# AT: CAP

## Cap Good

### Peace

#### Cap sustains peace – economic cost, resource drain, and market checks and balances dissuade conflict

Friedman, 10 --- Uri Friedman is the managing editor at the Atlantic Council and a contributing writer at The Atlantic. He was previously a staff writer and the Global editor at The Atlantic, and the deputy managing editor at Foreign Policy magazine. (Uri Friedman, "Capitalism's Most Overlooked Benefit: Peace", 12-17-2010, Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2010/12/capitalism-s-most-overlooked-benefit-peace/339363/)//EG

In discussing capitalism's attributes, [argues](http://spectator.org/archives/2010/12/15/capitalisms-gift-of-peace) J.T. Young at The American Spectator, we too often forget about peace: Virtually all conflicts of the last century have been initiated by fettered market, authoritarian states. Often the world's armed conflicts have been between two such regimes. Contrastingly, military conflicts have almost never pitted two capitalist, democratic nations against one another. Socialist, communist, fascist, or simply non-ideological dictator-governed nations have almost always been the world's aggressors. When capitalist democracies are drawn into armed conflict, it is almost always against such economically-fettered nations. To prove his point, Young, who's worked in the federal government and on Capitol Hill, points to the Korean Peninsula: "In South Korea, a capitalist market, open society, and democracy exist. In North Korea, a closed market, closed society, and totalitarian regime exist. You also have a stark distinction between peace and war." For capitalist countries, Young says, war is a **terrible economic investment**, since **resources** are **deployed for unproductive** rather than productive **ends**. War only becomes an option when the long-term costs of an enemy's continued aggression outweigh the short-term costs of resisting it. The economic calculation for non-capitalist nations is reversed, he continues. Since, by definition, their economies are not allocating resources optimally, conflict is actually the best economic investment. Young adds that free markets are also likely to create free political systems whose **checks and balances make it difficult for the government to go to war** or remain at war for a protracted period of time, whereas the opposite is true in societies with "fettered markets." After citing the economists Milton Friedman and Frederick Hayek to support his claims, Young concludes: "capitalism is frequently credited with only the most prosaic of goals and ends in society. In fact, it is really the **protector of society's most sublime goals**."

### AT: Ukraine proves cap X= peace

#### Ukraine proves high economic impacts of war limit combat capabilities and doom countries – sends a signal

**Alden, 4/11** --- Edward Alden is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, a visiting professor at Western Washington University, and the author of, "Failure to Adjust: How Americans Got Left Behind in the Global Economy.”(Edward Alden, "Perspective", 4-11-2022, Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/04/11/russia-china-peace-capitalism/)//EG

Despite these dispiriting developments, though, it is too soon to declare that the heirs of Kant have failed. Russian arms have proved deficient in Ukraine, but the power of money has never been more on display. Sanctions against Russia have cut off access to hundreds of billions of dollars of its central bank reserves, crashing the value of the ruble (it has recovered only because of [capital controls](https://www.reuters.com/business/russias-rouble-rebound-is-not-real-it-seems-2022-04-01/) that make the currency all but worthless outside Russia). Russia’s manufacturing industries, from steel to cars, have ground to a halt since the flows of Western parts and technology have ceased and foreign markets have been blocked. Its citizens have lost access to most Western goods and services — companies including McDonald’s, H&M, Visa and Mastercard [have left](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/russia-moscow-western-business/?itid=lk_inline_manual_8). Thousands of Russians have already [fled the country](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-60697763) in what is looking like a massive brain drain of the nation’s best and brightest. The Institute of International Finance forecasts that Russia’s economy will contract nearly 18 percent by the end of 2023, wiping out the [last 15 years](https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/putin-s-war-seen-wiping-out-15-years-of-russian-economic-growth-1.1742386) of economic growth. China, which only months ago declared its friendship with Russia to be “without limits,” is watching closely. While it appears to have adhered to Western sanctions against Russia, capital has nonetheless [been flowing out of China](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-03-24/china-sees-unprecedented-capital-outflow-since-war-iif-says). Investors, seeing massive losses in Russia, are recalculating the risks they face in authoritarian countries. If China were hit with similar sanctions, it would have many more economic weapons to fight back than Russia does. China’s economy is more diversified; its trade with the ASEAN nations is now larger than with either the United States or Europe. It has invested heavily in developing countries through its [Belt and Road Initiative](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/five-myths/five-myths-about-chinas-belt-and-road-initiative/2019/05/30/d6870958-8223-11e9-bce7-40b4105f7ca0_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_9), and those countries might be reluctant to enforce Western sanctions. And China has a near monopoly in some critical sectors, such as the processing of [rare-earth metals](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-rareearth-explainer/explainer-chinas-rare-earth-supplies-could-be-vital-bargaining-chip-in-u-s-trade-war-idUSKCN1T00EK), a vital component of many consumer products including electric and hybrid vehicles, and for military applications such as jet engines and satellites. But China still relies on the West for the most advanced technologies, especially [semiconductor equipment](https://www.brookings.edu/techstream/lagging-but-motivated-the-state-of-chinas-semiconductor-industry/) and fabrication capabilities. In an economic conflict, its vulnerabilities exceed its strengths. [*Russia’s military losses give diplomacy a fighting chance*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/04/01/negotiations-russia-ukraine/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_10) The West’s economic embrace of China and Russia, of course, was not all about peace. Businesses have profited handsomely. Former German chancellor Gerhard Schröder became board chairman of the Russian oil giant Rosneft, and he used his close relationship with Putin to champion the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline project, which Germany halted just before Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. U.S. companies lobbied furiously to bring China into the WTO, lured by cheap labor and the huge Chinese consumer market. It is easy to see how Putin would miscalculate, believing corporate interests to be so strong in the West that governments would be dissuaded from truly damaging sanctions. But those profits are exactly the point. Economic interdependence breeds peace only if the costs of breaking those ties are high enough — and just as important, if all sides *recognize* that the costs are high enough. If the West can remain united on sanctions in response to the invasion of Ukraine — a big if as energy prices soar and inflation hurts consumers — Russia will pay high and sustained costs. That cooperation is already being tested as pressure is growing in Europe to cut off gas and oil imports from Russia in the wake of the Bucha massacre, which Germany fears would throw its economy into recession. But a demonstration of unity may discourage Xi from following Putin’s example. [*We can do more to help Ukraine without provoking World War III*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/03/11/ukraine-no-fly-escalation-humanitarian/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_14) To prevent wavering, the United States and its allies should be working to ensure that economic vulnerabilities are as one-sided as possible. The Biden administration is properly seeking to bring home production in strategic industries such as semiconductors and electric-vehicle batteries, while denying the most advanced U.S. technologies to China and Russia. It is cooperating with Europe to find alternatives to Russian oil and gas as quickly as possible. The administration should also put aside its affinity for narrow “Buy American” approaches and pursue “[friendshoring](https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/public-sector/government-trends/2022/reshoring-global-supply-chains.html)” — working with allies to build up critical supply chains and limit Chinese and Russian economic leverage. And it should work with partners to minimize the harm from sanctions in the developing world. The Kantian ideal has certainly been damaged; the line between economic interdependence and peace is at best a crooked one. But the power of money has also been reinforced by the robust Western response. Demonstrating **the high economic price that countries will face for choosing war remains one of the best ways of sustaining peace**

### Environment

#### Yale and CoC study shows Capitalist countries have higher scores in environmental performance

Zitelmann, 21 --- Zitelmann studied history and political science, graduating with a doctorate “summa cum laude” in 1986. In 2016, Zitelmann was awarded his second doctorate, this time in sociology. (Rainer Zitelmann, "Capitalism is good, not bad, for the environment", 8/21/21, Washington Examiner, https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/capitalism-is-good-not-bad-for-the-environment)//EG

Every year, the Heritage Foundation ranks countries around the world on their economic freedom. It's a kind of capitalism [index](https://www.heritage.org/index/). But analysis shows that the most economically "free" countries also register the highest scores on Yale University’s EPI environmental [index](https://epi.yale.edu/), averaging 76.1, while "mostly free" countries averaged 70.2. These two groups have a significant lead over the "moderately free" countries, which received much lower ratings (59.6 points) for their environmental performance. The countries rated by the Heritage Foundation as either "mostly unfree" or "repressed" received by far the worst Environmental Performance Index scores (46.7 and 50.3, respectively). Researchers at Yale University found that there is not only a correlation between the Heritage Foundation’s index and their own EPI but also between the EPI and the "Ease of Doing Business Index." That latter [index](https://www.doingbusiness.org/en/data) is published each year as part of the World Bank’s "Doing Business Report" and is generally regarded as the world’s most comprehensive and reliable gauge of the ease of doing business. In 2016, researchers published [a study](https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/8/7/601) in the journal *Sustainability* that included an evaluation of the correlation between the EPI and the "Open Market Index" compiled by the International Chamber of Commerce. The OMI measures a country’s openness to free trade and is thus an important indicator of economic freedom. The researchers found a high degree of overlap between the OMI index and the EPI:19 of the OMI’s 27 highest-scoring countries also appear in the top 27 of the EPI. The survey covered a total of 75 countries, including all G20 and European Union members. Together, these countries account for more than 90% of international trade and investment. The researchers found evidence for their "hypothesis that countries with an open economy score higher in environmental performance." There are two real-world observations that also disprove the argument that stronger economic growth automatically leads to greater environmental pollution. First, in noncapitalist countries, environmental degradation has been a far more serious problem than in capitalist countries. Second, the correlation between economic growth and increasing resource consumption is becoming ever weaker in the age of dematerialization. Put simply, these studies point in the same direction: **Capitalism is not the problem. It is the solution — both economically and environmentally.**

#### **Yale’s EPI index proves capitalist countries have the best environmental performance**

**Zitelmann, 20** --- Contributor to Forbes (Rainer Zitelmann, "‘System Change Not Climate Change’: Capitalism And Environmental Destruction", 7-13-2020, Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/rainerzitelmann/2020/07/13/system-change-not-climate-change-capitalism-and-environmental-destruction/?sh=413d7ba16d72)//EG

