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#### NATO is the primary hand of the U.S. capitalist machine – extending rentier capitalism by securing markets through interactions for military bases – Only Workers based revolt can challenge the imperialism of the capitalist machine

**AL TARIQI ’22** (A. “What is NATO? Why do we call for its dismantling?”, originally posted on the Socialist Resurgence’s website, marzo 26, 2022, https://litci.org/en/what-is-nato-why-do-we-call-for-its-dismantling///HHW)

In previous posts and in our work in the Revolutionary Socialist Network, Workers’ Voice and Socialist Resurgence, along with our RSN comrades, have stated our unequivocal opposition to the Russian aggression in Ukraine and our support for the self-defense of the Ukrainian people. We demand the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from Ukraine and call for solidarity with Russian antiwar protesters, for an end to their repression, and for an immediate release of all detainees.

Does this mean that we support calls emanating from North America and Europe in support of further military expansion in Europe and the ongoing arms race? Does this mean that we support NATO? Unequivocally, we say no. The barbarity of the Russian invasion tempts those who oppose it to launder the reputation of NATO and of the U.S. imperialist project at its heart, to concede to false narratives about its supposed defensive nature rather than its true character as an aggressive and imperialist alliance. A look at its history and current function as a creature of US imperialism is necessary to combat such illusions.

NATO: A brief history

The origins of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) go back to 1948, when the United Kingdom, France, and the Benelux countries (Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg) formed a military alliance out of fear of potential German and Soviet aggression after World War II. By 1949, the founding members began to see this as insufficient. Soon thereafter, the United States and Canada joined. Subsequently, the alliance formed three commands: Europe, the Atlantic, and the English Channel (the last dissolved in 1994). France withdrew from military participation in 1966, rejoining in 2009.

When West Germany was admitted in 1955, the USSR responded by forming the Warsaw Pact, giving the lie to the original NATO founders’ perception of Soviet aggression. As Marxist geographer David Harvey explains, “Cultivating fear (both fake and real) of the Soviets and Communism was instrumental to this (cold war) politics. The economic consequence has been wave after wave of technological and organizational innovation in military hardware.”

The arms industry—a form of monopoly capitalism often referred to as the “military-industrial complex”—has always been at the heart of NATO, as it sought to balance the numerical superiority of the Warsaw Pact’s armed forces with technological superiority, including medium range nuclear weapons.

Article 5 of the NATO treaty states that an attack on any signatory would be regarded as an attack on the other members. This “collective defense” pact was first invoked in 2001 following the Sept. 11 attacks on the United States. Currently, 30 countries are NATO members, 28 of which are in Europe (the U.S. and Canada are the two non-European members). The most recent entrant is North Macedonia, a former Yugoslav province, admitted in May 2020. NATO’s courting of Ukraine—especially after the Western-supported 2013-2014 “Euromaidan” protests and the 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea—all the while maintaining that it refuses to directly militarily intervene there, has generated the ambiguity contributing to the current crisis. It also coincided with the increase of Ukraine’s debt with the IMF and the application of neoliberal austerity policies.

After the collapse of the USSR in 1991, the Warsaw Pact was dissolved but NATO kept growing. Since the late 1990s it has expanded to 14 new countries. This military encroachment has been largely naturalized by U.S. and European governments as a guarantee of peace, but its root causes have not been really explained. In the United States, the likes of The New York Times and PBS have been among the worst in this regard, constantly drilling audiences with Pentagon talking points and focusing almost entirely on issues of logistics rather than the larger geopolitical context.

Instead, we offer a materialist explanation, specifically contextualizing NATO’s aims both within U.S. imperialist ambitions and within the emergence of rentier capitalism since the 1990s. To summarize, as many have discussed, the U.S. regime rejected a “peace dividend” after the defeat of the USSR. This is puzzling only when we fail to consider how central to U.S. capitalist profits both the expansion of U.S. military bases since World War II and the military-industrial complex since the 1990s have been.

U.S. imperialism and expansion of bases

At the time of this writing, U.S. President Joe Biden is visiting Europe for an emergency NATO summit, along with meetings of the G7 and the European Council, in what the bourgeois media is depicting as an “honor lap” of sorts after the shambolic Trump years. Read without the fog of bourgeois sentimentality, European capitalist politicians are welcoming Washington back as their prodigal king. This trip occurs in the immediate aftermath of Biden’s pledge to devote $3 billion from the $13.6 billion Ukraine “aid” package to increase U.S. NATO troops in Europe, and another $700 million to support Foreign Military Financing and to foster U.S. counter-espionage activities ISR (intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance). This move can only be seen by the Russians as an escalation.

As of July 2021, the U.S. operates about 750 bases in at least 80 countries and spends more on its military than the next 10 countries combined. Since the Pentagon publishes incomplete data, the number of bases may be even be higher. A significant number of these bases are located in NATO member countries: Germany (119 bases), Italy (44), the UK (25), Portugal (21), Turkey (13), and Belgium (11). Moreover, the U.S. deploys approximately 173,000 troops in 159 countries. Again, NATO member states host a large proportion, at least 60,000, of these troops, with the following breakdown: Germany (33,948), Italy (12,247), UK (over 9000), Spain (over 3000), Turkey (1600+), Belgium (1000+), and Norway (700+).

Interestingly, one of the agenda points of Biden’s summit with the Europeans will be to discuss NATO’s long-term deployment plans. In 1997 the U.S. and Russia signed an agreement in which the U.S. promised not to deploy troops permanently in frontline states. In 2014, after Russia annexed Crimea, the U.S. began to exert a military presence in both Poland and the Baltic states, but “in rotating deployments to honor the letter of that agreement,” as reported by the Guardian. However, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has voided the deal, in the eyes of the U.S. and its NATO allies. Now the U.S. is pushing for permanent basing, which has long been the desire of the Baltic states.

The idea that U.S. bases and troops intervene in foreign countries to provide security and to promote human rights is belied by the real history of U.S. bases, as described in an excellent book, “Bases of Empire,” edited by the anthropologist and director of the Cost of War Project, Catherine Lutz. As Lutz shows, U.S. bases have many functions, none of which promote the security or human rights of host populations. For example:

• Basing comes with Status of Forces Agreements (SOFAs), not just with NATO countries but anywhere Uncle Sam goes. These grant U.S. soldiers immunity from local laws.

• Bases expand U.S. military capacity to wage war—for example, when the U.S. used its bases in Guam, Thailand, and Philippines during the Vietnam War.

• Bases provide “R&R” for invading U.S. soldiers, inflicting the misogyny and racism of many of these troops on local populations.

• The CIA used secret bases in Laos to ship heroine to U.S. troops in Vietnam.

• Bases facilitate the shipment of U.S. materiel to its theaters of invasion and intervention.

• Bases enable the U.S. to manipulate local governments and to exert influence on them to change laws in the interests of U.S. capital.

• Base agreements often come with U.S. investment and trade treaties tying countries into U.S. trade relations and forcing liberalization and privatization.

The ultimate goal of NATO today is to secure the support of governments allied to the U.S. in the region, offer so-called “protection” and IMF/WB “financing” in exchange for austerity policies and privatization, as well as pushing forward imperialist policies abroad which benefit U.S. capital. It is a military alliance to back a concrete economic and political project.

All of this helps explain why Biden and NATO see the Russia war on Ukraine as an opportunity to escalate imperialist intervention. However, it is not just old school military intervention and basing that is at play. Since the 1970s, U.S. imperialism has morphed into something more indirect yet equally sinister: the promotion of rentier capitalism.

Rentier capitalism: Minerals, militarism, and FIRE

The decline in U.S. manufacturing generated a profitability crisis, going back to the early 1970s. To revive profitability, U.S. capitalism shifted toward “rentier” sectors such as the arms industry (aka. The military-industrial complex or MIC), finance-insurance-real estate (FIRE), and oil, gas, and mineral extraction (OGM). Rent-seeking capital, as opposed to surplus-value generating capital—for example, manufacturing or agriculture—seeks profits through monopolization of property, whether in the form of resources, financial assets, or so-called intellectual property. Often, rent-seeking capital is described as the search for profit without the contribution of social value (think of the activities of your typical sleazy landlord).

Rent-seeking capital, specifically the MIC, FIRE, and OGM sectors, has risen to dominance in the United States over the past generation, and the promotion of these sectors has been the raison d’etre both of domestic national politics and of NATO in that time. Since 1991, the alliance has primarily served U.S. interests, shifting European and other U.S. allies’ focus from their domestic spheres toward that of U.S. “national security.” As economist Michael Hudson has explained, NATO has become, in effect, Europe’s foreign policy ministry, dominating domestic economic interests.

“Rejection of the peace dividend,”seen in Marxist terms, refers to the fear of the U.S. ruling class losing control over NATO and dollar-area states as they have sought increased trade with both Russia and China. MIC interests such as Raytheon, Boeing, and Lockheed-Martin generate their profits from “monopoly rent,” specifically from sales to NATO countries and Middle East oil exporters. These companies’ stocks rose sharply right after the Russian invasion, explains Hudson. Germany, for example, announced that it will raise arms spending to over 2 percent of GDP.

Meanwhile, the Nordstream 2 pipeline connecting Russia with Central and Western Europe has been seen as a major threat by the U.S. energy capitalist sector. Exerting intense pressure on European countries, especially Germany, to remain in U.S.-controlled supply networks and, more generally, isolating Russia (and Iran) from global energy markets, have been important motives for U.S. policy in recent years.

Finally, there is FIRE: Its profits are generated primarily through land rents paid to the banks in the form of mortgage interest and debt amortization (the paying off of debt over time in principal and interest). Approximately 80 percent of US and UK bank loans go to the real estate sector, in whose interest it is to maximize “capital gains” from rising land rent and the privatization of economies, inserting rent-seeking monopolies into public services, education, health care, and transport.

It is these three sectors of capital that dominate both domestic politics in the United States and NATO policy in Europe. None of this is to say that we agree with the campist line that Russia, or China, represent some sort of balance of power, let alone an emancipatory alternative to the NATO-dominated world order. In this clash between competing imperialisms, it is the workers both of Ukraine and of Russia that stand to suffer most. No workers—Ukrainian, Russian, or otherwise—have an interest in either of the imperialist camps.

Just as the working class is the only class that produces the wealth of society, it is the only social force that can permanently end wars. We therefore agree with and amplify the statement by our comrades in the Revolutionary Socialist Network: “It’s the internationalist solidarity of the workers of the world, in total independence of imperialist powers, that can force the retreat of Russian troops and put an end to these wars by overthrowing our own ruling classes.”

#### <Insert Specific Link>

#### Capitalism is unsustainable – only shifting away avoids inevitable extinction from escalating war, climate change, and biodiversity loss

Foster '19 [John Bellamy; 2/1/19; Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, PhD in Political Science from York University, President and Board Member of the Monthly Review; "Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?" <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/> smarx, HHW]

Indications of this failure of capitalism are **everywhere**. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 **Soaring inequality in income and wealth** has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7

The capture of the **surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions** of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is **rapidly widening once again**.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13

Adequate **health care**, **housing**, **education**, and clean **water** and **air** are **increasingly out of reach** for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15

In the United States and other high-income countries, **life expectancy is in decline**, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “**global health emergency**.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “**social murder**.”18

At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21

More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 **Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet.**

Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23

The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers.

Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27

War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a **global thermonuclear exchange**. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in **wars/bombings in seven different countries**—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and **nuclear arms race is in the making** between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it **marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons**.29

Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30

More than three-quarters of a billion people, over **10 percent of the world population**, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States **keeps climbing**, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling **poor quality and toxic food**. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35

The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generatedenormous riftsin planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38

If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40

Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity.

Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitationof workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value(value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42

We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs ofwar, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expenseof an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43

### Rejection Alternative---1NC

#### Rejection can solve – each decision we make differently has lasting effects towards sustainability

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 155-156] SPark

The good news is that even if there might not be visible changes for a long time, this work is not undertaken for nothing. Think back to the development and also ignition phase in the s-curve. Each choice to do differently, each questioning of the stated purpose or reasons, impacts the former reference frameworks, mind-sets and knowledge reservoirs. It offers alternative meaning, delegitimizes the notion that there are no alternative claims, and offers ideas about other ways of acting or doing things. Of course much structural power rests with those who benefit from the status quo and its hegemonic paradigm. But as Meadows wrote, many individuals— change research suggests about 60 % of people in a system—are open minded and willing to learn.

This is where radical incremental transformation begins, as illustrated nicely in Fig. 5.1. It stems from Ray Ison, professor of the Systems for Sustainability program at the Monash Sustainability Institute in Australia. I was fortunate enough to sit next to him at a conference on decoupling human well-being from resource use and after my presentation he told me he had just finished an article that he felt was relevant to my thinking. The following illustration (Fig. 5.1) is indeed spot on, even though his terminology is of course different:

Ison’s article summarizes 14 years of experience in transdisciplinary research on system innovation processes. As a result, he and his colleagues put “social learning” at the heart of their framework: humans engage in making sense of a situation by socially constructing the issue at stake. Through this process they either reify or change both their understanding of a situation and the practices in which they engage. Sometimes this entails amending the institutional setup (made visible as elements of a situation in the right hand graph). Change and dynamic adaptation is the normal state of being in a complex living system. So each alternative viewpoint, each act done differently, amends the framework for action in the future.

So, in essence, we cannot not be part of changing the world. The decision that lies with us concerns our choice to become aware of this and use it intentionally— even if cause and effect are not always visible or impressive. Over time and through collective or concerted action, the situational amendments transform the system in question even if each shifting from one dynamic stage to another is in itself not very radical or disruptive (here indicated as S1 to Sn in the left hand graph). As part of this process, the boundaries of one system may also be adjusted and thence the scope of what a particular transformation process involves.

So each questioning sparks thought processes in others—an inspiration or irritation that influences the dynamics. Each silence might be interpreted as others please. And we never know when exactly that last incremental activity necessary to prompt a social or ecological tipping point for wider and deeper—radical—regime changes occurs. Social scientists’ research findings suggest that 10 percent of the people in any given system provides the critical mass where new ideas or opinions start spreading rapidly (SCNARC 2011).

In order to strategically influence these permanently ongoing processes of learning and adaptation, it is important to open up a target system: to assess and understand the crucial path dependencies and which purpose or generative imaginary they are serving. This involves infrastructures and technologies, as STS research would point out, the ecological embeddedness that SES approaches highlight, and the enforceable laws, role definitions, and mind-sets that political economist emphasize.

### Fiated Movement Alternative---1NC

#### The alternative is an affirmation of the Communist Party – dual power is uniquely key to accountability mechanisms and connection of communities to foster a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18** (Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> HHW)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be **best forwarded through party organizing**, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on **dual power responds directly to this insight**. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact **create sympathy towards the cause of communism**, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party**.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we **must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism.** We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we **must adopt party organizing**. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, **party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions.** It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such **accountability is crucial**. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. **Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems** within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a **unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement.** Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism.

### Impact Overview---2NC

#### Engaging with NATO means mobilizing the U.S. capitalist machine – this extends the military industrial complex and rentier capitalism by securing markets through coercion – The alternative is the only hope to coalesce the working class’s opposition – that’s AL TARIQI

#### And, the impacts of capitalism ow and turn the case: inequality, exploitation, lack of clean air and water, antibiotic overuse, oil wars, and environmental destruction all independently lead to extinction in the world of the aff – That’s Foster

#### AND, Extinction is baked into the structure of capitalism. Military, health, economic, political and governance crises are reaching a tipping point now, fed by the logic of the market and capitalist expansion

#### Crisis is intrinsic to capitalism and ensures extinction.

Bhabani Shankar Nayak 20, political economist and Professor in Business Management and Programme Director of Business, Management and Marketing, University for the Creative Arts, UK, “Globalization Of Capitalist Crises – OpEd,” Eurasia Review 7/30/20, https://www.eurasiareview.com/30072020-globalization-of-capitalist-crises-oped/

The post pandemic economic recovery looks uncertain and the economic growth projections look gloomy in every stretch of policy paradigm within capitalist imaginations. The strong and existing multilateral cooperation within the Westphalian international system is falling apart and facing its existential threats due to its entrenched Eurocentric bias, democratic deficits and institutional dominance by the erstwhile colonial powers. The world is moving into a long-term crisis within capitalism. The capitalist system has failed to offer any viable alternatives to recover from the crises. It is rather deepening the globalisation of crises and miseries among the masses. The predicaments of hunger, homelessness and unemployment are growing. The idea of accessibility, availability and distribution of essential goods and services are becoming difficult. The markets are shrinking and sinking. Both the producers and consumers are facing the crises in their everyday lives.

The follies of globalisation and its flickers continue to be in denial mode. These illiberal charlatans of power live in the cocoons of their privileged ghettos and argue vehemently that the current crisis is not a capitalist crisis or crisis of globalisation. There is concocted propaganda that the crisis is a product of greedy and irrational individuals, inefficient governments and unproductive states. The free market led systems are only viable and competent alternatives. These reactionary and ahistorical narratives help capitalism by arguing that the current economic, social, political, environmental and Coronavirus led global health crises are products of state and government failures.

The right-wing economists, liberal commentators, salary seeking intellectuals and consultants in different thinktanks continue to glorify and provide ideological justification to capitalist globalisation by hiding its absolute failures in deepening egalitarian democracy, peace and prosperity.

The globalisation of crises under capitalism serves four objectives of the ruling and non-ruling classes. Firstly, these ridiculous propaganda makes people reject the state and government they have formed with the help of their collective will. Secondly, it diminishes citizens faith in their own abilities and own intellect. It weakens and diverts them to analyse and reflect on their own realities. Thirdly, it weakens the state and destroys the capabilities of the governments as instruments of social, economic, political and cultural change for common good based on scientific spirit and progressive future. Finally, it destroys democratic cultures by replacing it with authoritarianism that is concomitant with the requirements of capitalism for its growth. In this way, the fake narratives of reactionary politics and global capitalism helps to achieve these four specific objectives, which are central pillars in establishing authoritarianism accelerated by crises. The globalisation of capitalist crises means globalisation of authoritarian politics and vice versa.

The world is facing six major immanent capitalist crises i.e. i) Coronavirus pandemic led global health crises, ii) environmental crises, iii) economic crises, iv) political crises, v) military crises, and vi) crises of governance. These six crises are integral to each other. One crisis triggers the other. It is impossible to address them separately. Therefore, it needs an integrated and pluriversal approach to understand and address these crises together and find reliable alternatives.

Coronavirus pandemic led global health crises

The Coronavirus pandemic reveals that spill over of virus from their natural habitat to human body is associated with the burgeoning wildlife trade, deforestation and loss of natural wildlife habitat due to over exploitation of nature under capitalism. The monetisation of nature for profit is the foundation of health pandemics.

According to a recent research, two viruses enter into human body from their natural hosts every year for a century now. The Coronavirus led health crisis and other forms of global health crises are products of capitalism, which considers human body and nature as resources to be used for the expansion of capitalist profit. It also uses sickness as business opportunities for health insurance and pharmaceutical corporations. The profit driven healthcare and economic system breeds health crises across the globe. The Coronavirus led pandemic is aggravating existing health crises due to privatisation of public health infrastructures and corporatisation of health services. The alternative is to look at health as human rights and abandon the economic model that seeks profit from illness and business of sickness. The nationalisation and universalisation of healthcare is the only alternative.

Environmental crises

The unprecedented environmental crisis is not natural. The environment is degraded and destabilised by the growth of a desire-based society under capitalism. The magnitude and severity of environmental crisis reveals that capitalist economic system creates grave imbalance within the ecosystem by over exploiting natural resources. From global warming to pollutions and contaminations are the products of the productivist and utilitarian ideology of capitalism, which monetised the environment for the maximisation of profit. It has ruined the land, water and air. The outbreak of air and waterborne diseases are products of environmental crisis manufactured by capitalist system. The irreparable damage to environment is a threat to human lives. The environmental crisis aggravates global economic and health crisis. The reversal of profit driven desire-based capitalist economy is inevitable for a sustainable economic and social future.

Economic crises

Economic crisis is integral to capitalism. The faux neoliberal narrative of austerity as an economic policy alternative to recover from economic crisis is the logic of market on steroids. Austerity is not an economic policy but it is an economic project of the capitalist classes, which enforces economic miseries, political despondency and social alienation on majority of population. The voodoo of austerity and its alconomics culture reproduces crisis and empowers market forces by transferring public resources to the private pockets of the capitalist classes. The only way to recover from the crisis in short run is to abandon austerity driven neoliberal economic policies. The permanent alternative from crisis is to destroy capitalism and all its cultures with the help of popular struggles for a sustainable economy and society based on community and democratic control over resources.

Political crises

The neoliberal shift in economy led to the shift from welfarists social democracy to bourgeois democracy, where uninhibited market forces rule with their invisible free hand. The growth of island of prosperity and continents of miseries are the net outcomes of such a system, which led to the declining legitimacy of the democratic political forces. In this context, there is the rise of reactionary religious and conservative social forces are not only filling the vacuum but also providing legitimacy to the rule of capitalist politics in the name of culture, religion, and nationalism. The recent political upheavals within liberal democracies in different parts of the globe reflects this right-wing shift and reactionary trend in politics. The political crisis is an opportunity for the capitalist classes to dismantle all democratic norms and values in support of authoritarianism. In this decisive period of structural crisis of capitalism, it is only authoritarian politics that can help capitalism to further accumulate at this stage of its growth. The collective politics with collective vision is the only alternative for the survival of the masses.

Military crises

The authoritarian and reactionary political regimes breed conflicts, disputes and wars to stay in power and control resources. The global growth of nationalist war hysteria is producing military crises in land, ocean, air and space. It is also fuelling international arms trade. The colonial, imperialist and capitalist powers consider military crisis is an opportunity to expand their economic base by selling weapons of mass destruction. The guns and capitalist globalisation move together. The military-industrial complex is deepening the idea of security state led by the defence forces that ensures security to capital at the cost of human lives. The states and governments are spending all their resources on military equipment when citizens are suffering in hunger and homelessness. The military crisis puts citizens welfare in the dustbin. The global growth of defence spending is a threat to environment, human lives, peace and prosperity in the world.

Crises of governance

The world is witnessing the growing crisis of global, regional, national and local governance. The crisis of governance means crisis of rule of law, transparency and accountability. The criminogenic character of capitalism prefers a non-transparent and unaccountable system, which provides absolute freedom to the mobility of capital and control labour and its mobility with different legal mechanisms. The laws are for the masses and the capitalist classes live with legal impunity. This capitalist duality is central in creating crisis of governance. The growth of economic and social inequalities, rise of political illegitimacies and illiberal thoughts are also led to the crisis of governance. The struggle for liberal, progressive, egalitarian, cooperative and democratic governance is the only alternative which is destroyed by capitalism in regular intervals.

These six crises are intrinsic capitalism to overcome its own internal contradictions. The different incarnations of capitalism reveal that capitalism is an incubator of crises. There is no alternative to solve crises within capitalism. The globalisation is the diminuendos of capitalist world economy, which promised peace and prosperity but in reality, it is globalising crises and miseries. The astrologers of capitalism have lost all their gods and worshiping false god of propaganda has expired its usable date. The idolatry of capitalist falsehood is not an alternative to recover from the crisis of its own making. It is time to learn from our experiences with capitalist catastrophe and its history of crises. There is no individual freedom within capitalism in which majority suffer. Our individual freedoms are interlinked with collective emancipation. The glocal emancipatory struggle against capitalism is the only alternative for a collective future based on liberty, equality, justice and fraternity. The national socialism is only possible with practice of internationalism. The worldwide collective actions and resistance movements can revise and re-establish the hidden glory of socialism as only alternative.

# Framework

## Neg FW

### General FW

### Ontology Framework---2NC

#### Interpretation: Evaluate the ontology of the capitalist 1AC’s advocacy prior to material simulations of government action.

#### Logic---no one has the agency to enact the plan, but we can control the orientation of our political subjectivities and direct them either toward or against neoliberalism.

#### Pedagogy---the substance of the K is offense: students must be aware of how ideas either challenge or strengthen apparatuses of violence. Ignoring the question in favor of plan focus is self-defeating and complicit with evil, impact-turning the justification for their framework at its most basic level.

#### Ontology comes first – the false epistemic consciousness of a western world permits colonialism. Only thorough recognizing the multiplicity of worldviews can the matrix of colonial power be broken.

Blaney and Tickner 17 [David L. Blaney Macalester College, Usa Arlene B. Tickner University Del Rosario, Colombia, "Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR," SAGE Journals, https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817702446, smarx, HHW]

As hinted throughout this article, developing the ontological sensitivity required to break with the seal-sealing logic of modern metaphysics poses a daunting challenge to social scientists. Verran reminds us that even critical scholarship customarily embraces **‘the false epistemic consciousness of science [that] permits its colonialist commitment** to a spatial universalism’.86 Our sense is that existing calls for pluralising IR, important as they are for the future of the field, fall short of charting the moves necessary to undue the production of a colonial one-world world. Doing difference differently (meaning generatively and in good faith) **requires more than engaging across perspectives on a single world**; we need also to envision mechanisms for a cosmopolitics practiced both as diplomatic relations between worlds and collaborative revealing of knowledge that decolonises science.

Although promising, the Global IR project too readily slips back into a ‘one-world world’ by recognising a multiplicity of worldviews but not the existence of many reals. The awakening called for by a decolonial science demands, first and foremost, that attempts to tame ontological moments of rupture and disconcertment as **different ways of seeing, believing or knowing the same reality be resisted so that we can bring the pluriverse into view**. Though perhaps generative of more sensitive epistemologies, this mistaking of ontology as epistemology founders because it turns to familiar concepts and presumptions about the human condition and nature that **erase alternative worlds**. In contrast, the provocation posed by a pluriversal IR is not just that we hold other ways of knowing the world accountable to ‘our’ positivist, scientific or academic criteria for authoritative science. How we know reality is not the only issue at stake, but, rather, what reals we confront. Such a shift entails moving away from questions of who has the power to represent the world in certain ways towards examination of the ontological politics at play in creating (and suppressing) the worlds within with the study of specific problems and political action itself take place.

**The decolonial project/science that we have described works to puncture single-world (colonial) logics that render human (and non-human) experience as singular and the same**, while upholding the idea that ‘becoming worldly’ demands that we ‘become with many’.87 Contrary to the incredulity and uneasiness often expressed towards forms of practice, including knowledge-building and politics, in which ancestors, spirits and earth-beings partake, responding effectively and respectfully to the pluriverse presumes that we **learn to bend in the face of and to walk with others in the cosmos, thinking and being beyond the familiar**.88 Similarly, and perhaps in a language more familiar to our eyes, if worlds are made, the challenge that remains is to imagine creative and meaningful forms of reciprocity and collaborative practice that **might be the basis for forging connection and mutually supportive relations across ontological difference.**

**Enframing DA---contesting neoliberalism via ontological politics is necessary to solve the enframing of the subject and the world that is the root cause of the case.   
Anna Grear 20,** （Cardiff law professor, “Resisting anthropocene neoliberalism: Towards new materialist commoning?” https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/200757722.pdf 3. Commons and Commoning as Ontological Politics Escobar, primarily an anti-globalization AND -Capitalocene.）

To appreciate fully the decisive importance of commons as ontological politics, it seems important to locate reflection in the contemporary situation. This is, after all, the situation in which anti-capitalist commoning seeks to resist capitalist enclosures, appropriations and captures. The contemporary era is often referred to as “Anthropocene,” which is a widely deployed term for a “new age of man” in which the human species has become a geological, rather than just a biological, force.75 The terminology is etymologically drawn from Anthropos (man) and kainos (new)—and was first popularized in 2002.76 It is important to remember, however, that despite the notion that the “anthropos” of the Anthropocene is a species figuration, in reality, it is not. 77 Moreover, as Haraway has pointed out, the Anthropocene is intrinsically coupled with the scale of the “global,” and the “global” is highly specific in its origins and development.78 In reality, the Anthropocene reflects highly uneven historical processes of colonization79 and rampant capitalist neocoloniality. 80 So specific—indeed—is the “global” folded into the Anthropocene that the “Anthropocene” is also identified by some as the “Capitalocene.”81 I will use the term “Anthropocene-Capitalocene” to foreground the uneven origins and contemporary mal-distribution of Anthropocene climate and environmental fallouts; the fundamentally colonial capitalist imperatives driving the continuing structural dominance of the fossil-fuel economy; 82 extensive, and continuing, corporate enclosures in the Global South; 83 and the pervasive and expanding commodification and technification of “nature.”84 So much is at stake. Neoliberalism is now the dominant engine of the Anthropocene-Capitalocene: it enacts violence extensively visited upon communities, individuals, places, animals, ecosystems and other lively materialities either in the way of or (alternatively) in the sights of, neoliberal agendas. The colonizing of multiple life-worlds at stake in neoliberal accumulation reiterates, and builds on, earlier patterns of ontological (and epistemological) violence85 underlying Eurocentric power distributions of the international legal order. 86 More fundamentally, neoliberal accumulative rationalism ultimately relies—as Weber and Escobar both either state or imply—upon a central, binary set of severed ontological relations between “humans” and “nature,” between “subject” and “object”. Ontology is at the heart of the current sets of crises. The wellrehearsed, uneven, and entirely predictable mal-distributions of life and death characterizing the Anthropocene-Capitalocene thus draw upon the same fundamental ontological splits as have long operated in the service of Eurocentric, masculinist, colonizing power. 87 In the Anthropocene-Capitalocene, neoliberalism’s biopolitical/necropolitical logics are driving a potential terminus—including for human beings. As Stengers puts it in In Catastrophic Times, 88 human beings face, potentially “the death of what we have called a civilization [—and, she reminds us—] there are many manners of dying, some being more ugly than others.”89 Even death itself—the great leveler—is unevenly distributed, whether as terminus or process. Neoliberalism actively exploits the notion that there is no other solution to the enormity of the problems confronting humanity—and, accordingly, constructs the illusion that there is no alternative to neoliberal managerial eco-governance on a planetary scale. Indeed, Stengers argues that even “radical uncertainty with regard to the catastrophes that [the current crisis] is likely to produce . . . won’t make the capitalist machine hesitate, because it is incapable of hesitating: it can’t do anything other than define every situation as a source of profit.”90 The logics of consumptive capitalism will continue to insist—in short—that “the techno-industrial capitalist path is the only one that is viable”91 in the face of the Anthropocene-Capitalocene planetary crisis. The ascendancy of such logic is already evident in the growing popularity of ethically dubious92 commitments to geo-engineering as a way of techno-fixing the climate, irrespective of the risks involved. 93 Such hubristic strategies amount to a form of risky gambling with the futures of millions, 94 and reveal the vulnerability of “humanity in its entirety [to being] taken hostage” by capitalist profit making “solutions” for the otherwise (supposedly) insoluble: “In this way, an ‘infernal alternative’ [is] fabricated at the planetary scale: either it’s us, your saviours, or it’s the end of the world.”95 Against such horizons, it is all the more urgent for commoning to offer multiple forms of resistance. The dangers for the commons, however, are pervasive: panoptic governance and neoliberal eco-managerialism already subvert, as we have seen, some commons for pro-capitalist ends, and in the final analysis, there is absolutely nothing to guarantee that any commons will be, or remain, immune from capture. Moreover, [t]here isn’t the slightest guarantee that we will be able to overcome the hold that capitalism has over us (and in this instance, what some have proposed calling “capitalocene,” and not anthropocene, will be a geological epoch that is extremely short). Nor do we know how, in the best of cases, we might live in the ruins that it will leave us: the window of opportunity in which, on paper, the measures to take were reasonably clear, is in the process of closing.96 If the Anthropocene-Capitalocene leaves a window of opportunity in the process of closing, ontology as politics could not be more decisively important or timely—and commoning has never been more urgent as a dynamic of ontological resistance. What, then, might New Materialism offer to commons thought in the face of such struggles? And how does New Materialism offer agentic significance to the more-than-human? And why might that matter in the calculus of resistance to neoliberalism’s voracious colonization of lifeworlds?

### Epistemology Framework---2NC

#### Interpretation: The judge should evaluate the research practices and pedagogical implications of the 1AC’s capitalist advocacy prior to material simulations of government action.

#### It’s fair---it preserves aff choice while holding them accountable for choices made regarding the presentation and construction of the 1AC

#### Most logical---no one has the agency to enact the plan, but we can control the orientation of our political subjectivities and direct them either toward or against neoliberalism---ignoring how ideas either challenge or strengthen apparatuses of violence is both self-defeating and complicit with evil, impact-turning the justification for their framework at its most basic level.3

#### Epistemology comes first - competing positions educate us and amend the framework

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 155-156] SPark

The good news is that even if there might not be visible changes for a long time, this work is not undertaken for nothing. Think back to the development and also ignition phase in the s-curve. Each choice to do differently, each questioning of the stated purpose or reasons, impacts the former reference frameworks, mind-sets and knowledge reservoirs. It offers alternative meaning, delegitimizes the notion that there are no alternative claims, and offers ideas about other ways of acting or doing things. Of course much structural power rests with those who benefit from the status quo and its hegemonic paradigm. But as Meadows wrote, many individuals— change research suggests about 60 % of people in a system—are open minded and willing to learn.

This is where radical incremental transformation begins, as illustrated nicely in Fig. 5.1. It stems from Ray Ison, professor of the Systems for Sustainability program at the Monash Sustainability Institute in Australia. I was fortunate enough to sit next to him at a conference on decoupling human well-being from resource use and after my presentation he told me he had just finished an article that he felt was relevant to my thinking. The following illustration (Fig. 5.1) is indeed spot on, even though his terminology is of course different:

Ison’s article summarizes 14 years of experience in transdisciplinary research on system innovation processes. As a result, he and his colleagues put “social learning” at the heart of their framework: humans engage in making sense of a situation by socially constructing the issue at stake. Through this process they either reify or change both their understanding of a situation and the practices in which they engage. Sometimes this entails amending the institutional setup (made visible as elements of a situation in the right hand graph). Change and dynamic adaptation is the normal state of being in a complex living system. So each alternative viewpoint, each act done differently, amends the framework for action in the future.

So, in essence, we cannot not be part of changing the world. The decision that lies with us concerns our choice to become aware of this and use it intentionally— even if cause and effect are not always visible or impressive. Over time and through collective or concerted action, the situational amendments transform the system in question even if each shifting from one dynamic stage to another is in itself not very radical or disruptive (here indicated as S1 to Sn in the left hand graph). As part of this process, the boundaries of one system may also be adjusted and thence the scope of what a particular transformation process involves.

So each questioning sparks thought processes in others—an inspiration or irritation that influences the dynamics. Each silence might be interpreted as others please. And we never know when exactly that last incremental activity necessary to prompt a social or ecological tipping point for wider and deeper—radical—regime changes occurs. Social scientists’ research findings suggest that 10 percent of the people in any given system provides the critical mass where new ideas or opinions start spreading rapidly (SCNARC 2011).

In order to strategically influence these permanently ongoing processes of learning and adaptation, it is important to open up a target system: to assess and understand the crucial path dependencies and which purpose or generative imaginary they are serving. This involves infrastructures and technologies, as STS research would point out, the ecological embeddedness that SES approaches highlight, and the enforceable laws, role definitions, and mind-sets that political economist emphasize.

### Competing Ideologies Framework ---2NC

#### Interpretation: The ballot decides the desirability of capitalism

#### It’s educational – Our links prove that capitalism is the central ideological question of the resolution, which is meaningful educational ground for both sides

#### It’s fair – You get to weigh the aff as a reason cap is good, and if you can’t defend cap good on the NATO topic, you deserve to lose -- AL TARIQI proves that Post Warsaw Pact NATO exists to promote western capitalist goals

#### Pluralistic universalism is needed to upset the colonialist power imbalance of the west’s monistic universalism.

Blaney and Tickner 17 [David L. Blaney Macalester College, Usa Arlene B. Tickner University Del Rosario, Colombia, "Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR," SAGE Journals, https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817702446, smarx, HHW]

In another response to critical scholars’ growing sense of IR’s provincialism and complicity with relations of domination, Amitav Acharya asks, ‘does the discipline…truly reflect the global society we live in today?’ In his call for a Global IR, he answers unambiguously that the discipline remains trapped in a colonial pedagogical mentality, where ‘it is the universities, scholars, and publishing outlets in the West that dominate and set the agenda’.39 Indeed, the standard starting points of inquiry reveal deep provincialism. How can we think of the Cold War as a long-peace, given the vast body-count across the globe? How is a liberal peace consistent with liberal colonial wars? Why do the field’s foundational stories revert to World War I and not the administration of race relations and external (and internal) colonies? Why do theorists trace their genealogy almost exclusively to names like Hobbes and Locke, but almost never to Nehru or Fanon? The punch line is that the ethnocentrism so pervasive in International Relations constitutes one of its main handicaps.

Acharya lays out a programme for revitalising International Relations as ‘Global IR’.40 Importantly, Global IR is rooted in a ‘**pluralistic universalism’ in contrast to an objectionable ‘monistic universalism’**. Monistic universalism posits a homogenous global reality, manifested as ‘European imperialism’ and, closer to home, as ‘arbitrary standard setting, gatekeeping, and marginalization of alternative narratives, ideas, and methodologies’.41 In contrast, commitment to pluralism ‘allows us to view the world of IR as a large, overarching canopy with multiple foundations’.42 However, as authors such as Law might warn us, a power-saturated ‘one-world world’ imaginary seems to lurk within or alongside this all-inclusive umbrella.

Acharya’s vision aims to transcend ‘first generation efforts’ limited to a critique of Western-centrism in the discipline with a ‘second-generation challenge’ that demonstrates that non-Western concepts and theories are applicable beyond their original national and regional contexts.43 So, according to him, Global IR is grounded in world history in that it ‘recognizes the voices, experiences, and values of all people’44 and resists turning the non-West into a laboratory or ‘raw data’ for testing conventional Western/Northern theories. But, when we consult the details of this project, it exhibits a tension between one-world thinking and the existence of multiple reals.

#### And, if we win FW – The alternative is irrelevant – the question of whether capitalism is good or bad is a prior question to discerning potential alternatives.

#### Diagnosing capitalism is a pre-requisite

Bailey ’19 [David and Angela Wigger; August 21; senior lecturer in politics at the University of Birmingham, associate professor in global political economy at Radboud University, Netherlands; openDemocracy; “Studying capitalist dystopias, and avenues for change,” <https://app.slack.com/client/T03L34L1AQ5/C03L3S326S1>] SPark

We live in dystopian times. The crisis of global capitalism is revealing itself in the most uncompromising fashion. Quantitative easing – the one ‘solution’ to the last crisis – has only re-inflated the global financial bubble, and created the prospect for the next impending crisis to be greater than witnessed heretofore. Government bonds across the industrialized world are either [approaching, or already at, negative interest rates](https://www.ft.com/content/820e3aac-ba1a-11e9-8a88-aa6628ac896c). Financial investors, aware of the next big recession, are [betting against](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/15/upshot/inverted-yield-curve-bonds-football-analogy.html) long term economic growth, for [up to the next thirty years](https://www.ft.com/content/d74ee42e-beef-11e9-b350-db00d509634e). Something is clearly amiss!

Those not fortunate enough to gamble on financial markets are already living the dystopian consequences of capitalism. [In the Global North,](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_650551/lang--en/index.htm) [wages have stagnated](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_650551/lang--en/index.htm) over the past decade, employment is increasingly [temporary and insecure](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf), and the ongoing erosion of the welfare state has become manifest in a [housing crisis](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14616718.2014.997431), [health care crisis](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0168851016300860),[and an](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)60463-3/fulltext) [elderly care crisis](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)60463-3/fulltext), all of which increases the [care burden placed upon women](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0019793915588892). The ‘age of austerity’ created the perverse situation that [children of the rich industrialised world increasingly face poverty](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/Children_of_austerity.pdf). The aftermath of the global economic crisis has brought with it prolonged neoliberal restructuring, authoritarianism and heightened inequality.

In the Global South, poverty, violence and climate change continue to push [thousands into dangerous attempts to migrate across borders](https://www.voanews.com/europe/iom-migrant-deaths-globally-top-32000-2014), risking either death or imprisonment in [inhumane detention centres](https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/07/1041991) with little or no regard for human rights. Natural resources have been depleted to the extent that we have [little chance of reversing the harm](https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/ga12131.doc.htm) that has been caused, and climate change proceeds unabated.

This is global capitalism in 2019. In order to understand current political responses we need to diagnose capitalism, and point towards potential alternatives, grounded in a utopian vision for making a better world possible.

### Positional Competition Framework ---2NC

\*\*\*(This FW is to be read when defending a fiated movement alternative that is susceptible to losing to a permutation)

#### Framework: the affirmative’s philosophical investments in capitalism are bound to the plan.

#### The Neg gets a competing political strategy to capitalism, and the aff can dispute its efficacy.

#### We solve Education best-

#### Broadening Horizons - Centering the debate around major assumptions taken by the 1AC radically widens our exposure to better perspectives.

#### Strategy testing---plan focus artificially narrows the range of alternatives by simplifying eight minutes of scholarship into an eight second plan text.

#### Ballot Efficacy ---a neg ballot forces debaters to explore affs which link less or take down the system, an actively anti-capitalist approach that affects how we think and feel inside and outside the round.

**Key to Fairness**

#### Neg Flex - The K and framework are crucial weapons to preserving fairness on the NATO topic. Their interpretation turns fairness offense.

#### Provides Aff ground – Debating movement solvency is better ground than nebulous “rejection” alternatives, that also turn education by preventing discussions of real alternatives.

#### And, if we win FW No Perms – 1. They deck education and fairness - a “demilitarize K” incoherently wouldn’t compete against a heg good aff if the plan withdraws troops, AND 2. “overwhelm the link” arguments thrash clash and education by combining ideologically polarized political options.

#### 

#### Pluralistic universalism is needed to upset the colonialist power imbalance of the west’s monistic universalism.

Blaney and Tickner 17 [David L. Blaney Macalester College, Usa Arlene B. Tickner University Del Rosario, Colombia, "Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR," SAGE Journals, https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817702446, smarx, HHW]

In another response to critical scholars’ growing sense of IR’s provincialism and complicity with relations of domination, Amitav Acharya asks, ‘does the discipline…truly reflect the global society we live in today?’ In his call for a Global IR, he answers unambiguously that the discipline remains trapped in a colonial pedagogical mentality, where ‘it is the universities, scholars, and publishing outlets in the West that dominate and set the agenda’.39 Indeed, the standard starting points of inquiry reveal deep provincialism. How can we think of the Cold War as a long-peace, given the vast body-count across the globe? How is a liberal peace consistent with liberal colonial wars? Why do the field’s foundational stories revert to World War I and not the administration of race relations and external (and internal) colonies? Why do theorists trace their genealogy almost exclusively to names like Hobbes and Locke, but almost never to Nehru or Fanon? The punch line is that the ethnocentrism so pervasive in International Relations constitutes one of its main handicaps.

Acharya lays out a programme for revitalising International Relations as ‘Global IR’.40 Importantly, Global IR is rooted in a ‘**pluralistic universalism’ in contrast to an objectionable ‘monistic universalism’**. Monistic universalism posits a homogenous global reality, manifested as ‘European imperialism’ and, closer to home, as ‘arbitrary standard setting, gatekeeping, and marginalization of alternative narratives, ideas, and methodologies’.41 In contrast, commitment to pluralism ‘allows us to view the world of IR as a large, overarching canopy with multiple foundations’.42 However, as authors such as Law might warn us, a power-saturated ‘one-world world’ imaginary seems to lurk within or alongside this all-inclusive umbrella.

Acharya’s vision aims to transcend ‘first generation efforts’ limited to a critique of Western-centrism in the discipline with a ‘second-generation challenge’ that demonstrates that non-Western concepts and theories are applicable beyond their original national and regional contexts.43 So, according to him, Global IR is grounded in world history in that it ‘recognizes the voices, experiences, and values of all people’44 and resists turning the non-West into a laboratory or ‘raw data’ for testing conventional Western/Northern theories. But, when we consult the details of this project, it exhibits a tension between one-world thinking and the existence of multiple reals.

### Framework---AT: Fairness/Clash---2NC

#### Clash and fairness are wrong:

#### 1. PREDICTABILITY. Cap good/bad is one of the oldest, vibrant, and most researched philosophical debates in history. Especially predictable because we’re on the camp’s packet.

#### 2. SIDE BIAS. No ground loss, because YOU have the prep advantage AND choose the topic.

#### 3. STRUCTURAL FAIRNESS. Disparities in speed, experience, and camps all prove fairness is not the primary motivation for the activity.

#### 4. Debate is SELF-CORRECTING. The AFF’s dystopia of an unfair wasteland is incoherent, because the best teams will adapt (by investing in research that propels capitalism less). At worst, ground loss is temporary, meaning education outweighs.

5. INTERP SOLVES. Only Ks about capitalism are allowed, and you can weigh your aff.

It’s not a hard standard to meet---our interp isn’t “any risk of a link,” but asks whether the aff is more capitalist than anti-capitalist.

Theory---AT: Multi-Actor---2NC

#### Multi-actor fiat:

#### 1. FRAMEWORK IS OFFENSE. If we should reject capitalism, that precedes fairness, and the only important issue is how to take it down.

#### 2. PREDICTABILITY. Most anti-capitalist literature advocates for global movements.

#### 3. YOU LINK TOO. Enactment and enforcement of the plan includes the millions of members in the federal government.

#### 4. NEG FLEX. Cross-apply it.

#### 5. ARBITRARINESS. Non-resolutional theory is impossible to predict. Aff teams will continue to shift the goalpost towards interps that are marginally better for debate.

Theory---AT: Utopian Etc---2NC

#### Yes, it’s unlikely and fanciful---that’s good:

#### 1. EDUCATION---opening our minds to the politics of the possible allows us to develop novel ideas about how to challenge macropolitical structures.

#### 2. RECIPROCITY---debate encourages utopian visions of the world. Constraining our proposals to the politically feasible ruins the game for both sides.

#### 3. LOGIC---proposing a problem without a solution encourages resentful and fruitless subjects.

#### 4. AFF GROUND---if the neg can fiat a revolution, you get instant access to impact turns. Otherwise, alternatives become vague and shifty, which makes your job harder.

Theory---AT: Perf Con---2NC

1. No perf con---each disad is further proof for the K, demonstrating contradictions within the capitalist system itself.
2. EVEN IF---not a voter---kicking contradictory positions solves their offense.

### Positional Compeition FW Ext. Cards

#### Questioning the system and setting alternate paths are critical in sparking change

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 155-156] SPark

The good news is that even if there might not be visible changes for a long time, this work is not undertaken for nothing. Think back to the development and also ignition phase in the s-curve. Each choice to do differently, each questioning of the stated purpose or reasons, impacts the former reference frameworks, mind-sets and knowledge reservoirs. It offers alternative meaning, delegitimizes the notion that there are no alternative claims, and offers ideas about other ways of acting or doing things. Of course much structural power rests with those who benefit from the status quo and its hegemonic paradigm. But as Meadows wrote, many individuals— change research suggests about 60 % of people in a system—are open minded and willing to learn.

This is where radical incremental transformation begins, as illustrated nicely in Fig. 5.1. It stems from Ray Ison, professor of the Systems for Sustainability program at the Monash Sustainability Institute in Australia. I was fortunate enough to sit next to him at a conference on decoupling human well-being from resource use and after my presentation he told me he had just finished an article that he felt was relevant to my thinking. The following illustration (Fig. 5.1) is indeed spot on, even though his terminology is of course different:

Ison’s article summarizes 14 years of experience in transdisciplinary research on system innovation processes. As a result, he and his colleagues put “social learning” at the heart of their framework: humans engage in making sense of a situation by socially constructing the issue at stake. Through this process they either reify or change both their understanding of a situation and the practices in which they engage. Sometimes this entails amending the institutional setup (made visible as elements of a situation in the right hand graph). Change and dynamic adaptation is the normal state of being in a complex living system. So each alternative viewpoint, each act done differently, amends the framework for action in the future.

So, in essence, we cannot not be part of changing the world. The decision that lies with us concerns our choice to become aware of this and use it intentionally— even if cause and effect are not always visible or impressive. Over time and through collective or concerted action, the situational amendments transform the system in question even if each shifting from one dynamic stage to another is in itself not very radical or disruptive (here indicated as S1 to Sn in the left hand graph). As part of this process, the boundaries of one system may also be adjusted and thence the scope of what a particular transformation process involves.

So each questioning sparks thought processes in others—an inspiration or irritation that influences the dynamics. Each silence might be interpreted as others please. And we never know when exactly that last incremental activity necessary to prompt a social or ecological tipping point for wider and deeper—radical—regime changes occurs. Social scientists’ research findings suggest that 10 percent of the people in any given system provides the critical mass where new ideas or opinions start spreading rapidly (SCNARC 2011).

In order to strategically influence these permanently ongoing processes of learning and adaptation, it is important to open up a target system: to assess and understand the crucial path dependencies and which purpose or generative imaginary they are serving. This involves infrastructures and technologies, as STS research would point out, the ecological embeddedness that SES approaches highlight, and the enforceable laws, role definitions, and mind-sets that political economist emphasize.

### Epistemology FW Ext. Cards

#### Questioning the system and setting alternate paths are critical in sparking change

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 155-156] SPark

The good news is that even if there might not be visible changes for a long time, this work is not undertaken for nothing. Think back to the development and also ignition phase in the s-curve. Each choice to do differently, each questioning of the stated purpose or reasons, impacts the former reference frameworks, mind-sets and knowledge reservoirs. It offers alternative meaning, delegitimizes the notion that there are no alternative claims, and offers ideas about other ways of acting or doing things. Of course much structural power rests with those who benefit from the status quo and its hegemonic paradigm. But as Meadows wrote, many individuals— change research suggests about 60 % of people in a system—are open minded and willing to learn.

This is where radical incremental transformation begins, as illustrated nicely in Fig. 5.1. It stems from Ray Ison, professor of the Systems for Sustainability program at the Monash Sustainability Institute in Australia. I was fortunate enough to sit next to him at a conference on decoupling human well-being from resource use and after my presentation he told me he had just finished an article that he felt was relevant to my thinking. The following illustration (Fig. 5.1) is indeed spot on, even though his terminology is of course different:

Ison’s article summarizes 14 years of experience in transdisciplinary research on system innovation processes. As a result, he and his colleagues put “social learning” at the heart of their framework: humans engage in making sense of a situation by socially constructing the issue at stake. Through this process they either reify or change both their understanding of a situation and the practices in which they engage. Sometimes this entails amending the institutional setup (made visible as elements of a situation in the right hand graph). Change and dynamic adaptation is the normal state of being in a complex living system. So each alternative viewpoint, each act done differently, amends the framework for action in the future.

So, in essence, we cannot not be part of changing the world. The decision that lies with us concerns our choice to become aware of this and use it intentionally— even if cause and effect are not always visible or impressive. Over time and through collective or concerted action, the situational amendments transform the system in question even if each shifting from one dynamic stage to another is in itself not very radical or disruptive (here indicated as S1 to Sn in the left hand graph). As part of this process, the boundaries of one system may also be adjusted and thence the scope of what a particular transformation process involves.

So each questioning sparks thought processes in others—an inspiration or irritation that influences the dynamics. Each silence might be interpreted as others please. And we never know when exactly that last incremental activity necessary to prompt a social or ecological tipping point for wider and deeper—radical—regime changes occurs. Social scientists’ research findings suggest that 10 percent of the people in any given system provides the critical mass where new ideas or opinions start spreading rapidly (SCNARC 2011).

In order to strategically influence these permanently ongoing processes of learning and adaptation, it is important to open up a target system: to assess and understand the crucial path dependencies and which purpose or generative imaginary they are serving. This involves infrastructures and technologies, as STS research would point out, the ecological embeddedness that SES approaches highlight, and the enforceable laws, role definitions, and mind-sets that political economist emphasize.

#### Epistemology first – the aff and society is littered with capitalist propaganda

Horowitz 22 [Eli Horowitz, 6-26-2022, "Capitalism Is the Real Information War," MR Online, https://mronline.org/2022/06/26/capitalism-is-the-real-information-war/, DOA: 7-7-2022, SMarx, JTong]

Bigger Is Badder: Disinformation Economies of Scale

As if all of this wasn’t already bad enough, capitalists also engage in coordinated disinformation campaigns. You likely already know about some of these: the infamous “tobacco industry playbook” that protected cigarette revenues for decades against the threat of cancer lawsuits; the National Football League’s history of muddying the waters on concussions; and, of course, the fact that the oil industry knew about global warming nearly fifty years ago and chose to cover it up rather than lose out on profits. But corporate-backed disinformation programs like these are much more common and much older than you may think.

Instead of admitting that its products poisoned millions of children, the lead industry threatened to sue television networks and ran public relation campaigns blaming parents. The industry-backed National Rifle Association has been pushing pro-gun propaganda for decades. Not satisfied with having hidden the reality and severity of climate change from us for decades, the oil industry is now spreading lies about electric vehicles. Coca-Cola and Georgia-Pacific have been known to launder their propaganda through flawed publications in science journals. Sometimes, corporations even wage these campaigns against one another, as in the recent case of Facebook hiring a right-wing political strategy firm to spread false claims about TikTok, one of its competitors.

Nor is the problem limited to corporations that want to downplay specific dangers so as to protect their existing business models. More and more, falsehoods are the business model. The capitalist need for deception has become so widespread that there’s now an entire “disinformation-for-hire” industry whose entire purpose is to mislead and confuse the public. At the same time, traffic-oriented businesses like Facebook have learned to build themselves around anything that grabs users’ attention, even if those things are misinformation, manufactured controversies, or lies.

#### Epistemology Outweighs – Capitalist media is based around propaganda and lies

Pickard 21 [Victor Pickard, professor at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, 4-22-2021, "Unseeing propaganda: How communication scholars learned to love commercial media," Misinformation Review, https://misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu/article/unseeing-propaganda-how-communication-scholars-learned-to-love-commercial-media/, DOA: 7-7-2022, SMarx, JTong]

Instead of calling out capitalism’s corrosive effects on news and information, many were celebrating the affordances of new digital technologies and belittling concerns about monopoly power. Henry Jenkins (2006), for example, dismissed media reformers as “critical pessimists” for treating audiences as passive dupes and relying too much on “melodramatic discourse about victimization and vulnerability” (pp. 247–248). Over the years, strands of cultural studies (ironic, given their Marxist roots) joined positivist social scientists in privileging descriptive over prescriptive analyses and, at least by implication, dismissing reformist and normative concerns. This long-term marginalization of structural and critical approaches to communication research made identifying potential harms and necessary reforms less likely.

Today, as in the 1940s, communication scholars are scrutinizing monopolistic firms and their social roles. Using terms like dis- and misinformation, we too rarely acknowledge the unbridled commercialism driving these propaganda machines, from Facebook to Fox News. There’s less evasion now, but we still face a crossroads. Scholars who study these issues can once again travel the path that ultimately reaffirms existing power structures—perhaps through some “social responsibility” arrangement for platforms and media outlets. Or we can advocate for radically reforming and democratizing information and communication infrastructures. The choice is ours.

Fortunately, positive signs suggest we’re doing better this time. A new generation of critical scholars, many of whom are women and people of color, are connecting dis/misinformation and systemic racism to structural failures such as illegitimate business models, monopoly power, and capitalism writ large (e.g., Cottom, 2020; Noble, 2018), and media reform activists are centering critiques of racial capitalism in their calls for “media reparations” (Free Press, 2020). However, other analysts are contending there’s an overemphasis on such structural factors, denouncing it as so much social hysteria and moral panic. While some concerns about overreactions and misdiagnosing problems are legitimate, they run the risk of reinscribing a limited effects framework that de-emphasizes harms posed by commercial media institutions and implicitly pooh-poohs reform efforts.

Of course, misinformation alone doesn’t cause social pathologies, but it helps prolong and exacerbate them, from hardening distrust toward public institutions to promoting outright fascism. Falsehoods circulating through media don’t always produce dangerous mythologies and behaviors, but they can legitimate, reinforce, and amplify them. Media serve as ideological glue for keeping long-standing narratives intact. Studying political elites and social groups in disinformation campaigns—and cultural and psychological factors that comprise audiences’ affect and identity—is certainly important. But if we fail to acknowledge the structural enablers that make malignant communicative behavior possible in the first place, we doom ourselves to perpetuating it.

Ultimately, we should heed earlier critical scholars’ insights that structural problems require structural reform. These reforms should remove or reduce commercial logics incentivizing corporate behavior that hurts democracy. More than simply placing regulatory patches on broken commercial systems, we must intervene at media’s very foundations via a two-pronged strategy of breaking-up and/or aggressively regulating corporate monopolies while building out non-commercial, democratic alternatives. This approach recognizes that we need not only a negative program that aims to snuff out fascistic propaganda, but also a positive program that provides robust, diverse, and reliable news and information to all communities—and these communities should be centrally involved in governing and making their own media.

Trustbusting information monopolies always should be on the table, but we also must address systemic market failures that aren’t solvable by simply enhancing competition between media outlets. In other words, these aren’t just monopoly problems; they’re capitalism problems. In some cases, we should remove news and information from the commercial market entirely and treat them as the public goods they are. For example, it’s now abundantly clear that the market won’t support the local journalism that democracy requires. Therefore, we should bring local news media under public ownership and democratic governance (Pickard, 2020). Accordingly, we could treat platforms like public utilities, enforce strong public interest requirements, build out public media infrastructures, municipalize broadband services, and subsidize local journalism.

#### The Aff’s rejection of the alt is the only reason it fails – debating about capitalism and its reformation or refusal is good

Rollert 19 [John Paul Rollert, adjunct assistant professor at the Booth School of Business, 11-13-2019, "The Questions That Will Shape the Future of Capitalism," University of Chicago Booth School of Business, https://www.chicagobooth.edu/review/questions-will-shape-future-capitalism, DOA: 7-7-2022, SMarx, JTong]

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, unless the pendulum of practicable economics swings in the direction of a different system entirely, considerable disparities of wealth, an essential condition of capitalist advancement, will remain, and those who will continue to occupy the favorable end of this bell curve will be business professionals. They will be rich in a time when the instrumental role of riches will be suspect and the respectability of great wealth doubtful. They will not be able to justify to others, and perhaps even to juries of conscience, that material success is a moral justification unto itself, that simply by doing the best for themselves, they have already done the best they might do for others. Unlike for those who preceded them, this ideological assumption, so tempting and convenient, will no longer be available to them. Great wealth will not be its own justification. It will need to be vindicated by the power it confers.

Such an undertaking calls for a reengagement with debates over the responsibilities of citizenship, one that involves visiting anew questions of liberty, justice, equality, wealth, power, and tradition. It also requires a willingness to use power, in both the private and public spheres, less as a club to clear the way for commercial activity than as an implement of some higher aim, undertaken in a spirit of great responsibility and obligation.

Such an approach is hardly foreign to the business community. Indeed, such aspirations were a common language for the commercial elect in the decades after World War II, and they still fill the charters of public companies, professional associations, and major business schools alike. If, today, they seem the stuff of boilerplate, a few scattered phrases that are little more than an empty nod to etiquette, that’s more a reflection of our own civic disengagement than the dead letter of misbegotten ambition.

#### Need alt now educate yourself dude. Stop being stagnant.

Guerrero ’18 [Dorothy Grace; 2018; Head of Policy and Advocacy of Global Justice; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “THE LIMITS OF CAPITALIST SOLUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CRISIS,” Ch. 2, p. 39] SPark

A growth-driven and market-dependent system is incompatible with environmental security. Rethinking the ways that states and societies value nature and how resources are allocated and managed must be done now by those who believe in a meaningful and productive life. The climate crisis is not just an environmental issue – it is a global social and ecological crisis requiring an overhaul of the global political and economic systems. There is no time to lose. Linking various social justice issues with the problem of climate change, coupled with radical anti-capitalist analysis and out-of-the-box solutions favouring equity and sustainability, has great potential for bottom-up social transformation. For climate justice activists, the severity of the climate crisis reaffirms the eco-socialist argument that capitalism not only generates war, poverty and insecurity but also potentially threatens human survival in vulnerable areas. The right to development and the need for alternative development also raises class issues and the divide not only between rich and developing countries, but also between the rich and poor within countries. Solving the climate crisis affects all aspects of society – the economy, technology, trade, equity, ethics, security, as well as relations within and between countries. The only alternative is to resist the decapitating grip of exploitative capitalism and to take on the responsibility of educating oneself and being a conscious political subject, organising, mobilising, forging unities and exposing the false solutions peddled by those who created the crisis in the first place.

#### We drive the societal change - we just need to challenge the system

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 154] SPark

So how does Gramsci say we can escape hegemonic rule? As a political economist he of course refers to structural problems within the production processes. Resource constraints or too high levels of inequality might challenge their smooth continuation and therefore the acceptance of the division of labor and revenues within them. But, most relevant for this book, he also suggests the weakening of the cultural and ideational consensus or dominant paradigm that helps to justify the unequal distribution patterns and provide moral hazard on a sociocultural rather than structural level.

Public discourse after the financial crisis, at least in Germany, was full of statements—for example, that human nature is simply greedy and that it was not the fault of individual bankers but of regulatory loopholes that they basically had to use. The question these articles never answer is which of these implacably greedy humans should then suddenly be enlightened enough to write laws without loopholes. Nor do these articles suggest how it might be possible to find laws without loopholes for globalized systems. The moral hazard discussion so far points out that systems too big to fail and contracts with golden parachutes are not very conducive to good governance.

But there is also a sociocultural moral hazard perpetuated by a narrative and proclaimed common sense in which people are innately greedy. The ethical default changes from one of ‘intending no harm’ to one of ‘do everything that is not explicitly forbidden because this is legitimate.’ Even regulatory and judicial consequences will differ from those of a society in which egoistical behavior to the detriment of the great majority is considered an individual and civilizational failure. Different sentences for corruption or rape in different cultural settings are just one example of this hazard effect.

German philosopher Richard David Precht offers a forthright view on the effects of the widespread adoption of mainstream economic ideas and the commodification of human relationships: “Strict and tough calculation of utility, ruthlessness and greed are not man’s main driving forces, but the result of targeted breeding. One could call this process ‘the origin of egoism by capitalist selection’, following Charles Darwin’s famous principal work” (ibid., here cited by Habermann 2012: 15).

More subtly, Gill writes: “a change in thinking is a change in the social totality and thus has an impact on other social processes; a change in the social totality will provoke change in the process of thought. Hence the process of thinking is part of a ceaseless dialectic of social being” (Gill 2003: 22). This means that many of the ultimate drivers of societal change are located within each one of us. Here, as indicated in purple and blue arrows in Fig. 2.6, we find the connection between the big picture of meta-level paradigms and hegemonic narratives on the meso-level and the mini-level of individual thinking and acting: everyone can challenge the declared system-purpose and the ideas and assumptions it needs to appear as beneficial or legitimate. By questioning the standard answers and ways of doing things we can drive change from below, within and above, at the same time.

#### Our Marxist critical pedagogy is pretty great actually

**Foley et al 15** (Jean, Doug, Panayota, Faith, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, USA, Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, New Mexico, USA, University of Massachusetts, Boston, USA, Aurora University, Aurora, Illinois, USA, “Critical Education, Critical Pedagogies, Marxist Education in the United States”, “<http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/13-3-7.pdf>”, page 112-113, Accessed 7/7/22, ML)

As an opening to this group authored chapter, a review of McLaren’s (2005) ten characteristics of a revolutionary or Marxian critical pedagogy is helpful for the purposes of distinction from typical implementation. First, critical pedagogy is reflective and does not present itself as eternal, always existing, or disconnected from history. It rejects religious and idealistic notions of a permanent or natural human condition or ‘human nature.’ Second, critical pedagogy meets the local needs of people and considers the importance of social context while not walling off people into local or isolated groups, as is often done with postmodern identity politics. Third, critical pedagogy, while emphasizing the importance of the scientific method, is careful to not conflate biological with cultural and political practices that only serve to reinforce inequality in the name of objective rationalism. It therefore rejects notions of inherent differences between racial groups, ethnocentrism, and other ways that science has ‘dressed up’ oppressive practices. Fourth, critical pedagogy attacks the notion of normative intelligence “and the ways in which ‘reason’ has been differently distributed so that it always advantages the capitalist class” (p.94). This makes practices such as standardized testing open to question. Fifth, critical pedagogy accounts for the move from industrial capitalism to its current, neoliberal global form. This creates challenges in communicating how the working class is still the working class even if the outward appearance of labour has changed. Sixth, rather than presenting itself as multicultural, critical pedagogy goes further and is openly anti-homophobic, anti-sexist, and anti-racist. Seventh, critical pedagogy not only addresses questions of meeting human needs, but seeks to ensure human survival in the face of environmental destruction, even if this means challenging capital. Eighth and ninth, critical pedagogy does not seek to work within the existing capitalist system, but openly advocates socialist democratic solutions in terms of distribution of existing resources. It rejects locating the source of global poverty in overpopulation and other racist memes and instead asserts that capitalism itself needs to move to the next economic and social phase of meeting all human needs, not just the needs of a few. Finally, critical pedagogy places its alliances with the oppressed, and isn’t particularly interested in giving the oppressor ‘equal time.’ Standpoint epistemology (Wallace & Wolf, 2005), which not only respects but privileges the experiences of the working class, can be an essential component of communicating the tenets of critical pedagogy in a Marxian manner. This does not mean that all working class viewpoints are emancipatory, but it does mean that for a dialectical critical pedagogy the **burden of proof of oppression is no longer on the oppressed**, who have historically had to work overtime in order to demonstrate that their grievances have merit. Instead, the oppressor should be compelled to demonstrate that oppression does NOT exist.

#### A critical pedagogy centered around Marxist values and grounded in revolutionary love is vital

**McLaren 10** (Peter, Canadian scholar who serves as Distinguished Professor in Critical Studies, Attallah College of Educational Studies, Chapman University, where he is Co-Director of the Paulo Freire Democratic Project and International Ambassador for Global Ethics and Social Justice, “Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy” , “<https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1127&context=education_articles>, Accessed 7/7/22”, ML)

A pedagogy of critique is aimed at freedom from necessity. Teresa Ebert (2009) writes that a pedagogy of critique is a materialist critique whose purpose is not simply to perform an immanent examination of the cognitive validity of categories and forms of knowledge (by locating contradictions in the rules and systems necessary to the production of those forms) but to relate these categories to the outside, material conditions of their possibility. The role of materialist critique is to begin with an immanent investigation of a system or a practice in its own terms and to relate these inside terms to their outside historical and social conditions. Materialism, as I am using the term, consists of the objective productive activities of humans that involve them in social relations under definite historical conditions that are independent of their will and are shaped by struggle between contesting classes over the surplus produced by social labor. Derrida argues that critique has no ground because there is no outside, only the economy of signification, the inside and outside of language effects—outcomes of representations. The very language, for instance, with which we articulate or describe totalizations deconstructs those totalizations, according to Derrida. However, the more important question is not one of norm, truth, or totalization— part of all discourses and practices—but how they further or resist the interest of a particular class. On which side of history do you struggle? Marx maintains that the question of whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but a **practical question**—hence, we must prove the truth of our own thinking in practice. A pedagogy of critique is a mode of social knowing that inquires into **what is not said**, into the silences and the suppressed or the missing, in order to un-conceal operations of economic and political power underlying the concrete details and representations of our lives. It reveals how the abstract logic of the exploitation of the division of labor informs all the practices of culture and society. Materialist critique disrupts that which represents itself as natural and thus as inevitable and explains how it is materially produced. Critique, in other words, enables us to explain how social differences—gender, race, sexuality, and class—have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation – namely within the international division of labor in global capitalism, so that we can fight to change them (Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008). Thus, a pedagogy of critique is about the production of transformative knowledges. It is not about liberty as the freedom of desire, because this liberty, this freedom of desire, is acquired at the expense of the poverty of others. A pedagogy of critique, as Ebert (2009) points out, does not situate itself in the space of the self, or in the space of desire, or in the space of liberation, but in the site of collectivity, need, and emancipation. A pedagogy of critique is grounded not in desire, but revolutionary love, that is, recognizing that love can only exist between free and equal people who have the same ideals and commitment to serving the poor and the oppressed. It is this moral affinity that constitutes the conditions of possibility of love. A pedagogy of desire works against the creation of revolutionary love by celebrating the unknowable, the endless deferral of meaning and the impossibility of certainty (Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008). The principle of uncertainty is one of the key framing mechanisms of capitalism and the expansion of the market. It is about creating new ways to access cheap labor by disturbing social conditions under capital’s relentless expansion. In all sites of everyday life under capitalist social relations we have institutional power relations which are not free spaces that foster equality. Thus, we need a pedagogy of critique grounded in revolutionary love in the struggle for transforming these social relations.

### Diagnose The Disease Ext. Cards

#### Diagnosing capitalism is a pre-requisite

Also could be a justification for utopian fiat \*\*

Bailey ’19 [David and Angela Wigger; August 21; senior lecturer in politics at the University of Birmingham, associate professor in global political economy at Radboud University, Netherlands; openDemocracy; “Studying capitalist dystopias, and avenues for change,” <https://app.slack.com/client/T03L34L1AQ5/C03L3S326S1>] SPark

We live in dystopian times. The crisis of global capitalism is revealing itself in the most uncompromising fashion. Quantitative easing – the one ‘solution’ to the last crisis – has only re-inflated the global financial bubble, and created the prospect for the next impending crisis to be greater than witnessed heretofore. Government bonds across the industrialized world are either [approaching, or already at, negative interest rates](https://www.ft.com/content/820e3aac-ba1a-11e9-8a88-aa6628ac896c). Financial investors, aware of the next big recession, are [betting against](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/15/upshot/inverted-yield-curve-bonds-football-analogy.html) long term economic growth, for [up to the next thirty years](https://www.ft.com/content/d74ee42e-beef-11e9-b350-db00d509634e). Something is clearly amiss!

Those not fortunate enough to gamble on financial markets are already living the dystopian consequences of capitalism. [In the Global North,](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_650551/lang--en/index.htm) [wages have stagnated](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_650551/lang--en/index.htm) over the past decade, employment is increasingly [temporary and insecure](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf), and the ongoing erosion of the welfare state has become manifest in a [housing crisis](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14616718.2014.997431), [health care crisis](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0168851016300860),[and an](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)60463-3/fulltext) [elderly care crisis](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)60463-3/fulltext), all of which increases the [care burden placed upon women](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0019793915588892). The ‘age of austerity’ created the perverse situation that [children of the rich industrialised world increasingly face poverty](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/Children_of_austerity.pdf). The aftermath of the global economic crisis has brought with it prolonged neoliberal restructuring, authoritarianism and heightened inequality.

In the Global South, poverty, violence and climate change continue to push [thousands into dangerous attempts to migrate across borders](https://www.voanews.com/europe/iom-migrant-deaths-globally-top-32000-2014), risking either death or imprisonment in [inhumane detention centres](https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/07/1041991) with little or no regard for human rights. Natural resources have been depleted to the extent that we have [little chance of reversing the harm](https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/ga12131.doc.htm) that has been caused, and climate change proceeds unabated.

This is global capitalism in 2019. In order to understand current political responses we need to diagnose capitalism, and point towards potential alternatives, grounded in a utopian vision for making a better world possible.

#### Rejection of Capitalism and the education of the self is a pre-requisite - We must wake up from the eternal loop of capitalism we are in before we are to find solutions

Neal ’17 [Phil; April 21; “Just say “no” to capitalism,” The Ellsworth American; <https://www.ellsworthamerican.com/opinions/letters-to-the-editor/just-say-no-capitalism/>] SPark

If we step back from our political situation we can observe a revolving historical event: As long as our economy is based on capitalist principles, the best we can hope for is to place some constraints on the byproducts of capitalism. Capitalists resist the constraints by paying shills to confuse us and legislators to roll them back. Think Sisyph[u]s pushing the bolder uphill, only to watch it roll back down…forever. Until we reject capitalism we will be stuck in this back and forth of which constraints will be left in place.

For example, drug companies want to get authorization to make drugs as quickly as possible, pay for advertising to convince you why you need them and then sell them for as much as possible. Left to their own devices, they have sold drugs that kill, harm or do not do what they claim, overcharge customers, pay their executives exorbitant wages, pay our legislators to look the other way, etc. Slowly we catch on and force our legislators to constrain them through law. Then, as now, those legislators, acting in the interests of drug companies, reach a critical mass and roll back the laws. Of course, they don’t admit to what they are doing. They spend their time concocting fantasies about why the rollback was good for their constituents.

This scenario can be applied to just about any aspect of our society. Capitalists will fight constraints.

How to combat capitalists? You can reason with them, boycott their products, write articles, educate consumers, but to what end? Just witness what we’re seeing now for your answer.

Another approach is to opt out from supporting capitalism. There are alternative approaches, but you need to educate yourself and change your perspective. It’s not scary to envision another approach. Educate yourself about employee-owned cooperatives, a variety of sharing economies and yes, socialism. Most people under 30 have no issue with this. Most of us, when presented with the appropriate questions, have no problem with this. So, instead of complaining about capitalist byproducts, find a different way, a different perspective. It’s not all that hard.

#### We must analyze policy and political leaders with an anti-capitalist lens in order to diagnose the capitalist disease within american society-Trump proves

Joshua Inwood 18[Joshua Inwood, Director of Penn State Lab for Analysis of Culture and Environment (PLACE), "White supremacy, white counter-revolutionary politics, and the rise of Donald Trump", 07-18-2018, Sage Publications , https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326651334\_White\_supremacy\_white\_counter-revolutionary\_politics\_and\_the\_rise\_of\_Donald\_Trump, 1LEE]

The psychological wage underscores how whites receive a material beneﬁt for their white identity. Roediger further argues that the pleasures of whiteness “could be used to make up for alienating and exploitative class relationships” that were and are a hallmark of capital-ism (1991: 12). This insight connects to a longer history in the United States in which different ethnic groups could enter into whiteness to secure social and civil beneﬁts(Ignatiev, 1995: 3). According to Du Bois, this presents myriad opportunities for white politicians and capitalists to exploit white working fears of the loss of their position by the erosion of whites’ privileged position within the US racial hierarchy. Thus, Breitbart’s messaging reﬂect nativist and white supremacist discourses, and they are meant to drive those fears among white working-class identity. Du Bois explains that the “doctrine of inferiority” of racism was driven “primarily because of economic motives” and this devel-opment was “disastrous for modern civilization in science and religion in art and gov-ernment” because it proffered that the “colored peoples of the world were so far inferior to the whites that the white world had the right to rule mankind for their own selﬁsh interests” (1935: 39). Therefore when a Breitbart article describes a Democratic political rally in California quoting: “‘Welcome to Oaxacafornia,’ said a Oaxacan woman, referring to the impoverished region of Mexico from which many immigrants come” (Nazarian,2016), they tap into the most base and destructive forces in the US, reinforcing narratives of white superiority and black and brown inferiority. While much of the focus has been on former Breitbart editor Steve Bannon, Du Bois’ insight reveals that the Trump campaign’s engagement with white supremacist politics has a much more profound association. Accordingly, it is imperative that we not view Trump as a peculiarity; instead, he is part of a broader context in which white supremacist practices suture to American politics. The rise of Trump embodies a 400-year racialized legacy of white supremacy and the workings of racialized capital. This is the embodiment of the role white counterrevolutionary politics play in the United States. The economic history of the United States is built through covert and overt appeals to white solidarity that soothes over class divisions and forestalls broader critiques of the US-based capitalist economy. The reality is that Trump routinely played on the fears of white working class voters during the campaign. In one of the most infamous appeals made to throngs of fans at his rallies citation/date, Trump declared that this was going to be the last election when (white)voters would genuinely be able to decide the outcome because so many minority groups were coming across to the United States that it would not be possible to elect the next President should Clinton win. His message was calculated to drive home the fears of whites who were worried about the demographic transitions occurring in the United States as well as the threats to their marginalized economic position. Through his public declarations and his openly racist message, Trump has expanded the global danger of race to a range of groups that are deemed to pose a challenge to the nation.14 Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space 0(0)

Conclusion and significance Writing in 1967 at the height of the white backlash towards civil rights and a short year away from his own assassination, Martin Luther King, Jr., stated the “value in pulling racism out of its obscurity and stripping it of its rationalizations lies in the conﬁdence that it can be changed” (King, 1967: 83). He went on to argue that if we are ever going to take on racism in all of its brutality it is necessary to diagnose the “disease of racism accurately” and that the US was going to have to embark on a crusade of redemption that would entail a “humble acknowledgment of guilt and an honest knowledge of self” (King,1967: 83). The rise of Donald Trump and his ability engage some of the darkest currents of the US racial state call into question how far we have come from the status King outlined in1967. To see Trump as an anomaly or an outsider who ran an improbable campaign—as many mainstream political commentators would have us believe—is a mistaken diagnosis and only obscures the central role white-counter revolutionary politics play in the US polit-ical economy. Throughout the development of the United States’ political economy, white-ness has stalled modest progressive and even radical change; as Du Bois worked through in Black Reconstruction, whiteness is central to understanding the workings of US-style cap-italism. Robinson (1983: 194) writes that when entering a period of extended crisis, “the ruling classes” in the United States turn to “legal and illegal violence, election corrup-tion, and a renewed emphasis on white supremacy” as the antidote to economic ills. To give an accurate diagnosis on Trump’s election, we should focus on the long history of white resentment and fear over a demographic collapse. The changes to the political economy wrought through neoliberalism should be at the center of efforts to understanding Trump’ selection, and the unwavering backing from white supporters.

#### **Adopting a framework of Emancipatory social science is necessary in order to diagnose the disease of capitalism**

Erik Olin 19[Erik Olin, Erik Olin Wright, an analytical Marxist sociologist at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, specializing in social stratification and in egalitarian alternative futures to capitalism, “Erik Olin Wright | Compass Points: Towards a Socialist Alternative”, 1-23-2019, Versobooks, https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/4218-erik-olin-wright-compass-points-towards-a-socialist-alternative, 1LEE]

Emancipatory social science, in its broadest terms, seeks to generate knowledge relevant to the collective project of challenging human oppression and creating the conditions in which people can live flourishing lives. To call it a social science, rather than social criticism or philosophy, is to recognize the importance for this task of systematic scientific knowledge about how the world works.[2] To call it emancipatory is to identify its central moral purpose—the elimination of oppression, and the creation of conditions for human flourishing. And to call it social implies a belief that emancipation depends upon the transformation of the social world, not just the inner self. To fulfil its mission, any emancipatory social science faces three basic tasks: first, to elaborate a systematic diagnosis and critique of the world as it exists; second, to envision viable alternatives; and third, to understand the obstacles, possibilities and dilemmas of transformation. In different historical moments one or another of these may be more pressing than others, but all are necessary for a comprehensive emancipatory theory.

Diagnosis and critique

The starting point for an emancipatory social science is not simply to show that there is suffering and inequality in the world, but to demonstrate that the explanation for these ills lies in the specific properties of existing institutions and social structures, and to identify the ways in which they systematically cause harm to people. The first task, therefore, is the diagnosis and critique of the causal processes that generate these harms.

This is often the most systematic and developed aspect of emancipatory social science. In the case of feminism, for example, a great deal of writing centres on diagnosis of the ways in which existing social relations and institutions generate various forms of women’s oppression. The focal point of such research is to show that gender inequalities are not the result of ‘nature’, but are the product of social processes. Studies of labour markets have emphasized such things as sex-segregation of work, evaluation systems which denigrate culturally defined feminine traits, discrimination in promotion, institutional arrangements that put working mothers at a disadvantage. Feminist studies of culture have demonstrated the ways in which a wide range of practices in the media, education, literature and so on have traditionally reinforced gender identities and stereotypes. Feminist analyses of the state have examined the ways in which state structures and policies have systematically entrenched the subordination of women and various forms of gender inequality. A similar set of observations could be made about empirical research inspired by labour-movement traditions, by theories of racial oppression and by radical environmentalism.

Diagnosis and critique are closely connected to questions of social justice and normative theory. To describe a social arrangement as generating ‘harms’ is to infuse the analysis with a moral judgement. Behind every emancipatory theory, there is thus an implicit theory of justice: a conception of what conditions would have to be met before the institutions of a society could be deemed just. A full exploration of the normative theory that underlies the critique of capitalism is beyond the scope of this paper; but put briefly, the analysis which follows is animated by what may be called a radical democratic egalitarian understanding of justice. This rests on two broad normative claims, one concerning the conditions for social justice, the other those for political justice:

Social justice: in a just society, all people would have broadly equal access to the necessary material and social means to live flourishing lives.

Political justice: in a politically just society, people should be equally empowered to contribute to the collective control of the conditions and decisions which affect their common fate—a principle of both political equality and collective democratic empowerment.

Taken together, these two claims call for a society that deepens the quality of democracy and enlarges its scope of action, under conditions of radical social and material equality. The problem, of course, is to show how these principles could be put into practice.

Developing alternatives

The second task of emancipatory social science is to develop a coherent, credible theory of alternatives to existing institutions and social structures that would eliminate, or at least significantly reduce, the harms they generate. Such alternatives can be elaborated and evaluated by three different criteria: desirability, viability and achievability. These are nested in a kind of hierarchy: not all desirable alternatives are viable, and not all viable alternatives are achievable.

The exploration of desirable alternatives, without the constraints of viability or achievability, is the domain of utopian social theory and much normative political philosophy. Typically such discussions are institutionally very thin, the emphasis being on the enunciation of abstract principles rather than actual institutional designs. Thus, for example, the Marxist aphorism describing communism as a classless society governed by the principle ‘to each according to his need, from each according to his ability’ is almost silent on the institutional arrangements which would make this principle operative. Liberal theories of justice similarly elaborate the principles that should be embodied in the institutions of a just society without systematically exploring whether sustainable, robust structures could actually be designed to carry out those principles in the pure form in which they are expressed. [3] Though discussions of this kind may contribute much to clarifying our values and strengthening our moral commitment to the business of social change, they do little to inform the practical task of institution-building, or add credibility to challenges to existing institutions.

The study of viable alternatives, by contrast, asks of proposals for transforming existing social structures whether, if implemented, they would actually generate in a sustained manner the emancipatory consequences that motivated their proposal. Perhaps the best known example of this is central planning, the classic form used to implement socialist principles. In lieu of the anarchy of the market, socialists believed that the people’s lot would be improved by a rationally planned economy, implemented through the institutional design of a centralized comprehensive plan. But the ‘perverse’, unintended consequences of central planning subverted its intended goals, with the result that few people today believe it to be a viable emancipatory alternative to capitalism.

