence that low or falling public support for democracy causes democratic breakdowns. As for elite norms, Latin American countries where a radicalized military supported dictatorship have sometimes succumbed to antidemocratic coups. But excluding such extreme cases, the claim that eroding norms cause democracies to fail appears to rest on anecdotal evidence. Even if it does not constitute a general trend, deterioration in the quality of democracy in countries such as Hungary and Poland is obviously cause for concern, as is the reversion to authoritarianism in Russia and Turkey. It is certainly possible that a global slide in democracy has begun that will accelerate in coming years. It is also possible that US institutions will prove weaker than expected. Few democracies have been tested by the kind of demographic change forecast for coming decades, as the previously dominant race loses its majority status. Still it is important to distinguish between fears for the future and expectations that are reasonable based on available evidence. The historical record suggests that democracies like the US have inner resources that distinguish them from younger and poorer ones. They are far less vulnerable to destructive demagogues than much current commentary implies

#### But - capitalism is sustainable and only option to prevent catastrophic climate change.

Shi-Ling Hsu 21, D'Alemberte Professor of Law at the Florida State University College of Law, “2 How Capitalism Saves the Environment,” Capitalism and the Environment, Cambridge University Press, 10/31/2021, pp. 28–55

2.8 CHOOSING CAPITALISM TO SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT: LARGE-SCALE DEPLOYMENT

Finally, a third reason that capitalism is suited to the job of environmental restoration and protection is its ability to undertake and complete projects at very large scales. In keeping with a major thesis of this book, construction at very large scales should give us a little pause, because of the propensity of capital to metastasize into a source of political resistance to change. But some global problems, especially climate change, may require very large-scale enterprises. For example, because greenhouse gas emissions may already have passed a threshold for catastrophic climate change, technology is almost certainly needed to chemically capture carbon dioxide from ambient air. But carbon dioxide is only about 0.15% of ambient air by molecular weight, and a tremendous amount of ambient air must be processed just to capture a small amount of carbon dioxide. This technology has often been referred to as "direct air capture," or "carbon removal." Given that inherent limitation, direct air capture technology must be deployed at vast scales in order to make any appreciable difference in greenhouse gas concentrations. There is certainly no guarantee that direct air capture will be a silver bullet. But if it is to be an effectual item on a menu of survival techniques, it will more assuredly be accomplished under the incentives of a capitalist economy. Capitalism might also help with the looming crisis of climate change by helping to ensure the supply of vital life staples such as food, water, and other basic needs in future shortages caused by climate-change. In a climate-changed future, there is the distinct possibility that supplies of vital life staples may run short, possibly for long periods of time. Droughts are projected to last longer, with water supplies and growing conditions increasingly precarious. Capitalist enterprise could, first of all, provide the impetus to finally reform a dizzying multitude of price distortions that plague water supply and agriculture worldwide. Second, capitalist enterprise can undertake scale production of some emergent technologies that might alleviate shortages. Desalination technology can convert salty seawater into drinkable freshwater.54 A number of environmental and economic issues need to be solved to deploy these technologies at large scales, but in a crisis, solutions will be more likely to present themselves. A technology that is already being adopted to produce food is the modernized version of old-fashioned greenhouses. The