But isn’t there a price for this growth: environment devastation? Of course, nobody would deny that industrialization causes environmental problems. But the **assertion that growth automatically leads to ever accelerating environmental degradation is simply false**. Yale University’s [Environmental Performance Index](https://epi.yale.edu/epi-results/2020/component/epi) (EPI) uses 16 indicators to rank countries on environmental health, air quality, water, biodiversity, natural resources and pollution. These indicators have been selected to reflect both the current baseline and the dynamics of national ecosystems. One of the Index’s most striking findings is that there is a strong correlation between a state’s wealth and its environmental performance. Most developed capitalist countries achieve high environmental standards. Those countries with the worst EPI scores, such as Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Chad and Niger, are all poor. They have both low investment capacity for infrastructure, including water and sanitation, and tend to have weak environmental regulatory authorities. Contrary to prevailing perceptions, industrial development and technological advances have contributed significantly to relieving the burden on the environment. Both Indur Goklany in his book The Improving State of the World and Steven Pinker in chapter ten (“The Environment”) of his book Enlightenment Now demonstrate that we are not only living longer, healthier lives in unprecedented prosperity, but we are also doing so on a comparatively clean planet. [Researchers have confirmed that economic freedom](https://www.dallasfed.org/~/media/documents/research/pubs/ftc/stroup.pdf)—in **other words, more capitalism**—**leads to higher, not lower, environmental quality**. Every year, the Heritage Foundation compiles its [Index of Economic Freedom](https://www.heritage.org/index/book/chapter-4), which analyzes individual levels of economic freedom, and thus capitalism, in countries around the world. The Heritage Foundation’s researchers also measure the correlation between each country’s environmental performance and its economic freedom. The results couldn’t be clearer: the world’s most economically free countries achieve the highest environmental performance rankings with an average score of 76.1, followed by the countries that are “mostly free,” which score an average of 69.5. In stark contrast, the economically “repressed” and “mostly unfree” countries all score less than 50 for environmental performance.

### AT: Structural violence

#### Capitalism sustains life by reducing hunger and poverty – Socialism doesn’t Zitelmann, 20 --- Contributor to Forbes (Rainer Zitelmann, "‘System Change Not Climate Change’: Capitalism And Environmental Destruction", 7-13-2020, Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/rainerzitelmann/2020/07/13/system-change-not-climate-change-capitalism-and-environmental-destruction/?sh=413d7ba16d72)//EG

As one argument would have it, capitalism is responsible for the destruction of the environment because capitalism is based on growth. And yes, capitalism has led to tremendous economic growth. But without this growth, an ever-expanding world population would not have been able to provide even the most basic necessities. After all, in 1800, there were just one billion people on the planet; today there are more than seven billion. **Economic Growth Helps To Combat Hunger And Poverty** It is all the more astonishing that, despite this rapid population growth, the world has not been overcome by rampant poverty. Looking back to 1800, most people in the world were extremely poor—average incomes were the same as they are in the poorest countries in Africa today and more than 90% of the global population was living in extreme poverty. The development of capitalism and economic growth reduced the proportion of extremely poor people in the world to less than 10%—despite the sevenfold increase in the global population during this same period. So growth is not a bad thing in and of itself. In fact, **growth has led to a reduction in hunger and poverty**. Life expectancy at birth has increased more than twice as much in the last century as in the previous 200,000 years. The probability of a child born today reaching retirement age is higher than the probability of previous generations ever celebrating their fifth birthdays. In 1900, the average life expectancy worldwide was 31 years; today it stands at 71 years. Of the roughly 8,000 generations of Homo sapiens since our species emerged approximately 200,000 years ago, only the last four have experienced massive declines in mortality rates. In the last 140 years there have been 106 major famines, each of which has cost more than 100,000 lives. The **death toll has been particularly high in socialist countries** such as the Soviet Union, China, Cambodia, Ethiopia and North Korea, killing tens of millions of people through the forced transfer of private means of production to public economies and the weaponization of hunger. On its own, the biggest socialist experiment in history, Mao’s Great Leap Forward in the late 1950s killed more than 45 million Chinese. The number of deaths due to major famines fell to 1.4 million per year in the 1990s—not least as a result of the collapse of socialist systems worldwide and China increasingly embracing capitalism. In the first two decades of the 21st century approximately 600,000 people perished of hunger. That is equivalent to roughly 2% of the death toll from the early 20th century—despite the fact that the global population is four times larger today than it was back then.

### Feminism

#### Capitalist tech developments enabled women to join the labor force and opportunities for income allows investment in education – socialism counters this **Stefano, 19** --- Executive VP & Chief Strategy Officer at Commonwealth Foundation and Fellow at Independent Women’s Forum. (Jennifer Stefano, Opinion Contributor, "Feminists should thank God for capitalism", 4-25-2019, Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/civil-rights/440477-feminists-should-thank-god-for-capitalism/)//EG

When it comes to feminism, “t’s the economy, stupid.” Pantsuits didn’t liberate women; washing machines did — and we have American capitalism to thank for that. So, why are so many self-styled feminists trying to tear down capitalism? Take, for example, Rep. [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez](https://thehill.com/people/alexandria-ocasio-cortez-2/) (D-N.Y.), popularly known as AOC. She calls herself a feminist, even fronting as a suffragette at national events. But her socialist [Green New Deal](https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/5729033/Green-New-Deal-FINAL.pdf) won’t make American women more independent. As a feminist myself, I know it will create a whole new category of “kept” women — this time dependent upon government instead of a man. {mosads}Big government is a sugar daddy by another name. Expanding it will set women back 100 years. AOC’s “new deal” would stifle the very thing that got us this far. We’ll never achieve equal opportunity and prosperity for women until we finally accept that women have what it takes to make it in the free market — [where jobs aren’t guaranteed](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cnbc.com_2019_02_08_alexandria-2Docasio-2Dcortez-2Dnew-2Dgreen-2Ddeal-2Djobs-2Dguarantee-2Dwhat-2Dto-2Dexpect.html&d=DwMFAg&c=cnx1hdOQtepEQkpermZGwQ&r=AA442jMvbCURPtZiNmMNtJBnripGQYCHw7_DqJFkmec&m=wbVK7wvJj8CQOlZVvNVIYxI5yeIUW595_LnU3ubm_1M&s=c5vrvr-wNAwJfDhQtHfDMn9X0ARNOGk83ru3oJKVSxM&e=). Instead we need to guarantee that all women are free to utilize their skills and talents to help each other, and themselves, without government interference. Over the past 200 years, the **free market has driven unprecedented technological advances that benefited women** — a fact highlighted in the famous “[kitchen debate](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.history.com_this-2Dday-2Din-2Dhistory_nixon-2Dand-2Dkhrushchev-2Dhave-2Da-2Dkitchen-2Ddebate&d=DwMFAg&c=cnx1hdOQtepEQkpermZGwQ&r=AA442jMvbCURPtZiNmMNtJBnripGQYCHw7_DqJFkmec&m=wbVK7wvJj8CQOlZVvNVIYxI5yeIUW595_LnU3ubm_1M&s=1HDFFm1sBp0xTFtFrm19EL0-t4ZQpdw1iQF-D3GPC8w&e=)” between then-Vice President Richard Nixon and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. In 1959, the United States opened an exhibit in Moscow to display the innovations our country was producing. It featured labor-saving devices for the home that more than 450 American companies built explicitly for women, and which — as Nixon crowed to Khrushchev — nearly any American could afford. That exchange was about more than one-upping the Russians. Those appliances were transformative, enabling our grandmothers and mothers to leave behind scrub boards, hand wringers and coal ovens and enter the labor force en masse. Now, U.S. women are free to outwork men in the business world. Professor [Ann E. Cudd](https://www.provost.pitt.edu/content/ann-e-cudd), a founding member of the [Society for Analytical Feminism](https://sites.google.com/site/analyticalfeminism/) and the provost and senior vice chancellor at the University of Pittsburgh, adds **women’s education to the laundry list of capitalism’s benefits**. “By providing an opportunity for an income independent of their male relatives, [capitalism] provides women with the ability to advocate for their education or to directly invest in their own and their daughters’ education,” she writes in her book, “[Capitalism, For and Against: A Feminist Debate](https://www.amazon.com/Capitalism-Against-Feminist-Ann-Cudd/dp/0521132118).” If you look at female accomplishments — [from high school and college graduation](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.aei.org_publication_prediction-2Dno-2D2017-2Dgraduation-2Dspeaker-2Dwill-2Dmention-2Dthis-2Dthe-2Dgrowing-2Dgender-2Dcollege-2Ddegree-2Dgap-2Dfavoring-2Dwomen_&d=DwMFAg&c=cnx1hdOQtepEQkpermZGwQ&r=AA442jMvbCURPtZiNmMNtJBnripGQYCHw7_DqJFkmec&m=wbVK7wvJj8CQOlZVvNVIYxI5yeIUW595_LnU3ubm_1M&s=9-AhjoJiKpRHiDJq5OnqnLoRjCrtxYnTgeVtk4u6oUE&e=) rates to income growth — we are crushing it. Automation, information technology and other outgrowths of capitalism are allowing women to compete and win in traditionally male-dominated fields. Clearly, America’s free-market system is a beacon to the world showing how to empower women in technology, business, education and other sectors. AOC’s plans would change all that, but why? In socialist countries where government regulation and ownership dominate the economy, we don’t see women with opportunities for career success. There, many women struggle to survive under the thumb of a bureaucracy that might as well be the patriarchy reincarnate. Socialism breeds corruption, not female empowerment. Travel to socialist Venezuela, where the United Nations reports less than 1 percent of the 70,000+ violent crimes against women [resulted in criminal trials](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.theguardian.com_global-2Ddevelopment_2018_feb_06_us-2Dhuman-2Drights-2Dcourt-2Dlandmark-2Dhearing-2Dvenezuela-2Drape-2Dtorture-2Dcase-2Dlinda-2Dloaiza&d=DwMFAg&c=cnx1hdOQtepEQkpermZGwQ&r=AA442jMvbCURPtZiNmMNtJBnripGQYCHw7_DqJFkmec&m=wbVK7wvJj8CQOlZVvNVIYxI5yeIUW595_LnU3ubm_1M&s=xfZN7eF5_5qv99OSZMiK-FtnLABA_lln1P3Y-eoN14Y&e=). You can’t pull even with men when you are fighting for your life. **Socialism empowers that system, not the women in it. In contrast, the free market goes hand and hand with a free, just and civil society.** For years, misogynists have claimed women are helpless — that we can’t think or provide for ourselves. The capitalist system has allowed women to rack up accomplishments that proved them all wrong. Now, AOC and other progressive lawmakers [embracing socialism](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/house-democrat-rejects-socialism-calls-herself-a-proud-capitalist) want to take it all away by having us become “kept” women, dependent on and under the thumb of an overreaching government. We don’t need it. It’s time for the socialists to get out of our way and keep government out of our business.