The viability of a specific institutional design, of course, may not be an all-or-nothing affair. It may crucially depend upon various kinds of side conditions. For example, a generous unconditional basic income may be viable in a country in which there is a strong, culturally rooted work ethic and sense of collective obligation, but not in a highly atomistic consumerist society. Or, a basic income could be viable in a society that had already developed over a long period of time a generous redistributive welfare state based on a patchwork of targeted programmes, but not in a society with a miserly, limited welfare state. Discussions of viability, therefore, tend also to include the contextual conditions of possibility for particular designs to work well.

The exploration of viable alternatives brackets the question of their practical achievability under existing social conditions. Some have questioned the value of discussing theoretically viable alternatives if they are not strategically achievable. The response to such sceptics would be that there are so many uncertainties and contingencies about what lies ahead that we cannot possibly know now what the limits of achievable alternatives will be in future. Given this uncertainty, there are two reasons why it is important to have clear-headed understandings of the range of viable alternatives. First, developing such understandings now makes it more likely that, if future conditions expand the boundaries of what is possible, social forces committed to emancipatory change will be in a position to formulate practical strategies for implementing an alternative. Second, the actual limits of what is achievable depend in part on beliefs about what sorts of alternatives are viable. This is a crucial sociological point: social limits of possibility are not independent of beliefs about limits. When a physicist argues that there is a limit to the maximum speed at which a thing can travel, this is meant as an objective, untransgressable constraint, operating independently of our beliefs about speed. In the social case, however, beliefs about limits systematically affect what is possible. Developing compelling accounts of viable alternatives, therefore, is one component of the process through which these limits can themselves be changed.

It is no easy matter to make a credible argument that ‘another world is possible’. People are born into societies that are always already made, whose rules they learn and internalize as they grow up. People are preoccupied with the daily tasks of making a living, and coping with life’s pains and pleasures. The idea that the social world could be deliberately changed for the better in some fundamental way strikes them as far-fetched—both because it is hard to envisage some dramatically better yet workable alternative, and because it is hard to imagine successfully challenging the structures of power and privilege in order to create it. Thus even if one accepts the diagnosis and critique of existing institutions, the most natural response is probably a fatalistic sense that not much could be done to really change things.

Such fatalism poses a serious problem for those committed to redressing the injustices of the existing social world. One strategy, of course, is simply not to worry too much about having scientifically credible scenarios for radical social change, but to try instead to create an inspiring vision of a desirable alternative, grounded in anger at the inequities of the world in which we live and infused with hope and passion about human possibilities. At times, such charismatic wishful thinking has been a powerful mobilizing force. But it is unlikely to form an adequate basis for transforming the world so as to produce a sustainable emancipatory alternative. History is filled with heroic victories over existing structures of oppression, followed by the tragic construction of new forms of domination and inequality. The second task of emancipatory social science, therefore, is to develop in as systematic a way as possible a scientifically grounded conception of viable alternative institutions.

Developing coherent theories of achievable alternatives is central to the practical work of strategies for social change. This is a difficult undertaking, not only because assessments of what is achievable are vulnerable to wishful thinking, but also because the future conditions which will affect the prospects of any long-term strategy are highly contingent. As in the case of viability, moreover, achievability does not pose a simple dichotomy: different projects of institutional transformation have different prospects for ever being implemented. The probability that any given viable alternative could at some future date be put into practice depends upon two kinds of process. First, upon the consciously pursued strategies and relative power of the social actors who support or oppose the alternative in question. Second, upon the trajectory over time of a wide range of social structural conditions which affect these strategies’ chances of success. This trajectory is itself partially the product of the cumulative unintended effects of human action, but it is also the result of the conscious strategies of actors to transform the conditions of their own actions. The achievability of an alternative thus depends upon the extent to which coherent, compelling strategies can be formulated which both help to create the conditions for implementing alternatives in the future, and have the potential to mobilize the necessary social forces to support that alternative when such conditions occur.

A theory of transformation

Developing an understanding of these issues is the objective of the third general task of emancipatory social science: the theory of transformation. We can think of emancipatory social science as an account of a journey from the present to a possible future: the critique of society tells us why we want to leave the world in which we live; the theory of alternatives tells us where we want to go; and the theory of transformation tells us how to get from here to there. This involves a number of difficult, interconnected problems: a theory of the mechanisms of social reproduction which sustain existing structures of power and privilege; a theory of the contradictions, limits and gaps in such systems, which can open up space for strategies of social transformation; a theory of the developmental dynamics of the system that will change the conditions for such strategies over time; and, crucially, a theory of the strategies of transformation themselves. I will return to the problem of transformative strategies in the concluding section of this paper. Our central concern in what follows, however, will be the second of the three core tasks identified above: the problem of elaborating viable emancipatory alternatives to capitalism. To set the stage for this discussion, it may be helpful first to sketch the basic elements of a critique of capitalism, laying out the harms that are caused by capitalist processes and which animate the search for an alternative.

#### Education and research have been manipulated by capitalism

Debarros 20 [Edward Debarros, 9-29-2020, "The Unspoken Secret of Capitalism Destroying Education," Medium, https://medium.com/@debarrosedd/the-unspoken-secret-of-capitalism-destroying-education-59041385aabf, DOA: 7-7-2022, SMarx, JTong]

The education system and capitalism have been, since its premise, intertwined. Capital, along with many other facets of this country, dictate the state of education, a core pursuit untenably necessary for any member of society. Despite education being a fundamental sector of any country, it’s an aspect still neglected by the massive amount of accumulated wealth in this country. By extension of capitalism, the federal government acts as a vehicle to manipulate the education systems. However education is not only underfunded by the economy’s handlers, but treated as a commodity. Since the premise of established education in the U.S., we can see the development producing diverging and nascent sectors of education systems. As the branches of education develop separately, all of these fundamental sources of knowledge for students become monopolized as pseudo-businesses. As capitalism prevails, the division between public, private, and rising charter schools will blend, becoming the most crucial battle in education, and arguably in this country.

# Links

## Generic Links

### 2NC -- Ext: Communication Link

#### Communication drives capitalist and imperialist growth around the globe

Muller et Tworek 15(Dr. Simone Muller is a project manager and principal investigator of the Emmy Noether Research Group and Heidi JS Tworek is Canada Research Chair and associate professor of international history and public policy at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.19, June 2015, “‘The telegraph and the bank’: on the interdependence of global communications and capitalism, 1866–1914\*”, Cambridge Press, <https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/09E91AB90AE1274717589316F28B6E73/S1740022815000066a.pdf/the-telegraph-and-the-bank-on-the-interdependence-of-global-communications-and-capitalism-18661914.pdf>") - EM

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, trade and communications on a global scale had developed in strong connection with the emergence of a globe-spanning submarine telegraph network. By 1903 roughly 406,000 kilometers of submarine cables crossed the world’s oceans. The highly important North Atlantic connection alone processed about 10,000 messages daily; the companies operating the twelve Atlantic cables represented a total estimated capital of £17 million, making them some of the most lucrative contemporary multinationals.2 This article disentangles why Angell, along with other economists, government officials, submarine cable entrepreneurs, and colonial subjects, came to see global capitalism and communications as so intertwined that they no longer bothered to explain why the two fitted together. Similarly, to today’s scholars, they postulated the intricate connection between intercontinental telegraphic communication and world commerce without explaining the specifics of this link or its consequences for the structuration of the modern world.3 Analyzing the structures, ideas, and mechanisms underlying the mutual interaction between communications and capitalism opens up new perspectives on the political, economic, and social geographies of the modern world. The historian Norma Aventine has argued that the global submarine cable network facilitated the very existence of ‘world commerce’ and ‘world politics’, but did not examine how this occurred.4 Other scholars have investigated how capitalism affected the specific market of communications companies.5 This article incorporates the business history of communications companies into global history to build upon and move beyond the mere idea that world communication enabled globalization processes of commerce, finance, and trade. Scholars have tended to examine the connections between communications and politics (as well as between communications and the military) far more than those between communications and commerce or, more specifically, the emergence of global industrial capitalism.6 Some economic historians have focused on the telegraph’s influence on the London and New York stock markets and have developed models to ‘calculate’ that influence, but few have written on understandings of the market and communications infrastructures.7 Others have investigated the political economy of Anglo-American communications or the economics of the cable business, but have paid less attention to contexts beyond the communications market or the interrelation between imperialism and the expansion of the world economy.8 Economists, too, have recently started to explore the media as a business and as a key influence in politics, though they have focused on the United States.9 This article uses the example of submarine telegraphy to substantiate how histories of communications and capitalism fit together and reciprocally influence each other in three important ways. First, the business history of communications companies would benefit from incorporating broader context beyond the firms, the analysis of the communications market as such, or the interrelation of communications and empire. As historians have shown for the Anglo-American sphere, the development of communications networks depended upon decisions made within firms about capital investments, profits, and potentially lucrative markets.10 This article further uncovers how cable entrepreneurs created the global telegraph network based upon particular understandings of cross-border trade following the logic of economic liberalism, profit maximization, and natural monopoly theory, while economists such as John Maynard Keynes and John Hobson saw global communications as the foundation for capitalist exchange based on telegraphic speed and the dematerialization of information. During the nineteenth century, new communications technologies radically altered contemporaries’ experiences of time and space, which in turn fundamentally reconfigured business and investment strategies, structures, and decisions.11 For the communications market, these contemporary views on the interconnections between communication and commerce resulted in a duopoly of primarily government-owned landlines and primarily privately owned submarine lines. This created two distinct political economies of communications, both interlocking with the emergence of global industrial capitalism.12 In business conduct, telegraphic communication eliminated the middleman and promoted business transactions based on speed, such as futures trading.13 The business history perspective on the private and multinational business of submarine telegraphy in particular shows how new (and faster) forms of economic interaction – as well as new forms of managing and financing commercial interactions – emerged.14 Second, the history of communications is also an economic history of the agents that structured and territorialized the modern world by creating myriad (market) identity spaces. Telegraphy enabled capitalist exchange, and understandings of telegraphy supported the development of particular global capitalist systems. This exchange not only consolidated existing markets, such as the transatlantic Euro-American trade, but later created new markets, such as the Pan-American and Pacific markets. Economists, too, saw global communications networks as the foundation for understanding the political organization of world trade. The ‘metaphorical constitution’ of the national economy enabled contemporaries to develop the notion of a national economic unity as a tangible object.15 German and Austrian economists extended that metaphor to the world economy.16 The business history of communications companies enables us to rethink the spaces of capitalism and how those spaces emerged. Finally, the relationship between communications and capitalism reconfigured social interaction. The initial cable system seemed to cover the world, but it often followed imperial economic logic. Networks operated along pre-existing colonial trading and shipping lines, leaving many places ‘untouched’ by telegraphy.17 Simultaneously, contemporary understandings of capitalism affected where cables were laid and who could use them. The geography of global telegraphy therefore created particular understandings of the ‘world’ that excluded significant portions of its population. The article examines how the interaction between telegraphy and capitalism reinforced social orders that excluded most of the world’s population based on concepts of race, gender, and class from participation in global communication. Telegraphy affected many more people than its actual users, while also spurring protests from around the globe about its perceived Western and capitalist hegemony. Depending upon their points of view, protagonists from across the world saw economic and communications networks as overlapping, coterminous, or mutually antagonistic. Figures primarily from non-Western contexts, such as Gandhi, viewed capitalism and communications as so intertwined that they simultaneously sought alternatives to both. Taken together, these three aspects reveal how communications and commerce together mapped the modern world, carving out non-congruent spaces of political, economic, and social interaction. Overall, the article argues for a new chronology to understand the development of communications. In the 1860s, national developments made land telegraphy a concern of the state within European nations, while global submarine telegraphy became a private enterprise dominated by the theory of natural monopoly and intended to buttress existing trade routes. Global telegraphic networks were constructed to support extant capitalist systems until the 1890s. Submarine cable companies followed imperial logic only as far as it was profitable and solidified pre-existing commercial connections through telegraphy. In the 1890s, however, states and corporations began to lay submarine cables either to open up new markets, particularly in Asia and Latin America, or to use telegraphs for military, imperial, or strategic control. Changes to global communications (both wired and wireless) spawned ideas of developing new markets and using cables and wireless not just to reinforce existing networks of trade but also to support state geopolitical ambitions and exploit new markets. These reconfigurations only occurred within the political economy of global communications, not national networks. Ultimately, the success of global telegraph networks laid the groundwork for a system of intertwined communications and capitalism that has lasted until today.

### 2NC -- Ext: Security Link

#### Security links – valuing security only furthers capitalist society

Rigakos 16 [George S. Rigakos, 2016, Security/Capital, Introduction: Security under Capitalism, Edinburgh University Press, SMarx, JTong]

Over the last four decades a number of powerful social and eco nomic trends have begun to significantly impact both class politics and how we may theorize it. These socioeconomic trends have been exacerbated even further in the aftermath of the economic crisis of 2008–9, resulting in the re-mobilization of a wide array of popular movements crystallizing with Occupy and Syriza. Bourgeois insecurity has become more acute as evidenced by rising inequality 1 marching in lockstep with climbing public and private policing employment since at least the 1970s. 2 Increased inequality has also coincided with greater rates of exploitation; 3 significant decreases in union membership; 4 and the intensification of the everyday economic insecurity of workers, especially part-time and precarious workers, 5 who have taken on more and more debt 6 in order to maintain a standard of living comparable to previous generations. Emerging into popular consciousness at this time has also been the economic and social insularity of the 1 per cent 7 – an awareness that has produced a renewal of critique aimed at addressing how, in the wake of the Great Recession, there has been no clear political alternative to the retrenchment of neoliberalism through austerity and further global economic uncertainty.8 This generalized insecurity has taken place alongside the rhetorical rise of the “war on terror” layered over the top of an already existing “war on drugs” and a “war on crime” with their concomitant race, class, and gender implications. 9 War making as a form of peace-making or “war as peace” 10 has become an essential facilitator for the proliferation of a security– industrial complex inextricably bound up with capital accumulation 11 and Empire.12 Mass demonstrations against the ceremonial gathering of corporate and state elites during meetings of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) or the Group of Twenty (G20) have cast in stark relief the politics of the 99 per cent with that of the 1 per cent; have drawn visible, geographic boundaries 13 around the permissibility of dissent; 14 and have facilitated the occupation and colonization of urban space for the purpose of “extending the scope of productive labour” 15 and the circuit of capital accumulation.16 These processes, of course, have a very long history 17 tied to the formation of “police science” and the functional connection between wealth accumulation and the fabrication of a social order. 18 Police science gave rise to a form of prudential thinking and planning that foreshadowed an increasingly elaborate system of risk management and threat assessment. 19 Police science thus comprises the strategic field of bourgeois planning aimed at making populations “productive” through the enforcement of a wage-labor system. It supports, in short, the only war contemporary politics dares not recognize but that has served as the foundation for all projects of pacification: class war. Marx long ago warned about the embedded nature of “security” with its associated projects of bourgeois social ordering. In On the Jewish Question (first published in 1844) he wrote: “security is the supreme concept of bourgeois society. The concept of police.” 20 His words are particularly prophetic today in light of how deeply entrenched and entangled US corporate interests are with police power and surveillance. 21 The National Security Agency (NSA) leaks22 highlighted the reach of Empire and increasingly how tactics aimed at jihadist terrorists have been extended to domestic dissidents. 23 Of course, snooping on both domestic and foreign dissidents is certainly not new 24 but the colonization by risk 25 and security logics of almost all facets of social and political discourse 26 has significant ideological and material consequences. Radical scholars have certainly taken note of these developments but are also the first to point out that none of these trends is inherently new or necessarily a post-9/ 11 development. They argue instead that “the security apparatus that revved up in the days after the attack had been in the making for decades” 27 and should best be understood as part of the long duree28 of the logic of capitalism through pacification.29 To that end, analyses of pacification have included considerations of privacy; 30 the response to ‘Black Bloc’ tactics and anarchist social movements;31 the relentless surveillance and policing of the poor, 32 precarious migrant workers, 33 and welfare recipients; 34 the infiltration and cooption of aboriginal resistance; 35 the increasing control of pro tests as a form of insurgency;36 and even the military mobilization against resistance through air power 37 to name but a few. 38 A prevalent theme that binds these recent analyses 39 is their recur ring reference to the materialist basis of pacification 40 and the study of how “productive labor” is imagined and achieved by political economists, police intellectuals, and colonial planners who are, more often than not, one in the same.

### 2NC -- Ext: DoD Link

#### DOD is very reliant on American private entities that facilitate capitalist growth

Werner 19 (Debra Werner is  a correspondent for SpaceNews based in San Francisco.  
Debra earned a bachelor’s degree in communications from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master’s degree in Journalism from Northwestern University. She is a recipient of the 1989 Gerald Ford Prize for Distinguished Reporting on National Defense. Her SN Commercial Drive newsletter is sent out Wednesdays., 10-9-2019, "Military turns to private sector for rapid space innovation," SpaceNews, <https://spacenews.com/warfare-satellite-innovation-2019>) - EM

MOUNTAIN VIEW, California – Decades ago, the U.S. Defense Department led innovation in communications and remote sensing technology. Increasingly, U.S. military agencies are turning to the private sector for innovative communications and Earth observation products and services, according to government and industry executives at the Satellite Innovation 2019 conference here. “In terms of cost, capacity and volume, it would be hard for the military to beat what commercial industry is doing,” Rick Lober, vice president and general manager for Hughes Network Systems’ Defense and Intelligence Systems Division, told SpaceNews. The Defense Department is trying to speed up access to innovative commercial technologies through a variety of contracting mechanisms like other transaction authority as well as pilot and pathfinder programs aimed at testing new technologies and system architectures. U.S. Air Force Space Command, for example, is focused on replacing stove-pipe communications networks with enterprise architectures. Air Force Space Command [took over responsibility](https://spacenews.com/air-force-space-command-officially-takes-over-as-chief-buyer-of-satellite-communications-for-the-defense-department/) in December for procuring the Defense Department’s commercial satellite communications services from the Defense Information Systems Agency. “We have a number of initiatives that our office has put in effect with more to come,” said Mike Nichols, chief of commercial satellite communications for Air Force Space Command’s Satellite Solutions Branch. Gen. John Raymond, who leads Air Force Space Command, “told us get after it: enterprise architecture, real-time provisioning, real-time situational awareness,” Nichols said. However, the Defense Department faces cultural challenges when it tries to quickly adopt commercial technology, said Ken Peterman, Viasat Government Systems president. Private sector innovation in space, cybersecurity and mobile networking are prompting changes in acquisition policy, practice and culture, Peterman said. “An acquisition system predicated on invention has to turn into one that can assess, adopt, apply and then evolve more effectively than ever before,” he added. As an example, Peterman points to Apollo program. “When we put a man on the moon, there were probably 10,000 NASA contracts to invent everything from aluminum foil to Tang, the breakfast drink,” Peterman said. “If NASA wanted to put a man or woman on Mars today, the fastest, most effective way to do that, might be to write a one or two-page statement of objectives and let Elon Musk, [Jeff] Bezos, Richard Branson and some others bid on that.” If government agencies don’t embrace commercial innovation, the consequences could be grave, according to a panel of experts discussing the implications of space as a warfare domain. “The U.S. government’s ability to maintain dominance in space will be heavily dependent on their ability to work quickly to take advantage of all the commercial innovation we’re talking about here,” said Chris DeMay, HawkEye 360 chief technology officer and co-founder. “We see enemy nations investing in their own companies with parallel capabilities that will exceed ours if the U.S. government can’t continue to invest at a faster rate.” Rajeev Gopal, advanced programs vice president for Hughes Network Systems’ Defense and Intelligence Systems Division, suggested government agencies gain access to commercial innovation with brief documents describing their needs instead of publishing 100 pages of requirements. He also suggested the government award fixed price contracts. “Give the high-level requirements and let commercial solutions emerge,” Gopal told SpaceNews. “With fixed price contracts, there is some risk but there is also flexibility to innovate.” Hughes has found that flexibility in its work applying artificial intelligence and machine learning to improve interoperability and network management, Lober said. In July, Hughes won an $11.8 million contract to help the U.S. Army improve satellite communications resiliency and interoperability. Specifically, Hughes plans to apply machine learning and artificial intelligence to improve network management, automated control and interoperability of narrowband satellite communications architectures for the Army’s Combat Capabilities Development Command Space and Terrestrial Communications Directorate. When networks are built for interoperability, “service can be ported from one satellite to another and from one beam to another,” Gopal said. “If one asset is compromised you have to others to take its place. That is happening today with automation, modular architecture and machine learning.”

### 2NC -- Ext: NATO Link

#### NATO is a weapon of control that exists purely to forward capitalism and its markets

Gliniecki 22 [Ben Gliniecki, 2-23-2022, "The Real Role and History of NATO: A Reply to Keir Starmer," Socialist Revolution, https://socialistrevolution.org/the-real-role-and-history-of-nato-a-reply-to-keir-starmer/, smarx, HHW]

Recently, British Labour Party leaders, “Sir” Keir Starmer, published a cringeworthy love letter to western imperialism in the Guardian newspaper. His frothy excitement about NATO and his cartoonish patriotic chest-beating are an attempt to paint himself as a champion of the British establishment and an enemy of the left. But his **article is a mess of lies and imperialist propaganda from start to finish.**

Starmer showers praise on the military alliance of western imperialists, cynically—and nauseatingly—comparing it to Britain’s National Health Service as one of “the great achievements of the 1945 Labour government”; a “transformational legacy” that apparently has Labour’s “proud,” “unwaverable,” and “unshakeable” support.

“To condemn NATO is to condemn the guarantee of democracy and security it brings,” the Labour leader writes. **We wonder if Afghan workers and youth feel the same way, 20 years after NATO forces invaded their country.**

Starmer says NATO is a “defensive alliance that has never provoked conflict.” But over the last 30 years, NATO has zealously participated in **aggressive military action in Iraq, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Somalia, and Libya.**

At the same time, it has continually expanded eastwards towards Russia, surrounding the country with troops and military equipment.

Starmer’s fairy stories are akin to those that we are taught at school and force-fed by the media—about the **good guys in the West and the bad guys in the East**. Such claptrap is only fit for children, not thinking workers and youth.

Western Aggression

In reality, NATO was founded in 1949 not as an instrument of peace, but **as a weapon** to fight the Cold War. **It has remained a weapon ever since.**

**It is a military alliance,** which gets three-quarters of its funding from the USA; and which says that if one member is attacked, then every other member must respond with force.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the **Russian economy entered free fall. Chaos reigned, and** Russia was on its knees. The **western imperialists seized the opportunity to expand their markets** and spheres of influence eastwards. **NATO has been a key part of this strategy**.

In 1999, former Warsaw Pact countries Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic joined NATO. In 2004, they were joined by Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Slowly but surely, Russia’s borders were being ringed by members of a hostile military alliance.

Starmer describes Russia as “the aggressor” and a “bully.” But **which of NATO and Russia has hawkishly expanded into the markets and territories of the other’s former allies**? **Which has been placing troops and military hardware on the borders of the other for many years**?

NATO’s provocations towards Russia continued. In 2003, a rabidly pro-US government was brought to power in Georgia. US advisers helped train the Georgian army, and encouraged them to test the limits of Russia’s defensive capability.

At a 2008 summit in Bucharest, NATO members agreed that Georgia and Ukraine, both bordering Russia, would join the alliance in the future.

Whipped up by these events, Georgian president Saakashvili attacked the autonomous region of South Ossetia in 2008, where over 90% of the population are Russian citizens.

#### NATO Link – NATO is used to exploit and subjugate nations

Gliniecki and Alizadeh 22 [Ben Gliniecki and Hamid Alizadeh, 6-27-2022, "NATO and western imperialism's growing contradictions," Socialist Appeal, https://www.socialist.net/nato-and-western-imperialism-s-growing-contradictions.htm, SMarx, JTong]

Today, however, the crisis of capitalism and its effects on a world scale has drastically changed the context. The US has a historically high sovereign debt, a social crisis and rising class polarisation all of which has led to a deep political crisis. This limits its ability to intervene on a world scale as it used to in the past. But Europe is no better off. The European Union is cracking and the British Brexit vote has set in motion a chain of crises which had been prepared over the last period.

The Italian banking crisis is only one of these, but it is huge and it is in turn affecting the German financial system which is at the heart of European capitalism. All of these are in turn feeding back into the global crisis. This summit demonstrated that the power of NATO is suffering from the same crisis which is affecting all levels of society.

In spite of attempts to act as if nothing has happened, The Guardian reports of a different mood behind the scenes:

“However, a Nato official said the issue was driving anxious conversations behind the scenes ahead of the summit.

“‘How can it not affect western cohesion? How can trillions being wiped out in market value not affect perceptions of western strength?’”

Another commentator, Krzysztof Blusz, said:

“Regardless [of] how and when Brexit happens, it will create a situation where Nato member states are more inward looking, more preoccupied with their nationalist tendencies. The impulse is already there, but this will add to the distraction and the Kremlin will not miss the chance to use the situation for its advantage.”

As well as pitting national capitalist classes against each other, the economic crisis has also paved the way for a rise in class struggle and through that political turmoil in the west. The political stability which was based on the post-war economic boom is at an end. In one European country after another, the established parties of the ruling class are losing legitimacy and new left and right-wing parties are gaining influence. The attitude towards foreign interventions is extremely critical and parties are increasingly reluctant to risk their political future on imperialist adventures with little chance of success.

Of course NATO is still an important tool of the western ruling classes used to subjugate and exploit nations throughout the world. But it is clear that the conditions which brought NATO into being no longer exist. In fact as a recent article in the New York Times put it, “it is hard to imagine that Europe and the United States would, if they had the chance in 2016, write another Article 5 at all.”

The result is a NATO entering into a period of crisis erupting from the contradiction between the present underlying objective situation and the treaty of a past period. The most intelligent bourgeois see this and are worried about the repercussions of major incident on the cohesiveness of NATO:

"It’s easy to imagine how the scenario would play out: Poland and the Baltic countries would call for a strong response to pre-empt another annexation like that of Crimea. The Germans and French would call for negotiations with Moscow, doubting that Article 5 would be invoked. The Greeks, Italians and Spanish would make clear that their economies had already suffered enough from the sanctions on Russia after the annexation of Crimea. And much of the public across Europe, manipulated by Russian propaganda, would ask if the Russians weren’t somehow right in trying to support their fellows in the Baltic States. Wasn’t it actually the imperial United States who set all this up, some would argue, just like Washington’s agents were behind the coup in Kiev?" Does NATO Still Exist?

In this context Russia could play a larger role on a global scale by exploiting the crisis of western imperialism. Western European ruling classes are wary of provoking Russia to meddle in EU affairs and the eastern European ones fear Russia intervening in their countries politically and militarily. This fear in itself will be enough to strengthen Russia’s influence in the region.

The crisis and decline of western imperialism the most reactionary force on the planet is a part of the general crisis of capitalism. In the next period this will increase instability and tension between the nations, but it will also be an impulse for more intense class struggle. The only alternative to the barbarism spread in the wake of imperialism is an international revolutionary working class movement. As the contradictions come to the fore and the narrow minded corrupt nature of the ruling classes are exposed, the basis for building such a movement will also grow.

#### Turns case – Russian aggression is only due to the threat of Western and NATO imperialism

Euronews 22 [euronews, 6-30-2022, "Putin blasts NATO 'imperialism' over Western military shake-up plan," https://www.euronews.com/2022/06/30/vladimir-putin-blasts-nato-imperialism-over-western-military-shake-up-plan, SMarx, JTong]

NATO's promise of continued support for Ukraine in the face of Russia's "cruelty" has brought an angry response from Vladimir Putin, who denounced the alliance's "imperialist ambitions".

At their summit in Madrid, members of the Western military alliance pledged to back Ukraine for as long as necessary, modernising the country's army to help it resist Russia’s invasion. NATO also updated its strategic plan to name Russia as the biggest "direct threat" to Western security.

The alliance has also approved membership applications from Finland and Sweden and announced a massive boost in troop numbers along its eastern flank.

But speaking during a visit to Turkmenistan, the Russian president blasted the West's attitude. "The leading countries of NATO want (...) to assert their hegemony, their imperial ambitions," he said.

"The call for Ukraine to continue fighting and refuse negotiations only confirms our assumption that Ukraine and the good of the Ukrainian people is not the goal of the West and NATO, but a means to defend their own interests," the Russian leader added.

### NATO Link Ext. Cards

#### NATO is responsible for the current Russian-Ukrainian War – Continued support for NATO and silencing of critics will create endless Russian War

**MARCETIC ’22** -- a Jacobin staff writer and the author of Yesterday's Man: The Case Against Joe Biden(BRANKO , “The Orwellian Attacks on Critics of NATO Policy Must Stop”, https://jacobin.com/2022/03/russia-ukraine-war-invasion-nato-expansion-criticism

There’s Jack Matlock, who served as US ambassador to the Soviet Union under Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush after a decades-long career as one of the top Soviet experts in the US Foreign Service. He wrote in the lead-up to this war that “there would have been no basis for the present crisis if there had been no expansion of the alliance following the end of the Cold War,” and that “the policies pursued by Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden have all contributed to bringing us to this point.” Matlock had called for a diplomatic solution to prevent war, principally around Moscow’s negotiation demands to draw a hard line on NATO’s expansion, saying that “what Putin is demanding is eminently reasonable.” Stephen Walt, Harvard professor of international relations and columnist for Foreign Policy, made a similar argument, puzzling over the fact that while Western countries ruled out fighting on Ukraine’s behalf, “the US negotiating position (and thus NATO’s position as a whole) hasn’t budged at all on the central issue dividing the two sides” — meaning, Ukraine’s status in NATO. He lamented the “black-and-white view of the situation in Ukraine” that holds that “Russia’s stated grievances have no legitimate basis whatsoever; and the only conceivable Western response is to refuse to make any concessions.” Walt’s fellow “realist” thinker John Mearsheimer has been making this case for years, chiding Western officials for continually trying to bring Ukraine into their orbit, leading Russia to take drastic, illegal steps to counteract it. He recently told the New Yorker he believed “all the trouble in this case really started in April 2008,” when Bush made his infamous announcement on Ukraine and Georgia, despite Moscow making it clear “they viewed this as an existential threat, and they drew a line in the sand.” Mearsheimer dismissed the idea Putin is bent on conquering a broader swath of Europe to restore the Russian Empire or Soviet Union as an argument “invented” by “the foreign-policy establishment in the United States, and in the West more generally,” and believes Kiev can come to some kind of “modus vivendi” with Moscow. Samuel Charap, a Ukraine expert at the RAND Corporation (a Pentagon-aligned think tank originally started by the air force), argued that what had been in early February just the Ukraine “crisis” was “a symptom of [Washington’s] runaway success” after the Cold War. He charged that “Russia is destined to clash again with the United States and its allies over the status of these former Soviet republics unless all parties can agree on a mutually acceptable arrangement for the regional order.” Or see international relations professor Rajan Menon and former George W. Bush national security staffer Thomas Graham, who urged US officials in Politico back in January to stave off war by “accommodating some of Russia’s principal security concerns,” and formalizing “a declared moratorium on the accession of Ukraine, or any other former Soviet state” into NATO for as long as twenty-five years. See the recent comments by the critical Russian sociologist Greg Yudin, who was recently arrested and brutalized at an antiwar protest in Moscow, and who warned just a day before the invasion began that “NATO is certainly a potential military adversary of Russia,” that it “is not a peaceful and innocent alliance,” and that its expansion is “an unfriendly action towards Russia” that “any responsible Russian government should seek to prevent.” The Ukrainian sociologist Volodymyr Ishchenko has warned that it was becoming “increasingly clear that a Putin successor, however progressive or democratic they may be, would still see Ukraine’s NATO membership as a threat,” and that among the solutions to the then building crisis was, among other things, “restoring Ukraine’s non-alignment status” and reversing the 2019 amendment that enshrined the goal of “Euro-Atlantic integration” into the country’s constitution. You could go on and on: Katrina vanden Heuvel writing that “NATO now largely exists to manage the risks created by its existence” in the Washington Post; Jeffrey Sachs urging Washington to “compromise on NATO to save Ukraine” in the Financial Times; or Kings College Ukraine expert Anatol Lieven, who has stressed that same history and repeatedly called for solutions like a neutral Ukraine and a moratorium on its entry into the alliance, first to stave off this war and now to end it. In fact, when Lieven convened a collection of former US and British ambassadors and experts in January this year, their consensus was that “the Russian government has not yet decided on war,” and that Washington would “have to go much further” than its initial responses to Moscow’s first negotiation bid. That’s not even getting into the many, many US establishment figures who warned throughout the decades that NATO expansion would eventually provoke the very thing it was meant to be guarding against. First among them is George Kennan, widely regarded as the father of the Cold War containment policy, who presciently warned in 1997 that expanding NATO eastward would “inflame the nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion,” “have an adverse effect on the development of Russian democracy,” and “impel Russian foreign policy in directions decidedly not to our liking.” Or the eighteen former diplomats who warned the policy risked “significantly exacerbating the instability that now exists in the zone that lies between Germany and Russia, and convincing most Russians that the United States and the West are attempting to isolate, encircle, and subordinate them.” Or the fifty prominent foreign-policy experts, including retired military officers, diplomats, and former senators, who signed on to a letter calling NATO expansion “a policy error of historic proportions” that was “opposed across the entire political spectrum,” and would “strengthen the nondemocratic opposition, undercut those who favor reform and cooperation with the West, [and] bring the Russians to question the entire post-Cold War settlement.” Or Biden’s current CIA director, William Burns, who wrote from Moscow in 1995 that “hostility to early NATO expansion is almost universally felt across the domestic political spectrum here,” and that the move was “premature at best, and needlessly provocative at worst.” Thirteen years later, Burns would inform the Bush administration that “Ukrainian entry into NATO is the brightest of all redlines for the Russian elite (not just Putin),” and that “in more than two and a half years of conversations with key Russian players,” he had “yet to find anyone who views Ukraine in NATO as anything other than a direct challenge to Russian interests.” Just two years ago, Burns wrote of how “Russians stewed in their grievance and sense of disadvantage” and how “a gathering storm of ‘stab in the back’ theories slowly swirled.” Or the US intelligence agencies, which, according to former intelligence analyst Fiona Hill (now a Russia expert at the Brookings Institution), all opposed the idea of offering membership to Ukraine and Georgia in 2008, only for Bush to override them — now viewed by most foreign policy experts as a key turning point in US-Russian relations after the Cold War and Putin’s own relationship with Washington. Or the numerous other establishment voices, from Tom Friedman and Henry Kissinger to Zbigniew Brzezinski and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who all made similar criticisms of the policy at the time. In the fervor of war, we are suddenly being told to believe all of these are merely the foolish and traitorous apologetics of Putin sycophants and fringe extremists, invented just now to vindicate Moscow’s invasion and even strengthen Russia. The speed with which these ideas have, in the West, gone from conventional mainstream opinion to treasonous lies and propaganda has been shocking to witness. Explaining War Is Not Justifying It Why is all this important? We have to know how we got to this point, what policy choices we in the West had control over contributed to it, and what we could have done differently. By doing so, we can not only avoid repeating the same mistakes and watching a terrible history replay again and again, but find some political, nonmilitary way out of what’s happening now, and secure a lasting stability for Ukraine and Europe, if not long-term peace. The idea now widely advanced that Putin is an Adolph Hitler–like madman bent on world domination, and that Western policy over the past decades played no meaningful role in the choice he made to launch this atrocious and illegal invasion, is a very convenient one. It’s a convenient one for those Western officials who played leading roles in that policy, including the sitting US president, who led the very first effort to expand NATO. It’s convenient for arms manufacturers and every other corporate leech feeding off endless global conflict. It’s convenient for the war hawks who would cynically use this war to justify breathtakingly dangerous ideas like turning Ukraine into an Afghanistan-like permanent warzone. And, of course, it rules out any diplomatic settlement to end this terrible crime, because a madman who wants to take over the world cannot be negotiated with. Just as important, if we don’t understand how Western policy helped lead to this conflict and we don’t work to veer away from similar mistakes in the future, conflict and war is forever inevitable. As the figures listed above pointed out, opposition in Russia to NATO’s expansion goes well beyond the single figure of Putin. If and when he eventually leaves power, and Western policymakers continue to plow ahead with the policy — having been persuaded by the political and media figures now assuring us that NATO has nothing to do with what’s going on and all this is merely the product of one man’s megalomania — we will likely find that the leadership that replaces him is no less opposed, creating the conditions for a permanent state of conflict. Maybe you disagree with this analysis, or the possible solutions to end this war. You have every right to do so. But to delegitimize them with smears and character assassinations, even cast them as borderline criminal, is outrageous and shocking behavior that risks repeating some of the most shameful episodes of history, such as the disastrous post-9/11 war frenzy, the McCarthyite witch hunts of the 1950s, and the repression and abuses of the 1920s Red Scare and World War I. Trying to explain the role of Western foreign policy in stoking jihadist terrorism doesn’t justify or excuse the atrocity committed on September 11. Understanding how the Treaty of Versailles helped lead to World War II doesn’t justify or excuse Hitler’s invasions that triggered that war. Two weeks ago, these were things that went without saying. Now they’re apparently treasonous.

#### NATO creates war in the name of democracy and virtue – Citizens’ education is key to holding its leaders accountable and taking down capitalism

**BURTENSHAW ’22 --** Ronan Burtenshaw is the editor of Tribune. (RONAN, “Socialists Fight for a Future Without War”, February 2022, https://jacobin.com/2022/02/antiwar-movement-uk-ukraine-russia-nato//JC)

There is no force more destructive in human society than war. With every day and every mile it advances, it tears apart the fabric of life around it. Schools close, transport stops, the streets empty, and that is the deep breath before the plunge. When the wave itself arrives, it brings with it fear like few of us who do not live in war zones can truly understand: the sounds of bombs, the images of destruction in places just minutes from your home, then the sight of blood and injury and death. In the end, that is what war is: organized killing.

That is the reality facing millions of people across Ukraine today. It is brutal and tragic and heartbreaking in equal measure. There should be no equivocation on the Left in condemning Vladimir Putin’s invasion and the murder it brings in its wake. Context matters when it comes to conflict, but there can be no justification for sending tanks and planes into a sovereign country. It is a historic crime. We must do what we can to support the Ukrainian refugees who are its victims, and to show our solidarity with the brave protesters in cities across Russia who insist that it is not carried out in their name.

Today, Volodymyr Zelenskyy, elected with an overwhelming mandate by the Ukrainian people in 2019, called on the Putin government to end the violence and negotiate. Everyone who thinks of themselves as a democrat should back that call.

It is precisely because war is so devastating that we need an antiwar movement. This is especially the case in a world in which unipolarity, and the unquestioned dominance of the United States, is quickly unraveling. The geopolitics of the 2020s, ’30s, and ’40s will not look like those of the 1990s or 2000s. They will look a lot more like the twentieth century, with major powers competing for influence across the globe. If we want to avoid the worst episodes of the last hundred years from repeating themselves, we need to learn their lessons once again — and swiftly.

A Mass Movement That Dissents

One lesson is this: we must be able to criticize our own governments. The path to war is paved with the nationalist mythologies of great powers and the impunity of their leaders. In Russia’s case, this has been on clear display in recent days, with Putin’s hour-long lectures laying out a particularly distorted version of history. But it isn’t only in Russia where great powers have mythologies and leaders go to war with impunity.

In Britain, our leaders have invaded sovereign states without provocation. They did in Iraq in 2003, taking part in the killing of hundreds of thousands. The people who lied to take us into that war faced no consequences. Their careers continued, as did their luxurious lives, as an entire region of the world was plunged into the depths of hell for decades. We are still living with its consequences today, including here in Britain, whether it be the refugee crisis or the restriction of civil liberties brought about by the “war on terror.”

But they did not only do it in Iraq. We hear very little today about Britain’s role in the NATO-led war in Libya in 2011, which demolished that state, left its people in the hands of warlords, and pushed thousands to flee and drown in the Mediterranean. Nor do we hear about Britain’s complicity in the ongoing war in Yemen, conducted by our ally Saudi Arabia with our weapons, £17.6 billion of which have been provided by BAE systems to the Saudis since 2015. The United Nations estimates that 377,000 Yemenis have died in that conflict.

These lives are not any less or any more important than the lives of Ukrainians. We should fight to end all of these wars, and all of the wars yet to come.

One thing is for certain: we will not end war by saying that our side represents virtue and the other side represents evil. But that is the mythology we swallow from our leaders and media in the West every single day. Ever since the Cold War, the West has framed itself as a defender of democracy and freedom of expression across the globe. Liberal opinion in our home countries has repeated this ad nauseam. But it was hardly ever true.

Even in Russia, when the Cold War ended and the West reigned supreme and unchallenged across the face of the earth, the West could not and would not stand up for democracy. It intervened brazenly in the 1996 Russian election to help the fraudsters who won it for Boris Yeltsin, a result that in many ways paved the way for the Russia we see today.

How many people in the West know about their governments’ role in that election? How many know that the mass privatization that followed under Yeltsin resulted in millions of excess deaths in the former Soviet Union? This academic study is not from some fringe journals; it was a 2009 finding published in the Lancet. Life expectancy among Russian men fell from sixty-seven in 1985 to sixty in 2007. That is a social catastrophe, and we helped to cause it.

Is it any surprise, then, that when the dream of capitalist democracy we sold the Russian people turned out to be a fraud, they turned to a nationalist demagogue like Putin? It is not, but they didn’t do it alone. Britain’s intelligence services helped to facilitate Putin’s rise and Tony Blair even flew to St Petersburg to attend the opera at his side in order to bolster his credibility. Even more damning, our leaders supported Putin in his brutal slaughter in Chechnya, ignoring the war crimes he committed in order to further the interests of British Petroleum.

Challenging the Political Class

This is the same political class that bloviates in Parliament now about its opposition to Putin, making grandiose statements and rattling sabers. None of it should provide any solace to the people of Ukraine. For our leaders in the West, they were just as much a pawn on a geopolitical chessboard as they are for Putin. But unless that reality — the fact that we do not represent justice, democracy, or peace on a global scale — dawns on people living here, they will never be held to account for their actions.

In 2008, NATO invited Georgia and Ukraine to join its alliance. The logic for Georgians and Ukrainians, with an overwhelming and increasingly hostile military power next door, was obvious enough. But what kind of a game were our leaders playing? Did they ever intend, as NATO membership requires, to go to war with Russia if it invaded these countries? Did they ever really see them as important enough? The answer to that question was clear almost immediately when Russia invaded Georgia. It is even clearer today.

But onward our leaders pushed regardless, encouraging the Ukrainian government to continue down a path of military integration with the West. They sold the Ukrainian people a lie that their democracy and freedom would be safeguarded with US and British and French military might. It was never going to be — and nor should it. Would the world be a safer place today if nuclear powers faced each other head-on in Eastern Europe? What would the prognosis be for freedom and democracy anywhere on earth under those circumstances?

And so, what was all this for? Why were the Ukrainians walked up a garden path only to be abandoned to their fate? Did anyone really believe that Russia would permit American missiles to be placed on its border? They didn’t, for the same reason we all know that the United States would never permit China to place its missiles in Guadalajara. In fact, we don’t need the hypothetical: when the Soviet Union tried it in Cuba, we got the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuban Missile Crisis, the closest the world has ever come to nuclear war.

No War but Class War

It is correct to damn Vladimir Putin for his role in the bloodshed in Ukraine today. It is also important to account for our own governments’ role in the crisis — the point at which we had real leverage and could have changed the course of history. The fact is, Britain could have spent recent decades building a multilateral international order of cooperation, dialogue, and peace. Instead, it spent its time fighting and funding wars and pursuing the interests of its corporate elite.

The only people who will tell you that story, amid the constant self-aggrandizement of the political and media class, are those in the anti-war movement. That is why their voices matter. They may not always get the analysis correct, but their perspective is invaluable.

And it is exactly at moments like this that the establishment tries to shut them up, because their own approach to the world stands so exposed. The hawks scoff at the idea of multilateralism or a world of genuine dialogue. They see it as naive. They say it could never contain a leader like Putin.

But what has their bellicose rhetoric achieved? How naive was their approach to Ukraine and its people? Why is it that these figures, who actually influence foreign policy in this country, are never held to account for their failures?

Part of the answer is that they find scapegoats. They line up eleven Labour left MPs who signed an anti-war statement and offer them up as examples of national traitors or Putin puppets. They threaten to purge them. They turn their bellicose rhetoric on the enemy within, people who they know had absolutely no influence over the decisions that led to this war in the first place.

And the cycle goes on. Meanwhile, the same government that claims to support Ukrainians pushes through anti-refugee legislation that will make the lives of any who flee to Britain a living hell. The arms sales to authoritarian regimes around the world that wage wars of aggression will continue. The mythology about the West’s defense of democracy will endure, even as it offers illusions to peoples it never cared about or intended to protect.

#### NATO is a weapon of control that exists purely to forward capitalism and its markets

Gliniecki 22 [Ben Gliniecki, 2-23-2022, "The Real Role and History of NATO: A Reply to Keir Starmer," Socialist Revolution, https://socialistrevolution.org/the-real-role-and-history-of-nato-a-reply-to-keir-starmer/, smarx, HHW]

Recently, British Labour Party leaders, “Sir” Keir Starmer, published a cringeworthy love letter to western imperialism in the Guardian newspaper. His frothy excitement about NATO and his cartoonish patriotic chest-beating are an attempt to paint himself as a champion of the British establishment and an enemy of the left. But his **article is a mess of lies and imperialist propaganda from start to finish.**

Starmer showers praise on the military alliance of western imperialists, cynically—and nauseatingly—comparing it to Britain’s National Health Service as one of “the great achievements of the 1945 Labour government”; a “transformational legacy” that apparently has Labour’s “proud,” “unwaverable,” and “unshakeable” support.

“To condemn NATO is to condemn the guarantee of democracy and security it brings,” the Labour leader writes. **We wonder if Afghan workers and youth feel the same way, 20 years after NATO forces invaded their country.**

Starmer says NATO is a “defensive alliance that has never provoked conflict.” But over the last 30 years, NATO has zealously participated in **aggressive military action in Iraq, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Somalia, and Libya.**

At the same time, it has continually expanded eastwards towards Russia, surrounding the country with troops and military equipment.

Starmer’s fairy stories are akin to those that we are taught at school and force-fed by the media—about the **good guys in the West and the bad guys in the East**. Such claptrap is only fit for children, not thinking workers and youth.

Western Aggression

In reality, NATO was founded in 1949 not as an instrument of peace, but **as a weapon** to fight the Cold War. **It has remained a weapon ever since.**

**It is a military alliance,** which gets three-quarters of its funding from the USA; and which says that if one member is attacked, then every other member must respond with force.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the **Russian economy entered free fall. Chaos reigned, and** Russia was on its knees. The **western imperialists seized the opportunity to expand their markets** and spheres of influence eastwards. **NATO has been a key part of this strategy**.

In 1999, former Warsaw Pact countries Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic joined NATO. In 2004, they were joined by Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Slowly but surely, Russia’s borders were being ringed by members of a hostile military alliance.

Starmer describes Russia as “the aggressor” and a “bully.” But **which of NATO and Russia has hawkishly expanded into the markets and territories of the other’s former allies**? **Which has been placing troops and military hardware on the borders of the other for many years**?

NATO’s provocations towards Russia continued. In 2003, a rabidly pro-US government was brought to power in Georgia. US advisers helped train the Georgian army, and encouraged them to test the limits of Russia’s defensive capability.

At a 2008 summit in Bucharest, NATO members agreed that Georgia and Ukraine, both bordering Russia, would join the alliance in the future.

Whipped up by these events, Georgian president Saakashvili attacked the autonomous region of South Ossetia in 2008, where over 90% of the population are Russian citizens.

#### NATO and its expansion exist for the purpose of benefiting the economic interests of US and exerting capitalism on the rest of the world

Tariqi 22 [Felice, 3-26-2022, "What is NATO? Why do we call for its dismantling?," IWL-FI, https://litci.org/en/what-is-nato-why-do-we-call-for-its-dismantling/, smarx, HHW]

The origins of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) go back to 1948, when the United Kingdom, France, and the Benelux countries (Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg) formed a **military alliance out of fear** of potential German and Soviet aggression after World War II. By 1949, the founding members began to see this as insufficient. Soon thereafter, the United States and Canada joined. Subsequently, the alliance formed three commands: Europe, the Atlantic, and the English Channel (the last dissolved in 1994). France withdrew from military participation in 1966, rejoining in 2009.

When West Germany was admitted in 1955, the USSR responded by forming the Warsaw Pact, giving the lie to the original NATO founders’ perception of Soviet aggression. As Marxist geographer David Harvey explains, “Cultivating fear (both fake and real) of the Soviets and Communism was instrumental to this (cold war) politics. The economic consequence has been wave after wave of technological and organizational innovation in military hardware.”

**The arms industry—a form of monopoly capitalism** often referred to as the “military-industrial complex”—has always been at the heart of NATO, as it sought to balance the numerical superiority of the Warsaw Pact’s armed forces with technological superiority, including medium range nuclear weapons.

Article 5 of the NATO treaty states that an attack on any signatory would be regarded as an attack on the other members. This “collective defense” pact was first invoked in 2001 following the Sept. 11 attacks on the United States. Currently, 30 countries are NATO members, 28 of which are in Europe (the U.S. and Canada are the two non-European members). The most recent entrant is North Macedonia, a former Yugoslav province, admitted in May 2020. NATO’s courting of Ukraine—especially after the Western-supported 2013-2014 “Euromaidan” protests and the 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea—all the while maintaining that it refuses to directly militarily intervene there, has generated the ambiguity contributing to the current crisis. It also coincided with the increase of Ukraine’s debt with the IMF and the application of neoliberal austerity policies.

After the collapse of the USSR in 1991, the Warsaw Pact was dissolved but **NATO kept growing**. Since the late 1990s it has expanded to 14 new countries. This military encroachment has been largely naturalized by U.S. and European governments as a guarantee of peace, but its **root causes have not been really explained**. In the United States, the likes of The New York Times and PBS have been among the worst in this regard, constantly drilling audiences with Pentagon talking points and focusing almost entirely on issues of logistics rather than the larger geopolitical context.

Instead, we offer a materialist explanation, specifically contextualizing NATO’s aims both within U.S. imperialist ambitions and within the emergence of rentier capitalism since the 1990s. To summarize, as many have discussed, the U.S. regime rejected a “peace dividend” after the defeat of the USSR. This is puzzling **only when we fail to consider how central to U.S. capitalist profits both the expansion of U.S. military bases since World War II and the military-industrial complex** since the 1990s have been.

At the time of this writing, U.S. President Joe Biden is visiting Europe for an emergency NATO summit, along with meetings of the G7 and the European Council, in what the bourgeois media is depicting as an “honor lap” of sorts after the shambolic Trump years. Read without the fog of bourgeois sentimentality, European capitalist politicians are welcoming Washington back as their prodigal king. This trip occurs in the immediate aftermath of Biden’s pledge to devote $3 billion from the $13.6 billion Ukraine “aid” package to increase U.S. NATO troops in Europe, and another $700 million to support Foreign Military Financing and to foster U.S. counter-espionage activities ISR (intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance). **This move can only be seen by the Russians as an escalation**.

As of July 2021, the U.S. operates about 750 bases in at least 80 countries and spends more on its military than the next 10 countries combined**. Since the Pentagon publishes incomplete data, the number of bases may be even be higher.** A significant number of these bases are located in NATO member countries: Germany (119 bases), Italy (44), the UK (25), Portugal (21), Turkey (13), and Belgium (11). Moreover, the U.S. deploys approximately 173,000 troops in 159 countries. Again, NATO member states host a large proportion, at least 60,000, of these troops, with the following breakdown: Germany (33,948), Italy (12,247), UK (over 9000), Spain (over 3000), Turkey (1600+), Belgium (1000+), and Norway (700+).

Interestingly, one of the agenda points of Biden’s summit with the Europeans will be to discuss NATO’s long-term deployment plans. In 1997 the U.S. and Russia signed an agreement in which the U.S. promised not to deploy troops permanently in frontline states. In 2014, after Russia annexed Crimea, the U.S. began to exert a military presence in both Poland and the Baltic states, but “in rotating deployments to honor the letter of that agreement,” as reported by the Guardian. However, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has voided the deal, in the eyes of the U.S. and its NATO allies. Now the U.S. is pushing for permanent basing, which has long been the desire of the Baltic states.

The idea that U.S. bases and troops intervene in foreign countries to provide security and to promote human rights is belied by the real history of U.S. bases, as described in an excellent book, “Bases of Empire,” edited by the anthropologist and director of the Cost of War Project, Catherine Lutz. As Lutz shows, **U.S. bases have many functions, none of which promote the security or human rights of host populations. For example:**

Basing comes with Status of Forces Agreements (SOFAs), not just with NATO countries but anywhere Uncle Sam goes. These grant U.S. soldiers immunity from local laws.

Bases expand U.S. military capacity to wage war—for example, when the U.S. used its bases in Guam, Thailand, and Philippines during the Vietnam War.

Bases provide “R&R” for invading U.S. soldiers, **inflicting the misogyny and racism of many of these troops on local populations.**

The CIA used secret bases in Laos to ship heroine to U.S. troops in Vietnam.

Bases facilitate the **shipment of U.S. material to its theaters of invasion and intervention.**

Bases enable the U.S. to **manipulate local governments and to exert influence on them to change laws in the interests of U.S. capital.**

Base agreements often come with **U.S. investment and trade treaties tying countries into U.S. trade relations and forcing liberalization** and privatization.

The ultimate goal of NATO today is to secure the support of governments allied to the U.S. in the region, offer so-called “protection” and IMF/WB “financing” in exchange for austerity policies and privatization, as well as **pushing forward imperialist policies abroad which benefit U.S. capital**. It is a military alliance to back a concrete economic and political project.

All of this helps explain why Biden and NATO see the Russia war on Ukraine as an opportunity to escalate imperialist intervention. However, it is not just old school military intervention and basing that is at play. Since the 1970s**, U.S. imperialism has morphed into something more indirect yet equally sinister: the promotion of rentier capitalism.**

The decline in U.S. manufacturing generated a profitability crisis, going back to the early 1970s. To revive profitability, U.S. capitalism shifted toward “rentier” sectors such as the arms industry (aka. The military-industrial complex or MIC), finance-insurance-real estate (FIRE), and oil, gas, and mineral extraction (OGM). Rent-seeking capital, as opposed to surplus-value generating capital—for example, manufacturing or agriculture—seeks profits through monopolization of property, whether in the form of resources, financial assets, or so-called intellectual property. Often, rent-seeking capital is described as the search for profit without the contribution of social value (think of the activities of your typical sleazy landlord).

Rent-seeking capital, specifically the MIC, FIRE, and OGM sectors, has risen to dominance in the United States over the past generation, and the promotion of these sectors has been the raison d’etre both of domestic national politics and of NATO in that time. Since 1991, the alliance has primarily served U.S. interests, shifting European and other U.S. allies’ focus from their domestic spheres toward that of U.S. “national security.” As economist Michael Hudson has explained, **NATO has become, in effect, Europe’s foreign policy ministry, dominating domestic economic interests.**

#### Use of NATO promotes capitalism

**Wojcik**, 20**19** (John, Editor in Chief of People’s World. “NATO gathering this week did nothing for world peace and progress” People’s World. December 4, 2019. <https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/nato-gathering-this-week-did-nothing-for-world-peace-and-progress/> ///MF)

This week, the heads of the NATO countries have been meeting in London to “celebrate” the 70th anniversary of the military alliance. The main news coverage coming out of the gathering revolves around Trump demanding that the members up their contributions to the alliance piggy bank, tales of how leaders of many countries are gossiping about the behaviors of the American president, and Donald Trump’s description of the Canadian prime minister as “two-faced.”

The so-called liberal media, reflected by MSNBC, goes a bit further in its commentary, but, unfortunately, it too parrots the false description of NATO as the long-time guarantor of democracy and peace in Europe and around the world. In the eagerness to lampoon whatever Trump says or does, the knee-jerk response for some in the media is to support or praise anything the president might criticize.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy for seven decades, has never been the good-guy guardian of world peace and progress. Instead, it has been the instrument by which U.S. and transnational corporations can dominate the planet through military, economic, and political means.

When the situation called for it—whether in Iraq, Serbia, Croatia, Libya, Syria, or Afghanistan—NATO could be counted on to step forward in full support of U.S. foreign policy. Today it plays that role by planning, under the leadership of the U.S., war games on the borders of Russia that involve hundreds of thousands of troops and weapons and by backing up U.S. military operations in the Middle East.

NATO policy, like most of U.S. foreign policy over the last 70 years, has resulted not in peace and democracy but in war, massive human suffering, displacement of millions of refugees, and, not least, incredible numbers of deaths.

In addition to being a military protector of capitalism and guarantor of its export to formerly socialist Eastern European countries, NATO is also an international outlaw organization.

Like the U.S., it has conducted many illegal wars. In violation of its own constitution, it goes to war without UN authorization and almost always in cases where there has been no military attack on one of its members. Essentially every single military exploit undertaken by NATO has been just as illegal under international law as have been the wars conducted by the United States since NATO was founded.

Instead of bringing these truths to Americans, the media was busy this week talking about the fight between Trump and French President Macron over France paying its “fair share” into the alliance piggy bank. They never bothered to touch on where those NATO dues go once they’re paid up.

When the corporate media does talk about the alliance, they usually put forward false narratives. They say, for example, that NATO was formed in response to Soviet aggression.

When the alliance was founded in 1949, the Soviet Union had just lost 25 million of its people fighting Hitler and the Nazis. The countries that founded NATO, with the exception of Germany of course, had been allied with the Soviet Union in that fight. What changed by 1949 was that the capitalists in control of NATO’s founding members were alarmed that in one European country after another, the left was growing and often taking political power.

Around the world, former colonies were breaking away from their masters. NATO was created to foster the unity of the capitalist Western countries to enable them to maintain economic and political control of as much of the world as possible. The need, as far as NATO was concerned, was to make sure the 20th century would be the century that saw capitalism triumph over socialism. The truth is that when NATO began in 1949, there was no threat of aggression coming from the Soviet Union.

If the reason for starting NATO was to counter Soviet aggression, then why did NATO not disband after the Soviet Union and the socialist countries were defeated? The reason, of course, is that maintaining capitalism and imperialist control of the world was always the real goal. From the time of the end of the USSR and the socialist countries in Europe until now, NATO has continued in this role, becoming capitalism’s global military arm.

After the defeat of the socialist countries, Russia was promised by the U.S. that NATO would not be expanded to include Soviet-allied states. That pledge was of course ignored. Instead, the alliance expanded from a dozen to 29 countries, including many on the borders of Russia. And they haven’t stopped, pushing now to grab Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine—all former republics that made up part of the Soviet Union itself. On top of that, they are also expanding into Latin America, with their eyes on Colombia and Brazil.

Trump bragged this week that he had a good meeting with NATO General Secretary Jens Stoltenberg. Stoltenberg was happy about Trump’s push for higher NATO spending by member countries, who have now pledged to hike the NATO coffers by some $400 billion.

It should frighten us that where the people rise up for economic justice, like in Venezuela and Bolivia, for example, the progressive forces have to be ready for the U.S. and NATO to pounce. It is no accident that NATO is putting the moves on countries that surround Venezuela and Bolivia, countries that have rejected U.S. imperialism. Free elections, democracy, and human rights are not the criteria for NATO action. The alliance acts whenever and wherever the interests of imperialism or capitalism are threatened.

Yet today, we unfortunately see liberal lawmakers who join in support for NATO even though the defense of that alliance and support for the U.S. military budget threatens world peace and the funding for progressive programs here at home. Even the best in the U.S. Congress, among them Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Ilhan Omar, voted for the NATO Support Act earlier this year.

We know that for some the vote was a tactical one—they figure it will pass anyway so why go out on a limb? At some point, however, the line must be drawn and the truth must be told. NATO is a dangerous and international military strike force for capitalism. U.S. generals operating under NATO cover at Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany are sitting on top of nuclear missiles that they say protect against “aggression from the East.”

The direction we have to move in is one that creates a new international order involving bodies that use diplomacy rather than war to resolve disputes. This might involve strengthening the UN or perhaps creating new bodies with the power to prosecute any country that violates human rights or tries to foment war. Unlike NATO’s focus on military action, there has to be a focus on ending the threat of war, particularly nuclear war.

NATO has done nothing to make the world safer in this or any other way. Instead, it poses a clear and present danger to humanity.

#### NATO expansion is based in capitalist ideals

**Briggs,** 20**22** (William. “The Globalization of NATO and the madness of capitalism” green left. May 6, 2022. [https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/globalisation-nato-and-madness-capitalism ///](https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/globalisation-nato-and-madness-capitalism%20///)MF)

In an astonishing speech delivered in London on April 27, British foreign secretary [Liz Truss](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-secretarys-mansion-house-speech-at-the-lord-mayors-easter-banquet-the-return-of-geopolitics) called for the “globalisation” of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to pre-empt “threats in the Indo-Pacific”, namely China. Truss’s speech, entitled “The return of geopolitics” promoted a stronger NATO in response to the war in Ukraine, but reserved much of its venom for China.

See also

[Hysteria builds over the Solomon Islands-China security pact](https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/hysteria-builds-over-solomon-islands-china-security-pact)

[‘The most significant consequence in Finland has been the question of NATO membership’](https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/most-significant-consequence-finland-has-been-question-nato-membership)

It is almost a year since Britain sent its new aircraft carrier, the [HMS Queen Elizabeth](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/military/article/3143308/british-navy-shows-global-ambitions-aircraft-carriers-south#:~:text=HMS%20Queen%20Elizabeth%20and%20its%20strike%20group%20are%20in%20the,the%20end%20of%20the%20year.) for military drills in the South China Sea — the first such mission since the beginning of the Korean War. Truss visited Australia in January to further sound the drums of war, with totally unfounded denunciations of China’s intentions in the region.

Britain’s previous imperial exchanges with China include running opium into the country, launching the opium wars, and the seizure of Hong Kong. Given this history, Truss’s most recent outburst hardly endeared her to the Chinese.

Truss said the globalisation of NATO is a necessary step. China, the South China Sea, and the entire region is, according to her logic, within the sphere of influence and responsibility of NATO.

But the concept of globalising NATO is absurd. NATO is constituted as a regional military alliance concerned with the North Atlantic. Thus, China does not easily fit into NATO’s purported mission to protect Europe from security threats.

The hypocrisy of the Foreign Secretary when it comes to relations with China is unacceptable. Truss envisions “a world where free nations are assertive and in the ascendant. Where freedom and democracy are strengthened through a network of economic and security partnerships. Where aggressors are contained and forced to take a better path”. These few lines outline an entire world view that threatens us all.

First, there is the appeal for free nations to become increasingly “assertive”. Freedom, in this logic comes at the point of a bayonet. China has been routinely criticised over the past decade for being too assertive. But China’s "assertiveness" has often been in response to aggressive actions by successive United States administrations, with the loyal support of Australia.

Truss claims that economic and security agreements strengthen democracy and freedom. China and [the Solomon Islands](https://www.greenleft.org.au/content/solomon-islands-elections-and-preparing-war) have just entered into a security agreement which might well include economic benefits, but this is being used as proof of China’s aggressive intent.

China’s economic rise is a fact. It is something that the US is fighting, and the British ruling class seems to think it a fight that can be won. Truss argues that “by talking about the rise of China as inevitable we are doing China’s work for it. In fact, their rise isn’t inevitable. They will not continue to rise if they don’t play by the rules". Some might see that as a direct threat.

The British anti-China campaign insists China observes certain rules. But these imperialist rules have nothing to do with observing democratic values. Instead, imperialism demands that China must not seek economic power, and must not influence others. Such imperialism [cannot be simply dismissed](https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2022/jan/24/former-australian-pm-paul-keating-criticises-liz-truss-over-demented-china-comments): the actions of Britain are part of a broader movement that is gaining momentum and is becoming more strident.

Britain’s overt militarism in the region is often portrayed as a response to Chinese assertiveness and imagined aggression. But behind this an overarching agenda of struggle for control of the world economy.

The influential [Australian Strategic Policy Institute](https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/australia-should-make-its-own-long-range-missiles/) is urging that Australia should begin to produce long-range missiles. The only possible target for such missiles would be China.

Australia, Britain and the US have pledged to expand their cooperation in the development and deployment of [hypersonic weapons](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2022/apr/05/aukus-pact-extended-to-development-of-hypersonic-weapons) as part of the AUKUS security arrangement.

China has responded to this heightened threat by decrying what it describes as an “[Asia-Pacific version of NATO](https://www.thesaturdaypaper.com.au/post/max-opray/2022/04/07/china-rages-against-asia-pacific-nato)”. China’s concerns are understandable and such provocative actions serve to make the region more insecure. These actions, along with the calls for a globalised NATO will only generate more fear and distrust.

This is a dangerous state of play. Threats are inevitably met by counter threats. Arms build-ups are met with arms build-ups. War preparations continue, and billions upon billions of dollars are spent on preparing for a war that is in no-one’s best interests. There will be huge ramifications for working people everywhere.

The [global economy is fragile and growth is slowing](https://thenextrecession.wordpress.com/2022/05/03/its-not-looking-good-for-2022/). In the first quarter of 2022 the US economy shrunk by 0.4%, Germany’s rose by just 0.2% and China’s by 1.3%. Other economies have yet to release data, but the trend is clear. The International Monetary Fund forecasts total global growth for the next two years to be in the range of 2%. While all economies are slowing, China’s remains relatively healthy with annual growth predictions of about 5%.

If China does not play by the "rules" as determined by the US, Britain and Australia, then its economic growth must be curtailed, or so runs the imperialist narrative. If this is the case then the capitalist global economy is set for contraction, recession and depression, as it is largely due to the continued relative health of the Chinese economy that global capitalism is still keeping its head above water. These realities, it would seem, are secondary to the desire to stop China’s economic growth.

There is madness in this approach. The upholders of the rules-based order are prepared to fight tooth and claw to preserve capitalism, not democracy. They are prepared to do anything to maintain US domination. A confrontation with China is a fight against a capitalist rival. China does not threaten capitalism, but it does pose a real risk that US economic power will be lost.

The world has never been more insecure. Global capitalist growth is crumbling. The climate crisis is an existential threat. War rages in Europe, and the US and its allies are turning their attention to a potentially devastating conflict with China.

Truss is but the latest of a long line of warmongers who threaten the peace and stability of us all. She is not alone. She speaks on behalf of the nations of AUKUS — a cog in the wheel of a globalising NATO.

#### NATO was built to promote capitalism – spreads it under the false pretense of “global peace”

KAZMİ and FİDA 21 (Aqeel Abbas KAZMİ is an Educationist & Researcher with over 10 years of experience in research and Business Development as well as Monitoring & Evaluation experience alongside teaching experience of English Language, International Relations , Economics, Social Work, Zeeshan FİDA is a lecturer on Defense and Diplomatic Studies at Fatima Jinnah Women University, Crisis of Liberal Hegemony and the US, Pg. 54//JL)

Second, the US desired states to integrate with international institutions. The liberal logic behind such an approach is that international organisations promote peace and stability. Peeve House and Bruce Russet claim that international organisations promote peace and stability through multilateralism. International organisations settle disputes particularly those organisations that are of homogenous nature. Moreover, international organisations provide a platform for negotiations to overcome trust deficit among states and mitigate fear of cheating (Pevehouse, Russet 2006, p.969-1000). Furthermore, international organisations ensure states comply with rules and regulations of the international system, reduce transaction cost of exchange, and socialize states to cooperate with each other at international level (Ruggie, 1992). Thus, the US pursued such an approach in the immediate aftermath of the Cold war. Various Eastern European states integrated into the NATO and European Union. And this wave of NATO and EU expansion from Central Europe to the Eastern Europe continued without interruption (Mearsheimer, 2011). However, finally, these expansions stopped when Russian President Putin drew red lines over Ukraine and Georgia. The Putin administration communicated to the US that Russia would wreck Ukraine but would not let it become part of NATO and European Union and this eastward expansion of these two organisations led towards Ukrainian crisis (Mearsheimer, 2014). Moreover, the US maneuvered international organizations to pursue its vested interests in the world. For example, in the Gulf War of 1991, the US through the platform of the United Nations Security Council got an endorsement to intervene in Kuwait to liberate her from Iraqi occupation. Similarly, the US intervention in Yugoslavia and Somalia also came under the banner of the UNSC and NATO. US intervention in Afghanistan also came while utilizing the UNSC forum. Under the UNSC Resolution 1386 (2001) American invaded Afghanistan. Moreover, the norm of multilateralism was exploited by the US, when the US intervened in Libya. Thus, to wind up the argument, the US wanted more states to become part of a global network of international organizations (Kissinger, 1994, p.805). The third goal of liberal hegemony is to promote global capitalism (Mearsheimer, 2018). The US as a leader of the capitalist world promoted free trade, multinational corporations, and forces of globalization (Kissinger, 2014, p. 364,368,369) (Kissinger, 1994, p.804, 805). The driving forces of globalization are trade, finance, technology, and communication. According to Liberal economists, the end product of these forces of globalization is prosperity and peace in the world. Global capitalism favors forces of globalisation. As a result, there is more interconnectedness among states. Global trade has increased many folds. Moreover, because of the availability of finance, more states are relying on global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Furthermore, due to technology, economic institutions have been transformed. Now, states as well as non-state actors can easily interact with one another. Time and space have been shrunk and squeezed (Baylis, 2020). As a result of all these processes, the world has become a global village. Globalization promotes complex interdependence among states and which eventually reduces likelihood of wars among states. Thus, the US pursued liberal ideas of global capitalism and wanted more and more countries to embed with global economic institutions in order to promote prosperity and peace in the world. The assumed benefits of pursuing liberal hegemony were to eliminate human rights violations in the entire globe. However, the US justification for intervention in Somalia, Iraq, Libya, Syria and Ukraine to protect universal human rights was liberal delusion rather the US intervention in these states created a power vacuum that resulted in intense rivalries among various factions which ensued in bloodshed and anarchy (Hamasaeed, Nada, 2020, p.1) (Boke, 2016).

### 2NC -- Ext: Russia War Link

#### Capitalism is the root cause to not only the recent invasion of Ukraine but ALL conflicts

Wolff ’22 [Richard D.; April 19; American Marxian economist, Professor Emeritus of Economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; Mail & Guardian; The role of capitalism in the war in Ukraine, <https://mg.co.za/opinion/2022-04-19-the-role-of-capitalism-in-the-war-in-ukraine/>] SPark

Ukraine, per se, is not the issue. It is tragically a war-ravaged pawn in a much larger conflict. Nor is the issue about either Russian President Vladimir Putin or US President Joe Biden as leaders. The same history and confrontation would prevail on their successors. Meanwhile, former US president Donald Trump’s effort to force change on China by imposing the biggest sanctions action in history (that is, a trade war and a tariff war) utterly failed. Trump was caught up in the same history as Biden, even if each focused on attacking the Russian-Chinese alliance differently.

Eventually, some compromise will end the Ukraine war. Both sides will likely declare victory and blame the war on the other among propaganda blizzards. The Russian side will stress demilitarisation, denazification, and protection of Russians in eastern Ukraine. The Ukraine side will stress freedom, independence, and national self-determination. Meanwhile, the tragedy goes beyond Ukraine’s suffering. The entire world is caught up in the decline of one capitalist empire and the rise of yet another. Conflicts between the capitalist empires can occur anywhere where differences between them flare up.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy lies in not recognising the responsibility of the capitalist system with its markets of competing enterprises run/dominated by the minorities we call employers. That system lies at the root of these historic repetitions. The minority employer class controls or is the leadership of the nations that have absorbed and reproduced the competition that capitalism entails. The majority employee class pays most of the costs on both sides (in dead, wounded, destroyed properties, refugee lives and taxes). A different economic system not driven by a profit motive offers a deeper solution than any on offer at present.

#### The capitalist market drives the war in Ukraine – European payments to Russia have not stopped

ŽIŽEK 4/18 – [SLAVOJ ŽIŽEK is a professor of Philosophy at the European Graduate School, is International Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities at the University of London and the author; 4/18/22; “War in a World that Stands for Nothing”; <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/russia-ukraine-war-highlights-truths-about-global-capitalism-by-slavoj-zizek-2022-04>; accessed: 7/6/22; Lowell-JL]

Vladimir Putin’s war engine is being sustained not just by European payments for Russian oil and gas but also by a complicit class of “lumpen-bourgeoisie” motivated solely by the trappings of material wealth. Ukrainians, and everyone else, are learning the hard way how global capitalism trumps democracy and human rights.

LJUBLJANA – The so-called oligarchs in Russia and other ex-communist countries are a bourgeois counterpart to what Marx called the lumpen-proletariat: an unthinking cohort susceptible to political manipulation because its members have no class consciousness or revolutionary potential of their own. Unlike the proletariat, however, the lumpen-bourgeoisie who emerged in these countries from the late 1980s onward control capital – lots of it – thanks to wild “privatization” of state-owned assets.

An exemplary case is Rok Snežič, a collaborator and friend of Slovenia’s right-wing prime minister, Janez Janša. An “independent tax adviser,” Snežič helps Slovene companies redomicile in the lower-tax jurisdiction of Republika Srpska (the Serb part of Bosnia and Herzegovina). He apparently has no private possessions, and he has erased his own past tax bills by declaring bankruptcy.

Yet Snežič also cruises around in new luxury cars and has the means to pay for jumbo billboard ads. He is officially employed by a company owned by his wife, where he receives a monthly salary of €37,362 ($40,346) in cash.

But “normal” capitalism also generates a lumpen-bourgeoisie. Snežič is not so different from Donald Trump, who similarly thrives precisely because he stands for nothing, motivated solely by money and the trappings of material wealth.

Market values have also determined the contours of Russia’s war in Ukraine, whose president, Volodymyr Zelensky, appears to have had a crash course in how global capitalism and democracy really work. Since the start of the war, Europe has sent Russia almost $40 billion in payments for oil and gas, prompting his observation that Western countries are more concerned about rising energy prices than Ukrainian lives. The capitalist market – the one that has been fueling the Russian war engine – has forsaken Ukraine.

Ending this bloody trade would require governments to abandon their reliance on market mechanisms and start organizing energy supply directly, as would addressing the global food crises that Russia’s war is generating. (In addition to being two of the world’s biggest wheat exporters, Russia and Ukraine are also major sources of chemical fertilizers for Europe.) Paradoxically, only measures recalling the newborn Soviet Union’s “war communism” can save Ukraine and preserve Western power. After all, Russia is coordinating with China not only to challenge the West geopolitically but also to depose the US dollar and the euro as global currencies.

### 2NC -- Ext: China War Link

#### Capitalism competition sparks and escalates the China Conflict - empirics prove

Hung ’20 [Ho-Fung’ September 11; Professor in Political Economy and chair of the department of sociology at Johns Hopkins University; Jacobin; “The US-China Rivalry Is About Capitalist Competition,” <https://jacobin.com/2020/07/us-china-competition-capitalism-rivalry>] SPark

The dynamics of US-China rivalry is an inter-imperial rivalry driven by inter-capitalist competition. Competition for the world market could soon turn into intensifying clashes of spheres of influence and even war. It is not new. It resembles a lot of the dynamics as described in Lenin’s Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism. In the book, published in 1917, Lenin talked about the competition between German and British banks to lend to Latin American countries to build railroads and to ensure the projects would rely on German or British supplies. This is just like talking about the competition between China and the U.S. to offer credits to Belt and Road countries to build infrastructure. In the early twentieth century, inter-capitalist competition led to inter-imperial rivalry culminated in two world wars.

#### The tension isn’t caused by competing ideologies but the market - empirics prove

Hung ’20 [Ho-Fung’ September 11; Professor in Political Economy and chair of the department of sociology at Johns Hopkins University; Jacobin; “The US-China Rivalry Is About Capitalist Competition,” <https://jacobin.com/2020/07/us-china-competition-capitalism-rivalry>] SPark

Today, there is a lot of talk about a [“New Cold War”](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jun/22/us-v-china-is-this-the-start-of-a-new-cold-war) between China and the United States: a Cold War between authoritarianism and liberal democracy. But we all know that China did not become authoritarian just two years ago. The whole establishment of the United States has been very happy about Chinese authoritarianism for a long time.

Just two weeks after the June 4, 1989 massacre in Tiananmen Square, on June 20, President George H. W. Bush wrote a [secret letter to Deng Xiaoping](http://www.standoffattiananmen.com/2012/06/document-of-1989-president-bushs-secret.html). The letter said that the United States was not so mad about the Communist Party sending the army to shoot its people. Bush told Deng that the United States was only a two-hundred-years-young country, and China was a five-thousand-years-old country [sic] with great contributions to world civilization, so the Chinese leaders were wise and knew what was best for the Chinese people. Bush assured Deng that Tiananmen was not going to stand in the way of the great commercial relationship between the United States and China. If there were an ideology-based Cold War between the United States and China, it should have started thirty years ago.

Rivalry

In my ongoing research, I look at the origins and dynamics of the transformation of US-China amity into rivalry by examining US corporations’ exposures to China over the last three decades. I also look at the lobbying activities of these firms on behalf of China. I discuss how these firms shaped US-China policy over the years. This is a historical materialist explanation for the changes in US-China relations. This shift was ultimately driven by a huge shift of corporate American’s disposition toward China.

### Surveillance Capitalism Scenario

\*\* This is a link scenario that I found for the concept of surveillance capitalism which is very similar to (it is basically) cybernetics + securitization

The link has two large stages?. The first is that the securitization of threats is used to justify the use of surveillance, as was the case with the war on terror

The second stage says that the US, by expanding the technosphere through the aff and also securitization as mentioned above, inevitably takes tech from companies, allowing those companies to access the surveillance data that they gain, therefore causing Surveillance Capitalism

The reason why capitalism is important in this process is because capitalism is what drives companies and the government to

1 - buy and sell data representing futuristic probabilistic human behavior

2 - want to gain a competitive edge on other nations and agents, making them actively check other states using surveillance

3 - use surveillance target anti-capitalist agents which prevents beneficial change

BUT if you wanted to use it for another file, I am pretty sure that it would still work fine with a bit of re-formatting

Sorry for the bad explanation but that should have everything I had in mind while organizing these links/impacts - Spark

Also, if anyone who is cutting cybernetic cards needs a good source, the text Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis and Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism? seemed to have a lot of good stuff.

#### Information awareness and its justification is a vehicle for capitalism. Companies use their intel and data to shut down capitalist opposition.

Van der Pijl ’18 [Kees; January; Chair of International Relations and the University of Sussex, Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE), President of the Committee of Vigilance against Resurgent Facism; Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis; “Introduction,” p. 6] SPark

The Post-Cold War, global intelligence infrastructure that grew out of it was then applied to a key problem big capital faced after the collapse of the USSR triggered a global restructuring of production: the existence of a billion-size surplus population, a reserve army of labour for which no employment was to be expected. This required devising control strategies of various types. After 9/11, the NeoCons revived the War on Terror concept to stir and then repress segments of this vast reserve army of labour, developing the notion of Total Information Awareness to allow it to know in advance, not just the intentions of rival states ranged against the West or just insufficiently submissive, but more particularly, the potential systemic opposition to capitalism at home and abroad. Using double agent tactics as well as provocation and targeted assassination, this has created the condition of endless war and a politics of fear sustaining it. Politics and society today operate under a permanent state of exception in which the Internet has been turned into a vast search engine on the lookout for meaningful opposition. Meanwhile in the name of weeding out ‘fake news’, the big Internet companies such as Google have changed their algorithms to prevent Left websites from popping up in searches by the public: the World Socialist Website, Global Research, and others, have already experienced sharp declines in numbers of visitors (Tveten 2018: 22). Facebook takes orders from the United States and Israeli governments to remove accounts (Greenwald 2017). Why do these large Internet companies collaborate, and why do they collaborate with these two governments specifically? That is what I intend the clarify in the pages that follow.

#### Securitization of information causes violent regimes of fear and control – war on terror proves

Van der Pijl ’18 [Kees; January; Chair of International Relations and the University of Sussex, Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE), President of the Committee of Vigilance against Resurgent Facism; Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis; “Introduction,” p. 5] SPark

The United States has sought to turn its historic advantage of hosting the world’s key IT industries into a competitive advantage. Profiting from its military pre-eminence, its role as the provider of the world’s reserve currency, and enjoying the privilege of running permanent budget, commercial, and current account deficits, the US worked with the IT firms to establish a global security state grounded in ‘Total Information Awareness’. This is the link between the surveillance regime (which includes the voluntary deposition of personal data in social media) and the War on Terror. On the basis of its information advantage, the United States keeps global society in a state of tension by a range of military and intelligence activities targeting ‘demographic bulges’ in the reserve army of labour. In the process, even risking or provoking acts of violence against US/Western targets is part of the scenario because this allows armed control to be imposed. A domestic politics of fear has been deployed to win public support.

All this was explicitly discussed as a single project in the Israeli-US NeoCon discussions on a War on Terror. It was originally worked out in the early 1980s and revived after the Twin Towers attacks on 9/11, combining the attack on terrorists with pre-emptive war against ‘states supporting terror’ as well as imposing the corollary surveillance regime and suspending a range of freedoms on the home front.

Ultimately the doctrine behind the global strategy of tension entails the explicit option and regular practice of targeted assassination of opponents. ‘The subliminal purpose of terror tactics,’ Douglas Valentine argues in his book on the ‘Phoenix’ assassination programme in Vietnam, ‘was to drive people into a state of infantile dependence. In this sense, the CIA psy[chological] war[fare] experts were not exorcists come to heal Vietnam and liberate it from Communist demons; their spells were meant to break up the society and project its repressed homicidal impulses onto the Communists’ (Valentine 2000: 63, emphasis added). This insight still today applies to the condition of Western society in the War on Terror. As Dominick Jenkins observes, the Bush administration began the practice of making al-Qaeda a blank screen for the people’s fears; the spectacular theatrics of the Twin Towers collapses was exploited to show ‘the existence of a new kind of terrorist network with the power to threaten civilisation itself’ (Jenkins 2002: 265).

#### Link 2A - Capitalism molds google and other companies into data harvesters

Laidler ’19 [John; March 4; Havard Correspondent; The Harvard Gazette; “High tech is watching you,” <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/03/harvard-professor-says-surveillance-capitalism-is-undermining-democracy/>] SPark

ZUBOFF: I define surveillance capitalism as the unilateral claiming of private human experience as free raw material for translation into behavioral data. These data are then computed and packaged as prediction products and sold into behavioral futures markets — business customers with a commercial interest in knowing what we will do now, soon, and later. It was Google that first learned how to capture surplus behavioral data, more than what they needed for services, and used it to compute prediction products that they could sell to their business customers, in this case advertisers. But I argue that surveillance capitalism is no more restricted to that initial context than, for example, mass production was restricted to the fabrication of Model T’s.