tiny country of the Netherlands, with its 17 million people crowded onto 13,000 square miles, is the second largest food exporter in the world,55 exporting fully three-quarters that of the United States in 2017.56 The secret to Dutch agriculture is its climate-controlled, low-energy green-houses that project solar panel-powered artificial sunlight around the clock. Dutch greenhouses produce lettuce at ten times the yield57 and tomatoes at fifteen times the yield outdoors in the United States58 while using less than one-thirteenth the amount of water,59 very little in the way of synthetic pesticides and, of course, very little fertilizer given its advanced composting techniques. Sustained shortages in a climate-changed future might require that a capitalist take hold of greenhouse growing and expand production to feed the masses that might otherwise revolt. 2.9 CHOOSE CAPITALISM Clearly, the job in front of humankind is enormous, complex, and many-faceted. The best hope is to be able to identify certain human impacts that are clearly harmful to the global environment, and to disincentivize them. Getting back to notions of institutions in capitalism, what is crucial is aligning the right incentives with profit-making activity. What capitalism does so well — beyond human comprehension — is coordinate activity and send broad signals about scarcity. Information about a wide variety of environmental phenomena is extremely difficult to collect and process. If a set of environmental taxes can help establish a network of environ-mental prices, then an unfathomably large and complex machinery will have been set in motion in the right direction. Also, because of the need for new scientific solutions to this daunting list of problems, new science and technology is desperately needed. Capitalism is tried and true in terms of producing innovation. Again drawing upon the study of institutions, it is not so much that individuals need a profit-motive in order to tinker, but the prospect of profit-making has to be present in order for institutions, including corporations, to devote resources, attention, and energy towards the development of solutions to environmental problems. Corporations can and should demonstrate social responsibility by attempting to mitigate their impacts on the global environment, but a much more conscious push for new knowledge, new techniques, and new solutions are needed. Finally, the scale of needed change is profound. Huge networks of infrastructure centered upon a fossil fuel-centered economy must somehow be replaced or adapted to new ways of generating, transmitting, consuming, and storing energy. A global system of feeding seven billion humans (and counting), unsustainable on its face, must be morphed into something else that can fill that huge role. About a billion and a half cars and trucks in the world must, over time, be swapped out for vehicles that must be dramatically different. This is a daunting to-do list, but look a bit more carefully among the gloomy news. Elon Musk, a freewheeling, pot-smoking entrepreneur shows signs of breaking into not one, but two industries dominated by behemoths with political power. Thanks to California emissions standards, automobile manufacturers have developed cars that emit a fraction of what they did less than a generation ago. Hybrid electric vehicles have thoroughly penetrated an American market that powerful American politicians had tried to cordon off for American manufacturers only. At least two companies have developed meat substitutes that are now widely judged to be indistinguishable from meat, and have established product outposts in the ancient power centers of fast food, McDonald's and Burger King. The tiny country of the Netherlands, about half the size of West Virginia, exports almost as much food as the United States, able to ship fresh produce all the way to Africa. At bottom, all of these accomplishments and thousands more are and were capitalist in nature. While they collectively repre-sent a trifle of what still needs to be accomplished, they were also undertaken without the correct incentives in place, and thus also represent the tremendous promise of capitalism.