#### Cap benefits women - Creation of factories helped women escape rural gender roles, individualism breaks down sexist norms, and markets empower equality and freedom

**Follett, 17** --- Policy Analyst and Managing Editor of HumanProgress.Org (Chelsea Follett, "Why Feminists Should Embrace Capitalism", 5/15/17, Cato Institute, <https://www.cato.org/commentary/why-feminists-should-embrace-capitalism)//EG>

* **AT: IT’S THE CATO INSTITUTE** – yes it is but that isn’t a reason to ignore the ev – the card doesn’t make baseless claims it has clear warrants – don’t discount them, and the author bases her writing on data and information from 2 other credible professors in the field and even answers competing arguments

Does capitalism help or hurt women is an enduring question. And one that a fascinating book, [Capitalism, For and Against: a Feminist Debate](http://www.cambridge.org/gb/academic/subjects/philosophy/political-philosophy/capitalism-and-against-feminist-debate?format=PB&isbn=9780521132114) (Cambridge University Press), seeks to answer that question. Philosophy professors Ann Cudd of Boston University and Nancy Holmstrom of Rutgers University both want more freedom and higher material living standards for women. But they disagree on how to achieve that goal. One thinks capitalism is the answer; the other socialism. Their differences boil down to two points: how capitalism has affected women to date, and the viability of alternative systems to improve a woman’s lot. The professors may disagree — yet the data sides overwhelmingly with capitalism. When it comes to material living standards, Cudd presents page after page of evidence to demonstrate “that capitalism has brought about a massive improvement in life for human beings” by reducing poverty and spurring technological innovations in, for example, healthcare. Death in [infancy](http://humanprogress.org/story/2386) or [childbirth](http://humanprogress.org/story/2391) is much rarer that it once was. Family sizes are smaller, since children generally survive into adulthood. And women’s options have multiplied as a result. Holmstrom, however, claims that capitalism has lessened women’s material well‐​being; it has, she says, exacerbated inequality, which she conflates with poverty. Cudd counters that those who care about women’s welfare should focus on poverty, which is at a [historic low](http://humanprogress.org/static/3180). Yet Holmstrom does not want to count any past socialist system as truly socialist — which in turn shows her bias. But giving women the freedom to flee rural penury in order to work in factories, counters Holmstrom, has made them worse off. “The lives of subsistence peasants may be limited, but materially adequate and stable,” she writes. She thinks factory jobs “seldom provide a way out of poverty”. Cudd answers that the world’s poorest people are overwhelmingly rural, performing informal subsistence agricultural labour: “Global capitalism has not changed their lives very much; they live much as their ancestors did.” As the data shows, **factory work has, indeed, helped women escape both** [**poverty**](https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/how-t-shirt-saves-world) **and the stricter** [**gender roles**](http://humanprogress.org/blog/freedom-and-the-factory-girls) **of rural areas**. And while Holmstrom implies that the world’s poor prefer agricultural drudgery to urban work, the ongoing global migration from rural areas to cities provides evidence to the contrary. Capitalism, says Cudd, has not just **liberated women from the fields but helped society to see them as individuals**. It promotes not only material progress, but also social innovation, which has helped [break down](https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/15280/ACudd_JofBusinessEthics_21May2014.pdf?sequence=1) those old prejudices such as sexism. “Capitalism derives its primary justification from the maximisation of individual liberty,” she says, “**and capitalist societies promulgate the ideology of individualism, which helps to break down … sexist norms and practices.”** Indeed, **the capitalist worldview subverts sexism and other forms of collective prejudice** — just look at how it eroded [India’s caste system](https://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/capitalisms-assault-on-the-indian-caste-system). “Capitalism reduces the oppression of traditional societies that impose hierarchies of gender and caste,” writes Cudd, because embedded within market exchange itself is the idea that each individual should be free to pursue her self‐​interest. **Market participation** also increases women’s bargaining power within society, **empowering them to lobby for legal equality and greater freedom**. Holmstrom, on the other hand, defines freedom as negative liberty (freedom from interference) and what some philosophers call positive liberty (the means to act). To be free, Holmstrom contends, a woman needs adequate material resources and an environment of social tolerance. But capitalism has actually increased freedom as Holmstrom conceives it — by [reducing](http://humanprogress.org/static/3469) poverty and [encouraging](http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/B/bo3750637.html) social tolerance. As the philosopher Jason Brennan [noted](https://books.google.com/books?id=p-Gqy-JAso8C&source=gbs_navlinks_s), “as a matter of historical fact, protecting negative liberties is the most important and effective way of promoting positive liberty”. Holmstrom is resistant to this view, observing that some capitalist states deny their citizens freedom outside the economic realm. But then, aren’t dictatorships that at least allow their citizens economic freedom (Chile under Pinochet) better than anti‐​capitalist dictatorships (modern Venezuela)? After all, capitalism fosters [the conditions](http://humanprogress.org/blog/chile-is-thriving-so-why-is-socialism-rising) for people to escape poverty and ultimately [demand more](http://www.humansandnature.org/culture-how-capitalism-changes-conscience) personal and political freedoms. The debate is complicated by the fact that the professors disagree over how to define a capitalist state. For example, Cudd and Holmstrom both denote Sweden and similar states with high social spending as capitalist, but Cudd does not count oligarchic states such as Saudi Arabia as such. And Holmstrom insists that the exclusion of such states makes for a biased “persuasive definition” of capitalism. Yet Holmstrom does not want to count any past socialist system as truly socialist — which in turn shows her bias. Cudd notes that capitalism [compares favourably](http://humanprogress.org/) on practically every indicator of human wellbeing to the socialism practised by the Soviet Union, Maoist China, and Cuba today. Holmstrom, bizarrely, alleges that the Soviet and Maoist systems helped women, and praises the Soviet Union for offering “free” childcare and laundry services. One might respond that if a woman must resort to [cannibalising](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4076244/Distressing-photos-1920s-Russian-famine-turned-hopeless-peasants-cannibals-five-million-people-starved-death.html) her own children to survive a manmade famine (as [thousands](http://www.slate.com/articles/life/the_spectator/2011/02/stalins_cannibals.html) did while millions of others died starving), endure [rape](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/206817/inside-dark-michael-ledeen) in a gulag (“rape was so common as to be considered routine”), or face [execution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milada_Hor%C3%A1kov%C3%A1) for political dissent, then laundry services do not meaningfully improve her situation. While Holmstrom thinks those states helped women, she believes no society has ever truly given “the people” (rather than a bureaucracy) control over the means of production. She does admit she is comparing capitalism to an imagined ideal of socialism. And anticipating charges of Utopianism, she points out that many major social changes such as women’s suffrage once seemed unreachable. Yet ultimately, she offers little in the way of evidence that her vision wouldn’t fail like [all of the other](https://www.cato.org/events/socialism-human-nature) socialist experiments throughout history. There, is after all, ample data on [where that road leads](https://capx.co/socialisms-true-legacy-is-immorality/) — and it is hardly a paradise for workers, women or anyone else.

#### **Patriarchy is the root cause of war – pressure to fulfil gender roles and ideas of protection and domination**

Hasan, 20 --- Graduate in MA Conflict Analysis and Peace building (Ateka Hasan, "Gender Relations as the Root Cause of Militarization and War", 10-24-2020, NIICE, https://niice.org.np/archives/6386)//EG