Right from the start at Google it was understood that users were unlikely to agree to this unilateral claiming of their experience and its translation into behavioral data. It was understood that these methods had to be undetectable. So from the start the logic reflected the social relations of the one-way mirror. They were able to see and to take — and to do this in a way that we could not contest because we had no way to know what was happening.

We rushed to the internet expecting empowerment, the democratization of knowledge, and help with real problems, but surveillance capitalism really was just too lucrative to resist. This economic logic has now spread beyond the tech companies to new surveillance–based ecosystems in virtually every economic sector, from insurance to automobiles to health, education, finance, to every product described as “smart” and every service described as “personalized.” By now it’s very difficult to participate effectively in society without interfacing with these same channels that are supply chains for surveillance capitalism’s data flows. For example, ProPublica recently reported that breathing machines purchased by people with sleep apnea are secretly sending usage data to health insurers, where the information can be used to justify reduced insurance payments.

#### Link + Internal Link - Capitalism reinforces surveillence by replicating its characteristics of monopolization and inequalities - cause dispossession of the self

Cong ’18 [Wanshu; September 30; Faculty of Law at European University Institute - Department of Law (LAW), Global Academic Fellow at The University of Hong Kong; “Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism?” p. 22-24] SPark

Emerging from the background of the neoliberal financial capitalism, surveillance capitalism exhibits and reinforces some of the key features of financial capitalism which pose critical challenges to democracy. The mutual interdependence and reciprocity between the capitalist economy and the masses, already significantly undermined by financial capitalism, are further eliminated in surveillance capitalism where people are technologically mediated, structural excluded from the processes of capital extraction and accumulation and rendered merely as raw materials. Due to the exclusion from the processes of value creation and accumulation, people are deprived of their bargaining power to ask for more equal redistribution of the value that surveillance economy creates. In surveillance capitalism, the deprivation of the bargaining power is more covert and subtler thanks to the unprecedented consumerism of our age. The surveillant capitalists give people little treats such as customized services, convenience and ideas about smart life and meanwhile create an illusion for the consumers about greater control over one’s life. Such an illusion reassures the one-sided ownership and control over the means of production of surveillance capitalism by the surveillant companies. They face little risk of a revolt of the consumers, since simply showing the consumers a new device can already make them happy and excited. The one-sided control over the means of production and processes of value creation causes not only economic inequalities in the sense that the raw material-like consumers whose behavioural data have generated enormous capital value do not have a fair share because their use of the services such as social media is not recognized as labour. 43 It also creates the inequality about who get to determine and control one’s way of life. In surveillance capitalism which operates a market for future behaviour, the predictions of future behaviour guide all sorts of economic activities, and the products and services offered to consumers are designed to maintain this business model and to keep it evermore lucrative. As people’s way of life is increasingly mediated and conditioned by those services and products, the surveillant companies become more and more effective in superimposing their predictions of future behaviour on consumers. The totalization of a hyper surveillance capitalism creates the feelings of dispossession and appropriation of one’s own lifeworld and lack of alternatives except resignation from such a cybernetic world.

Surveillance capitalism also reinforces the idea of an impersonal and perfectly rational market that neoliberal capitalism has been propagating for a few decades. Wolfgang Streeck describes such a rhetoric of Hayekian market justice, “it is claimed that market justice, with its ostensible impersonality and price-theoretical calculability, functions in accordance with universalist principles, in a ‘clean’ manner in the sense of untouched by politics.”44 It is important to notice that such a rhetoric often defends the capitalist economy against state’s redistributive interventions and depicts the latter as political and therefore corrupt. The claim of surveillance capitalism about the full transparency and complete knowledge about human affairs through datafication and digitalization certainly strengthens the rhetoric about the perfect rationality and purity of the capitalist market, and hence makes the redistribution policies addressing social justice issues not only unnecessary but a threat to the market’s purity and rationality. The acclaimed impersonality, objectivity and rationality of the knowledge produced by surveillance capitalism are simultaneously accompanied by its authority of truthfulness and facticity and hence the legitimacy of its superimposition on human affairs. But such knowledge is accessible and intelligible only to the elites of the surveillance capitalism. The rationalization and legitimation of their power are a significant step forward to what Wolfgang Merkel calls a “dictatorship of the market”. 45

#### Internal Link + Impact - Their use of the government to expand technology is entrenched in the concept of surveillance capitalism - it destroys democracy by viewing humans as products to be rendered AND is an epistemological catastrophe that is ultimately false

Cong ’18 [Wanshu; September 30; Faculty of Law at European University Institute - Department of Law (LAW), Global Academic Fellow at The University of Hong Kong; “Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism?” p. 17-22] SPark

So, digital surveillance of people’s behaviours and the world people live in becomes an integral part of the capital economy. Zuboff describes the four steps in the new way of value extraction in surveillance capitalism:

“First, the push for more users and more channels, services, devices, places, and spaces is imperative for access to an ever-expanding range of behavioural surplus. Users are the human nature-al resource that provides this free raw material. Second, the application of machine learning, artificial intelligence, and data science for continuous algorithmic improvement constitutes an immensely expensive, sophisticated, and exclusive twenty-first century “means of production.” Third, the new manufacturing process converts behavioural surplus into prediction products designed to predict behaviour now and soon. Fourth, these prediction products are sold into a new kind of meta-market that trades exclusively in future behaviour… Surveillance capitalism’s profits derive primarily, if not entirely, from such markets for future behaviour.”

All the four steps contain elements that are exploitive and nondemocratic. To start with, the installation of equipment and technologies for surveillance online and offline by the surveillant companies are often unilateral and creepy, and often in the disguise of providing better services, more convenience and customizing user experiences. People’s realization and complaint about the intrusiveness of commercial surveillance often come too late and make little difference, because the tech giants’ have the capacity to shape users’ habits and way of thinking and to make users increasingly dependent on the services that create more behavioural data. What follow the generation of behavioural data are even more obscure to ordinary users, not least because people normally lack the information and knowledge about the means of production by which their behavioural data are processed into commodities. The surveillance capitalism that operates the market for future behaviour is simply not people-facing, unlike the industrial capitalism that relied on the masses for labour input and consumption and had to constantly face the demands of the working class. In surveillance capitalism, commodities are produced by information technologies and consumed by other data-driven entities. This economic structure largely precludes any meaningful active engagement of people from the processes of capital production and accumulation. The exploitative nature of this surveillance economy lies precisely in this preclusion. As people are often unaware of how their behavioural data make profits and how they are ultimately consumed by the companies who trade the data commodities about the predictions of their future behaviours, people hardly consider themselves as being “working” for the surveillant companies and hence deserve a share of their profits, especially as the services and devices that extract and collect behavioural data are often used in the time and space of leisure and domicile. 35 Unable to actively engage in the processes of surveillance capitalism as either labour input or consumers, people are converted into data and become raw materials for value extraction by the surveillant companies.

This structural exclusion of surveillance capitalism is perhaps most dramatic in the socalled data broker industry. Data brokers acquire the data typically not by way of direct interaction with people themselves. 36 According to a report made by the US Federal Trade Commission on nine major data brokers in 2014, data broker companies acquire the data by buying them from commercial entities, government agencies or other data brokers, trawling public information such as court records and census data, and running programmes – the socalled web crawlers – to systematically browse and capture data on the internet. 37 Once acquired, data are developed into various commodities to be sold for various purposes, including targeted advertising and marketing, identity verification and fraud detection. The clients of the data broker industry include a wide range of commercial enterprises as well as governmental and nongovernmental organizations. There are also often long-term relationships where the client entities are also the data sources for the data brokers by way of cooperative arrangements.38 The products of the data broker industry can be the actual, raw, unstructured data from the data sources or the processed data segments such as group profiles. While quality control of the data product is necessarily important, it does not mean that quality control allows for people to have access to their data and to ask for correction or deletion of the wrong or inaccurate information about them. For one thing, as data brokers are not consumer-facing, their existence and business activities are invisible and unknown to people, and their invisibility effectively pre-empts possible information requests. For another, individual verification of the accuracy of the personal data matters little when the data-driven companies deal with massive amount of raw and derived, non-personal data or rely on these data products for decision or strategy-making. The solution to quality control is often technical: increasing the investment in advanced data analytics and enlarging databases to make better inferences, validate the data products and remove the chances of false positive. 39 The means of production, hence, is a technological and organizational enclosure that does not need any active engagement of the people.

What underpins the surveillance capitalism’s relationship of production that excludes people’s active engagement and renders people into raw materials is an extraordinary epistemic presumption. It is the belief that people’s behaviours have patterns which can be observed and extracted into a form of probabilistic knowledge based on which decisions can be made. This belief is itself not new. Biological studies tell us that life itself requires constantly monitoring the living environment and adapting oneself to the environment and that the recognition of patterns is inherent in this process. But it is not simply that the epistemic presumption has caused the means of production and economic structure of surveillance capitalism. Surveillance capitalism, embracing this epistemic presumption, also produces its own form of knowledge about human beings, market and the world and superimposes on them such probabilistic knowledge as facts through massive expansion and deepening of digital mediation and conversion. The primary task is to render human behaviour and interaction increasingly and evermore transparent by these digital devices and technologies. Whereas knowledge or information obtained from human interactions can only be limited and partial, surveillance capitalism believes that a universal, complete knowledge about human affairs through digital mediation is more and more attainable. The barriers on the way to this complete knowledge are just technological, which means what we need are more tools to create, extract and process more data. 40 This epistemic shift already poses significant challenges to the traditional liberal humanism on which democracy is premised. Whereas the inherent finiteness of human knowledge requires us to constantly reflect on the acquired knowledge, and as Mireille Hildebrandt argues, this conscious reflection on our limited knowledge gives us the freedom to deliberate on them and to decide what to do with them, 41 the acclaimed full transparency and complete knowledge of human affairs and the living environment would eliminate the need for such conscious reflection and deliberation. It does not just make self-determination, autonomy and the moral capacity to realize and overcome the inherent limitation of someone’s experience and judgment even more fictive. It also makes institutions such as the rule of law and market unnecessary, precisely because these are the institutions designed to foster the mutual trust and common interest in a world where human behaviour and interaction are uncertain and cannot be fully known. 42 The execution of this epistemic presumption by surveillant companies in practice is a particular way of making people passive objects whose current and future behaviours become always knowable and hence controllable. And by making people passive objects, surveillance capitalists have no need to maintain a positive feedback loop and a social pact of reciprocity with them and hence no need for democratic institutions to address their needs.

#### Google links - the market forced it to become of a surveillant capitalist nature, leading to the bidding of control regarding human clients and their data

Cong ’18 [Wanshu; September 30; Faculty of Law at European University Institute - Department of Law (LAW), Global Academic Fellow at The University of Hong Kong; “Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism?” p. 16] SPark

Zuboff’s analysis of surveillance capitalism starts from Google’s discovery of the surplus value of users’ behavioural data and its expansion of the digitalization of human life. To see how dramatic and transformative the discovery is, we cannot forget the anti-commercialism and cyber liberalism embraced by Google in its early days. Chastising advertiser-sponsored search engines for their inherent biases towards advertisers, Google advocated for dispassionate algorithms that offered better search results by learning from users’ search-related data. 32 However, due to the increasing pressure from investors in the market, the company could not remain only user-facing because only generating good search results does not make revenues. But completely relying on the sponsorship of advertisers would compromise the search results and cause damage to user experience and trust. The magic shift Google made was, like a matchmaker, to provide the ads that could be useful and informative for users. The matchmaking was done with Google’s sophisticated analytical capacities to measure the quality of the landing page of the ad, the relevance of the ad to the search terms or keywords, and above all the percentage of times users actually click on a given ad appeared on a result page. 33 The latter two factors are largely analyses of users’ behavioural data which Google held in great amount. Meanwhile, Google was running an auction-like system – the AdWords – where advertisers bid for the slots on the search result pages to show their ads, and the slots would be given by Google’s rank formula that combined the quality scores and the bids.

# Link Wall to Michigan Affs

## Space

### 2NC -- Ext: Space Link

#### 1 - Securitization - Spending billions on weaponizing space makes US a “security export” that will fight endless wars across the world in order to force the corporate capitalist system

Karl Grossman 21[Karl Grossman, Investigative reporting in a variety of media for more than 50 years and full professor of journalism at the State University of New York/College at Old Westbury, "Insane U.S. plan to spend billions on weaponizing space makes defense contractors jump for joy—but rest of World cowers in horror at prospect of new arms race leading to World War III",8-25-2021, https://mronline.org/2021/09/01/insane-u-s-plan-to-spend-billions-on-weaponizing-space-makes-defense-contractors-jump-for-joy-but-rest-of-world-cowers-in-horror-at-prospect-of-new-arms-race-leading-to-world-war-iii/, 1LEE]

The Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space was formed in 1992 at a meeting in Washington, D.C., and has been the leading group internationally challenging the weaponization and nuclearization of space.

Its coordinator, Bruce Gagnon, in a 2021 interview with me, said: “The aerospace industry has long proclaimed that ‘Star Wars’ would be the largest industrial project in human history. Add the nuclear industry’s ambition to use space as its ‘new market,’ and one can imagine the money that would be involved. These two industry giants have put their resources together to ensure their ‘control and domination’ of the U.S. Congress. Both political parties are virtually locked down when it comes to appropriating funds to move the arms race into space and to colonize the heavens for corporate profits. Just one example is the recent approval in Congress of the creation of the ‘Space Force’ as a new service branch in the military.”

“During the Trump administration (with the Democrats in control of the House of Representatives) the Space Force was ‘stood up’ as they like to say in the biz,” said Gagnon. “The Democrats could have stopped the creation of this new military branch. During the little congressional debate that did occur, the only thing the Democrats requested was to call it the ‘Space Corps’ (like the Marine Corps). It’s a rigged game in Washington when it comes to handing out money to the aerospace industry.”

Gagnon continued: “In his book, The Pentagon’s New Map: War and Peace in the 2lst Century, former Navy War College Professor Thomas Barnett writes that, under globalization of the world economy, every country will have a different role. We won’t produce shoes, cars, phones, washing machines and the like in the U.S. anymore because it is cheaper for industry to exploit labor in the global south.

Our role in the U.S., Barnett says, will be ‘security export.’ That means we will endlessly fight wars in the parts of the world where nations are not yet ‘fully integrated’ into corporate capitalism. Having a dominant military in space would enable the U.S. to see, hear and target everything on the Earth.”

“In order to put together a global ‘Leviathan’ military capability,” Gagnon continued, “space must be militarized and weaponized. The cost of doing so is enormous and requires cuts in social and environmental spending and larger contributions from NATO member nations.”

“In addition to using space technology to control Earth on behalf of corporate capital, the new Space Force will have another key job. They will be tasked with attempting to control the pathway on and off the planet Earth. In the 1989 Congressional Study entitled Military Space Forces: The Next 50 Years, congressional staffer John Collins writes on pages 24 and 25: “Nature reserves decisive advantage for L4 and L5, two allegedly stable [space] libration points that theoretically could dominate Earth and moon, because they look down both gravity wells. No other location is equally commanding…. Armed forces might lie in wait at that location to hijack rival shipments on return.”

Privatized Gold Rush

“The Pentagon is looking to a future where space would be fully privatized and a new gold rush would ensue. Corporations and rich fat-cats like Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk and Richard Branson, while ignoring the UN’s Outer Space and Moon Treaties that call the heavens the ‘province of all mankind,’ would move to control the shipping lanes from Earth into space. The Space Force would be used by these ‘space entrepreneurs’ as their own private pirate forces to ensure they controlled the extraction of resources mined from planetary bodies. This provocative vision would in the end recreate the global war system, which has been deeply embedded into the culture and consciousness here on Earth. Russia, China and other space-faring nations are not going to allow the U.S. to be the ‘Master of Space.’”

#### 2 - Expansion - The Space Race to constantly grow and expand to new frontiers is ultimate capitalism-the growth on growth liberal virus denies morality

Tim Jackson 21[Tim Jackson, Professor of Sustainable Development and Director of the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity (CUSP) at the University of Surrey, "Opinion: The billionaire space race is the ultimate symbol of capitalism’s flawed obsession with growth",7-21-2021, TheJournal.ie, https://www.thejournal.ie/readme/billionaires-going-to-space-capitalism-5500763-Jul2021/, 1LEE]

The space rhetoric of the super-rich betrays a mentality that may once have served humanity well. Some would say it’s a quintessential feature of capitalism. Innovation upon innovation. A driving ambition to expand and explore. A primal urge to escape our origins and reach for the next horizon. Space travel is a natural extension of our obsession with economic growth. It’s the crowning jewel of capitalism. Further and faster is its frontier creed.

I’ve spent much of my professional life as a critic of that creed, not just for environmental reasons but on social grounds as well. The seven years I spent as economics commissioner on the UK’s Sustainable Development Commission and my subsequent research at the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity revealed something fundamental about our aspirations for the good life. Something that has been underlined by the experience of the pandemic.

Prosperity is as much about health as it is about wealth. Ask people what matters most in their lives and the chances are that this will come out somewhere near the top of the list. Health for themselves. Health for their friends and their families. Health too – sometimes – for the fragile planet on which we live and on whose health we ourselves depend.

There’s something fascinating in this idea. Because it confronts the obsession with growth head on. As Aristotle pointed out in Nicomachean Ethics (a book named after his physician father), the good life is not a relentless search for more, but a continual process of finding a “virtuous” balance between too little and too much.

Population health provides an obvious example of this idea. Too little food and we’re struggling with diseases of malnutrition. Too much and we’re tipped into the “diseases of affluence” that now kill more people than under-nutrition does. Good health depends on us finding and nurturing this balance.

This task is always tricky of course, even at the individual level. Just think about the challenge of keeping your exercise, your diet and your appetites in line with the outcome of a healthy body weight. But as I’ve argued, living inside a system that has its sights continually focused on more makes the task near impossible. Obesity has tripled since 1975. Almost two-fifths of adults over 18 are overweight. Capitalism not only fails to recognise the point where balance lies. It has absolutely no idea how to stop when it gets there.

You’d think our brush with mortality through the pandemic would have brought some of this home to us. You’d think it would give us pause for thought about what really matters to us: the kind of world we want for our children; the kind of society we want to live in. And for many people it has. In a survey carried out during lockdown in the UK, 85% of respondents found something in their changed conditions they felt worth keeping and fewer than 10% wanted a complete return to normal.

When life and health are at stake, the ungodly scramble for wealth and status feels less and less attractive. Even the lure of technology pales. Family, conviviality and a sense of purpose come to the fore. These are the things that many people found they lacked most throughout the pandemic. But their importance in our lives was not a COVID accident: they are the most fundamental elements of a sustainable prosperity.

#### 3 - Satellites - Satellites are the epitome of space capitalism-unregulated and exploited

John Holden 18[John Holden, contributor to The Irish Times specialising in science, technology and innovation, "Why space capitalism will eat itself",7-12-2018, Irish Times, https://www.irishtimes.com/business/innovation/why-space-capitalism-will-eat-itself-1.3556368, 1LEE]

“Space junk” makes up a significant proportion of the guesstimated 500,000 plus objects floating around in orbit. About 23,000 of these objects are currently being tracked and maintained by the US Strategic Command. These so-called resident space objects are either satellites still in use or are known objects no longer fit for purpose. They could be as small as a tennis ball or the size of a double decker bus. In addition, however, there are hundreds of thousands of other objects – bolts, exploded satellite pieces, large rockets and other space debris – that are unaccounted for.

Efforts have been made to try to consolidate public with private data on what is up there but, for various reasons, the space community does not openly share information on where all objects are located.

Lack of regulation

For the entrepreneurially inclined, it is probably not that surprising to hear many are taking advantage of the severe lack of regulation in space. Sure why wouldn’t you? Moreover why would anyone publicly disclose how and where their interests lie in a given market, intergalactic or otherwise, if they weren’t obliged to?

But space isn’t just another market. Thinking one can apply the same rules up there as we use on earth is shortsighted for so many reasons.

Down here the economic “unknowns” are known. Space is replete with unknown unknowns. If a satellite that is used to collect data to sell on to business customers one day stops sending data, and you haven’t the foggiest notion why, what do you tell the customers? How do you attribute cause? How does a company predict the likelihood of loss or damage to its equipment in space or perform other prudent exercises before getting into the space game?

One of the chief concerns for any new business is risk and how to mitigate it. There couldn’t be a much riskier bet than entering a market with no regulation, patchy knowledge of your competitors’ location or size, and to top it all off, little understanding of the physical environment within which the business will operate.

#### 4 - Rehighlighting - The aff’s proliferation of space weaponry to deter adversaries is to protect capitalist interests-we read green

1AC Madeline Moon 20, a member of the UK Delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Vice-Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation from 2012 to 2015, rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities “THE SPACE DOMAIN AND ALLIED DEFENCE,” NATO Parliamentary Assembly, https://www.nato-pa.int/document/2017-space-domain-and-allied-defence-moon-report-162-dscfc-17-e-rev1-fin, p. 1-10 /BL

42. Non-kinetic means, for example, cyber hacking, laser dazzling, or the emission of electromagnetic pulses, can also be used to interrupt or disable rather than destroy satellites. While considered less damaging to the space environment and potentially less traceable, many forms of non-kinetic attacks are very difficult to attribute, stirring fears of quick escalation and questions of proportionality of response in a near future conflict where space-assets would likely be involved. Russia and China are already heavily invested in this domain, ultimately seeking the means to disrupt US hegemony in space (Pellegrino, Stang, 2016).

Non-kinetic means: cyber-attacks, jamming, spoofing, and dazzling

43. Because of the resulting debris, which can have a mutually destabilising impact, destroying satellites with kinetic force is not an ideal method for damaging satellite capability. Non-destructive and covert methods, such as cyber-attacks, jamming, spoofing, or dazzling are alternative means to disrupt and deny access to satellite capabilities. In fact, space warfare is more likely to involve the denial of vital information flows supporting command and control of an enemy’s forces, rather than the exoatmospheric destruction of its space-based assets.

44. By attacking a satellite’s control system, or mission package, an actor could take over control of the satellite, shut it down, change its orbit, put it on collision course with other space objects, or destroy its solar panels by exposing it to damaging levels of radiation. In addition, a satellite’s global network of ground stations might be subject to attack with potential serious consequences. 45. Rather than ASAT weaponry, cyber-attacks can instead be used to take control of a satellite or the whole communication network, including the ground stations (Suzuki, 2016). As implied above, cybersecurity and space security are inherently linked. As satellite technologies and space assets are sourced from a broad international supply base they require regular security upgrades to their software systems via remote, distributed connections, which make them vulnerable to cyber-attacks (Livingstone and Lewis, 2016).

46. Due to the nature of their missions, the military pays more attention than commercial operators to the defence of their space systems. As a result, commercial satellite telecommunications are more often than not less resilient than military ones. Still, as commercial satellites are increasingly co-opted or leased for military communications or other civilian mission-critical functions such as air traffic control, train rail traffic, electrical grid management, and other critical civilian infrastructure, commercial satellites can be considered high-value soft targets for adversaries (Suzuki, 2016). In addition, radio frequencies for satellite communications are limited and the increase in the number of commercial and private satellites puts pressure on scarce resources. Some operators are therefore using less secure frequencies, which are easier to hack (Suzuki, 2016).

47. As such, it is clear a range of cyber threats exists against space-based systems. The large amount of data transmitted through satellites presents an opportunity for adversaries to corrupt accuracy and reliability with a relatively low probability of discovery. Examples could be: States seeking a military advantage via the theft of intellectual property; organised criminal elements with sufficient resources seeking financial gain; amateur or professional hackers showing off their skills; or even capable terrorist groups wishing to disrupt services provided by space-based assets or inflict damage on the space environment. Of course, any combination of these threats is also imaginable depending on the adversaries’s assets and capabilities (Livingstone and Lewis, 2016).

48. Satellite feeds can also be jammed via the intentional interference in signal transmission and reception through the deliberate use of radio noise and electromagnetic signals. In particular, global navigation satellite system (GNSS) signals are vulnerable to jamming attacks because civil applications have not always been designed with security in mind. Often, jamming of GPS signals or other radio telecommunications can even be carried out using simple, commercially-available tools (Suzuki, 2016). By way of example, North Korea has carried out a series of coordinated jamming attacks against the Republic of Korea, which affected GNSS signals in the Seoul area and led to the degradation of infrastructure such as mobile phone networks (Livingstone and Lewis, 2016).

49. Spoofing allows an adversary to manipulate the information about the location, position and condition of a satellite. Spoofed data is relatively hard to detect. If successful, the spoofing attack could damage critical infrastructure, such as the national power grid, by introducing false timing signals, or cause economic damage by targeting trading systems in the financial services sector (Livingstone and Lewis, 2016). Spoofing could also confuse the coordination of command and control of a nation’s armed forces in a time of crisis.

50. Dazzling is a way of blinding a satellite with a laser. If the laser is powerful enough, it can even burn satellite sensors and disable them (Airbus Space briefing). Docking and rendez-vous methods are alternative ways of damaging a satellite by using electronic or kinetic force. While docking would have the benefit of not producing space debris, it would expose the attacker to detection. To mitigate the potential consequences of a docking attack, the United States and its allies are developing a programme of Space Situational Awareness, which monitors any objects approaching existing space assets (Suzuki, 2016).

51. The trend toward the development of increasingly disruptive and non-attributable non-kinetic means puts the long-term stability of the space environment at risk. Increasing dependence on space-based architecture coupled with hybrid and asymmetrical disruption tactics will create a space environment ripe for rapid escalation and instability.

V. NATO AND THE SPACE DOMAIN

A. WHY SPACE MATTERS FOR NATO

52. As is clear from above, improvements in space technology drive the development of advanced military systems; they are important force multipliers when integrated into joint operations. Therefore, a clear and mutual understanding of how military, civil, commercial, national and multinational space capabilities contribute to military operations in order to achieve Alliance security objectives is essential. Increased awareness about the potential for adversaries seeking to exploit their own access to space for military purposes to the detriment of Allied assets and capabilities is vitally important (NATO Allied Joint Doctrine for Air and Space Operations, 2016).

53. At the strategic level, NATO is well positioned to strengthen deterrence in space. NATO’s collective defence and economic prosperity rely on space-based infrastructure, and an attack on the space assets of one Ally would impact the security of all. As such, NATO needs a whole-of-alliance approach to protect its interests in space to enhance resilience and deter any threat to its space-based capabilities. At the operational level, space needs to be incorporated in NATO planning and command structures. At the tactical level, relevant training should be provided to personnel and NATO exercises should reflect space warfare scenarios wherein Allied space-assets are denied or temporarily disabled (Schulte, 2012).

54. Today’s modern operational environment relies heavily on guaranteed access to space-based architecture – Allied forces' daily training, and maintenance and execution of ongoing operations are all made capable by a vast network of shared space assets. Allied space capabilities provide a number of products and services, including: global, strategic and intra-theatre satellite communications; positioning, navigation and timing services; terrestrial and space environmental monitoring; real-time space, geological, meteorological and oceanographic situational awareness; advanced intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities; as well as NATO Shared Early Warning and transponder tracking such as Friendly Force tracking and maritime tracking (NATO Allied Joint Doctrine for Air and Space Operations, 2016).

55. NATO’s most advanced military systems are dependent upon space-based assets in order to execute missions successfully, particularly Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACs), the Alliance’s Ballistic Missile Defence programme, and the Alliance Ground Surveillance System (AGS), set to become operational in 2017. The AGS system consists of air, ground and support segments and will perform all-weather and persistent terrestrial and maritime surveillance in near real-time, contributing to a range of missions1 , providing military commanders with a comprehensive picture of the situation on the ground (GovSat, 2016).

56. Space capabilities contributing to the Alliance’s mission planning and execution at all levels of warfare come from government, military, civilian and commercial providers. NATO does not currently own any orbit spacecraft. It does, however, own and operate several terrestrial elements (e.g. SATCOM anchor stations and terminals). The United States provides the majority of space support NATO currently uses. However, in 2013, there were approximately 39 ‘military or government’ satellites owned by NATO Member States other than the US providing communication, imagery and automatic identification system detection.

57. The primary European NATO Member States who have space capabilities are France, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Italy: The availability of a space capability in support of NATO operations, however, is determined exclusively by the nation or company that owns the satellite. It should be noted that France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom have advanced and capable observation systems supporting their conventional forces today: they are the Pléiades; SAR-Lupe (radar) and Helios 2 (optical, infrared); COSMO-SkyMed; and Skynet 5 respectively.

58. Currently the SATCOM Post-2000 programme provides the Alliance with satellite communications capabilities. The British, French, and Italian governments work in concert to provide the Alliance with advanced SATCOM capabilities. Under the signed Memorandum of Understanding between the three governments, the Alliance is allowed access to the French SYRACUSE 3, the Italian SICRAL 1 and 1Bis, and the British Skynet 4 and 5 military networks (Briefings NATO officials).

59. The current contract negotiated by the consortium is for a 15-year period, scheduled to end in 2019. The NATO Communications and Information Systems Services Agency (NCSA) needs a contract upgrade, however, as the Alliance’s current satellite bandwidth requirements have outpaced what is available under the current contract. Among other deficiencies, the current arrangement does not include EHF-/Ka-band capabilities, which will be critical to future Alliance SATCOM needs (De Selding, 2016).

60. To contract the necessary upgrade of its SATCOM capacity, NATO can look to eight Allies currently developing or in possession of the satellite capacity necessary for military communications; France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States (De Selding, 2016). In November 2016, NATO awarded a contract to support the operational phase of the above mentioned AGS system to Luxembourg’s GovSat, an affiliate of satellite operator SES. Launching in 2017, the GovSat-1 satellite will provide an end-to-end service including the delivery of satellite capacity in commercial Ku-band and sensor data communications between the NATO Global Hawk UAVs and ground segment over the AGS operational area. With this contract, Luxembourg Authorities and the NCI Agency as procurement executive agent acquire and manage these services.

61. While the centrality of space is also recognised in NATO’s Strategic Concept, which mentions technological trends that could potentially impede access to space (NATO, 2010), NATO has not issued any policy or military strategy for space operations. So far, only the Allied Joint Doctrine for Air and Space Operations provides some guidelines on the role of space support in operational planning. In 2013, NATO also released the NATO Space Handbook, which explains space fundamentals for commanders and their staff.

B. NATO AND THE SPACE DOMAIN: A WAY FORWARD

62. NATO should renew its focus on space cooperation. Every NATO country relies on safe and reliable access to space assets for both commerce and military operations. However, NATO doctrine and planning have lagged and the Alliance has not issued any military strategy or policy for space operations. For example, the Joint Airpower Competence Centre (JAPCC) has proposed a narrow framework for a NATO Space Policy concentrating on the employment, coordination, and defence of space capabilities used to support NATO operations and core business (JAPCC, 2012). Any NATO policy should furthermore be coherent with existing policies, such as those of the EU and the US. The JAPCC proposes five guiding principles:

#### 5 - Awareness - the affirmative attempts to become aware of all occurring events through the expansion of satellite capabilities - that links to surveillance and once again to capitalism. Companies use their intel and data to shut down capitalist opposition.

Van der Pijl ’18 [Kees; January; Chair of International Relations and the University of Sussex, Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE), President of the Committee of Vigilance against Resurgent Facism; Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis; “Introduction,” p. 6] SPark

The Post-Cold War, global intelligence infrastructure that grew out of it was then applied to a key problem big capital faced after the collapse of the USSR triggered a global restructuring of production: the existence of a billion-size surplus population, a reserve army of labour for which no employment was to be expected. This required devising control strategies of various types. After 9/11, the NeoCons revived the War on Terror concept to stir and then repress segments of this vast reserve army of labour, developing the notion of Total Information Awareness to allow it to know in advance, not just the intentions of rival states ranged against the West or just insufficiently submissive, but more particularly, the potential systemic opposition to capitalism at home and abroad. Using double agent tactics as well as provocation and targeted assassination, this has created the condition of endless war and a politics of fear sustaining it. Politics and society today operate under a permanent state of exception in which the Internet has been turned into a vast search engine on the lookout for meaningful opposition. Meanwhile in the name of weeding out ‘fake news’, the big Internet companies such as Google have changed their algorithms to prevent Left websites from popping up in searches by the public: the World Socialist Website, Global Research, and others, have already experienced sharp declines in numbers of visitors (Tveten 2018: 22). Facebook takes orders from the United States and Israeli governments to remove accounts (Greenwald 2017). Why do these large Internet companies collaborate, and why do they collaborate with these two governments specifically? That is what I intend the clarify in the pages that follow.

### Space Link Ext. Cards

#### Outer space is in the newest space for capitalism

Shammas and Holen, 20**19** (Victor L., Work Research Institute. Tomas B., independent scholar. “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space” Polgrave Communications. January 29, 2019. [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9 ///](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9%20///)MF)

Outer space is becoming a space for capitalism. We are entering a new era of the commercialization of space, geared towards generating profits from satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and related ventures. This era, driven by private corporations such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origins, has been labeled by industry insiders as ‘NewSpace'—in contrast to ‘Old Space', a Cold War-era mode of space relations when (allegedly) slow-moving, sluggish states dominated outer space. NewSpace marks the arrival of capitalism in space. While challenging the libertarian rhetoric of its proponents—space enterprises remain enmeshed in the state, relying on funding, physical infrastructure, technology transfers, regulatory frameworks, and symbolic support—NewSpace nevertheless heralds a novel form of human activity in space. Despite its humanistic, universalizing pretensions, however, NewSpace does not benefit humankind as such but rather a specific set of wealthy entrepreneurs, many of them originating in Silicon Valley, who strategically deploy humanist tropes to engender enthusiasm for their activities. We describe this complex as ‘capitalistkind'. Moreover, the arrival of capitalism in space is fueled by the expansionary logic of capital accumulation. Outer space serves as a spatial fix, allowing capital to transcend its inherent terrestrial limitations. In this way, the ultimate spatial fix is perhaps (outer) space itself.

#### Space increases capitalism and unsustainable growth

**Jackson,** 20**21** (Tim, Professor of Sustainable Development and Director of the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity (CUSP). “Billionaire space race: the ultimate symbol of capitalism’s flawed obsession with growth” The Conversation. July 20, 2021 [https://theconversation.com/billionaire-space-race-the-ultimate-symbol-of-capitalisms-flawed-obsession-with-growth-164511 ///](https://theconversation.com/billionaire-space-race-the-ultimate-symbol-of-capitalisms-flawed-obsession-with-growth-164511%20///)MF)

Mars ain’t the kind of place to raise your kids, laments the Rocket Man in Elton John’s timeless classic. In fact, it’s cold as hell. But that doesn’t seem to worry a new generation of space entrepreneurs intent on colonising the “final frontier” as fast as possible.

Don’t get me wrong. I’m no sullen technophobe. As lockdown projects go, Nasa’s landing of the [Perseverance rover](https://theconversation.com/as-the-perseverance-rover-lands-on-mars-theres-a-lot-we-already-know-about-the-red-planet-from-meteorites-found-on-earth-155459) on the surface of the red planet earlier this year was a hell of a blast. Watching it reminded me that I once led a high school debate defending the motion: this house believes that humanity should reach for the stars.

It must have been around the time that Caspar Weinberger was trying to persuade President Nixon [not to cancel](https://www.wired.com/2013/09/ending-apollo-1968/) the Apollo space programme. My brothers and I had watched the monochrome triumph of the [Apollo 11 landing](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/apollo/apollo11.html) avidly in 1969. We’d witnessed the near disaster of [Apollo 13](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/apollo/missions/apollo13.html) – immortalised in a 1995 Hollywood [film](https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/apr/17/apollo-13-tom-hanks-space-ron-howard) – when Jim Lovell (played by Tom Hanks) and two rookie astronauts narrowly escaped with their lives by using the Lunar Module as an emergency life raft. We knew it was exciting up there.

I remember later going to see Apollo 13 (the film) with a friend who wasn’t born when the mission itself took place. “What did you think?” I asked as we came out of the cinema. “It was OK,” said my friend. “Just not very believable.”

But we kids were glued to our black-and-white TV sets the entire week of the original mission. We watched in horror as CO₂ levels rose in the Lunar Module. We endured the endless blackout as the returning astronauts plunged perilously back to Earth. We held our breath with the rest of the world as the expected four minutes stretched to five and hope began to fade. It was a full six minutes before the camera finally came into focus on the command module’s parachutes – safely deployed above the Pacific Ocean. We felt the endorphin rush. We knew it was believable.

That was 1970. This is now. And here I am again on the edge of another sofa, in the lingering uncertainty of the time of COVID-19, waiting for signs of arrival from another re-entry blackout on another barren rock, devoid of breathable atmosphere, 200 million miles away. And when the Perseverance Rover finally touches down on the surface of Mars: that same exhilaration. That same endorphin rush. Quite difficult to witness the jubilation behind the masks at Nasa’s mission control without feeling a glimmer of vicarious joy. Hope, even.

But Nasa’s clever science experiment is just the tip of an expansionary iceberg. A teaser, if you will, for an ambitious dream that is being driven faster and faster by huge commercial interests. A curious twist in a debate that has been raging now for almost half a century.

Growth wars

Ever since 1972, when a team of MIT scientists published a massively influential report on the [Limits to Growth](https://www.clubofrome.org/publication/the-limits-to-growth/), [economists have been fighting](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/366/6468/950) about whether it’s possible for the economy to expand forever. Those who believe it can, appeal to the [power of technology](https://andrewmcafee.org/more-from-less/overivew) to “decouple” economic activity from its effects on the planet. Those (like me) who believe it can’t point to the [limited evidence for decoupling](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332500379_Is_Green_Growth_Possible) at anything like the pace that’s needed to avoid a climate emergency or prevent a catastrophic decline in biodiversity.

The growth debate often hangs on the power you attribute to technology to save us. Usually it’s the technophiles arguing for infinite growth on a finite planet – sometimes putting their hopes in speculative technologies such as [direct air capture](https://theconversation.com/new-co-capture-technology-is-not-the-magic-bullet-against-climate-change-115413) or dangerous ones like nuclear power. And usually it’s the sceptics arguing for a [post-growth economy](http://www.timjackson.org.uk/postgrowth). But the simple division between technophiles and technophobes has never been particularly helpful. Very few growth sceptics reject technology completely. No one at all is asking humanity to return to the cave.

My own research teams at the University of Surrey have been [exploring the vital role](https://www.cusp.ac.uk/team/team/t_jackson/) of sustainable technology in transforming the economy for almost three decades now. But we’ve also shown how the dynamics of capitalism – in particular its relentless pursuit of [productivity growth](https://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/27/opinion/sunday/lets-be-less-productive.html) – continually push society towards materialistic goals, and undermine those parts of the economy such as [care, craft and creativity](http://www.timjackson.org.uk/pwg), which are essential to our quality of life.

And now suddenly, along comes a group of self-confessed technology lovers finally admitting that the planet is too small for us. Yes, you were right, they imply: the Earth cannot sustain infinite growth. That’s why we have to expand into space.

Wait. What just happened? Did somebody move the goalposts? Something is wrong. Maybe it’s me. One thing I know for sure. I’m no longer the same kid I was – the one from the debating society. This house believes that humanity should grow the fuck up.

Before it spends [trillions of dollars](https://www.sciencefocus.com/space/top-10-what-are-the-top-10-most-expensive-space-missions/) littering its [techno-junk](https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Space_Debris/The_cost_of_space_debris#:%7E:text=Space%20debris%20is%20expensive%2C%20and%20will%20become%20even%20more%20so&text=For%20satellites%20in%20geostationary%20orbit,higher%20than%205%E2%80%9310%25.) around the solar system, this house believes that humanity should pay a little more attention to what’s happening right here and now. On this planet.

The human condition

Perhaps ironically, it was from space that we saw it first. In October 1957, the Soviets sent an unmanned orbital satellite called [Sputnik](https://www.nasa.gov/multimedia/imagegallery/image_feature_924.html) into space. It was one of those odd moments in history (like the coronavirus) that dramatically reshapes our social world. Sputnik kicked off the space race, intensified the arms race and heightened the cold war. It was a huge blow to US self-esteem not to be the first nation to reach space and it was the jolt it used to kickstart the Apollo Moon shot. No one likes coming second. Least of all the most powerful people on the planet.

But Sputnik also signalled the beginning of a new relationship between humanity and its earthly home. As the political philosopher [Hannah Arendt](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/arendt/) remarked in the prologue to her 1958 masterpiece, [The Human Condition](https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_Human_Condition/bGlwDwAAQBAJ), going into space allowed us to grasp our planetary predicament for the first time in history. It was a reminder that “the Earth is the quintessence of the human condition”. And nature itself, “for all we know, may be unique in providing human beings with a habitat in which they can move and breathe without effort and without artifice”.

Fair point. And nothing we’ve learned in the intervening years has changed that prognosis. Mars may be the most habitable planet in the solar system, outside our own. But it’s still a very far cry from the beauty of home – whose fragility we only truly learned to appreciate fully from the images sent back to us from space.

Nature photographer Galen Rowell once called William Anders’ iconic photo [Earthrise](https://www.nasa.gov/centers/johnson/home/earthrise.html) – taken from the Apollo 8 module in lunar orbit – “the most influential environmental photograph ever taken”. Earthrise brought home to us, in one astonishing image, the stark reality that this shining orb was – and still is – humanity’s best chance for anything that might meaningfully be called the “good life”.

Its beauty is our beauty. Its fragility is our fragility. And its peril is our peril.

An inconvenient truth

In the very same year that Arendt published The Human Condition, a Shell executive named Charles Jones presented [a paper](http://www.climatefiles.com/trade-group/american-petroleum-institute/1958-air-pollution-research-program-smoke-fumes/) to the fossil fuel industry’s trade group, the American Petroleum Institute, warning of the impact of carbon emissions from fossil fuel combustion on the atmosphere. It was early evidence of climate change.

It was also evidence, according to lawsuits [now being filed](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2021/jun/30/climate-crimes-fossil-fuels-cities-states-interactive) by cities and states in the US, that companies like Shell knew it was happening more than 60 years ago – three decades before James Hansen’s [scientific testimony](https://grist.org/article/james-hansens-legacy-scientists-reflect-on-climate-change-in-1988-2018-and-2048/) to Congress in 1988 brought global warming to public attention. And they did nothing about it. Worse, argue plaintiffs like the [state of Delaware](https://eu.delawareonline.com/story/news/2020/09/10/delaware-sues-exxon-chevron-and-bp-role-climate-change/3457202001/), they lied over and again to cover up this “inconvenient truth”.

Why such a thing could happen is now clear. Evidence of their impact was a direct threat to the profits of some of the most powerful corporations on the planet. Profit is the bedrock of capitalism. And as I argue in [my new book](http://www.timjackson.org.uk/postgrowth), we have allowed capitalism to trump everything: work, life, hope – even good governance. The most enlightened governments in the world have turned a blind eye to the need for urgent action. Now we’re on the verge of being too late to fix it. Achieving net zero by 2050 is [no longer enough](https://theconversation.com/2050-is-too-late-we-must-drastically-cut-emissions-much-sooner-121512). We need much more, much faster to avoid ending up in an unliveable [hothouse](https://theconversation.com/hothouse-earth-our-planet-has-been-here-before-heres-what-it-looked-like-101413).

Even as I write, [record-breaking temperatures](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/10/us/west-heat-wave-death-valley.html), 10-20℃ above the seasonal average, have forced citizens on the west coast of North America into [underground shelters](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2021/07/01/portland-heatwave-like-microwave-hairdryer-blowing/) to avoid the searing heat. [Wildfires](https://news.sky.com/story/us-wildfires-firefighters-grapple-with-raging-blazes-as-temperatures-soar-to-54c-in-californias-baking-death-valley-12354197) are raging in California’s Death Valley, where temperatures have reached an astonishing 54℃. On the storm-struck east coast, [flood waters](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/jul/09/new-york-city-storm-flooding-climate-change) have inundated the New York subway system. Thousands remain homeless and hundreds are still missing, meanwhile, as [historic flooding](https://news.sky.com/story/germany-and-belgium-floods-rescuers-search-for-hundreds-of-missing-as-more-than-120-die-in-historic-disaster-12357532) across central Europe has left almost 200 people dead.

In the face of the blindingly obvious, even recalcitrant presidents and politicians are at last beginning to acknowledge the scale of the peril in which our relentless pursuit of economic growth has placed the planet. And in principle they still have time to do something about it.

As I and many colleagues have argued, the pandemic offers us a unique opportunity to fashion [a different kind of economy](https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/news-media/press-releases/economy-environment-and-peoples-well-being-must-go-hand-hand-post-covid-eu). The 26th Conference of the Parties to the UN Climate Change Convention ([COP26](https://ukcop26.org/)) in Glasgow in November 2021 could well be the place to do that. Whether that happens or not will depend as much on vision as it does on science. And on our courage to confront the inequalities of power that led us to this point.

It will also depend on us going back to first principles and asking ourselves: how exactly should we aim to live in the only habitable world in the known universe? What is the nature of the good life available to us here? What can prosperity [possibly mean](http://www.cusp.ac.uk/) for a promiscuous species on a finite planet?

The question is almost as old as the hills. But the contemporary answer to it is paralysingly narrow. Cast in the garb of late capitalism, prosperity has been captured by the ideology of “growth at all costs”: an insistence that more is always better. Despite [overwhelming evidence](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Jq23mSDh9U) that relentless expansion is undermining nature and driving us towards a devastating climate emergency, the “[fairytales of eternal growth](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMrtLsQbaok)” still reign supreme.

Shouldn’t humanity focus on shoring up the good life on Earth before we race off into space? [Tegan Mierle/Unsplash](https://unsplash.com/photos/fDostElVhN8), [FAL](http://artlibre.org/licence/lal/en)

Zero gravity

It’s an ironic twist in the tale of the debate society kid I used to be that I’ve spent most of my professional life confronting those fairytales of growth. Don’t ask me how that happened. By accident mostly.

I toyed with the idea of studying astrophysics. But I ended up studying Maths at Cambridge, where I confess to being baffled by the complexity of it all, until I realised that even math is just a trick. Quite literally a formula. Believe in it and you can travel to the stars and back. In your mind, at least.

And there I was wandering around in zero G, when I woke up one day (in April 1986) to find that the Number four reactor at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in Ukraine had suffered a catastrophic meltdown. I suddenly realised that the very same skills I’d spent my life developing were leading humanity not towards the stars but away from the paradise we already inhabit.

So yes. I changed my mind. The next day I walked into the Greenpeace office in London and asked what I could do to help. They set me working on the [economics of renewable energy](https://www.elsevier.com/books/renewable-energy/jackson/978-1-4832-5695-5) I became, accidentally, an economist. (Economics needs more accidental economists.) And that’s when it began to dawn on me that learning how to live well on this fragile planet is far more important than dreaming about the next one.

Mine is bigger than yours

Not so the space race billionaires. A handful of unbelievably powerful men, whose wealth has [exploded](https://www.forbes.com/sites/chasewithorn/2021/04/30/american-billionaires-have-gotten-12-trillion-richer-during-the-pandemic/) massively throughout the pandemic, are now busy trying to persuade us that the future lies not here on Earth but out there among the stars.

Tesla founder and serial entrepreneur, Elon Musk is one of these new rocket men. “Those who attack space,” he [tweeted](https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1414782972474048516) recently, “maybe don’t realise that space represents hope for so many people”. That may be true of course in a world where huge inequalities of wealth and privilege strip hope from the lives of billions of people. But, as the spouse of a Nasa flight controller pointed out, it obscures the [extraordinary demands](https://www.salon.com/2021/07/07/no-billionaires-wont-escape-to-space-while-the-world-burns/?fbclid=IwAR3Hzv3TGOuflDjlSatFJQN0_nastGp1MCqP-AOU0PJrUQWtHIMxNcP-BEM) of escaping from Mother Earth, in terms of energy materials, people and time.

Undeterred, the rocket men gaze starward. If resources are the problem, then space must be the answer. Amazon founder Jeff Bezos is pretty explicit about his own expansionary vision. “We can have a trillion humans in the solar system,” [he once declared](https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/jeff-bezos-foresees-trillion-people-living-millions-space-colonies-here-ncna1006036). “Which means we’d have a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins. This would be an incredible civilisation.”

Bezos and Musk have spent their lockdown contesting the top two places on the Forbes [rich list](https://www.forbes.com/billionaires/). They’ve also been playing “mine is bigger than yours” in their own private space race for a couple of decades now. Bezos’s personal wealth [almost doubled](https://inequality.org/great-divide/updates-billionaire-pandemic/) during the course of a pandemic that destroyed the lives and livelihoods of millions. He’s now stepping down to spend more time on Blue Origin, the company he hopes will deliver vast human colonies across the solar system.

The [declared aim](https://www.spacex.com/mission/) of Musk’s rival company, SpaceX, is “to make humanity multiplanetary”. Just like [Kim Stanley Robinson](https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/our-greatest-political-novelist)’s science fiction [trilogy](https://space.nss.org/book-review-red-mars/) back in the 1990s, Musk aims to establish a [permanent human colony](https://www.cnet.com/news/elon-musk-drops-details-for-spacexs-million-person-mars-mega-colony/) on Mars. To get there, he reasons, we need very big rockets – or, in the original terminology of SpaceX, Big Fucking Rockets ([BFRs](https://techcrunch.com/2018/09/19/18-new-details-about-elon-musks-redesigned-moon-bound-big-fing-rocket/?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAJd2kjzq4ZnY7YFIEcz1ZTmBPm7MmuQ_2wfNs9erxRMlo4qDio6p9lDkDY7I00A3KvMN5ZKZkkkxZB_ldqttJgYIGM2a4zE5NLSWLYRZMI11-1xbvn31Q6uJBOOn11q5oVbllHCYDhH3ygdBFbWUXOu2H2tXqDsVhtsvMKEe5s_w)) – eventually capable of transporting scores of people and hundreds of tonnes of equipment millions of miles across the solar system.

The BFRs have now given way to a series of (more sedately named) Starships. And to prove his green credentials Musk desperately wants these [starships](https://www.spacex.com/vehicles/starship/) to be reusable. So much so that SpaceX conspired to blow up four consecutive Starship prototypes in quick succession during the first four months of 2021 trying unsuccessfully to re-land them.

Move fast and break things is the Silicon Valley motto of course. But eventually you’ve got to bring the goods home. [Starship SN15](https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2021/5/6/the-starship-has-landed-spacex-nails-reusable-craft-touchdown) finally achieved that on May 5 – three weeks after SpaceX had landed a massive [US$2.9 billion](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/16/science/spacex-moon-nasa.html) contract from Nasa, nudging Blue Origin into the space race shadows.

Not wanting to be outdone, Bezos came up with what he must have hoped was the ultimate comeback. When Blue Origin’s [New Shepard](https://www.blueorigin.com/new-shepard/) rocket – which is also reusable – made its first manned space flight on July 20, he and his brother Mark would be two of the first few passengers on board. Wow, Jeff! Kudos man! Now you really show us your cojones! Nobody likes coming second. Least of all the most powerful people on the planet.

But sometimes you get no choice. Out of the blue, without so much as a by-your-leave, Virgin boss, Richard Branson swooped in to steal everyone’s thunder. On July 11, nine days before Bezos’s big day, Branson became the first ever billionaire to [launch himself into space](https://theconversation.com/virgin-galactic-space-tourism-takes-off-with-bransons-inaugural-flight-164142).

And for a cool US$250,000, he promised us, you too can be one of Virgin Galactic’s 600 or so breathless customers, waiting to enjoy three or four weightless minutes gazing back in rapture at the planet you’ve left behind. Apparently, Musk has [already signed up](https://www.theverge.com/2021/7/12/22573850/elon-musk-richard-branson-spaceplane-virgin-galactic). Bezos doesn’t need to. He’s made his own [virgin space flight](https://www.space.com/news/live/blue-origin-jeff-bezos-launch-updates) now.

Prosperity as health

The space rhetoric of the super-rich betrays a mentality that may once have served humanity well. Some would say it’s a quintessential feature of capitalism. Innovation upon innovation. A driving ambition to expand and explore. A primal urge to escape our origins and reach for the next horizon. Space travel is a natural extension of our [obsession with economic growth](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/02/10/can-we-have-prosperity-without-growth). It’s the crowning jewel of capitalism. Further and faster is its frontier creed.

I’ve spent much of my professional life as a critic of that creed, not just for environmental reasons but on social grounds as well. The seven years I spent as economics commissioner on the UK’s [Sustainable Development Commission](http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/) and my subsequent research at the [Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity](http://www.cusp.ac.uk/) revealed something fundamental about our aspirations for the good life. Something that has been underlined by the experience of the pandemic.

Prosperity is as much about health as it is about wealth. Ask people what matters most in their lives and the chances are that this will come out somewhere near the top of the list. Health for themselves. Health for their friends and their families. Health too – sometimes – for the fragile planet on which we live and on whose health we ourselves depend.

There’s something fascinating in this idea. Because it confronts the obsession with growth head on. As Aristotle pointed out in [Nicomachean Ethics](http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html) (a book named after his physician father), the good life is not a relentless search for more, but a continual process of finding a “virtuous” balance between too little and too much.

Population health provides an obvious example of this idea. Too little food and we’re struggling with diseases of malnutrition. Too much and we’re tipped into the “diseases of affluence” that [now kill more people](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight) than under-nutrition does. Good health depends on us finding and nurturing this balance.

This task is always tricky of course, even at the individual level. Just think about the challenge of keeping your exercise, your diet and your appetites in line with the outcome of a healthy body weight. But as [I’ve argued](https://www.timjackson.org.uk/postgrowth), living inside a system that has its sights continually focused on more makes the task near impossible. Obesity has tripled since 1975. Almost two-fifths of adults over 18 are overweight. Capitalism not only fails to recognise the point where balance lies. It has absolutely no idea how to stop when it gets there.

You’d think our brush with mortality through the pandemic would have brought some of this home to us. You’d think it would give us pause for thought about what really matters to us: the kind of world we want for our children; the kind of society we want to live in. And for many people it has. In a survey carried out during lockdown in the UK, [85% of respondents](https://www.thersa.org/press/releases/2019/brits-see-cleaner-air-stronger-social-bonds-and-changing-food-habits-amid-lockdown) found something in their changed conditions they felt worth keeping and fewer than 10% wanted a complete return to normal.

When life and health are at stake, the ungodly scramble for wealth and status feels less and less attractive. Even the lure of technology pales. Family, conviviality and a sense of purpose come to the fore. These are the things that many people found they lacked most throughout the pandemic. But their importance in our lives was not a COVID accident: they are the most fundamental elements of a sustainable prosperity.

The denial of death

Something even more surprising has [emerged](https://timjackson.org.uk/consumerism-theodicy/) during my three decades of research. Behind consumer capitalism, behind the frontier mentality, beyond the urge to expand forever lies a deep-seated and pervasive anxiety.

What does day two look like, Bezos once [asked a crowd](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fTwXS2H_iJo&ab_channel=AmazonNews) of the faithful, referring to his famous maxim about the need to innovate. “Day two is stasis, followed by irrelevance, followed by excruciatingly painful decline, followed by death,” he said. “And that. Is why. It is always. Day one!” His audience loved it.

Musk plays out his own inner demons just as disarmingly. “I’m not trying to be anyone’s saviour,” [he once told](https://www.ted.com/talks/elon_musk_the_future_we_re_building_and_boring/transcript?language=en) TED’s head curator, Chris Anderton. “I’m just trying to think about the future – and not be sad.” Again, the applause was deafening.

A well-trained therapist could have a field day with all of this. Take that miraculous day a few weeks after the Perseverance rover started sending home the most amazing selfies in the universe, when the Ingenuity helicopter made its [virgin flight](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kQMTo0KuN5M) in the wafer thin atmosphere of Mars. It was the kind of outcome that could have intelligence agencies drooling over far less benign uses of the technology. But there was also something pretty existential going on.

The faint whispering of the Martian wind, relayed faithfully across the solar system, doesn’t just confirm the possibilities for aerial flight on an alien planet. It’s grist to the mill of an essential belief that human beings are endlessly creative and fiendishly clever.

Our visceral response to these momentary triumphs speaks to a branch of psychology called [terror management theory](https://www.psychologytoday.com/gb/basics/terror-management-theory) drawn from the work of cultural anthropologist Ernest Becker. It was explored in particular in his astonishing 1973 book [The Denial of Death](https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_Denial_of_Death/jyqGDwAAQBAJ). In it, Becker argues that modern society has lost its way, precisely because we’ve become terrified of confronting the inevitability of our own demise.

Terror management theory tells us that, when mortality becomes “salient”, instead of addressing the underlying fear, we turn for comfort to the things which make us feel good. Capitalism itself is a massive comfort blanket, designed to help us never confront the mortality that awaits us all. So too are the dreams of the rocket men.

Beyond lockdown

When Sputnik kickstarted the first “space race” six decades ago, a US newspaper headline called it “one step toward [our] escape from imprisonment to the Earth”. Arendt read those words with astonishment. She saw there a deep-seated “[rebellion against human existence](https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/The_Human_Condition/bGlwDwAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=hannah%20arendt%20%27rebellion%20against%20human%20existence%27&pg=PA2&printsec=frontcover&bsq=hannah%20arendt%20%27rebellion%20against%20human%20existence%27)”. It isn’t just the pandemic that locks us down, the implication is. It’s the entire human condition.

The anxiety we feel is nothing new. The choice between confronting our fears and running away from them has always been a profound one. It’s exactly the choice we’re facing now. As vaccine roll-out brings a glimmer of light at the end of COVID-19, the temptation to rush into wild escapism is massive.

But for all its glamour, the “final frontier” is at best an amusement and at worst a fatal distraction from the urgent task of rebuilding a society ravaged by social injustice, climate change and a loss of faith in the future.

With most of us still reeling from what the World Health Organisation has called a [shadow pandemic](https://theconversation.com/domestic-abuse-and-mental-ill-health-twin-shadow-pandemics-stalk-the-second-wave-148412) in mental health, any kind of escape plan at all looks remarkably like paradise. And emigrating to Mars is one hell of an escape plan.

Let’s dream of some “final frontier” by all means. But let’s focus our minds too on some quintessentially earthly priorities. Affordable healthcare. Decent homes for the poorest in society. A solid education for our kids. Reversing the decades-long precarity in the livelihoods of the frontline workers – the ones who saved our lives. Regenerating the devastating loss of the natural world. Replacing a frenetic consumerism with an economy of care and relationship and meaning.

Never have these things made so much sense to so many. Never has there been a better time to turn them into a reality. Not just for the handful of billionaires dreaming of unbridled wealth on the red planet, but for the eight billion mere mortals living out their far less brazen dreams on the blue one.

#### Space is a demonstration of capitalist power

**Marx**, 20**20** (Paris, author and host of *Tech Won’t Save Us* podcast. “Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism” June 8, 2020. [https://jacobin.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism ///](https://jacobin.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism%20///)MF)

Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk have a vision of space that serves the narrow interests of capitalists. But we don’t want to be indentured servants on a Martian colony — we want solar exploration that benefits humanity as a whole.

On May 30, SpaceX finally launched astronauts into space more than two years behind schedule. President Donald Trump was on hand for the launch. After pushing for [the militarization of space](https://theconversation.com/donald-trumps-space-force-the-dangerous-militarisation-of-outer-space-98588) with the formation of the US Space Force, Trump fused his own vision with that of SpaceX founder Elon Musk, declaring, “We’ll soon be landing on Mars and we’ll soon have the greatest weapons ever imagined in history.”

Early in Trump’s presidency, Musk faced criticism for being part of the administration’s advisory council and [refusing to step down](https://www.vox.com/2017/2/4/14508874/elon-musk-trump-business-council-twitter-tesla-spacex) even as Trump signed his signature Muslim ban. It was believed Musk was hoping to benefit from greater public subsidies, on top of the billions NASA gave to SpaceX, and he’s set to do so as part of [Trump’s plan to get astronauts back on the moon by 2024](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/02/11/nasa-space-budget-billions-to-spacex-blue-origin-maxar-and-more.html). More recently, the two have found themselves of the same mind on the pandemic as they shared misleading health information and Musk echoed Trump’s calls to “open the economy” and give people their “[freedom](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/elon-musk-give-people-their-freedom-back-and-reopen-america-2020-04-29)” back.

The May 30 launch symbolized both Trump’s desire to project an image of revived American greatness and Musk’s need not only to bolster the myth that makes his wealth possible, but to set the foundations for a privatized space industry.

The space billionaires — Musk and Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos foremost among them — have little stake in the well-being of the majority of the population. Their space visions are designed for wealthy people like themselves, with little mention of where the working class would fit in. They’ve built their wealth on exploitation, and their visions of the future are little more than an extension of their present actions.

A History of Violence

The business practices of Musk and Bezos are increasingly well known and have been on clear display during the pandemic. Musk tried to claim Tesla’s Fremont, California factory was “essential” until [authorities forced him to close it;](https://www.sfchronicle.com/business/article/Tesla-s-Fremont-factory-ordered-to-shut-down-15137774.php) then he [reopened it in defiance of health orders](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/5/12/21255812/elon-musk-tesla-factory-coronavirus-reopening). As Tesla CEO, Musk has a long history of [opposing the unionization of workers](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/sep/10/tesla-workers-union-elon-musk), presiding over a high rate of worker injuries ([which the company tried to cover up](https://www.revealnews.org/article/tesla-says-its-factory-is-safer-but-it-left-injuries-off-the-books/)), and even having a former worker [hacked and harassed](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2019-03-13/when-elon-musk-tried-to-destroy-tesla-whistleblower-martin-tripp) after he became a whistleblower.

Meanwhile, Bezos has a similar history of abusing Amazon workers. Amazon’s warehouses are known for having [higher injury rates than the industry average](https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2019/11/amazon-warehouse-reports-show-worker-injuries/602530/), the company has [fought unionization](https://gizmodo.com/amazons-aggressive-anti-union-tactics-revealed-in-leake-1829305201), and the stories of the [terrible](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-warehouse-2011-9) [conditions](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/feb/05/amazon-workers-protest-unsafe-grueling-conditions-warehouse) [experienced](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/amazon-protests-workers-urinate-plastic-bottles-no-toilet-breaks-milton-keynes-jeff-bezos-a9012351.html) [by](https://www.theverge.com/2019/4/25/18516004/amazon-warehouse-fulfillment-centers-productivity-firing-terminations) [workers](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-warehouse-workers-share-their-horror-stories-2018-4) are legendary. During the pandemic, that has continued, with the company failing to enforce social distancing or provide adequate protective equipment [until workers began walking out](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/mar/30/amazon-workers-strike-coronavirus), refusing to be [open about infection information](https://www.latimes.com/business/technology/story/2020-05-28/amazon-whole-foods-workers-track-coronavirus-cases), and firing workers who dared [criticize](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/apr/02/amazon-chris-smalls-smart-articulate-leaked-memo) [the](https://www.theverge.com/2020/4/14/21220353/amazon-covid-19-criticism-protest-fired-employees-cunningham-costa-climate-change) [company](https://www.vice.com/en_ca/article/y3zd9g/whole-foods-just-fired-an-employee-who-kept-track-of-coronavirus-cases), all while Bezos’s wealth has increased by [more than $30 billion](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/05/21/american-billionaires-got-434-billion-richer-during-the-pandemic.html).

But it goes beyond that, because the worldviews of these billionaires began to be formed long before they started the empires they currently lord over.

Musk did not have a regular childhood, but rather a wealthy upbringing in apartheid South Africa. His father was an engineer and owned part of an emerald mine in Zambia, telling [Business Insider](https://theconversation.com/donald-trumps-space-force-the-dangerous-militarisation-of-outer-space-98588), “We were very wealthy. We had so much money at times we couldn’t even close our safe.” In Elon Musk: Tesla, SpaceX, and the Quest for a Fantastic Future, Ashlee Vance describes how Musk got money from his father when he was starting one of his original ventures. He also had a particular admiration for his grandfather, who moved to apartheid South Africa from Canada after rallying “against government interference in the lives of individuals.”

Bezos has a not dissimilar story. His father was a well-off oil engineer in Cuba while Fulgencio Batista was in power. In Bit Tyrants, Rob Larson explains that Bezos’s father left the island after the Cuban Revolution and passed his libertarian views down to his son. Bezos’s parents [invested nearly $250,000](https://money.com/amazon-jeff-bezoss-parents-investments/) in Amazon in 1995 as it was getting started.

These space barons made their billions through the exploitation of their workers and came from well-off backgrounds made possible from resource extraction. When digging into their visions for a future in space, it’s clear that they seek to extend these conditions into the cosmos, not challenge them in favor of space exploration for the benefit of all.

The Future They Want

Musk and Bezos are the leading drivers of the modern push to privatize and colonize space through their respective companies, SpaceX and Blue Origin. Their visions differ slightly, with Musk preferring to colonize Mars, while Bezos has more interest in building space colonies in orbit.

In 2016, Musk claimed he would [begin sending rockets to Mars in 2018](https://observer.com/2016/06/elon-musk-charts-path-to-colonizing-mars-within-a-decade/). That never happened, but it hasn’t ended his obsession. Musk is determined to make humans a multi-planetary species, framing our choice as either space colonization or the risk of extinction. Bezos says that Earth is the best planet in our solar system, but if we don’t colonize space we doom ourselves to “[stasis and rationing](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/07/space-colonies-jeff-bezos-blue-origin).”

These framings serve the interests of these billionaires, and make it seem like colonizing space is an obvious and necessary choice when it isn’t. It ignores their personal culpability and the role of the capitalist system they seek to reproduce in causing the problems they say we need to flee in the first place.

Billionaires have a [much greater carbon footprint](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2017/12/1/16718844/green-consumers-climate-change) than ordinary people, with Musk [flying his private jet](https://arstechnica.com/cars/2019/01/elon-musk-private-jet-flew-150000-miles-in-2018-washington-post-reports/) all around the world as he claims to be an environmental champion. Amazon, meanwhile, is [courting oil and gas companies](https://gizmodo.com/amazon-is-aggressively-pursuing-big-oil-as-it-stalls-ou-1833875828) with cloud services to make their business more efficient, and Tesla is selling [a false vision of sustainability](https://jacobinmag.com/2020/01/elon-musk-climate-apocalypse-tesla-spacex) that purposely serves people like Musk, all while capitalism continues to drive the climate system toward the cliff edge. Colonizing space will not save us from billionaire-fueled climate dystopia.

But these billionaires do not hide who would be served by their futures. Musk has given many figures for the cost of a ticket to Mars, but they’re never cheap. He told Vance the tickets would cost $500,000 to $1 million, a price at which he thinks “it’s highly likely that there will be a self-sustaining Martian colony.” However, the workers for such a colony clearly won’t be able to buy their own way. Rather, Musk tweeted a plan for [Martian indentured servitude](https://gizmodo.com/elon-musk-a-new-life-awaits-you-on-the-off-world-colon-1841071257) where workers would take on loans to pay for their tickets and pay them off later because “There will be a lot of jobs on Mars!”

Bezos is even more open about how the workforce will have to expand to serve his vision, but has little to say about what they’ll be doing. His plan to maintain economic “growth and dynamism” requires the human population to [grow to a trillion people](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/07/space-colonies-jeff-bezos-blue-origin). He claims this would create “a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins” who would live in space colonies that are supposed to house a million people each, with the surface of Earth being mainly for tourism. Meanwhile, industrial and mining work would move into orbit so as not to pollute the planet, and while he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge it, it’s likely [that’s where you’ll find many of those trillion workers](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/12/jeff-bezos-the-expanse-space-fantasy-sci-fi-syfy/) toiling for their space overlord and his descendants.

Space Shouldn’t Serve Capitalists

In 1978, Murray Bookchin [skewered a certain brand of futurism](http://unevenearth.org/2019/10/bookchin_doing_the_impossible/) that sought to “extend the present into the future” and desired “multinational corporations to become multi-cosmic corporations.” Much of this future thinking obsesses about possible changes to technology, but seeks to preserve the existing social and economic relations — “the present as it exists today, projected, one hundred years from now,” as Bookchin put it. That’s at the core of the space billionaires’ vision for the future.

Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction.

This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making.

Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “[a new age of American ambition has now begun](https://twitter.com/TeamTrump/status/1266846741787074560?s=20)” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.

#### Under capitalist society space expansion is unsustainable-only in a socialist system can we expand towards stars

Mark Rahman 15[Mark Rahman, Writer for socialist revolution, Socialist Appeal Usa "The role of the state in the space race",6-23-1905, Socialist Appeal, https://www.socialist.net/the-role-of-the-state-in-the-space-race.htm, 1LEE]

In a relatively short period of time, what seemed something only found in science fiction novels became reality. Humanity has left footprints on the moon, has satellites orbiting nearly every planet in the solar system, has a rover on Mars, and very recently the European Space Agency put a lander on the surface of a comet. However, as the capitalist crisis unfolds, it seems we will have to abandon hopeful plans for the exploration of space and the further development of technologies associated with it.

The astronomer Fred Hoyle once said, “once a photograph of the Earth, taken from the outside, is available . . . a new idea as powerful as any will be let loose.” Astronauts and cosmonauts who have had the opportunity to view the Earth from space have all experienced something called the “overview effect.” Viewing the Earth for the first time from the outside reveals how fragile our “pale blue dot” is. It is the only planet we have yet discovered capable of sustaining human life. It has just the right amount of water, it is just the right distance from our Sun, and it has an atmosphere to protect us from the hostility of space. Inherent in the "overview effect" is a sense of internationalism—after all, when viewed from above, the Earth has no visible borders.

The Earth has been described as being our one space ship, with only one crew. And unless we overthrow the capitalist system, our spaceship is in jeopardy. Capitalism threatens the environment through pollution and unplanned usage of natural resources. It threatens human culture through the destruction of public education and cuts in funding for the arts and sciences, not to mention the destruction caused by wars and the shuttering of the means of production .

The Marxist James Connolly, speaking of the starry plow banner of the Irish Citizen Army, said that its significance was that a free, socialist Ireland would control its own destiny from the plow to the stars. Only international socialism, free from the constraints of capitalism and private ownership of the means of production, with universal, quality education for every human on the planet, and free exchange of all technology and research, can usher in a new age in which humanity can look to conquer our own destiny, from the Earth to the stars.

#### Race to space is a vehicle for capitalism’s development

Jackson ’21 [Tim; 7-20; Professor of Sustainable Development and Director of the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity (CUSP), University of Surrey; The Conversation; “Billionaire space race: the ultimate symbol of capitalism’s flawed obsession with growth,” <https://theconversation.com/billionaire-space-race-the-ultimate-symbol-of-capitalisms-flawed-obsession-with-growth-164511>] SPark

The space rhetoric of the super-rich betrays a mentality that may once have served humanity well. Some would say it’s a quintessential feature of capitalism. Innovation upon innovation. A driving ambition to expand and explore. A primal urge to escape our origins and reach for the next horizon. Space travel is a natural extension of our obsession with economic growth. It’s the crowning jewel of capitalism. Further and faster is its frontier creed.

I’ve spent much of my professional life as a critic of that creed, not just for environmental reasons but on social grounds as well. The seven years I spent as economics commissioner on the UK’s Sustainable Development Commission and my subsequent research at the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity revealed something fundamental about our aspirations for the good life. Something that has been underlined by the experience of the pandemic.

Prosperity is as much about health as it is about wealth. Ask people what matters most in their lives and the chances are that this will come out somewhere near the top of the list. Health for themselves. Health for their friends and their families. Health too – sometimes – for the fragile planet on which we live and on whose health we ourselves depend.

There’s something fascinating in this idea. Because it confronts the obsession with growth head on. As Aristotle pointed out in Nicomachean Ethics (a book named after his physician father), the good life is not a relentless search for more, but a continual process of finding a “virtuous” balance between too little and too much.

#### Space development continues to satisfy Capitalist greed for resources absent radical changes

Marx 20 Paris Marx is is the host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast and author of Road to Nowhere: What Silicon Valley Gets Wrong about the Future of Transportation, coming in July from Verso Books, 6-8-2020, "Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism.," Jacobins, <https://jacobin.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism> - EM

In 1978, Murray Bookchin [skewered a certain brand of futurism](http://unevenearth.org/2019/10/bookchin_doing_the_impossible/) that sought to “extend the present into the future” and desired “multinational corporations to become multi-cosmic corporations.” Much of this future thinking obsesses about possible changes to technology but seeks to preserve the existing social and economic relations — “the present as it exists today, projected, one hundred years from now,” as Bookchin put it. That’s at the core of the space billionaires’ vision for the future. Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction. This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making. Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “[a new age of American ambition has now begun](https://twitter.com/TeamTrump/status/1266846741787074560?s=20)” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.

#### Space dev, including satellite launches are poisoned by capitalist lust

Shammas et Hollen 19 (Dr. Victor Lund Shammas is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Agder, Norway, Tomas B Hollen is an independent scholar and journalist, , 1-29-2019, "One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space," Nature, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9>) - EM

The 2010s may very well be remembered as the ‘Age of New Space', the decade when outer space was turned into a capitalist space, when private corporations pushed the price of launches, satellites, and space infrastructure downwards, exerting what industry insiders call the ‘SpaceX effect' (Henry, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR28)), centered on the technological achievement of ‘reusability', recovering used rocket boosters for additional launches, promising to drastically reduce the price of going to space (Morring, [2016](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR44)). As one report observes, ‘Not only has the number of private companies engaged in space exploration grown remarkably in recent years, these companies are quickly besting their government-sponsored competitors' (Houser, [2017](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR31)). What the rockets, shuttles, ships, and landing pods will carry beneath their payload fairing or in their cargo hold, however, along with supplies and satellites, is the capitalist worldview, a particular ideology—just as Robinson Crusoe, in Marx’s ironic retelling in Capital, ‘having saved a watch, ledger, ink and pen from the shipwreck… soon begins, like a good Englishman, to keep a set of books' (Marx, [1976](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR41), p. 170), brings with him English political economy—'Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham', as Marx ([1976](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR41), p. 280) says elsewhere—to his desert island. In early 2018, astronomers across the world learned that a New Zealand start-up, Rocket Lab, which aimed to launch thousands of miniature satellites into orbit around Earth (so-called ‘smallsats'), had planned to launch a giant, shining ‘disco ball'—the ‘Humanity Star'—into orbit around Earth. It was an elaborate marketing stunt masked by humanistic idealism. ‘No matter where you are in the world, or what is happening in your life', said Rocket Lab CEO Peter Beck, ‘everyone will be able to see the Humanity Star in the night sky' (Amos, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR1)). Many astronomers expressed outrage at these plans, fearing that the light from the Human Star would threaten their ability to carry out scientific observations. But while these astronomers were incensed by the idea of a bright geodesic object disrupting their ability to carry out observations, concerns with the effects of the arrival of capitalistkind on their ability to collect data were non-existent.

#### Space dev is polluted by Capitalistic rhetoric, any action will end up greasing the wheels of capitalism.

Shammas et Hollen 19 (Dr. Victor Lund Shammas is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Agder, Norway, Tomas B Hollen is an independent scholar and journalist, , 1-29-2019, "One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space," Nature, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9>) - EM

It is not humankind but capitalistkind that ventures forth. In early 2018, NASA was set to request $150 million in its 2019 budget to ‘enable the development and maturation of commercial entities and capabilities which will ensure that commercial successors to the ISS…are operational when they are needed', only one of many signs that space is becoming a space for capitalism. According to one estimate, the value of just one single asteroid would be more than $20 trillion in rare earth and platinum-group metals (Lewis, [1996](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR37)), a precious prize indeed for profit-hungry corporations.[Footnote10](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn10) Even the UNOOSA spoke vociferously in favor of the commercialization of space, appealing variously to the ‘industry and private sector' and elevating the ‘space economy' to a central pillar in its Space2030 Agenda (including the ‘use of resources that create and provide value and benefits to the world population in the course of exploring, understanding and utilizing space'), even as the UN agency falls back on a humanistic, almost social-democratic vision of the equitable distribution of benefits (and profits) from space mining, exploration, and colonization (UNOOSA, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR65)).

### 2NC -- Ext: Space Cyber Assets Rehighlights ↓

### ASATs Advantage

#### Present NATO commitments in space have fostered strategic ambiguity AND capability gaps for Russia and China to exploit---effectively opening grey zones for China and Russia to test NATO resolve. Only the plan creates united NATO capabilities to deter adversaries.

Aurel Sari & Hitoshi Nasu 21. Associate Professor of International Law and Director of the Exeter Centre for International Law, University of Exeter; Fellow, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe. The views expressed are those of the author in a personal capacity; Professor of International Law, University of Exeter; Senior Fellow, Stockton Center for International Law, United States (US) Naval War College. The thoughts and opinions expressed are those of the author and not those of the US Government, the US Department of the Navy, or the US Naval War College. “NATO and Collective Defense in Space: Same Mission, New Domain”, ECIL Working Paper 2021/2 (forthcoming in Turkish Policy Quarterly, Summer 2021, Vol 20, No 2, <https://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/collegeofsocialsciencesandinternationalstudies/lawimages/research/Sari_and_Nasu_-_NATO_and_Collective_Defence_in_Space_-_ECIL_WP_2021-2.pdf> //EM

Strategic Ambiguity: How Much is too Much?

Overall, the Brussels Communiqué sends a strong signal that the Allies are prepared to defend their interests in space, including through the use of force if necessary. However, the clarity of this message is diluted by the uncertainty surrounding the exact conditions which may prompt the Allies to invoke Article 5 in response to an armed attack. This ambiguity may be seen as an asset: leaving hostile powers guessing the exact conditions that could trigger a forceful military response by the Alliance may prompt those powers to proceed with greater caution.25

Strategic ambiguity thus has its benefits. However, hostile actors may also read it as a lack of resolve. In the present case, at least two factors may encourage such a reading. The first relates to the uncertain parameters of the right of self-defense itself and the ambiguities that surround its application in space.26 For example, could non-kinetic interference against space-based assets or services, such as signal jamming, rise to the level of an armed attack? If so, under what circumstances does such interference satisfy the gravity threshold required to constitute an armed attack?27 Is it lawful to declare a space exclusion zone or to deploy “bodyguard” satellites to defend critical space-based assets in anticipation of an attack in the exercise of the right of self-defense? Having recognized the applicability of Article 5 to space attacks, NATO nations need to develop a shared approach to these and related questions in order to demonstrate unity and resolve.

The second factor relates to the geographical limits that Article 6 of the NAT imposes on the operation of Article 5 of the NAT. The first sub-paragraph of Article 6 deals with attacks on Allied territory. It is clear from the language of this sub-paragraph that armed attacks launched into the territory or islands of NATO members from or through space fall squarely within the ambit of Article 5. Armed attacks launched against their assets in space are caught by the second sub-paragraph of Article 6, which deals with attacks against the “forces, vessels or aircraft of any of the Parties.” While neither the notion of a vessel,28 nor that of an aircraft, 29 extends to objects primarily designed for operation in outer space, the concept of ‘forces’ is broad enough to cover spacecraft and their personnel. There is a catch, however. The second sub-paragraph of Article 6 of the NAT refers to attacks taking place “in or over” Allied territories. This means that, at best, attacks against Allied forces in space are covered by Article 5 only whilst in orbit “over” such territories and above their airspace. Accordingly, the destruction of an Allied satellite may engage Article 5 if the satellite was orbiting over the territory of a NATO nation, but not if it was orbiting over the South China Sea, for instance.30

NATO nations thus face a dilemma. The geographical limitations imposed by Article 6 of the NAT on the operation of their mutual assistance commitment increases the vulnerability of their space assets to hostile maneuvers by potential adversaries, especially in the Southern Hemisphere where the Alliance has the fewest Space Surveillance Network (SSN) assets. To address this vulnerability, the Allies may consider Article 5 to be applicable to attacks against their space assets wherever they may operate, that is without any geographical restrictions. However, extending the scope of Article 5 to cover all around Earth may expose NATO to accusations that it seeks to militarize this domain. Also, such a move would lack credibility unless it is underwritten by capabilities necessary to defend Western space assets and the services they provide.

Ignoring the matter is not an option. China and Russia are known for exploiting legal “grey zone” situations by conducting hostile operations below the traditional threshold of physical violence amounting to an armed attack.31 They are likely to test NATO’s legal readiness and political resolve in the space domain, for example, by using blind spots to undertake nefarious activities such as co-orbital jamming or RPOs. Strategic ambiguity on the geographical scope of application of Article 5 is likely to invite, rather than deter, such hostile probing.

#### Specifically, the recent ban on ASAT testing signals US weakness in space deterrence, incentivizing adversaries to proliferate space capabilities.

Kevin Chilton 4-29. Retired, U.S. Air Force Gen, explorer chair for space warfighting studies at the Mitchell Institute for Aerospace Studies. He previously led U.S. Strategic Command and Air Force Space Command, and he served as a NASA astronaut. “The anti-satellite test ban must not undermine deterrence.” Defense News. 4-29-2022. https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2022/04/29/the-anti-satellite-test-ban-must-not-undermine-deterrence/ //EM

While the U.S. would like to prevent conflict from escalating to space, many of our adversaries do not share this goal. Instead, they see developing and fielding capabilities to hold our systems on orbit at risk as an opportunity to gain decisive advantages. Our space enterprise is the super glue that empowers a broad range of military functions. It is exceedingly difficult to project modern American combat power without a range of crucial, space-based systems. This includes our communication, weather, intelligence, navigation and missile-warning satellites. It may even be impossible for us to project effective combat power if we lose our space-based capabilities, and our adversaries retain theirs. Our adversaries know this, and it is exactly why they have pressed so hard to hold our satellites at risk by demonstrating and fielding known terrestrial and, likely, space-based anti-satellite weapons.

Given this reality, it is important to present our leaders with a broad range of options that will deter adversaries from attacking U.S. space-based assets. We must convince our adversaries they cannot destroy our critical satellites, while retaining theirs. Several of our opponents are equally dependent on their constellations. A nightmare scenario for the U.S. would see us send our terrestrial forces into combat without the support of our space capabilities, while our enemy retains all of theirs. A far better outcome would see us deter hostile actions in space altogether through holding their assets similarly at risk, thereby empowering deterrence. Should an opponent miscalculate, and deterrence fails, it is crucial our leaders have options, including direct-ascent, anti-satellite missiles, to level the playing field.