### 1NC – AT – Anarchy

#### Your guerilla tactics get put down HARD by the government

Culper 19 [Samuel, former soldier, Intelligence NCO, “Thoughts on “CIVIL WAR 2 in America – WHO WOULD WIN?” Video,” *Forward Observer*, 6/18/19, https://forwardobserver.com/thoughts-on-civil-war-2-in-america-who-would-win-video/]

I’m reminded of the Clausewitz quote, “Everything in war is very simple, but the simplest thing is difficult.” In other words, thinking through and executing a war is easier said than done. The killing people part can be commonly understood, but winning a war is actually very complex. That tends to glossed over when talking about conflict, especially “Civil War 2,” which is why this topic has become a pet peeve of mine. What really piqued my interest about this particular is that it’s supposedly an “in-depth analysis,” a point on which I disagree. I found it to be very superficial. And I don’t mean to be rude or condescending, I just think for as complete as its being sold, it lacks a lot of important factors, which I’ll detail below. And that’s not to make light of the serious points discussed, but I’ll point out some glaring flaws of the thinking here, along with time stamps. (John Mark, if you read this or if someone can get us in touch, there are a lot of things to consider when thinking through a conflict scenario. You’ve considered a lot of factors. I believe you’re missing some critical ones. I do this for a living, and I’d be happy to talk with you about your video and matrix.) First, let me start off by saying I agree with a few things. 1. Many Americans on both sides are angry at each other. 2. Demographically speaking, the Left is going to be able to achieve one-party rule within the next 10 years. (The next time they get power, they can push through amnesty and create a permanent majority. My thoughts on this point are covered here, from April 2018.) 3. Trump very well could be the last Republican president, which I’ve pointed out numerous times on this Dispatch blog. Now let’s get into what wrong, which is a lot… ~4:00: John Mark begins reading off this alleged “red team” (RT) planner’s analysis. RT makes the statement: “The moment civil war is declared, the government loses,” which is patently false. Let’s consider that the government is full of bureaucrats, many (possibly most) of whom are Left Wing apparatchiks, as evidenced by how President Trump finds it so difficult to get mid-level apparatchiks to implement the policies with which they disagree. Unlike you, they will keep their jobs during this war. I would push back on the idea that the federal government is completely helpless because government controls financial institutions: bank accounts, 401ks, IRAs, other retirement accounts and pensions, etc. An enormous amount of power and influence can be brought to bear against those involved in a legitimate civil war. (Side note: If you expect to fight in this civil war, you might want to cash out before it happens.) Under a Democratic president, that power and influence would absolutely target the ‘domestic terrorists’. We’re talking about easy territory for Emergency Powers, in which the finances of those involved would be immediately frozen and probably confiscated. That means in addition to being on the run from at least federal law enforcement (if not parts of the military), you have no job, you have no income, you have no access to your finances, you will lose your house, your family’s well-being will be put in jeopardy, and that’s going to keep a lot of people out of this supposed fight. We’re not talking about millions of Americans walking away from their jobs, or taking time off work, to go fight in some fantasy civil war. And it’s incredibly short-sighted to think that any force opposing the federal government would win in the snap of some fingers, as RT alleges. We’re not looking at a high intensity, conventional war. It’s not going to happen. What’s far more likely is that states or regions disassociate themselves from federal authority and decouple from the Union, if a war were to occur. But, again, I’d point out that so many Americans are so dependent on a functioning national economy and our financial system that there’s too much at risk for most people to get involved at any level. This is going to bring financial hardships that most have not considered. You have to understand that a conventional war like the one John Mark and RT are talking about would be the end of trillions of dollars of financial interests. Win, lose, or draw, it means losing everything because a left wing government is not going to allow ‘domestic terrorists’ to have comfortable lives. They will immediately seek ways to raise the cost of your involvement, and they need the money, anyway. Stealing your bank accounts and retirement savings is a no-brainer. 6:20: “[Disrupting public utilities like electricity] would also turn the people against the government more quickly and paralyze the government’s propaganda machine.” I’ve been to Iraq and Afghanistan where utilities were disrupted by insurgents. The people didn’t blame the government for the attacks. They mostly blamed the Americans, followed by the insurgents. Even if attacks to take down the grid were successful, we’re again talking about the immediate loss of trillions of dollars in financial interests. You are not going to be heralded as the saviors of the country. You are going to be seen as domestic terrorists, and you’re going to piss off a lot of people — including law enforcement, military, and others who may have nominally been on your side, but who’s lives will be vastly more difficult because they no longer have their livelihoods, retirements, pensions, or benefits. And now their families are put at risk because you took away the last part of convenient