Analysing the causes of war has been an important area of study in the International relations for decades. Many agree that it has several dimensions attached to it, which are all interconnected or in relation with each other and play out together. According to Brian Fogarty, all wars have immediate causes, antecedent causes, and root causes. All these causes work together, through the means of intersectionality. For him, the immediate causes are mostly around economic needs and motivations. He believes that countries go to war for increasing their economic resources and capability. For example, the valuable minerals in African countries today can be seen to play an important role in its violent conditions. The second dimension, which is the antecedent cause, are the ethno-nationalist’s issues or foreign-ness. This, here, brings to focus the most contemporary issue, of nationalism, which is one of the most prevalent factors in the today’s chaotic world. The war may thus be influenced by the need for recognition or autonomy. The biggest defining factor of such causes are the propagandas which openly promote hate speech and othering of other communities. For example, the Rwandan genocide was a civil war which was heavily motivated by ethno-nationalistic desires. The third dimension, which is probably one of the most important ones and yet highly neglected one, are the root causes or favourable conditions. This dimension refers to the culture of the society which indirectly promotes violence and violent behaviour. And a cultural aspect which is heavily ignored by scholars is the patriarchal gender relations prevalent in the society. The **patriarchal structure of the society gives way to the rise of militarization**. This culture of masculinity and militarism *makes war thinkable* and a solution to uphold pride. Majority of the times the emotions of **frustration and humiliation motivate violent behaviours** within a society. And while these emotions can be an outcome of many things, a major cause is the pressure for men to fulfil the gender roles. Living in a patriarchal society, men are expected to carry out a certain set of responsibilities like supporting the family, or being a protector to the weaker sex. However, in contemporary times, women have been taking the initiatives to improve their family situations after wars affect their family’s livelihood, leading to their displacement. For example, since 1975 Angola has been divided by conflict. This had led to the migration of many families. This situation created a difficult task for men to work because they were not that privy to the concept of adjustment, whereas women managed to quickly get accustomed to them (women) becoming the new bread winners. This meant that the men would have to stay home and live the domesticated life, while women will carry out the financial burden. This change in the gender role was not accompanied by change in the ideological structure, and thus led to aggravating men’s sense of failure and frustration. It is important to note here, that nobody goes to war for gender reasons, but gender is an antecedent that makes it possible. According to a tentative model of possible links to gender identities and conflict given by Judy El- Bushra, it is these negative emotions and sense of failure which leads to the secondary impacts of conflict (these include depression, suicide, militarization, violent crime, domestic friction, inter-generational conflict), which eventually lead to breakdown of social structures – leading to distorted gender identities, ultimately leading to conflict. Thus, patriarchy is a very critical component in relating the culture to the cause of war, because, as Betty Reardon pointed out, **Patriarchy invented war and maintains war** to hold in place the social order it had spawned. It is, thus, imperative to understand and analyse war as a system (gendered order that makes war possible), as a cultural thing and as a continuum. All these dimensions eventually lead to the rise of violent characteristics in the society, mainly in the perspectives of the males. The aspect of violence is inherently linked to the system of power, which is a common subpoint in patriarchal structures. Power can further be divided into three dimensions, mainly, economic power, ethnic or national power (for e.g. White supremacy), and gender power. These dimensions are similar to Fogarty’s causes, however, studying the causes of war through the link of power, provides with an additional understanding through ‘intersectionality’ and ‘positionality’. These concepts allow for an understanding of an individual’s sense of self, which is derived by where he or she positions himself or herself in all these dimensions of power. The matter of self becomes significant here, because power is practiced by people when they want to be superior to an inferior and exploit other. The relations here can be of a rich man and labourer, a citizen and a foreigner, and a woman as the property of man. This **need to dominate over the inferior other eventually leads to violence** (through coercion, or force). The main issue here posits the desire for accumulation of more wealth, which leads to the condition of being civilized. But as noted by William Eckhardt, the more civilized the people became, the more warlike they became. This relation of power with patriarchy and militarization or use of force, goes to show that a war is caused because of all these dimensions, and neither can be at play without the other two. This indicates the point which feminist scholars have been trying to make for many years; which is that gender relations are an important part of any society and have their roots in its functioning. They try to bring attention to the fact that analysing a war without really capturing the gender drama, would be an incomplete study. However, most theories of sociology and international relations do ignore this element, and criticize the feminist authors for being trivial and not paying attention to the big picture. On this point Cynthia Enloe has raised the question, of considering the real big picture to include the gender dimension. The ignorance, which the topic of gender has faced up until now, is one of the major reasons behind the continued rise in masculinization and patriarchy in the societal structures. Its absence has led to the major gap in understanding a major component in war. Thus, gender relations are one of the root causes of militarization and war. The societies which we live in are heavily monopolized by a patriarchal narrative. This narrative reinforces the cliched understanding, which is that men need to protect the women, because they are weaker, and thus need to be protected. The **notion of protection provides the men with the justification for enforcing violence and going to war.** With the continued subjugation of the women in domestic spheres, the gender narrative after war is also similar to war, sometimes even worse. Which is why many anti-war women’s organisations like *Vimochana*, in Bangalore, said, “we didn’t start as women against war, but as women against violence against women.” Because while the sexualization of war might be a different violent act taking place during war, but women in their every-day lives face violence of some kind already. Additionally, the claims of men for peace act as a paradox, for they believe that the path for peace is through war. Even the post-war scenarios are so disastrous that the type of peace and security achieved is not really peace, particularly for women. This goes to show that masculinization of the societal structures inevitably leads to war, however, as Laurel stone has reviewed, encouraging the participation of women increases the chances of ending the violence within a year by 24 percent. Even Mary Caprioli, has studied the correlation between gender equality indicators and a country’s propensity for peacefulness. This can also be brought about by aiming to demilitarize the arms arena leading to a change in masculinity- which holds as a very strong component in militarization of the society. Apart from this an important element which has hardly been touched upon under masculinity is the topic of homosexuality, which faces a lot of brunt for not matching the characteristics of true masculinity. R.W. Connell showed the variation in masculinity. He points out to the refusal of the homosexual men to conform to patriarchal norms and manhood, and participate in the militaristic aspect.

#### Patriarchy destroys the environment

Ahmed, 15 --- Dr. Nafeez Ahmed is an investigative journalist, bestselling author, and international security scholar. He is a regular contributor to The Ecologist where he writes about the geopolitics of interconnected environmental, energy and economic crises (Nafeez Ahmed, "Patriarchy is killing our planet", 13/3/15, Ecologist, <https://theecologist.org/2015/mar/13/patriarchy-killing-our-planet-women-alone-can-save-her)//EG>

The systemic marginalization and repression of women is not an accidental feature of our civilizational crisis. It is an integral and fundamental pillar of the pervasive injustice of the global system. The global epidemic of violence toward women is inherently bound up with our male-dominated system of violence toward the natural world as a whole. The rapist, the abuser, is no different from an insatiable tyrant, a slave to his sadistic appetites, unconcerned by the pain inflicted in the process of satiating them. Just as violence against women is about power, self-gratification through dominance and control, extreme egoism and narcissism, and ultimately a lack of empathy bordering on psychopathology, so ultimately is our systemic violence against nature. Throughout the course of our exploitative plundering of planetary resources in the pursuit of endless material growth, the global system continues its asymmetric war on women, just as it annihilates species, destroys eco-systems, and exhausts resources for the profit and power of a tiny minority. The gender divide is not just a mirror image of humanity's external dislocation from nature: it is both a symptom and driver of that dislocation. But it is not working. Contemporary global capitalism might be making some people richer, but it is making more people poorer and unhappier, in a context of accelerating uncertainty and conflict. And by the end of this century at least, we face the prospect, according to the consensus of our best scientific minds, of a largely uninhabitable planet if we continue business-as-usual. The global system is failing, and the mass murder, abuse and murder of women by men is central to that failure: *misogyny is an integral function of planetary destruction*. **If we want to save the planet, patriarchy must die.** That means recognizing and taking responsibility for the fact that patriarchy is integral to the structures of power we take for granted, across East and West. There's no no time to waste. If misogyny wins, the planet dies.

## Cap sustainable

#### Cap sustainable – incentive to stretch recourses and responsibility to consumers allows less consumption than socialism

**Butcher, 19** --- [Danielle Butcher](https://thehill.com/people/danielle-butcher/)is the chief operating officer of the [American Conservation Coalition](http://acc.eco/). (Danielle Butcher, Opinion Contributor, "Socialism does more harm than good for the environment", 8-20-2019, Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/458125-socialism-does-more-harm-than-good-for-the-environment/)//EG

As Republicans gear up for 2020, [new polling](https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000016c-8a3e-d2ec-ad6c-ce7f7eb90001) from the [American Action Network](https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000016c-8a3d-d895-a5ee-bbbd3e5d0002) suggests that they would do well to hold their capitalist roots. Among the results, the polling found that in a split sample, highlighting “socialist” policies like the Green New Deal moved suburban women and 18 to 44-year-old voters toward conservative policies and away from liberal policies. Republicans have notoriously struggled with the youth vote, and it’s no secret that the millennial generation shares a [deep concern](https://www.forbes.com/sites/josephcoughlin/2018/05/05/greener-than-you-boomers-gen-x-millennials-score-themselves-on-the-environment/#20d990354d8b) for the environment. This information could be key to Republicans as they head into climate and environmental debates this fall. While AAN’s polling may indicate a simple PR battle, the conservative ideology has it right on the economics and impact of capitalism versus socialism on our environment. As pointed out by [Marion Tuby](https://fee.org/articles/there-is-nothing-green-about-socialism/) of Human Progress, environmental harm will assuredly always be a factor in human activity and production. There is no economic system in which people can thrive and progress with absolutely zero environmental impact. Because of this, we must stop looking at which economic system entirely avoids environmental damage, but instead, determine which system best mitigates that harm. With a simple [compare and contrast](https://www.perc.org/2019/05/17/socialism-is-bad-for-the-environment/), the choice is clear: capitalism wins every time. **In no other economy do producers have such a responsibility to consumers and to their resources as they do under capitalism**. Free-market societies require excellent business practices. If you do not treat your fellow man with the best of intentions, if you do not follow sustainable business practices, and if you do not responsibly manage your resources, consumers have the option to leave for a competitor. You will have a surplus of goods with no buyers, and your business will fail. It is in the best interest of everyone to do business well. Believing that corporations and the market will do well is not an idealist fantasy of the right — it happens every day. Delta Airlines works with The Nature Conservancy to voluntarily [offset carbon emissions](https://www.delta.com/content/www/en_US/about-delta/corporate-responsibility/carbon-emissions-calculator.html). Madewell gives their customers [a $20 discount](https://www.madewell.com/inspo-do-well-denim-recyling-recycle-your-jeans-with-us-a-very-animated-how-to-video-111518.html) on new jeans when they bring in an old pair. Those old jeans are then donated to Habitat for Humanity to be upcycled into housing insulation. Patagonia recently saved $10 million dollars through tax cuts and [planned to donate](https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2018/11/28/patagonia-money-saved-trump-tax-cut-environmental-cause/2143733002/) that sum to conservation and charity organizations. Companies are able to do this because they make a profit and feel a responsibility to their consumers, who are a demographic made up widely of hikers, hunters and others who enjoy outdoor recreation. Patagonia understands that stewardship and conservation are key components to their business, and they are willing to invest their own funds to maintain the amenities their customer base so utilizes. These corporate sustainability practices are simply not possible under socialism. Under capitalism, there is an **incentive to stretch your resources**, and to make more with less and therefore stretching what you have without creating waste. Businesses are then able to invest profits back into their product and scale up as the market demands. **No natural incentives exist under socialism because the conservation of resources serves no direct benefit to production**. Additionally, those who consume resources have no responsibility to those who are most impacted by consumption. As a result, excessive product is often produced to the point where there is no longer a demand, which in turn drives up the cost of goods to make up for lost resources. While capitalism may have a bad reputation for driving consumerism and always wanting “more, more, more,” the inverse is actually true. Capitalism does not cause consumption — it can only respond to it. Without a market demand to guide socialist central planners, such a check does not aide socialism in the same way. A critique provided by Soviet economists Nikolai Shmelev and Vladimir Popov observed such a model of poor resource allocation. They noted, “[to bolster the production of gloves, the Soviet government more than doubled the price it paid for moleskin. Warehouses soon filled with mole pelts, but glovemakers were unable to use them all, so many rotted.](https://www.nationalreview.com/magazine/2019/06/03/socialism-is-bad-for-the-environment/)” The single illustration of government-influenced excess is not uncommon. The root of this problem is summed up quite easily: Socialist central planners are simply unable to administer resources as effectively as a market of supply and demand. Economic theory and real-world case-studies prove that capitalism can be clean — Republicans need only get the messaging right. While there is no perfect economic system, we ought to be promoting the one proven to provide the safest, most innovative environmental solutions. Capitalism is the only system through which competition enables both the economy and the environment to thrive. Environmentally-minded voters would do well to remember that a socialist economy would be detrimental to the environment. We’ve seen it before: Socialism doesn’t work on an economic level, and it certainly doesn’t work on an environmental level, either. Republicans should use this point in demonstrating how capitalism benefits the world around us in more ways than one.