This is why the administration’s admirable announcement to unilaterally ban the testing of direct-ascent, anti-satellite missiles must not constrain the development and fielding of U.S. offensive space capabilities. This approach mirrors the policies and posture of our nuclear deterrent forces: Our voluntary compliance with the nuclear test ban treaty does not impede our fielding of a credible triad to deter adversarial strategic attacks on the U.S. or our allies. We understand these realities here on Earth, and we must ensure we apply the same calculus to space. It is why the nuclear triad was so important to check the Soviet Union in the Cold War, and why it remains essential today. We did not invest in nuclear weapons because we wanted to launch them. Quite the contrary: It was so we would never have to employ them or be subject to them.

“Using” our strategic deterrent force means developing the enterprise, fielding the various components and ensuring our adversaries understand the credibility of our commitment. The same will hold true for keeping the peace in space. However, for a set of capabilities to be persuasive, we must ensure our commitment to use is credible. This means we must speak with care and ensure our actions reflect our resolve.

#### Adversarial intent is certain; it’s only a question of NATO resolve.

Courtney Albon 4-14. C4ISRNET's space and emerging technology reporter. She previously covered the U.S. Air Force and U.S. Space Force for Inside Defense. “Defense Intelligence Agency cites 70% growth in Russia and China’s combined space assets since 2019.” C4ISRNet. 4-14-2022. https://www.c4isrnet.com/battlefield-tech/space/2022/04/13/defense-intelligence-agency-cites-70-growth-in-russia-and-chinas-combined-space-assets-since-2019/ //EM

WASHINGTON — A new report from the Defense Intelligence Agency links China and Russia’s increased operational space capabilities in recent years to their growing intent to extend future conflict into space.

The unclassified “Challenges to Security in Space” report follows a 2019 DIA report that surveyed space and counterspace programs being pursued by adversary nations, including Russia, China, North Korea and Iran. The 2022 report highlights growth in Russian and Chinese on-orbit systems as well as efforts to better organize their military space capabilities

“Evidence of both nations’ intent to undercut the United States and allied leadership in the space domain can be seen in the growth of combined on-orbit assets of China and Russia, which grew approximately 70% in just two years,” DIA Intelligence Officer for Space and Counterspace John Huth said during a Tuesday press briefing.

That expansion of capability follows a 200% combined increase between 2015 and 2018 and reflects a recognition by the two countries of the United States’ reliance on space assets and its role as a leader in the domain.

“As the number of spacefaring nations grow and counterspace capabilities become more integrated into military operations, the U.S. space posture will be increasingly challenged and on-orbit assets will face new risks,” Huth said. “A secure, stable and accessible space domain is crucial as challenges to the United States and our allies’ space capabilities continue to increase.”

Chinese ASAT attacks create an open window for invasion of Taiwan---extinction.

Brian G. Chow & Brandon Kelley 21. Independent policy analyst with over 160 publications; Director of Debate at Georgetown University <3 and a graduate student in the Security Studies Program. “China’s Anti-Satellite Weapons Could Conquer Taiwan—Or Start a War.” National Interest. 8-21-2021. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/china%E2%80%99s-anti-satellite-weapons-could-conquer-taiwan%E2%80%94or-start-war-192135 //EM thx Marsh <3

On July 1, 2021—the one-hundredth birthday of the Chinese Communist Party—President Xi Jinping declared that China will “advance peaceful national reunification” with Taiwan. It would be easy to dismiss such statements as mere political rhetoric: certainly, Taiwan would never willingly accede to Chinese demands to rejoin the fold. But China’s rapidly advancing anti-satellite (ASAT) capabilities could open up another avenue: deterring United States intervention on Taiwan’s behalf in order to coerce reunification without firing a shot.

If current trends hold, then China’s Strategic Support Force will be capable by the late 2020s of holding key U.S. space assets at risk. Chinese military doctrine, statements by senior officials, and past behavior all suggest that China may well believe threatening such assets to be an effective means of deterring U.S. intervention. If so, then the United States would face a type of “Sophie’s Choice”: decline to intervene, potentially leading allies to follow suit and Taiwan to succumb without a fight, thereby enabling Xi to achieve his goal of “peacefully” snuffing out Taiwanese independence; or start a war that would at best be long and bloody and might well even cross the nuclear threshold.

This emerging crisis has been three decades in the making. In 1991, China watched from afar as the United States used space-enabled capabilities to obliterate the Iraqi military from a distance in the first Gulf War. The People’s Liberation Army quickly set to work developing capabilities targeted at a perceived Achilles’ heel of this new American way of war: reliance on vulnerable space systems.

This project came to fruition with a direct ascent ASAT weapons test in 2007, but the test was limited in two key respects. First, it only reached low Earth orbit. Second, it generated thousands of pieces of long-lasting space junk, provoking immense international ire. This backlash appears to have taken China by surprise, driving it to seek new, more usable ASAT types with minimal debris production. Now, one such ASAT is nearing operational status: spacecraft capable of rendezvous and proximity operations (RPOs).

Such spacecraft are inevitable and cannot realistically be limited. The United States, European Union, China, and others are developing them to provide a range of satellite services essential to the new space economy, such as in situ repairs and refueling of satellites and active removal of space debris. But RPO capabilities are dual-use: if a satellite can grapple space objects for servicing, then it might well be capable of grappling an adversary’s satellite to move it out of its servicing orbit. Perhaps it could degrade or ~~disable~~ it by bending or disconnecting its solar panels and antennas all while producing minimal debris.

This is a serious threat, primarily because no international rules presently exist to limit close approaches in space. Left unaddressed, this lacuna in international law and space policy could enable a prospective attacker to pre-position, during peacetime, as many spacecraft as they wish as close as they wish to as many high-value targets as they wish. The result would be an ever-present possibility of sudden, bolt-from-the-blue attacks on vital space assets—and worse, on many of them at once.

China has conducted at least half a dozen tests of RPO capabilities in space since 2008, two of which went on for years. Influential space experts have noted that these tests have plausible peaceful purposes and are in many cases similar to those conducted by the United States. This, however, does not make it any less important to establish effective legal, policy, and technical counters to their offensive use. Even if it were certain that these capabilities are intended purely for peaceful applications—and it is not at all clear that that is the case—China (or any other country) could at any time decide to repurpose these capabilities for ASAT use.

There is still time to get out ahead of this threat, but likely not for much longer. China’s RPO capabilities have, thus far, lagged about five years behind those of the United States. There are reasons to believe this gap may close, but even assuming that it holds, we should expect to see China demonstrate an operational dual-use rendezvous spacecraft by around 2025. (The first instance of a U.S. commercial satellite docking with another satellite to change its orbit occurred in February 2020.)

At the same time, China is expanding its capacity for rapid spacecraft manufacturing. The Global Times reported in January that China’s first intelligent mass production line is set to produce 240 small satellites per year. In April, Andrew Jones at SpaceNews reported that China is developing plans to quickly produce and loft a thirteen thousand-satellite national internet megaconstellation. It is not unreasonable to assume that China could manufacture two hundred small rendezvous ASAT spacecraft by 2029, possibly more.

If this happens, and Beijing was to decide in 2029 to launch these two hundred small RPO spacecraft and position them in close proximity to strategically vital assets, then China would be able to simultaneously threaten disablement of the entire constellations of U.S. satellites for missile early warning (about a dozen satellites with spares included); communications in a nuclear-disrupted environment (about a dozen); and positioning, navigation, and timing (about three dozen); along with several dozen key communications, imagery, and meteorology satellites. Losing these assets would severely degrade U.S. deterrence and warfighting capabilities, yet once close pre-positioning has occurred such losses become almost impossible to prevent. For this reason, such pre-positioning could conceivably deter the United States from coming to Taiwan’s aid due to the prospect that intervention would spur China to disable these critical space systems. Without their support, the war would be much bloodier and costlier—a daunting proposition for any president.

Should the United States fail to intervene, the consequences would be disastrous for both Washington and its allies in East Asia, and potentially the credibility of U.S. defense commitments around the globe. Worse yet, however, might be what could happen if China believes that such a threat will succeed but proves to be wrong. History is rife with examples of major wars arising from miscalculations such as this, and there are many pathways by which such a situation could easily escalate out of control to a full-scale conventional conflict or even to nuclear use.

This Catch-22 of so-called “peaceful reunification” on the one hand and catastrophic miscalculation on the other is entirely preventable. To do so, however, the United States must act now. To deter such pre-positioning and provide a clear framework for how to handle it if it does occur, the United States should immediately begin coordinating with its allies to establish shared understandings for the rules and operations of warning/self-defense zones in orbit. Additionally, the United States should develop and deploy bodyguard spacecraft to monitor and enforce such rules.

The United States cannot afford to wait; once the potential threat arrives, it will already be too late.

#### A lack of a cooperative framework leaves NATO uncertain on how to respond, undermining deterrence while simultaneously increasing the likelihood of escalation.

Liselotte Odgaard 22. Professor at the Norwegian Institute for Defense Studies in Oslo and a non-resident senior fellow at the Hudson Institute focusing on US-China-Europe relations. “NATO’s China Role: Defending Cyber and Outer Space,” The Washington Quarterly Volume 45, 2022 - Issue 1, 45:1, pp. 167-177, T&F, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2022.2059145>. //EM \*thx Marsh <3

NATO in Cyber and Outer Space

Cyber and space is a promising arena for NATO to address China challenges by building member state resilience. Like the air and sea domains, as areas that belong to no one state and which provide access to much of the globe, they form part of the global commons. Command of the commons has been the key enabler of the US global position of power for many decades.26 However, China wields a sufficient range of sea, air, cyber, and space capabilities such that the global commons is now a contested zone. In contrast to the sea and air domains, cyber and space are sparsely regulated. This lack of international norms enhances the risk of conflict based on misperception, making NATO cooperation pertinent. Adversarial activities toward the US and Europe in the cyber and space domain threaten transatlantic security. These come not just from China, but also from other adversaries such as Russia and Iran. Mechanisms for addressing these challenges in the military sector are essentially generic and not, at least in their basic design, established with a particular country in mind. Thus, cyber and space provide an avenue for NATO to contribute significantly to deterrence of China without having to combat major internal resistance. NATO would also benefit from long-standing US-EU cooperation on cyber and space issues.27

Cyber and space provide an avenue for NATO to contribute without major internal resistance

NATO has vowed to clarify Article Five’s collective defense commitment to encompass threats to satellites in space and coordinated cyberattacks. NATO can design this effort to include adversarial behavior from China. The alliance already has an array of instruments to deal with cyber and space challenges from adversaries. These can be extended to encompass China without pronouncing it a threat.28 This approach allows the US and Europe time to adjust their cooperation to take into account the fact that China poses military threats to them both without explicitly using the language of threat at a time when NATO members do not agree if China should be defined as a challenge that can trigger Article Five responses.

Since the late 1990s, the vulnerability of shared space assets to cyberattacks has been a concern for both the US and Europe. For example, in 1998 a US-German satellite, used for peering into deep space, was rendered useless after it turned suddenly toward the sun, damaging its High Resolution Imager by exposure. NASA later determined that the accident was linked to a cyber-intrusion at the Goddard Space Flight Center. Coordinated cyberattacks have emerged as a major threat to both the US and Europe since the late 1990s. For example, for about eighteen minutes on April 8, 2010, China Telecom advertised erroneous network traffic routes that instructed US and other foreign internet traffic to travel through Chinese servers. Other servers around the world quickly adopted these paths, routing all traffic, including government and military traffic, to about 15 percent of the internet’s destinations through servers located in China.29

In the future, the need to enhance situational awareness in space is likely to lead to further integration of space assets between the US and its allies. Civilian entry points are likely to provide a growing opportunity for infiltration. The weak state of cybersecurity in civilian agencies should also be considered. Chinese military doctrine prioritizes weaponry that targets vulnerabilities in the deployment of US and allied power, such as the use of cyberattacks to disrupt surveillance assets, intelligence networks, and command-and-control systems.30 These threats are significant, since next generation systems, including fighter aircraft, destroyers, and special forces, will not function without access to space communication and space-derived data.

Although European and US allies have indigenous space programs outside the NATO framework, cyber security and outer space would be a useful field for joint explorations of how to divert and manage attacks and identify an agency which can coordinate transatlantic responses to attacks. Allies are embedded in a range of information networks which may be disrupted, giving rise to alliance management concerns emerging from attacks. The lack of red lines regarding behavior in cyber and outer space between the US and its allies on one hand, and adversaries such as China on the other, adds to the risk of misperception and escalation, and hence also highlights the need for allied coordination to avoid starting a war by mistake. An improved NATO dialogue on safeguards and alliance consultation could also assist communication with China on arms control and conflict prevention in cyber and outer space, which is not currently taking place.

Looking to the future, NATO’s success in establishing transatlantic mechanisms for cyber and outer space safeguards and consultation will be crucial to allow NATO a key role in taking on the China challenge in ways that help restore faith in NATO’s credibility as a provider of collective defense in all domains. It will also assist NATO in straddling the chasm between member states prioritizing threats from either China, Russia, the Middle East, or North Africa, since cyber and space threats potentially stem from all of them, and the effectiveness of cyber and space defense mechanisms do not necessarily depend on geographical origin.

Cyber and space would allow NATO a key role in the China challenge without prioritizing China.

3. INTEGRATION---interoperability with NATO is key for the signal of deterrence against ASATs AND solves network capabilities to solidify space redundancy.

Sam Wilson & Colleen Stover 21. Senior policy analyst for the Center for Space Policy and Strategy at The Aerospace Corporation; Project manager and researcher at The Aerospace Corporation’s Center for Space Policy and Strategy. “Defense Space Partnerships: A Strategic Priority.” Aerospace Center for Space Policy and Strategy. 09-17-2020. https://csps.aerospace.org/papers/defense-space-partnerships-strategic-priority //EM

Unlike during the Cold War, when space was dominated by a few major powers, space has become increasingly democratized. As of 2019, over 60 countries have a national space budget, over 70 countries own or operate satellites in orbit, and nine countries—plus the European Space Agency—can independently launch into orbit.4 This growing international engagement in space presents enormous opportunities for defense space partnerships. This new era also presents serious risks. Space is becoming increasingly contested. In April 2020, Russia tested a direct ascent anti-satellite missile.5 A few months earlier, U.S. officials called out Russian satellites for trailing a U.S. national security satellite.6 Also in April 2020, Chris Ford, a senior official in the State Department, said that China was exploring capabilities to attack U.S. satellites, including in high orbits such as those of U.S. nuclear command, control, and communications satellites.7 The seriousness of the threat underlines the importance of defense space partnerships—the United States should not try to manage these threats purely on its own.

To enable more international defense space partnerships, U.S. leadership will need to treat such partnerships as a strategic priority, not as an afterthought or add on. This chapter looks at advantages, challenges, and mitigations for broadening and deepening security space partnerships that could prompt key decision points during the next presidential term.

Advantages of Partnerships

Defense space partnerships offer considerable advantages. These include allowing the United States to expand and improve its network and capabilities with fewer resources, deter adversaries from attacking its systems, and coalesce allied and partner thinking on space security concepts.8 A look at some common space maturity metrics suggests that many of the most mature space nations in the world are partners of the United States. Specifically:

The United States and its close partners make up 11 out of the top 15 countries with the biggest national space budgets.9

Of the roughly 2,700 active satellites in orbit, over 500 are operated by international partners and over 1,300 are operated by the United States.10

* Among the world’s 22 active space launch centers, six are operated by partners and five by the United States.11

Many allies are also taking steps to emphasize the seriousness of space security. In the past year, France and Japan have established their own military units dedicated to space.12 The United Kingdom officially recognized space as an operational domain in 2018.13 And NATO, which historically has said little on space, came out with a space policy in 2019.14 Given the space maturity of many of its allies and partners, and the shared recognition of the importance of the domain, the time is advantageous for the United States to place more priority on establishing and deepening space partnerships for defense. Expand and Improve Networks and Capabilities.

Partners have capabilities that can improve U.S. systems and networks in geographically dispersed and strategic locations. This is particularly true in space situational awareness, an area in which a diverse set of geographically-distributed sensors can more accurately and completely capture the operational environment.15 Partners can help us collectively attain more persistent surveillance and continuous global coverage of satellites and debris, which is only possible if we have more and better sensors in a variety of locations. Radars and optical telescopes spread around the world can also more comprehensively identify space threats. For example, Japan is developing a deep-space radar that will observe objects in geosynchronous orbit. Given the counterspace threats from potential adversaries, the radar could also be invaluable to the United States because of its capability and location.

Additionally, space capabilities and operations are expensive. A clear advantage of military space partnerships is that they generate opportunities for sharing the financial burden of operating in space. As an example, the United States putting its security payloads on the Norwegian satellite will reportedly generate up to $900 million in savings.17 Hosting U.S. payloads on foreign systems, like this example, represents an area in which the United States could leverage allied and partner capabilities more so than it does currently. Hosted payloads offer affordable means to expand protected communications satellites; position, navigation, and timing satellites; and space situational awareness capabilities, among other systems. Rather than host payloads, partners can also simply contribute to the cost of a satellite system. For example, through multilateral agreements, Canada, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and New Zealand provided funding for the U.S. Wideband Global SATCOM-9 satellite that launched in March 2017.18 Or the United States can use partners’ satellites. For example, the United States partners with Japan and Europe to obtain weather information from space-based sensors, providing accurate weather information to warfighters around the world and avoiding the need to field additional U.S. systems.19 And it is not just satellites and payloads. Partners have terrestrial infrastructure and user equipment, including for position, navigation, and timing and satellite communications, that can be used collectively to achieve needed capabilities more efficiently. Leveraging allied systems can offer technological insights, system improvements, and capability expansions at lower costs.

Deter Aggression.

Partnerships can create opportunities for integrating allied and partner capabilities, such as incorporating combined systems in satellite networks and ground infrastructure. Such integration can strengthen the cohesiveness of a defense partnership, which could also help deter an attack. A potential adversary may consider an attack on a purely U.S. system differently than an attack on a system that incorporates several allied and partner capabilities. Deployment of NATO’s multinational battlegroups in the eastern part of the Alliance (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland) is an example of this concept in the ground domain. If Russia’s military were to invade Estonia and attack the multinational forces there, the invasion could be seen as not just an attack on Estonia but on all of the countries represented in those forces and perhaps all of NATO.20 A May 2017 NATO fact sheet on its multinational forces reaffirms this: “[The multinational] presence makes clear that an attack on one Ally will be considered an attack on the whole Alliance.”21 Similarly, in the space domain, an attack on a U.S. constellation of satellites with U.S. payloads might prompt a response from the United States; an attack on a satellite constellation with a mix of U.S. and partner capabilities might prompt a response from several countries acting collectively, which may help deter a potential adversary from attacking in the first place.

With integrated allied and partner systems, U.S. satellite networks and ground infrastructure, as well as other equipment and capabilities, can become more resilient. The more systems you have, the larger an attack would need to be to take out a given percentage of capability: all else equal, two satellites would be more resilient than one, three satellites more resilient than two, and so on. The resilience offered by integrating allied and partner capabilities into a network, therefore, may also contribute to deterring a potential adversary from attacking the network.

### Domain Awareness Advantage

#### Cross-sectional space domain awareness unlocks vast tracking of orbital objects---effectively, preventing debris collisions---but revitalizing DoD credibility is key.

AT: Advantage CP---AT: ADR
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1. Growing Number of Objects in Space

Space is becoming increasingly more crowded: in the last 60 years nearly 8,500 objects have been launched to space, about 1,500 in geosynchronous Earth orbit (GEO) and about 7,000 in low Earth orbit (LEO) (McDowell 2018). A large fraction remains (Figure 2-1) especially in LEO (Figure 2-2). Going forward, LEO is expected to become more crowded. As an illustration, over 6,200 small satellites (satellites weighing less than 500 kg) are expected to be launched between 2017 and 2026 (Euroconsult 2017a). Although the main space players will continue to dominate (85 percent of the government space market will remain concentrated in the 10 countries with an established space industry—U.S., Russia, China, Japan, India, and the top five European countries), the other 50 countries engaged in space will launch almost 200 satellites by 2026, twice the number they launched over the past 10 years (Euroconsult 2017a, b).

The concern is not just the increasing number of satellites and active payloads, but the amount of debris (rocket bodies, other inert bodies, dead payloads) in earth orbit, which comprises more than 95 percent of the currently tracked objects in space. The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) is currently tracking 23,000 objects larger than 10 cm in diameter in Earth orbit (of these, almost 16,000 are in LEO, of which nearly 13,000 were classified as space debris ). An estimated 500,000 objects larger than 1 cm in diameter are not currently tracked, and over 100 million objects smaller than 1 mm in diameter are likely not trackable (NASA Orbital Debris Program Office). It is not

trivial to identify space debris and other junk, especially objects under 10 cm, using active beacons or other markers (e.g., radiofrequency tracking); they need to be physically spotted and tracked. Starting in 2019, the U.S. Air Force's Space Fence System will bring the catalog of debris tracked by Space Command from 23,000 to an estimated 200,000 objects. Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2 visually show the overwhelming fraction of debris in space by orbit.

In addition to implications for the safety and sustainability of the future space environment, these capabilities have other policy implications. For example, the principal reason Swarm Technologies' sandwich-sized "Space Bees" did not get a spectrum license from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) was due to concerns that they might not be tracked consistently by DoD.7,8

2. Growing Number of Operators in Space

It is not just the number of satellites that is increasing: the number of satellite operators has been increasing steadily over the last 60 years (Figure 2-3). More countries have become active in space. Figure 2-4 plots data on number of satellites launched by country, and shows the crowding in the 2010s. This changing landscape is driven by two primary trends: increasing State interest in independent national space programs and the globalization of the aerospace industry (Schroegl 2018).

Smaller, lighter, and more capable satellites make Earth observation and remote sensing within the reach not just of countries, but also corporations and individuals. For example, Bank Rakyat in Indonesia has launched a satellite, built by Space System Loral and launched by Arianespace, to manage its 50 million accounts. Another example is the satellite launched by NanoRacks by an individual who wanted to fly a cubesat and was able to afford it. This trend is likely to continue, making the space environment increasingly more crowded. \*\*\*FIGURE 2-1,2,3,4 OMITTED\*\*\*There is also growing participation in space by the private sector. It is important to note, however, that private space, especially in the near- and mid-term, is primarily a U.S. phenomenon. For most other countries, space is still a strategically-oriented government-run activity. Of the 44 companies that plan to launch constellations between 2017 and 2025, 20 are in the United States (Lal et al. 2017). Of the almost 10,000 satellites that are expected to launch as part of constellations, over 80 percent are from companies in the United States (Euroconsult 2016). More generally, of the 1,700 space companies listed by NewSpace Ventures, about half are headquartered in the United States; the remaining half were distributed around the rest of the world (see Figure 2-5).

The increased number of owners and operators requires more coordination and governance in space, given that a standardization system to coordinate on-orbit behaviors across operators (other than spectrum, which is coordinated by the ITU) does not currently exist. Each private entity (e.g., universities, research institutes, non-profits, commercial companies) is governed by its licensing nation, potentially resulting in a varied set of behaviors in space. This issue could be exacerbated as the number of nations launching government assets as well as licensing private entities continues to increase.

3. Changing Space Activities and Architectures

The current U.S. military SSA system relies heavily on sensors originally created for missile warning and works relatively well for tracking satellites in simple orbits around Earth. However, emerging architectures will change the way objects will need to be tracked Emerging applications, including missions related to rendezvous and proximity operations, such as satellite servicing and refueling, inspection, space RF mapping, and space-based spacecraft assembly and manufacturing, will require SSA services that would be qualitatively different than the current system.

For example, formation flying—the ability for satellites to act as single units while they maintain similar orbits and operate within close proximity to one another—poses challenges to current DoD SSA systems, as these systems are not optimized to differentiate objects that are closer together; the space of uncertainty around each object is compromised by each object's closeness to other satellites in the constellation. Additionally, tracking and predicting the orbits of constellations containing hundreds of small satellites may challenge existing systems due to the number and size of objects involved. Going forward, the number of satellites in such systems is expected to increase. Figure 2-6 shows 60 companies that have plans to launch constellations. While only a fraction of these plans are likely to pan out, it is an important driver of changes required in the SSA system. Beyond constellations, further changes in the space sector include growing activity in several other areas beyond remote sensing and communication. \*\*\*BEGIN FOOTNOTE 10\*\*\*One example of a new activity is the removal of space debris – the goal being to decrease the number of objects in space and thus reduce collision risk. Beyond the technical and regulatory challenges (e.g., restrictions on the ability to move an object even if it is no longer in use), any debris removal action will require more and more accurate SSA.\*\*\*END FOOTNOTE 10\*\*\* Countries are operating satellites across orbits with varied capabilities, further complicating orbital prediction as the nature of any object in space becomes further unpredictable. Satellite operations automation, the continuous thrust allowed by electric propulsion, and other non- Keplerian activities for which the DoD system is not optimized make tracking difficult as the satellites' orbits can change any time, compromising the effectiveness of orbit prediction.

The popularity of electric propulsion on satellites has grown since the 1990s and implementation has increased sharply in the last decade; many of the proposed large LEO constellations require electric propulsion (Lev et al. 2017) and many GEO satellites now use electric propulsion as well. Unlike chemical thrusters, which impart thrust at one time, electric propulsion systems can impart thrust over the course of many months. This increases the number of observations needed to understand the satellite's new orbit. It also creates challenges for astrodynamics algorithms that model maneuvers as instantaneous, as well as catalog maintenance routines that only update orbits every several hours (such as that of the 18 SPCS). This capability can also be used to change a satellite's orbit mid-life, further complicating tracking. Although many small satellites do not have an on-board propulsion system, some small satellites in low Earth orbit can change their orbit by orienting themselves in such a way to increase atmospheric drag, again affecting projections of the satellites trajectories. Impulsive maneuvers through chemical propulsion bring their own set of challenges, given that a spacecraft moving with electric propulsion can be reflected in the surveillance data (e.g., through a negative drag coefficient) as long as the thrust is constant. Additionally, impulsive maneuvers can be challenging to account for with existing U.S. military satellite surveillance capabilities; thus, the image from a surveillance system is not reliable, given that more impulsive maneuvers may occur. An accurate prediction of such an object requires operator-level data that details whether a maneuver is taking place. This operator data is often not openly shared with providers; the necessity of this information suggests that cooperation for SSA is inevitable. An example of this is the actions of Space Data Association (SDA) in GEO, and a similar effort is likely in LEO, especially in response to the large satellite constellations that have been proposed (Schrogel, 2018).

Materials and specifics of satellites—e.g., size (smaller satellites and components), composition, and antenna technology both hardware and software (e.g., software defined radio)— can make the satellites more difficult to detect, especially given the limitations imposed by the rotation speeds of telescopes, which minimize the opportunities to sight and track objects. More efficient and smaller space electronics mean that power requirements of systems are shrinking, which in turn reduces the need for large solar panels. This not only reduces the satellite cross section, but may also reduce the reflectivity of satellites.

New technologies and smaller satellite components have enabled satellite operators to increase the capabilities of satellites in ever-smaller form factors. New materials used in satellite composition affect tracking attributes such as reflectivity. Cubesats and chipsats have smaller cross-sections and are thus more difficult to observe. These cross-sections are reduced even further by the improved technologies that allow for smaller antennas and solar panels. The cubesat standard is a satellite architecture based on 10 cm-wide units. This standard has led to an increase in commercial availability of small standardized parts, which in turn has led to a decrease in the price of components for such satellites, which can now be mass produced rather than built individually and/or by hand. Additionally, major providers of launch services have designed satellite deployment units for the cubesat standard, further increasing the number of entities that will use this standard when designing satellites. Chipsats are standalone satellites built onto computer chips approximately the size of a credit card. Because of their size, many of these satellites do not have propulsion units, making predictions of their orbits easier once they are detected. However, due to their small form factors, initial and follow-up detection is difficult without higher resolution telescopes. One reason FCC turned down the Swarm Technologies' license application was that there was concern that their satellites were too small to be reliably tracked by DoD.

Future space activities that allow and often require close proximity of space objects (e.g., rendezvous and docking, on-orbit servicing or assembly) will require even more precise orbital estimations and predictions to avoid collisions. Companies engaged in such activities would need to supplement DoD information with on-board or space-based sensors to more precisely assess their location with regard to other objects in close proximity.

B. Growing Concerns about Increasing Collisions

Although relatively few catastrophic collisions have occurred thus far in space, the likelihood of a collision is predicted to increase in the near future, given the expected growing number of objects in both LEO and GEO and limited ability to track objects' orbits, which will make it difficult for operators to adequately avoid threats. This problem may be exacerbated if any of the proposed constellations of small satellites in LEO (shown in Figure 2-6 above) are launched, as they will dramatically increase the number of objects that require tracking, thus increasing the tracking and computational requirements for SSA in general and conjunction warnings in particular. Some industry representatives interviewed for the project noted that the emergence of constellations is driving the need for higher precision knowledge and services to mitigate the risk of collision: if numerous small satellites are deployed at once, tracking can be difficult, as resolution may not be great enough to distinguish multiple satellites.

NASA projects nearly one collision per year in the next 200 years if there is no debris mitigation. Independently, insurance companies have predicted a total exposure of $1.3 billion in LEO and $18 billion in GEO (Lal et al. 2015).

To estimate the number of collisions resulting from the increasing number of small satellites, several simulations of expected collisions per year for a number of large satellite constellations in LEO over 200 years have been conducted (Muelhaupt 2017). One such exercise evaluated the effect of adding two large constellations—those of SpaceX and OneWeb—to the current constellations in LEO (Iridium, Orbcomm, and Globalstar). The simulations found that within its first 20 years in orbit, the first constellation is expected to cause one collision annually; this number would grow to approximately 8 per year at its peak collision rate, which occurs about 190 years after launch (see Figure 2-7). Although the majority of the collisions in the simulation were due to satellites that failed to be deorbited following end-of-life protocol, satellites that did attempt to be deorbited still accounted for approximately 40 percent of the total collisions.

Given that the systems developed to track space objects were developed at a time there were fewer objects in space, the accuracy of prediction is low. Oftentimes, a DoD conjunction warning message has an error ellipse of 100 km or more; the rate of false positives is high as well. Because of these two factors, as traffic in space grows, both the number of conjunction warning messages as well as the rates of both false positives—and false negatives— are likely to increase. For example, one study estimated that upon launch of its proposed constellation, SpaceX would receive 7.2 million conjunction warnings per year, and Iridium would receive about 384,000 per year. Some operators, aware of the increasing risk of collision, will be more likely to pay heed to notifications. This could result in increased maneuvers as operators attempt to avoid collision, even if the warning is not sound. These maneuvers—even if they are reported to the providers of SSA (e.g., the DoD, or commercial vendors), which may often not be the case—will still contribute to uncertainty regarding objects' paths, thus compromising the resulting predictions. Other operators, especially those with low-value assets, are likely to continue to ignore warnings as they currently do, which is equally problematic as they will collide with debris or put the onus to maneuver fully on the operator of the asset it threatens.

To avoid a significant increase in notifications, operators will increasingly look for higher quality SSA information. This could put further pressure on emerging systems to improve their predictions.

C. Changing National Level Motivations

Space is increasingly recognized as a sector of strategic importance with applications for security, capacity building, and social benefit. The increasing number of countries seeking to use space for science, safety, national security, and commercial purposes means increased threats (both accidental and nefarious) of collision and harm to assets (e.g., through radiofrequency interference).

1. Growing Recognition of the Need for Timely and Actionable SSA Services and Products

As space capabilities become integral to more applications (e.g., earth observation, communications, global positioning), a growing number of countries are recognizing the security and economic value of space and increasing their spending in space. The number of countries involved in space continues to increase: a decade ago, fewer than 50 countries were investing in space; today, there are 70. In the coming decade, that number is expected to increase to more than 80 countries, and the annual government space expenditure globally is expected to double, from about $40 billion in 2006 to $80 billion in 2026 (Euroconsult 2017b, c). This increased value (both mission-specific and financial) has led many nations to treat safety of such assets as higher priority, leading to growing efforts to develop norms and guidelines for behavior in space. Additionally, many countries (e.g., Brazil, China, France, Japan, and South Africa) want to be (and be viewed as) responsible stewards of space, and thus support these efforts.

In our dataset of 18 countries, most of those actively pursuing SSA focus on protecting their assets from satellite collisions—due to both the increasing number of assets and the increasing amount of space debris on orbit. Some countries (e.g., Japan, Canada) generally pursue protection of their space assets and interests—either for the sake of those assets specifically, or for the role they play in national security broadly. Some countries are more interested in the application of SSA (e.g., the data products) while others (e.g., Japan) value the collection and analysis side as well. SSA can also help with safe operation and control of assets. Though most are concerned with on-orbit collision warnings, some, such as India, use SSA only to avoid collision on launch.

Interviewees from some nations, such as Germany, noted that SSA can be useful in protecting what has been achieved in space thus far and avoiding major incidents. ESA's SSA program is interested in developing a hazard warning system by federating existing European assets and developing new sensor technology, with the goal of securing Europe's access to space, protecting the involved economies, and strengthening European industry.

Some countries prioritize detection of risks to their territory, and thus seek to detect either threats on reentry such as rogue space assets (e.g., France) or natural threats such as space weather and asteroids (e.g., South Africa). Some are specifically interested in protecting their satellites used for Earth observation; for example, representatives of Brazil note the importance of using space to protect its borders given significant issues with drug trafficking. This increasing reliance on space assets for security necessitates greater interest in and efforts toward SSA. For some (e.g., UK), SSA is seen as underpinning all other space roles in that it details the hazards, risks, and threats to the domain.

Our discussions with stakeholders demonstrated some countries' concerns that if they do not participate in global discussions (e.g., long term sustainability [LTS] guidelines), their national interests will not be appropriately reflected in the rules, and they will miss out on critical opportunities. This involvement suggests that more countries are becoming concerned with safe and sustainable operations in space—keeping space open to activities in the future and preventing problems (e.g., proliferating debris) from adversely impacting or precluding space activities. It is important to note that smaller and less powerful countries benefit greatly from these international discussions, as they are given a voice in the proceedings. More powerful and established nations may not always agree, as these deliberations have to include more players and typically take longer to conclude negotiations. This is specifically true for European countries; stakeholders noted that Europe can only have a voice in future regulations regarding the creation of global space traffic regulation if the EU and ESA work together. They noted that for European industry to become involved in challenging projects and thus be competitive on a global scale, the involved nations need to organize at the European level.

2. Lack of Confidence in DoD-Provided Data

Many stakeholders indicated that they need to have trust and confidence in the data being shared for collision warnings and other SSA products; many acknowledged the usefulness of verifying the information that is part of any database. There are many concerns with the current systems for provision of SSA. Some operators question the accuracy and especially the completeness of the information provided to them by the DoD. For example, some South Korean government officials estimate that their country receives data on only about 40 percent of the objects tracked by the DoD, due to sensitivity of U.S. assets.

This distrust is further complicated by the lack of transparency related to computing outcomes such as probabilities of collision. Owners and operators believe they require more [high quality] information to make well-informed decisions about maneuvering. But because they do not know the process by which U.S.-provided information on an object's location is processed into a collision assessment or warning, they often do not feel confident maneuvering based on that warning. Skepticism regarding the reliability of the shared information is exacerbated by the nonstandard and nontransparent methods of calculation (often referred to by stakeholders in our discussions as "black box processing"). Beyond the distrust, some users perceive the U.S. DoD systems as limited, given that they are not well-suited to the emerging space environment; additionally, given the separation of the provision of SSA from the DoD's core mission, it is also perceived as overworked and understaffed, leading to further dissatisfaction. There is also some concern that going forward, the United States will either not share data or will charge for it. This last concern has heightened the sense of urgency in some countries to set up parallel SSA systems.

3. National Security Considerations

Many of the 18 countries are interested in developing or strengthening their strategic early warning capacities, specifically regarding space-based intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (e.g., South Korean awareness of potential North Korean targeting, France's goal of detecting objects presenting a risk to its territory). Often the national security goal is two- pronged: entities are interested in protecting their own assets while building knowledge of the location and intention of adversary assets.

Beyond threats, some of these countries' concerns have been driven by recent space events— natural and accidental, such as the February 2013 meteor explosion over Chelyabinsk, Russia, and the de-orbiting of Tiangong-1 in April 2018. China, for example, desires increasing information from improved national SSA and strategic early warning capacity.

#### Collisions trigger cascades, blanketing the LEO---extinction.
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ABSTRACT

Humanity faces an existential crisis; space debris are at risk of becoming the equivalent of a "drifting island of plastic." Large constellation (LC) systems plan to operate tens of thousands, or even hundreds of thousands, of satellites in low Earth orbit (LEO), posing the threat of an inglorious end to the Space Age. Satellites that cannot maneuver, cannot avoid collisions. Even satellites that can maneuver, can be involved in collisions. Collisions between LEO satellites tend to be catastrophic resulting in large numbers of new debris objects spread across LEO altitudes.

A model is developed to explore the dependence of the time to Kessler Syndrome on the number of satellites, the satellite sizes, and the orbits of LCs. Simulations show: 1) that LCs of small satellites (<25 kg) are significantly safer than constellations of medium (25 to 300 kg) or large (>300 kg) satellites, and 2) that if LCs of medium or large satellite are deployed, they are safer at lower orbits, such as 450-km rather than at 600-km or 1,200-km orbits. The orbital capacity (number and type of satellites that can be sustainably deployed) and tipping point (at which it is no longer possible to avoid a Kessler Syndrome by ceasing launches) concepts are demonstrated.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humanity faces an existential crisis; space debris are at risk of becoming the equivalent of a "drifting island of plastic" [1]. Large constellation (LC) systems plan to operate tens of thousands, or even hundreds of thousands, of satellites in low Earth orbit (LEO) [2], posing the threat of an inglorious end to the Space Age. A "take risks and fail often" approach to new technology is being extended to space without considering that mistakes in space cannot be cleaned up as easily as they can on Earth.

Satellites that cannot maneuver, cannot avoid collisions. Loss of maneuverability can result from failures of satellite sub-systems in the maneuver chain or from collisions with small (untracked) objects that disable these subsystems. Passive deorbit times can be minimized with lower LEO altitudes and larger area-to-mass ratios but can still require years depending on the solar cycle and larger area-to-mass ratios realized by increasing area can lead to increased collision risk.

Even satellites that can maneuver, can be involved in collisions. Conjunction warnings may not be generated, not all lethal debris are trackable. Every time a satellite is not maneuvered in response to a low probability conjunction warning, there is a non-zero collision risk that depends on the space situational awareness (SSA) accuracy. Additionally, every time a satellite is maneuvered, there is another non-zero probability that the maneuver will result in a collision. In both cases, with a sufficient number of conjunctions occurring, even six sigma events can become likely.

Collisions between LEO satellites are typically catastrophic resulting in large numbers of new debris objects spread across LEO altitudes. For example, there are currently 1439 tracked debris objects in orbit from the 2009 collision between Iridium-33 and COSMOS-2251 [3]. Even though the collision occurred at 800-km, the debris' apogees now range from 400 km to over 1,600 km.

Constellations are appropriately analyzed over their orbital lifecycles. LCs are incrementally deployed, and satellites are replenished as they fail, reach end-of-life, or are replaced with more capable models. This replenishment can be reasonably modeled to continue until the constellation is no longer economically viable. The result is a continuing process of orbit raising and phasing, and a combination of active and passive deorbiting.

Sub-system failures and small object collisions can be mitigated with sub-system redundancy, and small objects collision can be further mitigated with shielding. Operational techniques, such as initiating deorbit immediately after the (N - 1)-th failure with N-th redundancy, can be used to improve the effective satellite reliability.

The debris environment naturally evolves over time as objects decay and new objects are created by collisions between existing debris objects. Satellite collisions can cause step increases in the debris population. In addition, there are over 900 derelict rocket bodies remaining in orbit which pose further debris generating risk.

Previous work [4] using a simplistic model showed that reducing the number of non-maneuverable satellites significantly increases the time to Kessler Syndrome, a self-sustaining collision cascade [5]. Another approach [2] used simplified rate equations to model population evolution. One of the simplifications was ignoring collisions of debris with other debris, precluding the possibility of a Kessler Syndrome.

This paper expands on the previous work with more sophisticated Markov models and Monte Carlo simulations to explore the dependence of time to Kessler Syndrome on key parameters of LCs (the number of satellites, the satellite sizes, and the orbits). The approach is not only useful in the design of environmentally friendly broadband LEO systems, but also in assessing the environmental impact of existing and planned LC systems. Further, it can help in understanding the implications of multiple LCs occupying interleaving or overlapping orbits.

While it is generally agreed that LEO is a finite resource and that collisions may lead to loss of access to space [6][7][8][9], this work can be used to help address the key questions:

1) How many satellites are too many? What is the "orbital capacity", the number and type of satellites that can be sustainably deployed in each orbit without risking a Kessler Syndrome?

2) How close are we to a "tipping point", i.e., how urgent is this issue? A tipping point in that point in time at which it is no longer possible to avoid a Kessler Syndrome by ceasing launches.

This is an active area of research with numerous contributions, including [10][11][12].

The models are described in Section 2, Section 3 discusses the simulation results, and the conclusions are summarized in Section 4.

2. MODELS

A model is developed to explore the dependence of time to Kessler Syndrome on the constellation sizes and orbits, and on the size of the satellites deployed. The key simplifying assumptions employed to create this model are:

1. Only the LCs being studied are replenished over time, other constellations and individual satellites are not replaced as they deorbit, fail, or fragment.

2. No new rocket bodies are left in orbit.

3. Collisions with debris between 1 cm and 10 cm never result in fragmentation, only the possibility of damage resulting in loss of maneuverability, and the estimated 128 million debris from 1 mm to 1 cm [13] are ignored.

4. All orbits are circular, including those of satellites, debris, and rocket bodies, and orbits are fully characterized by their altitude and inclination.

5. Objects are grouped into classes with one set of characteristics modeled for each class.

6. The probability of non-maneuverable satellites experiencing catastrophic collisions is approximated as described in Section 2.4.1.

The first three assumptions are believed to be optimistic. Further work is required to access the impact of the last three.

Objects are divided into 10 classes. At the top level, objects are categorized as satellite (S), debris (D), or rocket body (RB). Satellites are sub-categorized as maneuverable (SM) or non-maneuverable (SN). They are further sub-categorized by mass: large (SML and SNL) for mass greater than 300 kg, medium (SMM and SNM) for mass

between 25 kg and 300 kg, and small (SMS and SNS) for mass less than 25 kg. Debris are sub-categorized by diameter, large (DL) for 1 to 3 m diameter, medium (DM) for 0.3 to 1 m diameter, and small (DS) for 0.1 to 0.3 m diameter. Rocket bodies (RB) are not further sub-categorized.

For each class, the number of objects in each orbit is stored in a matrix with the structure shown in Fig. 1. The possible orbits include all altitudes between 200 km and 2,000 km in 25 km bins (Sh = 25 km), and all inclinations between 0° and 180° in 10° bins (Si = 10°). The number of objects in each bin at time tm is X^ . These matrices are initialized using Space-Track SATCAT data [3]. A total of 16,621 LEO orbits were used - 3,773 maneuverable satellites, 920 non-maneuverable satellites, 10,992 debris, and 957 rocket bodies.

The LC orbit models are discussed in Section 2.1 and the object models in Section 2.2. Section 2.3 introduces the state evolution model, and the state transition probabilities are derived in Section 2.4. The object life process models are discussed in Section 2.5.

2.1 Large Constellation (LC) Orbit Models

Three LC orbits are considered: 1) 450 km altitude at 40° inclination, 2) 600 km altitude at 50° inclination, and 3) 1,200 km altitude at 60° inclination. These were selected to be representative of the LC orbits proposed for various NGSO systems [2].

2.2 Object Models

The key parameters for each object class are shown in Tab. 1. They are representative of objects in each class and are not based on any specific objects. The area-to-mass ratios (A/M) of the non-maneuverable satellites are modeled as one-half of those for the maneuverable satellites to account for tumbling.

2.3 State Evolution Model

State evolution is modeled as shown in Fig. 2. Newly launched satellites start in the Maneuverable State. At each time step, there are four possibilities for evolution of maneuverable satellites (SML, SMM, SMS): 1) transition to

the Non-Maneuverable State due to a failure or due to small object collision damage that disables maneuverability, 2) transition to the Fragmentation Process as the result of a large object collision, 3) transition to the Decay Process due to atmospheric drag, or 4) remain in the Maneuverable State.

Non-maneuverable Satellites (SNL, SNM, SNS), Debris (DL, DM, DS), and Rocket Bodies (RB) are always in the Non-Maneuverable State. There are three possibilities for these objects: 1) transition to the Fragmentation Process as the result of a large object collision, 2) transition to the Decay Process due to atmospheric drag, or 3) remain in the Non-Maneuverable State.

2.4 Transition Probability Models

These models are used to calculate the transition probabilities for the objects in each state at each time step. 2.4.1 Probability of Non-Maneuverable Object Catastrophic Collision

PN2F is the probability of an object transitioning from the Non-Maneuverable state to the Fragmentation process. The probability that an object with radius r, in an orbit with altitude hj, inclination ik, and shell thickness Sh experiences a collision over one orbit period at time tm is given by

where is the total number of objects at altitude hj and inclination iq at time tm, and noting that orbits are modeled as circular and the object radius, r, is much less than Sh so that

The probability that an object in an orbit with altitude hj and inclination ik experiences a collision with an object in an orbit with altitude hj and inclination iq is approximated by

The first factor in the "otherwise" value approximates the probability that both objects are inside a square with sides 2r on the surface of a sphere. When the difference in inclinations is such that the crossing angles for planes in a LC are near 0 or n, the geometry degenerates to a single dimension, and the appropriate probability to consider is that of both objects being in a segment of the orbit circle with length 2r. The second factor is the probability that two objects in a square on the surface of the sphere are in the same cube within an orbit shell of height Sh, or equivalently for the degenerative case.

2.4.2 Probability of Maneuverable Object Catastrophic Collision

The probability of a maneuverable satellite transitioning to the fragment process (PM2F) is the probability of a collision avoidance failure, either due to an untracked object, a low probability conjunction prediction being ignored, or an avoidance maneuver causing a collision. It is modeled as

PM2F = AvoidanceFailureRate x PN2F

The avoidance failure rate is set to 0.1%, which assumes that 999 out of every 1,000 collisions that would be experienced if the satellite did not maneuver are avoided using maneuverability.

2.4.3 Probability of Maneuverable Object Orbit Decay

PM2D is the probability of a satellite object transitioning from the Maneuverable state to the Decay process. It is modeled based on the estimated satellite lifetime as

where St is the simulation step size in seconds and SatelliteLifetime is in years.

Satellite design life is modeled as 5 years.

2.4.4 Probability of Non-Maneuverable Object Orbit Decay

PN2D is the probability of a non-maneuverable object transitioning from the Non-Maneuverable state to the Decay process. Assuming that atmospheric drag is the only nonconservative force and modeling the orbits as circular the change in altitude over one period is given by [14]

where St is the simulation time step in seconds and Sh is the object matrix altitude bin size in kilometers. 2.4.5 Probability of Satellite Becoming Non-Maneuverable

The probability of a maneuverable satellite transitioning to the non-maneuverable state (PM2N) is the probability of loss of maneuverability. This can occur either due to a failure mechanism or a small object collision. It is modeled based on the estimated satellite lifetime, satellite failure rate over lifetime, and probability of maneuverability being lost due to a small object collision

where St is the simulation step size in seconds and SatelliteLifetime is in years.

The small collision factor is set to 5.3 assuming that only 20% of the collisions with debris between 1 cm and 10 cm result in loss of maneuverability and noting that ESA estimates [13] that there are 900,000 debris objects in that range compared to 34,000 above 10 cm (0.2 x 900,000 / 34,000 = 5.3).

2.5 Object Life Process Models

The launch, decay, and fragmentation processes manage the life cycle of the objects.

2.5.1 Launch Process

The launch process maintains the LC(s) being evaluated at a fixed size for the duration of the analysis. The appropriate object flux matrix (SML, SMM, or SMS) is updated by maintaining a constant number of satellites in the object matrix cell corresponding to the orbit (altitude and inclination) of each LC at each timestep.

2.5.2 Decay Process

The decay process moves non-maneuverable objects to the next lower row of the object matrix. If an object in the h1 row decays, it is assumed to have completed deorbit, and is removed from the object matrix. For maneuverable satellites, the decay process moves them to a 300-km circular disposal orbit as non-maneuverable satellites.

2.5.3 Fragmentation Process

When a collision occurs, the fragmentation process removes the objects involved from the associated object matrices, determines the numbers and characteristics of the fragments, and adds the new objects to the appropriate debris matrices. Fragments with perigee <200 km or mean altitude outside the 200 km to 2,000 km LEO range are dropped from the model.

The Fragmentation Process is modeled based on the MASTER-8 version of the EVOLVE 4.0 NASA Standard Breakup Model for spacecraft [15]. The number of fragments is determined from a power law distribution characterized by the object masses and the minimum and maximum object sizes. It is well known that the NASA model does not conserve mass, and many workarounds have been proposed. However, for this analysis, the important quantiles are the number of fragments, their diameter distribution, and their velocity distribution.

The number of fragments with size in the range from dMIN (m) to dMAX (m) is given by

Assuming that all collisions are fragmenting (specific kinetic energy of projectile, greater than 40 J/g) and truncating at a minimum fragment size to dMIN and maximum fragment size to dMAX, the cdf for fragment diameter is given by

Area-to-mass ratio is characterized by a bi-normal distribution parametrized based on 5 = log10 (dF) for x = logw(A/MF)

where the parameters a, p1, oi, and a2 are functions of S.

The fragment delta velocity (m/s) is related to the fragment A/M (m2/kg) for fragmenting collisions by

The delta velocity is uniformly distributed over a sphere, added to the state vector for a randomly located object in the original orbit, and the resulting state vector converted to orbital elements to determine the delta altitude and inclination of each fragment relative to the original orbit.

The number of fragments and distributions for the fragment diameters, area-to-mass ratio, and delta altitude are shown in Fig. 3 for dMIN = 0.1 m and dMAX = 3 m. \*\*\*FIGURE 3 OMITTED\*\*\*

3. SIMULATIONS

Monte Carlo simulations are used to characterize the debris population sensitivity to LC orbits and satellite sizes over one hundred years, or until a Kessler Syndrome occurs. The simulation flow is shown in Fig. 4. \*\*\*FIGURE 4 OMITTED\*\*\*Initially, 146 cases were run, a baseline case with the initial object matrices and no new satellite launches, and an additional 145 cases based on 29 configurations (combinations) of small (15 kg), medium (250 kg), and/or large (500 kg) satellites in the three orbits considered. Each configuration results in 5 cases with 10,000, 20,000, 30,000, 40,000, or 50,000 satellites maintained in each orbit. Depending on the case, from 10,000 to 150,000 satellites are maintained in orbit.

The simulation parameters are summarized in Tab. 2. The start year is used to determine the solar flux at each time step, which is used to compute the atmospheric density in Section 2.4.4. The 100-year duration was selected to focus on near-term (in a cosmic sense) events. The time step, altitude bin size, and inclination bin size are selected to provide reasonable simulation times. Reducing the first two by an order of magnitude did not significantly change the results. Reducing the inclination step size by an order of magnitude resulted in an observable increase in the time to Kessler Syndrome but did not change the relative times between cases. LC satellites typically range from 3 to 10 year predicted lifetimes; 5 years is selected as a representative value. The ODMSP [16] requires that LC satellites have a 90% probability of successful post mission disposal with a goal of 99%. The 5% failure rate (95% success rate) is chosen to be in the middle of this range. The small constellation factor is discussed in Section 2.4.5 and avoidance failure rate in Section 2.4.2. Sensitivity analysis was not preformed with respect to the last 4 parameters.

The baseline case does not result in a Kessler Syndrome after 100 years. Tab. 3 shows the time to Kessler syndrome (years) for the remaining 145 cases. There are twenty-nine rows for the configurations and 5 columns for the number of satellites per orbit. The Satellite Size/Orbit columns indicate which orbits are populated for each configuration and with which size satellites: S - small (15 kg), M - medium (250 kg), or L - large (500 kg). For example, the Configuration 1 / 10K case is 10,000 small satellites in 450-km orbits, for that case a Kessler Syndrome did not occur within 100 years. Another example, the Configuration 22 / 30K case is 30,000 small satellites in 450-km orbits and 30,000 medium satellites in 600-km orbits, that case results in Kessler Syndrome in 23.4 years.

It is seen that the number of satellites, the satellite size, and the orbit altitude all matter. None of the cases consisting of only small (15-kg) satellites experiences a Kessler Syndrome within 100 years. This includes the 150,000-satellite case with 50,000 satellites in each orbit. The cases with at least 30,000 medium (250-kg) satellites in the 600-km or 1,200-km orbits experience a Kessler Syndrome within 25 years. The cases with at least 10,000 large (500-kg) satellites in the 600-km or 1,200-km orbits experience a Kessler Syndrome within 12.5 years.

Configurations 28 and 29 are interesting. In Configuration 28, small satellites (15-kg) are maintained in the 450-km orbit and large satellites (500-kg) in the 1,2000-km orbit. In Configuration 29, the sizes are reversed, large in 450km and small in 1,200-km. In both configurations, medium satellites are maintained in the 600-km orbit. The time to Kessler Syndrome for of the numbers of satellites per orbit is from 3 to over 10 times longer for the Configuration 29 cases. All these cases have the same number of satellites and the same total mass in orbit. The only difference is the switch of which orbits the small and large satellites occupy. Clearly, the larger satellites in lower orbit are safer than the larger satellites in higher orbit.

Four cases are explored in more detail. The baseline case in Section 3.1, the 150,000 small satellite case in Section 3.2, the 30,000 medium satellite 600-km orbit case in Section 3.3, and the 10,000 large satellite 1,200-km orbit case in Section 3.4.\*\*\*TABLE 3 OMITTED\*\*\*

3.1 Baseline Case

The time evolution of the baseline case is shown in Fig. 5. The maneuverable (active) satellites (solid lines) completely decay due to the 5-year lifetime model and post mission disposal of maneuverable satellites. The number of rocket bodies (dash-dot-dash line) decreases due to drag and collisions. The number of non-maneuverable (passive) satellites (dashed lines) deceases initially due to decay at the lower altitudes and then stabilizes. The debris (dotted lines) are observed to grow exponentially with an approximately 6-year time constant until the active satellites decay, and then at a much slower rate (approximately 100-year time constant). \*\*\*FIGURE 5 OMITTED\*\*\*

Fig. 6 compares the object fluxes at the start of simulation and at the end, 100 years later. After 100 years, debris growth has increased the number of objects in the orbits that had the higher object concentrations.
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The evolution of objects by altitude in the baseline case is shown in Fig. 7. An interesting feature is the clear indication of the solar cycle in the decay below 400 km. It is also interesting to note the spread of objects into higher orbits over time. As there are no new launches, the only mechanism for this in the model are fragmentation events.
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3.2 150,000 Small Satellites Case (Configuration 19 / 50K)

In this case the LCs consist of 50,000 small satellites in the 450-km orbits, 50,000 small satellites in the 600-km orbits, and 50,000 small satellites in the 1,200-km orbits, for a total of 150,000 satellites. After 100 years, there is little difference in object distribution by orbit compared to the baseline (no new launches) case, as shown in Fig. 8. The additional objects around 1,200 km are from the operational satellites at that orbit, the debris spread around that orbit, and the non-maneuverable satellites decaying from that orbit.
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3.3 30,000 Medium Satellite at 600-km Orbit Case (Configuration 5 / 30K)

In this case the LC consists of 30,000 medium satellites in the 600-km orbits. The result is a Kessler Syndrome in slightly more than 22 years, consuming the satellites in that orbit and creating millions of debris objects. The evolution of the object classes in shown in Fig. 9. The SMM curve jumps to 30,000 at time zero and continues at that level until just before the Kessler Syndrome when the satellites are consumed by the debris. Fragmentation of LC satellites that lose maneuverability due to failures or small object collisions cause the increase in the SNM curve. Fragments from these non-maneuverable satellites as they experience collisions result in the increases of the DL, DM, and DS curves. The approximately 11,000 lethal debris objects at time zero grows to over 33 million at the start of Kessler Syndrome.
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The debris evolution by altitude is shown in Fig. 10. The spike in debris around 600-km leading to the Kessler Syndrome is apparent.
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An interesting question raised by these results - when is the tipping point? Additional simulations were run to address this question for the 30,000 medium satellites in the 600-km orbit case. The previous results showed a Kessler Syndrome occurring in 22 years. Stopping launches after year 15 was found to reliably avoid a Kessler Syndrome within the 100-year simulation time.

Fig. 11 compares the object evolution for the continuous launch and the launch stop after 15 years cases. Note that the time scales are different. The continuous launch case plot ends at the time of Kessler Syndrome while the stop after 15 years case plot continues for 100 years.
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As shown in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13, stopping launches after 20 years delays the Kessler Syndrome by 4 years but does not prevent it - the tipping point has been reached.

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

10,000 Large Satellites in 1,200-km Orbit Case (Configuration 9 / 10K)

In this case the LC consists of 10,000 satellites in the 1,200-km orbit. The result is a Kessler Syndrome in 10 years. The object evolution is shown in Fig. 14. The SML curve jumps to 10,000 at time zero and continues at that level until just before the Kessler Syndrome when the satellites are consumed by the debris. The tail of the curve are the remaining large satellites from the baseline case at orbit altitudes away from the debris spike. Fragmentation of LC satellites that lose maneuverability due to failures or small object collisions cause the increase in the SNL curve.

#### It turns every impact.

Johnson 13 [Les Johnson, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 9-12]

Whatever the initial cause, the result may be the same. A satellite destroyed in orbit will break apart into thousands of pieces, each traveling at over 8 km/sec. This virtual shotgun blast, with pellets traveling 20 times faster than a bullet, will quickly spread out, with each pellet now following its own orbit around the Earth. With over 300,000 other pieces of junk already there, the tipping point is crossed and a runaway series of collisions begins. A few orbits later, two of the new debris pieces strike other satellites, causing them to explode into thousands more pieces of debris. The rate of collisions increases, now with more spacecraft being destroyed. Called the "Kessler Effect", after the NASA scientist who first warned of its dangers, these debris objects, now numbering in the millions, cascade around the Earth, destroying every satellite in low Earth orbit. Without an atmosphere to slow them down, thus allowing debris pieces to bum up, most debris (perhaps numbering in the millions) will remain in space for hundreds or thousands of years. Any new satellite will be threatened by destruction as soon as it enters space, effectively rendering many Earth orbits unusable. But what about us on the ground? How will this affect us? Imagine a world that suddenly loses all of its space technology. If you are like most people, then you would probably have a few fleeting thoughts about the Apollo-era missions to the Moon, perhaps a vision of the Space Shuttle launching astronauts into space for a visit to the International Space Station (ISS), or you might fondly recall the "wow" images taken by the orbiting Hubble Space Telescope. In short, you would know that things important to science would be lost, but you would likely not assume that their loss would have any impact on your daily life. Now imagine a world that suddenly loses network and cable television, accurate weather forecasts, Global Positioning System (GPS) navigation, some cellular phone networks, on-time delivery of food and medical supplies via truck and train to stores and hospitals in virtually every community in America, as well as science useful in monitoring such things as climate change and agricultural sustainability. Add to this the [destruction] ~~crippling~~ of the US military who now depend upon spy satellites, space-based communications systems, and GPS to know where their troops and supplies are located at all times and anywhere in the world. The result is a nightmarish world, one step away from nuclear war, economic disaster, and potential mass starvation.

#### Extinction.

Ilan Noy & Tomáš Uher 22, Chair, Economics of Disasters, Victoria University of Wellington. Professor, Economics, Victoria University of Wellington; Research Fellow, Economics & Finance, Victoria University of Wellington, "Four New Horsemen of An Apocalypse? Solar Flares, Super-Volcanoes, Pandemics, And Artificial Intelligence," Economics of Disasters & Climate Change, 01/15/2022, Springer.

Active regions on the surface of the sun can produce solar flares, which are jets of solar energy and coronal mass ejections (sudden release of plasma accompanied by a magnetic field) (Kahler 1992). These phenomena are produced when local regions of the sun's magnetic field suddenly change configuration (Knipp and Biesecker 2015) and are typically interconnected, occurring within a relatively short period of time. The resulting electromagnetic radiation can create disruptions of the Earth's magnetic field (termed geomagnetic storms), commonly known as “space weather events” (Schwenn 2006).

The most important implication of these events is in terms of disruptions to electricity-powered technology. Due to the global economy’s increasing reliance on such technologies, it has grown increasingly more vulnerable to the impacts of space weather.Footnote1 An extended power outage that lasts for weeks or months, affecting a large population (potentially tens of millions), can easily become a major catastrophe, and even a systemic threat to society.

Societal Impacts of Severe Space Weather and Solar Flares

Space weather events have been associated with a multitude of negative, mainly technological, direct economic consequences such as blocked radio communications, satellite damage and malfunctions, disruption to rail networks and wireless networks, and global navigation systems such as GPS (Cannon et al. 2013; Eroshenko et al. 2010). However, the most consequential possible effect is extensive damage to electricity transformers and therefore potentially long-term disruption to the electricity transmission infrastructure (Khurshid et al. 2020; Kappenman 2012). Such a disruption would cause severe problems with the supply of many basic services, including the access to pumped potable water, and the loss of all perishable foods and medications that depend on refrigeration (National Research Council 2009; Kappenman 2012).

The observed history of space weather in modern economies is very limited. The biggest geomagnetic storm of the last few decades happened in 1989 and caused transformer damage in multiple countries and an approximately 9 h-long power outages for over 6 million inhabitants of Quebec (Lakhina et al. 2004; Barnes and Van Dyke 1990).

The most severe directly observed events were the storms of 1859 (the Carrington Event) and 1921, which were roughly three times as powerful as the 1989 event and are typically considered to be a 1 in a 100-year events (Kappenman 2010). However, since economies at the time were not so dependent on electricity (especially, of course, in 1859), the impact of both these events was much less severe than the impacts of the 1989 event and consisted mostly of disruption to the telegraph service (Boteler 2006).

While these historical events are associated only with relatively mild societal impacts, a similar event today would have severe global consequences. Many of the studies attempting to analyse the future potential impacts of such an event focus on the economic effects associated with major power outages. A study by Kappenman (2010) estimates that a Carrington storm hitting the United States could put more than 200 large power transformers at risk of permanent damage and cause severe damages to the power grid, leading to long-lasting (months or potentially years) blackouts for approximately 130 million people in the US and a full recovery time of 4–10 years. The total cost of a long-term power outage affecting a significant area is estimated at USD 1–2 trillion during the first year (National Research Council 2009).

In a report for Lloyd’s, Maynard et al. (2013) points out that the duration of the power outage depends largely on the availability of spare transformers. These authors estimate that, in the worst-case scenario of no spare transformers, a Carrington-like event would lead to a power outage in the US affecting 20–40 million people and lasting 5 months. They estimate an associated economic loss of USD 0.5–2.6 trillion.Footnote2

Moran et al. (2014) analyse the economic impacts of space weather from a global perspective and conclude that “a severe space-weather event could be the worst natural disaster in modern history” (p. 8). Assuming a power outage lasting 1 year for an event of a magnitude between the 1989 storm and the Carrington event (with annual probability of occurrence likely to be higher than 1%), the authors conclude a major disruption of global supply chains affecting all industries and estimate a global economic loss of up to USD 3.4 trillion (5.6% of global GDP) in the first year.

Oughton et al. (2016) find that an extended power outage in the US caused by a similar space weather event would lead to global economic losses with respect to global supply chain disruptions valued at USD 0.5–2.7 trillion. Using a globally integrated economic model to account for the post-event dynamic responses of global trade, they estimate a decrease of global GDP by up to USD 1.1 trillion over a five-year period. The economic loss to the US manufacturing industry is estimated to be USD 350 billion with approximately half of the losses being indirect (roughly equally split between the losses associated with upstream and downstream disruptions to the supply chain). The losses to the US insurance industry are estimated to be up to USD 334 billion, with 90% of the losses caused by service interruption within property insurance policies.

In another paper, Oughton et al. (2017) suggest that a severe geomagnetic storm, causing a power outage for 66% of the population in the US, would create a daily economic loss of USD 41.5 billion. Approximately half of the total economic loss is estimated to be inflicted indirectly outside of the blackout zone due to supply chain disruptions; Moran et al. (2014) reach similar conclusion for the global economy.

Oughton et al. (2019) estimate an economic impact of a significant geomagnetically-induced power grid failure in the UK and distinguish between scenarios in terms of the ability to forecast the event. They find that a 1 in a 100-year event with the current level of forecasting would cause a GDP loss of GBP 2.9 billion in the UK, but an enhanced forecasting ability based on further investment in this technology would bring the loss down significantly, to GBP 0.9 billion.

In all these modelling exercises, power outages for a significant portion of the population are assumed to lead to cascading effects over many sectors. National Research Council (2009) emphasised banking and finance, government services and emergency response. Eventually, however, all economic sectors would be adversely affected (Moran et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2018). Apart from the sectoral vulnerability to power outages due to the reliance on electricity, Moran et al. (2014) note that the global economic production system today is made even more vulnerable due to the common use of practices such as just-in-time production, reduced inventories, and increased reliance on long-distance supply chains with many links.

More difficult to model, but maybe not less important to evaluate, is the public response to such an event. Hapgood et al. (2021) suggest that a power grid disruption caused by a severe space weather event would lead to panic buying and stockpiling of essential goods such as petrol, bottled water, non-perishable foods, and toilet paper. There could be various flow-on effects from this panic. Ultimately, the longer-term economic consequences of that are unclear.

It is uncontroversial that an extended power outage for a significant portion of the population would lead to disastrous economic impacts. However, the potential of space weather events of the magnitudes discussed above to cause such extended power outages are questioned by studies such as NERC (2010, 2012) and Cannon et al. (2013). They argue that extensive power grid hardware damage is unlikely, and the more probable consequence is a temporary system collapse due to voltage instability. In their view, this will result in only short-term stoppages in electricity supply and thus modest economic consequences.

Superflares

Research focusing on the risk of even more severe space weather events is scarce, partially because there have so far been no direct observations of “superflares” in our solar system. Some evidence suggests that a superflare 100 times stronger than the Carrington event may have happened in AD 775 (Melott and Thomas 2012; Usoskin et al. 2013; Mekhaldi et al. 2015) and may have led to regional changes in the Earth’s surface temperature (Sukhodolov et al. 2017). The nature of this AD 775 event, however, is inconclusive (Cliver et al. 2014; Stephenson 2015; Neuhäuser and Neuhäuser 2015). Another extremely powerful event possibly happened in AD 993 (Miyake et al. 2013; Mekhaldi et al. 2015). Furthermore, astronomical observations of other sun-like stars in our galaxy suggest that such events are indeed possible (Maehara et al. 2012; Nogami et al. 2014).

Lingam and Loeb (2017a) propose that the most powerful superflares might have been the cause of some of the previous mass extinction events and that a very rare superflare with energy 100,000 times larger than the Carrington event might be able to destroy the ozone layer and lead to widespread destruction of ecosystems with potentially existential consequences. In a follow-up paper, Lingam and Loeb (2017b) suggest that the societal vulnerability to superflares in terms of economic damage is increasing rapidly, due to the growth of technological infrastructure. They propose a mitigation strategy of setting up a protective shield between the Earth and the Sun to avoid these dire consequences.

#### Independently, a perfected TCBM controls responses to every risk.

José Monserrat Filho 15. Head of the international Affairs Office of the Ministry of Science and Technology Brazil, Vice President of the Brazilian Association of Air and Space Law, an honorary board member of the International institute of Space Law, member of the Space Law Committee of the International Law Association as well as the International Academy of Astronautics, Professor at the Hague Academy of International Law. 2015. “Earth in Danger and Space Law.” Proceedings of the International Institute of Space Law, edited by Rafael Moro-Aguilar et al., vol. 2015, Eleven International Publishing, pp. 657–674.

We live in “a time of profound transformations to our global context,” stressed Klaus Schwab, Founder and Executive Chairman of the World Economic Forum, during the presentation of the Global Risks Report 2015,4 in Davos, Switzerland. For him, mankind faces the accelerated effects of climate change and the increasing uncertainty about the global geopolitical context. Going further, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Science and Security Board, in a recent analysis, pointed out that “ in 2015, unchecked climate change, global nuclear weapons modernization, and out-sized nuclear weapons arsenals pose extraordinary and undeniable threats to the continued existence of humanity.”5 That led its Doomsday Clock to be advanced by two minutes. Today it marks three minutes to midnight, the moment of the Earth's collapse.

There are many other reports and studies alerting to this catastrophe. Such an immeasurable disaster on Earth may affect all space activities, and their legal achievements. While focusing on outer space and space activities, international space law can be considered not only a probable victim of this disaster, but also an important instrument capable of preventing it. The fundamental 1967 Outer Space Treaty,6 as its Preamble points out, is inspired “ by the great prospects opening up for humanity as a result of man’s entry into outer space” and recognizes “ the common interest of all mankind in the progress of exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.”

This obviously means that the fate of humanity is in the core of its attention. This paper attempts to demonstrate the ability and the need for international space law to face the critical situation of the Earth in extreme danger, including the legal examination and the use of juridical provisions presented in the recommendations of the main scientific documents already drawn up on this transcendental subject. In conclusion, some viable initiatives in the space law field are proposed as contributions to efforts to provide Earth with new guarantees of survival.

I. The Preventive Function of Law

The paper’s proposals raise the opportunity and the need to expand the scope and the objectives of international space law, including in it specific space issues of the Earth and of its life expressions. Furthermore, it is timely to underline that “ in today’s world, the preventive function of law is more vital than ever,” as observed Manfred Lachs (1914-1993) about 28 years ago. For him, it would be necessary for men around the world to feel this reality, “ in order to incite them to abandon something of the parish spirit and give them the feeling of the existence of a common interest, and of responsibility in application of law in the everyday life of nations, as well as to make them understand that, as usually is said, it is worth more act wisely together than commit follies separately,” At the same time, as a notable jurist and thinker, Lachs foresaw the dangers that the Earth is currently experiencing: “Today, it is required to work at a time when science and technology have placed in man’s hands weapons capable of creating a danger to life and even cause total destruction; when modern techniques create other dangers threatening the earth, water and air; when economic and political relations between the states require that a new order abolishes abyss between rich and hungry [...]” .7 If the world already was in great danger in the 1980s, what could be the magnitude of danger today?

II, Poly-Catastrophe

“Dark times [...] are not only not new, they are not a rarity in history,” as Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) observed.8 But today we are certainly living in often darker times. According to the Global Solidarity, Global Responsibility: An Appeal for World Governance - launched in Geneva, Switzerland, on 6 March 2012, and endorsed by the Collegium International members

"we are facing a conjunction of global crises that are unprecedented in history: depletion of natural resources, irreversible destruction of biodiversity, disruption of the global financial system, dehumanization of the international economic system, hunger and food shortages, viral pandemics and breakdown of political orders [...] none of these phenomena can be considered independently of the others. All are highly interconnected, constituting a single ‘poly-crisis’ that threatens the world with a ‘poly-catastrophe’ [...]”

The Appeal stresses that “ the great crises of the 21st century are planetary,” and that “ this is no butterfly effect, but the realization, grave and strong, that our common home is in danger of collapsing and that our salvation can only be collective.”9

III. Our World Today

The new Global Sustainable Development Goals - Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development10 - have been adopted by Heads of State and Government and High Representatives, during the meeting at the United Nations (UN) Headquarters in New York from 25-27 September 2015 - with the UN celebrating its 70th anniversary. Paragraph 14 of this historic document presents the vision of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on the world global situation today, as follows: “We are meeting at a time of immense challenges to sustainable development. Billions of our citizens continue to live in poverty and are denied a life of dignity. There are rising inequalities within and among countries. There are enormous disparities of opportunity, wealth and power. Gender inequality remains a key challenge. Unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, is a major concern. Global health threats, more frequent and intense natural disasters, spiraling conflict, violent extremism, terrorism and related humanitarian crises and forced displacement of people threaten to reverse much of the development progress made in recent decades. Natural resource depletion and adverse impacts of environmental degradation, including desertification, drought, land degradation, freshwater scarcity and loss of biodiversity, add to and exacerbate the list of challenges which humanity faces. Climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time and its adverse impacts undermine the ability of all countries to achieve sustainable development. Increases in global temperature, sea level rise, ocean acidification and other climate change impacts are seriously affecting coastal areas and low-lying coastal countries, including many least developed countries and small island developing States. The survival of many societies, and of the biological support systems of the planet, are at risk.”

“ Climate change will amplify existing risks and create new risks for natural and human systems. Risks are unevenly distributed and are generally greater for disadvantaged people and communities in countries at all levels of development,” as Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says in Climate Change 2014 - Synthesis Report - Summary for Policymakers.11

IV. Care for Our Common Home

Pope Francis in his 2015 Encyclical Letter Laudato Si ~ On Care for Our Common Home - issued in 25 May - makes an “ urgent appeal for a new dialogue about how we are shaping the future of our planet.” According to Pope, “we require a new and universal solidarity,” as “ our present situation is in many ways unprecedented in the history of humanity.”

“ The Earth, our home,” - he stresses - “ is beginning to look more and more like an immense pile of filth,” because “ each year hundreds of millions of tons of waste are generated, much of it non-biodegradable, highly toxic and radioactive, from homes and businesses, from construction and demolition sites, from clinical, electronic and industrial sources.”

Pope Francis also warns:

“A very solid scientific consensus indicates that we are presently witnessing a disturbing warming of the climatic system [...} most of global warming in recent decades is due to the great concentration of greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen oxides and others) released mainly as a result of human activity [...] The problem is aggravated by a model of development based on the intensive use of fossil fuels, which is at the heart of the worldwide energy system. Another determining factor has been an increase in changed uses of the soil, principally deforestation for agricultural purposes.”

“Warming has effects on the carbon cycle. It creates a vicious circle which aggravates the situation even more, affecting the availability of essential resources like drinking water, energy and agricultural production in warmer regions, and leading to the extinction of part of the planet’s biodiversity. If present trends continue, this century may well witness extraordinary climate change and an unprecedented destruction of ecosystems, with serious consequences for all of us,” as “ climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political and for the distribution of goods.”

Moreover, Pope Francis remarks:

“We all know that it is not possible to sustain the present level of consumption in developed countries and wealthier sectors of society, where the habit of wasting and discarding has reached unprecedented levels. The exploitation of the planet has already exceeded acceptable limits and we still have not solved the problem of poverty. ”

“Caring for ecosystems demands far-sightedness, since no one looking for quick and easy profit is truly interested in their preservation. But the cost of the damage caused by such selfish lack of concern is much greater than the economic benefits to be obtained,” points out Pope Francis, And he adds that “ the alliance between the economy and technology ends up sidelining anything unrelated to its immediate interests.”

“The failure of global summits on the environment makes it plain that our politics are subject to technology and finance. There are too many special interests, and economic interests easily end up trumping the common good and manipulating information so that their own plans will not be affected.”

“ It is foreseeable that, once certain resources have been depleted, the scene will be set for new wars, albeit under the guise of noble claims. War always does grave harm to the environment and to the cultural riches of peoples, risks which are magnified when one considers nuclear arms and biological weapons [...] Politics must pay greater attention to foreseeing new conflicts and addressing the causes which can lead to them. But powerful financial interests prove most resistant to this effort, and political planning tends to lack breadth of vision.” 52

Wouldn’t these observations also applicable to outer space?

V. The Tragedy f Common Goods

To explain how we arrived to it at current bad situation of the common resources of Earth, Eduardo Felipe P. Matias recalls the article Tragedy of Common Goods, written in 1968 by American ecologist Garrett Hardin (1915-2003). Hardin recounts the case of a village of shepherds, whose sheep used a pasture in common. Each shepherd was engaged in putting more and more sheep in the pasture in order to increase his income. Over time, the pasture was saturated, and there was no pasture left to feed all the sheep. Most of them died. In sum, a tragedy. The shepherds abused the common good to increase their individual gains, ignoring the limits of nature. Although they gained more in short term, they lost out in long run. Already in 1999, it was recognized that “ a globalized world requires a theory of global public goods to achieve crucial goals such as financial stability, human security or the reduction of environmental pollution.” And that “many of today’s international crises have their roots in a serious under supply of global public goods.” 13

As to global human security as a public good, the 1994 Human Development Report has showed threats to world peace in transborder challenges: unchecked population growth, disparities in economic opportunities, environmental degradation, excessive international migration, narcotics production and trafficking and international terrorism,” It was equally said that the society would be “willing to pay for public goods that serve our common interest, be they shared systems of environmental controls, the destruction of nuclear weapons, the control of transmittable diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS, the preservation of ethnic conflicts or the reduction of refugee flows,” 14

Addressing the present question of common goods in his 2015 Encyclical Letter, Pope Francis points out:

“Whether believers or not, we are agreed today that the Earth is essentially a shared inheritance, whose fruits are meant to benefit everyone. Hence every ecological approach needs to incorporate a social perspective which takes into account the fundamental rights of the poor and the underprivileged. The principle of the subordination of private property to the universal destination of goods, and thus the right of everyone to their use, is a golden rule of social conduct He also notes that “ the natural environment is a collective good, the patrimony of all humanity and the responsibility of everyone. If we make something our own, it is only to administer it for the good of all. If we do not, we burden our consciences with the weight of having denied the existence of others.”

Antonio Cassese (1937-2011) commented that “ the concept of ‘common good’ is not yet felt by the members of the international society. Only state interests and their occasional convergence regulate international relations.” 15 The refugees tragedy in Europe today proves it.

VI. Uncertainty

According to Klaus Schwab, Executive Chairman of World Economic Forum, “ in the coming decade [...] our lives will be even more intensely shaped by transformative forces that are under way already. The effects of climate change are accelerating and the uncertainty about the global geopolitical context and the effects it will have on international collaboration will remain. At the same time, societies are increasingly under pressure from economic, political and social developments including rising income inequality, but also increasing national sentiment [...] [N]ew technologies, such as the Internet or emerging innovations will not bear fruit if regulatory mechanisms at the international and national levels cannot be agreed upon.”

The Global Risks Report 2015, in turn, stresses: “ 2015 differs markedly from the past, with rising technological risks, notably cyber-attacks, and new economic realities, which remind us that geopolitical tensions present themselves in a very different world from before. Information flows instantly around the globe and emerging technologies have boosted the influence of new players and new types of warfare [...] Past warnings of potential environmental catastrophes have begun to be borne out, yet insufficient progress has been made - as reflected in the high concerns about failure of climate-change adaptation and looming water crises in this year’s report.”

The Report sees three risk constellations that bear out its findings:

“ 1) The interconnections between geopolitics and economics are intensifying because States are making greater use of economic tools, from regional integration and trade treaties to protectionist policies and cross-border investments, to establish relative geopolitical power. This threatens to undermine the logic of global economic cooperation and potentially the entire international rulebased system;

2) The world is in the middle of a major transition from predominantly rural to urban living, with cities growing most rapidly in Asia and Africa. If managed well, this will help to incubate innovation and drive economic growth. However, our ability to address a range of global risks - including climate change, pandemics, social unrest, cyber threats and infrastructure development - will largely be determined by how well cities are governed; and

3) The pace of technological change is faster than ever. Disciplines such as synthetic biology and artificial intelligence are creating new fundamental capabilities, which offer tremendous potential for solving the world’s most pressing problems. At the same time, they present hard-to-foresee risks. Oversight mechanisms need to more effectively balance likely benefits and commercial demands with a deeper consideration of ethical questions and medium to long-term risks - ranging from economic to environmental and societal. Mitigating, preparing for and building resilience against global risks is long and complex, something often recognized in theory but difficult in practice.”

How to govern the emerging technologies and uncertainties?

VII. The Doomsday Clock

It is a symbolic clock face, marking countdown to doomsday. On 19 January 2015, it went on to score 23:57h, three minutes to midnight - the time of global catastrophe able to extinguish the human species inhabiting the Earth for many thousands of years. The decision to advance the clock by two minutes was taken after consultations with more than 20 scientists, including 17 Nobel laureates, among them famous physicists, such as the British Stephen Hawking, the Japanese Masatoshi Koshiba, pioneer in the study of neutrinos, and the American Leon Lederman. The clock has been maintained since 1947 - when the Cold War between the USA and the former USSR began - by the members of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Science and Security Board. In 68 years, this sui generis indicator has been adjusted 22 times. Its worst moment came in 1953, triggered by American and Soviet tests with hydrogen weapons when the Clock scored 23:58h.

The Clock was conceived by the celebrated Chicago Atomic Scientists, that had actively participated in the Manhattan Project in the creation of the atomic bombs launched over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, in August 1945. Haunted with these bombings - that killed more than 100,000 people just on the first day, and many more in the following months - they started to publish a mimeographed warning newsletter and then the Bulletin. The closer they set the Clock to midnight, the closer the scientists believe the world is to a global disaster.

The Clock hangs on a wall in a Bulletin's office in the University of Chicago. Originally, it represented an analogy to the threat of global nuclear war. But since 2007 it has also reflected climate change, and new developments in the life sciences and technology that could inflict irrevocable harm to humanity.

The analysis of the Bulletin - addressed “to the leaders and citizens of the world” - says in sum: “ In 2015, unchecked climate change, global nuclear weapons modernizations, and out-sized nuclear weapons arsenals pose extraordinary and undeniable threats to the continued existence of humanity.” The group said in a statement: “ [Wjorld leaders have failed to act with the speed or on the scale required to protect citizens from potential catastrophe. These failures of political leadership endanger every person on Earth.” In 2014, with the Doomsday Clock at five minutes to midnight, the members of the Science and Security Board concluded their assessment of the world security situation by writing: “We can manage our technology, or become victims of it. The choice is ours, and the Clock is ticking.”

In 2015, with the Clock hand moved forward to three minutes to midnight, the Bulletin feels compelled to add, with a sense of great urgency: “The probability of global catastrophe is very high, and the actions needed to reduce the risks of disaster must be taken very soon.”

In face of the dangers affecting today civilization on a global scale, the Bulletin urges the citizens of the world to demand that their leaders, among other measures, "dramatically reduce proposed spending on nuclear weapons modernization programs” , as “ the USA and Russia have hatched plans to essentially rebuild their entire nuclear triads in coming decades, and other countries with nuclear weapons are following suit.”