life they had. I also need to point out that John Mark gives a “big advantage” to the right wing in their ability to take out the power grid. Furthermore, John Mark says of this: “The Left establishment and the military have no equivalent ability to create such a big bang for buck type activity [sic] or leverage over the grassroots right wing revolutionaries.” Wrong. You know what’s easier than taking out the power grid? The government selectively turning off parts of the grid under its emergency powers. The power goes down in areas where the uprisings are the worst and the government lets the people know that the power comes back on as soon as the uprising is quelled. This happens around the world all the time. It’s a standard procedure, along with cell services. That’s a lot of people who want a return to normalcy and who are now turned against the insurgents. That’s a lot of people turning on the insurgents so they can get their lives restored. 8:00: RT then goes on to describe that government studies show that 30 percent of the American public would join a revolution against the government. I can’t confirm or deny that, and neither can RT without some evidence. (Does John Mark even mention where he found RTs post?) We’d have to break down this 30 percent along the lines of what we know to be true about modern civil wars: only a small fraction does any of the fighting. Maybe one percent on average, certainly no more than five percent. The rest would provide what’s called “combat support” or “combat service support.” Transportation, logistics, sabotage, propaganda, etc. — the other two sides of the three-part insurgency (guerrilla fighters, the underground, the auxiliary). Read this for additional information. RT claims that, historically, you only need 10 percent of a population to participate in an armed rebellion in order to win. One of the most preeminent thinkers and strategists on guerrilla warfare, USMC Brigadier General Samuel Griffith and his studies show that popular support from 15-25 percent of the population is the bottom of what’s required for a successful insurgency. I don’t know where RT got his information, but I’m willing to share my citations if he’ll share his. John Mark claims that 10-15 million Americans consider themselves Alt-Right, which was probably based on the famous 2016 poll, back when Alt-Right still meant merely ‘fed up with the GOP establishment,’ instead of the association with white nationalism that it carries today. Maybe there are legitimately 10-15 million white nationalists in America, but they’re geographically dispersed and have negligible political power. And the establishment is dead set on limiting their influence. Even if that number were 15 million, the Alt-Right represents less than five percent of the American populace — which is far short of what’s required for a successful insurgency. In other words, a “white nationalist civil war” is not going to happen. A “conservative civil war” is only slightly more likely, as I’ll explain below. When viewed in proper context, the point John Mark is actually making favors secession or a regional conflict with a higher likelihood of success… which is a far more likely possibility than a conventional, nationwide, coast to coast civil war, which is just bonkers to consider. 11:45: RT points out that the U.S. is among the world’s largest arms manufacturers. In the event of a civil war, the federal government would immediately move to shut down and confiscate production. In the lead up, there would likely be laws and additional regulations, which would ironically accelerate the conflict. Either way, these factories won’t be churning out arms during the conflict. On the topic of 4GW and Afghanistan, the thinking here is incredibly, incredibly short-sighted and people who say these things have no clue what they’re talking about. YES, the Taliban has run circles around U.S. Forces in Afghanistan but let’s keep in mind a few things… – The kill ratio for U.S. soldiers is something like 30:1. That is, 30 Taliban killed for every one U.S. soldier. U.S. Forces win a large majority of tactical engagements. By a landslide, it’s not even close. Tactically, no one is better than the U.S. military. Afghanistan was a strategic loss due to politics, the doctrinal failures of nation building, and our “security partners” in the Afghan military and government, 90% of whom were too incompetent and/or too corrupt to win. – U.S. Forces were greatly limited by resources and manpower in Afghanistan. Nearly everything soldiers used or consumed was flown or driven in from out of country. That won’t be the case in the United States. – This is probably the greatest differing factor: Had Afghanistan ubiquitously adopted social media like Americans, that war would have been over in weeks. If I, as a targeting intelligence analyst, had access to years worth of Facebook photos and check-ins, Twitter posts, YouTube videos, Instagram photos, and other information, we could have mapped out insurgent cells in hours. (In fact, there’s software that can automatically do that for you.) Access to that kind of data is a targeteer’s dream. You throw in Google data, cell phone geolocation, Ancestry DNA, and people who know you and also hate you, and we’re talking about an incredible amount of targeting intelligence — not to mention some of it would be real-time. Yes, there are frustrations with that volume of information and those kinds of data, but most people who engage in the “civil war” talk don’t understand how radically their lives would have to change in order to avoid being killed or captured. John Mark and whoever else can talk about 4GW as much as they want, but if that’s as much as you understand about warfighting and how wars are executed in real life, you don’t know enough.