## Communism Fails

### Environment

#### Communism dooms the environment due to need for superiority, maximizing employment, consumption, and consumerism – China proves

**Smith, 20** --- Richard Smith is an economic historian and commentator on China, capitalism, and the environment.(Richard Smith, "The Chinese Communist Party Is an Environmental Catastrophe", 7-27-2020, Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/27/chinese-communist-party-environment-co2/)//EG

China’s bureaucratic rulers are driven by three imperatives that are at least as powerful, if not more powerful, drivers of hyper-growth than profit maximization under capitalism . First, they must maximize economic growth and self-sufficient industrialization. As a state-based ruling class and communist nation in a world dominated by more advanced and powerful capitalist nations, Mao and his successors understood, like the Soviet Union, that they must “**catch up and overtake the United States**”: build relatively [self-sufficient](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/07/business/china-trade-manufacturing-europe.html) [high tech superpower economies](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-05-20/china-has-a-new-1-4-trillion-plan-to-overtake-the-u-s-in-tech?sref=4KuSK5Q1) shielded from Western takeover by [barring foreign investment in key state sectors like energy, rails, telecom, etc.](https://www.ft.com/content/719b1134-d763-11e4-94b1-00144feab7de), protecting state industries against foreign competitors, and so on. The Soviets’ failure to win the economic and arms race with the United States doomed the Soviet Communist Party. Mao’s successor as leader, Deng Xiaoping and those following him, notably Xi Jinping, have been determined to avoid that error. **Environmental concerns come a far second behind the fear of economically induced collapse.** Secondly, they must maximize employment. In capitalist economies, employers have no obligation to the unemployed. If workers are laid off, it’s not the capitalists’ problem. It’s not even the government’s problem—except in severe downturns like the Great Depression when they could face unrest or even revolt. But because the CCP was once a workers’ party, and because it derives its legitimacy from its status as the self-appointed representative of the working class, it can’t completely ignore the workers. And it’s better to have them producing something than just milling about producing nothing. That’s why the government seeks to keep them busy: by generating jobs. Five-year plans regularly include job creation targets. In November 2013, Premier Li Keqiang underscored this imperative, saying: “Employment is the biggest thing for well-being. The government must not slacken on this for one moment. … For us, [stable growth is mainly for the sake of maintaining employment](https://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/06/business/international/chinas-leaders-confront-economic-fissures.html).” Yet keeping China’s hundreds of millions of workers working often means producing superfluous steel, needless infrastructure, ghost cities, etc. **Maximizing employment is a major driver of overproduction, over-construction, so-called blind growth and blind investment, and profligate waste of energy and resources across the economy.** And finally, they must maximize consumption and consumerism. In the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Communist Party in 1991 and the Chinese Communists’ own near-death experience with the Tiananmen Square protests in 1989, the party leadership resolved to create a mass consumer economy and raise incomes, in order to focus people’s attention on consumption and take their minds off politics. That’s why, ever since the early 1990s, successive Five-Year Plans have prioritized new consumer industries and the government has promoted one consumer craze after another: cars; condos; shopping malls; tourism; golf courses; theme parks; bike sharing; cruise boats; food delivery; online shopping, and [more](http://en.people.cn/n3/2020/0721/c90000-9712803.html). To this end, the government has also partnered with and backed private capitalists like Jack Ma’s e-commerce giant Alibaba to promote shopping, the movie industry, video gaming, theme parks, tourism, social media, and more. State banks went into the mortgage business to promote housing speculation, then created a consumer credit industry to keep consumers focused on making money to spend on new trinkets. Housing privatization promoted the growth of furniture, home decoration, and renovation markets, spurring yet more growth—and all of this, the government constantly reminds its citizens, is thanks to the glorious Communist Party. No doubt after centuries of privation and decades of Maoist austerity, China’s masses were overdue for some creature comforts. But thepromotion of mindless consumerism for the sake of consumerism on the model of Western capitalism is contributing mightily to China’s and the world’s [waste](https://www.sixthtone.com/news/1001003/the-mountains-of-takeout-trash-choking-chinas-cities) and [pollution](https://www.scmp.com/article/1711744/china-produces-about-third-plastic-waste-polluting-worlds-oceans-says-report) crises. Less enviable among China’s many firsts is this headline, from the China Daily: “China No. 1 dumper of plastic into ocean.” The problem with all of this is that to **maximize economic growth, employment, and consumerism, China’s leaders have no choice but to let the polluters pollute**. There’s just no way around that. This tendency is further exacerbated in China’s case because as nationalists concerned with self-reliance, the government strives to rely on China’s own energy resources: mostly coal, because it’s available nearly everywhere and 24/7. That’s why, rather than rely mainly on intermittent renewables or the world market for oil and natural gas (though it imports those, too), Xi’s government is firing up more coal-fired power plants. In short, in **their race to overtake the United States, China’s leaders find they must prioritize hyper-growth over the environment, even if this ends in global climate collapse and eco-suicide.**

#### Communist imperatives are causing China to lead the world in increasing CO2 emissions – US emissions are declining

Smith, 20 --- Richard Smith is an economic historian and commentator on China, capitalism, and the environment.(Richard Smith, "The Chinese Communist Party Is an Environmental Catastrophe", 7-27-2020, Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/27/chinese-communist-party-environment-co2/)//EG