At the start of 2015, nine States - the USA, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea) - possessed about 15,850 nuclear weapons, of which 4,300 were deployed with operational forces. Roughly 1800 of these weapons are kept in a state of high operational alert, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Launched on 15 June 2015, the SIPRI Yearbook 2015, which assesses the current state of armament, disarmament and international security, notes as one of its key findings that “ all the nuclear weapon-possessing states are working to develop new nuclear weapon systems and/or upgrade their existing ones.” 16

“There are too many nuclear weapons,” said Sharon Squassoni, an expert in nuclear weapons nonproliferation at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, USA. And she added: “The existence of these weapons takes a lot of time, effort, and money to keep them safe, and the bureaucracies are poised to keep these systems going indefinitely.” 17

For Hans M Kristensen, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, “ the projected costs of the nuclear weapons modernization program are indefensible, and they undermine the global disarmament regime.” 18

That is why another demand from Bulletin, addressed to world leaders, is to “ re-energize the disarmament process.” In practice it means that “ the USA and Russia, in particular, need to start negotiations on shrinking their strategic and tactical nuclear arsenals.”

The creation of “ institutions specifically assigned to explore and address potentially catastrophic misuses of new technologies,” is also a requirement proposed by the Bulletin.

The Bulletin’s appeals are also, to some extent, applicable to outer space, and some of its requirements can be objects of proper regulation by international space law.

VIII. Transparency and Confidence

The Earth being in danger, the transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) are as vital as those of collective security. These actions are means by which Governments can share information aiming at creating mutual understanding and trust, reducing misconceptions and miscalculations and thereby helping both to prevent military confrontation and to foster regional and global stability. They played an important role during the Cold War, contributing to reducing the risk of armed conflict through mitigating misunderstandings on military actions, particularly in situations where States lacked clear and timely information.19 The need for such measures in outer space activities has increased significantly over the past 20 years, The world’s growing dependence on space-based systems and technologies and the information they provide requires collaborative efforts to address threats to the sustainability and security of outer space activities. TCBMs “ can reduce, or even eliminate, misunderstandings, mistrust and miscalculations with regard to the activities and intentions of States in outer space” , This is the conclusion of the Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on TCBMs in Outer Space Activities - a study adopted by consensus and issued on 29 July 2013.20

The Report adds that “ these measures can augment the safety, sustainability and security of day-to-day space operations and can contribute both to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples.”

It is acknowledged that “ the existing treaties on outer space contain several TCBMs of a mandatory nature. Non-legally binding measures for outer space activities should complement the existing international legal framework on space activities and should not undermine existing legal obligations or ham per the lawful use of outer space, particularly by emerging space actors.” The Group also discussed other measures, including those of a legally binding nature. The Group further agreed that “ such measures for outer space activities could contribute to, but not act as a substitute for, measures to monitor the implementation of arms limitation and disarmament agreements,” help States to enhance clarity of their peaceful intentions and create conditions for establishing a predictable strategic situation in both the economic and security arenas.

Similarly, included in the Report were "coordination and consultative mechanisms aimed at improving interaction between participants in outer space activities and clarifying information and ambiguous situations.” Likewise the Report recommended a coordination between the Office for Disarmament Affairs, the Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA) and other appropriate UN entities. Moreover, the Report drafted “ a series of measures for outer space activities, including exchange of information relating to national space policy such as major military expenditure in outer space, notifications of outer space activities aimed at risk reduction, and visits to space launch sites and facilities.”

The Group took note of the “Guidelines for appropriate types of confidencebuilding measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level” , as contained in the “ Study on the application of confidence- building measures in outer space”21

TCBMs for outer space activities are integrated in a broader context. The UN General Assembly endorsed, in its resolution 43/78 H, the guidelines on confidence- building measures adopted by the Disarmament Commission at its 1988 session. This resolution noted that “ confidence-building measures, while neither a substitute nor a precondition for arms limitation and disarmament measures, can be conducive to achieving progress in disarmament” .

The Report indicates the following categories of TCBMs for space activities as relevant: “ a) General transparency and confidence-building measures aimed at enhancing the availability of information on the space policy of States involved in outer space activities; b) Information exchange about development programs for new space systems, as well as information about operational space-based systems providing widely used services such as meteorological observations or global positioning, navigation and timing; c) The articulation of a State’s principles and goals relating to their exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes; d) Specific information-exchange measures aimed at expanding the availability of information on objects in outer space and their general function, particularly those objects in Earth orbits; e) Measures related to establishing norms of behavior for promoting spaceflight safety such as launch notifications and consultations that aim at avoiding potentially harmful interference, limiting orbital debris and mini mizing the risk of collisions with other space objects; f) International cooperation measures in outer space activities, including measures aimed at promoting capacity-building and disseminating data for sustainable economic and social development, that are consistent with existing international commitments and obligations.

In fact, some TCBMs for outer space activities have already been enacted at the multilateral and/or the national level. They include pre-launch notifications, space situational awareness data-sharing, notifications of hazards to spaceflight safety and other significant events, and the publication of national space policies. But they need to be further developed.

IX. Common Law of Mankind and Earth

More than ever, it is time to think big. International space law is usually defined as dealing with outer space, celestial bodies - Moon and asteroids, Mars and other planets as well as with the space activities which so far are carried out only by the human species from the planet Earth, However, the very specific situation of Earth as celestial body responsible for the creation and development of the international space law is not taken into the due consideration. Earth is not recognized as one of the main objectives of this branch of law.

Ironically, in this context, we could say that the international space law takes care of the solar system and the universe as a whole, minus of Earth, although it is the cradle of the exploration and use of outer space in general, and, therefore, of international space law.

Let’s take just two examples. “At its broadest, space law comprises all the law that may govern or apply to outer space and activities in and relating to outer space,” write Francis Lyall and Paul B. Larsen.22 In the same sense, the Education Curriculum of Space Law, adopted by United Nations Office For Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), on March, 2014, states that “ space law can be described as the body of law applicable to and governing space related activities.”23

Nevertheless, the Outer Space Treaty, of 1967, has, at least, two extremely important norms for the security of Earth and its inhabitants in Articles IV and IX, respectively: 1) “not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction,” and 2) to avoid “harmful contamination and adverse changes in the environment of the Earth resulting from introduction of extraterrestrial matter.” The sky always has played a crucial role in the evolution of mankind and all life manifestations on Earth. However, today the importance of outer space to our planet and its common life has increased as never before. The data coming from satellites are absolutely fundamental for any efforts to assure the sustainability of Earth and all its life expressions. In this global reality it is sheer recklessness to ignore the imperative of protecting our planet and its population, based on inclusive international space legislation. Hence the necessity of a Common Law of Mankind24 and Earth, specially related with international space law.

More and more, outer space protection25 must be seen as an indispensable factor to Earth protection, and vice-verse. As the globalization of Earth - with the interdependence of physical, social and political events - is more than ever recognized as an undeniable fact, the universalization of outer space {its cosmic reach), with the interconnection of everything with everything, cannot be bypassed, as it has been in the past. As Ervin Laszlo remarks, “ the reality we call universe is a seamless whole, evolving over eons of cosmic time and producing conditions where life, and then mind and consciousness can emerge.”26 Or, as Edgar Morin says, “we carry inside of us all the cosmos” and “we are all children of the sun.”27

X. It Is up to International Space Law

If we are really determined to avoid a likely apocalypse visible on the horizon, one of the main tasks of the international space law that we must trigger is to help save the Earth from space, using the powerful scientific and technological resources we have installed there.

Centuries ago Earth ceased to be the center of the universe, as our ancestors thought. But in face of unprecedented global dangers that threaten our planet today, its place cannot be other than the center of our universal concerns. Probably, a collapse of Earth would deprive the universe of a specie of intelligent life.

In reality, as Jonathan Schell (1943-2014) pointed out, “ the vision that counts is the view from Earth, from life,” as “ from our strategic position on Earth different view opens, bigger even than the one taken from space. It is the vision of our children and grandchildren, of all future generations of mankind, stretching ahead of us into the future.”28

The question, as posed by Antonio Cassese, is that “ international society is still grounded in the mere juxtaposition of its subjects - not in their solidarity, let alone in their integration.” 29

In any event, “ from the microbes inhabiting the earth beneath our feet to environments of the universe unknown to us now, the next 100 years of ecological discoveries will influence our lives. We enter a time when society is armed with the scientific knowledge and ability to make responsible decisions,” as a recent editorial of Science affirms.30 And with “ a new human consciousness ” , as says Edgar Morin.31

So, “ the choice is our: form a global partnership to care for Earth and one another or risk the destruction of ourselves and the diversity of life,” according to The Earth Charter.32

The current global situation seems to be so serious that the titanic work of saving mankind and our planet can be seen as a kind of utopia, maybe the major utopia of all times. A dream still far from having a general support. Coincidentally we’ll commemorate in 2016 the 500 years since the English humanist and statesman Thomas More (1478-1535) published his Utopia„ considered “ a playfully serious social critique to a social reality deadly and tragically grave.”33

In this context, it is urgent to build a positive agenda for the international space law.

### Solvency

The plan streamlines NATO cooperation over non-kinetic ASATs---US leadership ensures threat assessments and military exercises, vital for allied planning and collective deterrence.

Frank A. Rose 20. Senior fellow and the co-director of the Center for Security, Strategy, and Technology in the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution. While at Brookings, he focused of nuclear strategy and deterrence, arms control, strategic stability, missile defense, space security, and emerging security challenges. “NATO and outer space: Now what?.” Brookings. 4-22-2020. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/04/22/nato-and-outer-space-now-what/ //EM [IC = intelligence community]

THE EMERGING ANTI-SATELLITE THREAT

The threat to U.S. and allied space systems from anti-satellite weapons continues to grow. As former Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats noted in testimony before Congress in January 2019: “China and Russia are training and equipping their military space forces and fielding new anti-satellite weapons to hold U.S. and allied space systems at risk.” Coats’ testimony is complemented by numerous reports and studies by government and non-governmental organizations like the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Air and Space Intelligence Center, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Secure World Foundation.

NATO has also been the victim of real-world anti-satellite activities. In March 2019, the Norwegian government accused Russia of “harassing” communications systems during NATO exercises. Recent press reporting notes that the Norwegian Intelligence Service has documented a number of incidents in which “GPS signals and other secured communications between the Norwegian Armed forces, or NAF, units engaged in exercises were subjected to ‘blocking’ measures from sites located in Russia.” And just last week, U.S. Space Command released a statement claiming that on April 15th, Russia had conducted a direct-ascent anti-satellite missile test. Faced with these real threats, how should NATO respond?

IMPROVE INTELLIGENCE-SHARING

Collective action by NATO on outer space security issues will only happen when allies reach a consensus on the anti-satellite threat. As a first step, an appropriate organization at NATO (e.g., the Assistant Secretary General for Intelligence) should be directed to develop a comprehensive assessment of the anti-satellite threat to the alliance.

To be successful, this effort will require the full support of the U.S. intelligence community. Additionally, NATO officials should ensure relevant alliance political and military bodies (e.g., the North Atlantic Council, Military Committee, Senior Political Committee, and Defense Policy and Planning Committee) receive regular updates on the anti-satellite threat.

MAINSTREAM OUTER SPACE AT NATO

NATO should ensure that outer space is “mainstreamed” and fully integrated within alliance political and military institutions, and is not treated as merely a “novelty item.” For instance, overall responsibility for outer space should be placed in an organization like the Office of the Assistant Secretary General for Defense Policy and Planning, or the Office of the Assistant Secretary General for Defense Investment, which are responsible for defense policy, planning, and capability investment at NATO. Furthermore, noting the interrelationship between outer space and other domains like nuclear and cyber, NATO will need to establish mechanisms that encourage effective coordination and cooperation across the entire organization, including the military commands.

At the operational level, the alliance should ensure that outer space is incorporated in its major military exercises and wargames. This is critical because if NATO ever comes into a major conflict with Russia, one of Russia’s first targets would be the alliance’s space assets and space-derived information. Therefore, it is important for NATO to conduct its exercises with this in mind. Allied Command Transformation, NATO’s warfare development command, should be tasked to make this a reality.

If NATO ever comes into a major conflict with Russia, one of Russia’s first targets would be the alliance’s space assets.

ENSURE COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE UNITED STATES

At the end of the day, NATO’s ultimate effectiveness in outer space will depend on its cooperation with the alliance’s most important space power: the United States. To date, U.S. leadership has been the key driver of NATO decision-making on outer space, and senior U.S. officials have actively engaged the alliance leadership. For example, in October 2019, General John Raymond, commander of U.S. Space Command and chief of space operations, briefed the NATO Military Committee on outer space security issues. These types of senior-level engagements between U.S. political and military leaders should continue and be expanded.

In addition to senior-level engagements, there are a number of other actions NATO and the United States could take to improve cooperation and coordination. Specifically, they should establish clear consultative mechanisms between NATO, U.S. Space Command, and the U.S. Space Force. One relatively easy step that could be taken quickly would be to establish a NATO liaison officer at U.S. Space Command and/or U.S. Space Force headquarters. Indeed, a number of allied officers are currently attached as liaisons at several U.S. combatant commands like U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM).

The United States should also seek to incorporate NATO representatives into its outer space-related wargames where possible, especially the Schriever Wargame, the premier U.S. space wargame. According to a U.S. Air Force press release, several allies including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan, have participated in previous Schriever Wargames. The United States should invite NATO political and military officials to participate in the next Schriever Wargame.

COOPERATE WITH THE EU

NATO should also explore ways to cooperate with the EU on outer space, primarily because the EU has developed and deployed the Galileo global navigation satellite system, which like the U.S. Global Position System (GPS), provides accurate positioning and timing information. In particular, Galileo includes a capability known as the Public Regulated Service (PRS), an encrypted navigation service for governmental authorized users and sensitive applications that require high continuity. In a crisis situation, PRS could provide NATO important redundancy against an adversary’s attempt to jam or destroy GPS. While many members of NATO are also members of the EU and have access to PRS, non-EU NATO members, and NATO as an organization, currently does not. Therefore, NATO should begin consultations with the EU about the possibility of gaining access to PRS for the alliance.

DON’T FORGET DIPLOMACY

Military solutions alone will not allow the United States and its allies to address the increasing anti-satellite threat. While I have generally supported many of the Trump administration’s space security initiatives like the re-establishment of U.S. Space Command, a key element missing from the Trump administration’s outer space security strategy has been the complete lack of a diplomatic component. Without a more comprehensive strategy that includes a strong diplomatic element, it will make it difficult for NATO to maintain enough political cohesion to pursue effective military policies. These tensions were highlighted in a recent article that noted: “With the exception of France and the United Kingdom, many Europeans countries are deeply uncomfortable with, or down right opposed to, the development and use of weapons in space.”

This is not a problem unique to outer space. Throughout its history, there has been constant tension within NATO over the appropriate balance between defense and diplomacy in its strategy. Since the late 1960s, with the approval of the Harmel Report, named after former Belgian foreign minister Pierre Harmel, NATO has sought to more effectively balance some of the inherent tensions between defense and diplomacy. One of the key findings from the Harmel Report was that “military security and a policy of détente are not contradictory but complementary.” Arms control was considered an essential element of this strategy. The general Harmel Report approach has shaped the key strategic decisions that the alliance has taken over the past 50 years, most notably the “Double-Track” decision in 1979 to deploy intermediate-range nuclear forces in Western Europe, while simultaneously engaging the Soviet Union in arms control negotiations.

As part of its overall strategy for outer space, NATO should develop options and recommendations on how it can advance diplomatic solutions to address the emerging threat to outer space systems. In particular, NATO should task the Arms Control and Disarmament Committee to examine what role the alliance could play in developing norms of behavior to encourage responsible use of outer space. And even though the Trump administration has generally been opposed to arms control, it has expressed openness to the development of norms for outer space. In an recent speech, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Ford stated: “We clearly need to do more to develop non-legally–binding international norms of responsible behavior that are complementary to the existing legal regime.”

U.S. LEADERSHIP WILL BE KEY

With the increasing role that outer space is playing in military operations, and the rise of the anti-satellite threat, NATO was correct in its decision to declare space as an operational domain in December 2019. The question now is whether the alliance will be able to translate this broad political guidance into an effective strategy.

An effective NATO strategy for outer space will depend on the ability of the alliance to build consensus on the threat; mainstream outer space into NATO’s political and military institutions; find ways to cooperate with the EU; and incorporate diplomacy into that strategy. But at the end of the day, all of this will require clear, sustained, and consistent U.S. leadership.

## Info Warfare

### 2NC -- Ext: Info Warfare Link

#### The expansion of information gathering and securing capabilities securitizes the threat of disinformation and militarizes the use of the cyberspace - it justifies crackdowns on “disinformation” that is used to shut down capitalism AND target “demographic bulges” that, according to the US, are perpetrators of extinction - this regime of fear and control re-intrenches society in authoritarianism - turns democracy and makes the threat of extinction inevitable

#### 1 - Information security and its justification is a vehicle for capitalism. Companies use their intel and data to shut down capitalist opposition.

Van der Pijl ’18 [Kees; January; Chair of International Relations and the University of Sussex, Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE), President of the Committee of Vigilance against Resurgent Facism; Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis; “Introduction,” p. 6] SPark

The Post-Cold War, global intelligence infrastructure that grew out of it was then applied to a key problem big capital faced after the collapse of the USSR triggered a global restructuring of production: the existence of a billion-size surplus population, a reserve army of labour for which no employment was to be expected. This required devising control strategies of various types. After 9/11, the NeoCons revived the War on Terror concept to stir and then repress segments of this vast reserve army of labour, developing the notion of Total Information Awareness to allow it to know in advance, not just the intentions of rival states ranged against the West or just insufficiently submissive, but more particularly, the potential systemic opposition to capitalism at home and abroad. Using double agent tactics as well as provocation and targeted assassination, this has created the condition of endless war and a politics of fear sustaining it. Politics and society today operate under a permanent state of exception in which the Internet has been turned into a vast search engine on the lookout for meaningful opposition. Meanwhile in the name of weeding out ‘fake news’, the big Internet companies such as Google have changed their algorithms to prevent Left websites from popping up in searches by the public: the World Socialist Website, Global Research, and others, have already experienced sharp declines in numbers of visitors (Tveten 2018: 22). Facebook takes orders from the United States and Israeli governments to remove accounts (Greenwald 2017). Why do these large Internet companies collaborate, and why do they collaborate with these two governments specifically? That is what I intend the clarify in the pages that follow.

#### 2 - Turns Case - Securitization of information causes violent regimes of fear and control – war on terror proves

Van der Pijl ’18 [Kees; January; Chair of International Relations and the University of Sussex, Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE), President of the Committee of Vigilance against Resurgent Facism; Surveillance Capitalism and Crisis; “Introduction,” p. 5] SPark

The United States has sought to turn its historic advantage of hosting the world’s key IT industries into a competitive advantage. Profiting from its military pre-eminence, its role as the provider of the world’s reserve currency, and enjoying the privilege of running permanent budget, commercial, and current account deficits, the US worked with the IT firms to establish a global security state grounded in ‘Total Information Awareness’. This is the link between the surveillance regime (which includes the voluntary deposition of personal data in social media) and the War on Terror. On the basis of its information advantage, the United States keeps global society in a state of tension by a range of military and intelligence activities targeting ‘demographic bulges’ in the reserve army of labour. In the process, even risking or provoking acts of violence against US/Western targets is part of the scenario because this allows armed control to be imposed. A domestic politics of fear has been deployed to win public support.

All this was explicitly discussed as a single project in the Israeli-US NeoCon discussions on a War on Terror. It was originally worked out in the early 1980s and revived after the Twin Towers attacks on 9/11, combining the attack on terrorists with pre-emptive war against ‘states supporting terror’ as well as imposing the corollary surveillance regime and suspending a range of freedoms on the home front.

Ultimately the doctrine behind the global strategy of tension entails the explicit option and regular practice of targeted assassination of opponents. ‘The subliminal purpose of terror tactics,’ Douglas Valentine argues in his book on the ‘Phoenix’ assassination programme in Vietnam, ‘was to drive people into a state of infantile dependence. In this sense, the CIA psy[chological] war[fare] experts were not exorcists come to heal Vietnam and liberate it from Communist demons; their spells were meant to break up the society and project its repressed homicidal impulses onto the Communists’ (Valentine 2000: 63, emphasis added). This insight still today applies to the condition of Western society in the War on Terror. As Dominick Jenkins observes, the Bush administration began the practice of making al-Qaeda a blank screen for the people’s fears; the spectacular theatrics of the Twin Towers collapses was exploited to show ‘the existence of a new kind of terrorist network with the power to threaten civilisation itself’ (Jenkins 2002: 265).

#### 3 - Turns case - Capitalism undermines democracy through redundancy and inefficiency – it causes further data and security breaches as well as destroying all liberal values

Cong ’18 [Wanshu; September 30; Faculty of Law at European University Institute - Department of Law (LAW), Global Academic Fellow at The University of Hong Kong; “Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism?” p. 13-14] SPark

But the sort of democracy driven by financial capitalism cannot be more socially and politically-detached. Under financial capitalism, corporations compete no longer on the basis of their manufacturing capacities but their stock values, “immediately through gimmicks and trickery, but more basically through firing workers, moving production, and raiding pension funds”. 26 Connected to the expansion of the global value chains, manufacturing is outsourced to overseas and organized at a global level that further separates the labour supply and consumption. Financialized companies thrive fast and collapse even faster, unable to provide long-term employment and other benefits to the employees while benefiting the corporate managers who cannot consume their incomes and must reinvest the money. The pathology of the neoliberal, financial capitalism is a much-discussed subject. Suffice it to say here that the interdependent and reciprocal relationship between capitalist economy and people that gave favourable conditions for democracy is significantly undermined and reaches to a breaking point. The break of the positive and reciprocal interdependence further deprives people of the means of production and alienates people from the commodities that bear capital value, as the generation and accumulation of financial capital is largely independent from the work and consumption of the wage-labour. Without the need to rely on the masses, financial capitalism successfully removes its social-embeddedness and detaches itself from democratic regulatory frameworks.27 The change of the means and relationship of production has also profoundly weakened the bargaining power of the masses. 28 Furthermore, it is also increasingly difficult to form meaningful labour movements that push forward institutional changes for common good and public interest, as people in the neoliberal and consumerist age are left to take care of themselves, in the name of so-called self-development or self-entrepreneurship. 29

One consequence of the undermining of the reciprocal interdependence is the deepening of socioeconomic inequalities which neoliberal governments retreat from dealing with. Socioeconomic inequalities cause serious problem to democracy, as they lead to unequal political participation and more selective political representation. 30 That socioeconomic inequalities lead to political inequalities can be vividly testified by the turnout rates and demographics of the elections in the western countries of recent years.31 They also form the large social background of the recent scandals about cyber security breaches, data breaches and fake news in elections. It can therefore be argued that the current democratic crisis is deeply rooted in the economic structure and relationship of production of the neoliberal financial capitalism.

### Info Warfare Link Ext. Cards

#### The impacts the aff attempt to avoid occur due to capitalism

Horowitz 22 [Eli Horowitz, 6-26-2022, "Capitalism Is the Real Information War," MR Online, https://mronline.org/2022/06/26/capitalism-is-the-real-information-war/, DOA: 7-6-2022, SMarx, JTong]

Looking Ahead: The Future of Capitalist Lies

Resurgent labor unions can act as a partial solution to these problems—that is, assuming that workers do not believe the lies that companies tell about them. Still, the truly grim thing is that the problems exist—and are so deeply integrated into our way of life—in the first place. Let us be brutally honest: our economic system is so completely saturated with deceit that it is impossible to imagine a version of it that we could actually trust. The examples above are just the tiniest sliver of what we already know about capitalism’s assault on knowledge, and what we know is only a fraction of the whole truth. Even when we aren’t being actively lied to, misled, confused, or distracted, we have to struggle to find important information because capitalist investors go out of their way to hamstring the organizations that are supposed to keep us informed.

In recent years, philosophers have begun to discuss what they call epistemic harms. As they see it, an epistemic harm is something that interferes with our ability to know or reason. Under capitalism, we suffer not just epistemic harms but epistemic aggression, that is, intentional, targeted acts of epistemic interference that are aimed at achieving dominance. Indeed, given how broadly and how routinely capitalist agents lie, we should all consider ourselves to be belligerents in an epistemic battle—or, to repurpose Alex Jones’s phrase, an information war.

And it’s not getting better. As we develop more advanced forms of communication and more reliable knowledge about how humans form beliefs, capitalists race to invent new forms of deception. Corporate propagandists quickly learned to take advantage of influencers and streamers. Thanks to advances in information technology, scams are now automated, cons are data-driven, and profitable hoaxes spread algorithmically. As deepfakes proliferate and virtual worlds blend with the physical one, the potential for capitalistic dishonesty will only grow.

Nor are capitalists satisfied with lying their way to the top of the digital world. They aim to expand their influence in the physical world by forming privately owned cities, replacing the public courts with their own private arbitration system, and perfecting the gatekeeping mechanisms that punish us for being anything other than productive, compliant subjects. If corporations can succeed in replacing public and community services with capitalist surrogates, they can redefine every part of our lives, changing the very meanings of the words and concepts that structure our reality.

#### The epistemology of the affirmative is grounded in lies and deception as a result from capitalism

Horowitz 22 [Eli Horowitz, 6-26-2022, "Capitalism Is the Real Information War," MR Online, https://mronline.org/2022/06/26/capitalism-is-the-real-information-war/, DOA: 7-6-2022, SMarx, JTong]

In the foreword to Last Dance, Last Chance, Ann Rule meditates on the nature of liars. “Once a lie is successful,” she says, “it grows and multiplies, burnished and perfected until it works every time. It’s a sad irony that the more honest a potential victim is, the more innocent, the more likely such a person is to become prey. Honest people don’t expect to be lied to, because they wouldn’t lie to someone else. That doesn’t matter at all to dedicated liars. They only smile.” As a true-crime writer, Rule was talking about murderers, kidnappers, and other violent offenders. But she could just as easily have been talking about corporations.

Under capitalism, corporate dishonesty has become so commonplace that most of us take it for granted. In doing so, however, we’ve allowed ourselves to become numb to the breathtaking scale and bottomless arrogance of corporate deception. To be blunt, capitalism wages a constant, active, ever-evolving war against knowledge and reason. Not only are we constantly deluged by false and misleading advertisements for goods, services, and even jobs, we’ve been sold ideals that do not and cannot exist, told to navigate a supply and demand system that’s been maliciously bent out of shape, and led astray on crucial matters of public interest by industry-backed disinformation campaigns. Capitalism even interferes with language itself, hindering our fundamental ability to name our world and cooperate with one another in order to bring about a better one. What’s more, these aren’t rare or abnormal events. Once you stop taking all of this for granted, the list of ways in which capitalists lie is frighteningly endless.

#### Turns Case – the aff’s impacts only occur through a continuation of capitalist society

Horowitz 22 [Eli Horowitz, 6-26-2022, "Capitalism Is the Real Information War," MR Online, https://mronline.org/2022/06/26/capitalism-is-the-real-information-war/, DOA: 7-6-2022, SMarx, JTong]

False Names: “Procrustics” and the Capitalist Attack on Free Communication

In an ideal world, all of these nefarious tactics would be met by a robust response from governments, researchers, nonprofits, and the press. But we are not living in an ideal world. If anything, the opposite is closer to the truth: under capitalism, we are fast approaching dystopia.

Stanislaw Lem, the Polish science-fiction master, foresaw our situation in a way that no other writer did. In his 1958 novel Eden, he proposed a method by which a tyrant could achieve total, permanent control over a populace—but without the use of jails, guards, or even constant surveillance. He called this method procrustics, and he described it like this: “It’s not that they do not have names for things, and for the relations between things, but that the names they have are in fact false, are masks.… In order to control the world, one must first name it.” Without the ability to speak the truth to one another, we cannot unite in action; and without the ability to unite in action, we cannot overthrow the tyrant that drives us toward poverty, strife, sickness, and misery. In Eden, the name of this tyrant is never revealed. In the real world, however, we know its name: capital.

Thanks to the constant presence of corporate deception in our lives, we barely even have the words to describe what is happening to us. Regulatory agencies are dwarfed by the corporations they are supposed to oversee, watchdog nonprofits are overwhelmed, and the higher education system is buckling under the weight of private profiteering. But it is media organizations that have been hardest-hit in recent years, as private equity firms and other hostile investors have stripped newsrooms and shuttered entire reporting divisions. In other words, even when capitalism isn’t profiting by lying to us, it finds a way to profit by silencing the voices that want to offer us the truth.

As news outlets get picked off like so many deer in hunting season, the ones that remain are being increasingly corrupted by hard-right ideologies and corporate money. Paid content and “advertorials” are now ubiquitous, making it difficult to know whether we are reading honest reporting or an ad with a byline. Profit-maximizing news organizations also shy away from stories that might damage their bottom lines, even when the stories are indisputably true. In 2018, for example, ESPN altered a fluff piece about a linebacker’s diet in order to avoid offending Wendy’s, one of its advertising partners. All of these practices are blatant violations of journalistic ethics, but capitalism will never choose transparency—let alone morality—over money.

Not even our day-to-day conversations are safe. As many observers have noted in recent years, capitalist culture has begun leaking out into the broader world, interfering with our ability to simply talk to one another. Corporate “garbage language” has spilled over into casual speech, filling our conversations with meaningless jargon and inspiring many of us to think in toxic, empty-headed “grindset” memes. Naturally, the situation inside the workplace is even worse. Hundreds of posts on the popular r/antiwork subreddit feature bosses who falsely tell their employees that they are not allowed to discuss their wages. Other workers strain against job requirements that require them to lie to customers and colleagues. And by threatening, censoring, and retaliating against any workers who dare to speak their minds, corporations chop away at our ability to communicate with one another, thereby attacking dissent at the root.

## Biotech

### 2NC -- Ext: BioTech Link

#### The advancement of biotechnology is fueled by neoliberal greed - all of their advantages are just illusions to cover up their true intentions - the existence of capitalist makes all biotech ineffective and subject to ethical violations

#### 1 - Capitalism incentivizes biotechnological innovation

**Edwards 21** (Chris, Director of tax-policy studies and editor of DownsizingGovernment.org at the Cato Institute, “The Triumph of Biotechnology and Private Capital”,“<https://www.nationalreview.com/2021/09/the-triumph-of-biotechnology-and-private-capital/>”, ML)

People often claim that capitalism focuses only on short-term profits. But the venture capitalists and angel investors who fund firms such as Moderna and BioNTech are hugely patient, and they lose money on most of their investments. Typically, their model rests on the calculation that a small percentage of their investments will generate a sufficiently high return on going public or being sold to both “pay” for those that — as will often be the case in a very tricky sector — lose money (or make very little) and make the sort of good money that they and their clients are expecting when putting together an investment portfolio. In biotechnology and other leading-edge industries, after-tax investor gains are often reinvested in the next round of risky startups, thus creating a virtuous cycle. If the government had taxed away the Struengmanns’ capital gains from selling Hexal, they might not have had the cash or incentive to invest in BioNTech. One of the reasons that nearly all high-income countries keep capital-gains taxes low is to help ensure that investors and entrepreneurs are incentivized to take the risk of committing time and resources to ventures that can offer no promise of a good return, the sort of ventures, in other words, so typical of ventures relying on scientific and technical innovation. Those who take high risks should be rewarded, if that risk works out, with high rewards. Unfortunately, that logic eludes President Biden and congressional Democrats. They not only would like to raise capital-gains-tax rates, but some of them would also like to broaden the capital-gains-tax base, including by taxing gains before they are realized. If applied to startup investing, that could do terrible damage to the ability of early stage companies to secure the patient capital that they need. Punishing capital gains makes no sense if we want investors and entrepreneurs to pursue valuable but risky growth opportunities. Some cynics are griping about the big profits that Moderna and BioNTech are now making, but investors in those firms absorbed losses for a decade.

#### 2 - Developments in biotech are driven by neoliberal greed

**Edwards,** 20**21** (Chris, director of tax-policy studies at the Cato Institute. “The Triumph of Biotechnology and Private Capital” National Review. September 24, 2021. <https://www.nationalreview.com/2021/09/the-triumph-of-biotechnology-and-private-capital/> ///MF)

We continue to fight COVID-19 and its variants, but the rapid development of vaccines last year put us on the offensive against the disease. Vaccines from Moderna of Massachusetts and BioNTech of Germany have led the way, with 360 million doses delivered in the United States to date. (BioNTech teamed with Pfizer for the manufacturing and distribution of its shot.)The federal government expedited drug approvals and helped to fund the vaccine roll-out. But how were Moderna and BioNTech able to design and deliver highly effective vaccines so quickly — in months, rather than the years it usually takes for vaccines?

The answer is that the two companies had been working on the mRNA technologies behind the vaccines for a decade, and they were supported by more than $3 billion of private capital. Moderna’s and BioNTech’s vaccines are a triumph of the biotechnology industry and of the venture capitalists and wealthy angel investors who fund it.

The large potential of mRNA technology now seems clear, but that was not always the case. Katalin Karikó at the University of Pennsylvania spent years studying mRNA, but she [received](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.statnews.com/2020/11/10/the-story-of-mrna-how-a-once-dismissed-idea-became-a-leading-technology-in-the-covid-vaccine-race/&g=MDkyZjE0ZTQxZmYzZTU5MA==&h=NDU0MzYxN2RmZjY2Mjg0MGQwZjRiYmQ3OTI2MWU5YjRiMGI1NDdlNzU4YzU1ZTlkZDZjYTFkZDVkNjBiM2UxMA==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) little academic or government support. Fortunately, Karikó and her colleague Drew Weissman made a breakthrough in the early 2000s for practical applications of mRNA technologies.

Derrick Rossi of Harvard Medical School added his own advances and then teamed with a group of scientists and venture-capital firm Flagship Pioneering to found Moderna in 2010. Moderna’s “highly risky” plan [was](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.statnews.com/2016/09/13/moderna-therapeutics-biotech-mrna/&g=MjJlODY5YzcyNTFkODg2NQ==&h=MGM3NGNhMTZmOTUzM2Q1NzYwMmIzY2I5YmVmYWVhMGU4ODIzODlkMzc1NjQxZjEzMWM0ZDdjYjYwZjhhNjkxNw==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) to “cut out the middleman in biotech [by] creating therapeutic proteins inside the body instead of in manufacturing plants.” Skepticism “dogged Moderna since its creation,” [reported](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.wsj.com/articles/inside-moderna-the-covid-vaccine-front-runner-with-no-track-record-and-an-unsparing-ceo-11593615205&g=N2FmMjUzNWMxM2YwODlkNA==&h=MTc0NTMyNWNlZDEwMGY3ODAyMzE1ODhkYTNjMDg0NjA4MjE2MjVkYWFkMzM2Mzg2ODU1MGJiNTQ3YjMzOTU3Nw==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) the Wall Street Journal, especially since the big pharmaceutical companies were [not](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-merck-is-playing-catch-up-in-the-coronavirus-vaccine-chase-11603470832&g=N2I0NzFhNzcwNjBkZGYwNw==&h=YjMxNDM5OGRiZjBjYjg0NTJhY2JmNzdkNWVjNDFmZWI3ZTJkYWQ3MjA3NjcwNTZjZDUzNjc0NjY2MTZmOTgzMA==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) pursuing the approach.

But Moderna plowed ahead, supported by venture capitalists and angel investors. The company had raised more than [$2 billion](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://news.crunchbase.com/news/with-flagship-behind-it-moderna-quickly-scaled-from-startup-to-world-changing-biotech/&g=OTUxZWYxMzg5YWFiYTc0MA==&h=ZTFlZWRhOTBkNDQyYjY4NzBiNmNmZThjOTJiMzkwYzI1Y2I5MGMyZTY2MThmYWRkNTk1NGExOTNiNzUzN2I5Zg==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) in private capital before going public in 2018. Many people think that federal funding is crucial for medical research, but that was not the case for Moderna. Prior to 2020, the company received just two [federal awards](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.usaspending.gov/&g=NGUwMjdhNWQ3ZjIwZGI2MA==&h=NGY4MGFiOGI5NTI0MWZkZDUwZTM5ZWZjNGJhOGY2ZjdkY2E0MDJlZWFhNTNmYzI2ZmE0YmU0NzFmY2U2ZmU4NA==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) totaling $150 million, a fraction of the private funding it received.

Meanwhile, in Germany, biotech entrepreneurs Uğur Şahin and Özlem Türeci co-founded BioNTech in 2008 to explore advances in mRNA technologies. The startup received a [€180 million](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1776985/000119312519241112/d635330df1.htm&g=ZTkxNDhhZjRmMDI1MmQxYw==&h=YzQzOWJjMWUwOGM1MTU2NDYwMDJhMjM0ZTg5ODZlMTBjNTAwZjY2YmY3OWI0NjBkOTdkMjg3ODhjODRmOWNmNw==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) angel investment from Thomas and Andreas Struengmann, brothers who had gained wealth by building drug firm Hexal. BioNTech raised a total of $1.3 billion in private investment before it went public in 2019. Like Moderna, the company [appears](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1776985/000119312519241112/d635330df1.htm&g=Yjg1ZGM3OTIxYTJhNWI3OQ==&h=NjM1MDUyZGQ3ODg4NmVmNDM5OGYxZWI3OTdjNGIxYzA4OTNiNjA3ZWY1MTcxYjc0OTU2NTExNzU5NTMwYWFhOA==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) to have received relatively little government funding before 2020, only a few tens of millions of dollars.

Applying their knowledge from years of research, both Moderna and BioNTech responded quickly when they learned of the new virus in January 2020. When the Chinese published COVID-19’s genetic code, it took Moderna just two days to design a vaccine and [42 days](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.wbur.org/news/2020/02/25/coronavirus-vaccine-moderna-therapeutics-cambridge&g=MjllMGI5NGY3Yzc3NGYwYQ==&h=YzM5NmYyY2MxOGZjOGU0ODljOWY0NDI3ZWMwODk5ZWZlYmQ5Nzg1YjIxNzRkZWZlY2EwMzdlOWZmMTJjMzRhYg==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) to ship vials of the drug to the National Institutes of Health. Both companies gained government approval for their vaccines by December and began distributing millions of doses. These are the world’s first vaccines created by mRNA technologies.

People often claim that capitalism focuses only on short-term profits. But the venture capitalists and angel investors who fund firms such as Moderna and BioNTech are hugely patient, and they lose money on most of their investments. Typically, their model rests on the calculation that a small percentage of their investments will generate a sufficiently high return on going public or being sold to both “pay” for those that — as will often be the case in a very tricky sector — lose money (or make very little) and make the sort of good money that they and their clients are expecting when putting together an investment portfolio.

In biotechnology and other leading-edge industries, after-tax investor gains are often reinvested in the next round of risky startups, thus creating a virtuous cycle. If the government had taxed away the Struengmanns’ capital gains from selling Hexal, they might not have had the cash or incentive to invest in BioNTech. One of the reasons that nearly all high-income countries keep capital-gains taxes low is to help ensure that investors and entrepreneurs are incentivized to take the risk of committing time and resources to ventures that can offer no promise of a good return, the sort of ventures, in other words, so typical of ventures relying on scientific and technical innovation. Those who take high risks should be rewarded, if that risk works out, with high rewards.

Unfortunately, that logic eludes President Biden and congressional Democrats. They not only would like to raise capital-gains-tax rates, but some of them would also like to broaden the capital-gains-tax base, including by taxing gains before they are realized. If applied to startup investing, that could do terrible damage to the ability of early stage companies to secure the patient capital that they need. Punishing capital gains makes no sense if we want investors and entrepreneurs to pursue valuable but risky growth opportunities.

Some [cynics](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/04/business/pfizer-covid-vaccine-profits.html&g=MDMxNGNmOGVmOWNjMmY3MA==&h=MTVkNTdjYzY0NWE5YTlmYTU5OTc4NWEzYTlhYjJiMjk4OGMyOWU1NmU1MzdmZjNjZjJmOTM2MjUyMjBkNzc3ZA==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) are griping about the big profits that Moderna and BioNTech are now making, but investors in those firms absorbed losses for a decade. Besides, there is no better place for profits to flow right now than to biotech firms and their research. BioNTech [announced](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19-vaccine-pioneer-biontech-plans-to-make-new-malaria-and-tuberculosis-shots-in-africa-11627308000&g=NTVkYTkyN2IyZWUwMzlhMA==&h=Yjc5ZjYxMDJjY2Y0YjllYjNmOGE1YWM4MTJkZDNkZmU5YTQ4YmM0NjRiYTJkNGJlMTk0MDY4Y2JiZWE2NmMxNg==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) that it will build on its mRNA advances to develop shots against malaria and tuberculosis, which together kill more than a million people a year. And numerous biotech firms [are](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-next-target-for-mrna-vaccines-after-covid-19-the-flu-11627041601&g=NWMzMmM2ZDQ0YThjMzVmNA==&h=MzA4OTUxNGZmZTViN2NmNDU2ODU3MGM4YzlmNjJmNTRmMzVhNTRjYmRjYmFkN2MzODJhOTg2MmJmNzAxYjcwNQ==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) now aiming to create more effective influenza vaccines based on mRNA technologies.

One of the key moments in the development of the biotech sector as we know it today was the launch of Genentech in 1976, backed by venture-capital firm Kleiner Perkins. The success of that pioneering firm “gave credence to the view that scientific research, infused with start-up firm spunk, could be a critical component of economic growth,” [noted](https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238072270_Chance_Necessite_et_Naivete_Ingredients_to_create_a_new_organizational_form&g=MzRmMmM5YTU1YWY2MjNjOA==&h=MGFjOTllMjUyZjM0ZDgyNTZjZmYwNzM2YThjNzNkYWRjNGYxOTQxMmY2OTAzYTVmZmJjY2QxYWY5MzExYWMzNQ==&p=YXAzOmNhdG9pbnN0aXR1dGU6YXZhbmFuOm86MjZiNWU0YTg1MTVjMDA2ZDllZDRhNmIyNDVmNGZjYzk6djE=) a history of the industry by Walter Powell and Kurt Sandholtz.

To undermine an approach that has worked so well, and delivered so much, by raising capital gains makes no economic sense. Worse still, as we consider the lives saved or improved by companies in biotechnology and other innovative sectors, companies that relied on private risk capital, it may well come at considerable human cost, too.

#### 3 - Biotech makes capitalism ethically worse

**Cohen**, 20**06** (Eric , author and editor-at-large of The New Atlantis. “Biotechnology and the Spirit of Capitalism” The New Atlantis. 2006. [https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/biotechnology-and-the-spirit-of-capitalism ///](https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/biotechnology-and-the-spirit-of-capitalism%20///)MF)

The spirit of modern capitalism is as varied as the souls of modern men. Virtually every type of morality is “for sale,” and virtually every human type finds his place in the modern economy. The cosmetic surgeon specializing in breast implants. The observant Jew rushing to finish work before sundown. Sex stories on MTV and salvation stories at the movies. Oil-drilling corporations and embryo-destroying start-ups. Queer Eye for the Straight Guy and NASCAR racing.

Watching commercials on television, trolling the Internet, going to work, it is clear that commerce captures the many possibilities of human life, both for better and for worse. It mostly involves decent men and women working hard to better themselves and provide for their families. But commerce sometimes goes deep into the human gutter — the multi-billion-dollar child-pornography industry is perhaps the grossest example — dragging many ordinary people down with it. The modern economy relies largely on average people doing average work, competently if not brilliantly. But it also nourishes and depends upon more-than-average individuals — including those who remake the world with their talents and visions, often with technologies that aim to satisfy every human desire.

Perhaps the most striking dimension of the modern economy is the commerce of the body, including an impressive array of new biotechnologies and biological procedures that promise to improve, control, or manipulate our native biology. In myriad ways, the better body is for sale — from anti-impotence drugs to anti-depressants, from cosmetic surgery to low-carb diets, from baby-making clinics promising you a healthy child to the current push to legalize the buying and selling of human organs. And if one looks ahead to the biotechnologies of the future — improved mood- and memory-altering drugs, stem-cell-based medicine, genetic muscle enhancements, new techniques for controlling the genomes of one’s offspring — it is clear that the commerce of the body will only become more ambitious, selling bodily perfection to anyone with enough disposable income.

This leaves us to wonder: Is “bio-capitalism” something novel, bringing with it a new spirit and new dilemmas? Or is it simply the continuation of modern capitalism’s promise to “better our condition” indefinitely? No doubt the answer is some combination of continuity and novelty. The interesting question is whether the novel dimensions of bio-capitalism are so fundamental that we need to rethink our moral intuitions about capitalism itself. In a word: Does the new commerce of the body portend a moral crisis for modern capitalism?

As always, to understand where we are heading, we need to revisit where we came from. From the beginning, the idea of modern capitalism was connected to various notions of the good life, or different assessments of the best life possible for limited, selfish, and imperfect human beings. Morality and modern commerce were always inseparable, and the defense of commerce (like the lament) was originally made in moral terms.

By morality, I mean living well (both as individuals and as a society) with the permanent questions of being human, including the questions that arise because we are bodily beings with bodies that fail or fail to satisfy: How do I face suffering and death? What are my obligations to my parents and children? Do the religious traditions of my birth still bind me, and how do I regard the piety or impiety of others? What are my obligations to the weak, poor, nasty, and insane? What is the meaning of my sexual desires and erotic longings? Does the noble end I seek — saving a soul, freeing the oppressed, curing the sick — justify a given means to try to achieve it?

Modern capitalism, at its origins, addressed these moral and existential questions — sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly. It did not spring from a single idea of the human condition or embody a single answer to man’s great questions, but at least three different attitudes toward life and commerce. One is the spirit of God-seeking enterprise embodied in early Protestantism; the second is the irreverent self-love embodied in the likes of Voltaire; and the third is the worldly moderation best articulated by Adam Smith. To be sure, typologies such as this one often distort as much as they clarify; history is messy and complex, and the history of capitalism is winding and tumultuous, with passionate defenders, savage critics, and many unexpected turns. Still, the presence of these three different spirits of capitalism is undeniable, and undeniably important.

Capitalism’s Three Spirits

In [The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/048642703X/the-new-atlantis-20), Max Weber describes how a new idea of salvation — a new creed about the relationship between man and God, worldly life and other-worldly grace — unexpectedly initiated the age of modern capitalism. It would be a vast oversimplification to say that there was a single Protestant Reformation; for there were many cross-currents, as Weber describes. But two ideas in particular — Luther’s idea of “calling” and Calvin’s idea of “predestination” — fundamentally altered the behavior of believing Christians and the trajectory of the West. Worldly work could now be understood in vocational terms. “The fulfillment of worldly duties is under all circumstances the only way to live acceptably to God,” describes Weber. “It and it alone is the will of God, and hence every legitimate calling has exactly the same worth in the sight of God.”

But only by combining the idea of “calling” with the theology of “predestination” — that is, the belief in salvation by God’s unfathomable grace alone, breathed into us at birth — did the spirit of capitalism find its paradoxical roots. For men could not live in practice or for long with a grace so mysterious, or with the state of their eternal souls so uncertain. They wanted “proof” — proof to themselves, proof before others, and proof before God that “I” am indeed saved. This desire for proof gave believing Protestants an “irrational” will to work with little interest in savoring the worldly fruits of their labors. The individual toiled instead as a sign of other-worldly salvation, and in accordance (as he saw it) with a divinely chosen calling. Every detail of life was rationalized and perfected; even the smallest sign of waywardness might be a sign of one’s un-chosenness. Practical science was welcomed and mystical speculation discouraged.

The result of such an ethic, according to Weber, was a magnificent increase in material wealth, due largely to the accumulation of capital that came from producing so much and enjoying so little, from the combination of restless toil and ascetic self-denial. But the wealth produced as the outward fruit of man’s piety threatened to undermine the inner commitment to God. As John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, declared:

I fear, wherever riches have increased, the essence of religion has decreased in the same proportion…. [T]he Methodists in every place grow diligent and frugal; consequently they increase in goods. Hence they proportionally increase in pride, in anger, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life. So, although the form of religion remains, the spirit is swiftly vanishing away. Is there no way to prevent this — this continual decay of pure religion? We ought not to prevent people from being diligent and frugal; we must exhort all Christians to gain all they can, and to save all they can; that is, in effect, to grow rich. What way, then, can we take, that our money may not sink us to the nethermost hell? There is one way, and there is no other under heaven. If those who gain all they can, and save all they can, will likewise give all they can, then the more they gain the more they will grow in grace, and the more treasure they will lay up in heaven.

Whether Weber is quite correct about the historical connection between the Protestant ethic and the birth of capitalism is a complicated and much disputed question. What seems clear is that God-seeking Protestants were central to the first flourishing of modern commerce, and that over time the fruits of such enterprise came to seem more desirable in themselves. As Weber put it: “The intensity of the search for the Kingdom of God commenced gradually to pass over into sober economic virtue; the religious roots died out slowly, giving way to utilitarian worldliness.” In this way, the formula was reversed — not material success as proof of salvation, but salvation via our material success.

Through Protestantism, commerce was made a realm of “grace.” But over time, it was not God’s grace alone, or at all, that men sought, but the grace of being a “self-made man” — the grace that was formed by one’s own labors or secured by one’s own ingenuity, not bestowed as a divine gift and obligation. Before Protestantism, salvation was largely set apart from (or above) the realm of commerce — in the sacraments, the monastery, or the Sabbath. Protestantism weakened this separation — directing men, if somewhat unintentionally, to see the labors of life as proof of salvation, and eventually as its very source. But sooner or later, the self-made man confronts the limits of his own self-made grace. He is struck by misfortune, or boredom, or mortality. His grace is haunted and incomplete. The “religious roots” of commerce continue to lurk as ghosts within the modern economy. To this day, we are still haunted by the salvation that modern commerce once promised, and still hunting after the kinds of salvation it might yet give us — not in heaven, but in the flesh.

For Voltaire, the delights of the flesh were worth celebrating, and he admired commerce precisely for its capacity to promote worldly goods (including bodily pleasures) through freedom and exchange. Where the Protestant ethic prized self-denial, Voltaire celebrated self-love; and where the Protestant believer labored out of devotion to a saving God, Voltaire celebrated commerce for making such pious devotions irrelevant. “Religionists may rail in vain,” he wrote. “I own, I like this age profane.” He liked its physical comforts and the room it afforded for his playful, “worldly mind.” He led a life of wild speculation — filled with financial schemes that would have made the managers of Enron proud — and he praised the London Exchange as a place where the only “infidels” were those who went “bankrupt.”

As Jerry Muller describes in his superb book [The Mind and the Market](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0385721668/the-new-atlantis-20), the real enemy for Voltaire was religious enthusiasm, which led men to slit each other’s throats over archaic and trivial superstitions. “Here Voltaire is the prophet of the profit motive,” Muller describes. “Compared to the competitive quest for salvation, the quest for wealth is more likely to make men ‘peaceful’ and ‘content.’ Compared to the altruistic crusade of forcibly saving one’s neighbor’s soul, even if it leaves his body in ruins, the pursuit of wealth is a potentially more peaceable pursuit, and one that leaves one’s neighbor content.”

But it was not just religious conflict that Voltaire abhorred, but the pious man’s devotion to a false salvation, his idealization of a wretched past at the cost of making a better future. In a poem with the fitting title “The Worldling,” Voltaire pays tribute to the wonders of his age — the “needful superfluous things,” the “luxury and pleasures.” He mocks Adam and Eve for the wretchedness of their flesh, the dirty ground they slept in, the tasteless food they ate.

My fruit-eating first father, say,  
In Eden how rolled time away?  
Did you work for the human race,  
And clasp dame Eve with close embrace!  
Own that your nails you could not pare,  
And that you wore disordered hair,  
That you were swarthy in complexion,  
And that your amorous affection  
Had very little better in’t  
Than downright animal instinct.  
Both weary of the marriage yoke  
You supped each night beneath an oak  
On millet, water, and on mast,  
And having finished your repast,  
On the ground you were forced to lie,  
Exposed to the inclement sky:  
Such in the state of simple nature  
Is man, a helpless, wretched creature.

Eve, in other words, could use a trip to the perfume counter and the salon. To embrace such a “wretched creature” is to be nothing more than an animal. Beyond the flesh, Voltaire praises the artists and the architects — the real makers of “grace.” He delights in what is visible to the eye inside “rich golden frames,” not what is knowable to the soul oriented toward heaven. The poem ends with Voltaire’s fitting words of self-praise: “Terrestrial paradise is where I am.” He is a “worldling” and nothing else, living in a paradise of “self-love” and “happy commerce,” one that he desperately hopes to sustain — decaying flesh be damned.

Adam Smith, you might say, offered a moderate vision — between the Protestant quest for other-worldly salvation and Voltaire’s irreverent delight in the luxuries of the flesh. With Voltaire, he believed that an alternative needed to be found to the wars of religious piety, and that state-regulated salvation was a recipe for tyranny and slaughter. And yet, he did not see religion itself as an enemy, and he took for granted, as Irving Kristol and others have argued, the habit-forming effects of traditional institutions like church and family. Without the Puritan work ethic, it is unlikely that Smith’s practical vision would have gotten off the ground. But Smith did not offer a commerce of salvation — worldly or other-worldly — but a commerce of progress, one that expanded man’s liberty and gradually improved his condition. It was a sober and practical vision for sober and practical men. He was interested in building a decent society, by taking seriously both man’s rational self-interest and his capacity for self-restraint, both his natural acquisitiveness and his latent civility. And he sought a society that improved the condition of all willing individuals, not simply a society where the strong triumphed over the weak, or where the wealthy pursued life’s niceties while the poor remained in a condition of permanent desperation.

Smith, in other words, sought to build a future that “worked” — and by most accounts, he succeeded tremendously. We live in the world he built, with souls still shaped in large measure by his vision, and a politics still informed by his realism about the limits of radically remaking the human condition by conscious design. Smith’s “system of natural liberty” worked in two basic ways: First, it explained how the natural desire for self-improvement and the range of natural human capacities could cohere to produce a prosperous economic system — one in which individuals responded to the changing needs of the market and the changing possibilities of production, and lived with the freedom to “better their condition” according to their own lights. In this way, the desire for private profit could serve the public interest, and the largely free market could produce an organic order from below, one impossible to create from above. Second, Smith showed how commercial life could have a civilizing effect on acquisitive individuals, who needed to work hard and tolerate others in order to prosper. The commercial society does not stamp out selfishness or spread the gospel of brotherly love. But it does channel self-interest and promote civil society among individuals with different backgrounds and tastes. And it creates the wealth necessary for somewhat higher aspirations, if not necessarily the desire to pursue them.

Smith believed an economic system should be judged in moral terms — judged for the kind of people it produces and the way of life it allows to flourish. And he was not blind to capitalism’s moral shortcomings — including the rise of scheming businessmen moved only by greed and devoid of conscience, and the existence of laborers made dull and brutish by performing a few simple functions without end. But the problems of greed, nastiness, and stupidity were hardly unique to modern capitalist life, and in many ways they were much worse in pre-capitalist societies. The problem, of course, was and remains the limits of human nature itself; a social system, at best, could promote virtues and curb vices — not make average men into philosophers or saints.

Peculiarly, the one thing that pious Protestantism and Voltairean atheism agreed upon was that commerce was a good thing. Traditional (Catholic and Orthodox) Christianity had thought otherwise, and modern radical progressivism thinks otherwise, too. But in that moment, two key combatants on the battlefield of the early modern age agreed about the virtues of enterprise. Adam Smith, in turn, sought to assuage the struggle between them by focusing on this point of agreement, and so we now think of this great moral philosopher as an economist, but only because he saw that commerce was the way to peace in modern times. This age was almost bound to be defined by commerce, because those who fought to shape the age agreed almost only in their veneration of trade. But trade, alas, is not the most venerable thing, because what men buy and sell cannot address man’s deepest longings, even if the culture of the marketplace sometimes curbs his worst excesses.

Biotechnology and the Counterculture

In 1991, with the last vestiges of communism crumbling and the Cold War ending, Irving Kristol warned that the greatest threats to a capitalist future were spiritual and cultural. “In a sense,” he said, “it is all Adam Smith’s fault. That amiable, decent genius simply could not imagine a world where traditional moral certainties could be effectively challenged and repudiated. Bourgeois society is his legacy, for good and ill. For good, in that it has produced, through the market economy, a world prosperous beyond all previous imaginings — including socialist imaginings. For ill, in that this world, with every passing decade, has become ever more spiritually impoverished.”

In the end, Smith’s error was his lack of “eschatological realism.” Man is not simply an average being who seeks to improve in material ways. He is also an imperfect being who yearns for perfection, a mortal being who yearns for immortality, and an ambitious being who sometimes believes that he can make others more perfect or less mortal through his own mastery of nature. And so Adam Smith’s world of practical commerce — a great success — is still haunted by the Protestant desire for other-worldly grace and by Voltaire’s desire for “terrestrial paradise.” We demand that material progress offer salvation — which is exactly what socialism once promised and what biotechnology may promise in the future. Or we demand that material progress be abandoned in the name of salvation — soberly, by those who seek to preserve sacred retreats in a profane world, or radically, by extremists who seek to dismantle modern life altogether.

This quest for salvation can either go “with the grain” or “against the grain” of modern commercial society. Modern science — especially modern biological science — has long gone with the grain: seeking useful inventions, practical advances, and the “relief of man’s estate” through a growing mastery of nature’s laws and human biology. Technology has long been the art of self-improvement, and commercial society has long been inseparable from the creation and dissemination of new technologies. The implementation of Francis Bacon’s vision has rarely shocked the Smithian mind, and mostly pleased it.

By contrast, modernist culture — art, literature, mores, and manners — has largely gone against the grain of modern commercial society. It saw the bourgeois world as boring, repressed, and unsatisfying — a world of “one-dimensional men,” hungry for property, ruled by old-fashioned values left-over from outdated religions. Modernism sought a life of the spirit in a life of immodesty — a life without limits, sexual or otherwise. It saw the mass of men as automatons, and it saw mass society as guilty of the degradation of both nature and culture. And yet it also imagined that man himself was a creature without shame, a being beyond sin. It believed that alienation was a problem of history, not a condition of our nature. This attitude was epitomized in the counterculture of the 1960s — with its liberation of the body from old taboos, and its childish illusions about the remaking of man.

Back then, it seemed as though the culture of technology and the counterculture were mortal enemies. The machine vs. the spirit. Dionysian feeling vs. rational investigation. Gradual progress vs. spontaneous liberation. And of course, in some ways, they were and still remain bitter enemies. But perhaps not in the most important ways. For it may be that the peculiarities of our own recent history mask a deeper connection between the counterculture and the culture of modern technology — a connection grounded in the belief that human limits should be overcome, taboos are anathema, and human shame is an illusion. Both cultures believe that no knowledge or no experience should be off limits, and that death is an unfair or unnecessary sentence — to be overcome by technology or mocked artistically into submission. Both are willing to go where modest men never went before, at least not in public.

Let me make this point with a rather unpleasant example. Within a few days of one another I recently came upon the following two stories: Story #1, in The New Yorker, was about new works of art. It included a picture of a grotesque sculpture, consisting of a number of naked children, connected to one another in the flesh, with penises as noses. Story #2 was about a promising new technique of assisted reproduction, which allows women to remove a piece of their ovaries, freeze it indefinitely, and implant it into their arm or abdomen as a source of eggs whenever they decide to have children.

Now I suspect many bourgeois scientists would find the penis-faced statue appalling, though they might defend the right to produce it as freedom of expression, akin to their own freedom of research. But the artists, I suspect, would actually admire the scientist’s biological “transgression,” the splicing of reproductive organs out of their “normal” context, the making public of once private parts. And even if the scientists reject such works of art as absurdities, modern biotechnology — and much else about modern commerce — has benefited greatly from the triumph of postmodern culture. For it was the radicals of the 1960s that cleared away the very taboos surrounding the body that would have inhibited the newest possibilities of modern biotechnology. Can we imagine the commerce of the body today — or even the science that underlies it — without the prior triumph of the culture of immodesty? Would there have been terrain upon which scientists — and their investors — feared to tread if the counterculture had not tread there first? Could it be that scientific rationalism and post-modern irrationality have more in common than it once seemed?

The genius of commerce is that it tames remarkable things; it makes past transgressions seem normal. What shocks the parents bores the children — both in culture and in science. Living together before marriage, test-tube babies — that’s yesterday’s news. We can already imagine a future where cosmetic surgery is as common as orthodontics; where mood-altering drugs are a mass phenomenon, like vitamins (or painkillers) for the soul; where people sell their deceased loved one’s organs; where 10 to 15 percent of women reproduce using in vitro fertilization, screening their embryos for sex, height, and other desirable genetic predispositions; and where sick patients harvest embryonic clones of themselves as a source of life-saving stem cells. And we are left to wonder: What will it be like to live in such a world, to raise a family in such a world, to work in such a world, to invest money in such a world? What will be the relationship between biotechnology, morality, and commerce?

The New Commerce of the Body

Of course, most biotechnology is admirable; it is a continuation of bourgeois progress as we have long known it, whose only negative effect is raising expectations, and thus raising the stakes of potential calamity. But there are also reasons to believe that the new commerce of the body is growing increasingly removed from Smith’s sober vision. It promises perfection, not progress; and it heeds no limits, treating the sacred and the profane as indistinguishable objects for sale, ruled only by the amoral law of supply and demand. Lest this all seem too abstract, consider a few everyday examples.

Example 1. The Betrayal of the Child.

By now, the idea of selling one’s eggs or sperm to others who wish to produce a child is commonplace. One need only look in any elite college’s newspaper to find advertisements offering substantial sums of money — $25,000 or $50,000 — for egg donors with perfect figures and high SAT scores. There are numerous companies that specialize in brokering eggs, often catering to very particular tastes. Recently, a law-student friend of mine received a solicitation in the mail:

Dear Potential Egg Donor: The Genetics and IVF Institute is looking for healthy, college educated, ethnically diverse women between the ages of 21 and 32 to assist infertile couples by becoming an anonymous egg donor….You will be adequately compensated for each cycle you complete … beginning at $5,000 [and going] up to $45,000…. Help an infertile couple experience the joy and fulfillment of parenthood.

Now in market terms, this potential transaction makes perfect sense — matching a willing seller and a willing buyer. Both parties get what they need — tuition money, the seeds of a new child — and no one is coerced into anything. But what is the human meaning of what is happening? One couple desperately seeks a child of their own, a child biologically related to the father genetically and the mother by pregnancy. This is why IVF came into existence in the first place — because the infertile seek not just a child to raise, but a child who is flesh of their flesh. But to make this possible, in some cases, they need a seller who is willing to abandon his or her own biological child; willing to be an anonymous donor; willing never to set eyes upon the child that is flesh of their flesh. The buyers who desperately want a biological child need a seller who sees having a biological child as no big deal. In market terms, again, this makes sense: a case of two parties valuing different commodities differently. But in human terms, it means finding a seller who denies the very human longing that the buyer wishes to act upon. It requires a seller who is willing to betray his or her own flesh and blood offspring — not out of desperation, but for a price.

Example 2. The Shaming of the Father.

By now, ads for anti-impotence drugs are common fare in magazines and on television. One of the most memorable campaigns starred the former Chicago Bears coach “Iron” Mike Ditka — once the consummate tough guy, who takes the “Levitra challenge” to “stay in the game.” Coach Ditka is apparently comfortable discussing his erectile dysfunction, and perhaps proud of his continued desire for virility. He flaunts his nakedness — the loss of his powers, the hunger for his powers — for all the world to see, including his children.

Now consider another story — the story of Noah in the book of Genesis, naked in his tent; and the story of his sons (Shem and Japheth), who so revere their father that they do not look upon him. They walk backward to him and cover him with their cloak. As Leon Kass describes: “They intuitively understand that, were they to see with their own eyes their father’s nakedness, their family order would be permanently altered…. By protecting Noah’s dignity and authority, they safeguard their own capacity to exercise paternal authority in the future…. They knowingly choose to live leaving some things in the dark, without pressing back to the naked truth about temporal beginnings or ultimate origins.” Even in his old age, they see their father as a giant, the source of their own being.

Today, by contrast, we leave nothing in the dark and we strip down every giant. Both proper pride and proper shame are thrown to the wind. While Coach Ditka might seek such drugs in the name of his manliness, it is precisely his manliness that is compromised. By flaunting his desire to “stay in the game,” he loses the reverence — the majesty — that a dignified old man should command of those beneath him. Instead, he lays out his nakedness for all the world to see, including the sons who now cannot help but shame him. In his quest for potency, he reveals his ultimate dependence, with no cloak to preserve any ennobling illusions.

Example 3. The Modern Birth-Mark.

Not long ago, the Fox network aired a “reality” show called The Swan, which took a score of average-looking women, sent them to a team of cosmetic surgeons who remade their bodies under the knife, and then put the refurbished ladies on stage to decide who is the most beautiful — to decide which ugly duckling is now the swan. Already, cosmetic surgery is no longer simply the province of actors in Hollywood and politicians in Washington. It is becoming — slowly but steadily — a mass phenomenon, and perhaps soon a middle-class phenomenon. Some parents now give their teenage daughters nose-jobs and breast implants as high school graduation presents.

As a consequence, physical beauty is no longer seen as nature’s endowment but as man’s creation. Aging is no longer accepted gracefully but fought back with the knife. Imperfection is increasingly intolerable. Like Georgiana in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s “The Birth-mark,” we subject ourselves to technicians of the body in the hope of being loved, or in the hope of making bystanders into lustful worshippers of our flesh. And the question is: In so doing, what have we lost? After all, beauty is never an achievement but an undeserved gift of nature. Why does it matter whether the giver of the gift is God, the gods, or the master surgeon? What is lost in removing this year’s imperfections? Perhaps nothing. The trouble, of course, is next year’s imperfections. And the problem is that our new “look” will inevitably change all our pre-surgery relations: To our parents, perhaps it will be a partial indictment of their own sub-par appearance; to our spouse, perhaps it will be an admission that I was not beautiful enough then; to our children, perhaps it will teach them that they too might need cosmetic surgery someday, since the genes they inherit come from the pre-surgical self. Even as we remake the flesh in accordance with our will, we cannot escape the attachments of the flesh that we did not will — the attachments to our parents and our children. We have the swan’s face and the ugly duckling’s family.

Example 4. The Broken Soul.

Of course, it is not just the body we seek to fix but also the embodied mind. Commercials for mood-altering drugs are ubiquitous, and the use of such drugs has skyrocketed in the last decade, with distracted two-year-olds to the depressed elderly to everyone in between as part of the market. According to the dean of one Ivy League school, roughly 20 percent of the incoming class takes some kind of anti-depressant.

The commercials for these drugs all work in the same way: a troubled child or employee — failing at work, failing at school, growing more distant from loved ones. Then a drug that promises, as one slogan puts it, to “reveal the real you.” And then a sudden transformation, a new life of smiles, friends, and productivity. A thirty-second commedia with neurochemistry as the playwright. Without question, such drugs can help many individuals who suffer from terrible mental illness, rooted in chemical problems in the brain, that only medication can ameliorate. For such people — the truly sick — psychotropic drugs are a godsend. And no doubt the strategy of selling these drugs is the same as selling any other product: convincing people they are inadequate as they are, yet within reach of perfection; making people feel sick and desperate, only to discover that what they lack is some liberating product.

But surely something deeper is at work here, when the inadequacy is the psyche itself, and the liberation involves, in part, a new identity altogether. The real questions about the rise of psychotropic drugs go beyond the present essay — questions about why so many people feel so depressed in the first place, why they believe only medication can help them, and who they really are once they start taking these mood-altering medications and start forming human relationships that depend on taking the drugs to sustain them. I can only note here the strangeness of this new marketing of dependence, and the significance of coming to believe that life’s dilemmas are fundamentally problems of brain chemistry, only solvable by medication. Perhaps we will also come to believe the inverse: that life’s best possibilities are likewise matters of chemistry, only achievable with medication.

In a certain sense, of course, this is all true: we live as given bodies, with drives that we do not fully control and cannot fully explain, and limits that come with our particular set of DNA. But we also live — or have long lived — with the belief that we are more than our chemicals, that our choices, joys, and miseries are more than inexplicable neuroactivity, that there is a difference between what is real and what is induced.

Perhaps the deepest problem with such drugs — taken by a widow to ease the pain of her mourning, or after a terrorist attack to calm one’s sense of horror — is that they will confound, not restore, our sense of the world as it really is. To sleep easily amid carnage or rest easily after the death of a beloved spouse is to live in a world of fantasy. It is to seek salvation by no longer being fully human.

Example 5. The Embryo and the Coffee Grind.

My final example is somewhat more futuristic, but not entirely so. Depending on where the science takes us, it is not too far-fetched to imagine that human embryos will one day be valuable medical commodities — harvested routinely as a source stem cells. Embryo destruction for research purposes is now commonplace. Scientists are already exploring methods that would allow us to produce human eggs artificially, thus eliminating the only practical barrier to embryo production on an industrial scale. And no doubt such embryos will trade in the market like any other commodity — perhaps even on the “commodities exchange.”

Perhaps I exaggerate, but it is an exaggeration with a point. What the market does is veil the meaning of what it uses so that everything can be used efficiently. It tames the remarkable and makes it seem normal — like everything else. It reduces each commodity to measurable data — where what matters is not the different things in themselves but the differential movements on the chart: coffee grinds up, embryos down; computer parts up, body parts down; Viagra up, Paxil down. Even the individual who is troubled by this prospect — who still asks whether a human embryo deserves more respect than a natural resource — will find it hard not to participate: Will he reject embryo therapies that might save his child? Will he leave his job at the insurance company that covers such therapies? Will he sell the mutual fund that buys shares in an embryo-production company?

Beyond “science says”

The New Atlantis is building a culture in which science and technology work for, not on, human beings.

We should not forget that the goal of embryo commerce would be humanitarian — the pursuit of health, the very good that modern societies most desire. But the means are, arguably, a form of cannibalism of the weak by the strong — if a cannibalism not obvious to the eye because embryos look so un-human, and thus without a visceral repugnance to awaken our conscience and guide our behavior. But the violation is no less real for being unobvious, and it is only possible because we now take for granted a truly remarkable thing — the power to initiate human life outside the body, the power to see and hold what was once left shrouded.

And this, I think, is what we should most fear about biotechnology’s transformation of modern capitalism: that in the desire for worldly salvation — salvation of the flesh — we will profane the sacred, with the modern marketplace greasing the skids. We will come to believe that bio-capitalism can sell us everything we desire, and thus come to accept that everything is for sale.

The Moral Limits of Capitalism

Such a critique is not meant as an act of ingratitude for our economic prosperity and freedom. Only a fool would belittle the genuine virtues of progress, and I can imagine no better way to organize a modern society than democratic capitalism. At the same time, however, we must face up to the fact that modern commerce is often a moral problem, the capitalism of the body most especially.

Perhaps ironically, it is the friends of commerce (conservatives) who will most likely see the profaning power of commerce. Critics on the left mostly attack capitalism because they want more of the very things that capitalism creates, but believe “big business” is keeping the fruits of progress from little America. But conservatives realize that the deeper problem with capitalism is that it creates many things we should not create in the first place, and may ask us to do many things we should not do at all.

Without turning our backs on the modern economy — a prospect as foolish as it is impossible — we need to reconsider the relationship between modern technology and modern commerce, in the hope that we can salvage Smith’s moderation from Bacon’s excesses, and perhaps salvage better answers to man’s permanent questions than simply buying what the cosmetic surgeon and the neurochemist eagerly want to sell us.

### Biotech Link Ext. Cards

#### Greed and profit are the main motives for biotech

**Bhalla**, 20**21** (Bag, author. “Biotechnology greed is prolonging the pandemic. It’s inexcusable.” ASBMB. Oct. 30, 2021. [https://www.asbmb.org/asbmb-today/opinions/103021/biotechnology-greed-is-prolonging-the-pandemic-it ///](https://www.asbmb.org/asbmb-today/opinions/103021/biotechnology-greed-is-prolonging-the-pandemic-it%20///) MF)

Did greed just save the day? That’s what British Prime Minister Boris Johnson claimed recently. “The reason we have the vaccine success,” he said in a private call to Conservative members of Parliament, “is because of capitalism, [because of greed.](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2021/mar/23/greed-and-capitalism-behind-jab-success-boris-johnson-tells-mps)”

Despite later backpedaling, Johnson’s remark reflects a widely influential but wildly incoherent view of innovation: that greed — the unfettered pursuit of profit above all else — is a necessary driver of technological progress. Call it the need-greed theory.

Among the pandemic’s many lessons, however, is that greed can easily work against the common good. We rightly celebrate the near-miraculous development of effective vaccines, which have been widely deployed in rich nations. But the global picture reveals not even a semblance of justice: As of May, low-income nations received [just 0.3 percent](https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/more-million-covid-deaths-4-months-g7-leaders-failed-break-vaccine-monopolies) of the global vaccine supply. At this rate it would take 57 years for them to achieve full vaccination.

This disparity has been dubbed “[vaccine apartheid](https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/g7-must-finance-global-covid19-vaccination-drive-by-gordon-brown-2021-06),” and it’s exacerbated by greed. A year after the launch of the World Health Organization’s Covid-19 Technology Access Pool — a program aimed at encouraging the collaborative exchange of intellectual property, knowledge, and data — “not a single company has [donated its technical knowhow](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/jun/17/covid-vaccine-nationalism-internationalist-approach),” wrote politicians from India, Kenya, and Bolivia in a June essay for The Guardian. As of that month, the U.N.-backed COVAX initiative, a vaccine sharing scheme established to provide developing countries equitable access, had delivered only about 90 million out of a promised 2 billion doses. Currently, pharmaceutical companies, lobbyists, and conservative lawmakers continue to oppose proposals for [patent waivers](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/6/29/explainer-what-are-covid-vaccine-patent-waivers) that would allow local drug makers to manufacture the vaccines without [legal jeopardy](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/05/05/993998745/biden-backs-waiving-international-patent-protections-for-covid-19-vaccines). They claim the waivers would [slow down existing production](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2021/05/07/patent-waivers-wont-impact-big-pharmas-bottom-line-but-could-slow-covid-vaccine-rollouts/?sh=7dc29a6c7862), “[foster the proliferation of counterfeit vaccines](https://www.phrma.org/Press-Release/PhRMA-Statement-on-WTO-TRIPS-Intellectual-Property-Waiver),” and, as North Carolina Republican Sen. Richard Burr said, “undermine the very [innovation we are relying](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/05/05/biden-waives-vaccine-patents/) on to bring this pandemic to an end.”

All these views echo the idea that patents and high drug prices are necessary motivators for biomedical innovation. But examine that logic closely, and it quickly begins to fall apart.

A great deal of difficult, innovative work is done in industries and fields that lack patents. Has the lack of patent protections for recipes led to any dearth of innovation in restaurants? An irritating irony here is that economists who espouse the need-greed theory themselves innovate for comparative peanuts. For instance, in 2018, the median compensation for economists was about [$104,000](https://www.aeaweb.org/resources/students/careers/earnings). The typical pharmaceutical CEO, meanwhile, earned a whopping [$5.7 million](https://www.biopharmadive.com/news/biotech-pharma-ceo-employee-pay/554283/) in total compensation that year. (The hands-on innovators aren’t the need-greeders here; the median compensation for pharmaceutical employees — including benefits — was about $177,000 in 2018.) Even in Silicon Valley, writes ever-astute technology insider Tim O’Reilly, "the notion that entrepreneurs will stop innovating if they aren’t rewarded with billions is a [pernicious fantasy](https://www.oreilly.com/radar/two-economies-two-sets-of-rules/)."

To be sure, it was not greed but rather a vast collaborative effort — funded largely with public dollars — that generated effective coronavirus vaccines. The technology behind mRNA vaccines such as those produced by Pfizer and Moderna took decades of work by University of Pennsylvania scientists you’ve likely never heard of. According to The New York Times, one of those scientists, Katalin Kariko, “[never made more than $60,000 a year](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/08/health/coronavirus-mrna-kariko.html)” while doing her innovative foundational research. The researchers at Oxford University who developed the technology behind AstraZeneca’s vaccine, which was mostly publicly funded, initially set out with the intention of “[non-exclusive, royalty-free](https://innovation.ox.ac.uk/technologies-available/technology-licensing/expedited-access-covid-19-related-ip/)” licensing for their vaccine. Only after pressure to work with a multinational pharmaceutical company from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, among others, did they [renege](https://khn.org/news/rather-than-give-away-its-covid-vaccine-oxford-makes-a-deal-with-drugmaker/) and license the technology solely to AstraZeneca.

It was astonishing, then, when Pascal Soriot, AstraZeneca’s CEO, said that intellectual property, or IP, “is a fundamental part of our industry and if you don't protect IP, then essentially there is no incentive for anybody to innovate.” The Oxford scientists whose work AstraZeneca licensed literally just innovated without the incentives Soriot claimed are essential. Why do journalists present need-greeder claims, [such as Soriot’s](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/patent-pool-potential-covid-19-products-nonsense-pharma-leaders/), without holding the specific role of profit seeking to account?

It’s no secret that innovators (and people generally) often aren’t necessarily greed-driven. For instance, as Walter Isaacson notes in his book about superstar biochemist Jennifer Doudna's work on Crispr gene manipulation technology, she was never motivated primarily by money. In fact, he reports that corporate maneuvering over her work made her "physically ill." Countless cases like hers show that innovations in science and technology typically aren’t the result of genius lightning strikes but rather of field-wide efforts with multiple teams circling the same goal. If anyone withdraws for lack of greed-gratifying incentives, no problem: They’re welcome to write themselves out of history. Others will gladly grasp the glory. And we, the public, lose nothing.

Perhaps Soriot meant, more generally, that reduced revenues would cut AstraZeneca’s overall research and development (R&D) spending. But even that claim is detectably dubious. When drug makers claim that high prices are essential for innovation, they are “[flat out lying](https://www.nakedcapitalism.com/2019/12/financialization-of-the-u-s-pharmaceutical-industry.html)” financial expert Yves Smith wrote in 2019. Smith cited data published with the Institute for New Economic Thinking showing that, between 2009 and 2018, 18 drug makers listed in the S&P 500 spent 14 percent more on stock buybacks and dividends than they did on R&D. These companies could easily ramp up investments in innovative drugs, the authors wrote, simply by reining in distributions to shareholders. (Don’t forget that share buybacks were effectively classified as [illegal market manipulation](https://www.vox.com/2018/8/2/17639762/stock-buybacks-tax-cuts-trump-republicanssi) until the Securities and Exchange Commission, under Reagan, relaxed the rules in 1982.)

Of the money that drug companies do invest in R&D, a significant amount for many goes not toward innovative research but to “finding ways to suppress generic and biosimilar competition while continuing to raise prices,” according to a [recent report](https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/COR%20Staff%20Report%20-%20Pharmaceutical%20Industry%20Buybacks%20Dividends%20Compared%20to%20Research.pdf) from the U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform. In these cases, executive and investor greed demonstrably impede innovation. A recent [Congressional hearing](https://twitter.com/RepKatiePorter/status/1394724627566391297?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1394724627566391297%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fthehill.com%2Fhomenews%2Fhouse%2F554329-katie-porter-brings-her-whiteboard-) dramatized this issue when Rep. Katie Porter, a California Democrat, grilled the CEO of AbbVie, a biopharmaceutical company which she said spent $2.45 billion on research and development, $4.71 billion a year on marketing and advertising, and [$50 billion on shareholder payouts](https://thehill.com/homenews/house/554329-katie-porter-brings-her-whiteboard-to-accuse-pharma-ceo-of-inflating-drug) between 2013 and 2018. She characterized the idea that R&D justified astronomical prices as “the Big Pharma fairy tale.”

Even if greed makes sense for some for-profit ventures, it would be unwise for us to rely only on for-profit enterprise to harness innovation for social goals. There are many things that we must do whether they are profitable or not, and the horrific fiasco over vaccine patents has shown us that biotech executives and other members of the “thinkerati” are not above putting profits ahead of saving lives. As White House adviser Anthony Fauci noted to [the Hill](https://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/551971-fauci-covid-19-vaccine-patent-waiver-should-not-be-off-the-table) earlier this year, America has a "moral obligation” to “make sure that the rest of the world does not suffer and die” from something that we can help to prevent. Our government is failing in its duty to act in the public interest if it allows “your money or your life” to pass as an acceptable business model.

As an open letter signed by more than a hundred intellectual property scholars [recently stated](https://research.kent.ac.uk/socril/ip-scholarship-trips-waiver/), IP rights (which includes patents) “are not, and have never been, absolute rights and are granted and recognized under the condition that they serve the public interest.” The scholars noted precedents like last year’s use of the Defense Production Act to increase production of medical supplies, and the U.S.’s commandeering of penicillin production during World War II. If Covid-19 vaccine makers refuse to make life-saving technology publicly available, governments should enact mandatory licensing or similar measures.

There are also compelling reasons to develop a standing, publicly operated rapid-response vaccine manufacturing capability. Pfizer’s CFO suggested that prices on vaccines will go up once we are out of the “[pandemic-pricing environment](https://www.fiercepharma.com/pharma/pfizer-eyes-higher-covid-19-vaccine-prices-after-pandemic-exec-analyst),” noting that the company can charge nearly nine times more than they have been (“$150, $175 per dose,” the CFO said, versus the $19.50 Pfizer is charging the U.S. in one supply deal). Even if those who haven’t received a single dose of the vaccine never do, that could mean roughly a $30 billion bonanza from U.S. booster shots alone. Patient advocates estimate that it would cost [just $4 billion](https://theweek.com/articles/981550/how-joe-biden-could-vaccinate-world) for the U.S. to set up a public-private operation capable of manufacturing enough mRNA vaccines to immunize the whole planet, with each shot costing $2. This would be a great way for America to show global leadership, and would surely be way cheaper, both individually and collectively, than being annually “Pfizered.” Plus, the usefulness of such a facility would long outlast the current pandemic, with climate change making zoonotic spillover events more likely (not to mention the risks of weaponized viruses). Covid-19 was our “[starter pandemic](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/10/coronavirus-election/616884/),” as Ed Yong usefully dubbed it.

If greed-driven companies fail to exercise their powers responsibly, they should face competition from the public sector. President Biden let the cat out of the bag when [he said](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/07/09/remarks-by-president-biden-at-signing-of-an-executive-order-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) that “capitalism without competition isn't capitalism; it's exploitation.” While many people applauded his sentiment, stop and think about the implication: The president was, in essence, saying that we expect corporations to exploit us if given half a chance.

We pay a huge price in blood and treasure when we give the need-greeders free rein to lie to and exploit the public with impunity. We must be clear-eyed about exactly when greed can help our collective interests and when it hinders them. During a crisis as dire as a global pandemic, greed won’t save us.