#### No chance any grab for power succeeds – politics and coalition building are the only tools that have a chance.

Fredrik deBoer 16, Limited-Term Lecturer, Introductory Composition at Purdue Program, 3/15/16, “c’mon, guys,” <http://fredrikdeboer.com/2016/03/15/cmon-guys/>

I could be wrong about the short-term dangers, and the stakes are incredibly high. But in the end we’re left with the same old question: what tactics will actually work to secure a better world?

In a sharp, sober piece about the meaning of left-wing political violence in the 1970s, Tim Barker writes “If you can’t acknowledge radical violence, radicals are reduced to mere victims of repression, rather than political actors who made definite tactical choices under given political circumstances.” The problem, as Barker goes on to imply, is those tactical choices: in today’s America they will essentially never break on the side of armed opposition against the state. The government knows everything about you, I’m sorry to say, your movements and your associations and the books you read and the things you buy and what you’re saying to the people you communicate with. That’s simply on the level of information, before we even get to the state’s incredible capacity to inflict violence. Look, the world has changed. The relative military capacity of regular people compared to establishment governments has changed, especially in fully developed, technology-enabled countries like the United States. The Czar had his armies, yes, but the Czar’s armies depended on manpower above and beyond everything else. The fighting was still mostly different groups of people with rifles shooting at each other. If tomorrow you could rally as many people as the Bolsheviks had at their revolutionary peak, you’re still left in a world of F-15s, drones, and cluster bombs. And that’s to say nothing of the fact that establishment governments in the developed world can rely on the numbing agents of capitalist luxuries and the American dream to damper revolutionary enthusiasm even among the many millions who have been marginalized and impoverished. This just isn’t 1950s Cuba, guys. It’s just not. In a very real way, modern technology effectively lowers the odds of armed political revolution in a country like the United States to zero, and so much the worse for us. This isn’t fatalism. It doesn’t mean there’s no hope. It means that there is little alternative to organization, to changing minds through committed political action and using the available nonviolent means to create change: a concert of grassroots organizing, labor tactics, and partisan politics. Those things aren’t exactly likely to work, either, but they’re a hell of a lot more plausible than us dweebs taking the Pentagon. Bernie Sanders isn’t really a socialist, but he’s a social democrat that moves the conversation to the left, and if people are dedicated and committed to organizing, the local, state, and national candidates he inspires will move it further to the left still. You got any better suggestions? Listen, commie nerds. My people. I love you guys. I really do. And I want to build a better world. Not incrementally, either, but with the kind of sweeping and transformative change that is required to fix a world of such deep injustice. But seriously: none of us are ever going to take to the barricades. And it’s a good thing, too, because we’d probably find a way to shoot in the wrong direction. I can’t dribble a basketball without falling down. American socialism is largely made up of bookish dreamers. I love those people but they’re not for fighting. And even if you have a particular talent for combat, you’re looking at fighting the combined forces of Google, Goldman Sachs, and the defense industry. Violence is hard. Soldiering is hard. In an era of the NSA and military robots, it’s really, really hard. “Should we condone revolutionary violence?” is dorm room, pass-the-bong conversation fodder, of precisely the moral and intellectual weight of “should we torture a guy if we know there’s a bomb and we know he knows where it is and we know we can stop it if we do?” It’s built on absurd hypotheticals, propped up by the power of anxious machismo, and undertaken to no practical political end. It’s understandable. I get it, I really do. But it’s got nothing to do with us. The only way forward is the grubby, unsexy work of building coalitions and asking people to climb on board.

#### Even if they win their harms, they can’t solve it: anarchist cooperative politics is incapable of resisting the macro-level global forces of capitalist competition.

Wigger & Buch-Hansen 13 [Angela, Assoc Prof in Global Political Economy at Radboud Univ, Hubert, Assoc Prof of International Political Economy at the Copenhagen Business School, “Competition, the Global Crisis, and Alternatives to Neoliberal Capitalism: A Critical Engagement with Anarchism,” *New Political Science* 35.4, p.623-5, JCR]