As China struggles to recover economically from the impact of the pandemic, it is set to deal a painful blow to global efforts to fight climate change. The party has often sacrificed environmental regulations as soon as GDP targets and economic growth have been threatened, thus industrial or trade decline paradoxically produces soaring pollution. But even in normal times, China’s soaring carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions are a massive part of the dire threat to all life on earth posed by climate change. While it’s often reported that China’s CO2 levels lead the world, few appreciate the scale: how disproportionate they are compared to other large emitters; the speed of their growth; and the **impossibility of reining them as long as the CCP remains in power**. In 1990, China’s CO2 emissions were just half those of the United States. In the next 15 years they more than doubled, overtaking the United States. Then in just 12 years, from 2005 to 2017, China’s emissions nearly doubled again to [more than twice those of the United States](https://climateactiontracker.org/countries/china) (13,110 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent, or mtCO2e, compared with 6,457 million)—although China’s GDP was only 63 percent as large as the U.S. GDP in 2017. It’s often said in China’s defense that while its emissions may lead the world, its per capita emissions are a fraction of those of the United States and that America’s historical emissions dwarf those of China. Yet after three decades of breakneck growth, China is catching up fast. The country’s per capita CO2 emissions surged past those of the EU six years ago and are now just under half those of the United States (7.45 mtCO2e vs. 15.56 mtCO2e in 2018). Yet China’s per capita GDP was just 15 percent that of the United States in 2018 ($9,627 vs. $62,904). Similarly, China’s cumulative emissions between 1965 and 2018 are now more than two-thirds those of the United States, and according to one assessment in Forbes, based on present trends “China will be responsible for the most atmospheric carbon dioxide [in less than 20 years.](https://www.forbes.com/sites/rrapier/2018/07/01/china-emits-more-carbon-dioxide-than-the-u-s-and-eu-combined/#10b6e52f628c)” The atmosphere doesn’t care about per capita emissions—only total atmospheric CO2 concentrations. And unlike elsewhere in the developed world, China’s numbers are trending upward, not down. And unlike elsewhere in the developed world, China’s numbers are trending upward, not down. **Emissions from the United States have declined** from the peak in 2007, and EU nations—collectively the world’s third largest emitter—have trended downward for the past three decades. To be sure, those declines are far from sufficient to reverse global warming. They’re not even enough to meet U.S. and EU commitments to the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change. But at least they’re declines. By contrast, China’s carbon emissions have relentlessly grown, quadrupling between 1990 and 2017. As the world’s largest emitter, [accounting for 30 percent of total global emissions](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/global-greenhouse-gas-emissions-data) against 15 percent for the United States, 9 percent for the EU-28, 7 percent for India, 5 percent for Russia, and 4 percent for Japan, China is by far the leading driver of global warming. The country presents a climate crisis paradox. China is the largest producer of photovoltaic panels and wind turbines; it leads the world in installed capacity of both, accounting for about 30 percent of global total in 2018. It has invested more money in renewable energy and electric vehicles than the rest of the world combined. Moreover, President Xi Jinping stated his aspiration to lead the fight against global warming. In June 2017, when President Donald Trump announced that the United States would withdraw from the Paris Agreement, Xi termed it a “hard-won achievement” that “all signatories must stick to.” “Walking away from the pact would endanger future generations,” he said. Yet that’s exactly what Xi has done. As China’s economy has rebounded from the coronavirus, industrial pollution has surged. “As the world’s largest carbon dioxide emitter and as the first major economy to reopen after the crisis, all eyes are on China,” said Lauri Myllyvirta, lead analyst [Center for Research on Energy and Clean Air (CREA)](https://energyandcleanair.org/publications/coal-power-projects-accelerate-after-covid-19-lockdown-a-new-coal-boom-in-china/). “It is essential for policymakers to prioritize clean energy and reduce the country’s economic reliance on highly polluting, energy-intensive industries. But China’s leaders are doing no such thing.” Instead of prioritizing clean energy, Xi’s government is [slashing funding for wind and solar power](https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/07/10/134239/clean-energy-investments-are-plummeting-bloomberg-bnef/) while [ramping up spending on new coal-fired power plants](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/nov/20/china-appetite-for-coal-power-stations-returns-despite-climate-pledge-capacity). That’s an inevitable result not only of the post-pandemic economic crisis but of the general slowing in the Chinese economy in the last few years. For all of China’s investments in renewables to date, solar and wind produced barely 8 percent of the country’s electric generation in 2018 (compared with [9 percent in the United States](https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/electricity/electricity-in-the-us.php) with [less than a third as much investment](https://qz.com/1247527/for-every-1-the-us-put-into-renewable-energy-last-year-china-put-in-3/)) while [coal accounted for 70](https://blog.energybrainpool.com/en/overview-of-chinas-evolving-energy-market-in-2018/) percent. In the most optimistic Chinese government scenario, coal and other fossil fuels will still provide at least two-thirds of China’s electricity until as late as 2050, by which time it will be too late to matter. Similarly, instead of reducing reliance on highly polluting energy-intensive industries, Xi’s government is pouring investments into yet more unnecessary industries and infrastructure—more steel, aluminum, plate glass, cars, and dozens of other commodities that are already in oversupply, more unnecessary high-speed trains that run near empty, more useless subway systems built in small towns, more empty airports, more empty “ghost cities” even as the population is set to decline, more gargantuan “blingfrastructure” vanity projects to the glory of the party and local officials, such as the world’s largest radio telescope (which was finished in 2016 but [remains unused](https://www.wired.com/story/china-fast-worlds-largest-telescope-tourists/) because China has no qualified scientists to operate it), the world’s largest and second largest dams, the most skyscrapers, longest bridges, fastest trains, magnetic levitation trains, and so on. **China’s bureaucratic rulers are driven by three imperatives that are at least as powerful, if not more powerful, drivers of hyper-growth than profit maximization under capitalism**

#### Communist governments suppress resistance to their agenda and hide emissions so eco-responsibility is impossible

**Smith, 20** --- Richard Smith is an economic historian and commentator on China, capitalism, and the environment.(Richard Smith, "The Chinese Communist Party Is an Environmental Catastrophe", 7-27-2020, Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/27/chinese-communist-party-environment-co2/)//EG

True, Western capitalist economies led by the United States are racing China to the brink of climate collapse, and likewise cannot prioritize people and planet over profit, as I’ve argued [elsewhere](https://www.amazon.com/Green-Capitalism-God-that-Failed/dp/1848902050). But what’s uniquely dangerous about the Chinese case is that its emissions are so huge, nearly a third of total global emissions, and growing [so fast](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-17/china-s-carbon-dioxide-emissions-expand-fastest-since-2011?sref=4KuSK5Q1) that scientists tell us they could eventually [doom the climate on their own](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/20140213/chinas-plan-clean-air-cities-will-doom-climate-scientists-say) regardless of what the rest of the world does. And while citizens in the West (still) have the freedom to mobilize and fight governments and companies whose emissions threaten our survival, and their collective actions have in fact restrained—if not enough—the growth of emissions in the United States and Europe, by contrast, the Communist Party runs a totalitarian police state that ruthlessly **suppresses all resistance to the party agenda.** In the comparatively liberal atmosphere of the 1990s and 2000s, there was some limited space for NGOs and discussion of non-party suggestions. **In the comparatively liberal atmosphere of the 1990s and 2000s, there was some limited space for NGOs and discussion of non-party suggestions.** But Xi has doubled down both on repressing any hint of opposition while simultaneously accelerating and broadening his superpower ambitions, regardless of their environmental consequences. Given the Great Firewall, most Chinese people today **have no idea** that their country leads the world in CO2 emissions, and even if they did know, they have **no legal means to organize and resist** the vainglorious but eco-suicidal ambitions of their rulers. In October 2019, climate scientists published new research showing that on present trends, global warming will “[all but erase](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/10/29/climate/coastal-cities-underwater.html)” Shanghai, Shenzhen, and most of the world’s great coastal cities by 2050—barely thirty years from now. There won’t be any “great rejuvenation” and glory for the Communist Party when Shanghai and Shenzhen are underwater, when China’s glaciers melt and its rivers dry up, and when soaring temperatures and drought collapse farming across the North China Plain. Even those in the leadership who do care about the country’s outsized emissions can’t suppress them because that would require pulling the emergency brake: **shutting down and/or retrenching China’s overproducing, overpolluting industries—and that would doom Xi’s “China Dream” of global tech supremacy and Communist Party glory, if not the party itself.**

### Unsustainable

#### Communism is unsustainable – eliminates profits and losses which decimates economic guidance

**Carden, 20** --- Art Carden is a Senior Fellow at the American Institute for Economic Research. He is also an Associate Professor of Economics at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama and a Research Fellow at the Independent Institute. (Art Carden, "What’s Wrong With Communism?", 11-30-2020, AIER, https://www.aier.org/article/whats-wrong-with-communism/)//EG

What’s wrong with communism?” It’s a question I heard recently, and while “pretty much everything” is accurate, it deserves a bit of additional elaboration. Here are a few thoughts on what’s wrong with communism. As Bryan Caplan points out in [his article on communism](https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Communism.html) for the Concise Encyclopedia of Economics, “Communism” and “socialism” were basically synonyms until the Bolshevik Revolution. After that, “communism” came to be more closely associated with the revolutionary philosophy of Vladimir Lenin. The two terms can be used interchangeably, and they basically mean “[a centrally planned economy in which the government controls the means of production](https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Socialism.html).” In [the Communist Manifesto](https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/ch02.htm), Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels write “the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.” Later, Ludwig von Mises would write that “socialism is the abolition of rational economy.” Means of production that are not privately owned cannot be exchanged. Therefore, no market prices can emerge. Without market prices, we don’t get profits and losses. **Without profits and losses, we don’t learn whether or not we are using resources wisel**y (producing things consumers want more urgently and thereby earning profits) **or wastefully** (producing things consumers want less urgently and thereby earning losses). Profits and losses are informative, not decisive: there are a lot of things that might be financially profitable that you might find morally unacceptable. Maybe you could earn a handsome side income writing college term papers on behalf of cheaters for an online essay mill (and note that, as Jason Brennan and Peter Jaworski argue in their 2016 book Markets Without Limits, this would be wrong not because profits are involved but because cheating is involved). Furthermore, there might be a lot of things that aren’t profitable that you might find obligatory. There are very few people who would say that a market test is an appropriate way for me to determine whether or not I should feed, clothe, and shelter my family. This, I think, is where a lot of people get tripped up. Families are little socialist enterprises governed by the principle “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” The rules and norms that make families or tribes work well don’t map very well onto an extended order populated by strangers. In a family, tribe, or club, people know one another intimately and see one another regularly. The farther people get from one another geographically and genetically, the less well they are likely to know one another that well or see one another that often. Add several millennia, widely varying conditions, and a lot of historical accidents and you have almost eight billion people with different tastes and talents. [As I explained last summer](https://www.aier.org/article/why-i-am-not-a-socialist/), markets and market prices make rational economic calculation possible in such a setting. A lot of self-described communists and socialists are motivated by enthusiasm for communists’ and socialists’ stated goals like equality, plenty, and dignity. They ask us to imagine a brotherhood of man in which everyone has abundant food, clothing, shelter, education, medical care, and other opportunities for flourishing. To oppose communism and socialism is not to question the desirability of equality, plenty, and dignity However, just as [opposing subsidies isn’t opposing what’s subsidized](https://www.aier.org/article/opposing-subsidies-isnt-opposing-whats-subsidized-bastiats-lesson/), opposing communism isn’t opposing equality, plenty, and dignity. To paraphrase Thomas Sowell, we regularly find ourselves talking past one another, with one group speaking in terms of hoped-for results and the other group speaking in terms of the characteristics of social processes. In the view of Sowell and a lot of his intellectual allies, the social question is not “what specific policies could we enact that might make the world a better place?” Rather, it is “which institutions best facilitate cooperation among strangers?”