#### Mainstream bioethics are replicating the ideological discourse of neoliberalism

**ten Have 14** (Henk, Professor emeritus at the Center for Healthcare Ethics at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, U.S.A. where he has been Director since 2010. Previously, he served in UNESCO as Director of the Division of Ethics of Science and Technology, “Vulnerability as the Antidote to Neoliberalism in Bioethics”, “<https://redbioetica.com.ar/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Art9-tenHave-A5V1N9-2014.pdf>”, ML)

How should the bioethical debate be refocused? The recent use of the notion of vulnerability in scholarly literature is fueled by the heightened sense of vulnerability at the global level. The background is well-known. Processes of globalization are strongly influenced by neoliberal market ideology. The market is regarded as the main source of vulnerability and insecurity (Kirby, 2006; Thomas, 2007). Neoliberal policies are multiplying insecurities: less and more precarious employment, deterioration of working conditions, financial instability, growth of poverty, and environmental degradation. They also lead to the breakdown of protective mechanisms; safety networks and solidarity arrangements that existed to protect vulnerable subjects have been minimized or eliminated. Rules and regulations protecting society as well as the environment are weakened in order to promote global market expansion. As a result, precariousness has generally expanded. **This is precisely what the ideology wants to accomplish**: people only flourish if they are confronted with challenges, if there is the possibility of competition. Individual security is “a matter of individual choice” (Harvey, 2005: 168). It is exactly this ideological discourse that is replicated in mainstream bioethics’ interpretation of vulnerability as deficient autonomy. But if, on the contrary, vulnerability is regarded as the result of the damaging impact of the global logic of neoliberalism, a different approach will emerge. It is not surprising that the language of vulnerability is often used by international and intergovernmental organizations. The devastating effects of neoliberal policies are most visible in the developing world. But nowadays, **existential insecurity is everywhere**. It is also obvious that market ideology has not in fact increasing human welfare. It has mainly promoted increasing inequality. It has created a world in which the 85 richest persons have as many financial resources as the 3.5 billion poorest people (Oxfam 2014). A small elite has appropriated the political process and has bended the rules of the economic system for its own benefit. Read the story of Iceland; in the 1970s and 1980s an egalitarian country with a rapidly growing economy. Neoliberal policies and privatization of the banking system in 1998- 2003 resulted in fast enrichment of a small elite but massive indebtedness of the country so that in 2004 it had the highest national debt in the world (Reid, 2014). When bioethics discourse was initiated and expanded during the 1970s and 1980s the major moral challenges were related to the power of science and technology. How can patients be protected against medical interference and paternalism? How can citizens have more control over healthcare decisions? In what ways can patients’ rights be defined and implemented? These questions have shaped the agenda and methodology of mainstream bioethics, especially in more developed countries. But in a global perspective, many citizens do not have access to modern science and technology. They are marginalized in a system that is increasingly privatized and commercialized. They are exploited in clinical research projects since it is their only change to receive treatment and care. It is obvious that in this perspective, especially since 1990s the major moral challenges have changed. It is no longer the power of science and technology that produces ethical problems but the power of money. Healthcare, research, education, and even culture and religion are regarded as businesses that are competing for consumers.

#### Biotech innovation proliferates capitalist corporation exploitation – recent vaccines prove

Whyte Professor of Socio-legal Studies at the School of Law and Social Justice, University of Liverpool 21

[David Whyte, Vaccinating Capitalism: corporate pharma raids the commons and leaves the root causes untreated, Corporate Watch, 04-01-2021, https://corporatewatch.org/vaccinating-capitalism-corporate-pharma-raids-the-commons-and-leaves-the-root-causes-untreated/, //1LEE]

The vaccines developed to deal with COVID-19 have undoubtedly given us a unique springboard to develop other vaccines in future. Yet this does not make up for years of neglect. We started from a low knowledge base about COVID-19 precisely because the big four had calculated that developing vaccines for the earlier coronaviruses was not worth the portfolio risk.

Our earlier Vaccinating Capitalism report on the profits being made by the main vaccine producers shows how this time portfolio risk was taken out of the equation. The reason the COVID-19 vaccines arrived at such warp speed is that the risk model changed overnight. Indeed, the normal risks associated with vaccine development were almost completely removed from investors. First, research and development, combined with direct subsidies, were mobilised on an unprecedented scale. Second, governments used our money to place the biggest drug advance orders in history and remove all market risk from future sales. Those two things prompted an unprecedented single-purpose investment in the sector. This unprecedented investment will, of course, be followed by unprecedented profits.

The development of this vaccine is part of a vast system of public subsidy that deceives the public into thinking that it is private capital in the form of Big Pharma that saves us through its innovation. Yet perhaps the biggest subsidy to those companies is hidden.

Universities provide trained scientists, a foundation of knowledge that has been built up over hundreds of years. It is in universities that the rules for clinical research are developed, and it is university researchers who establish the system of peer review and publish results in academic journals. Universities make the largest social contribution to verifying and disseminating scientific breakthroughs. It is knowledge that we hold in common. Part of the ‘commons’ it may be, but in economic terms, this knowledge production counts as an ‘externality’: an invisible subsidy that never shows up on a corporate balance sheet.

The infrastructure that produced the vaccines was nurtured in publicly funded universities, in public institutes and in heavily subsidised private labs. When we recognise this, we realise that it is we who are saving Big Pharma from its failure to develop an effective vaccine against similar viruses in the first place.

VACCINATING CAPITALISM

Most infectious disease experts expect that new viral diseases resulting from zoonotic ‘spillover’ – moving from animals to humans – will become ever more frequent occurrences. SARS-Cov-19 is not the first case, and we are likely to face many more. There are difficult issues that we need to face regarding this unprecedented vaccination programme: how it allows governments to avoid tackling the root causes of SARS-Cov-2, and indeed may help weaken our defences against the next pathogen that spreads from animals to humans.

We know some of the main drivers of spillover. One is deforestation. New pathogens are released when land that has been left relatively un-touched is cleared for development and industrial use by humans. Once wild animals carrying those pathogens are displaced, the pathogens then need to maximise the opportunity to ‘leap’ from one species to another in a process of genetic drift. This is not an easy process. But, as writers like Rob Wallace have been warning us for years, large scale industrial farming can vastly increase the chances of a virus mutating into a form that can make the leap. Once it is in the human pool, it finds its most fertile conditions in closely packed workplaces like factories, warehouses and call centres.

The problem is that it is not just us who are being vaccinated but capitalism itself. The danger is that the vaccines will merely provide a short-term “technofix” which helps ensure the survival of the system that keeps on killing us.

The entire public funding effort – furlough, government loans, suspension of the normal regulatory rules – has had one primary aim: to keep corporations on life support. Some of our most damaging and irresponsible corporations have been kept alive by public funding, often in ways that have allowed them to sack workers, rip-off customers, and profit from intensifying poverty. Meanwhile, the Covid crisis (despite all the celebratory news about falling pollution levels) has also been used to weaken efforts against climate change. Corporations in Europe and North America have taken the opportunity to lobby hard – with some success – for environmental deregulation and further weakening of Paris Agreement targets.

The development of the vaccines will save many lives, but there is a price to pay. The profit-maximising, risk-minimising model ensures that we, not the corporations, will ultimately end up paying the financial costs. But there is an even higher social cost that might be paid. If we don’t deal with the root causes of the problem, and simply continue to reproduce the same uncontrolled conditions of capitalist development and industrial farming, then we will keep being exposed to more and more zoonotic pathogens long after we have got rid of this one.

## AI

### 2NC -- Ext: Ethical AI Link

#### AI---AI increases capitalist exploitation---the link alone turns case because AI steals human jobs---that triggers all of their impacts

Justie 20, Brian Justie, Brian Justie is a PhD student at UCLA, and a researcher at the UCLA Labor Center. His current work focuses on the political economy of CAPTCHA, 3/11/2020 “The Rise of AI Capitalism: An Interview with Nick-Dyer Witheford”, <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-rise-of-ai-capitalism-an-interview-with-nick-dyer-witheford/> - FT

The moment is ripe because of the surging corporate interest in and applications of machine learning and other new branches of AI research. Major info-tech companies have come to see the cognitive and biological limits of the human as a barrier to accumulation, and glimpse the possibilities of smashing through that obstacle with machine learning, advanced robotics, and other “fourth industrial revolution” technologies. AI today is still in a rudimentary phase, limited to narrow, domain-specific applications, very far from the human-equivalent or human-exceeding general AI that remains the stuff of sci-fi imaginaries, although it is also the target of some serious research programs. Nevertheless, in this restricted form AI permeates everyday life, in the Global Northwest, in China, and to some degree globally: its algorithms organize social media feeds, financial activities, virtual games, workplace monitoring, welfare systems, and police surveillance. We are now in what I and my co-authors, Atle Mikkola Kjøsen and James Steinhoff, term “actually-existing AI capitalism.” Its technologies will likely continue to encroach on what we have thought of as exclusively human capacities, and be applied across a steadily broadening spectrum of activities. As James Steinhoff speculates, AI may well become what Marx termed a “general condition of production,” a prerequisite infrastructure for commercial activity, as steam engines and railways were in the 19th century, and electricity and mass transportation for the 20th. This process is unfolding almost entirely under the direction of giant oligopolistic corporations — Google, Microsoft, IBM, Amazon, Facebook, Alibaba, Tencent, Baidu — with help thrown in by governments eager for AI’s national security state applications. Marx would have understood this very well. So we need a Marxist critique of AI, as what is probably the prime contemporary example of profit-driven and revolt-suppressing appropriation and direction of techno-scientific knowledge. But this process is also throwing into doubt the humanist assumptions built into Marx’s concept of labor: so we also need to critique Marxism from the viewpoint of AI.

#### Markets---the affirmative expands NATO control which is based on “markets” and “freedom” - Neg reads yellow

1AC, Gilli, 2020 - Senior Researcher at the NATO Defense College [Andrea, NDC Research Paper No.15 – December ““NATO-Mation”: Strategies for Leading in the Age of Artificial Intelligence” https://www.ndc.nato.int/news/news.php?icode=1514 Acc 4/21/22 TA]

Artificial Intelligence, machine learning and big data represent some, but not the only, instances of technological progress. In contrast to other realms of technology, however, artificial intelligence bodes far-reaching ramifications across all areas of society, the economy, and the military, on account of its ubiquitous nature that enables pervasive diffusion. When major technological changes occur, governments usually step in to update regulations or introduce ethical rules to help align incentives among different actors. Some measures include providing key complementary goods and services, which the market may otherwise undersupply. Governments also draw strategic directions. The Atlantic Alliance is encountering a major challenge; but is also standing before a potent opportunity to shape the future security environment, thereby preserving the freedom and well-being of its Allies’ citizens, and maintaining its technological leadership. One possible way forward consists of pursuing the NATO-mation agenda described in this report: a set of individual and collective initiatives, joint solutions and coordinated actions spanning across several fields and domains and at different levels. This Research Paper has highlighted 11 different areas where action is possible and desirable. Challenges, dynamics, actors and constraints differ in each area, but NATO can play a significant role as both as initiator and as coordinator. In the ethics domain, NATO has an interest in upholding its founding values. Innovation-wise, there is a strong rationale for the Alliance to identify or even create an internal actor to champion AI as well as to help Allies generate an innovative workforce and pioneer more modern work environments. Change, however, is difficult. Innovation, if history has any lesson to spare, is even more difficult. Launching pilot projects can help subdue scepticism and temper the understandably reluctant attitude of some, all the while fostering greater familiarity with new technologies. While the transformation we are observing is technology-driven, its main repercussions will be on human beings, their ideas, their norms and their organizations. In addition to ushering in an innovative workplace and an innovative workforce, experimentation will be necessary to accept, understand and improve novel technologies, as well as to steer their evolution to fulfil ethical considerations, alongside tactical, operational and strategic necessities. Traditionally, NATO has played a significant part in this respect and, if anything, should continue and probably expand this role further. NATO Allies have, however, a broader opportunity to shape the evolution of AI-related technologies both through increasing R&D spending and through targeted investments. The bulk of AI research is driven by the private sector. Most observers worry that this has deprived military establishments of the control over new technologies. Private-sector driven research, at least in the realm of AI, has several drawbacks, including a short-term and narrow focus, and a reliance on economically, technologically and environmentally unsustainable solutions. There is a role for NATO-wide coordinated public action and investments, and eventual concertation with the European Union, in tackling these issues. Similarly, Allies will soon have to contemplate and prepare for the infrastructures on which AI systems will run: quantum and cloud computing as well as 5G networks warrant closer scrutiny. Whether NATO should provide cloud computing the way it does through AWACS aircraft, airspace management, is however, another issue. Historically, NATO has delivered collective defence with a strong attention to arms control. Whilst not an easy endeavour with immediate payoffs, the Alliance can contribute to ongoing debates on how to reach the goal of preserving international stability. NATO armed forces, combined, are more than the sum of the single parts: this is attributable to interoperability. In the NATO context, standardization plays a critical role: coordination among Allies is important, both within the Alliance and without, such as in Standards Development Organizations (SDOs). The Atlantic Alliance won the Cold War and overcame the challenges it faced in the ensuing decades because of the bonds among the Allies. Such bonds are not primarily political, military or diplomatic: they are cultural, ideological and ethical, and are based on the founding principles on which the Alliance was built. Democracy, rule of law, human rights, and free markets have guaranteed the longevity of transatlantic relations. AI technologies, through deep-fakes, may undermine those values. This is an insidious challenge which, however, may also one day prove existential. This is why NATO must be poised to play a key role in this technological realm.

#### Control---the affirmative increases NATO control over AI---that guarantees “Western” American control over AI markets and others---ties in with their modelling claims---the affirmative increases NATO control over ethical AI development---not only does that guarantee a faulty development, but it also spreads NATO influence and western imperialism. If they win their modelling claims, capitalism is modelled and spreads internationally.

#### NATO---NATO is a capitalistic and imperialist alliance---the aff’s rooting in NATO proves that they are capitalist

Payne 19, Liz Payne, Liz Payne is convenor of the British Peace Assembly, 4/3/2019, “Nato: Seven decades of the evil alliance”, <https://morningstaronline.co.uk/article/f/nato-seven-decades-of-the-evil-alliance> - FT

THIS week foreign ministers from Nato countries are in Washington DC for a series of events to mark the 70th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty. Signed in that city on April 4 1949 by the US, Canada, Britain, France, Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Portugal, Denmark, Iceland and Norway, it was the first military treaty binding together the US, key imperialist states in Europe and their allies on both sides of the Atlantic to pursue what Winston Churchill had referred to in his Fulton, Missouri speech in 1946 as the US-led “overall strategic concept.” However dressed up, the plan was to secure the post-war world for monopoly capitalism, bring down the Soviet Union and socialist countries of eastern Europe and crush any green shoots of socialism wherever they might spring up — in the heartlands of imperialism or in the newly liberated former colonies. Article 5 of the Treaty provided for mutual assistance should any member be attacked. The Soviet Union was cast as an existential threat — though all its energy was directed towards rapid post-war reconstruction, securing international arms reduction agreements, banning the use of nuclear weapons and achieving peaceful coexistence. The mass media whipped up fear of communism and of imminent attack through conventional warfare and weapons of mass destruction to be unleashed by the Kremlin and its Red Army. The treaty and media-induced panic facilitated the moulding of Western Europe as a vast military bloc, the maintenance of huge armies with extensive periods of national conscription, the proliferation of US and other military bases in Britain and elsewhere and the deployment of US troops and warplanes. It also stimulated soaring expenditure on research into ever more lethal warfare, eating up the government science budgets of member countries which could have been directed to meeting people’s needs. In Britain, government spending on science increased from £5 million in 1937 to £78m in 1947 to £234m in 1953, 80 per cent of which was warfare-related. It engaged the Soviet Union in an unwanted and economically devastating arms race, forced the formation of the Warsaw Pact alliance for the self-defence of the socialist countries in 1955, and terrorised the whole world with the threat of nuclear annihilation — anything by any method to halt the progress of socialism. These developments did not, of course, come out of nowhere. While the war still raged across the continents and people everywhere hoped for peace, democracy and freedom from colonial oppression, imperialism was laying the foundations of a very different world that would meet its need for hegemonic control of resources, labour and markets once the current hostilities had ceased. Winston Churchill was on the case on behalf of the right-wing British establishment before the ink had even time to dry on the document bringing war in Europe to a halt. On May 9 1945 in Berlin, the German high command formally ratified the instrument of total and unconditional surrender. Duplicitous Churchill told Stalin that the future of humanity depended “on the friendship and understanding between the British and Russian peoples,” to which, on May 10, Stalin replied, looking forward to “the further successful and happy development in the post-war period of the friendly relations which have grown up between our countries in the period of the war.”

#### Discourse---Discourse surrounding NATO and how it can be used for “security cooperation” allows for the expansion of the capitalist alliance, justifying imperialism---their attempt to do something good masks NATO’s various atrocities in the past and attempts to make NATO appear as good when it is in fact a flawed alliance. In other words, the affirmative puts a “band-aid” over a machine gun wound to the stomach.

#### Expansion---Their attempts to cause NATO modelling links in two ways: the first is that it expands capitalist control over the world as Western imperialism is adopted in new markets---that spreads capitalism and gives elites control over materials from other countries---the second way is that their discourse of modelling presents the idea that the West is a shining city on the hill that other countries should “model”. That justifies imperialism, colonialism, and capitalist expansion.

### 2NC -- Ext: AI Logistics Link Rehighlightings ↓

#### The first piece of evidence in the 1AC hypes up the benefits of “Big Data” and claims that security professionals and industry cooperation is necessary to maintain efficiency, justifying the usage of commercial AI. Neg reads blue.

George Christou 21, Professor of European Politics and Security, University of Warwick. “NATO Decision-Making in the Age of Big Data and Artificial Intelligence” Editors: Sonia Lucarelli; Alessandro Marrone; and Francesco Niccolò Moro. Sonia Lucarelli is Professor of International Relations and European Security at the University of Bologna, and member of the Board of Directors of the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). Alessandro Marrone is Head of the Defence Programme of IAI and teaches at the Istituto Superiore di Stato Maggiore Interforze (ISSMI) of the Italian Ministry of Defence. Francesco N. Moro is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Bologna and Adjunct Professor of International Relations at the Johns Hopkins University Europe Campus. This publication is the result of the Conference “NATO Decision-making: promises and perils of the Big Data age”, organized by NATO Allied Command Transformation (ACT), the University of Bologna and Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) of Rome. <https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/978195445000.pdf> //pipk

Just like with the commercial and public sector, then, technological progress has allowed militaries and security sector professionals to gather large amounts of data, and a number of countries (governments and armed forces) are in the process of constructing and implementing governance models to ensure the benefits of Big Data in terms of real time intelligence, enhanced decision-making, situational awareness and overall competitive edge against increasingly capable opponents. The synergy between Big Data, ML and AI is particularly important in this context when it comes to all aspects of combat readiness, with experts agreeing that AI and its application in the armed forces is “present in all domains…and all levels of warfare” (Svenmarck et al., 2018) with the potential to have a transformative impact on national security technology (Allen and Chan, 2017; see also Tonin, 2019). Many, however, are at an early stage in the development of any BDA strategy. Thus, the lessons from other sectors – and indeed leading governments and security organizations – can provide guidance on best practice as they move from their ‘data’ governance models to ‘Big Data’ governance frameworks that will give them the ability to ensure maximum value and advantage is extrapolated from the BDA life-cycle.

The first lesson or best practice relates to having a clear rationale, goals and guiding principles in place to ensure effective governance of Big Data in the organization. This includes strategically assessing the type of model required, based on current capabilities, resources and future needs, i.e. decentralized/centralized/hybrid. More importantly, governments and security organizations need a clear understanding of the value of Big Data across different domains (land, sea, air) and landscapes (human, physical, information) so that high quality, usable, real-time information can be delivered through AI and ML at strategic, tactical and operational levels. This is certainly recognized in the NATO context, with a Dutch Position Paper highlighting that, in terms of Big Data and AI, “the focus should be on assessing and…demonstrating the added value that innovations can provide to NATO military theatres” (Smallgange et al., 2018). This is critical, so that the full possibilities of influencing the three landscapes – through situational awareness and effective command and control – can be developed in a broader way than that offered by traditional military means. This way, there is also a recognition that in order to take full advantage of the data-centric technologies (BDA and AI), a data-centric methodology is required, so that effective support can be offered at different levels (Blunt et al., 2018).

In the second place, related to the first lesson learned, in a military and security context where there is often a unified command in combination with tiered formal hierarchy that tends towards specialization, there can also be structural inefficiencies in the flow of information; operating jointly can thus often come at a high cost (Zelaya and Keeley, 2020). When considering any data-driven methodology, then, much thought has to be given to the organizational data management life cycle – including how to integrate the use of BDA and new technologies (e.g. AI, ML) with human decision-making, control and communication of information. Indeed, it has been argued that whilst BDA and associated technologies offer significant advances in rapidly collecting, processing and deciphering complex forms and varieties of data for the purposes of action, the human element is still critical in contextualizing any such data and offering insights on the complexity and “shades of grey” that might be missed by BDA (Van Puyvelde et al., 2018: 1414; see also Desclaux, 2018: 9). To this end, thought has already been given to the implementation of the Observe, Orient, Decide, Act (OODA) loop to determine the type of decision support required and how meaningful human control can be enabled. The OODA perspective or approach, it is argued, represents “the life cycle from data acquisition to decision making and also reflects how sophisticated a technology should be in order to provide value” (Smallgange et al., 2017: 6). An important element within this loop is giving full consideration to any legal, ethical and moral questions that arise in relation to action and particularly the use of lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS).

The third best practice relates to buy-in from the organization as a whole. That means not just having the technology, tools and mechanisms in place within a data driven environment that ensures access to and use of Big Data for all team members, but also: a) Leadership from those at the top (Commanders) and within the different echelons of command within and across domains, landscapes and levels through to data engineers, analysts, assessors, translators – and the ability of the various communities of interest to use data communicated to them in an effective way; b) The creation of an organizational (big) data-driven culture and data-centric paradigm – including ensuring that all relevant staff are data literate, have the requisite skills, literacy and readiness, and are provided with the education, training and skills to operate effectively. To this end, NATO has identified a key capability gap when it comes to literacy and readiness and has also recognized that in terms of recruiting AI specialists, engineers and data scientists the pool of talent is shallow and it can be difficult to compete with Big Tech companies.

Here, leading national governments in developing their Big Data strategies have sought to ensure the requisite investment is in place going forward for developing a (resilient, secure and trusted) technology architecture and recruiting the right talent. They have also, alongside leading security organizations such as NATO, recognized that partnerships (in particular with industry) and contracted services, as well as in-house expertise, that will be needed to deliver and sustain the necessary skills and understanding for assessing, interpreting and communicating information in an effective way (Tonin, 2019; Blunt, 2018; Defence IQ, 2020; Big Data for Defence, 2019). Finally, the non-defense commercial/industry sector will not just be important in terms of the skills and expertise element, but also for technological adaptation and integration, given that many innovations stem from commercial companies; the UK government, for example, has awarded IBM a GBP 3.8 million deal for the development of an AI-powered military software platform prototype (Defence IQ, 2020). More broadly, governments and security sector organizations will have to overcome certain hurdles – organizational, cultural, and incentive structures – to ensure that new technologies are adapted so they can bring advantages across strategic, tactical and operational levels (Kostopoulos, 2019: 9) and allow efficient and effective decision-making when needed.

Conclusions This chapter has highlighted the central ways in which commercial organizations have been successful in constructing and executing a BDA strategy, and discussed the main pitfalls that organizations should seek to avoid in embarking on any such strategy. In this context it is clear that there are many lessons to be learnt and best practices that can be adapted by the security sector in relation the integration of BDA into existing strategies. Indeed, a cursory look at the leading nations with regards to Big Data strategies – and security organizations such as NATO – demonstrate that their central objectives have been developed (and appropriately adapted) with commercial best practice in mind in relation to data management, governance and analytics.

To this end, there are general principles for success that are underpinned by a need for a clear rationale, goals and strategy, a strong leadership, an agile, resilient, secure and adaptable technical infrastructure, a data-centric approach and methodology, and a data culture that permeates the whole organization. Of course, this chapter did not have the space or scope to discuss the micro-level BDA requirements within the security sector in relation to all dimensions, and in particular innovative hardware and software architectures or indeed process techniques and challenges.

What is clear going forward, however, is that the security sector will face challenges of a technical and nontechnical nature that will require financial investments in AI systems and human talent, as well as cooperation and collaboration with industry and leadership, if BDA strategies are to deliver the advantages expected to those engaged at strategic, tactical and operational levels. In this, lead nations and organizations, whilst not starting from scratch, have clearly started to negotiate the steep learning curve when it comes to Big Data and decision-making (Street et al., 2019). They are at a formative phase of development with regards to constructing and implementing strategies and governance frameworks, and indeed modelling and simulation environments, tools and techniques to allow them to derive maximum value from Big Data. The journey ahead, however, whilst entailing certain risks, is also an opportunity – if objectives and goals are clearly defined, strategies grown and adapted according to ever-changing needs, data and technological environments, and data governance and management practices enabled by strong leadership are underpinned by a philosophy of date-centric methodology, technology and clear legal and ethical code of conduct. Testing (through exercises, simulations, etc.), failure and the ability to reflect are important components of evolving and (re)defining BDA governance so that real value can be extracted in real time, with trustworthy and accurate data, and systems, technology and skills required to exploit data all the way through the decision-making process are sustained.

#### The 1AC evidence cites fears of damage to the private sector as the primary reason to pass the plan, constructing a capitalist threat to justify militaristic policy. Neg reads blue.

Sonia Lucarelli et al 21. Sonia Lucarelli is Professor of International Relations and European Security at the University of Bologna, and member of the Board of Directors of the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). Alessandro Marrone is Head of the Defence Programme of IAI and teaches at the Istituto Superiore di Stato Maggiore Interforze (ISSMI) of the Italian Ministry of Defence. Francesco N. Moro is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Bologna and Adjunct Professor of International Relations at the Johns Hopkins University Europe Campus. “NATO Decision-Making in the Age of Big Data and Artificial Intelligence” Editors: Sonia Lucarelli; Alessandro Marrone; and Francesco Niccolò Moro. This publication is the result of the Conference “NATO Decision-making: promises and perils of the Big Data age”, organized by NATO Allied Command Transformation (ACT), the University of Bologna and Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) of Rome. <https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/978195445000.pdf> //pipk

Digital revolution has substantially transformed the world we live in, providing great opportunities but also making societies more vulnerable and transforming the meaning of state borders. Technology makes external interferences cheaper, faster and all-encompassing: citizens can potentially become direct targets of information warfare, all members of a society can be part of conflicts one way or another. From advanced weaponry to command and control, most security-related domains are undergoing deep transformations as data availability and transmission increase exponentially. This is especially true as the emergence of so-called hybrid tactics contributes to universalize the battlefield. Also, attackers may lose control of their offensive cyber weapons, and ‘collateral damages’ across the private sector and the public worldwide might be more and more difficult to contain. Less visible, yet important challenges connected with Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) also exist. For instance, data overload can create problems for decisionmakers that are unable to detect important signals. Losing sight of how machines make their calculations – a somewhat inherent feature of Artificial Intelligence (AI) – can hinder deeper understanding of phenomena as well as learning, besides having dense ethical implications.

A crucial question for Western societies and governments is how to deal with technological changes by exploiting their many benefits while managing to limit their risks. Broadly speaking, observers have long noticed the potentialities of technologies in the security domain: better situational awareness, early warning against threats and risks, the ability to prevent and/or stop attacks to happen, the use of technology against the adversaries’ own technologies, and eventually deterrence of high-end hybrid warfare or, at least, the increase of resilience against it. In particular, in order to harness the potential of new technologies, higher levels of security are needed. While internet is unfortunately not secure by design, it has to be somehow retrofit to guarantee a certain level of protection – for instance by avoiding a single point of failure, developing better firewalls, etc. Ultimately, the digital revolution poses challenges to decision makers both as potential users of new technologies and as leaders of targeted societies. Learning to achieve political aims through the support of technological innovations and at the same time acquiring the ability to prevent and manage interferences, if not attacks, have become paramount.

However, achieving such results is not only about engineering. Technologies need ad hoc governance, organizations and skilled users to properly function. Actually, history is full of examples of good technologies that were improperly used and/or unable to provide the expected gains. Therefore, a joint, multi-disciplinary efforts is needed to think and manage technologies in a more comprehensive and secure way across various domains. For instance, the very same design of AI needs exchanges with social scientists in order to limit analytical biases and increase the quality of data that will then be processed through Machine Learning (ML). Moreover, many public policies involve technologies with a strong security dimension. This is one of the main reasons security standards should be harmonized across individual government’s policies as well as among Allies: this is what has been leading NATO’s renewed efforts on standardization beyond the strictly military perimeter, for instance towards the 5G domain.

While digital technologies continue to dramatically increase in scope and relevance, they are deeply embedded into the broader geopolitical framework, with the re-emergence of multipolarism and looming great power confrontation. This connection has to be discussed and understood as it affects not only security but also economic and technological domains. The globalized supply chain of technology building block entails vulnerabilities and dependencies on unreliable suppliers. Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) in hightech companies, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and critical infrastructures are guided not only by an economic rationale but also by a politico-military one, and have to be monitored accordingly. Cyber space and, partly, outer space are de facto unregulated global commons where the ability to set regulations and standards could be a matter of competition and/or cooperation among major countries worldwide. The notions of ‘whole-of-government’ and ‘whole-of-society’ approaches confirm that these problems should be dealt with comprehensive strategies.

Great and middle powers increasingly rely on stand-off weapons, both physical and cyber ones, able to create damages rapidly, worldwide and on a large scale. This trend is going to be accelerated by AI. Some countries are adopting principles on responsible use of AI, including in terms of control and accountability. However, a vacuum remains in international law. And such vacuum is more difficult to fill because of the aforementioned interaction between geopolitics and technologies. Different powers conceive technology – and what it can bring them in terms of benefits – in different ways, and they are unwilling to regulate internationally this field of competition and warfare.

In such a rapidly changing security environment, NATO and allied activities directly or indirectly defend citizens’ daily life. In the age of Big Data, AI and the pervasive use of internet, the challenge is to defend the ever-expanding information environment while maintaining all its functionalities.

Against this backdrop, in the post-Cold War period NATO somehow missed the opportunity to involve Allies and partners in a debate on how defense technologies and norms have been changing with the ICT revolution. The result is that the web is not secure by design, and both private and public actors struggle to mitigate risks and threats in an unregulated environment where attackers are structurally advantaged over defenders. Today, the Alliance should not miss the opportunity twice vis-à-vis Big Data, AI and, broadly speaking, the current and future (r)evolution of ICT. The aim of the 2020 Academic Conference was precisely to explore some fundamental aspects of the challenges and opportunities posed by technological change to the security environment in which NATO works. Below follows a brief introduction to NATO, cyber defense and three sets of issues investigated in closer detail: Big Data and decision-making; hybrid threats to allied decision-making; AI adoption by allied armed forces.

NATO, Cyber Defense and Emerging Disruptive Technologies NATO begun to focus on cyber defense already in 2008, and over time it built up institutions and frameworks to deal with it from a well-limited military perspective. Allies recognized a cyber attack could lead to the activation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty on collective defense. In that case, there is a clear procedure where NATO authorities take the military lead. Article 5 does not prescribe a clear procedure factoring in new technologies. On a regular basis, headquarters and the Secretary General cabinet carry on exercises on situational awareness, whereby they receive intelligence and military advice and are immersed in an information space with blue and red teams. Moreover, every two years, there is a large-scale exercise involving national governments. These efforts aim to build familiarity with the technology-related security challenges. However, further evolution of AI-based cyber attacks can constitute an increasing threat for datareliant organizations such as NATO.

Beyond cyber defense, the Alliance started to work on the broader issue of Emerging Disruptive Technologies (EDTs) only in 2019, by setting up an innovation board co-chaired by the Deputy Secretary General and the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation. Moreover, a dedicated unit was created in the Emerging Security Challenge Division. Two White Papers were produced, respectively on AI and on autonomous weapons, to provide inputs for Allies’ decisions in this regard. The current NATO approach is based on the motto “adopting and adapting”, entailing five complimentary goals: (1) better understand emerging disruptive technologies; (2) properly look at their implications for defense; (3) decide about their use; (4) mitigate their risks; and (5) exploit their advantages.

Noticeably, the traditional defense industrial ecosystem entails long planning, oligopolistic supply and monopsonic demand. Over time, it was characterized by substantial technology transfers from the military to the civilian domain (the so-called ‘spin offs’), including the very same embryonic Internet. In recent years, several new technologies with relevant implications for security and defense have been emerging from a different ecosystem, marked by bottom-up innovation, a rapid development-to-market cycle, and a technology transfer from the civilian to the military domain. As a result, with the relevant exception of certain space assets and hypersonic technologies, the civilian sector is increasingly developing into the innovation driver, and defense one has become quite dependent. Such a shift implies that priority setting for current and future technology development is not substantially driven by states anymore. In the US, the Pentagon’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) struggles to develop a dialogue with the private sector gravitating around the Silicon Valley to embrace certain research lines. The NATO Industry Partnership on the cyber domain serves as platform for Alliance’s officials and industrial representatives to exchange notes, yet major ICT players do not seem very interested in having such a structured dialogue. Moreover, investments in these technologies require venture capitals and the acceptance of the risks to fail – something which usually states, and particularly Ministries of Defense, cannot afford. The US, the UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands and other Allies made certain steps to adapt their defense innovation models in these domains, but this is only the beginning of a long transformation process.

As a matter of fact, adapting to emerging and disruptive technologies is harder for some Allies than others. The related risk is moving towards a multi-layer Alliance, with some member states holding new technologies, and others not having such advantage. Ideally, the solution would be to collectively adopt certain new technologies, but this represents a challenge for the NATO Defence Planning Process, military procurement, common funding, etc. A technology group of experts has been appointed to reflect upon issues including but not limited to these, and the Secretary General will probably present a report to the next summit of Heads of state and governments.

#### The 1AC evidence uses fear of Russia and China to encourage private sector involvement to ensure the future of capitalism. Neg reads blue.

Hanna Smith 21, Director of Research and Analysis at the Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats and visiting professor for the academic year 2020–2021 at the College of Europe, Bruges. “NATO Decision-Making in the Age of Big Data and Artificial Intelligence” Editors: Sonia Lucarelli; Alessandro Marrone; and Francesco Niccolò Moro. Sonia Lucarelli is Professor of International Relations and European Security at the University of Bologna, and member of the Board of Directors of the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). Alessandro Marrone is Head of the Defence Programme of IAI and teaches at the Istituto Superiore di Stato Maggiore Interforze (ISSMI) of the Italian Ministry of Defence. Francesco N. Moro is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Bologna and Adjunct Professor of International Relations at the Johns Hopkins University Europe Campus. This publication is the result of the Conference “NATO Decision-making: promises and perils of the Big Data age”, organized by NATO Allied Command Transformation (ACT), the University of Bologna and Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) of Rome. <https://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/978195445000.pdf> //pipk

Putting together the five characteristics of hybrid threats (use of multiple synchronized tools, ability to create ambiguity and to hide true intentions, deliberate threshold manipulation, exploitation of the seams of democratic societies, and use of decoys); the SEES model (situational awareness, explaining, estimating, and strategic notice); and the new challenges of today’s information environment (speed, volume, AI, and degrading expertise), they result in a mix that can influence decision-making algorithms and, in Omand’s words, “it is our own demons that are most likely to mislead us” (2020).

Since hybrid threats are designed to interrupt effectiveness of the SEES model at some point, by trying to create cognitive errors such as those arising from group thinking, 2 mirror imaging or applying unconscious confirmation bias, they can challenge organizations like the European Union (EU) and NATO even more than a state. The multilateral setting – with several, connected national interests – can be more vulnerable to hybrid threat activities. The things that can go wrong in the SEES model are especially vulnerable in a multilateral setting, unless there is a comprehensive approach, willingness to exchange information, joint understanding on resilience, and mechanisms to counter and respond in place.

The way Moscow and Beijing think about interference and influence is different from countries with a democratic system. For the EU and NATO, both Russia and China are difficult states to deal with. China is seen in the EU as a global partner, competitor and systemic rival. It has not been on NATO’s radar before the 2019 London Summit, but the Report “NATO 2030” delivered by the Group of Expert appointed by the Alliance’s Secretary General states that “NATO must devote much more time, political resources and action to the security challenges posed by China” (2020: 12). Russia has been viewed by the West as a systemic rival for much longer, but it has also been considered part of the European cultural heritage in the EU. For NATO, Russia has been the greatest military power in the East, which has conflicts of interest with NATO. For the moment, open military conflict is not viewed as very likely neither for Moscow nor for Beijing, although it is not excluded. This leaves the door open to hybrid threats, a mechanism that has roots in authoritarian strategic culture but also has national specificities. The things that can go wrong in the SEES model are challenged by the new information environment being manipulated according to the tactics of hybrid threats. Even if the EU is not a military alliance, while NATO is, both organizations are challenged in similar ways by hybrid threats. Given several factors, including overlapping membership, it is clear that weakening one will also weaken the other. Therefore, in the landscape of hybrid threats, the EU and NATO are considered as a united target by hostile actors – and they can also best counter and respond to these threats if working together.

Against this backdrop, here follow some recommendations aimed to policy-makers and expert communities in both NATO and EU countries: • The importance of analysis is growing. Too much effort has been put into collecting data, and not enough into training analysts. Older analysts need to be trained about the new information environment and its functioning. In turn, the younger generation needs to be trained on history, context and connections. Central elements in training are understanding the psychology of the adversary, the assessments of motivations, and rationales.

The cultural context of information is lost in the volume of information. International cooperation, especially on the part of an alliance like NATO, needs to be lifted to a new level. This does not only concern joint situational awareness about hostile actors, but also involves understanding partners and their perspectives. Without that mutual understanding among allies and partners, divergences can become over politicized and decision-making paralyzed, which is what the actors behind hybrid threats want.

There is a need for more effective training in the use of open-source intelligence, focusing on the sources and tools for finding information, including the biases they may have. In addition, more knowledge is needed to be able to detect linkages between actions. Hybrid threat activities start in a settled way, often on a very legal basis, and the potential for such activities to turn into hostile acts needs to be recognized.

Military communities should reach out more often to non-military expert communities. To counter hybrid threats, a multidisciplinary approach needs to be taken, which really means combining different disciplinary fields and expertise coming from practitioners, academics and the private sector.

Sharing the vocabulary is important when building situational awareness. Civil-military cooperation is needed here. The civilian side uses different words than the military and sometimes, even if the understanding of a concept would be shared, actors do not understand due to the use of different terms, and discussions can turn into an unnecessary battle of words.

#### The 1AC overstates the fear of a nuclear war to glorify innovation and justify the plan. Neg reads blue.

Matthew Kroenig and Bharath Gopalaswamy 18, Matthew Kroenig is Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. Bharath Gopalaswamy is the director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council. He holds a PhD in mechanical engineering with a specialization in numerical acoustics from Trinity College, Dublin. “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” November 12. <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war> //pipk

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response.

For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack.

Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched.

If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem.

According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities.

This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly.

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war.

If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states.

These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

#### The 1AC even demonstrates empirical examples of European nations falling into the capitalist trap of innovation and trade for the sake of “liberal democracy”. Neg reads blue.

Ulrike Esther Franke 21, senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR). She leads ECFR’s Technology and European Power initiative. Her areas of focus include German and European security and defence, the future of warfare, and the impact of new technologies such as drones and artificial intelligence on geopolitics and warfare. PhD in International Relations from the University of Oxford. Franke is a policy affiliate at the Governance of AI project at Oxford University’s Future of Humanity Institute. "Artificial divide: How Europe and America could clash over AI" – ECFR/367 2. January. <https://ecfr.eu/wp-content/uploads/Artificial-divide-How-Europe-and-America-could-clash-over-AI.pdf> //pipk

A glance at the history of artificial intelligence (AI) shows that the field periodically goes through phases of development racing ahead and slowing down – often dubbed “AI springs” and “AI winters”. The world is currently several years into an AI spring, dominated by important advances in machinelearning technologies. In Europe, policymakers’ efforts to grapple with the rapid pace of technological development have gone through several phases over the last five to ten years. The first phase was marked by uncertainty among policymakers over what to make of the rapid and seemingly groundbreaking developments in AI. This phase lasted until around 2018 – though, in some European states, and on some issues, uncertainty remains. The second phase consisted of efforts to frame and AI challenges politically, and to address them, on a domestic level: between 2018 and 2020, no fewer than 21 EU member states published national AI strategies designed to delineate their views and aims, and, in some cases, to outline investment plans.

The next phase could be a period of international, and specifically transatlantic, cooperation on AI. After several years of European states working at full capacity to understand how to support domestic AI research, including by assembling expert teams to deliberate new laws and regulations, there is growing interest among policymakers and experts in looking beyond Europe. On the EU level, AI policy and governance have already received significant attention, with the European Commission playing an important role in incentivising member states to develop AI strategies, such as by starting to tackle issues around how to make sure AI is “ethical” and “trustworthy”. But recent months have seen a rise in the number of calls for international cooperation on AI driven by liberal democracies across the world. Western countries and their allies have set up new forums for cooperation on how to take AI forward, and are activating existing forums. More such organisations and platforms for cooperation are planned.

Calls for cooperation between the United States and Europe have become particularly regular and resonant: following last year’s US presidential election, it was reported that the European Commission planned to propose a “Transatlantic Trade and Technology Council”, which would set joint standards on new technologies. And, in September 2020, the US set up a group of like-minded countries “to provide values-based global leadership in defense for policies and approaches in adopting AI”, which included seven European states, in addition to countries such as Australia, Canada, and South Korea. In June 2020, the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence was founded to consider the responsible development of AI; it counts among its members the US, four European states, and the European Union.

This paper examines the reasons European states may want to work with the US on AI, and why the US may want to reach out to Europe on the issue. It also identifies the points of disagreement that may stop the allies from fully fleshing out transatlantic AI cooperation. The paper shows that, while both sides are interested in working together, their rationales for doing so differ. Furthermore, economic and political factors may stand in the way of cooperation, even though such cooperation could have a positive impact on the way AI develops. The paper also argues that transatlantic cooperation in the area of military AI could be a good first step – here, Europe and the US should build on existing collaboration within NATO. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the different forums that have been created or proposed for transatlantic and broader Western cooperation on AI.

#### The 1AC weaponizes ideas like “democracy” and “liberal values” to justify “globalized markets” and “integrated supply chains” for AI. We read blue.

Andrew Imbrie et al 20, Andrew Imbrie Ryan Fedasiuk Catherine Aiken Tarun Chhabra Husanjot Chahal. Center for Security and Emerging Technology (CSET) at Georgetown’s Walsh School of Foreign Service is a research organization focused on studying the security impacts of emerging technologies, supporting academic work in security and technology studies, and delivering nonpartisan analysis to the policy community. February. "Agile Alliances: How the United States and its Allies Can Deliver a Democratic Way of AI" //pipk

How can the United States collaborate with allies and partners to shape the trajectory of artificial intelligence in ways that will promote liberal democratic values and protect against efforts to wield AI for authoritarian ends?

This question is both important and urgent. It is important because America’s broad network of alliances and security partnerships is a singular asset in defending liberal values. It is urgent because China, Russia, and other authoritarian powers seek to achieve strategic advantage through AI and the export of censorship and surveillance technologies to countries across the globe.1 By one estimate, more than 100 countries purchase surveillance and censorship gear from China and Russia, receive training on these technologies, or simply imitate methods of surveillance and censorship that are designed to control public opinion and stifle dissent.2

As the digital and physical environments become intertwined, authoritarian practices in one domain will increasingly encroach upon the other. At stake are the core values of liberty, equality, and justice that underpin free and open societies. All democratic nations must work together to uphold basic principles, set international rules of the road, and articulate a positive vision for the future in the age of AI.

Within the United States, and certainly within allied countries, debate persists over the threat of digital authoritarianism and how to counter it. While U.S. allies will likely vary in their strategic orientations toward China and Russia, there is a growing consensus on the need to showcase a democratic way of AI. These debates will take shape in a world of globalized markets for AI talent and integrated supply chains. In this context, the right U.S. approach would leverage its network of allies and partners to safeguard democracy and liberal values. An alliance-centric strategy provides a competitive advantage over any single country that attempts to develop a robust AI ecosystem on its own.

The United States and its allies should play to their strengths. This positive agenda begins with shaping the ecosystems for the development and deployment of safe and reliable AI. The most effective approach would capitalize on advances in AI and machine learning to foster sustainable and inclusive economic growth, improve service delivery, and promote transparent and accountable governance. The United States and its allies should pursue a vision of the future in which AI enables strengthened data privacy standards and respect for civil liberties; economic empowerment of citizens within rules-based market economies; cleaner, safer, and more efficient transportation; precision medical diagnosis; greater access to education; and more effective disaster response.

#### The 1AC portrays AI as a type of technology that can lead to a “dream of plentitude” and benefit society despite its existential risks, perpetuating a totalizing capitalist fairy tale. We read blue.

Yves Tiberghien et al 22, professor of political science and director emeritus of the Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia. Danielle Luo, senior analyst, international public affairs at CPP Investments. Panthea Pourmalek is a master of public policy and global affairs student at the University of British Columbia. "Existential Gap: Digital/AI Acceleration and the Missing Global Governance Capacity" February 14. <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/existential-gap-digitalai-acceleration-and-the-missing-global-governance-capacity/> //pipk

We are facing an ever-growing gap between the phenomenal acceleration of technology and of connectivity, and the human capacity to manage these trends. The gap is well-documented in the fields of finance, climate change, pandemics and nuclear risks. But the contrast between the exponential growth of disruptive technology and the lacklustre supply of governance mechanisms is starkest in the fields of digital governance and artificial intelligence (AI).

That gap becomes existential when we consider the likely future development of artificial general intelligence (AGI) (Ord 2020) or superintelligence (Bostrom 2015) that can be misaligned with human values or even the goal of ensuring the continuity of human existence. This question of the governance of life with AI may be the most essential question of our time (Tegmark 2017), but you would not know it from the current output of global governance in this field. Summarizing the judgement of many scientists in the field, Toby Ord argues that unaligned AGI is actually the number-one global existential risk for humanity, with a 10 percent chance of human extinction within 100 years. The prophesized existential threats posed by extreme and accelerated technological advancement and expansion have never been as close to reality as they are now. As noted by Yuval Noah Harari and Daniel Kahneman (2021) in a recent conversation, the task of taming and governing the digital/AI revolution is daunting. Humanity may have no slack for a mistake this time around, given the existential consequences of such a mistake.

Today, we already benefit from tremendous digital or AI innovations in e-commerce, social media and communication, home management, work, health care, education, transportation, and entertainment (West and Allen 2020). We can foresee that AI-driven algorithms may soon be able to correct human judgement flaws (or noise) caused by fatigue, irregularity, emotions and other weaknesses, afflictions that can generate variation in decisions by up to 50 percent (Kahneman, Sibony and Sunstein 2021). Within two decades, we can envisage a world with generalized deep learning and virtual reality, computer vision, contactless love, fully autonomous vehicles in most advanced and emerging economies, autonomous weapons in militaries and a dream of plenitude (Lee and Chen 2021).

Yet, today, we witness tremendous havoc created by the explosion of social anger, exacerbated by sophisticated social media algorithms, deep polarization, the return of tribal politics, the loss of agreed truths and the spread of misinformation and dangerous conspiracies, the loss of privacy, the rise of massive and uber-powerful tech companies, and massive job displacement and inequality (Bartlett 2018). Influence operations by foreign states have also amplified such social anger and polarization in many democracies, adding a degree of external threat and urgency. We also live with a world of security-driven digital decoupling between the United States and China (Ma 2021). In other words, the digital revolution is moving faster than the human capacity to cope with it, embed it within a public good-oriented framework and steer its disruptive power toward a non-destructive direction.

The problem is visible at the national level but particularly salient at the global level. Digital/data governance is fragmenting among at least four poles: a US model with maximum innovation and limited regulation; an EU model with a strong regulatory balance; an India model with an emphasis on digital sovereignty and infant industry protection (applicable to other developing countries); and a Chinese model with both rapid innovation, strong state control and surveillance. Our global governance capacity is affected by multiple splits: a US-EU split over privacy, tax and anti-monopoly regulations; an India-West split over data ownership and first-mover advantage; and, worst of all, a potential digital cold war between the United States (and its allies) and China. In response to this dire need for governance, Rohinton P. Medhora and Taylor Owen (2020) have proposed a need for a new fundamental effort at coordinated governance — or a “digital Bretton Woods.” While fundamental international conditions and global distribution of power today differ drastically from the Bretton Woods era, a high-stake and fragmented digital world is in dire need of such renewed cooperative spirit.

Recognizing the gap in digital governance, we ask the following questions: What is the scale of the gap in governance relative to requirements needed to keep the digital economy afloat? And what could be a pathway forward in the context of the growing securitization and increasing divides?

It is urgent to raise a sense of awareness, mobilize all social and public actors around this urgent dilemma and catalyze a multi-level effort to address this conundrum. We argue that no global, regional or national institution alone will be able to deliver the right governance capacity. Instead, we recommend a highly reactive, innovative and competitive model of networked governance that operates at multiple levels with key nodes and catalysts.

Governance innovation must keep pace with technological innovation. Given how far the digital cold war has already proceeded and the currently low capacity to cooperate between the United States and China, part of the solution will need to involve clubs and alliances of countries and non-state actors. At the same time, some level of global coordination and basic rules for global co-existence are crucial for success in managing this existential threat. The Group of Twenty (G20) is one critical venue for such work, even though it has not delivered so far.

Key Indicators on the Exponential Rise of the Digital Economy

Over the last few years, and particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic period, the digital economy has experienced an exponential rise and begun to transform human interactions, production and trade (Suominen 2019). In Table 1, we offer a review of selected indicators on cross-border data flows and digitalization. It is clear that digital trade and cross-border data flows, along with other digital innovations, are rising faster than physical trade flows.

Table 1: Summary of Key Indicators on the Explosion of the Digital Economy

TLP\_Table1.png

Sources: Data on cross-border data flows retrieved from TeleGeography; Data on e-commerce as a % of global GDP derived from global e-commerce value and global GDP; global e-commerce value data retrieved from Insider Intelligence; global GDP data retrieved from World Bank; data on cross-border mobile payments retrieved from GSMA; data on AI economy size retrieved from Fortune Business Insights; data on self-driving cars growth trend retrieved from Facts and Factors Research; data on facial recognition growth trend retrieved from Emergen Research. Note: Numbers with an asterisk are projected data.

Table 1 shows that key components of the digital economy, including e-commerce, AI economy and cross-border mobile payments, have experienced steady growth since 2017, and are projected to continue growing. 2020 saw the sharpest growth in several components, likely due to mobility constraints and increased reliance on digital tools associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. While current data illustrates useful trends, it is important to note that the volume of digital trade — a key component of data on the digital economy — is very hard to measure.1 This is in part due to the lack of a shared definition of what constitutes digital trade, highlighting a need for technocratic standardization as a basis for high-level digital governance.

Why Addressing the Digital Governance Gap Matters

We offer here a typology of risks involved in the digital governance gap:

Under-institutionalized markets (North 1990; Williamson 1985): All markets require basic rules and governance to ensure trust, accountability and resilience, and to prevent abuse by potential oligopolistic players. Global markets require global institutions. Digital governance is a new domain, where innovators and disruptors have been able to run ahead of rule making. We are emerging from more than two decades of an under-institutionalized digital economy, in which many large imbalances and market deficiencies are appearing in every society around the world.

Unprecedented power of digital companies: The current moment may be the first time in human history that a private company such as Facebook (Meta) has the ability on its own to screen messages of leaders and politicians from every country in the world, except China, North Korea, Cuba, and maybe Iran. And this global function is only peripheral to Facebook’s core business, with just hundreds of assigned staff. In other words, Facebook, along with Twitter and a couple more giant for-profit digital companies, has acquired in less than 15 years the power to control information, emotions, narratives and political/social mobilization in the majority of countries of the world, including the United States. And they are generating disproportionate profits from this dominant position. All this is taking place in a near complete vacuum of digital governance. Most countries outside the United States and China have limited power to regulate and control these US-based and China-based global digital companies. The US government retains residual power to do so, but has been unable to act due to constitutional constraints and great polarization in Congress. China (behind its internet firewall) has already started wrestling with this power and cracking down on its own giants. India has started to pass restricting measures on the power and freedom of social media companies on its territory. The European Union is taking its own regulatory path through the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and its successor currently under negotiations, as well as tough competition rules, within the constraints of its relative weak position in the space (no EU-based digital giants). But the governance gap remains enormous in the United States and many other countries, as well as at the global level.

Risk of explosive social disruptions and inequality: The scale of disruption induced by digital and AI innovation under current intellectual property protection and lack of redistribution accrues immense winner-take-all benefits to first movers. We are witnessing at the same time a historic concentration of capital and wealth and growing numbers of displaced or laid-off workers in declining industries. We can soon expect to have digital entrepreneurs with a net worth of US$1 trillion (from a quarter of a trillion so far with Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos), alongside massive job displacement. Such fast-paced social dislocation and inequality could prove politically explosive and very hard to manage (Lee 2018). No social system is ready — and the global governance is not ready either. The viability of modern states is also at stake, as their revenue base keeps eroding. In the late nineteenth century, when the oil and railroad revolutions generated a similar concentration of wealth, it took all the power and energy of a Teddy Roosevelt to tame these forces. We don’t have such capacity today.

Global systemic risks: The global digital economy is extraordinarily interconnected and fast-paced. It encompasses data flows, e-commerce, mobile payments, digital currency (with increasing future prevalence), AI algorithms, fully automated cars and weapons. Is the current system resilient against contagion effects or collapse? What is the safety net in case of a crisis?

Loss of privacy and potential loss of human freedom: The rise of the surveillance state is an extreme reality in China, including in repression operations. But it is also a reality all over the world. Companies such as Google and Facebook not only have more data about each individual than they can imagine, but also the capacity to couple this data with future AI algorithms for all kinds of usage. For the first time in human history, most humans have handed over fundamentally private information to either giant private actors, states or both. Even worse, regulatory breaches (cf. Cambridge Analytica) give political or criminal actors access to important and strategic data, with which they can manipulate human psychology.

Democratic existential crisis: The explosion and equalization of information, and the intensification of complexity, have eroded any sense of agreed truth and reality within most nations. Social media has unexpectedly accelerated polarization, amplified echo chambers and closed loops among like-minded individuals, greatly contributing to extreme polarization in many societies across the planet. Absurd conspiracies can spread virally and inspire violent actions by large spontaneous groups, as shown by the January 6 insurrection in the United States (with a large number of people mobilized by QAnon beliefs). At a deeper level, new understandings about the concept of extended mind in psychology show that humans are increasingly delegating part of their thinking processes to smart phones and their algorithm-driven suggestions devised to serve profit-seeking companies (cf. work by Peter Reiner).2 Human behaviour may be profoundly changing in ways never seen before, which our democratic institutions are not ready for. Facebook’s move to a metaverse world that can attract humans to spend time and to be transformed in a totally unregulated environment has the potential to further increase this risk.

External cyberthreats to democracy: The current digitalized world is also increasingly used as a tool to undermine democracy from the outside. Russia’s interference in the 2016 American presidential election through social media campaigns highlights the extent to which an unregulated digital sphere could undermine democratic institutions. China’s propaganda efforts on platforms such as Twitter and YouTube during the 2020 Taiwanese presidential election are yet another example that an unregulated cyberspace could warrant injudicious digital campaigns. More recently, the sale of Israeli spyware Pegasus to various governments — who in turn used it for malicious efforts against other states, and individuals such as journalists, reporters and human rights activists.

Rise of cybercrimes, cyberpiracy and cyberattacks (Deibert 2013, 2020; Sanger 2018). The open structure of the internet has left great space for hackers and organized gangs. Worse, the existence of an illegal black market incentivizes smart young digital talents in many places around the world to look for zero-day loopholes in operating systems and sell those to the highest bidders, including the national security agencies of many countries (Perlroth 2020). This quickly escalates into a growing cyberspying competition and even cyberwar (Segal 2016).

Fragmentation of the internet and of the digital economy into rival spheres (splinternet), and weaponization of interdependence (Drezner, Farrell and Newman 2021; Farrell and Newman 2019; Ma 2021; Suominen 2019). The raising of stakes in the digital economy, the sudden acceleration of the digital transformation in China, the intensification of security competition and the high prevalence of dual-use technologies in the digital/AI space have led to an increasing potential for a digital cold war, as well as other fractures among various regional poles. As Winston Ma (2021, 42) writes: “all in all, U.S.-China tech decoupling is real and accelerating. Hence, the digital economy is in a vital conflict and crisis: the global tech world, together with at least part of the world economy, is now fractured into two-and potential more…spheres of influence, whereas tech entrepreneurs are driving the prospect of a technological singularity, hyper-connected society, and internet of everything.” This decoupling is extremely risky, because it is abrupt, driven by fears and not negotiated. It leads to highly explosive tit-for-tat measures that are hard to contain. This process massively interferes with the human effort to generate a global governance framework.

Measuring the Digital Global Governance Gap

In Table 2 (and, in greater detail, in Annex 1), we offer a summary of existing digital governance at the global, regional, club or national levels. Overall, we evaluate that the governance of basic internet functions remains surprisingly resilient (8/10), but other dimensions of digital and AI governance are extremely weak (2/10 in most cases).

One powerful indicator that highlights the gap between the risks outlined above and the current state of global governance is found in the recent G20 Rome Leaders’ Declaration. The focus remains on sharing the gains of digital innovation for the green economy, education and economic growth. However, the digital economy gets only brief mentions toward the latter part of the declaration with generic and toothless statements such as the following:

“In cooperation with social partners, we will adopt human-centered policy approaches to promote social dialogue and to ensure greater social justice; safe and healthy working conditions; and decent work for all, including within global supply chains. To reduce inequalities, eradicate poverty, support worker transitions and reintegration in labour markets and promote inclusive and sustainable growth, we will strengthen our social protection systems” (G20 Leaders 2021, para. 35).

“We recognize the role of technology and innovation as key enablers for the global recovery and sustainable development.…With this in mind, we will work to strengthen bilateral and multilateral cooperation to secure our ICT, address shared vulnerabilities and threats, and combat cybercrime” (ibid., para 46).

“Well aware of the benefits stemming from the responsible use and development of trustworthy human-centered Artificial Intelligence (AI), we will advance the implementation of the G20 AI Principles” (ibid., para 47).

“We will also continue to further common understanding and to work towards identifying commonalities, complementarities and elements of convergence between existing regulatory approaches and instruments enabling data to flow with trust, in order to foster future interoperability. Recognizing the responsibility of digital service providers, we will work in 2022 towards enhancing confidence in the digital environment by improving internet safety and countering online abuse, hate speech, online violence and terrorism while protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms” (ibid., para. 48).

This summary of current global digital governance reveals the extent of the gap with what is at stake!

Table 2: Evaluation of What We Have and of the Gap to a Functional Global System, under Conditions of Securitization and Great Power Rivalry
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Source: Authors. Notes: ASEAN = Association of Southeast Asian Nations; CARICOM = Caribbean Community; CPTPP = Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership; DEPA = Digital Economy Partnership Agreement; ECOWAS = Economic Community of West African States; FAANG = Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix and Alphabet (formerly Google); ICANN = Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers; NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organization; OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; OIE = World Organisation for Animal Health; SADEA = Singapore-Australia Digital Economy Agreement.

From Table 2, we can draw several important lessons. First, the well-established nature of internet governance shows that governance in the digital domain is indeed possible. Internet governance was established several decades ago and is operated by largely independent and apolitical entities. However, times have changed. It is important to recognize the current geopolitical stakes and inherent international context that now constitutes multi-polarities of interest. Second, despite the absence of a centralized governance mechanism for digital trade, the language and framing of rules on digital trade as expressed in recent free-trade and digital partnership agreements are increasingly similar, and indicate some degree of convergence in the governance of digital trade. Finally, the domain that fairs most poorly in terms of governance is also the domain that is most politicized. The primary motivation behind limited alignment on accepted 5G or semiconductor providers is driven by the US geopolitical push against Chinese 5G giant Huawei and semiconductor giant SMIC, risking bifurcation in global standards and encouraging autarkic behaviours such as the EU idea of “chips self-sufficiency.”

As a reference, Table 3 offers a comparative summary of different approaches used by the United States, European Union, China and India. For a more detailed look at key legislation shaping digital governance in each jurisdiction, refer to Annex 2.

Table 3: Four Competing Approaches to Digital Governance
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Conclusion and Global Digital Governance Proposals

There is a huge disconnect between the speed of technological development, the scale of existential risks involved, and the acceleration of securitization on the one hand and the supply of national/global governance and increase in human capacity on the other hand.

Political leaders are not yet incentivized to deal with this existential set of issues. They are distracted by short-term political urgencies and the acceleration of tit-for-tat rivalry.

A digital Bretton Woods captures the spirit of global digital governance we should strive for. However, it is essential to recognize the radically different context of today compared to 1944. The lack of “global yearning for peace and stability” highlighted by Medhora and Owen (2020), is further aggravated by a new environment of multi-polarity and diffused interests. Thus, we may only be able to reach a thin global framework under current geopolitical conditions, and it can only be part of a larger multi-level and partly competitive effort to generate governance capacity.

The human solutions to the predicament cannot come from a single locus or look like responses to past governance issues. There will need to be multiple entry points with a networking and competitive dynamic among them — some from the G20, World Trade Organization (WTO), United Nations, some from club governance (Group of Seven [G7], Quad, China-based solutions, along with bilateral forums such as the US-EU dialogue), and some from private actors, civil society networks, think tanks and academic actors.

For any critical mass process of capacity development to occur in such a way, both catalyzing focal points and elements of coordination will be required. The global level may yet play a key signalling role or allow minimum convergence on dimensions of common interest. The G20 urgently needs an upgraded high-level working group on all digital governance questions.

### 2NC -- Ext: General AI Link

#### AI innovation in the capitalist economy is driven by capitalist ideals of the winner takes all - this makes inequality, poverty, unemployment and every other instance of violence and exploitation exponentially worse - turns case and ensures that the use of AI is always ineffective and for the wrong goals

#### 1 - AI innovation is integral to capitalism-uses capitalist economics and increases worker exploitation

Markov 19

[Kieran Markov, The dangers of artificial intelligence under capitalism, Fightback, 7-31-2019, https://www.marxist.ca/article/the-dangers-of-artificial-intelligence-under-capitalism, //1LEE]

Indeed, AI is playing an integral part (along with other important technologies such as quantum computing) in ushering forward a new technological stage in human history, what scientists and economists call the “fourth industrial revolution”. Global consulting firm McKinsey & Company recently released a report detailing that, while the introduction of steam engines offered a 0.3 per cent increase to annual GDP growth between 1850 and 1910, they expect AI to raise annual GDP growth by 0.8-1.4 per cent by 2065. Another massive consulting firm, Accenture, anticipates that AI will offer a $14-trillion boost to global GDP by 2035.

However, these bourgeois predictions should be taken with a large grain of salt. Under capitalism, the development of the means of production is always accompanied by job losses, and AI is no exception. Kai-Fu Lee, who is certainly no Marxist (but much more sober-minded than Elon Musk!) predicts,

As deep learning washes over the global economy, it will indeed wipe out billions of jobs up and down the economic ladder: accountants, assembly line workers, warehouse operators, stock analysts, quality control inspectors, truckers, paralegals, and even radiologists, just to name a few. … Rising in tandem with unemployment will be astronomical wealth in the hands of the new AI tycoons [e.g., Google, Facebook, etc]. … [We] will begin to see greater and greater concentration of these astronomical sums in the hands of a few, all while unemployment lines grow longer.

[…]

The AI world order will combine winner-take-all economics [i.e., capitalism!] with an unprecedented concentration of wealth in the hands of a few companies in China and the United States. This, [Lee believes], is the real underlying threat posed by artificial intelligence: tremendous social disorder and political collapse stemming from widespread unemployment and gaping inequality.

AI Superpowers, 2018, pp. 53-58

In other words, under capitalism, AI means the rich get richer while the workers enjoy increased exploitation, unemployment, and social crisis. As well, contrary to what many predict, wide-scale introduction of AI will not lead to unheard of levels of growth. In an epoch of capitalist crisis like the one we live in today, the capitalists are incapable of using the amazing technological advances to deliver economic growth. The fact is that there are already historically low rates of what is known as “capacity utilization,” which means that the capitalists are already unable to use the productive capacity at their disposal.

This is because world capitalism is saddled with a crisis of over production. The introduction of AI would only exacerbate this by making millions of jobs obsolete thus reducing the consumer market. This is the fundamental barrier to growth today. If the capitalists cannot sell their products, they will not invest and the economy will enter crisis. Only under a democratically planned socialist economy could we harness the amazing potential of AI for the benefit of all.

Impacts of AI today

We don’t need to wait for the future to see how AI will impact us—it is already playing a disruptive role in the lives of workers. We experience unprecedented levels of privacy violation: from systematic surveillance via cameras with precise facial recognition technology, to implicit bias and racism in algorithms used for purposes such as credit assessments and the criminal justice system. Indeed, an algorithm may assign a longer prison sentence to a black person because the data suggests “they are more likely to reoffend.” In addition, every person who uses social media is well aware that everything they do is invasively tracked by advertising companies to a creepy degree; this is because all of your data (your likes, dislikes, buying history, etc) is held and monopolized by private companies like Google and Facebook.

AI also motivates large-scale exploitation in new forms. Recalling that these AI algorithms require huge amounts of human-labelled data to work well, it’s not surprising that the extremely mind-numbing work of so-called “data farming” has become a new, prominent source of income for private companies. AI startups in Finland have adopted the creative business strategy of hiring prison labourers to do their data farming. Meanwhile, Amazon has created “Amazon Mechanical Turk” as a platform for extreme exploitation of humans to do data farming for companies and universities, where the workers make a median wage of $2/hour from the safety of their home computer. In China, “data factories” are becoming ubiquitous, and their workers make between 10-20 yuan ($1.47-2.94) per hour.

#### 2 - AI integration through capitalism causes endless terror – empirics

Damon 2018

[Andre Damon, Capitalism and the artificial intelligence revolution, World Socialist Web Site 4-1-2018, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2018/04/06/pers-a06.html> //1LEE]

The object of the military and intelligence agencies’ use of artificial intelligence is the holy grail of every totalitarian regime: what the National Security Agency called “total information awareness,” or, as its unofficial mission statement put it, “Collect It All, Know It All… Exploit It All.”

This mission statement, which in another context would seem to be an unhinged dictator’s megalomaniacal fantasy, is fast becoming an imminent reality through the power of artificial intelligence.

In his statement to the World Socialist Web Site's January 16 online webinar, "Organizing Resistance to Internet Censorship," Wikileaks founder Julian Assange warned of the immense dangers posed to humanity by the misuse of artificial intelligence.

“The future of humanity is the struggle between humans that control machines and machines that control humans. Between the democratization of communication and usurpation of communication by artificial intelligence,” Assange warned. “Undetectable mass social influence powered by artificial intelligence is an existential threat to humanity. The phenomena differs in traditional attempts to shape cultural and political phenomena by operating at scale, speed and increasingly at a subtlety that eclipses human capacities.”

The use of artificial intelligence for mass surveillance and war-making is only one of the destructive purposes to which this transformative technology is being used under capitalism.

Already, artificial intelligence is being used at Amazon warehouses to track every move employees make. Amazon’s systems count how many times workers go to the bathroom and alert foremen if workers stop to catch their breath in the up to 15 miles they are forced to walk during a single shift. At companies such as Uber and Lyft, artificial intelligence is used to push drivers to work longer and harder, often to the detriment of their health and well-being.

But even more radical changes are on the horizon. As ride-sharing companies and shipping lines rush to implement driverless cars, trucks and boats, tens of thousands of jobs will be eliminated. The integration of AI with robotics will extend the wave of mass automation that has already displaced countless thousands of industrial workers into every single field, from the building trades to food preparation, to custodial work and retail.

According to a 2013 survey by Oxford University, nearly half of US jobs will be destroyed by AI and robotics in the next two decades alone.

Since the industrial revolution, capitalism has managed to transform every development in technology into an instrument of human oppression and butchery. The introduction of the spinning jenny ushered in the horrendous social misery of 19th century slums of London and Manchester. The cotton gin brought a resurgence of American slavery. The airplane was converted—through the doctrine of “strategic bombing”—into a method for killing civilians by the tens of thousands. And the nearly limitless energy created by nuclear fission was turned into a means of destroying entire societies, and perhaps humanity itself.

But why should these technologies, which objectively create the conditions for a massive expansion of the standard of living for billions of people, be put to such horrendous uses? As the Russian revolutionary Leon Trotsky wrote in 1926:

Technique and science have their own logic—the logic of the cognition of nature and the mastering of it in the interests of man. But technique and science develop not in a vacuum but in human society, which consists of classes. The ruling class, the possessing class, controls technique and through it controls nature. Technique in itself cannot be called either militaristic or pacifistic. In a society in which the ruling class is militaristic, technique is in the service of militarism. (“Radio, Science, Technique and Society”)

In the hands of the ruling elites that control society under capitalism, every technological innovation becomes a cudgel: against the working class and against countries they seek to conquer and suppress through military violence.

In different hands, the same technology will produce different results. In a socialist society, the artificial intelligence and robotics revolution will create the circumstances for a massive elevation of not only the economic well-being of the population, but also its cultural life. The replacement of tedious and back-breaking occupations will mean not mass unemployment and destitution, but rather greater leisure and an expansion of workers’ opportunities for education, family life and cultural enrichment.

The automation of the building trades and the expansion of additive manufacturing (3D printing) to construction will vastly reduce the amount of labor required to build homes, schools and hospitals and ensure excellent housing for all. The leveraging of artificial intelligence in gene sequencing, drug development and analysis of medical studies will result in unprecedented breakthroughs in human health for the whole of humanity, not just the few who can pay soaring drug prices.

The roboticization of both farming and transportation will vastly reduce the cost of food, ending malnutrition and ensuring a high-quality diet for all—not the ruin of small farmers by agriculture conglomerates.

In holding out this prospect for humanity, Marxists base themselves on the traditions of the Enlightenment, which drew a connection between human progress in science and society. Just as men like Isaac Newton were unlocking the secrets of nature, so too society could be rationally understood, and, once understood, changed for the better.

This view stands in direct contrast to the middle-class pessimists of the Frankfurt School, who, in rejecting the Enlightenment, claimed that the theory of gravity paved the way to the gas chambers of Auschwitz. What demoralized intellectuals such as Herbert Marcuse and Max Horkheimer—who falsely claimed to be students of Karl Marx and whose theories are still palmed off as Marxism at universities—ignored was precisely Trotsky’s point: that “technique and science develop not in a vacuum but in human society, which consists of classes.”

The question is: Who controls the means of production, and thus society?

Two roads are open to humanity. The capitalist road offers a relentless escalation of war, poverty, mass repression and totalitarian dictatorship. The road of socialism offers not just freedom from all those horrors, but the liberation of all mankind from oppression and want.

### AI Links Ext. Cards

#### AI is bad – it’ll increase the inequality of capitalism even more

Marr 18 – [Bernard Marr is an internationally best-selling author, popular keynote speaker, futurist, and a strategic business & technology advisor to governments and companies; 7/2/18; “How Artificial Intelligence Could Kill Capitalism”; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr/2018/07/02/how-artificial-intelligence-could-kill-capitalism/?sh=741382734222>; accessed: 7/5/22; Lowell-JL]

Without this happening, humans will find themselves in a situation where they have to go out and compete for whatever paid jobs are still available to humans in the robot-dominated workforce. As a simple example, a fully automated farm would, in theory, provide food at a far cheaper cost than one staffed with human farm hands, machinery operators, administrative staff, distributions operatives and security guards. However, if the owner of the farm still parts with his goods to the highest bidder, there would be inequalities in how that food is distributed among the populace and the potential for a poverty-struck underclass which lacks access to adequate sustenance. Nothing new there – of course, this underclass has always existed throughout history. However, it doesn’t exactly fit with the idea of the Star Trek utopia we need to have in place before we can comfortably hand the reigns to the machines.

This makes it something of a “chicken and egg” problem, and the ideal way for it to play out would seemingly be a gradual and managed transition to a smart machine-driven economy. This process would involve careful oversight of which human roles were being automated, and ensuring that the “plentiful” resources are in place to support those who unfortunately do find that they are being replaced, rather than merely “augmented.”

The problem is that this would require two elements: A concerted and informed effort from governments and regulators to understand the scale of the challenge and enable the right framework for it to happen. And an acceptance by those leading the charge – the tech industry – that there is a more important motive than profit for getting the change right.

Neither of those seems likely to happen any time soon. Despite the “make the world a better place” ethos, big tech’s overriding aim is still to generate growth and profit for their enterprises.

Also, managing the political change could be an even tougher job than persuading a tech CEO that she shouldn’t be focusing on revenue or profits.

“People aren’t stupid,” Chace says, while discussing how automated driving systems look set to erode the employment opportunities for humans whose trade is driving.

“They will see these robots driving around taking people’s jobs, and think ‘it won’t be long until they come for mine’ – and then there will be a panic. And panics lead to very nasty populist politicians, of the left or the right, being elected.”

Chace also doesn’t believe that the concept of universal basic income – currently being trialed in some Scandinavian countries – is the right answer, or at least not in its current form.

“The problem with universal basic income is that it’s basic. If all we can do is give people a basic income, we’ve failed, and society probably isn’t saveable.”

A future where the majority of humans live a subsistence-level income funded by the fruits of a robotic labor force, while a “1 percent” upper class – those in control of the robots – build their empires and reach for the stars – isn’t appealing to those with an egalitarian mindset. However, it could be the direction we’re heading in.

#### AI has bad ramifications for workers

**Abdelrahman ‘22** (Maha, before joining the Centre of Development Studies in 2007, Dr Abdelrahman worked as an Associate Professor of Sociology at the American University in Cairo, “The Indefatigable Worker: From Factory Floor to Zoom Avatar”, page 79-80, ML)

AI is but a recent technology in an overarching historical project in which a regime of labor surveillance and control over workers’ bodies has been evolving to respond to new developments in capitalism and to emerging new technologies, regimes of expertise and measurement capacities. These interventions, which are intended to reduce fatigue and to adapt the living machine of the worker’s mind and body to the rules of a dead machine without fatigue, have always been presented as technical, scientific and totally free of politics and ideology. One of the most fascinating features of this long project of surveillance and control has been its assumption of the worker’s body as one which is free of gender, sexual, racial or other power relations. More significantly, ostensibly putting the well-being of the worker at the heart of this regime has made it difficult for workers to reject these efforts which claim to help them cope with fatigue and stress. This paradigm of caring has also partly worked to obscure the conditions which create workers’ fatigue in the first place, making these conditions ever more difficult to challenge.

#### **The capitalist nature of AI development inevitably trades off with ethics.**

Schwab ’20 [Katharine; deputy editor of Fast Company's technology section; 10-5-2020; The biggest barrier to humane, ethical AI: Capitalism itself; Fast Company; https://www.fastcompany.com/90558020/ai-ethics-money-facial-recognition-fei-fei-li; 7-6-2022; SK]

Over the last several years, a growing chorus of academics, activists, and technologists have decried the ways in which artificial intelligence technology could engender bias, exacerbate inequity, and violate civil rights.

But while these voices are getting louder, they still butt up against systems of power that value profit and the status quo over ensuring that AI is built in a way that isn’t harmful to marginalized people and society writ large.

In a panel discussion for Fast Company’s 2020 Innovation Festival, experts in ethical AI explained what they’re up against in trying to change the way that large companies and institutions think about building and deploying AI.

For Timnit Gebru, the technical colead of the Ethical Artificial Intelligence Team at Google, one challenge is that she has to work against the incentive structures inherent to capitalism. For publicly traded companies such as Google, constantly increasing profit is the highest good. “You can’t set up a system where the only incentive is to make more money and then just assume that people are going to magically be ethical,” she said.

When it comes to face recognition, the most controversial AI technology right now, Gebru explains that it took a global protest movement against police brutality for the host of large companies including Amazon, IBM, and Microsoft that build the technology to reconsider what they were deploying. Even so, Amazon only agreed to a one-year moratorium on selling its technology to police. (In contrast, Google decided not to sell facial recognition algorithms way back in 2018, and CEO Sundar Pichai has indicated support for EU legislation to temporarily ban the technology.)

Gebru advocates for changing the way AI is built through building “pressure from all sides,” including from internal advocates such as herself, other tech workers, outside activists, everyday people, journalists, regulators, and even shareholders.

“Internally, you can advocate for at least something that’s not so controversial, which is better documentation,” Gebru said. “It means you just have to test your system better, make it more robust. Even then if you’re asking for more resources to be deployed, why should they do that if they think what people have been doing so far has been working well?”

Another challenge is the sheer amount of money available for people building AI systems. Even if large companies stay away from selling face recognition to police to avoid a public relations disaster, smaller upstarts such as the controversial Clearview AI will step in to fill the void. When money is on the line, it becomes more difficult to make decisions in the interest of society rather than to pad a company’s bottom line.

“The reality is there’s just a lot of easy money to be made in AI,” said Olga Russakovsky, an assistant professor of computer science at Princeton University who focuses on computer vision. “I think there’s a lot of very legitimate concerns being raised, and I’m very grateful these concerns are starting to come to the forefront, to the center of these conversations. But there’s easy money and that has been the case for the past at least 10 years. I think it’s hard to resist that . . . and then have some of these deeper and harder conversations.”

#### The AI economy perpetuates monopolies and commodification of data because of AI capitalism’s incessant drive for growth.

Verdegem 4/9 [Pieter; CAMRI, Westminster School of Media and Communication, University of Westminster, London, UK; 4-9-2022; Dismantling AI capitalism: the commons as an alternative to the power concentration of Big Tech; SpringerLink; https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-022-01437-8; 7-6-2022; SK]

This article discusses the political economy of AI capitalism. It considers AI as a General Purpose Technology (GPT) and argues we need to investigate the power concentration of Big Tech. AI capitalism is characterised by the commodification of data, data extraction and a concentration in hiring of AI talent and compute capacity. This is behind Big Tech’s unstoppable drive for growth, which leads to monopolisation and enclosure under the winner takes all principle. If we consider AI as a GPT—technologies that alter society’s economic and social structures—we need to come up with alternatives in terms of ownership and governance. The commons is proposed as an alternative for thinking about how to organise AI development and how to distribute the value that can be derived from it. Using the commons framework is also a way of giving society a more prominent role in the debate about what we expect from AI and how we should approach it.

Introduction

We are at the crossroads of technological developments which are changing our economy and society. It is argued that much of our productivity and prosperity will be derived from the systems and machines we are creating (Brynjolfsson et al. 2014; Hall and Pesenti 2017). Artificial Intelligence (AI) is one of the most hyped innovations of our times. In business circles, AI is seen as a catalyst for growth, which will manifestly transform the economy (Agrawal et al. 2018; Lee 2018; McAfee and Brynjolfsson 2017). Policymakers are looking at the opportunities of AI for tackling global challenges, such as climate change (Dobbe and Whittaker 2019) or pandemics (Tzachor et al. 2020), while AI is also the subject of an arms race between the US, China and Russia to have their military forces equipped with automated weapons (Asaro 2019).

While AI is around for more than 60 years and periods of hope and optimism have been alternated with so-called AI Winters, it seems crucial parts of the puzzle finally have started to fall into place. The confluence of factors—the availability of powerful computing capacity, new techniques in machine/deep learning leading to more sophisticated algorithms and the growing availability of data with which to train these algorithms—enable AI to be deployed far more extensively (Elliott 2019; Hall and Pesenti 2017; Lee 2018). AI now seems ready to have a deep impact on our society and economy.

Especially, since 2015, a peak in corporate investment, a growing number of mergers and acquisitions and more intensive competitive hiring of AI talent can be noticed (Dyer-Witheford et al. 2019; Lee 2018). This is not surprising given assessments about the (future) size of AI in industry. For example, PwC (2017) predicts AI could contribute up to $15.7 trillion to the global economy by 2030. The same study states that the greatest economic gains from AI will be in China (26% boost to GDP by 2030) and North America (14.5% boost) (PwC 2017). This is not unexpected as the US and China are in an intense competition to become world leaders in AI (Lee 2018).

The industrial landscape of AI, however, is dominated by Big Tech, a small number of extremely powerful companies. There are only a few companies that own exponential computing power, can attract AI talent and have access to data to develop and train advanced machine/deep learning models. AI is a General Purpose Technology (GPT), an enabling technology that impacts on how large sections of the economy and society are organised. Because AI is a GPT, we need to analyse AI capitalism. In particular, we want to understand how AI capitalism is organised, what is driving its concentration of power, and its impact. Beyond this, we also need to think about alternatives that can help mitigate the negative consequences of this power concentration and make sure that society at large can benefit from the new wave of AI innovation.

#### **AI capitalism furthers exploitative data management practices and exacerbates inequality.**

Verdegem 4/9 [Pieter; CAMRI, Westminster School of Media and Communication, University of Westminster, London, UK; 4-9-2022; Dismantling AI capitalism: the commons as an alternative to the power concentration of Big Tech; SpringerLink; https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-022-01437-8; 7-6-2022; SK]

The emergence of AI capitalism

In the aftermath of the global financial and economic crisis of 2007–2008, two separate albeit related developments contributed to an environment in which AI capitalism could emerge: a changing political context and a technological transformation.

First, the broader political context has changed by what Standing (2016) calls a global transformation. Essentially, he refers to a shift in the political context from neoliberalism to rentier capitalism. Neoliberalism promotes free markets and includes other dynamics and characteristics, such as commodification, privatisation and labour market reregulation (not deregulation) in favour of flexibility in terms of labour and capital (Harvey 2005). Rentier capitalism, on the other hand, refers to a system in which efforts are made to enlarge one’s existing share of wealth without actually contributing to the creation of new wealth (Christophers 2020; Standing 2016). It constitutes a model of monopolistic rent-seeking, which often leads to markets dominated by a small number of extremely powerful multinationals (Birch 2020).

Second, at the same time we are witnessing a technological transformation, which increasingly dominates and transforms the capitalist system. The technological element refers to the Internet and other related digital technologies that emerged since the early 2000s (social media, the Internet of Things and AI). Other scholars have framed this digital capitalism (Schiller 2000), informational capitalism (Fuchs 2010), platform capitalism (Srnicek 2017), data capitalism (Sadowski 2019; West 2019) and AI capitalism (Dyer-Witheford et al. 2019).Footnote1

In the next paragraphs, I discuss the main building blocks of what constitutes AI capitalism and identify the problems within it. I first discuss the problems related to data (commodification and extraction) and then elaborate on the concentration of power within the hiring of AI talent and computing infrastructure.