However, whilst such cooperative production forms might certainly be less exploitative, they hardly break with the imperatives of the competitive accumulation of capital. As noted by Joseph Kay, “the assets of a co-op do not cease being capital when votes are taken on how they are used within a society of generalized production and wage labour.”94 In order to survive, horizontally organized production collectives have to produce sufficient surplus value to maintain or expand their market shares through re-investments. For the sake of competitive prices, workers who collectively own the means of production may conform themselves to austerity measures such as cutbacks in employment or wages, and hence subjugate themselves to collective self-exploitation. The coercive forces of competition can contradict the organizational democratic core principles and values. This is evidenced by existing cooperatives that follow market terms and compete with capitalist companies (as well as among themselves), including those in Emilia Romagna, but also cooperatives in Cleveland or the renowned Mondragon Corporation in the Basque region. Mondragon, for example has pursued international growth strategies by establishing affiliated subsidiary companies and outsourcing production to China, Mexico, Poland, Brazil, or the Czech Republic where unskilled or semiskilled labor is cheap.95 Rather than expanding solely through greenfield investments to enhance North–South cooperation, Mondragon proceeded through joint ventures and mergers and acquisitions.96 Although no Basque plants have been closed down, the actual cooperative member employment accounts for only 30%, while external non-member employment is on an upward trend.97 In other words, self-managed and democratically run production collectives frequently have no choice but to adapt to capitalist reality and to outsource to cheap labor areas, expand sales, profits and growth, and hence to compete. Competition operates at a systemic macro level and this is where the ontological focus of anarchist alternatives is reaching its limits. The centrifugal forces of competition at systemic level are difficult to shake off, particularly under current conditions of globalized neoliberal capitalism. This raises doubts about whether self-managed democratic production collectives alone have the potential to transform the existing socio-economic order. Anarchist theory and practice might not have the ambition to tackle problems that require a macro-systemic solution when probing alternatives. However, as a genuine societal reorientation of the organization of the economy cannot emerge from the micro level alone, anarchists need to redefine their terrain of social struggle. Building up new market institutions can facilitate a cultural change that gives centrality to anarchist values and principles. This requires institutions that assess, guide, supervise, and limit competition at local, regional, and global levels. Thinking beyond the local or regional level entails however a democratic dilemma, as local or regional (direct) democratic decision-making and action cannot extend beyond certain (territorial) boundaries. While horizontal and direct democratic solutions offer patent solutions for the organization of production at micro level, curbing competition requires some degree of hierarchical higher-order and centralized governance at the macro level. This does not imply that such institutions should resemble the “politically independent” agencies that are currently in charge of enforcing competition rules in a top-down manner. Precisely because the scope of competition and its regulation are inherently political, competition controlling instances should be democratized, be accountable and transparent and the content of competition rules be subject to democratic mediation and open to periodic re-evaluation and adjustment. In other words, democratically run production collectives require democratically accountable controlling instances. At the macro level however, nested and hierarchical structures are indispensable. Anarchist types of direct democracy and the ideal of constant communication become unmanageable when tackling macro-level problems. This may sound like an anathema to anarchist thinking, but horizontal organizational forms should not become a fetish either. 98 Local micro-level initiatives do not exist in isolation, and without linking the local to the global, the local can too easily be defeated. In fact, a range of anarchists have thought through how to link the local to the global. Proudhon, and with him many anarcho-syndicalists, suggested that workers should form local sovereign associations that are organized bottom-up and linked up through re-callable delegates in regional councils. In the vision of Proudhon, these associations would come together in a grand international agroindustrial federation.99 By following the principle of subsidiarity in decisionmaking, the larger units in the federation would have the fewest powers and be subordinated to the lower (local) levels, leaving the anarcho-syndicalist federation with the task of mere coordination.100 The utopian vision of a libertarian “municipal confederalism” by Bookchin expresses basically the same idea. Bookchin envisaged a replacement of the state by direct-democratic open municipal assemblies, which through recallable delegates participate at confederal assemblies where higher-order decisions are taken.101 By interlinking municipal citizens’ assemblies via a coordinating and administrating confederation, power would flow bottom-up rather than top-down. A concise roadmap on how to get there would be beyond the scope of this article, but these are issues that deserve consideration. New alliances between social forces that proactively and continuously support and discuss alternatives—and that eventually coalesce into a broader movement—are indispensable. The outlined alternative to the existing neoliberal competition order could provide a certain degree of thematic unity and coherence that disparate progressive social forces could subscribe to or simply reflect upon and discuss. As Erik Olin Wright has noted: “diagnosis and critique of society tells us why we want to leave the world in which we live; the theory of alternatives tells us where we want to go; and the theory of transformation tells us [ . . .] how to make viable alternatives achievable.”102 This article departed from an explanatory critique of capitalist competition from a historical materialist perspective and subsequently argued that anarchist-inspired utopian thinking provides a challenging and exciting avenue for exploring a post-neoliberal and for that matter post-capitalist alternative economic order. Anarchists make an important point in disdaining clear-cut blueprints and in favoring a myriad of different types of economic arrangements—arrangements that go beyond production for the sake of profits and that revolve around democratically managed horizontal production collectives. However, past and existing practices need to be subjected to a critical evaluation when exploring alternatives. This article has argued that by quintessentially limiting the focus to micro-contexts, anarchists frequently miss out exploring important questions on how local practices can be linked to the global economy. Particularly, when envisioning a non-capitalist economy, anarchists have not sufficiently dealt with competition and its profoundly global dimension. While competition, in the form of industrial emulation as Marx called it, cannot and maybe also should not be abandoned completely, competition nonetheless needs to be limited geographically and to surplus production only. Profound changes in the social relations of production and the emergence of a no-growth economy require a cultural change—a change that gives preeminence to values and principles central to anarchism, such as equity, solidarity, cooperation, mutual aid, and environmental sustainability, rather than cut-throat competition. Anarchists are correct to point out that there is no such thing as an instantaneous and grand transformation and that a new order will have to be built from existing social structures. One way to get there is to build new democratically managed competition-controlling institutions that embody anarchist values and logics. Given the macro-level nature of competition, such institutions have to extend from the local to the regional and global level, and hence require a certain degree of nested governance structures.