#### The communist tenant of a moneyless society is impossible – no incentive for production and can’t quantify how to spend time and capital

**Hersey and Walker-Werth, 22** --- Jon Hersey is managing editor of The Objective Standard and holds fellowships at Foundation for Economic Education. Thomas Walker-Werth is associate editor of The Objective Standard. He is an Ayn Rand Fellow with Foundation for Economic Education's Hazlitt Project. He holds a master’s degree in music from Oxford Brookes University (Hersey, Jon, and Thomas Walker-Werth, "Star Trek, Marx, Maezawa, and the Moneyless Dream: Utopian or Dystopian?", spring 2022, *The Objective Standard*, https://go-gale com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=umuser&id=GALE%7CA706181904&v=2.1&it=)//EG

Although Marx considered himself a social scientist and economist--and although his ideas are still some of the most widely taught--they aren't much taught in social science or economics departments, except as foils. That's because virtually all of Marx's hypotheses have been debunked. For one, who's going to build the free Ferraris that Maezawa has dreamed up, never mind tackle more mundane tasks, with no incentive? But for those who don't find such commonsense thought experiments convincing--or who think, as Marx did, that human nature will somehow mysteriously change--the impracticality of Marx's moneyless state was demonstrated by what Austrian economists have come to call the calculation problem. Ludwig von Mises once explained the problem as follows: If a hydroelectric power station is to be built, one must know whether or not this is the most economical way to produce the energy needed. How can he know this if he cannot calculate costs and output? We may admit that in its initial period a socialist regime could to some extent rely upon the experience of the preceding age of capitalism. But what is to be done later, as conditions change more and more? Of what use could the prices of 1900 be for the director in 1949? And what use can the director in 1980 derive from the knowledge of the prices of 1949? The paradox of "planning" is that it cannot plan, because of the absence of economic calculation. What is called a planned economy is no economy at all. It is just a system of groping about in the dark. (6) In short, without prices, people have no relatable, quantifiable means of comparing and contrasting options about how to spend time and capital, which is vital for determining how best to use these naturally scarce resources. "New Scientist magazine reported that in the future, cars could be powered by hazelnuts," said comedian Jimmy Fallon, in a skit that captures Mises's point hilariously. "That's encouraging, considering an eight-ounce jar of hazelnuts costs about nine dollars. Yeah, I've got an idea for a car that runs on bald eagle heads and Faberge eggs." But there's more. As has been shown with so many of Marx's ideas, a moneyless society is not only impractical, it's also deeply immoral. Marx often grumbled about greedy capitalists alienating workers from their labor. The focus on efficiency, he said, reduced the worker to a mere extension of a factory's machines, rendering him a brute tool of capitalist exploitation. Of course, workers chose industrial jobs because they paid better than those in agriculture and the like. And even if boring, such jobs rarely were so backbreaking as life on the farm. Far from alienating workers from their labor, the capitalist arranged new modes of production that vastly increased the value of that labor, not only for himself, but for workers, too. Whereas a slave truly is alienated from his labor--he works but is deprived of the fruits of his effort--the industrial worker could count on greater returns from his labor than ever before. Over the course of the Industrial Revolution and the following centuries, those returns have grown immensely and reduced the percentage of people living in extreme poverty from more than 80 percent to less than 20. Money stores the value of one's effort. It's made possible by the legal protection of property rights. In the words of Francisco d'Anconia from Ayn Rand's Atlas Shrugged: Money rests on the axiom that every man is the owner of his mind and his effort. Money allows no power to prescribe the value of your effort except the voluntary choice of the man who is willing to trade you his effort in return. Money permits you to obtain for your goods and your labor that which they are worth to the men who buy them, but no more. Money permits no deals except those to mutual benefit by the unforced judgment of the traders. (7) Just as the worker owns himself, he owns the values he produces, on which his life depends, either directly or indirectly via the sale of those values. Without money and the property rights that underlie it, we all would be truly and fully alienated from our labor, left without enforceable claim to the values we spend our time--and thus our lives--creating. That's an idea hardly fit even for science fiction, one best relegated to the dystopian genre.

### Human rights

#### A communist revolution will evolve into rejection of communist ideals and human rights violations

**Carden, 20** --- Art Carden is a Senior Fellow at the American Institute for Economic Research. He is also an Associate Professor of Economics at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama and a Research Fellow at the Independent Institute. (Art Carden, "What’s Wrong With Communism?", 11-30-2020, AIER, https://www.aier.org/article/whats-wrong-with-communism/)//EG

It’s a question of utmost importance in light of our species’ distressing habit of slaughtering one another. That’s one of the places where communism’s failures are most conspicuous. **Experiments with communism have a distressing tendency to descend into mass murder.** As Kristian Niemietz explains in his excellent book [Socialism: The failed idea that never dies](https://iea.org.uk/publications/socialism-the-failed-idea-that-never-dies/), intellectuals have a three-stage relationship with socialism. A socialist regime emerges and maybe has some successes. During this honeymoon phase, socialism’s defenders point out that the naysayers are wrong and this time is different. The honeymoon transitions into an “excuses-and-whataboutery” period where a regime’s defenders try to explain away the trouble in the workers’ paradise. During this phase, we might learn that bad weather or something like deliberate CIA sabotage, not central planning, is to blame for economic failure. Finally, once the experiment’s failures become too obvious to ignore or explain away, we enter the third stage, the “not-real-socialism” stage. The Soviet Union? Not real socialism. China under Mao? Not real socialism. Venezuela? Not real socialism. And so on. Weren’t these idealistic–if naive–crusades to better the lives of the downtrodden? In his foreword to Eugene Richter’s excellent [Pictures of the Socialistic Future](https://mises.org/library/pictures-socialistic-future-0), Bryan Caplan explains three theses: there is Lord Acton’s thesis, which is that “power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” People meant well when they got started, but having so much power derailed them. A second thesis is Friedrich Hayek’s explanation for “why the worst get on top.” Power will attract people who crave it, and hence ambitious, bad people will end up in positions of power. Hence, you might hear that the USSR would have avoided the horrors of the Stalinist regime had only Leon Trotsky and not Stalin ascended to power. Caplan tells a darker story, however, for why communist regimes move so quickly into oppression and mass murder: communism is “born bad” in that “the early socialists were indeed ‘idealists’” but “their ideal was totalitarianism.” At a fundamental level, communist revolutions have not been about merely producing things more efficiently or ensuring that output is shared equitably. Communist experiments have been efforts to fundamentally re-engineer humanity. They have been projects of social transformation, and their brutality has sometimes been excused as an unfortunate historical necessity. The historian Eric Hobsbawm, for example, agreed without hesitation that millions of deaths would be an acceptable price to pay for a communist society. After all, Lenin famously said “you can’t make an omelet without breaking eggs.” Alas, communist experiments have come and gone**. They have left us with no omelets, only millions and millions of broken eggs.**

#### **A utopian Communist world is a myth – maximization of profit has led to mass murder and violations of human rights**

**Somin, 17** --- Ilya Somin, a law professor at George Mason University, is the author of "Free to Move: Foot Voting, Migration and Political Freedom" and "The Grasping Hand: Kelo v. City of New London and the Limits of Eminent Domain." (Ilya Somin, " Lessons from a century of communism", 11-7-2017, Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/)//EG

Collectively, communist states [killed as many as 100 million people](https://www.amazon.com/Black-Book-Communism-Crimes-Repression/dp/0674076087), more than all other repressive regimes combined during the same time period. By far the biggest toll arose from communist efforts to collectivize agriculture and eliminate independent property-owning peasants. In China alone, Mao Zedong’s Great Leap Forward led to [a man-made famine in which as many as 45 million people perished – the single biggest episode of mass murder in all of world history](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2016/08/03/giving-historys-greatest-mass-murderer-his-due/?utm_term=.8e8655f91f4e&itid=lk_inline_manual_5). In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin’s collectivization – which served as a model for similar efforts in China and elsewhere – [took some 6 to 10 million lives](http://volokh.com/2010/11/23/did-joseph-stalin-commit-genocide/). Mass famines occurred in many other communist regimes, ranging from North Korea to [Ethiopia](https://www.commentarymagazine.com/articles/ethiopia-the-communist-uses-of-famine/). In each of these cases, communist rulers were well aware that their policies were causing mass death, and in each they persisted nonetheless, often because they considered the extermination of “Kulak” peasants a feature rather than a bug. While collectivization was the single biggest killer, communist regimes also engaged in other forms of mass murder on an epic scale. Millions died in slave labor camps, such as [the USSR’s Gulag system](https://www.amazon.com/Gulag-History-Anne-Applebaum/dp/1400034094) and [its equivalents elsewhere](http://www.thegulag.org/content/chinese-laogai). Many others were killed in more conventional mass executions, such as those of Stalin’s [Great Purge](https://www.warhistoryonline.com/world-war-ii/10-facts-stalins-great-purge.html), and the [“Killing Fields” of Cambodia](http://www.killingfieldsmuseum.com/s21-victims.html). The injustices of communism were not limited to mass murder alone. Even those fortunate enough to survive still were subjected to severe repression, including violations of freedom, of speech, freedom of religion, loss of property rights, and the criminalization of ordinary economic activity. No previous tyranny sought such complete control over nearly every aspect of people’s lives. Although the communists promised a utopian society in which the working class would enjoy unprecedented prosperity, in reality they engendered massive poverty. Wherever communist and noncommunist states existed in close proximity, it was the communists who used walls and the threat of death to keep their people from fleeing to societies with greater opportunity.