The commodification of data

Commodification is a central concept in CPE and refers to the processes, whereby online and offline objects, activities, ideas and emotions are transformed into tradable commodities, transforming use value into exchange value (Hardy 2014). In the context of AI capitalism, commodification is closely linked to datafication. The latter concept refers to the ability to render into data many aspects of the world that have never been quantified before (Cukier and Mayer-Schoenberger 2013). Our social relationships, communication patterns, shopping behaviour, etc. are transformed into digital data (Couldry and Mejias 2019), which is an essential characteristic of the attention economy (Wu 2017).

In AI capitalism, the interplay between data and digital platforms is important. Platforms are intermediaries that invite different types of users—producers and suppliers, consumers, advertisers, app developers, etc.—to engage and interact via their digital infrastructure (Srnicek, 2017; Van Dijck et al. 2018). Platforms are ideally positioned to function as a data broker: central in their business model is the possibility to capture, extract and analyse the data produced by the interactions on the platform (Crain 2018; West 2019). Using this extracted data as well as the skills workers gained when analysing it, made platform companies the leaders in the digital economy; working with data has become ever more important for gaining a competitive advantage (Srnicek 2018).

What connects data and platforms are network effects. Network effects mean that the value of the network is determined by its size (Katz and Shapiro 1985). Platforms thus become more valuable as more users join it. Engagement and interaction are only possible if there are active users on platforms. Generating network effects is thus a key strategic focus for platforms (Srnicek 2017). The power of network effects goes hand in hand with the availability of data: this combination further strengthens the leading position of already powerful data companies (Srnicek 2018). Data-driven network effects entail that more users active on a certain platform, means more possibilities for data collection, analysis and extraction. Consequently, this results in more opportunities to use that data for improving the features and services offered by the platform. Better services open up the possibility to attract more users. A similar positive data feedback loop exists for AI too: better access to data means more opportunities to train ML models and better AI also results in better services and more users (Lee 2018; Srnicek 2018; Varian 2018).

Data extraction

A second key characteristic of AI capitalism is the centrality of data extraction. We can conceptualise data as two distinct economic forms: First, data is a raw material—constant capital—which is necessary for the production of commodities (Crain 2018). AI companies use data such as raw materials to produce various informational goods and services, what Shoshana Zuboff (2019) calls prediction products. Data sets are an essential resource to train ML/DL models. Second, data itself is a commodity, the product of the digital labour of people engaging with applications and services offered by platforms.

While data is often considered as a raw material or a commodity, it makes sense to conceptualise it as a form of capital too. This is part of a broader discussion about how value is generated in the contemporary economy (Arvidsson and Colleoni 2012; Mazzucato 2018), particularly how value is derived from data and what normative aspects are relevant in the context of data collection and extraction (Couldry and Mejias 2019; Mezzadra and Neilson 2017; Zuboff 2019). Sadowski (2019) argues that treating data as capital allows for a more nuanced and detailed understanding of how AI capitalism functions and is organised.

What is the problem with using data to create value, as a resource to develop and optimise AI systems? Mazzucato (2018) analyses contemporary capitalism and highlights the critique that it rewards rent seekers over true value creators. Their rent seeking is based on overcharging prices, undercutting competition—by exploiting particular advantages, e.g., labour, or using a monopoly advantage. Where value creation refers to the use of different types of resources to produce new goods and services, value extraction is defined as “activities focused on moving around existing resources and outputs, and gaining disproportionally from the ensuing trade” (Mazzucato 2018: 6). Data extraction is a particular type of value extraction. Sadowski (2019: 9) defines data extraction as: “data is taken without meaningful consent and fair compensation for the producers and sources of data”. Evgeny Morozov (2018) follows a similar line of thinking and has coined data extractivism to refer to practices of tech giants launching products not for the revenue but for the data, which is afterwards monetised through different products and services (see also Couldry and Mejias 2019). It is clear we must scrutinise what the consequences are of data commodification and extraction in AI capitalism as well as considering alternatives.

AI talent

AI capitalism is dominated by the so-called Big Tech; tech giants that dominate and control the market. These companies are often referred to by the acronyms GAFAM and BAT (Kaplan and Haenlein 2020; Verdegem 2022). GAFAM refers to US-based companies and includes Google (Alphabet), Apple, Facebook (Meta), Amazon and Microsoft. BAT refers to tech companies in China, including Baidu, Alibaba and Tencent.

Especially, since 2015, the leading tech companies have intensified the competition for hiring AI talent, i.e., the computer science experts who are at the forefront of developments in machine/deep learning (CB Insights 2021). They mainly do this by acquiring AI startups and only face competition from blockchain companies and the military.

Google (Alphabet) purchasing the UK-based startup DeepMind (founded in 2010), the company that developed the DL models behind the famous victory of AlphaGo over Lee Sedol, is one of the most famous examples of acquisitions in the field of AI. Since then, DeepMind has become one of the world’s leading AI companies. All of the mentioned Big Tech companies have been very active in taking over startup companies with the purpose of acquiring AI expertise and talent. According to CB Insights (2021), Apple has made 29 AI acquisitions since 2010, Google (Alphabet) 15, Microsoft 13, Facebook (Meta) 12 and Amazon 7. A similar pattern is followed by Big Tech in China (Lee 2018).

While companies, such as IBM, Intel, Salesforce and NVIDIA—active in hardware (semiconductors) and software development—also try to establish themselves in the growing market and engage in take-overs of AI startups, the fiercest competition is happening at the level of smaller companies and/or startups. These companies are positioning themselves to either trying to occupy a profitable AI niche (which they hope might develop into a larger segment of the market) or to be taken over by one of the giants (Lee 2018). The problem this intense competition for AI talent creates is that it leads to a divide between the developers of ML/DL models who are hired by Big Tech and who can ask enormous salaries (Metz 2017), and the rest of computer scientists and other groups in society who are paid less or are even exploited for doing the work in the hidden infrastructure of AI (Crawford 2021; Altenried 2020). Hence, the need for alternatives becomes more prominent.

AI compute capacity

AI capitalism is not only determined by data commodification/extraction and the fierce competition over AI talent; another aspect that is crucial for AI dominance is computing power (Ahmed and Wahed 2020; Srnicek 2019). AI compute capacity refers to hardware and software engineered to support the development of AI applications. It includes large data centres, supercomputers and cloud providers. Having the most powerful and performant AI compute capacity is necessary for dominating the AI market.

Amazon (Amazon Web Services—AWS, launched in 2002) and Microsoft (Azure, launched in 2008) have traditionally been dominant in the market of cloud computing. More recently, especially since 2015, there have been major investments in data centres, supercomputers and cloud computing (Dyer-Witheford et al. 2019; Srnicek 2019). This can be explained by the fact that more businesses—beyond tech—became data-driven and need this infrastructure to process the data being collected as part of new services and business models. Still, the biggest investments in AI compute capacity are made by Big Tech. Companies such as Alibaba (Aliyun), Baidu (Wangpan), Google (Google Cloud) and Tencent (Tencent Cloud) have been investing massively in cloud computing with the goal to increase their market share (Verdegem 2022).

There is a clear explanation, relevant to our understanding of AI capitalism, why Big Tech has stepped up its investment in AI compute capacity. For making AI applications a reality—such as self-driving cars or AI systems used in the medical sector—an upgraded technical infrastructure is crucial. Performant computing infrastructure is an absolute key issue in terms of security, reliability, and speed. The roll-out of new AI systems diminishes the tolerance towards network latency and security issues. The problem is that only big companies, which have a lot of capital at their disposal, can make these investments. In addition, it is only Big Tech that has the resources to upgrade their compute capacity while simultaneously being able to collect data to train ML/DL models and to hire the specialised AI talent to work on these models. Ahmed and Wahed (2020) have documented the unequal access to compute capacity and argue that this creates divides between big tech corporations and elite universities who squeeze other companies and the computer departments of medium and smaller universities out of the field. Srnicek (2019) also points at the power of AI behemoths, who become global rentiers through their AI infrastructure: smaller companies are dependent on the hardware of Big Tech to make advancements in AI, whereas the leading AI companies can keep control over what is happening on their infrastructure. This power concentration is thus also potentially weakening the development of AI itself.

The AI industrial landscape: a concentration of power

The AI industrial landscape is dominated by a small number of companies. Table 1 gives an overview of how much the value of each of these giants (GAFAM and BAT) has increased in the last decade. This table illustrates how the commodification of data, in combination with data extraction, made these companies extremely profitable. The top ten of most valuable companies in the world is now dominated by AI companies (Statista 2020). Their drive for expansion resulted in intense concentration, where each one of them has achieved a highly dominant position in the market (Kaplan and Haenlein 2020; Montes and Goertzel 2019). For example, Google obtained an (almost) monopoly over online search, Amazon and Alibaba over e-commerce and Facebook and Tencent over the US and Chinese markets of social networking.

The drive for growth of AI companies demonstrates that the problem of monopolisation is real: it creates a massive power concentration in the hands of a few players. The AI giants dominate the field and aggressively acquire potential competitors. We face a situation, where there are only a few AI behemoths, who own the expensive computational infrastructure, have access to vast amounts of data to train ML and DL models and can attract the highly skilled AI talent to develop new systems and services. The economic power, expressed in their rapidly increasing value, highlights the point of AI as a GPT creating winners and losers (Trajtenberg 2018). The AI giants are definitely the winners in this context.

Table 1 also illustrates that the COVID-19 pandemic has only accelerated the tendency of expansion and monopolisation. The value of the AI giants has grown exponentially since the start of the pandemic, as we are all massively dependent on their digital services. One of the risks of this domination is that these companies alone have the economic power to make political decisions about how AI is developed, how it is used and what its impact will be. It is an illustration of the winner-take-all scenario (Srnicek 2017).

What is a source of concern is that the AI giants follow a strategy of enclosure, with the objective to maintaining their leading position and safeguarding their growth and profit. Enclosure entails that—after having achieved a monopolistic position—these AI companies move to control access to their data and limit the ability of users to switch to competitors, thereby enclosing more and more of the digital world within their private sphere (Couldry and Mejias 2019; Morozov 2018).

The enclosure by AI capitalism is clearly illustrated by OpenAI. Originally founded as a non-profit organisation, which would collaborate with other institutions and researchers and make their research open to the public, OpenAI is now dominated by corporate investors, including Microsoft, and is considered as one of the biggest competitors of DeepMind.

In this context, it becomes clear that we—as a society—need to reflect on this situation and come up with alternatives so to avoid we end up as losers, under the control of the winners, the AI giants. Only criticising the problems of AI capitalism, however, will not be enough. As a society, we need to start imagining what alternatives could challenge the power concentration of Big Tech. Critical political economy offers a framework to inquire about this.

#### AI expansion is capitalist

Damon, 18, Andre Damon, Writer and Editor for the World Wide Socialist Web, 6/4/2018“Capitalism and the artificial intelligence revolution”, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2018/04/06/pers-a06.html> - FT

The use of artificial intelligence for mass surveillance and war-making is only one of the destructive purposes to which this transformative technology is being used under capitalism. Already, artificial intelligence is being used at Amazon warehouses to track every move employees make. Amazon’s systems count how many times workers go to the bathroom and alert foremen if workers stop to catch their breath in the up to 15 miles they are forced to walk during a single shift. At companies such as Uber and Lyft, artificial intelligence is used to push drivers to work longer and harder, often to the detriment of their health and well-being. But even more radical changes are on the horizon. As ride-sharing companies and shipping lines rush to implement driverless cars, trucks and boats, tens of thousands of jobs will be eliminated. The integration of AI with robotics will extend the wave of mass automation that has already displaced countless thousands of industrial workers into every single field, from the building trades to food preparation, to custodial work and retail. According to a 2013 survey by Oxford University, nearly half of US jobs will be destroyed by AI and robotics in the next two decades alone. Since the industrial revolution, capitalism has managed to transform every development in technology into an instrument of human oppression and butchery. The introduction of the spinning jenny ushered in the horrendous social misery of 19th century slums of London and Manchester. The cotton gin brought a resurgence of American slavery. The airplane was converted—through the doctrine of “strategic bombing”—into a method for killing civilians by the tens of thousands. And the nearly limitless energy created by nuclear fission was turned into a means of destroying entire societies, and perhaps humanity itself. But why should these technologies, which objectively create the conditions for a massive expansion of the standard of living for billions of people, be put to such horrendous uses? As the Russian revolutionary Leon Trotsky wrote in 1926: Technique and science have their own logic—the logic of the cognition of nature and the mastering of it in the interests of man. But technique and science develop not in a vacuum but in human society, which consists of classes. The ruling class, the possessing class, controls technique and through it controls nature. Technique in itself cannot be called either militaristic or pacifistic. In a society in which the ruling class is militaristic, technique is in the service of militarism. (“Radio, Science, Technique and Society”) In the hands of the ruling elites that control society under capitalism, every technological innovation becomes a cudgel: against the working class and against countries they seek to conquer and suppress through military violence. In different hands, the same technology will produce different results. In a socialist society, the artificial intelligence and robotics revolution will create the circumstances for a massive elevation of not only the economic well-being of the population, but also its cultural life. The replacement of tedious and back-breaking occupations will mean not mass unemployment and destitution, but rather greater leisure and an expansion of workers’ opportunities for education, family life and cultural enrichment. The automation of the building trades and the expansion of additive manufacturing (3D printing) to construction will vastly reduce the amount of labor required to build homes, schools and hospitals and ensure excellent housing for all. The leveraging of artificial intelligence in gene sequencing, drug development and analysis of medical studies will result in unprecedented breakthroughs in human health for the whole of humanity, not just the few who can pay soaring drug prices. The roboticization of both farming and transportation will vastly reduce the cost of food, ending malnutrition and ensuring a high-quality diet for all—not the ruin of small farmers by agriculture conglomerates.

## PGM

### 2NC -- Ext: PGM Link

#### PGMs are tools to justify repeats of the “war on terror” for US capitalist gains - by giving the public a re-assurance that their weapons are “precise” the US government and arms agencies increase their influence on the market and lead the world to accumulation and eventually war

#### 1 - PGMs are capitalist tools to wage “war on terror” on the innocent and facilitate militarized accumulation

Connolly 21 [[CATHERINE CONNOLLY](https://www.teenvogue.com/contributor/catherine-connolly) is a teaching fellow of foreign and international relations at Dublin City University and DCU is ranked 6th nationally in Ireland for best studies, 5-14-2021, "“Precision” Weapons Are Often Nothing of the Sort," Teen Vogue, <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/precision-weapons-war-on-terror>] - EM

Still, the U.S. spends billions of dollars on these weapons every year. In 2020, the Department of Defense [requested $5.6 billion](https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11353) for more than 70,000 precision guided munitions. For fiscal year 2021, the [DoD requested $4.1 billion](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/IN11276.pdf) for more than 41,300 such weapons. Since 2014, [the Air Force alone has used 139,000 weapons](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R45996.pdf) — nearly all of them PGMs — in combat operations in the Middle East, with more used in counter-ISIS strikes in Iraq and Syria. What we see under the Biden administration is the continuation of a cycle of violence that kills people and destroys infrastructure — while at the same creating continued demand for these weapons from arms manufacturers, [who often have close political links with the White House](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/08/us/politics/lloyd-austin-pentagon-military-contractors.html). The U.S. [war on terror will be 20 years old](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html) this September. While President Biden has announced that [U.S. troops will withdraw from Afghanistan on September 11, 2021,](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/04/22/politics/mckenzie-afghanistan-air-strikes/index.html) U.S. air strikes in the country will likely continue. If, as military theorist Carl von Clausewitz said, [war is the continuation of politics by other means](https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191826719.001.0001/q-oro-ed4-00011287), I have to ask: What politics are being continued here? To my mind, presenting U.S. aerial strikes as sporadic and disconnected yet also precise and strategic acts of violence does a number of things. First, it focuses analysis on these individual acts, when in reality the U.S. is carrying out [a program of widespread violence](https://www.wbur.org/hereandnow/2021/03/02/countterorrism-cost-us-military), committed not only against individuals in militant groups, but against civilians and their communities, and the states in which they are situated. Secondly, the focus on and fetishizing of the “precision” of the weapons used helps to present U.S. war and violence as more [“civilized”](https://twailr.com/capitalism-civilisation-and-international-law/) than that of other countries. Taken together, I see U.S. practices in the war on terror as indicative of a politics of [neo-colonialism](https://www.britannica.com/topic/neocolonialism), and [a capitalist politics of militarized accumulation](https://www.ppesydney.net/content/uploads/2021/01/14_Robinson-and-Rodriguez.pdf). The “precision” drone strikes of the targeted killing program, for example, highlight the neo-colonial nature of U.S. actions in the Middle East and Africa: these “precision” strikes are justified in the name of U.S. security and self-defense, [and arguably go far beyond what is sanctioned by international law](https://www.justsecurity.org/75010/bidens-first-strike-and-the-international-law-of-self-defense/); but these choices are available to the U.S. [because of its privileged position in the international legal system,](https://doi.org/10.3318/isia.2020.31.14) and because of the localities in which these actions are carried out, i.e. in the Global South, outside the “West” or the “Global North.” As Robert Knox, senior lecturer in law at the University of Liverpool’s School of Law and Social Justice, has pointed out, [racialization and racism are intricately tied up in all of this](https://legalform.files.wordpress.com/2017/08/knox-stretched-marxism.pdf). In terms of militarized accumulation, the ongoing war on terror supports the broadly defined interests of U.S. “national security,” which in turn represents the interests of [transnational capitalism](https://theconversation.com/class-on-a-global-scale-the-emerging-transnational-capitalists-22940) rather than the interests of ordinary people. Violence is integral to the continuation of [capitalism](https://www.teenvogue.com/story/what-capitalism-is), with the world economy now based, as University of California at Santa Barbara professor [William I. Robinson writes](https://escholarship.org/content/qt3zd8w8jz/qt3zd8w8jz_noSplash_dfa7b9f128348cfc32b6100d61359448.pdf?t=pzn1s9), “More and more on the development and deployment of these systems of warfare, social control, and repression simply as a means of making profit and continuing to accumulate capital in the face of stagnation.” In this sense, whether or not the war on terror succeeds is beside the point. [Pacification](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/pacification) — the [process of creating security and order through the use of force](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0964663910395816?journalCode=slsa) — can be [made productive for capitalism even when it appears to be failing.](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/securitycapital/productivity-of-security/66F3AC09BBB817F51D30BD718754313F)

#### 2 - Military spending and arm sales are capitalist

Kirk ‘2k [Gwyn and Margo Okazawa-Rey; author and scholar-activist concerned with gender, racial and environmental justice, American professor emerita, educator, writer, social justice activist, and a founding member of the Combahee River Collective; Neoliberalism, Militarism, and Armed Conflict, “Goals of This Special Issue,” p. 1-2] SPark

The trend toward a neoliberal global economy and the prevalence militaries and militarism worldwide are often treated as separate, unrelated phenomena. Many activists and scholars who critique and challenge the negative effects of increasing global integration emphasize economic factors (e.g., Bales, 1999; Chossudovsky, 1997; Greider, 1997; Mander and Goldsmith, 1996; Sassen, 1998; Teeple, 1995). These include the fact that workers in one country are pitted against those of another as corporate managers seek to maximize profits, that systems of inequality based on gender, race, class, and nation are inherent in the international division of labor, that nation-states are cutting social welfare supports, that women and children experience super exploitation especially in countries of the global South, and that there is increasing polarization of material wealth between rich and poor countries, as well as within richer countries. Critics also point to the role of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), which require structural changes to make economies more profitable for private investors and to open markets for so-called free trade.

Activists and scholars who are concerned primarily with militarism and de-militarization critique the prevalence of war or the threat of war to resolve transnational and intranational disputes (e.g., Reardon, 1996; Hague Appeal for Peace, 1999). They point to bloated military budgets that absorb resources needed for socially useful programs in many countries, to the fact that civilians make up the vast majority of the casualties of contemporary warfare, and that massive numbers of people are displaced - 90% of them women and children - as a result of wars. They note the profitability of the arms trade. They also emphasize connections between militarism and violence against women, and the incidence of human rights violations in military conflicts.

We are not suggesting that such analysts and commentators see no overlap between these two clusters of issues. However, in critiquing and challenging neoliberal economic integration, it is essential to take account of militarism as an intrinsic element. Conversely, in analyzing militarism, war, and armed conflict, it is also necessary to consider global economic forces and institutions. The goal of this special issue, then, is to show how neoliberalism and militarism are inextricably linked.

#### 3 - Only demilitarization solves neoliberalism - continued weapon production and sales link back and re-affirm capitalist militarization

Kirk ‘2k [Gwyn and Margo Okazawa-Rey; author and scholar-activist concerned with gender, racial and environmental justice, American professor emerita, educator, writer, social justice activist, and a founding member of the Combahee River Collective; Neoliberalism, Militarism, and Armed Conflict, “Goals of This Special Issue,” p. 14] SPark

The analyses in this special issue show the need for understanding connections between neoliberalism and militarism and for addressing this linkage through activist efforts. This means opposing Plan Columbia, for example, as a neoliberal strategy as well as a military intervention into the FARC's struggle for self determination. It means exposing the fraud of the War on Drugs in the United States, Latin America, and elsewhere, and articulating genuine solutions to the problem of poverty and lack of economic opportunity for small drug producers and users.

Opposing neoliberalism also means seeking effective strategies toward de-militarization, dismantling the permanent war economy, and working for economic justice in a world of limited resources. It means opening up public discourse on the economic reasons for war, the profitability of arms sales, and the costs of militarism in human, environmental, and economic terms. Steps toward demilitarization include:

Decommissioning weapons of mass destruction and opposing the militarization of space.

Reducing weapons production and sales, and promoting initiatives for conversion of military-based industries to provide for civilian needs.

Developing nonmilitary forms of strength to counter military threats, and expanding and disseminating current knowledge and experience of peaceful resolution to conflicts.

Developing renewable sources of energy.

Stopping the glorification of war and warriors, supporting initiatives like the Hague Appeal for Peace and UNESCO's culture of peace, and defining adventure and heroism in nonmilitary terms.

Broadening notions of conventional masculinity and femininity and delinking masculinity and militarism.

Developing genuinely democratic processes and structures for political and economic decision-making at community, national, and transnational levels.

Redirecting public spending to meet human and environmental needs and opposing assaults on locally

## Cyber Security

### 2NC -- Ext: Cyber Security Link

#### Cybercrime is a threat to capitalism, building up defense and deterrence is a vehicle of which protecting capitalism hides behind

Dallas Morning 21 [Dallas Morning, 5-18-2021, "Cybercrime is a growing threat to capitalism and national security," Dallas News, https://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/2021/05/18/cybercrime-is-a-growing-threat-to-capitalism-and-national-security/, smarx, HHW]

Not all crises can be anticipated, but some **persistent threats deserve more attention than they get**.

Case in point is the cyberattack that crippled the Colonial Pipeline and caused fuel shortages across the eastern seaboard. According to published reports, the pipeline’s owners paid a ransom to DarkSide, a Russia-based criminal organization, to get its operation back on board. In a looking-glass moment, DarkSide issued a statement declaring that its goal is to obtain cash, and it did not have a political objective, as if that makes things better.

**Cyberattacks are increasing in magnitude and frequency**, raising concerns that executives aren’t focused enough **on this threat to their businesses**, as well as the cascading impact on the overall economy and national security. In a digitally connected world, the importance of realistic risk assessments, firewalls and ways to protect critical data and services can’t be overstated.

“Business executives have to stop looking at cybersecurity as a technical risk issue,” said Chris Krebs, former director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency in the Department of Homeland Security, during an interview Sunday on CBS’ Face the Nation. “It **truly is a business risk issue**, and we are talking about the resilience of the U.S. economy.”

What DarkSide did to the pipeline amounts to breaking into your house, stealing your valuables and changing all the locks to keep you out until you relent to its demands.

To pay encourages more threats to other companies. Not to pay risks the loss of millions, if not billions, of dollars from a prolonged shutdown. And it’s not like you will get your valuables back, unscathed and with no questions asked. Data breaches usually end up with sensitive financial information being sold and resold on the dark web, creating other opportunities for cybercrime.

About **85% of our nation’s critical assets, systems and networks are in private hands**, and their incapacitation would have a debilitating effect on national and economic security, public health and safety. Private banks control our financial system. Private electricity providers control the grid. Private railroads and airlines move people, goods and services. And the list goes on.

**Cyberattacks target the lifeblood of modern capitalism** — the seamless digital global networks that encourage convenient commerce with customers and suppliers. When cybercriminals, who may or may not have direct ties to rogue states, leverage the power of computers and internet connectivity to shake down businesses, **executives need to elevate cybersecurity on the list of corporate priorities.**

The precise number of private companies targeted for ransom is difficult to calculate since companies are reluctant to talk about breaches and will pay up if compromised. Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas speculated that ransomware losses may be more than $300 million so far this year — up 300% from last year. “**The threat is real,”** Mayorkas said. “The threat is upon us. The risk is to all of us.”

# Alternatives

### 2NC -- AT: Change isn’t Possible/No Spill-over

#### Change is possible - individuals matter

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 155-156] SPark

The good news is that even if there might not be visible changes for a long time, this work is not undertaken for nothing. Think back to the development and also ignition phase in the s-curve. Each choice to do differently, each questioning of the stated purpose or reasons, impacts the former reference frameworks, mind-sets and knowledge reservoirs. It offers alternative meaning, delegitimizes the notion that there are no alternative claims, and offers ideas about other ways of acting or doing things. Of course much structural power rests with those who benefit from the status quo and its hegemonic paradigm. But as Meadows wrote, many individuals— change research suggests about 60 % of people in a system—are open minded and willing to learn.

This is where radical incremental transformation begins, as illustrated nicely in Fig. 5.1. It stems from Ray Ison, professor of the Systems for Sustainability program at the Monash Sustainability Institute in Australia. I was fortunate enough to sit next to him at a conference on decoupling human well-being from resource use and after my presentation he told me he had just finished an article that he felt was relevant to my thinking. The following illustration (Fig. 5.1) is indeed spot on, even though his terminology is of course different:

Ison’s article summarizes 14 years of experience in transdisciplinary research on system innovation processes. As a result, he and his colleagues put “social learning” at the heart of their framework: humans engage in making sense of a situation by socially constructing the issue at stake. Through this process they either reify or change both their understanding of a situation and the practices in which they engage. Sometimes this entails amending the institutional setup (made visible as elements of a situation in the right hand graph). Change and dynamic adaptation is the normal state of being in a complex living system. So each alternative viewpoint, each act done differently, amends the framework for action in the future.

So, in essence, we cannot not be part of changing the world. The decision that lies with us concerns our choice to become aware of this and use it intentionally— even if cause and effect are not always visible or impressive. Over time and through collective or concerted action, the situational amendments transform the system in question even if each shifting from one dynamic stage to another is in itself not very radical or disruptive (here indicated as S1 to Sn in the left hand graph). As part of this process, the boundaries of one system may also be adjusted and thence the scope of what a particular transformation process involves.

So each questioning sparks thought processes in others—an inspiration or irritation that influences the dynamics. Each silence might be interpreted as others please. And we never know when exactly that last incremental activity necessary to prompt a social or ecological tipping point for wider and deeper—radical—regime changes occurs. Social scientists’ research findings suggest that 10 percent of the people in any given system provides the critical mass where new ideas or opinions start spreading rapidly (SCNARC 2011).

In order to strategically influence these permanently ongoing processes of learning and adaptation, it is important to open up a target system: to assess and understand the crucial path dependencies and which purpose or generative imaginary they are serving. This involves infrastructures and technologies, as STS research would point out, the ecological embeddedness that SES approaches highlight, and the enforceable laws, role definitions, and mind-sets that political economist emphasize.

### 2NC -- AT: Change is Possible in the Squo

#### Their examples of changes are nothing but illusions and maintenance by the structures we criticize

Pillay ’18 [Devan; 2018; Former trade unionist, Associate Professor and Former Head in Sociology, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, Co-editor of Labour and the Challenges of Globalization; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “CHALLENGING THE GROWTH PARADIGM: MARX, BUDDHA AND THE PURSUIT OF ‘HAPPINESS’,” Ch. 7, p. 152-153] SPark

Indeed, as noted, nature has responded, threatening to bring down not only capitalism but the entire edifice of human civilisation. While the science on global warming and other ecological threats clearly demands a radical rethinking of the growth paradigm, the short-term thinking of the global economic elites – who prefer seeing the world in terms of GDP growth rates and profit margins – obliges them to engage in deception to maintain this system. To put it simply, the art of paradigm maintenance – perfected by global institutions like the World Bank, but used by hegemonic elites at the global, national and local levels – means agreeing that there is a problem; capturing the critical discourse and controlling it, partly by hiring or co-opting critical activist– intellectuals; using new concepts of critics (such as ‘sustainable development’ or ‘green jobs’) but emptying them of meaning; drawing non-governmental organisations (NGOs), labour and social movements into extensive ‘participatory’ exercises that give the illusion of participation; conceding minor reforms (such as a little renewable energy, some social grants or a temporary minimum wage); and through all of this, securing the power elite’s legitimacy and maintaining the fundamental economic paradigm

#### Governmental creations are illusory – South Africa proves

Pillay ’18 [Devan; 2018; Former trade unionist, Associate Professor and Former Head in Sociology, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, Co-editor of Labour and the Challenges of Globalization; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “CHALLENGING THE GROWTH PARADIGM: MARX, BUDDHA AND THE PURSUIT OF ‘HAPPINESS’,” Ch. 7, p. 153-154] SPark

The example of South Africa’s ‘green economy’ discourse illustrates this very clearly. After growing opposition to neoliberal policies based on the minerals–energy–financial complex – which has seen the apartheid social deficit only partially addressed, with unemployment rising to around forty per cent, growing social inequality and persistent poverty – the ruling African National Congress (ANC) ousted its leader Thabo Mbeki in 2007 and replaced him with Jacob Zuma, with the backing of the Communist Party, the ANC Youth League and trade unions, amongst others. After the 2009 national elections, Zuma became president of the country and co-opted key Communist Party and trade union leaders into government. After eight years, little has changed to meaningfully tackle the social or ecological deficit. However, government has produced new policy initiatives in the form of the New Growth Path and the NDP, drawing in respectable intellectuals and activists from academia and civil society.

The NDP, which is now government policy, is a classic example of paradigm maintenance. It contains a competent analysis of both the climate and the social crisis, and promises ‘green jobs’ and ‘sustainable development’. However, the Economics chapter maintains the essential neoliberal economic growth paradigm, based on the minerals–energy–financial complex.12 This effectively washes away the promises of decent green jobs based on renewable energy. It represents what Jeff Rudin (2013) calls ‘symbolic policy-making’ – seeming to concede with one hand, but taking away with the other – where the government talks Left, but walks Right. This strategy succeeds in winning some over to its promised development path, such as trade unions and NGOs hoping for half a loaf at least – what could be called ‘reformist’ reforms that may bring some cosmetic changes, only in order to maintain the paradigm.

## Paradigm Shift

### 1NC -- Alt -- Paradigm Shift

#### The re-arrangement of priorities to doing better and doing well solves - it combines and builds on existing initiatives that are experiencing success now

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “Introduction,” Ch. 1, p. 9-10] SPark

Some of the detrimental effects these concepts have on understanding how to reach the goals of sustainable development are discussed by bringing in insights from twenty-first century social and natural sciences as well as alternative economic thought. Earth system sciences, ecological economics, sociology, well-being studies, psychology and neurosciences have much to say about human needs, nature’s laws and the impact on both of these of economic growth-driven societies. Adding these findings to the picture shows that the paradigm and ideas that informed the creation of unsustainable system dynamics cannot guide their removal.

So which paradigm can achieve this? This is the key question that spans Chap. 4 and the case studies on pioneers working with different imaginaries of what the purpose of sustainable development could mean in practice. With the intention of investigating which key ideas or concepts a new and transformational development paradigm could build on, I took a closer look at the following initiatives: the Economy for the Common Good (a prominent business initiative in Germany and Austria), Transition Towns (an urban community initiative born in the United Kingdom), the Commoning Movement (civil society initiative spanning the Atlantic between the United States and Europe) as well as the Bhutanese Gross National Happiness (GNH) Framework (government initiatives that want to supplement GDP with other performance indicators).

Although I would not venture to state that one can define a clear-cut new paradigm or streamlining development purpose like, for example, ‘economic growth,’ I was surprised by the common ground between theory and practice as well as across practice examples. The worldviews of how to understand human needs and nature’s laws and the narratives about what development should therefore aim to achieve are very similar. All of these movements adopt the view that ecological systems host sociocultural systems and that economic systems are subordinate means in successfully structuring nature–human relations. This is radically different to the view of the mainstream paradigm that pursues the ongoing integration of social and environmental concerns into economic governance logics by pricing them. So I would go as far as to set one common heuristic that expresses the radical purpose and another to capture the strategic directions that the incremental steps of these pioneers are taking.

The radical repurposing agenda could be summarized as recoupling economic processes with human well-being and nature’s laws by making the economic dimension the one that needs changing. Given the structural reality of today’s path dependencies, the foremost strategy for successive change in this direction—the incremental strategies that can achieve it—is double-decoupling:

1. Decouple the production of goods and services from unsustainable, wasteful or uncaring treatment of humans, nature and animals (do better).

2. Decouple the satisfaction of human needs from the imperative to deliver ever more economic output (do well).

#### Replacing the GDP with a new holistic indicator for common good solves

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Matrix of the ‘Common Good’,” Ch. 5.7.1, p. 261-262] SPark

The first pioneering initiative worth describing comes from the business world, and originates from the well-known concept of corporate social responsibility, based on the idea of finding a balance between responsibility towards the community and free enterprise because neither works in isolation: individuals need to cooperate to “flourish and create wealth”, while the community needs individual entrepreneurship to maintain its ability to adapt and diversify the goods and services that are produced. According to the proposal of Christian Felber, author of The Economy for the Common Good and the main leader of the movement, the key to sustainability lies in connecting the private sector to the old Christian idea of the common good, hence the name, because if a company is conducted in an appropriate and honest way it undoubtedly contributes to the welfare of all, i.e. operates for the common good.

The movement proposes new rules for the game, one of which is to avoid regarding the externalization of social or environmental costs (use of water or forest resources, polluting greenhouse gases) as a ‘competitive advantage’. Naturally, either all entrepreneurs agree to internalize these costs (paying special taxes for emitting GHG or for the use of water, for example), or competitors who do not internalize them have greater benefits thanks to these subsidies of nature. Hence new rules are required and these must be accepted by all on the basis of social responsibility, or at least by a majority if the internalization responds to a legal obligation. Consequently, these new rules with internalized costs (formerly subsidized by nature) must be reflected in balance sheets which no longer measure economic well-being by indicators of exchange-value but instead by those of use-value.

Indeed, the common good movement has proposed that GDP be replaced at macroeconomic level by the new indicator product of the common good, which should be reflected at micro-economic level with a new type of balance sheet for the common good (Common Good Balance Sheet or CGBC). Since 2010 this new indicator has been used by a pioneering group of 70 European businessmen who by the middle of 2015 had increased to 1811, along with 232 clubs and more than 6,000 individual members. As for the indicators of the common good, there are five categories - human dignity, solidarity, social justice, ecological sustainability, and democratic decision-making and transparency - which can be applied to groups or stakeholders such as suppliers, financial creditors, employees and co-owners, partners, and clientele. Moreover there are indicators of bad behaviour connected with the violation of labour standards established by the ILO and the OECD, such as human rights, labour protection, environmental standards, tax evasion, the secret use of payments to lobbyists, subsidiaries, prices below cost, and dumping.

The initiative of the common good encourages communities and local governments to support this type of business with consumer loyalty and public recognition, and even to make their own evaluations in the so-called “common good regions” which already exist in 45 countries, including Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, the UK, Greece and the United States. The vision of the movement is to have a global reach, which means fostering self-reliance and promoting changes to overarching regime structures in such a way that the ‘normal’ hegemonic mentality guided by interest in economic gains and profits is transformed, along with the way of doing business, introducing, for instance, Göpel’s ideas about doing things well and doing things better (Göpel 2016: 112-126).

#### Developing sustainable parameters for economic growth is key to social progress and well being
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Thus it seems quite clear that sustainable development supposes a displacement of the neoliberal ideology from its current hegemonic position of mainstream economics and that the criteria that should guide both national and global public policies require cosmopolitan global governance based on the well-being of both the people and the planet. Hence, neither unlimited growth nor consumerism should be regarded as suitable parameters for the assessment of sustainable development. Instead the principles of doing things better and doing things well suggested by Göpel (2016) should be used. Doing things better means discontinuing the production of nonrecyclable goods, either because they are harmful to the environment or to stop the excess of waste and garbage. Doing things well means decoupling production from the imperatives of growth, because if the satisfaction of human needs and respect for natural ecosystems are the paramount objectives of sustainable development, they must prevail over growth, and new parameters (such as Buthan’s ‘gross national happiness’) must be found to assess progress and social well-being.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Paradigm Shift

#### Good living solves – Bolivia proves
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According to Barié (2017), the concepts of buen vivir and Madre Tierra or Pachamama are the most novel aspects of the new constitutions of both Bolivia and Ecuador. Regarding the concept of buen vivir (good living), it is evident that all good living can be understood as the satisfaction of human needs, because ‘living well’ and ‘good living’ are quite clearly terms that refer to a rich life in which both the subsistence and protection needs (decent work, adequate housing, food, medical and educational services) as well as the affective ones (living with the family, community, loved ones, being respected and appreciated) and those relating to knowledge (understanding), cultural identity, freedom and political participation, creativity, leisure and spirituality in general are fully met. However, what I want to highlight in the case of the indigenous people of the Andean region (Quechua and Aymara) is that these needs are understood from the point of view of their respective cosmovisions and under their corresponding terminology in the native languages, so although ‘good living’ is a subjective notion not quantifiable or definable in objective terms, it is clear from its name that the concept is closely related to human values and needs. This explains why it is appropriate to place it not only in the sphere of the aspirations of the nation as a whole, but also in the field of human development, thus enabling it to acquire the precision that can be obtained from United Nations Human Development Indices.

A review of the main changes reveals, for instance, that in the Constitution of Bolivia the concept of “good living” appears in the preamble, which refers to the fact that the Bolivian state is based on and guided by new principles and values, such as “sovereignty, solidarity and equity in the distribution and redistribution of the social product”, and above all is based on the “search of living well”. This is one of several new ethical-moral principles, which are presented in the Aymara language as sum qamaña, very similar to the Quechua term of sumac kawsay. With this concept, the purpose is to make the idea of material well-being compatible with both social peace and support and mutual solidarity among the people. Consequently, a person who lives well (qamiri sum) is not the one who is rich but the one who shares:

The qamiri sum happens to be the one who lives and coexists well, because he is welcomed by everyone and knows how to welcome and collaborate with everyone, regardless of whether you have little or much. In a certain way it can no longer be given individually but only in and with a larger social group … Living well turns out to be a kind of meta-value (to which other more common values must be subordinated, such as equality, inclusion and social equity). Even the educational system and the new economic model must be guided by the principle of living well (Barié 2017: 57).

#### Putting well-being and respect of the environment foster successful movements – Ecuador proves
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In the new Ecuadorian constitution, good living has different connotations, Barié points out, although it appears in the context of the re-founding of the State: “We, the sovereign people of Ecuador […] decided to build a new form of citizen coexistence, in diversity and harmony with nature, to achieve good living, sumak kawsay” (Barié 2017: 59). The concept of good living is also associated with popular wisdom and the ancestral cosmovision. Incidentally, sumac kawsay has been part of the historical claims of the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) since its foundation, and has also been proposed by CONAIE as a criticism of capital accumulation because, as Barié argues, “the objective and the principles of the economy should not be about profitability, but human well-being, living well: the sumak kawsay. The economy is only a tool at the service of the community” (Barié 2017: 61).

For this reason, the Constituent Assembly proposed the concept of sumac kawsay as an ethical principle, based on reciprocity and promoted by indigenous communities so that the ‘rights of good living’ are located within economic, social and cultural rights, such as the right to water, food, education, physical culture, work, social security, healthy environments and others that support good living. It should be noted that the emphasis on good living in the Ecuadorian Constitution is broader than the Bolivian, since it includes two complete chapters on inclusion and equity as well as on biodiversity and natural resources, both divided into sections on different topics.

Another aspect of the Ecuadorian constitution highlighted by Barié is that, following criticism of the predominance of the market typical of neoliberal ‘mainstream economics’, one of the main axes of this concept of good living is, according to the CONAIE, the creation of a Social and Solidarity Economy that can to a large extent be compared with the same concept proposed by the Chilean-American academic Howard Richards, which I will examine in the next chapter. This system recognizes the human being as the subject and end of the economy, its main goal being to guarantee the production and reproduction of the material and immaterial conditions that make good living possible (Barié 2017: 64).

The constitution also establishes different forms of organization of production, favouring State forms and modalities that “ensure the good living of the population”, including public debt and the environment. Development is defined as the whole sustainable dynamic of economic, political, socio-cultural and environmental systems in order to achieve good living, with the State having the obligation to plan development at a national level and in a sustainable manner, as well as to organize the redistribution of resources for access to good living. Consequently, within the framework of a government that promotes development, natural wealth must benefit people, including all communities and ethnic groups, so that they can live in a good manner and simultaneously respect the right to a healthy environment that must be ecologically balanced in order to ensure good living (Barié 2017: 60).

#### The GHN is effective and works to secure happiness
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Alternative society-centred pathways have been attempted in the Indian state of Kerala, and in countries like Bolivia17 as well as the small mountain country of Bhutan. While not conventionally associated with the radical alternatives, Bhutan deserves closer examination as it tries to navigate out of its feudal past into a multiparty democracy and the challenge of pursuing gross national happiness (GNH) based on balanced development. Its GNH Index offers a deep and extensive methodology to measure development in all its dimensions, and all development plans must first be subject to a GNH audit.18 Fioramonti (2017) prefers the term ‘wellbeing economy’, which avoids an association with pop ‘happiness’ surveys, and focuses on practical alternatives to GDP growth economics based on local economies and meaningful artisanal work. By breaking down the economies of scale, his ‘artisanal revolution’ means ‘more mechanics, electricians, plumbers, architects, gardeners, teachers, nurses, therapists, doctors and caregivers, and fewer bankers, lawyers, CEOs and chartered accountants’ (Fioramonti 2017: 220) who service big business and big government.

#### Development necessitates satisfaction of human needs before growth
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It has been more than four decades since the United Nations promoted research that focused on responding to the means to satisfy basic human needs without transgressing the outer limits of the biosphere, that is, within the framework of the resolutions of the first United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, 1972) that were published in the book Another Development: Approaches and Strategies (Nerfin 1977). In this collective work, papers on different topics written by authors like Johan Galtung, Marc Nerfin, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Bolívar Lamounier, Cinthia de Alcántara, Paul Singer, and Sergio Bitar presented an innovative vision of development which is not based on growth and capitalist modernization. Since then, the narrow concept that considered development to be synonymous with economic growth and industrialization7 is not the generally accepted paradigm in academia. A good number of Latin American scholars - including the Norwegian Johan Galtung, who was living in Chile at the time - were among the pioneers of the new paradigm of sustainable development. The kind of “other development” which these Latin American pioneers were talking about is one that must be orientated towards satisfying a more comprehensive conception of human needs, i.e. one which encompasses material, economic, social, and cultural and spiritual needs, as can be seen in Neef and Elizalde’s matrix of needs and satisfactions reproduced in Table 4.1.

This comprehensive understanding of development is a matter of human development and not simply economic development measured by GDP. It began to be used by the United Nations in the 1990s with the annual publication of human development reports that introduced social categories such as health, education and political freedom as parameters for assessing development in this broad sense. This concept of human development is based on the ideas in the seminal text Development on a Human Scale: An Option for the Future, by Neef et al. (1989), which gave continuity to the paradigmatic line of research initiated in the previous decade by academics such as Stavenhagen (1981, 1990, 2013), Cardoso (1969, 2006), Singer (1980, 2002), Galtung (2003a, 2003b, 2004), and Nerfin (1978), who were among the authors of the innovative book Towards Another Development: Approaches and Strategies (1978). Hence, Development of Human Scale Development was the result of a collective effort that crystallized in a theoretical systematization of theses that in 1978 outlined only its more general features. It was designed to give precision and coherence to such ideas, and to establish the framework for a new approach to the theory of development that was not reduced to a “mere cosmetic arrangement of a paradigm in crisis”, as the authors of the text say, but instead was a genuine effort to transform and substantially modify existing thinking (Neef et al. 1989: 12-13).8

Indeed, in a recent book on sustainable development, the German researcher Göpel reproduces the same matrix in her criticism of mainstream economics. To the extent that it is based on economic growth and the individual search for profit, mainstream economics can be seen as responsible for the multiple obstacles and difficulties that sustainable development has suffered in all parts of the world. For Göpel, a change of mentality and the adoption of a new holistic paradigm that effectively seeks the full satisfaction of human needs in all their complexity are indispensable tools. Not only the most elementary and primary needs such as subsistence, protection and shelter, but also affection, creativity, freedom, political participation, leisure, and understanding, must be properly articulated within sustainable development processes (Göpel 2016: 64-65)

#### Mindset changes possible – statistics prove
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From my point of view, this analogy with the tragic Greek Medea myth equates to a fatalistic philosophical vision that denies human freedom since - according to Ward - our species is condemned to suffer an ineluctable destiny. I do not share Ward’s determinist vision, although I admit that the debate opened by his hypothesis is valid, especially regarding the crisis of the 2020/21 pandemic, because the predatory behaviour of human beings towards the planet and Mother Nature could lead to our extinction if we don’t react promptly and adequately to threats like climate change and pandemics provoked by malign viruses - the coronavirus is just one more of a long chain of lethal microbes. This again indicates that humankind must embrace a mindshift by disowning neoliberalism, the main culprit of the disarray and disasters created by an ideological economic doctrine that does not care about health and life (human security) or the environment and planetary boundaries (global security). I outlined in the previous chapter how, according to social scientist Jared Diamond, some civilizations (the Mayas in Yucatan and Guatemala) and settlements (the Norwegians in Greenland, the Polynesians in Easter Island) collapsed totally after failing to adapt to environmental strains after climate change triggered by cultural and collective comportment, while other civilizations and cultures (the Japanese of the Tokugawa dynasty, the natives of the highlands of Papua New Guinea, the natives of the tiny island of Tikopia in the South Pacific Ocean) succeeded in avoiding disastrous climate change by respecting nature (forests and the typical tropical vegetation) and taking appropriate decisions in time, thanks to the forethought and wisdom of their respective ruling elites. This essentially means that I believe in the capacity of humankind to overcome the challenges of destiny using intelligence, knowledge and freedom. Thus, if Gaia can conquer Medea our species is not doomed and hopeless. But I cannot make any predictions; it all depends on our behaviour from now on.

#### The alt turns war - satisfying human needs is a prerequisite
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Many people remember the famous phrase of Pope Paul VI in his Encyclical Populorum Progressio (1967) 17 about development as “the new name of peace”, but after what has been said on previous pages about the nature and history of the concept of sustainable development, and its relationship with both the environmental sciences and the theory of human needs, including cultural and community development and the cosmovision of indigenous people, it should be clear that sustainable peace requires sustainable development, among other reasons because the type of peace that goes beyond the absence of war - positive peace, as Johan Galtung calls it - requires the satisfaction of human needs to sustain itself.18

#### AT - No Radical Transformations in paradigms
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It is now time to refer to some of the more positive experiences that could indicate a change of paradigm, such as the situation in Denmark, where appropriate policies made it possible for local communities to launch numerous renewable energy projects, and the most notable case of Germany, which has exceeded its official goal of obtaining at least 45% of its energy from renewable sources by 2020. This change of paradigm in energy matters is of such magnitude that a substantial transformation in the thinking of citizens and the private sector has already occurred - a mind-shift described by Göpel (2016: 25) which demonstrates that it is feasible to change the dominant paradigm in the field of socio-technical systems (STS). This turn means that a multilevel perspective and its incremental radical transformations can also be applied to other spheres of human activities, such as the environment, production, trade, and so on. This is not a minor issue, since Germany is not just an economic power but also the most influential country within the European Union. Despite being highly dependent on the importation of hydrocarbons, it fostered a group of visionary entrepreneurs (who could met with opposition through the lobbying of conservatives) in order to promote the ecological niches indispensable for transforming the energy matrix by replacing fossil fuels with renewables. Göpel describes the process by which a clever mechanism effectively created a return on investment security that convinced banks and even risk-averse investors to lend small businesses, farmers and citizens money to install renewable energy technology, thereby creating a market for renewable energy even though the sector had previously been dominated by an oligopoly of powerful companies:

Since these older business models had rendered the transaction costs of switching to renewable energy solutions prohibitively pricey in the past, no pioneering movement had been possible. The Renewable Energy Law hedged the risks of a plethora of new, decentralized energy producers and unleashed the competitive activity of many small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) active in technology development. By the mid-2000s the tipping point into the acceleration or navigation phase had been reached, and pioneering activities had become mainstream considerations. Fossil energy suppliers now felt threatened and tried to fight the regulation at all levels, e.g., attempting to make the EU declare feed-in tariffs incompatible with energy market integrations. But the renewable energy sector grew very quickly, created many jobs in rural areas with high unemployment and turned Germany into an international technology leader that inspired other countries. Thus, an environmental issue had found technology solutions and became solidly economic when it served the export interests of the German economy and found wide, bottom-up citizen support. The share of renewable energy in the electricity mix increased steadily, debunking the strongly spun narrative that renewable energy systems were technologically unfeasible - although concerns about black-outs remain. However, a new narrative was established in which a transformation of the energy sector was both possible and in progress, drawing in many new participants (Göpel 2016: 25).

In other words, the strategy of a gradual radical transformation worked: it started from a pre-development phase, moved towards the take-off phase, and reached a point of maturation (tipping point) that led to a third phase of acceleration, until finally, the socio-technical system (STS) stabilized at a new level. This same process can be seen in a multi-level perspective, demonstrating that changes can be promoted from small innovative niches which, once gathered in a design that brings them together, can take advantage of windows of opportunity to lead to a new regime that exerts influence on the upper level of the ‘socio-technical landscape’. That is the level at which the ideology, the ‘mindset’, and the predominant way of seeing things in society is located and, despite belonging to an exogenous context, will react downwards so that the preferences of markets and consumers are properly articulated within public policies, culture, industry, science and technology in order to provide feedback through expectations and social networks to the small innovators who started the whole process. Figure 5.3 clearly shows how, starting from innovative actions at micro level (niches), influence is exerted on science, public policies, market patterns, social practices and the same technology at an intermediate level, thereby affecting the higher level, which is the field of ‘meta-narratives’ where world-views (‘cosmovision’) and paradigms are located. This all provides feedback to terrestrial ecosystems, which benefit from the change in the energy matrix by completing thecycle and, in the example provided, is consistent with moving from the predominance of non-renewable energy to renewable energy.

It is also important to point out that the mind-shift necessary to promote sustainable development coincides with the ideas of Sachs (2015), who argues that reconciling economic growth with ecological realities requires a profound change of economic model. It also aligns with the views of Klein (2015) and Wolff (2012), who are in favour of models in which local companies are managed democratically in the form of cooperatives or communal enterprises to produce food, energy, crafts and goods of all kinds in a renewed version of socialism.

## Communist Party

### 1NC -- Alt -- Escalante

#### The alternative is an affirmation of the Communist Party – dual power is uniquely key to accountability mechanisms and connection of communities to foster a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18** (Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> HHW)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be **best forwarded through party organizing**, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on **dual power responds directly to this insight**. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact **create sympathy towards the cause of communism**, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party**.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we **must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism.** We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we **must adopt party organizing**. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, **party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions.** It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such **accountability is crucial**. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. **Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems** within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a **unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement.** Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Escalante

**The socialist party is not ready for a revolution. Only dual power organizing can build institutions that meet the material needs of community to face the revolution and compounding crises of climate change, imperialism, and fascism.**

**Escalante, 19** [Alyson is a Marxist-Leninist, a Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist, "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach," *Failing That, Invent*, <https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/doa>: 7/8/22]//JL

I previously argued that a crucial advantage to dual power strategy is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis. Socialist agricultural and food distribution programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism.

One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have twelve years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly.

In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market-based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the left-wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends.

The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that “Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis.

The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the US can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the US. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the US military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change.

Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever-shrinking twelve-year time frame.

There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves?

Revolution and Dual Power

If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America-backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well-funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the US, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within twelve years.

While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the meantime? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the US today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a harsh truth, but it is true.

Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next twelve years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these twelve years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development.

Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society.

To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle.

What I want to suggest here is that the production of food through dual power institutions should be a central project for this revolutionary movement. There are several reasons why I think this is the case. First, food production allows us to meet the most immanent needs of the masses. The US is plagued by food deserts which deprive huge portions of the population access to fresh food. Poverty exacerbates this further, and the devastating effects of lack of access of healthy food due to poverty are well documented. This is an urgent need that socialists can meet in order to demonstrate to the masses that it is socialists who can serve them where the capitalist state has failed. Second, food production is a major contributor to climate change. Large-scale meat production produces massive amounts of greenhouse gas, and the transportation of food from rule agricultural areas to urban populations centers is a major contributor as well. Urban agricultural projects and the development of sustainable permaculture are not sufficient to fix these problems, as they are not able to overthrow the capitalist system of agricultural production. However, paired with a broader revolutionary movement, these projects allow us to undertake scientific experimentation with meeting food needs, in order to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative food production methods that can eventually replace the current unsustainable capitalist model. After all, if our revolution cannot replace unsustainable production models, we will not be able to resolve climate change any better than the capitalists.

#### A Democratic Socialist Party is key to change, autonomy, and freedom

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Richard Wolf,” Ch. 5.3.3, p. 231-232] SPark

According to the American scholar Richard Wolff, capitalism and democracy are in permanent contradiction, given the fact that corporations and enterprises are ruled by CEOs and managers who answer to the owners of capital, not to society and citizens. Consequently, radical reform of the economic system is needed to democratize the economic system by creating, for instance, producers’ cooperatives, or democratically managed enterprises that might be an alternative which generates a new, genuinely socialist mode of production which is fully consistent with the ultimate rationale underlying Marx’s theoretical approach in Das Kapital. Furthermore the proposition that firms should be run by the workers on their own was endorsed in the past by famous and well-known liberal thinkers such as John Stuart Mill and John Dewey - one of the prominent philosophers of the twentieth century - as well as Marxists like Karl Korsch, Wright Mills and Antonio Gramsci. Besides, the stark contrast between the innermost driving force behind capitalism and generally recognized ethical values, such as Christian ethics that extol virtues such as benevolence and care for our fellow-beings, condemns greed and discourages the accumulation of wealth, so there is nothing to be admired in individuals whose actions are solely guided by the personal profit motive, rather than the duty to take care of their fellowbeings, i.e. the behaviour of people operating in capitalistic systems of interpersonal ties does not proceed from democracy, but from the development of capitalism. Thus the establishment of a new system founded on solidarity is an absolute necessity, given that in capitalism “all the higher bonds of love and solidarity are dissolved: from the bonds of craftsmen’s guilds and social castes to those of religion and the family” (Gramsci 1994: 134). In a new democratic economic system where a cooperative or enterprise is ruled by workers’ councils, “limits are placed on the sway of capital in the workplace” and people gain autonomy and freedom as members of collectives. Hence socializing production also involves humanizing the workplace, making it is possible to say that citizens are better forged in the factory than in the electoral district. This also explains why it is important to press for the permanent inclusion of workers in the strategies and bargaining agendas of all trade unions. Furthermore, if the supreme value of life is not to have but to be, being oneself and enjoying life will be facilitated by a socialist order founded on being, rather than having, and this will be the result of the active involvement of workers in economic life as free citizens.

## Socialism

### 1NC -- Alt -- Socialism

#### The socialist movement solves for the environment

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Ian Angus,” Ch. 5.3.4, p. 234] SPark

Calamity has already struck for many among the poorer populations, whether from floods, droughts, heatwaves, or food shortages. Shortages and droughts provoke internal violent conflict - as in the Middle East - which in turn generates further scarcity alongside the violence, triggering massive migratory flows that then strain the resource-base in other countries, like Turkey and several European countries. The dialectic of scarcity feeds and is fed by terrorism and military intervention in countries like Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Palestine and Yemen, and the consequences are terrorist attacks against civilians in both Muslim and predominantly non-Muslim countries. In the last two chapters Angus outlines the main points of his eco-socialist alternative, underlining the importance of replacing carbon-based fuels (including biofuels) with clean sources of power under community control (wind, geothermal, wave and solar power), promoting collective transport instead of individual vehicles, promoting food sovereignty, drastically reducing greenhouse emissions, and so on. He stresses the main features of a social movement that must be an ecological and majority counterpower, pluralist and open to different views within what he calls “the green left”, and overall able to constantly extend the analysis and programme in the light of changing political circumstances and scientific knowledge. It should be internationalist and anti-imperialist, capable of overcoming all kinds of environmental struggles - large and small - and unite the eco-socialist consciousness in order to create an ecological civilization.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Socialism

#### Socialism solves the coming crises while also maintaining stable growth

Conor **Payne and** Chris **Stewart**, authors for MR online who talk against capitalism, Irish socialist party leaders, 2-7-2022, "The end of growth? The capitalist economy & ecological crisis,” MR Online, <https://mronline.org/2022/02/07/the-end-of-growth/)-> FT

Socialist planning can ensure the rational development of the quality of our lives without increasing environmental intensity. Only on this basis can we restructure our society around need, not profit, creating countless socially necessary jobs in pursuit of building a sustainable system. Socialists stand for massive investment in low carbon jobs and sustainable infrastructure, as well as the introduction of a four-day work-week with no loss of pay. This would not only solve the problem of permanent unemployment under capitalism by distributing work to all those who need it, but would also free workers up to participate in political and economic decision-making, and would achieve a better balance between work, our social lives and leisure.

## Redistribution of Wealth

### 1NC -- Alt -- Redistribution of Wealth

#### Redistribution of wealth is key
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Indeed, Piketty argues that the concentration of wealth in these rentier elites of owners of capital has in turn led to an exaggerated increase in social inequalities, a phenomenon that is undermining and threatening democracy itself among the member countries of the European Union. Given that the structure of social inequality is the central problem of twenty-first-century capitalism, Piketty dedicates his book to the study of it in several special chapters which deal with issues such as inequality and the concentration of wealth; the inequality of income at work; inequality in the ownership of capital; merit and inheritance in the long term; and inequality on a global scale.

According to Piketty, the market economy based on private property needs to be regulated by the State, otherwise, without rules and a legal order, very much in Habermas’ analytical line, “powerful forces of divergence … threaten democratic societies and the social justice values on which they are based” (Piketty 2014: 571). Piketty also emphasizes the fact that the main destabilizing force of capitalism is that the private rate of capital gains can be considerably higher than the income growth of wage earners, small and medium entrepreneurs and the rest of society. This means that wealth accumulated in the past grows faster than production and wages. Such inequality therefore expresses “a fundamental logical contradiction”, which inevitably leads the owners of capital to become rentiers with increasing dominance over those who rely on employment or their workforce. This is how a situation that favours luxury consumption and small market niches of luxury goods and services for these elites is generated, to the detriment of productive investment and employment.

The fact is that once capital works, it reproduces much faster than production, and the consequences in the long term lead to a brutal concentration of wealth so that on a global scale the problem becomes enormous and without simple solutions. During the twentieth century, two World Wars were necessary to reduce the excessive profits of capital, somewhat creating the illusion that the fundamental structural contradiction of capitalism had been overcome. With the current average of profits (4-5%) wars will hopefully not become the central phenomenon of the twenty-first century, as they were during the twentieth century (Piketty 2013: 572). Consequently, for wealth not to continue concentrating excessively, Piketty proposes creating an annual tax on capital in order to stop this “spiral of infinite inequality”. The rates suggested by Piketty are in the order of 0.1-0.5% for fortunes under 1 million Euros; 1% for capital of between 1 and 5 million Euros; 2% for the scale of 5-10 million and between 5 and 10% for fortunes of between several hundred and several thousand million Euros:

This would stop the unlimited growth of inequality in the distribution of global wealth that is expanding at a rate that cannot be sustained in the long term, and that should worry even the most fervent self-regulated market champions. Historical experience also shows that these immense inequalities in [the distribution of] wealth have very little to do with entrepreneurship and are not useful for promoting growth … The difficulty is that this solution, a progressive tax on capital, requires a high level of international cooperation and regional political integration. It is not within the reach of nation-states where social commitments are negotiated. Many worry that moving in the direction of greater cooperation and political integration, as seen within the European Union, only subverts the achievements already made … Although the risk is real, I do not see any genuine alternative: if we are to recover the control over capitalism we have to bet everything on democracy - and in Europe, democracy on a European scale. Larger political communities such as the United States and China may have a broader range of options, but for small European countries, which will soon appear smaller in relation to the global economy, retreating to national borders can only lead to worse frustrations and dislikes than those that already exist. The nation-state is still the appropriate level to modernize any number of social and fiscal policies and develop new forms of governance as well as shared ownership between public and private, which is one of the greatest challenges for the remainder of the century. But only regional political integration can lead to an effective regulation of the globalized patrimonial capitalism of the twenty-first century (Piketty 2013: 572-573).

The previous lines were written by Piketty in 2013, the year of the first edition of his book in French. It is worrisome that since then the situation has worsened with the unfortunate vote for Brexit by British people exasperated by EU regulations; Trump’s election by disenchanted American unemployed workers; the huge flow of refugees resulting from the wars in the Middle East, especially Syria; terrorism menacing European cities; the racism and xenophobia that these last phenomena have aroused throughout Europe; and, of course, the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020/21. To all this should be added the populist neo-nationalism in spite of Biden’s election, the damage caused by former. Trump administration, unchaining a new cold war against China, threatening Iran, Venezuela and North Korea, intimidating Mexico and the Latin American countries with his racism and xenophobia, distancing the US from its EU and NATO allies, and so on. Thus the picture could not be grimmer now in relation to the scenarios outlined by Piketty in the conclusions of his book. In any case, it is clear that there is no way out other than betting on democracy and the reform of capitalism at macro-economic level. At least in the European case, it is from their own institutions that Brussels must make appropriate decisions - such as the circular economy and the European Green Deal - to impose effective regulations on this “globalized patrimonial capitalism” which characterize these early decades of the twenty-first century.

In any case, the prospect of new concord in the European leadership and the possible reconstitution of the Paris-Berlin axis looms on the horizon thanks to the crisis provoked by the pandemic. Thus in a recent interview Piketty (2020) stated that it is now necessary to change the economic system because even though, after the fall of communism, changing the system was no longer fashionable, the pandemic has again put this issue on the agenda. It is clear that a different economic system is absolutely necessary if the EU really wants to solve both the social inequality crisis and the climate change threat produced by what Piketty calls ‘hyper-capitalism’. He is in favour of a participatory socialist system based on reforms such as sharing power with workers within big corporations and enterprises in order to give workers the right to vote on strategies; the establishment of a basic income; and the “permanent circulation” of wealth through fiscal reform, including a progressive tax on patrimony and heritage in order to change the current situation where in France and Italy, for instance, 50% of the population owns just 5% of the real estate, financial and professional assets whereas the richest 10% in those countries own 50% of the assets and another 1% owns 25% of the wealth.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Redistribution of Wealth

#### The redistribution of wealth solves for inequality and other neoliberal crises

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Howard Richards,” Ch. 5.3.5, p. 235] SPark

In summary, Richards’s Economy of Social Solidarity (ESS) coincides not just with views like those of Sousa Santos but also has parallels with technical and sophisticated macro-economic approaches, such as those of Varoufakis about the surpluses recycling mechanism that constitutes his key criterion to determine whether capitalism could be reformed. In the same manner that global-scale capitalism should be reformed to diminish inequality by sharing surpluses among the poor and establishing, for instance, a global tax on financial transactions (FTT) to finance the universal basic income advocated by Varoufakis, the ESS model deems that surplus recycling must take place at a local and community level. This is because it is in this physical location that economic surplus can be shared instead of accumulated for personal enrichment. Individuals who hoard their surplus cease to be responsible members of the community - or society - becoming rentiers, as Piketty similarly says in his critical historical analysis of the huge concentration of wealth and inequalities of twenty-first-century capitalism. Richards’s views could also be compared with those of Morin (2011), who, in an interesting book about ‘humankind policies’, refers to the cooperative movement, micro loans, fair trade, demography, indigenous peoples, water, and environmental experiences in different countries, including France (Morin 2011).

#### The redistribution of wealth is key to stability

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Yanis Varoufakis,” Ch. 5.3.1, p. 228] SPark

So if banks are the new rulers of the capitalist system and have governmental support as a result of the neoliberal policies launched by Reagan and Thatcher in the 1980s, the collapse of the welfare state is perfectly explicable. Varoufakis argues that the welfare state ‘civilized’ and ‘stabilized’ capitalism in those years, so the neoliberal wild capitalism prevailing again in current times must once more be put under state control, especially if the working class is no longer socially insured and their wages stagnated since the introduction of the so-called ‘Washington Consensus’. Consequently, to solve the current crisis (aggravated by the pandemic of 2020/21) the neoliberal narrative that maintains that wealth is created by the private sector must be discarded because, in fact, wealth is created by society (taxpayers who finance research and development) and appropriated by the owners of capital. This is demonstrated by simple facts: the internet is the result of research financed by the state but was appropriated by Google or Microsoft, the components of cellular phones and computers are also the result of state-financed research appropriated by Apple, the vaccines developed with public funding are appropriated by pharmaceutical corporations, and so on. Hence, Varoufakis affirms that the best way to stabilize and ‘civilize’ the system again would be the establishment of a universal basic income that could also help to solve the problem of the huge unemployment created by the pandemic crisis and prevent the same problem in the foreseeable future, when joblessness will increase due to automatization and robotization. Thus the need for a social safety net is not just a matter of social justice but of keeping the economy afloat by subsidizing demand.

## Cosmopolitics

### 1NC -- Alt -- Cosmopolitics

#### The alt is TRUE cosmopolitanism - transferring from capitalism provides foundations that allow sustainable development and the destruction of structural violence which is key

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Epilogue” Epilogue, p. 361-362] SPark

Not surprisingly, the democratization and legitimization of the international system require a new kind of multilateralism, a true cosmopolitan vision that could prevent and reduce the danger of internal ethnic cleansing and interstate warfare and violence, especially in the ‘flash-points’ of Eurasia, the South and East China Seas, the Middle East, and even Latin America, where geopolitics still confronts the trend towards regional integration. As previously stated, geopolitics and the territorial principle must be transformed. The contemporary concept of global security based on the preservation of planetary boundaries must be adopted, and the absence of sustainable development must be regarded as a threat to peace ecology because climate change is caused by the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Last but not least, positive peace based on the eradication of structural violence is also fundamental. In synthesis, in today’s world, sustainable development must be the answer to the multiple socio-economic, environmental and political crises that are threatening the survival of our own species. Thus, if the anthropogenic deterioration of climate is aggravated by the ecological threats linked to the Great Acceleration, urgent measures must be taken - the COP 21 commitments as a minimum - to stop an existential danger that could include humanity in the sixth mass extinction. Cosmopolitics is not a utopia that would never become reality. When a person acknowledges the reality of a situation, the social consequences of this perception can be transformed in reality. Thus, despite the fact that our contemporary world is still mainly Westphalian and neoliberal and that, unfortunately, neo-nationalism is reappearing, at the same time globalization and trans-nationalization have already introduced important changes in global civil society. If we want to avoid the collapse of civilization, sustainable development complemented with a substantial reform of capitalism, a return to the 362 Epilogue welfare state, the regulation of markets, imposing taxes on the super-rich, establishing a universal basic income, allowing everybody to enjoy a decent standard of living based on Buen Vivir (good living) - not personal gain - and the non-material dimensions of fulfilment such as meditation and spirituality, the quality of life, social solidarity, the preservation of ecosystems, and the protection of the environment are all fundamental issues. Then it will just be a matter of time before we attain the collective change of mentality and philosophy that will lead the majority of world citizens to redefine reality according to the new holistic and cosmopolitan paradigm with all its anticipated factual and social consequences. Nevertheless, engaging in these topics at world level requires a reassessment of how ethics, international relations, economics, sociology, natural sciences and ecology can work together towards sustainability, using cosmopolitanism, holism and transdisciplinarity as methodological tools that will help to overcome the current world crisis. Escaping extinction by embracing sustainability - that is the great challenge of our century.

#### The alt is critical NOW - current trends in globalization reiterate Capitalist ideals of “winners and losers”, causing unjustified norms in international order
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What are these cosmopolitan realities that intrude and demand a new cosmopolitan methodology capable of preventing social sciences “becoming a museum of antiquated ideas”, to quote Beck? First of all, national state borders have become porous, interdependences are growing exponentially, and restrictive immigration policies are trapped in contradictions: on the one hand the rich industrialized countries of the Global North are suffering a “spectacular demographic regression, with ageing populations that threaten to overwhelm pensions and health systems” and reinforce political conservatism - like the growing neonationalism and populism of the European extreme right and the former Trump administration - and on the other hand these very countries are busy “building ramparts to ward off both the feared and the real immigration flows from the poorer South”. Indeed, as social, economic and political interdependences are growing worldwide, leading to new forms of migration (of both migrant workers and refugees escaping from war and armed conflicts) these circumstances condemn anti-migratory policies as counterproductive and unable to stop human mobility, as happened in the aftermath of terrorist attacks of September 11, because “it is precisely this repressive impulse that undermines the necessary readiness to authorize more immigration, which could counter falling demographic curves and rejuvenate the population” (Beck 2003: 53). Interestingly, that lucid forecast about the ills of “methodological nationalism” was made by Beck in 2003! Another “cosmopolitan reality” is that certain cosmopolitan issues, such as human rights, have been internalized in nation states. As these standards become part of the universal jus cogens widely accepted as enforceable international law - regardless of whether or not its main instruments have been duly subscribed to and ratified by member states2 - the judges and courts of all UN member states are obligated to accept and apply these norms whether dealing with nationals and foreigners. In other words, to quote Beck (2003: 53), “Human rights are increasingly detached from citizenship status and are no longer bound by national contexts,” and “examples of this trend” can similarly be seen in educational curricula; the growing number of bi-national marriages and families; the increasing number of transnational work and private life connections; the growing mobility of communication, information, cash flows and risks (such as the pandemic and climate change catastrophes, products, services, and so on); trade agreements; diaspora cultures (the ‘re-ethnification’ or recuperation of ethnic identity, religion, culture and national customs revived in the daily life of people living in guest countries); and what Beck calls the “internationalization of national models of inequality”. To put it another way, the permeability of national boundaries entails a distribution of globalization winners and losers (according to the production sectors that are either shielded from the world market or exposed to it) in such a way that in some situations this can produce a contradiction between national and transnational elites “who fight over positions and resources within national power spaces” (Beck 2003: 64).

### 2NC -- Ext -- Cosmpolitics

#### Cap bad, cosmopolitics good

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Cosmopolitan Approach of Ulrich Beck,” Ch. 6.1, p. 288-289] SPark

On these pages I have presented the idea that the Anthropocene is not just a new geological epoch that replaces the Holocene but must additionally be understood as a normative cultural model based on the transdisciplinary holistic and cosmopolitan paradigm that unifies social and cultural sciences. Regarding the latter, my main goal is to make a contribution to academic understanding about ways to mitigate the Great Acceleration of GHG emissions endangering the survival of our species due to climate change threats, which are also closely related to the prevailing neoliberal economic model that misguidedly puts the accumulation of capital and economic growth over human needs and respect for natural ecosystems as the most important purpose of production and even of human individual lives. This is why I argue that the crucial alternative in the face of the global pandemic (aggravated by the dismantling of welfare and health systems in countries under the influence of neoliberalism, such as the US and some European and Latin American countries) and the threats of climate change is to abandon the pernicious worshipping of ‘markets’ or face the sixth mass extinction that science is foreseeing unless we change the predominant neoliberal mindset and prevailing economic policies. Evidently, everybody must realize that the way out of the crisis cannot be found in a national manner with isolated national policies. Something we have learned from the COVID-19 pandemic is that international cooperation is vital; developing vaccines and avoiding the increase in contagions and deaths would have been impossible if all countries of the world had not collaborated and shared knowledge, information, medical equipment and all kind of resources, including financial means.1 This is where the transnational cosmopolitan paradigm that I will be discussing on the following pages enters the scene, because a change in mindset from the conventional nationally or ethnically centred mentality to a world-centric cosmopolitan way of thinking is absolutely necessary. This change in the theoretical approach of social sciences from methodological nationalism to a cosmopolitan focus is fundamental because, as Beck argues, the cosmopolitan critique is not about nation-state sovereignty or why it has been subordinated to the forces of globalization, but about the power potentials, strategies and organizational forms of politics without borders (‘de-bounded’) which allow new actors (and networks of actors) from global civil society to influence the world scenario

#### Cosmopolitan movements can happen now - EU and other post-conventional groups prove - but capitalism is making them fail

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Globalization, the World System and the Crisis of the Westphalian Order,” Ch. 6.4, p. 301] SPark

From this perspective, globalization, as we have seen on previous pages, is a phenomenon that has been inherent in the world system since the sixteenth century. Nowadays it is better understood from the perspective of its current manifestations, which are the result of the impressive scientific and technological developments exemplified by the new information and communication technologies (ICTs) of the so called information era examined above. On a social level there is now a transnational civil society that, as a positive result of globalization, has facilitated the emergence of significant nuclei of a new type of citizenship (people with a world centric mentality or post-conventional cosmopolitan world consciousness) that rejects ethnocentric nationalism and constitutes the basis of the new transnational social movements that promote counter-hegemonic globalization (Santos 2010) and defend causes such as ecology, gender equality, the rights of indigenous peoples, human rights, humanitarian law, sustainable development, the UN 2030 Agenda, the commitments of the Paris COP 21, nuclear disarmament, and other similar causes. It is therefore possible to say that this cosmopolitan world-view and its social movements show that a significant layer of global civil society is emerging with a post-conventional cosmopolitan philosophy or world-view that could also be the bedrock or underpinning for the kind of transnational citizenship pioneered by the EU. Nevertheless, there are some negative expressions of globalization, such as the proliferation of organized crime and other phenomena that can be attributed to the characteristics of the capitalist system, like the growing number of transnational companies whose production is destined for the global market and requires intergovernmental agreements in order to permit merchandise to circulate freely (with reduced or no customs tariffs) or facilitate investments so that corporations may ‘relocate’ to places where wages are lower, in areas where the use of corrupt procedures is frequent with the purpose of obtaining government contracts which enable the accumulation of capital, the concentration of wealth, and the placing of funds in tax havens: all those negative features can be mitigated by appropriate global regulations negotiated in multilateral UN international fora.

#### AT - Cosmopolitics impossible - no social integration

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Transnational Citizenship in the European Union,” Ch. 6.3, p. 293-294] SPark

Unfortunately and in contrast, other regions of the world like Latin America have not yet succeeded in gaining the impetus for a social integration process comparable to the EU. Indeed, MERCOSUR, the Andean Pact and the Central American Integration System (SICA) have all failed to establish supranational institutions, so those initiatives consist of regionalization and multilateral cooperation, not integration. However, the absence of social integration does not mean that discussions concerning transnational citizenship are not possible in the context of regionalization, because the interconnectedness brought about by the internet and smartphones in this information era (Castells 1997) has facilitated the creation of links and networks between all kind of actors, including individuals and social movements involving religious, cultural and non-governmental organizations. For that reason it is indisputable that not just a regional but a global civil society exists, as pointed out at the beginning of this century by Kaldor et al. (2003). In Global Civil Society they refer to the concept as ‘normative’ but also as a useful way to describe what was then considered an emerging new social reality as a result of the connectivity of global civic action as a counterweight to the narrow notion relating globalization to strictly economic phenomena (Kaldor et al. 2003: 3-4).

## Subject Formation

### 1NC -- Alt -- Subject formation

#### Need alt now educate yourself dude. Stop being stagnant.

Guerrero ’18 [Dorothy Grace; 2018; Head of Policy and Advocacy of Global Justice; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “THE LIMITS OF CAPITALIST SOLUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CRISIS,” Ch. 2, p. 39] SPark

A growth-driven and market-dependent system is incompatible with environmental security. Rethinking the ways that states and societies value nature and how resources are allocated and managed must be done now by those who believe in a meaningful and productive life. The climate crisis is not just an environmental issue – it is a global social and ecological crisis requiring an overhaul of the global political and economic systems. There is no time to lose. Linking various social justice issues with the problem of climate change, coupled with radical anti-capitalist analysis and out-of-the-box solutions favouring equity and sustainability, has great potential for bottom-up social transformation. For climate justice activists, the severity of the climate crisis reaffirms the eco-socialist argument that capitalism not only generates war, poverty and insecurity but also potentially threatens human survival in vulnerable areas. The right to development and the need for alternative development also raises class issues and the divide not only between rich and developing countries, but also between the rich and poor within countries. Solving the climate crisis affects all aspects of society – the economy, technology, trade, equity, ethics, security, as well as relations within and between countries. The only alternative is to resist the decapitating grip of exploitative capitalism and to take on the responsibility of educating oneself and being a conscious political subject, organising, mobilising, forging unities and exposing the false solutions peddled by those who created the crisis in the first place.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Subject formation

#### AT: Humans are innately greedy - Turn - its structural and we can solve

Göpel ’16 [Maja; 2016; Secretary General of the German Advisory Council on Global Change, Co-founder of the Scientist for Future initiative, member of the Bioeconomy Council of the German Federal Government, the International Club of Rome, the World Future Council, the Balaton Group, and the German Commission for UNESCO, the Board of Trustees of WWF Germany, the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Natural History Berlin, and the advisory board of the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources (BSEER) at University College London, Delegate to the federal convention in 2022; The Great Mindshift, “How to Work a Great Mindshift for Sustainability Transformations,” Ch. 5, p. 154] SPark

So how does Gramsci say we can escape hegemonic rule? As a political economist he of course refers to structural problems within the production processes. Resource constraints or too high levels of inequality might challenge their smooth continuation and therefore the acceptance of the division of labor and revenues within them. But, most relevant for this book, he also suggests the weakening of the cultural and ideational consensus or dominant paradigm that helps to justify the unequal distribution patterns and provide moral hazard on a sociocultural rather than structural level.

Public discourse after the financial crisis, at least in Germany, was full of statements—for example, that human nature is simply greedy and that it was not the fault of individual bankers but of regulatory loopholes that they basically had to use. The question these articles never answer is which of these implacably greedy humans should then suddenly be enlightened enough to write laws without loopholes. Nor do these articles suggest how it might be possible to find laws without loopholes for globalized systems. The moral hazard discussion so far points out that systems too big to fail and contracts with golden parachutes are not very conducive to good governance.

But there is also a sociocultural moral hazard perpetuated by a narrative and proclaimed common sense in which people are innately greedy. The ethical default changes from one of ‘intending no harm’ to one of ‘do everything that is not explicitly forbidden because this is legitimate.’ Even regulatory and judicial consequences will differ from those of a society in which egoistical behavior to the detriment of the great majority is considered an individual and civilizational failure. Different sentences for corruption or rape in different cultural settings are just one example of this hazard effect.

German philosopher Richard David Precht offers a forthright view on the effects of the widespread adoption of mainstream economic ideas and the commodification of human relationships: “Strict and tough calculation of utility, ruthlessness and greed are not man’s main driving forces, but the result of targeted breeding. One could call this process ‘the origin of egoism by capitalist selection’, following Charles Darwin’s famous principal work” (ibid., here cited by Habermann 2012: 15).

More subtly, Gill writes: “a change in thinking is a change in the social totality and thus has an impact on other social processes; a change in the social totality will provoke change in the process of thought. Hence the process of thinking is part of a ceaseless dialectic of social being” (Gill 2003: 22). This means that many of the ultimate drivers of societal change are located within each one of us. Here, as indicated in purple and blue arrows in Fig. 2.6, we find the connection between the big picture of meta-level paradigms and hegemonic narratives on the meso-level and the mini-level of individual thinking and acting: everyone can challenge the declared system-purpose and the ideas and assumptions it needs to appear as beneficial or legitimate. By questioning the standard answers and ways of doing things we can drive change from below, within and above, at the same time.