#### No spillover solvency – there’s no internal link between micropolitical interruption and macropolitical change. The claim that it’s a “prerequisite” is the link to our arg

Carrabregu 13 (Gent Carrabregu, MA, PhD candidate in political science at Northwestern, “The Democratic Limits of the Ethical Turn-Myers's Worldly Ethics,” Theory & Event Volume 16, Issue 3, 2013)

In the hands of William Connolly's agonistic pluralism, the Foucauldian ethics of self-care is tied more explicitly to democratic practice, which is a most welcome move, even if it continues to beg the question. For Myers, **the problem is two-fold**. **First**, **what is the ground on the basis of which arts of self-craftsmanship aiming at micropolitical interventions on the self can provide an impetus to collective political mobilization**; and **secondly, why should we expect that**, in case they do, they will produce recognizable democratic effects instead of leading to **cynical withdrawal** or **narcissistic self-absorption**. In her view, when Connolly ties his analysis to actual political movements, such as the movement for the right to die, micropolitical interventions on the self will lead to democratic collective action because "they work in tandem" with political movements that engage something in the world by effecting its transformation from a matter of fact to a matter of common concern; but this is not something that can be conceptually underwritten, Myers insists, by his commitment to an ethics of self-care. Indeed, such a commitment puts Connolly at odds with the aims of a **political ethics oriented toward the world because**, more often than not, **it leads to a privileging of "action by the self on itself as a starting point and necessary prelude to macropolitical change"** (44). **This order of priority**, whether conceptual or chronological, **is not something that a conception of political ethics oriented toward care for the world,** such as Myers's "worldly ethics," **can possibly embrace.** On the other hand, the Levinasian conception of ethics, viewed through the lens of care for the world and the picture of associative democracy with which it seeks to captivate our political imagination, is just the other side of the ethical turn's coin. In addition to the similar questions already begged by Foucault's and Connolly's ethics of self-care, Levinasian ethics introduces yet another problematic and question-begging feature: namely, the "unequal dyadic model of charitable obligation" (62). This model that underwrites Levinas's conception of ethics as infinite responsibility to the singular Other is questionable before the bar of critical democratic reason for three interrelated reasons. First, it is anti-egalitarian insofar as it posits a hierarchical relationship between benefactor and recipient; second, it is mostly concerned with the direct fulfillment of basic needs (food, shelter, etc.); and finally, it is not clear whether there is anything political about it given that philanthropic altruism is quite a private affair (71-73). Levinas's later attention to the image of "the third," which some commentators point out to make the case for the political relevance of Levinasian ethics, does not seem convincing to Myers. While it might point to Levinas's acknowledgment that the world involves "multiple Others," this acknowledgment is not yet tied to politics in any recognizable way (68). Especially problematic, even in the face of acknowledging "the third," remains Levinas's rather Platonic view of ethics as the guardian of politics, regulating it by providing benchmarks for its evaluation (67). While certainly going beyond many aspects of Levinas's basic ethical project, Simon Critchley and Judith Butler remain bound to certain Levinasian prejudices that do not quite liberate democratic politics from the straightjacket of "ethics-as-first-philosophy." In the case of Critchley's attempt to link Levinasian ethical insights to democratic politics the main problem seems to be his "elision of the difference between charitable ethics and associative democracy" (71). Such an elision means that Critchley cannot provide an adequate answer to the basic problem of impetus: namely, why should an individual's acceptance of a radical demand to care for a singular Other lead to