#### **Communism fails and makes atrocities inevitable – full state control, no market incentives, and no sense of market needs**

**Somin, 17** --- Ilya Somin, a law professor at George Mason University, is the author of "Free to Move: Foot Voting, Migration and Political Freedom" and "The Grasping Hand: Kelo v. City of New London and the Limits of Eminent Domain." (Ilya Somin, " Lessons from a century of communism", 11-7-2017, Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/)//EG

How did an ideology of liberation lead to so much oppression, tyranny and death? Were its failures intrinsic to the communist project, or did they arise from avoidable flaws of particular rulers or nations? Like any great historical development, the failures of communism cannot be reduced to any one single cause. But, by and large, they were indeed inherent. Two major factors were the most important causes of the atrocities inflicted by communist regimes: perverse incentives and inadequate knowledge. The establishment of the centrally planned economy and society required by socialist ideology necessitated an enormous concentration of power. While communists looked forward to a utopian society in which the state could eventually “wither away,” they believed they first had to establish a state-run economy in order to manage production in the interests of the people. In that respect, they had much in common with other socialists. To make socialism work, government planners needed to have the authority to direct the production and distribution of virtually all the goods produced by the society. In addition, **extensive coercion was necessary** to force people to give up their private property, and do the work that the state required. Famine and mass murder was probably the only way the rulers of the USSR, China, and other communist states could compel peasants to give up their land and livestock and accept a new form of serfdom on collective farms – which most were then forbidden to leave without official permission, for fear that they might otherwise seek an easier life elsewhere. The vast power necessary to establish and maintain the communist system naturally attracted unscrupulous people, including many self-seekers who prioritized their own interests over those of the cause. But it is striking that the biggest communist atrocities were perpetrated not by corrupt party bosses, but [by true believers like Lenin, Stalin, and Mao](http://volokh.com/2010/04/06/competing-explanations-for-the-oppressive-nature-of-socialism/). Precisely because they were true believers, they were willing to do whatever it might take to make their utopian dreams a reality. Even as the socialist system created opportunities for vast atrocities by the rulers, it also destroyed production incentives for ordinary people. In the absence of markets (at least legal ones), there was little incentive for workers to either be productive or to focus on making goods that might actually be useful to consumers. Many people tried to do as little work as possible at their official jobs, where possible reserving their real efforts for black market activity. As the old Soviet saying goes, workers had the attitude that “we pretend to work, and they pretend to pay.” Even when socialist planners genuinely sought to produce prosperity and meet consumer demands, they often lacked the information to do so. As Nobel Prize-winning economist F.A. Hayek described in [a famous article](http://www.econlib.org/library/Essays/hykKnw1.html), **a market economy conveys vital information** to producers and consumers alike through the price system. Market prices enable producers to know the relative value of different goods and services, and determine how much consumers value their products. Under socialist central planning, by contrast, there is no substitute for this vital knowledge. As a result, **socialist planners often had no way to know what to produce, by what methods, or in way quantities.** This is one of the reasons why communists states routinely suffered from shortages of basic goods, while simultaneously producing large quantities of shoddy products for which there was little demand.

#### Communist incentives for supremacy has led China to commit genocide against Turkish Muslims and Uyghur populations

**Roth, 19** --- Kenneth Roth is the executive director of Human Rights Watch, one of the world's leading international human rights organizations, which operates in more than 90 countries. (Kenneth Roth, "World Report 2020: Rights Trends in China’s Global Threat to Human Rights", 7/5/19, https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2020/country-chapters/global)//EG

The motivation for Beijing’s attack on rights stems from the fragility of rule by repression rather than popular consent. Despite decades of impressive economic growth in China, driven by hundreds of millions of people finally emancipated to lift themselves out of poverty, the Chinese Communist Party is running scared of its own people. Outwardly confident about its success in representing people across the country, the Chinese Communist Party is worried about the consequences of unfettered popular debate and political organization, and thus afraid to subject itself to popular scrutiny. As a result, Beijing faces the uneasy task of managing a huge and complex economy without the public input and debate that political freedom allows. Knowing that in the absence of elections, the party’s legitimacy depends largely on a growing economy, Chinese leaders worry that slowing economic growth will increase demands from the public for more say in how it is governed. The government’s nationalist campaigns to promote the “China dream,” and its trumpeting of debatable anti-corruption efforts, do not change this underlying reality. The consequence under President Xi Jinping is China’s most pervasive and brutal oppression in decades. What modest opening had existed briefly in recent years for people to express themselves on matters of public concern has been decisively closed. Civic groups have been shut down. Independent journalism is no more. Online conversation has been curtailed and replaced with orchestrated sycophancy. Ethnic and religious minorities face severe persecution. Small steps toward the rule of law have been replaced by the Communist Party’s traditional rule by law. Hong Kong’s limited freedoms, under “one country, two systems,” are being severely challenged. Xi has emerged as the most powerful leader of China since Mao Zedong, building a shameless cult of personality, removing presidential term limits, promoting “Xi Jinping thought,” and advancing grandiose visions for a powerful, yet autocratic, nation. To ensure that it can continue to **prioritize its own power** over the needs and desires of the people of China, the **Communist Party has mounted a determined assault on the political freedoms that might show the public to be anything but acquiescent to its rule**. The Unconstrained Surveillance State More than any other government, Beijing has made technology central to its repression. A nightmarish system has already been built in Xinjiang, the northwestern region that is home both to some 13 million Muslims—Uyghurs, Kazakhs, and other Turkic minorities—and to the most intrusive public monitoring system the world has ever known. The Chinese Communist Party has long sought to monitor people for any sign of dissent, but the combination of growing economic means and technical capacity has led to an unprecedented regime of mass surveillance. The ostensible purpose is to avoid recurrence of a handful of violent incidents several years ago by alleged separatists, but the venture far surpasses any perceptible security threat. One million officials and party cadre have been mobilized as uninvited “guests” to regularly “visit” and stay in the homes of some of these Muslim families to monitor them. Their job is to scrutinize and report “problems” such as people who pray or show other signs of active adherence to the Islamic faith, who contact family members abroad, or who display anything less than absolute fealty to the Communist Party. This in-person surveillance is just the tip of the iceberg, the analog prelude to the digital show. Without regard to the internationally recognized right to privacy, the Chinese government has deployed video cameras throughout the region, combined them with facial-recognition technology, deployed mobile-phone apps to input data from officials’ observations as well as electronic checkpoints, and processed the resulting information through big-data analysis. Data it collects are used to determine who is detained for “re-education.” In the largest case of arbitrary detention in decades, one million or more Turkic Muslims have been deprived of their freedom, placed in an indefinite detention of forced indoctrination. The detentions have created countless “orphans”—children whose parents are in custody—who are now held in schools and state-run orphanages where they, too, are subjected to indoctrination. Children in regular Xinjiang schools may face similar ideological training. The apparent aim is to strip Muslims of any adherence to their faith, ethnicity, or independent political views. Detainees’ ability to recapture their freedom depends on persuading their jailers that they are Mandarin-speaking, Islam-free worshipers of Xi and the Communist Party. This brazen endeavor reflects a totalitarian impulse to **reengineer people’s thinking until they accept the supremacy of party rule.**

### **Democracy**

#### **Problems with communism are intrinsic and eliminate any possibility of a democratic government**

**Somin, 17** --- Ilya Somin, a law professor at George Mason University, is the author of "Free to Move: Foot Voting, Migration and Political Freedom" and "The Grasping Hand: Kelo v. City of New London and the Limits of Eminent Domain." (Ilya Somin, " Lessons from a century of communism", 11-7-2017, Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/)//EG

To this day, defenders of socialist central planning argue that communism failed for avoidable contingent reasons, rather than ones intrinsic to the nature of the system. Perhaps the most popular claim of this sort is that a planned economy can work well so long as it is democratic. The Soviet Union and other communist states were all dictatorships. But if they had been democratic, perhaps the leaders would have had stronger incentives to make the system work for the benefit of the people. If they failed to do so, the voters could “throw the bastards out” at the next election. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that a communist state could remain democratic for long, even it started out that way. Democracy requires effective opposition parties. And in order to function, such parties need to be able to put out their message and mobilize voters, which in turn requires extensive resources. In an economic system in which all or nearly all valuable resources are controlled by the state, the incumbent government can easily strangle opposition by denying them access to those resources. Under socialism, the opposition cannot function if they are not allowed to spread their message on state-owned media, or use state-owned property for their rallies and meetings. It is no accident that virtually every communist regime suppressed opposition parties soon after coming to power. Even if a communist state could somehow remain democratic over the long run, it is hard to see how it could solve the twin problems of knowledge and incentives. Whether democratic or not, a socialist economy would still require enormous concentration of power, and extensive coercion. And democratic socialist planners would run into much the same information problems as their authoritarian counterparts. In addition, in a society where the government controls all or most of the economy, it would be virtually impossible for voters to acquire enough knowledge to monitor the state’s many activities. This would greatly **exacerbate** [**the already severe problem of voter ignorance**](https://www.amazon.com/Democracy-Political-Ignorance-Smaller-Government/dp/0804799318/)that plagues modern democracy. Another possible explanation for the failures of communism is that the problem was bad leadership. If only communist regimes were not led by monsters like Stalin or Mao, they might have done better. There is no doubt communist governments had more than their share of cruel and even sociopathic leaders. But it is unlikely that this was the decisive factor in their failure. Very similar results arose in communist regimes with leaders who had a wide range of personalities. In the Soviet Union, it is important to remember that the main institutions of repression (including the Gulags and the secret police) were established n[ot by Stalin, but by Vladimir Lenin](http://volokh.com/2010/11/23/did-joseph-stalin-commit-genocide/), a far more “normal” person. After Lenin’s death, Stalin’s main rival for power – Leon Trotsky – [advocated policies that were in some respects even more oppressive than Stalin’s own](http://volokh.com/archives/archive_2009_08_09-2009_08_15.shtml#1250038247). It’s hard to avoid the conclusion that either the personality of the leader was not the main factor, or – alternatively – communist regimes tended to put horrible people to positions of power. Or perhaps some of both. It is equally difficult to credit claims that communism failed only because of defects in the culture of the countries that adopted it. It is indeed true that Russia, the first communist nation, had a long history of corruption, authoritarianism, and oppression. But it is also true that the communists engaged in oppression and mass murder on a far greater scale than previous Russian governments. And communism also failed in many other nations with very different cultures. In the cases of Korea, China, and Germany, people with very similar initial cultural backgrounds endured terrible privation under communism, but were much more successful under market economies. Overall, **the atrocities and failures of communism were the natural outcomes of an effort to establish a socialist economy in which all or nearly all production is controlled by the state.** If not always completely unavoidable, the resulting oppression was at least highly likely.