participation in the collective, democratizing efforts Critchley admires so much? In Myers's view, this lack of proper acknowledgment of the difference between ethics and politics is inherited from a Levinasian figure of thought-namely, the hierarchical relation between ethics and politics, which Critchley re-articulates by conceiving ethics as providing democracy with a "metapolitical moment," which it cannot provide if leftto its own resources (71). While certainly committed to admirable forms of democratic political action, such as the protest movement against the World Trade Organization, it is not clear that Critchley's anarchist politics can be abetted by a conception of ethics that remains heavily indebted to Levinasian tropes. If Critchley's loyalty to Levinas's "unequal dyadic model of charitable obligation" makes him subject to democratic deficits very similar to those of Levinas's original conception, Butler's ethics of universal vulnerability is a more complex elaboration precisely insofar as she departs from the letter of Levinas's ethics, if not exactly from its spirit. Most importantly for Myers, Butler's ethics avoids the hierarchical model of charity by making the singular Other into a generalizable Other standing for the universally shared human condition of vulnerability (78, 79). In addition to this egalitarian ontology of finitude, Butler's close attention to the way precariousness is politically distributed, and the way in which social norms that govern the intelligibility of suffering and pain may de-realize the sufferings of certain powerless groups of people, point clearly toward an admirable political awareness that adopts the right attitude toward the world that Myers wants us to always keep in mind (80). And yet this otherwise admirable reworking of Levinas does not convince her, mainly because no adequate answer is elaborated to address her recurring question of the precise link between this picture of human precariousness and the agency of democratic actors seeking to transform the world in praiseworthy ways. What exactly necessitates the movement from an "affirmation of vulnerability as an unavoidable existential truth" to the injunction to pursue an egalitarian distribution of precariousness is not a question that is answered by Butler (79). Neither is it clear to Myers, unless it might be a case of "cynicism or despair about the possibilities of democratic mobilization," why an ethical imperative beyond politics should be appealing to a thinker, such as Butler, otherwise so attuned to the political workings of normative violence (81). To think beyond the influential yet **problematic therapeutic and charitable models** offered by the ethical turn, Myers thinks we need to begin by **making ethical reflection subordinate to the needs of "associative democracy," understood as collaborative and contentious engagement in the informal political public sphere,** where it is **"a common object in the world" that connects and divides democratic actors**. We need, as it were, a gestalt switch from "ethics-as-first philosophy" to something like **"politics-as-first philosophy."** If we follow her on that front, a conception of ethics as **"care for the world" will begin to emerge.** Unlike the therapeutic and charitable models, this conception of ethics is based on Arendt's notion of love of the world (amor mundi). As a result, **democratic care for the world "is collaborative, expressed in joint action by plural participants"** (86). **In this conception of ethics, the agents and recipients also change. Instead of an individual self caring for himself or for an other singular self, we have an association of selves caring for the world**, understood as "the array of material and immaterial conditions under which human beings live," which is both our home and the mediating space (Arendt's Zwischenraum) between us. The payoff of this alternative for democratic politics, we are told, is consequential for instead of caring for the problem of hunger by engaging **only in therapeutic micropolitical interventions in one's self** (say, fasting) or only on the alleviation of the pain of the Other, worldly ethics makes us **turn to "the collective conditions, including worldly practices, habits, and laws, out of which hunger is born"** (109).