#### The alternative is seeing capitalism for what it truly is

Moore, 11, Jason Moore, environmental historian and historical geographer, PhD, Alice Hamilton Prize, Transcending the metabolic rift: a theory of crises in the capitalist world-ecology, Capitalism as world-ecology, or, the oikeios as dialectic , page 4- FT

This sort of social determinism was indeed where I began (Moore [2000a](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/03066150.2010.538579)). Nearly a decade ago, I argued that ‘environmental crises’ and long ‘systemic cycles’ of environmental transformation complemented capitalism's phases of development. It was clear, for instance, that the rise of monopoly capitalism in the later nineteenth century entailed a set of far-reaching agroecological transformations, from the wheatfields of the American Midwest to the copper mines of Chile and the rubber plantations of southeast Asia. I soon found that one could travel only so far with such a model. It was an approach that proceeded from a set of a priori constructions ontologically prior to the relations I wanted to discern: the game was rigged, the outcome determined in advance. The rise of monopoly capitalism, in this scheme of things, caused changes in ‘the’ environment. But such a view begs an important question. To wit, How does the nature–society relation ask for a rethinking of capitalism and its phases of development? Perhaps even more important: What can a socio-ecological method reveal about capitalism that was previously underappreciated or mis-recognized? This was a much more intriguing line of questioning. I appreciated the flood of critical scholarship that accounted for capitalism's environmental depredations, but after a certain point, I wasn't learning anything that most of us didn't already know: Capitalism is bad news for the birds and bees, the water, the soil, and pretty much all living creatures on the planet. Empirical evidence might be amassed to verify this or that ‘environmental’ impact, but within the limits of the Cartesian scheme, the socio-ecological constitution of capitalism itself remains unexplored. It is not that we don't need an analysis of impacts. Rather, the problem is that Cartesianism narrows, rather than expands, the kinds of impacts under investigation – farming is important, and so are CO2 emissions, but not global finance and its mania for securitization, or the Washington Consensus, or the dollar as world currency. In an expansive sense, the big question turns on how we think capitalism, or if you prefer, modernity, industrialization, imperialism, and the many other possible ‘master processes’ (Tilly [1984](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/03066150.2010.538579)) of world-historical change. The alternative is between differing ‘ways of seeing’– between, say, a capitalism (or modernity, or industrial society) that acts upon nature, and one that develops through human and extra-human natures. We have, I believe, arrived at a powerful eductive moment – one that allows us to erase old boundaries and open new vistas, and one where we can reconstitute each of these processes on the historical basis of the nature–society relation.[3](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/03066150.2010.538579)

## Coexistance

### 1NC -- Alt -- Coexistance

#### Coexistance with nature is key to harmony

Guerrero ’18 [Dorothy Grace; 2018; Head of Policy and Advocacy of Global Justice; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “THE LIMITS OF CAPITALIST SOLUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CRISIS,” Ch. 2, p. 39] SPark

Vivir bien (Bolivia) or buen vivir (Ecuador) is a Spanish term that emerged in the late twentieth century to refer to the practices and/or visions of indigenous peoples of the Andean region of South America. The practice of vivir bien/buen vivir may differ, but regardless of particularities some common elements have been identified and developed into a concept now codified in the constitutions of Ecuador and the Plurinational State of Bolivia (Focus on the Global South 2014). Buen vivir is a contrast to the capitalist way of life. It sees humans as an integral part of nature and not separate from it. Humans should thus not control nature but take care of it as one would take care of one’s mother, the one who has given life. The goal is harmony, not growth (Solon 2014). Without growth, the current capitalist system cannot exist. Although challenging, we must not turn away from the tasks of reconstructing or recreating processes, or the collective effort to articulate and popularise the need for alternative systems of national and global economic and political governance. Also gaining ground is the idea that the law of nature and the processes of the ecosystem, articulated as the ‘Rights of Mother Earth’ (World People’s Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth 2010), must be respected as much as we respect the principles of our rights as humans

# Impacts

## Laundry List

### 1NC -- Laundry List

### Foster

#### Capitalism is unsustainable – only shifting away avoids inevitable extinction from escalating war, climate change, and biodiversity loss

Foster '19 [John Bellamy; 2/1/19; Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, PhD in Political Science from York University, President and Board Member of the Monthly Review; "Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?" <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/> smarx, HHW]

Indications of this failure of capitalism are **everywhere**. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 **Soaring inequality in income and wealth** has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7

The capture of the **surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions** of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is **rapidly widening once again**.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13

Adequate **health care**, **housing**, **education**, and clean **water** and **air** are **increasingly out of reach** for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15

In the United States and other high-income countries, **life expectancy is in decline**, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “**global health emergency**.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “**social murder**.”18

At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21

More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 **Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet.**

Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23

The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers.

Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27

War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a **global thermonuclear exchange**. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in **wars/bombings in seven different countries**—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and **nuclear arms race is in the making** between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it **marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons**.29

Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30

More than three-quarters of a billion people, over **10 percent of the world population**, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States **keeps climbing**, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling **poor quality and toxic food**. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35

The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generatedenormous riftsin planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38

If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40

Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity.

Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitationof workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value(value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42

We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs ofwar, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expenseof an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43

#### **Laundry List of Impacts to capitalism – Intensified Conflict, Authoritarianism, Climate Change, Ozone Depletion, Land Use**

Kolin 2/7 [Andrew Kolin; Andrew Kolin is a professor of political science at Hilbert College. He received his PhD in political science from the City University of New York Graduate Center; 2-7-2022; ProQuest Ebook Central; Lexington Books; https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lib/umichigan/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&amp;docID=6869943; SK]

Global unevenness and global competition amongst capitalist nations devalues the total amount of surplus value and further intensifies conflict between capital and labor. In addition, this increases the tendency towards an accumulation crisis impacting the environment occurs as capital scrambles to obtain new resources. The physical environment is captive and transformed as capitalism attempts to span the entire globe. This global movement of capital especially within the dominant highly developed centers of production extract on an accelerated pace the fossil fuels needed to further create surplus value. In the short run this is driven by the movement of advanced capitalism towards the goal of achieving a higher rate of profit. Advanced capitalism monopolizes control and in so doing so increases detrimental environmental practice which are dysfunctional to the environment. While this is taking place, less advanced capitalist nations are focused on catching up, attempting to gain access to natural resources required for primitive accumulation. The resulting increase use of fossil fuels by advanced capitalism coupled with the mimic desire to do the same by underdeveloped capitalism only serves to increase degrading the environment. The cumulative impact of climate change is associated with the global drive to accumulate capital. “. . .the volume of greenhouse gas in the atmosphere is the highest it has been for hundreds of thousands of years. Changes in biospheric integrity. It has been estimated that species and are going extinct at the rate of about 1000 times greater than in preindustrial times. Bio geo chemical flows . . . as much as 50% of nitrogen ends up in lakes rivers and oceans where can cause abrupt ecosystem changes such as the notorious dead zone in Mexico. Stratospheric ozone depletion. In the 1970s scientist learned that widely used chemicals will destroy the ozone the blocks harmful radiation from reaching the surface of the earth. Ocean acidification. A proportion of CO2 emissions dissolved in seawater making it more acidic than in preindustrial times. This can interfere with the growth and survival of corals many shellfish and plankton causing the collapse of essential food webs and drastic reduction in Fish eye Marine mammal population. Freshwater use. Heavy withdrawals for agricultural and industrial uses are depleting major aquifers while melting glaciers are illuminating the source water of many rivers. Land system change. About 42% of all ice-free land is currently use for farming: that land formally supported 70% of the worlds’ grasslands 50% of savannas and 45% of temperate deciduous forest. Laws of this land reduces biodiversity and has negative effects on Earth’s climate and water systems. Atmospheric aerosol loading. Most of what is cold air pollution consist of microscopic particles and droplets called aerosols. Inhaling them causes about 7.2 million deaths per year. Introduction of novel entities. There are over 100,000 chemicals and plastic polymers in commercial use today. For almost all very little is known about the individual or combined effects on human or ecosystem health.”4

These are some of the visible indicators of how capital accumulation generates this life and death cycle in the environment. The abnormality of capitalism is manifested as its overall dysfunction in terms of the periodic breakdown and crisis of accumulation. The social effects of capitalism as a dysfunctional social system can be understood in relation to Marx’s fetishism of commodities as an example of money as the ultimate objective measurement placing value on people and things. As a byproduct of capital cumulation money functions as it arbitrarily assigned value and importance in terms of what the market will bear. In a strict psychological sense this fetishism narrows the human personality so that it overly emphasizes material needs at the expense of larger social needs.

From the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, Marx presents the idea of labor as the fulfillment of basic and social needs. His idea of social needs are those collective needs which are necessary. The development of social needs is to be understood as unalienated labor, which is in control of the productive process. Labor power purchased as a commodity and used to produce surplus value beyond the wage needed for subsistence sets the stage for the alienation of labor followed by the monetary fetishism. A decline in profits increases the tendency to ramp up the production of surplus value.

In principle, democracy is at odds with a capitalist economy, as Erich Fromm discusses in Escape from Freedom. The culture of capitalism embraces this escape from having responsibility for social freedom in favor of authoritarianism. As Fromm explains, “The feature common to all authoritarian thinking is the conviction that life is determined by forces outside of man’s own self, his interests, his wishes. The only possible happiness lies in the submission to these forces.”5 Especially in an accumulation crisis, an emerging form of authoritarian capitalism increases the tendency of capitalism to self-destruct. Capitalism is powerless to effectively resolve its inherent contradictions, confronting the environmental limits to capital accumulation but continues to extract resources which function to undermine the life of the environment. Capitalism diminishes the global quality of life and increases the movement towards greater global destruction. In its Hobbesian version of a war of all against all the culture of capitalism as Pacman (eat or be eaten), nature is regarded as something to conquer and exploit. It leads one to question the very sanity of a capitalist social system and what could be in Fromm’s words a sane society: “A society in which no man is a means towards another’s ends, but always and without exception an end in himself; hence, where nobody is used, nor uses himself, for purposes which are not those of the unfolding of his own human powers; where man is the center, and where all economic and political activities are subordinated to the aim of his growth. A sane society is one in which qualities like greed, exploitiveness, possessiveness, narcissism, have no chance to be used for greater material gain. . .”6 As a less than sane social system, capitalism moves forward with the sole obsession towards accumulating capital. Through the process of accumulation, the power of capital strives to overcome and overwhelm barriers to accumulation, reducing the quality of life to a more primitive, barbaric state.

#### Capitalism creates a laundry list of problems – the system itself is full of contradictions

**Kuttner 5/31** – [Robert Kuttner is co-founder and co-editor of The American Prospect, and professor at Brandeis University’s Heller School; “After Hyper-Globalization”; 5/31/2022; <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2671558849?parentSessionId=tQewAIYQgwaRU%2BkgQTVVwTbT%2FEPHUHQLjgS5V4PyU8A%3D&pq-origsite=primo&accountid=14667>; DOA: 6/17/22; Lowell-JL]

By hyper-globalization, I mean the premise that cross-border trade and capital movements should be free from regulatory restraints and national industrial policies. This became the new definition of “free trade” and the object of intense U.S. diplomacy beginning in the 1980s. After 1990, this vision was codified in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and in dozens of bilateral deals. Promoters of the shift invoked economic theory, but in practice it was driven by the corporate push to use trade rules aggressively to undermine national regulation of capitalism, from banking (rebranded as “trade in financial services”) to industry-created pollution.

NAFTA allowed corporations to sue in special courts to challenge health, safety, and environmental regulations as incursions on their trading rights. Within the EU, long-standing guarantees of collective bargaining were overturned as impinging on the cross-border rights of capital. WTO rules became obstacles to distributing free or cheap vaccines in a worldwide pandemic. Hyper-globalization was the global face of neoliberalism, as well as its enforcer.

From the start, the system was a bundle of contradictions. Western leaders who sponsored this shift knew from their national experience that unregulated markets are far from efficient. For almost a century, nations dealt with the anomalies of markets by regulating finance, labor, health, and the environment. They used industrial and research subsidies and public ownership to help their economies develop. Wherever nations failed to regulate, capitalism created gross inequality and environmental disasters, as well as periodic financial bubbles, systemic crashes, and prolonged depressions. But through some mysterious alchemy, when commerce crossed borders, unregulated markets were supposedly efficient after all. Free-traders never explained the inconsistency.

### 2NC -- Laundry List

#### Capitalism is Bad - laundry list (mostly environmental a bit of inequality)

Khan ’18 [Lal; March 5; International Secretary of Pakistan Trade Union Defence Campaign; Daily Times, “Looming environmental disaster”, <https://dailytimes.com.pk/210454/looming-environmental-disaster/>] SPark

US President Donald Trump recently took off the mask of the previous imperialist leaders. He exposed the hypocritical, false gestures to resolve this daunting threat to mankind. He has ditched the Paris and other accords on climate change. In any case, these wouldn't have made much of a difference. In its epoch of capitalism's terminal decay, it's fast becoming dangerous for civilisation's existence. The environmental harms of capitalism do not simply result from greed and lack of effective environmental regulation or indifference, though these undoubtedly exacerbate the situation. Environmental destruction is inherent to its functioning.

Pollution of the atmosphere, oceans, fresh waters, and land, the disruption of ecosystems and loss of biodiversity are not an auxiliary to the running of a globalised capitalist economy. There can be no 'green' or 'environmentally benign' capitalism, just as there can be no socially and economically humane capitalism. Industrial pollution, consumption related waste, carbon and other 'greenhouse' gas emissions, pilferage of natural resources and intensive 'industrialised' agriculture are its inevitable consequences. These harmful environmental effects are treated as 'externalities' - somebody else's problem. For much of capitalism's history, the consequences of its environmental aspects were not readily apparent but now, at the start of the 21st century, they cannot be ignored, despite being often camouflaged.

Atmospheric pollution and global warming, due mainly to gross overuse of fossil fuels, has reached a stage where even professional government and corporate liars admit that a world catastrophe involving the destruction of whole countries and populations is now inevitable, unless overall emissions are reduced by at least 80 percent from their 1990 levels. Yet capitalism's drive for profits and resultant demand for energy is intensifying 'unconventional' or 'extreme' energy production such a star sands, hydraulic fracturing and coal seam gasification, and aggravating environmental damage further.

Global climate change presents a real and instantaneous threat to the lives billions. It seems likely that several crucial 'tipping points' have already been crossed which will now - whatever inadequate responses are cobbled together - will inevitably result in a significant rise in sea level, and possibly irreversible changes in weather patterns and climate regimes.

To implement humane and rational plans for the human race the combined knowledge, initiative, skill, imagination and enthusiasm of the countless millions of people who have no material interest in profiteering - the working class - is indispensable

The problem does not lie in technology, but in the ability or inability of the economic and social system to manage it. A system based on private profit is incapable of handling an energy delivery programme where the interests of society as a whole and those of future generations are a priority. Addressing realistically the needs of both energy production and demand along with climate change reduction will require, however, massive investment and planning with (re-)nationalisations, under social ownership in a workers democracy.

Food production is largely divorced from the human need for sustenance, and driven almost entirely by profit. There is enough food produced, and enough land available for agricultural production, to feed the world's population. The contrast of food surplus and massive waste in the rich developed world, and shortage and famine in the 'underdeveloped' world reveals capitalism's character of exacerbating inequality.

Marx elaborated the contradiction of food production with workings of the capitalist system. 'All progress in capitalistic agriculture is a progress, not only of robbing the labourer, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time, is a progress towards ruining the lasting sources of that fertility.' (Capital Vol-I). Increase in agricultural productivity since the World War II has outstripped increases in productivity in every area but at the cost of the destruction of whole societies driving millions from the land into poverty and precariousness in the squalor of shantytowns on the edges of megacities in the ex-colonial world.

However, the system of private ownership and profiteering cannot even secure human survival. To implement humane and rational plans for the human race the combined knowledge, initiative, skill, imagination and enthusiasm of the countless millions of people who have no material interest in profiteering - the working class - is indispensable. The capitalist system and class now threatens the future of humanity. The great achievements of bourgeois science have been perverted into pseudo-science and outright superstition. Capitalism's rationalisation of its catastrophic environmental consequences is propagated as the folly of the masses in over-consuming and over-reproducing. In reality, it is the wastefulness, destructiveness and venality of capitalism itself. Capitalism is now fighting all that is progressive in modern dialectical and materialist science. The warning of Fredrick Engels to human kind, more than a hundred years ago, 'socialism or barbarism' - perhaps now could be put, as 'socialism or barbarism and the earth's destruction.' This is now the harrowing future of humanity under capitalism.

## Unsustainable

### 1NC -- Unsustainable

#### Capitalism is the root cause to our ecological crisis – certain extinction. Decapitalization is the only solution.

Erin Remblance 22 [Erin Remblance, 2-22-2022, "Decapitalising our minds: the key to addressing climate change," Resilience, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2022-02-22/decapitalising-our-minds-the-key-to-addressing-climate-change/, smarx, HHW]

Emissions continue to rise. Governments are failing us. A ‘global tipping point’ could be activated in as little as five years. Why aren’t we doing more to solve the greatest threat humanity has ever faced?

Capitalism is the root cause of our ecological crisis and the **key barrier** to solving it. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, because capitalism cannot exist without economic growth, and economic growth is the main reason why our emissions have been increasing over the last 30 years and further growth will make it impossible to decarbonise in time to avoid activating tipping points. Secondly, because our minds have been shaped by capitalism and it is stopping us from seeing both the role capitalism plays in the cause of climate change and the full scope of solutions available to address the crisis. Social psychologist, Professor Harald Welzer, sums this up well, describing economic growth of industrial societies as “enshrined in business and politics, but also in the psychological structure of the people who grow up in such societies.”

There are six key ways in which capitalism shapes our minds. Under capitalism we, collectively, believe:

Nature is nothing more than a ‘resource’ to be exploited

Our power lies in our consumption habits

Success lies in evermore material items and novel experiences

People are a ‘resource’ and must earn their living

Money is scarce and the government must make choices

We must compete with others

This ‘capitalisation’ of our minds creates a barrier to solving the climate crisis in many ways, including:

denial that the crisis exists because the solutions don’t fit one’s capitalistic ideology;

disinterest and disengagement with the crisis because nature is for others to focus on;

unconscious of how our minds are shaped by capitalism, we:

champion solutions that are well-intentioned but inadequate because they assume mythical ‘green-growth’;

implement targets that aren’t supported by policies to achieve them, instead relying on technology that doesn’t currently exist to cover the gap.

Unsurprisingly, the mindset we need to address the climate crisis is the exact opposite of the mindset described above.

**We are entirely dependent on nature**

Across the planet, from rainforests and indigenous lands to oceans and mountain tops, we view nature as existing for us to plunder, dominate, and use to fuel our economic growth. Nature is myopically viewed as nothing more than a resource that those with enough money can ‘own’ and exploit for gain, excluding all others from the use of those resources. Furthermore, in a desperate attempt to not address the root cause of the climate crisis, we are betting the planet’s ability to sustain life on technology that does not yet exist, exacerbating other ecological crises in the process. This is **not rational behaviour**. This is delusional and symptomatic of a collective mindset that believes technology rules over all else and that nature can be tamed.

We need to cherish nature for **without it we cannot exist**. We are a part of nature, not separate from it, and we are entirely dependent on it for humanity’s survival. Rather than selling off our natural environment to create private wealth we should be holding it in trust for future generations. Because we think we are separate to nature, we often ‘other’ people who care about the environment as ‘greenies’ or ‘environmentalists’ and dismiss their concerns as ‘passions’ which allows us to mentally compartmentalise them as someone with different beliefs and priorities to us when what we really should be doing is listening, questioning, learning and ultimately joining them.

**System change is the only solution**

It’s highly likely, if you are at all concerned about the climate crisis, you’ve had the thought “what can I do?” and concluded something along the lines of reducing your energy needs, switching to renewable energy, driving & flying less, buying an electric vehicle and eating less meat: actions that relate to how you, individually, spend your money. This is perhaps one of capitalism’s greatest achievements because it has rendered us unlikely to actually change capitalism itself. By reducing people to ‘consumers’ that believe they have little power beyond that of their consumption habits, the inertia to come together as citizens and communities of like-minded people to take collective action is significant. This is how capitalism likes it. Fittingly, it was a PR company engaged by BP that devised the personal carbon footprint concept, precisely to put the focus back on individuals and distract from the huge emissions generated by their business and their responsibility to address it.

Whilst individual actions are well-intended and an important ‘entry-point’, we are now so late in the game that acting as consumers won’t cut it. We need to use our collective power as citizens to influence as many people as we can and ensure we vote in leaders who will change the economic system to one that is focused not on growth, but on the wellbeing of people and the planet. We need to adopt a war-like mindset and work together, finding strength in numbers. Otherwise, the enduring legacy of our lifetimes will be the **collapse of human civilisation**.

#### Falling profits and realization crisis are inevitable – ultimately doom capitalism

Raag Trivedi 22 [Popular Posts, 1-22-2022, "How Did Karl Marx Predict The Fall Of Capitalism?," Science ABC, https://www.scienceabc.com/social-science/how-did-karl-marx-predict-the-fall-of-capitalism.html, DOA: 6-18-2022, smarx, HHW]

Karl Marx predicted several crises. The two major ones are the realization crisis and the falling rate of profit. According to him, such events would end capitalism. The time period of the 1920s to the early 1930s saw severe unemployment, economic depression, hyperinflation and global hysteria. This period is known as “The Great Depression”. The first world war, which ended in 1917, was a major reason behind this economic catastrophe.

Since many countries were involved in the war, and not all of them were on the same side, the experience of the Great Depression varies from country to country. For example, Germany encountered its Great Depression from the early 1920s onward, while the United States of America saw its decline in the year 1929.

To give you some idea of how bad the situation was, imagine that the currency of Germany in 1922 was “marks”. In Germany (1922), one loaf of bread would cost about 163 marks. When September 1923 arrived, this same loaf of bread would cost 1.5 million marks. By 1923, at the height of economic decline, one loaf of bread in Germany cost about 200 million marks (Source).

However, in the midst of all this turmoil, there were some people who were happier than ever. There was a section of people in society who saw all this turmoil as temporary, leading to something greater, something that they had believed in for a long time. These were the Marxists. The Marxists saw this severe depression as the end of capitalism, something Karl Marx had predicted in his writings in the 19th century. So… why did they believe that the Great Depression was the end? How had Marx predicted the end of capitalism?

Karl Marx, as an author, went through two major phases in his life. The first was the idealistic, while the second was the materialistic. The idealistic phase is when Marx focused on human suffering, what capitalism as a structure does to society and how it creates a class divide etc. After this, Marx decided to analyze the economic workings of a capitalist system. It was in this phase, with his classics like Das Kapital, that he delivered some of his iconic phrases: “Capitalism will create its own fall“, due to the economic crises that any capitalist system would **eventually suffer**. The two major types of capitalist crises are:

**Realization Crisis**

**Falling Rate of Profit**

For the purpose of understanding these crises, let’s assume that you are an industrialist, and have a lot of money to invest in any field.

Realization Crisis

This crisis is also known as the crisis of demand.

Consider the example where you are an industrialist. Imagine that you’ve been working in the gold industry for a long time, and the profits are no longer large. Like any other investor, you will now be looking to invest in a market that is fairly new, has big returns and, and will have balance. What balance is this? The balance of supply and demand!

Once you enter a new market (provided that your product is successful), the demand for your product increases and you start getting big benefits. As the demand for your product increases, you increase the costs and slowly try to reap more benefits. The growing demand for your product puts your production in overdrive, so you keep producing more and more, thinking that there are always people that will want to buy the product. However, after a point, because of the expanding market, you increase prices slowly and the product gets more expensive. Due to the fact that your product is successful, people still try to buy it, but after a point, they can **no longer afford your product**.

**Economic Bubble Burst**

A situation finally arises in which you keep producing your product, but there is no demand for it anymore. How does this happen? This can only happen when there is a separation between the laborers and consumers. The wages of the laborers will be lowered to exploit them to a maximum benefit. This phase, in which your production and benefits expand, is called an “economic bubble”. When the bubble bursts, the price of the product is exorbitant, there is too much of it, and nobody wants any of it!

**Falling Rate of Profit**

Now, go back to the example where you are an industrialist. Let’s assume that upon leaving the gold industry, you decide to join the paper-making industry. The regular way would be to get the machinery and laborers, and then start up production. However, if you invest in better machinery at the first stage, that could change the game. If you have better machinery, your production will be much more efficient and you can achieve what is known as a “super profit”.

For a while, you will enjoy huge benefits. Eventually, your new machinery will be open to everyone, however, and everyone else will start using the same machinery as you. This will result in your profits dropping; eventually, the market will come to a grinding halt, until another set of “new machinery” is introduced in the market.

#### Capitalism is destroying the Earth – the remaining healthy ecosystems are being commodified and extracted

**Foster 22** (John, Professor of Sociology @ the University of Oregon, Ph.D. in Political Science @ York University, editor of the Monthly Review, former critical Essay Editor/Archives Editor, Organization & Environment, editor and author of numerous books and articles about economics, environment, and capitalism, “The Defense of Nature: Resisting the Financializaton of the Earth”, <https://monthlyreview.org/2022/04/01/the-defense-of-nature-resisting-the-financializaton-of-the-earth/>, ML)

Plans for the expropriation and accumulation of natural capital by global finance are primarily directed today at the Global South. According to the UN Environment Programme, spatial mapping of natural capital indicates there is “a high concentration of terrestrial ecosystem assets in the equatorial regions, particularly in the Brazilian Amazon and the Congo Basin.” Marine ecosystem assets are highest in Southeast Asia (the South China Sea) and along coastlines.14 Indigenous territories cover some 24 percent of the earth’s land surface and “contain 80% of the earth’s remaining healthy ecosystems and global biodiversity priority areas,” making these primary targets for expropriation and conversion into marketable natural capital. Sub-Saharan Africa is a target since “it’s estimated that around 90% of land is untitled,” with the result that many Indigenous communities that have lived in these areas for untold years lack official land titles, and their land is therefore open to land grabbing.15 The African Forum on Green Economy, working with the Natural Capital Coalition and the World Wildlife Fund, stated in 2020 that “natural capital is part of a wider economic system,” implying that Africa’s ecosystems can be completely subsumed within the capitalist economy.16The implications of this rapid financialization of nature, which is promoting a Great Expropriation of the global commons and the dispossession of humanity on a scale exceeding all previous human history, are vast. This Great Expropriation is being justified on the grounds of saving nature by turning it into a market, thereby replacing the laws of nature with the laws of commodity value. Yet, not only is the logic behind this fallacious, but it is also likely to widen the associated colossal financial bubbles, while accelerating destruction of planetary ecosystems and of the earth as a safe home for humanity.

#### Capitalism causes extinction – prioritization of personal gain over societal gain dooms the earth

Less Radical, link for when you are reading economic alt \*\*

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Alternative Paths Towards Post-capitalism or a Renewed Democratic Socialism,” Ch. 5.1, p. 214-215] SPark

In the foreseeable future wild capitalism (neoliberalism) will be over because the unlimited growth and the monstrous inequalities that this economic model produces across the whole world is absolutely incompatible with planetary boundaries and the carrying capacity of the planet we inhabit. That is the main lesson of the Anthropocene. So what kind of model will replace neoliberalism? In this chapter I summarise some alternatives formulated by social scientists and movements, and refer to the Kingdom of Bhutan, which happens to be a real-life example, not based on any model but on the philosophical principles of Buddhism, which informs social practice, thinking and customs in that country. From my perspective, the name of the model to be established is unimportant; what matters is that neoliberalism must be terminated, otherwise humanity risks extinction. On the other hand, as seen on previous pages, IR theory has several dimensions in accordance with the different components of the subsystems that are part of the international system. The economic subsystem is a fundamental component of them, since the production of goods, services and trade is an indispensable part of satisfying human needs.

However, the modern capitalist system brought about the idea that the main purpose of an economy is personal enrichment and the accumulation of capital. Thus, according to this ideology, the owners of any business must prioritize growth and gain over the satisfaction of human needs. The well-being of people and the conservation of ecosystems are put in second and third places after the objectives of production and economic activity. The result of this mode of thinking is not just the alienation of the working class and the divorce between human beings and nature, but the Earth’s reaction against Homo sapiens. Consequently, in the future capitalism will be “sucked down” by “the alternatives that will appear in all parts of the world”, as Latour argues (2015: 218), because the political order is always interwoven with the natural order.

### 2NC – Unsustainable

#### Capitalism caused climate change

**T**rotskyist **F**raction, 20**19** (“Capitalism Is Destroying the Planet – Let’s Destroy Capitalism!” September 15, 2019. <https://www.leftvoice.org/capitalism-is-destroying-the-planet-lets-destroy-capitalism/> /// MF)

Climate Change, an Undeniable Reality

There is a broad scientific consensus that climate change is related to the dizzying increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere as a result of human activity. But the problem is not human activity in general. The problem is the activities carried out within a capitalist mode of production. Since 1880, the average temperature on the earth’s surface has risen by almost 1 degree Celsius, according to different investigative bodies. An increase in the global average temperature began during the Industrial Revolution and has accelerated in the neoliberal era.

Projections by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) indicate that the average global surface temperature could increase by 2 to 5 degrees Celsius (3.6 and 9 degrees Fahrenheit) in the coming decades. Ocean levels could rise by 18 to 59 centimeters (7 to 23 inches). The IPCC warns that past and future emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) will continue to contribute to warming for more than a millennium. At the same time, CO2 particles in the atmosphere recently exceeded 400 parts for million (ppm), and may even reach 500 ppm in the coming decades, levels never seen in human history.

According to the latest report by this UN agency (whose estimates are usually very conservative compared to other studies), emissions of greenhouse gases would have to be reduced by 45% by the year 2030—in less than 11 years—in order to avoid hitting the critical threshold of 1.5 degrees Celsius of warming. Above this level, there will be a generalized increase in ocean levels, extreme weather events and food shortages. The need for drastic measures against climate change is undeniable.

For many people, these estimates may seem abstract. But they become concrete when their real consequences are felt, in the form of the stronger climate-related catastrophic phenomena, with increased duration and frequency. Uncontrollable fires sweeping through entire cities around the globe (which is also associated with the spread of invasive species and forest management practices devoted to monoculture for profit), extreme heat waves, massive floods or catastrophic droughts. According to the UN, there are currently more than 20 million climate refugees. If the global temperature rises to more than 2 degrees, it is estimated that this number will grow to 280 million. Air pollution caused by vehicles (gases and particles) and industrial production in large cities kills 9 million people a year—800,000 in Europe alone.

Global warming is one of the most devastating expressions of the destructive nature of the capitalist system toward the environment. But it is not the only one. Capitalism also leads to the pollution of our air and water, soil degradation, deforestation, and the destruction of biodiversity. According to one study, the size of vertebrate populations has decreased by an average of 60 percent between 1970 and 2014. This trend will accelerate if the ecological crisis is not halted, and could produce a mass extinction of the planet’s biodiversity. The entire planet has been transformed into a giant garbage dump for the household, industrial and agricultural waste generated by capitalist production, distribution and consumption patterns.

#### Even new ways of combating climate change fail under capitalism

**T**rotskyist **F**raction, 20**19** (“Capitalism Is Destroying the Planet – Let’s Destroy Capitalism!” September 15, 2019. <https://www.leftvoice.org/capitalism-is-destroying-the-planet-lets-destroy-capitalism/> /// MF)

Green Reformism and the Green New Deal

On the spectrum of the defenders of green capitalism, there is a reformist variant that has gained a lot of attention recently: the Green New Deal, which calls for a program with hints of neo-Keynesianism in order to face the crisis. In the United States, this policy is supported by some candidates in the primaries of the Democratic Party, including Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren, and also by the self-styled democratic socialist Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. The GND is also appearing in speeches and programs by European social-liberal parties like the PSOE or neoreformist tendencies like Podemos.

According to Ocasio-Cortez, the GND would allow the U.S. to transition to 100% renewable energy within 10 years, while creating millions of jobs linked to the construction of an efficient electrical grid throughout the country based on renewable technology, among other measures. How? By subsidizing billion-dollar corporations, the ones responsible for the current ecological crisis, so they can develop infrastructure to get us out of it. For this, they are to receive massive subsidies from the state.

The idea behind this perspective is that if the governments of the central industrialized countries in the world and the big multinational corporations become aware of the situation, they will be able to adopt measures to preserve the environment. Both the Green New Deal and similar proposals (like the UN Agenda 2020), which are reference points for many “progressive” forces around the planet, are based on the idea that “sustainable capitalism” is possible and that the corporations that created the crisis can become the saviors of the planet. But the illusion that the contradictions between capitalist interests and environmental preservation—affecting the lives of hundreds of millions of people—can be resolved is utopian and reactionary.

The capitalist mode of production is in total contradiction with nature and its processes of development. For capital, the determining factor in this process is merely quantitative. Fierce competition forces each capitalist to constantly seek ways to replace workers with machines that increase the productivity of labor and the mass of goods thrown onto the market. This increases the amount of natural resources needed to produce them. The constant repetition of production and reproduction of capital ruthlessly eats up all resources, without taking into account the time required for their natural production and regeneration.

The cause of this type of environmentally destructive development, rather than capitalist irrationality, is its inherent logic. It is the logical result of an economic system whose engine is the capitalists’ thirst for profit.

#### Capitalism fails – unlimited growth in a limited world dooms it. A radical redirection is needed

Vercelli ’17 [Alessandro; 2017; Professor of Economics in the Department of Political Economy and Statistics of the University of Siena.; CRISIS AND SUSTAINABILITY:­ The Delusion of Free Markets, “The Neoliberal Trajectory and the Crisis,” Ch. 5, p. 119-121] SPark

This chapter argues that the recent global crisis is the direct consequence of a development paradigm that is unsustainable from the economic, financial, social, and environmental point of view. Such a model became progressively dominant since the late 1970s when the neoliberal policy strategy started to become hegemonic at the world level. 2

The increasing flexibility of labour market and the progressive dismantlement of the welfare state progressively increased income and wealth inequality, causing a growing polarisation among social classes that has undermined social cohesion. 3 In addition, this process reduced the purchasing power of middle and lower classes and increased the poverty plague also in several industrialised countries (social unsustainability). This tendency brought about a downward trend of aggregate demand that contributed to slow down the growth rate in many countries (economic unsustainability). The increasing indebtedness of the economic agents that has contributed to sustain their demand 4 and the rapid financialisation of the economy that has progressively increased the contribution of finance to income formation partially offset this tendency. This sort of “doping” of aggregate demand, however, was not sufficient to keep the growth rate of industrialised countries at the same level experienced during the Bretton Woods era (1945-1971), a period that was characterised by a predominant Keynesian policy strategy. 5 In addition, the rapid increase of private and public debt and the hypertrophy of finance have undermined the financial stability of the system. Severe financial crises, that were absent during the Bretton Woods period, reappeared during the 1970s and progressively increased their frequency, intensity, and geographical extension (financial unsustainability) . 6

The monetary policy aimed to sustain the value of financial assets pursued by the Federal Reserve under Greenspan (1987-2006) and his successor Bernanke (2006-2014), and then adopted by most other central bankers, managed to moderate the adverse effects of financial instability, though only in the short term. At the same time, however, this policy favoured the spread of ever-increasing speculative bubbles that transferred into the future the risks of the growing financial fragility up to the outburst of the recent global crisis.

The deep and persistent financial turmoil, originated by the subprime crisis in 2007, and the consequent recession of the real economy are thus the result of a deleterious interaction between different dimensions of unsustainability. The financial crisis, in its turn, has remarkably worsened many social and economic sustainability indicators generating a vicious circle that became increasingly difficult to reverse. The environmental unsustainability of the existing development model greatly reinforced the recent crisis. While the speculative bubble of the real estate sector started to deflate in the USA, the oil price rapidly increased from less than $50 per barrel in 2005 to a new record of about $150 in spring 2008. This provoked a rise in the production costs of all goods (particularly of food). The central banks reacted to the consequent cost inflation with a significant increase in the discount rate that raised the loans’ interest rate. This undermined the borrowers’ capacity to comply with mortgage payments, compelling many of them to sell their house or to default. The consequent collapse of the housing market sank the price of mortgage-based derivatives triggering a contagion process in the financial system.

This analysis calls for a systematic revision of the current development paradigm towards a more sustainable direction. We urgently need a radical redirection of the development trajectory to get out of the present crisis and start up a new development phase.

#### Capitalism is an unsustainable fairy tale - extinction

Velden ’21 [John van der and Rob White; 2017; Leader of Global Sales & Technology at Linde Engineering, former Vice President of Business development at Chicago Bridge and Iron company, former researcher at Unilever; The extinction curve : growth and globalisation in the climate endgame, “THE EXTINCTION CODE WITHIN THE CAPITALIST GROWTH PROTOCOL,” Ch. 3, p. 33-34] SPark

In its fundamentals, extinction-level ecological degradation and transformation are specific features of capitalist economic growth imperatives. These are inseparable from the cyclical expansionary and contractionary dynamics in accumulation, and divergent class structures of power and interests. There is no shortage of commentaries that argue this integrated ecological crisis is a consequence of industrialisation, unregulated capitalism, neo- liberalism, free-market fundamentalist ideology, extensive fossil fuel use, excessive consumption and/or population explosion. What is striking about these is that the problem is not necessarily equated to capitalism and its core growth imperative per se. It is features of the system, not the system itself, that tends to be targeted for criticism. The growing conundrum is that even the everyday Jo on the street intuitively grasps (like the School Strikers for Climate) that an endless growth economy is at odds with finite resources, that an endless expansion of consumption is required to absorb an endless growth in production, and that endless expansion of production and consumption means, if nothing else, endless by-product expansion of waste from planned obsolescence and pollution, even with diligent re-cycling. Also, intuitively grasped, is that the rich invest in order to get richer. The key puzzle demanding explanation is why anyone thinks that an economic system based upon endless growth on a finite planet, and a tiny rich minority getting richer relative to the vast social majority, somehow will not be punctuated by recurring crises and systemic collapses - economic and ecological. This is the great myth/silence that emanates from the corridors of power and their spin merchants. We are sleepwalking to catastrophe pursuing ‘endless growth and affluence for all’. It’s a fairy tale that school children openly and publicly acknowledge in their social media posts, rally speeches and placards. Yet it’s a fairy tale that seemingly infects many seasoned reform eco-capitalists: that a green capitalism, or a no-growth capitalism, or a ‘we are all in this together’ more altruistic and benign capitalist system and ruling class, is possible. There is an extinction code of exploitation that lies at the core of contemporary capitalist economy. This capitalist relation of exploitation with regard to labour and the natural world is poorly understood or acknowledged. Partly, this misunderstanding flows from pejorative connotations of the term ‘exploitation’. Yet, this form of appropriation of the social surplus remains central to understanding how capitalism as capitalism actually works

#### Capitalism causes extinction

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Are We in the Midst of the Sixth Mass Extinction?” Ch. 3.3, p. 98] SPark

Thus, I am not in any doubt that the whole world has now entered the sixth period of mass extinction of species, that this phenomenon could include Homo sapiens, and, even worse, that the main source of the extinction is human agency. Nevertheless, it is also clear that this unconscious, irresponsible and predatory behaviour is not perpetrated by humankind as a whole, but by its ruling capitalist classes. Within that segment of society rentiers oligarchies are the main culprits because they have been managing the economy in an unsustainable way for the sake of the accumulation of capital and not of human needs, and still less with adequate regard for the conservation of nature. Neoliberalism (the ideology that preaches the worshipping of ‘markets’) produces a mindset which rationalizes this kind of behaviour and justifies an economy based on “fossil capitalism” (Angus 2016) through its dependence on natural gas, petrol and carbon as the main combustibles for transport, the plastics industry, heating, energy and so on.

Thus ‘rampant capitalism’ is the real culprit of the climate change hecatomb to come in the foreseeable future, a catastrophe of gigantic proportions that could include the disappearance of Homo sapiens itself as the dominant species on the planet. Thus avoiding this hecatomb is a matter of life and death for humanity. That is why I have given this book such an arresting and interrogative title that is related to the fact that, as we are already living in the Anthropocene, either we must put an end to neoliberal capitalism or be obliged to face our own extinction. I will discuss some philosophical aspects of this situation on the following pages

#### Capitalism prevents sustainable development

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics  at the  Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Introduction,” Introduction, p. XXXV(35)-XXXVI(36)] SPark

Chapter 5 concerns sustainable development as an alternative to the dominant ‘mainstream economics’ paradigm proposed by the Brundtland Report Our Common Future (1987). It has not yet been fully implemented precisely because most governments of the world continue to be under the influence of neoliberalism and continue to regard growth as the quintessential parameter of development. In my view, one of the most appropriate ways to confront this predominant reductionist kind of thinking is the sustainable development paradigm, among other reasons because the dominant economic system based on the neoliberal ideology hidden beneath ‘mainstream economics’ responds to an unsustainable situation because development is not guided by the satisfaction of human needs but by the growth and accumulation of capital for the benefit of the world oligarchies of the super-rich. The majority of the world’s population lives in poverty, and it is important to realize that economic growth, as shown masterfully by the French scholar Thomas Piketty (2014) in his book Capital in the Twenty-First Century, does not respond to the interests of national states but to the interests of the small world elite of super-rich people transformed into a new class of rentiers in such an excessive manner that it is the main source of inequality and concentration of wealth at world level, not just within national states. This situation is absolutely unsustainable. It is also the root of social reactions expressed through protests and violence (like the gilets jaunes of France or the social movement of Chile in 2019). The electoral support for the extreme right nationalists in Europe, Trump in the United States and Brexit can be explained by thissocial malaise. It goes without saying that the inequality and enormous concentration of wealth provoked by neoliberalism are the sources not just of the world’s social uneasiness but also of the governments’ inaction concerning climate change and the political disarray of the international system that personalities of the US political establishment - such as Richard Haas (2017) and Henry Kissinger (2014) - deplore in books dealing with the crisis in the Westphalian system.

#### Capitalism not sustainable – destroys the environment and locks in extinction

Lauren Pollock 20 [Lauren Pollock, 2020, "How Capitalism is a Driving Force of Climate Change," No Publication, https://pitjournal.unc.edu/content/how-capitalism-driving-force-climate-change, smarx, HHW]

Abstract:

Global economic growth leads to the increased consumption of natural resources, pollution, and loss of biodiversity and simultaneously widens the income gap between the wealthy and the poor. Kim Stanley Robinson’s New York 2140 provides a fictional glimpse of the world 120 years in the future, examining the severe environmental changes that have taken place and how people of upper and lower economic classes are unevenly impacted by these changes. The experiences of the fictional characters reflect real issues that future generations will experience as irreversible changes to our climate are made.

Article:

“We’ve been paying a fraction of what things really cost to make, but meanwhile the planet, and the workers who make the stuff, take the unpaid costs right in the teeth” (Robinson 4). Modern economic growth and demand for goods require rapid production at low costs, leading to the **inevitable exploitation of nature and workers**. Kim Stanley Robinson’s New York 2140 explores the world one hundred and twenty years into the future, where the drastic continuation of climate change has resulted in a 50-foot rise in the global sea level, destroying coastal cities worldwide. Each section of the novel is broken into 8 parts, seen through the eyes of 10 different characters living in New York City in the year 2140. The characters hold various roles in society, ranging from political leaders to investors to orphaned children. Each of the characters’ lives intertwine, showing their daily interactions amid a changed and chaotic world. Robinson depicts what everyday life would look like for New Yorkers, and the rest of the world, if no significant measures are taken to prevent climate change and environmental destruction. The novel highlights the income inequalities that both drive climate change and influence how people survive those changes. This paper examines two important narratives in New York 2140 to argue that climate change is driven by capitalism, which in turn changes how people experience climate change.

Global capitalism and economic expansion are driving forces for both income inequality and climate change. The global economy within New York 2140 reflects the same systems in place today, with the existence of global capitalism driving production and consumption. Most **climate scientists have come to agree that the cause of climate change is the increased emission of greenhouse gases**, specifically carbon dioxide, which have **increased rapidly since the Industrial Revolution** (Baer 2). Progressive scholars recognize the serious damage that results from a global capitalist drive. Endless efforts of private owners to expand and increase their profits force a “perpetual treadmill of production and consumption” **relying mainly on fossil fuels** or alternative sources of greenhouse gas emissions (Baer 4). In 2010, the International Energy Agency projected that by 2030, global energy use would rise over 50%, with fossil fuels still the primary source of energy (Baer 64). Our continued dependence on the fossil fuel industry will continue to raise global temperatures as a **direct result of global capitalism. The most profitable decisions will never be the most environmentally friendly**, thus private owners of corporations will refrain from making environmentally conscious decisions without regulations.

#### Capitalism causes climate change

Guerrero ’18 [Dorothy Grace; 2018; Head of Policy and Advocacy of Global Justice; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “THE LIMITS OF CAPITALIST SOLUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CRISIS,” Ch. 2, p. 30-31] SPark

There is an increasing acceptance that capitalism is directly connected with climate change and that the apocalyptic consequences of it are already causing deaths, diseases, dislocations and destruction to ecology and people’s lives, which will continue as there is no decisive measure being taken to address the climate crisis. Society’s relationship with nature under extractivist capitalism follows the principles of ownership and rights of access, modes of production and consumption, the need for permanent added-value, as well as class and gender relations, all of which are associated with profit maximisation and exploitation of people and nature. It is important to emphasise that the privilege to profit, overconsume and overdiscard is reserved for a small portion of society. The extraction of fossil fuels (oil, coal, natural gas), which is the biggest cause of climate change, enables large-scale production of goods, transportation systems and efficient distribution networks of products and services. Climate change is therefore not just an environmental issue; it is both a social and an ecological crisis. Even modern wars in the last three decades, as exemplified by the invasion of Iraq, were at least partially about access to and control of the production and distribution of oil. As the impacts of climate change intensify, free-market ideology, big business and financial actors increasingly shape the strategies and priorities in addressing it. At the same time, resistance to neoliberalism, efforts to reclaim the commons (land, water and forests, knowledge, etc.), struggles against ‘development aggression’ by states and corporations and the promotion of alternative models of development are being globalised.

#### We will “die [buried by garbage]” because of Capitalism - not the best card

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United  Nations  at  the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics  at the  Faculty of Political Sciences of the  Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Jared Diamond: Unsustainable Systems and Sustainability,” Ch. 4.9, p. 202] SPark

Even worse, the capitalist system itself operates in such a way that the purpose of production (the well-being of people) is no longer the value that guides it. It is all for the sake of a productivity or competitiveness that does not seek to fulfil social needs, but is concerned exclusively with increasing profits and the accumulation of capital. What is of interest to transnational corporations is that the technocrats at their service should remain committed to the constant renewal of products, from mobile phones to computers, software, and electronic devices of all types, including automobiles. The commitment to this is required to be so great that concern for the environmental impact disappears, among other reasons because they do not worry about the damage that industrial waste causes to the environment. The interests of big capital are always very short term: to retain the decision-making power within companies, to stay competitive, and to accumulate capital to satisfy the shareholders, who, in turn, usually waste their sumptuous income on sumptuary consumption without caring about the sustainability of the ‘model’ in the long term, and still less about its long-term sustainability, i.e. about the conservation of the environment and terrestrial ecosystems in the framework of human needs, understood according to the matrix of Neef, Elizalde and Hopenhayn reproduced earlier in this chapter.

The most concerning aspect is that this type of attitude and behaviour (along with the consumerist ideology that justifies it), is rooted not only in the rich classes but also in the middle classes - including the middle classes of developing countries across the world - something largely due to the demonstration effect that is transmitted by advertising and the media in general. Diamond cites, as a paradigmatic case of this ‘contagion’ of consumerism social pathology, the custom of discarding in the Dominican Republic. This example can be applied to most middle-class sectors that have been emerging in the whole world, as it demonstrates that failure to take the appropriate measures could lead to an apocalypse that will not take the form of a devastating planetary earthquake, a new ice age or a gigantic tsunami like the catastrophes in movies, but will simply be that “we will all die buried by garbage”, as a Dominican citizen told the distinguished Californian professor.

#### Neoliberalism PREVENTS public investment - public investment is key to adapting to carbon change

This card is also supportive of growth, just opposed to neoliberalism\*\*

ALSO says that climate change has locked in, you could read it against a solves-CC impact to prove A-Climate Change is irreversible B-Only removing Neoliberalism solves\*

Fremstad ’22 [Anders and Mark Paul; July 2022; Department of Economics, Colorado State University, C306 Clark Building, Fort Collins, CO, USA and Division of the Social Sciences, New College of Florida, 5800 Bay Shore Road, Sarasota, FL 34243, USA; Neoliberalism and climate change: How the free-market myth has prevented climate action; “Defend public investment,” Ch. 4, p. 5-6] SPark

With the rise of neoliberalism, the U.S. entered an era of anemic public investment, shown in Fig. 2. As of 2018, U.S. federal government nondefense investment was 43% below 1967 levels—falling from over 2.5% of GDP in the 1970s to just over 1.5% in the Reagan administration.8 The U.S. experienced a particularly significant decline in largescale public works projects. In a 2014 report, the U.S. Treasury noted that “the economic case for expanding infrastructure investment is clear, yet public investment has been declining as part of a long-term trend toward fiscal consolidation and lower public investment” (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2014). The lack of investment in U.S. infrastructure will cost the economy an estimated $4 trillion in GDP between 2016 and 2025 (American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 2016) — without accounting for costs associated with climate change.

Much greater public investment is needed for rapid decarbonization. As an example of how public research and development (R&D) can transform an entire industry, consider the case of solar power. The price of Solar Photovoltaic (PV) panels has declined 99% over the past four decades. This occurred due to significant investments in public R&D along with market-based incentives and public investments to deploy PV. While economies of scale have played an important role in more recent years, Kavlak et al. (2018) find that R&D, much of which was publicly financed, played a dominant role in cost reduction. Following these successes, the U.S. government created the Advanced Research Projects Agency–Energy (ARPA-E) in 2006 to advance technologies in the energy sector by supporting high-risk, high-reward research which was systematically underprovided in the private sector (Azoulay et al., 2019). Despite the program’s success in energy-related innovation, ranging from energy efficiency to energy storage and transportation, the program remains too narrowly defined and drastically underfunded (Paul et al., 2019). In 2018 ARPA-E’s budget was $353 million, roughly one tenth of DARPA’s annual budget (Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E), 2019).

The shift away from large-scale public investments has constrained the U.S.’s response to climate change. Public investment remains a crucial component of any program to rapidly decarbonize the economy, because it is vital to leveraging economies of scale, solving coordination problems, and operating the economy at full employment. While a carbon price coupled with environmental regulation would provide households, firms, and governments with an incentive to transition away from fossil fuels, public investment is necessary to rapidly build carbon-free alternatives, and to facilitate a transition in a just and equitable manner (Griffith and Calish 2020; Galvin and Healy, 2020). Public investment is necessary for retrofitting buildings, providing green public transportation, building a smart national grid, increasing R&D, retiring obsolete appliances and vehicles, and adapting to climate change that is already locked in (Paul et al., 2019). By defunding public investment, neoliberalism has hampered decarbonization.

#### Capitalism’s overemphasis on productivity has caused global stress and burnout

**Abdelrahman ‘22** (Maha, before joining the Centre of Development Studies in 2007, Dr Abdelrahman worked as an Associate Professor of Sociology at the American University in Cairo, “The Indefatigable Worker: From Factory Floor to Zoom Avatar”, page 79-80, ML)

Capitalism is a system which is constantly reinventing itself, seeking new frontiers and markets, **adopting new technologies** and creating new ways of work (Yuill, 2005: 136). In this process, the skilling and deskilling of the workforce dramatically changes working conditions and the workers’ bargaining position. The last quarter of the 20th century, which was characterised by changing regimes of production, saw drastic changes in the working conditions of millions of workers including **increased unemployment, rising job insecurity and the growing withdrawal of social protection regimes.** With the transfer of most manufacturing jobs to developing countries and the expansion of the service sector, the factory was no longer the focus of scientific intervention to maintain and improve the productivity of the indefatigable worker in the West. In this new world, characterised by a series of global financial crises, industrial fatigue and workplace accidents ceased to be the main concern of the policy and scientific community (Davies, 2016; Long, 2011). In their place came mental health concerns, burnouts, exhaustion, depression, anxiety and stressrelated illness that were leading to increasing lost time and posing a growing threat to productivity. With the advent of the new millennium, the effects of mental health issues on US workers were allegedly costing the economy **$550 billion annually** (Mindful Nation UK, 2015). Britain’s Healthiest Workplace initiative, a platform launched in 2013, has shown that health-related lost productivity as well as ‘presenteesim’ was costing the UK economy an estimated £91 billion and costing the NHS at least £ 8 billion (2019). Globally, the WHO (2011) estimated that **by 2030, depression would become the world’s largest cause of disability.** The productive body needed to be refashioned to **survive** the pressures of changing work conditions and the mental and physical fatigue they brought with them.

#### Sustainable Growth” is directly connected to the environmental crisis, the world is driven by growth which consumes the finite resources we have and only further accelerates the environmental crisis we are in

**Leff 21** Leff, Deconstructing Capital and Territorializing Life, Enrique, Professor of Political Ecology at UNAM, pgs 210-211 - IShone

**Limits to Growth gave way to the proposal for “zero growth,” and for a “steady-state economy**” and “Blueprint for survival.” The precursors of **new ecological economics unveiled the ineluctable relation between the economic process and the degradation of Nature.** Tis, in turn, led to acknowledging the need to internalize ecological costs and to deploy distributive counter-measures to the ecological unbalance generated by market mechanisms. In his book **The Entropy Law and the Economic Process**, Nicholas **Georgescu-Roegen** (1971) **disclosed the** fundamental **connection between economic growth and the natural limits** set by the second law of thermodynamics. **the** production **process** generated **by** the economic **rationality** **that inhabits** the **machinery of the industrial** revolution **is defined by an impulse to grow or die**, unlike living beings, who are born, develop and die, and human populations, which can establish policies to stabilize their growth. **Economic growth, industrial metabolism, and exosomatic consumption imply a permanent**ly **growing consumption of natural resources** (matter and energy), **which** not only **runs up against the limits of the planet’s** provision**, productivity, and renewal** of E. Leff resources, but becomes degraded in the process of production and consumption, following the entropy law. Four decades after the eye-opening book Silent Spring by Rachel Carlson (1962) that divulged the effects of DDT, ecological destruction has increased dramatically, accentuating global warming caused by greenhouse gases, and by the inescapable laws of thermodynamics, which have set in motion the planet’s entropic degradation. the remedies generated by scientific and technological innovation are difficult to integrate into a sustainable economic system. the paradigms and policies that since then have been generated within the emergent geopolitics of “sustainable development” are showing to be short-lived, because they are not sustainable (Park et al. 2008); they are not rooted in the thermodynamic, ecological, symbolic, and cultural conditions of life. **In its** globalizing **drive, the economic world order** that **is supported by the discourse of “sustainable development” has** obscured **the fundamental problem of the environmental crisis**. Rather than internalizing the ecological conditions for sustainability, the geopolitics of “sustainable development” ended up commoditizing Nature and over-economizing the world. “Mechanisms for clean development” were put in place, alongside economic instruments for environmental management that established private property rights over the monetary value of environmental goods and services (Brand/Görg 2008). Natural commons (water, air, the sea, and the atmosphere) have been progressively privatized, while new market devices have been created for trading pollution rights (carbon bonuses) and giving a price to the ecological balance of the planet (carbon ofsetting).

#### Capitalism is unsustainable; capitalists perception of nature makes it impossible for them to regenerate what they’ve used

**Leff 21** Leff, Deconstructing Capital and Territorializing Life, Enrique, Professor of Political Ecology at UNAM, p

The general **conditions of production**, understood as everything that exists in Nature and society that is not produced according to the process of value formation and the laws of the market but rather which establishes the certain necessary conditions for capitalist production, **should also be redefned in** the context of extended **capital reproduction**. In this sense, ecological conservation principles that provide essential environmental services for the reproduction of Nature and the survival of humanity were incorporated into economic policies. These socio-environmental conditions include all those activities considered to be of strategic interest for the State that is unproftable for capital, such as infrastructure and public services; conservation areas, and environmental norms for industry, subsidies for basic foodstuffs, and health services. However, these traditional public sector activities are being challenged by neoliberal economics through privatization policies that extend the laws of the market to all environmental common goods and services, conditioning and reducing the ecological and cultural conditions of production to the dominating ontological regime of the economic process—the imperative of the development of the productive forces driven by capital accumulation, the potency of technology and the power of the rational—throughout the planet, from North to South, and East to West. Tus**, the strategies of** capital and the geopolitics of **sustainable development** have been **focused on the** re-elaboration—reframing, rephrasing and welding anew—of those **conditions for production** that are most difcult for capital to generate and regenerate, those processes which are ontologically excluded from and actually exterior to economic rationality E. Leff 195 due to their nature that rejects being objectified and quantified. These include qualitative processes where capital accounting and discount rates can not value time cycles—the resiliency and productivity of ecosystems; conservation conditions and regeneration times of natural resources; environmental services and common goods of the biosphere; health conditions, environmental quality, the meaning of life; local and global impacts; trans-generational efects of ecological risks and long-term ecological processes; the bio-cultural patrimony of the people and their existential rights. These socio-environmental conditions of production cannot be absorbed under the theories of a green economy and reduced to the concept of natural capital without exerting violence on Nature.

#### Capitalism completely destroys nature by prioritizing the benefit of the market

**Leff 21** Leff, Deconstructing Capital and Territorializing Life, Enrique, Professor of Political Ecology at UNAM, pg 181 - IShone

**The capitalist mode of production exploits Nature to the beneft of the market** and the extraction of surplus value, by disposing of the potentials of Nature and human beings as objects for economic expropriation. However, **despite capital’s legacy** **of destruction and degradation on Nature**, **it has not** yet **annihilated** **the** self-organizing and **productive processes** emerging **from** natural **sources of life** nor the existential resistance and cultural creativity from the peoples of the Earth. the productive forces of Nature and the ecological organization of the biosphere, under the dominance of the destructive forces of capital, lie there as a potential reserve waiting to be endowed, embodied and embedded by new productive rationality. If throughout history men have survived through diverse modes of appropriation/ transformation of Nature; if capitalism imposed its accumulative logic as a mode of expropriation/ degradation of Nature; after the environmental crisis a new era has opened up in the evolution of life in the planet for the social endowment of Nature: a mode of extracting matter and energy, of enacting and transforming the metabolism of the biosphere, respecting the conditions of life in the planet. Endowing Nature will imply en-knowing Nature: **learning to live with**in **the conditions** and **inhabiting Nature** **in the** immanence of **life on Earth**. That will be a turning point in history opening the horizons of sustainable, meaningful life on this planet.

#### Capitalism is not sustainable (Generally)

Korten ’16 [David; August 10; founder and president of the Living Economies Forum; David Korten, “The New Economy: A Living Earth System Model,” <https://davidkorten.org/new-economy-system-model/>] SPark

We have now returned to the historical norm by which the ruling class and the top ranks of the retainer class appropriate virtually all the economic surplus beyond subsistence for their private benefit. The rest of society struggles to survive under whatever conditions of wage and debt slavery the ruling class offers.

Unfortunately, what the favored classes consume as the system’s economic “surplus” is not a true surplus if it depends on drawing down the generative capacity of living Earth’s natural capital and its ability to support life. According to the Global Footprint Network, human consumption exceeded in the early 1970s the limits of what Earth could sustain and has since depended on depleting natural capital.

The promise of all the world’s people enjoying a U.S. or European style of material affluence, with sufficient economic growth, is a deception. Awareness of this is spreading, as is the sense that the current system is unsustainable. For many of us this does not come as news. But it is only beginning to penetrate the broader public consciousness.

The essential transformation of our unjust, destructive, and grotesquely wasteful institutional system depends on bridging the divisions that have for so long kept the many, who seek a world of peace and justice for all, divided against one another. The communications revolution, which has stripped away the physical barriers to our ability to join in common cause as a global community, holds the critical key to our ability to now navigate the transition to a new human era defined by the three core goals set forth at the beginning of this report:

-ecosystem health and balance,

-shared Prosperity, and

-living Democracy.

### 2NC -- Ext: Oceans

#### Capitalism is ruining the ocean

**T**rotskyist **F**raction, 20**19** (“Capitalism Is Destroying the Planet – Let’s Destroy Capitalism!” September 15, 2019. <https://www.leftvoice.org/capitalism-is-destroying-the-planet-lets-destroy-capitalism/> /// MF)

Capitalism has prospered for centuries by exploiting nature, either as an “inexhaustible” supply of resources to produce commodities, or as a waste dump. But the earth’s ability to endure the destructive processes of capital is reaching its limit.

Capital’s need for constant growth has led to the interruption of a complex natural cycle that took millions of years to develop. This has created a rift in the “metabolism” (to borrow Marx’s term) between society and nature.

Climate change and the crises of the biological cycles of carbon, water, phosphorus and nitrogen; the acidification of the oceans; the accelerated loss of biodiversity; the changes in the quality of soil and chemical pollution by industry—these are some of the terrible expressions of a completely unprecedented situation for humanity, namely the tendency toward the destruction of our natural conditions for production and reproduction. This destructive tendency is directly related to the social and material deprivation of hundreds of millions of people who suffer misery, unemployment and precarious employment, which capitalism needs to ensure its profitability and reproduction.

The barbarism represented by the recent fires in the Amazon—which were the product of incentives for deforestation (and which were intensified by Brazil’s right-wing President Jair Bolsonaro), the relaxation of environmental laws and the direct action of large landowners and ranchers who started the fires—is just another episode in the continual process of environmental degradation and destruction. The phenomenon of uncontrolled forest fires is growing more frequent, as shown by the fires ravaging Siberia and sub-Saharan Africa (which are more numerous, though less destructive than those in the Amazon), as well as the fires in California last autumn and in many regions of Europe. Climate change and the thirst for profit are intensifying them.

### 2NC -- Ext: Bio Diversity

#### Capitalism causes biod loss

**Moranta,** Torres, Murray, Hidalgo, Hinz, Gouraguine, 20**22** (Joan, Ecosystem Oceanography Group. Cati, professor of applied economics. Ivan, works in the department of geography. Hilmar, works in the department of ecology and marine resources. Adam, works in school of natural and environmental sciences. “Transcending capitalism growth strategies for biodiversity conservation” April 2022 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34405455/> ///MF)

The unlimited economic growth that fuels capitalism's metabolism has profoundly transformed a large portion of Earth. The resulting environmental destruction has led to an unprecedented rate of biodiversity loss. Following large-scale losses of habitats and species, it was recognized that biodiversity is crucial to maintaining functional ecosystems. We sought to continue the debate on the contradictions between economic growth and biodiversity in the conservation science literature and thus invite scholars to engage in reversing the biodiversity crisis through acknowledging the impacts of economic growth. In the 1970s, a global agenda was set to develop different milestones related to sustainable development, including green-blue economic growth, which despite not specifically addressing biodiversity reinforced the idea that economic development based on profit is compatible with the planet's ecology. Only after biodiversity loss captured the attention of environmental sciences researchers in the early 2000s was a global biodiversity agenda implemented. The agenda highlights biodiversity conservation as a major international challenge and recognizes that the main drivers of biodiversity loss derive from economic activities. The post-2000 biodiversity agendas, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the post-2020 Convention on Biological Diversity Global Strategy Framework, do not consider the negative impacts of growth-oriented strategies on biodiversity. As a result, global biodiversity conservation priorities are governed by the economic value of biodiversity and its assumed contribution to people's welfare. A large body of empirical evidence shows that unlimited economic growth is the main driver of biodiversity loss in the Anthropocene; thus, we strongly argue for sustainable degrowth and a fundamental shift in societal values. An equitable downscaling of the physical economy can improve ecological conditions, thus reducing biodiversity loss and consequently enhancing human well-being.

### 2NC -- Ext -- Disease

#### Capitalism makes diseases worse

**Shantz**, 20**10** (Jeffery, professor of Criminology and author. “Capitalism is making us sick: poverty, illness and the SARS crisis in Toronto” [Understanding Emerging Epidemics: Social and Political Approaches.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/) April 21, 2010. doi: [10.1108/S1057-6290(2010)0000011005](https://doi.org/10.1108%2FS1057-6290(2010)0000011005) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/> /// MF).

Purpose – For much of the first half of 2003 world attention was captured by news of a mysterious but deadly virus that was claiming lives in places as distant as Toronto and Beijing. In a matter of months there were around 8,000 infections and over 689 deaths related to severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). In my hometown, Toronto, 43 people died of SARS during the outbreaks of 2003.

Approach – This chapter examines issues of class and poverty in emergence of SARS. The chapter begins with a discussion of the political economy of the emergence of SARS, and its relation to the spread of the virus. It then discusses issues of public policy, and particularly neo-liberal cuts to social services and public spending, that set the stage for the SARS outbreak, influenced its impact and contributed to the failures of response in Ontario.

Findings – Through analysis of the lack of social resources available to working people in the province and the prioritizing of corporate, particularly tourism industry, concerns, the chapter illustrates how issues of class underpinned public responses to SARS, exacerbating problems. The chapter concludes by giving attention to the need for social solidarity and community mutual aid.

Contributions to the field – The chapter shows the extent to which neo-liberal governments prioritize business security above the health and social security of workers and reveals some of the ways in which the pressures of capitalist social relations make people ill.

[Go to:](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/)

Introduction

For much of the first half of 2003 world attention from Hong Kong to Geneva was captured by news of a mysterious but deadly virus, similar to pneumonia, that was claiming lives in places as distant as Toronto and Beijing. As accounts of the virus' growing toll became regular occurrences by February, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) became part of the global lexicon. In a matter of months there were around 8,000 infections and over 689 deaths related to SARS. In my hometown, Toronto, 43 people died of SARS during the outbreaks of 2003.

The recent outbreaks of SARS in Toronto shone a harsh light on the inadequacies and outright failures of neo-liberal public health policies and practices. They also showed clearly the extent to which neo-liberal governments prioritize business security above the health and social security of workers. Even more than this, however, the SARS crises revealed some of the ways in which the pressures of capitalist social relations make people ill.

Public health officials first received warnings of SARS in early February and a full-blown crisis was emerging by March. By late April Ontario's Conservative (Tory) Premier of the day, Ernie Eves, had not even recalled the legislature, which had been on hiatus since Christmas, to devise a plan for dealing with the various aspects of the crisis. For weeks the Conservative plan appeared to consist of little more than suggestions to ‘wash your hands’ or ‘continue to eat in Chinatown’. Governments only responded, and even then largely in terms of public relations, after the embarrassment of the late-April World Heath Organization (WHO) travel advisory and the threat of losses for tourist industry owners.

Even worse, the provincial government's rush to assure tourists that the crisis was over following the WTO advisory seems to have played a major part in a renewed outbreak during the end of May. The nurses' unions reported publicly that prior to the second outbreak their warnings to the government that it was too soon to let up on SARS went unheeded ([Boyle & Mallan, 2003](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/#bib1); [Diebel, 2003](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/" \l "bib3)). Clearly public relations, rather than public health, were at the forefront of Conservative concerns.

This chapter examines issues of class and poverty in emergence of SARS. These issues are also examined in relation to the public response to SARS in Toronto. Issues of poverty and illness are crucial in addressing emerging epidemics, especially in the global age in which diseases can travel the globe in hours rather than years. The chapter begins with a discussion of the political economy of the emergence of SARS, and its relation to the spread of the virus. It then discusses issues of public policy, and particularly neo-liberal cuts to social services and public spending, that set the stage for the SARS outbreak, influenced its impact and contributed to the failures of response in Ontario. Through analysis of the lack of social resources available to working people in the province and the prioritizing of corporate, particularly tourism industry, concerns, the chapter examines how issues of class underpinned public responses to SARS, exacerbating problems. The chapter concludes by giving attention to the need for social solidarity and community mutual aid in a context of emerging epidemics within capitalist globalization and questions why diseases and illnesses impacting poor people have received less attention and fewer resources than those largely impacting members of the global tourist classes.

#### Empirically proven by Canda during the SARS pandemic

**Shantz**, 20**10** (Jeffery, professor of Criminology and author. “Capitalism is making us sick: poverty, illness and the SARS crisis in Toronto” [Understanding Emerging Epidemics: Social and Political Approaches.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/) April 21, 2010. doi: [10.1108/S1057-6290(2010)0000011005](https://doi.org/10.1108%2FS1057-6290(2010)0000011005) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/> /// MF).

The frantic, if inadequate, attention given to SARS, by both media and governments, highlights other class-related issues in Canadian health care. Other recent outbreaks in Toronto, such as tuberculosis, Norwalk virus and Hepatitis A, have received less attention because there is a sense among governments that these diseases are confined to poor and homeless populations and not likely to spread to the population at large. SARS had such impact because it affected suburbanites, consumers and, potentially, tourists.

Street nurses, those trained nurses who devote themselves to assisting homeless and street-involved individuals and tending to their many health issues, [Crowe and Hardill (2003)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/#bib2) note that the TB outbreak in Toronto shelters in 2001 was predicted by front-line health workers as early as 1994; yet the city and province did nothing to change the conditions – overcrowding and poor shelter conditions, lack of affordable housing and community-based programs such as drop-in centers and unsatisfactory nutrition – that allow for the spread of such illnesses. Horribly, three homeless people died of consumption in Canada's richest city in 2001 ([Crowe & Hardill, 2003](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/#bib2)). Almost 40% of shelter residents have been exposed to TB ([Crowe & Hardill, 2003](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/#bib2)).

The conditions that underlie the spread of TB are really the same as those that underlie the spread of SARS: the insecurity of capitalist economics which forces people to spend much of their lives working for wages lest they face the consequences of homelessness and hunger. Many workers know that they are a paycheck away from being homeless and too many of us are faced with the decision to pay the rent or feed the kids. Lack of access to and control over the necessities of life, which are owned and controlled by various profit-seeking bosses, and the forced compulsion to work to survive undermine the capacities of individuals and communities to make their health a priority.

As [Crowe and Hardill (2003)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7162428/#bib2) affirm, ‘food, income, safety and housing protect people's health. Simply stated, housing is protection from disease’. A guaranteed income might provide the same protection. Clearly a broad-based program for community health would include not only increased funding for public health departments, but also more affordable housing, improved conditions in shelters, nutrition programs, a minimum wage increase to a living wage level and increased welfare rates (or better a guaranteed income).

SARS, and the social response to it, brought together many of these crucial issues. It showed fundamentally and often starkly that emerging epidemics are about political economy as much as anything. SARS brought to the fore relations of inequality, power, poverty, democracy and governance and the distribution of resources within capitalist societies such as Canada in the global period. It showed that relations of power and inequality are central in giving rise to epidemics but also in inhibiting the capacities of people, such as health care workers, to respond adequately, despite their often heroic efforts. Even advanced health care systems are imperiled by persistent disparities in wealth and access to resources and decision-making processes. These are lessons that must still be learned and acted upon in light of ongoing threats of emerging epidemics in the current period. As more people are negatively impacted through economic crisis, and as economic ‘recovery’ programs retrench neo-liberal policies and re-distribute public resources to private capital, the lessons of SARS, and its social underpinnings, press even more forcefully upon us.

#### Capitalism helped Covid-19 develop into the worst pandemic in over a century – many things has been sacrificed for the sole interest of business

Byttebier 22 (Koen Byttebier is an experienced author with a demonstrated history of working in the judiciary industry, Covid-19 and Capitalism Success and Failure of the Legal Methods for Dealing with a Pandemic, 1.3 Further Impact of Globalization, Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 2022, pg. 18-19//JL)

In the context of the contemporary globalised economy and driven by a wide variety of neoliberal economic theories, these disastrous consequences of “pure” or “unbri- dled” capitalism have, in recent decades, been further accentuated and amplified to extreme proportions.93

E.g., in the period 1989–1991, the neoliberal world order that had emerged in the 1980s under the influence of neoliberal doctrines was reinforced by the collapse of the communist system in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.94 More precisely, the collapse of the communist system in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union ended much of the resistance, especially on an economic and political level, to the power of capitalism. Since then, the collapse of the communist economies has even been used as a further argument that there is no alternative to the free market.95 As a result, the belief in the free market would become ever more fanatical than in previous centuries, leading to the idea that the free market is an absolute condition for a free society and for individual and collective progress. In the 1990s, these influences paved the way for an invisible “globalisation” of the capitalist economic system. This led to a continuous increase in the level of interconnection between countries at a socio-economic level, characterised by an increase in the international traffic of goods, services, capital and labour (thus people).96 The so-called principles of “liberalisation” and “deregulation” hereby became the guiding principles of public policy in almost all countries of the world.97

Since (economic) neoliberalism managed to make capitalism the dominant eco- nomic system on Earth, the polluting effect of economic activities has nowadays even taken on a global dimension (with so-called “new economies” even having made claims in the recent past to be as entitled to pollute the world as the Western countries have done in the past).98

As a result, during the past three ages, the protection of the global ecosystem, the only “habitat” of the human species and all other known living creatures, has been increasingly sacrificed to the capitalist principle of profit-making. Similarly, public health has also been sacrificed to the sole interests of business, with the working methods of the pharmaceutical industry as a clear example.99 (Cf. Sect. 9.2)

All of these elements helped Covid-19 develop into one of the worst pandemics the world has seen in over a century.100

## Terrorism

### 2NC -- Terrorism

#### Terrorists target us because of capitalism and our use of foreign policy to expand it

**Kriegger and Meierrieks 15** Journal of Peace Research 2015, Vol. 52(1) 46-61 © The Author(s) 2014 Reprints and permission: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/0022343314552940 - IShone

This contribution examines the role of capitalism in anti-American terrorism. It uses two theoretical frameworks, both of which contrast the pacifying effects of higher levels of capitalist development with the potentially destabiliz ing effects of a transition towards capitalism, but differ with respect to their definition of capitalism, capitalism's interaction with anti-American terrorism, and its empirical operationalization. Using panel data for 149 countries between 1970 and 2007 and providing further system-level time-series evidence, this contribution finds no support for hypotheses derived from the classical capitalist peace literature. There is no evidence that anti-American terrorism increases with external economic liberalization or that it decreases with higher levels of economic openness. By contrast, hypotheses derived from economic norms theory find empirical support. Conceptualizing capitalism as social market-capitalism, this article finds that higher levels of market-capitalism are associated with less anti-American terrorism, while the process of marketization fuels it. Consistent with expectations from economic norms theory, the destabilizing effects of the marketization process may stem from the violent opposition of antimarket interest groups that have benefited from the pre-market order to the economic-cultural change initiated by a transition towards a market economy. These interest groups deliberately target the USA as the main proponent of market-capitalism, globalization, and modernity, where anti-American terrorism serves the purpose of consolidating their societal position, rolling back pro-market reforms and limiting the perceived Americanization of their communities. This contribution's findings suggest that the USA may ultimately become a less likely target of transnational terrorism through the establishment of market economies, but should not disregard the disruptive economic cultural effects of marketization process in non-market economies. Anti-American terrorism is an important subset of trans national terrorist activity.1 As shown in Figure 1, terror ism directed against US interests was a constant threat between 1970 and 2007.2 During this time period the USA was the target of terrorist groups with various ideological profiles hailing from both Western countries and the developing world. For instance, US interests were attacked by the left-wing German Red Army Faction (RAF), the Philippine Moro Islamic Liberation Front, and the nationalist-separatist Popular Front for the Lib eration of Palestine (LaFree, Yang & Crenshaw, 2009). Shortly after the attacks of 11 September 2001 (9/11), US President George W Bush (2001 ) asked: 'Why do they [i.e. the terrorists] hate us?' This questions is also at the heart of several academic contributions examining the roots of anti-American terrorism. These studies primarily link its genesis to US foreign policy, that is, the overall politico military dominance of the USA in the international system. (e.g. Volgy, Imwalle & Corntassel, 1997; Sobek Braithwaite, 2005) and the involvement of the external conflicts, be it through military aid o dons (e.g. Pape, 2003; Neumayer & Plümper, 201 In this contribution we study another possible so of anti-American terrorism, the rise of capital Indeed, opposition to capitalism is a cornerstone of many ideologies that have spawned terrorist mo The anticapitalist nature of left-wing terrorism self-evident. For instance, Varon (2004: 72) describ the motivations of left-wing militancy in the USA Germany as follows: 'Under the banner of "rev anti-imperialism," Weatherman and the RAF a militant roles in an international movement o U.S. power and capitalism generally.' o This already hints at the close connection bet anticapitalism and anti-Americanism, which is d widespread perception of the USA as the 'epitom ket civilization' (Mousseau, 2002:6). For instance, ing a survey on anti-Americanism conducted in Fr 2002, Grunberg (2005: 66-67) comes to the follo conclusion: 'Traditional anti-Americanism is prima anticapitalism [.. . ] The United States stands at the heart of the capitalist system, as the prime agent of glo and its foremost beneficiary.' but diff Importantly, anticapitalism is not only associated left-wing but also nationalist-separatist, anticol religious, especially Islamist, terrorist activity directly against the USA. Here, the most prominent example. inflammatory effects of capitalism'. In Sec describe the variables and methodology used to examine the hypotheses developed in Section 2, country-level panel data for 149 countries betw and 2007. Section 4 discusses our findings. Sect vides further time-series evidence, where we a relationship between capitalism and anti-Ameri ism on the system. anti-American terrorism .... , . , , 1 he previous d Economic openness and an A number of empirical contributes capitalist countries are less l and intrastate conflict (e.g. Fjelde, 2010; for reviews of & Gleditsch, 2010; Schneide empirical support for the 'p sis' (Schneider & Gleditsch these studies generally 'equal’ markets or smaller govern (Mousseau et al., 2013: 80). capitalism, the classical capital several pathways through to peace. First, economic growth and develop the opportunity costs o Second, openness creates eco example through trade, capitalist division of labor (Sc make it less attractive to e negative economic consequence to backfire.

## Human Stuff

### 2NC -- Human Value

#### Capitalism causes money to become the purpose of our lives

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Technological Paradigm,” Ch. 3.7, p. 120] SPark

Therefore once a society follows the path of the technocratic paradigm - as Pope Francis says - it will be inexorably transformed into a technological society dedicated to values such as efficiency, expansion of power and control over nature, as had happened with industrialization phenomenon. Actually, this conception of technology functions in the same way as neoliberal mainstream economics (the so called invisible hand of the market, the individual permanent search for enrichment) and growth as the most obvious way to measure development. Hence, technology ceases to be an instrument and becomes the centre of our lives, which is analogous to viewing money as the main purpose of our lives. Normally one may believe that money is a neutral instrument of our objectives in life, but on closer examination it is clear that for a lot of people making money has become the main purpose of life. Even though there are clearly things money cannot buy (such as the recognition of others, or love and happiness), people do try to buy them constantly, with inevitably disappointing results. Those who base their whole lives on the acquisition of money have poor lives that usually corrupt and diminish people with this kind of belief. Like technology, money has implicit values, and basing a way of life on it is absolutely wrong.13

#### Accumulation for the sake of accumulation entrenches us in a cycle of violence, exploitation, and eventually extinction

Pillay ’18 [Devan; 2018; Former trade unionist, is Associate Professor and Former Head in Sociology, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, Co-editor of Labour and the Challenges of Globalization; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “CHALLENGING THE GROWTH PARADIGM: MARX, BUDDHA AND THE PURSUIT OF ‘HAPPINESS’,” Ch. 7, p. 149-151] SPark

The GDP paradigm is based on the assumption of continuous economic growth as an end in itself. This form of economic development arose with industrial capitalism and its treadmills of production and consumption, which are essential to the system’s forward momentum.2 Because this has brought about considerable improvements in the material conditions of living of vast numbers of people on Earth, it is deeply entrenched in modern society, which marvels at its creative and innovative powers. However, it also has immense destructive powers, characterised by massive social inequality, dispossession from the land, homelessness and slummification, widespread poverty and environmental degradation on a global scale.

In other words, as Marx observed, industrial capitalism simultaneously develops and destroys. The GDP metric measures some of its economic ‘goods’, but omits the socio-economic and environmental ‘bads’. For example, as Lorenzo Fioramonti (2013) argues, social and physical diseases caused by unfettered capitalist growth, like crime and pollution, result in increased home security or medical expenses, which is recorded as a positive GDP increase - thus grossly distorting the real well-being of a nation. More expansive indices, such as the United Nations Development Programme’s Human Development Index, give a better indication of well-being but still have at their core the GDP metric. Indeed, GDP has become a talisman of the growth paradigm - mesmerising whole nations and peoples into a seductive vortex that serves the interests of Capital3 as an end in itself.

In what Antonio Gramsci (1982) called a process of ‘hegemony’,4 the paradigm is maintained by a variety of social mechanisms and institutions that pervade society. Capitalism has brought about a global hegemonic power bloc5 consisting of both economic and political or state elites - what Ralph Miliband (1988), drawing on C. Wright Mills, calls ‘power elites’, who form the apex of the dominant class.6 While these power elites compete with each other in various ways, often aggressively and sometimes violently (both amongst themselves at the national level and between national elites at the global level, such as in geopolitical and trade competition), they are united by their common interest in maintaining the essential features of the growth paradigm, or what Marx called the accumulation imperative of capitalism. The accumulation of profit has no intrinsic morality other than to recreate the conditions for further accumulation. As such, capital usually contradicts societal (in particular working-class) interests and nature, through various processes of dispossession, exploitation and domination. The power elite usually makes compromises (directly or through the state) only when faced with resistance of various kinds. This includes struggles for a greater share of the social surplus (higher wages and better working conditions, a social wage), resistance to dispossession of the commons (land and other public assets), resistance to environmental degradation and campaigns for greater democratic participation.

In other words, capitalism has what Samir Amin (2004) calls a growth or ‘liberal virus’7 that operates within the logic of accumulation for the sake of accumulation. This is based on its inner drive towards compound growth (Harvey 2014) that demands maximum market liberalisation, as it scans the globe (including the oceans, deeper into the Earth, as well as within our bodies, and outer space) for investment opportunities. A key dimension to this is the system’s dependence on fossil fuels, what Elmar Altvatar (2007) calls ‘fossil capitalism’. This generates a number of crises on a continuous basis, at social and natural levels.

Briefly, the social crises involve the increasing exploitation of workers through the informalisation of work, lower real wages, a declining social wage, rising unemployment, privatisation of the commons such as public land and services, and rising global inequality within and between countries. Almost half the world does not have enough to eat, while less than one per cent of humanity (based mainly but not exclusively in the north) possesses most of the Earth’s material wealth (Oxfam 2014; Piketty 2014). This usually fuels social instability, through rising crime and political upheavals (including terrorism), which tends to further expand the security state on global and national levels, leading to a vicious cycle.

The social crisis is accompanied by ecological crises that can be grouped under three headings: the depletion of resources (in particular oil, which runs the system, but also rain forests and fresh-water sources, amongst others); pollution (including carbon emissions and their impact on climate change, as well as increasing waste and other industrial and vehicle pollutants that affect public health); and declining biodiversity (where animals and plants become extinct, with grave threats to the delicate ecosystem). This can bring human society to the precipice, where it faces extinction (Magdoff & Foster 2011).

#### Capitalism is an unsustainable system dependent on perpetual, never-ending growth, undermining the value of the individual.

Schmelzer/Vansintjan 6/28 [Matthias Schmelzer, Aaron Vansintjan; Matthias Schmelzer is an economic historian, political theorist, networker and climate activist based in Leipzig, Germany. He combines activism in social movements around climate justice and degrowth with academic research. Aaron holds an MSc in Natural Resource Sciences from McGill University and a BA in Philosophy with a Minor in Environment from McGill University. He is a PhD candidate at the University of London, Birkbeck; 6-28-2022; The Future is Degrowth: A Guide to a World Beyond Capitalism; Verso Books; <https://books.google.com/books> hl=en&lr=&id=mstzEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT9&dq=The+Future+is+Degrowth:+A+Guide+to+a+World+Beyond+Capitalism&ots=F9CJYfcHy0&sig=UMaxyBJuYCi0P8CSyWrs0K8xY4g#v=onepage&q=The%20Future%20is%20Degrowth%3A%20A%20Guide%20to%20a%20World%20Beyond%20Capitalism; SK]

Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!'" This quotation from Marx's Capital concisely summarizes the thesis that capitalism - through the competitive compulsion to accumulate - is fundamentally organized around competitive expansion, growth, and intensification and can only function in this way. In classical economics, accumulation (from the Latin accumulare, `to heap up'), describes the continuous process of adding value to capital. Value is created through the metabolic interaction with nature in the form of work, and then exploited by the property-owning classes who can extract surplus value by selling the finished commodity. In a competitive market system, this surplus value must largely be reinvested as capital (machinery, resources, labour), thus leading to expansion and the continued expanded reproduction of capital at ever-higher levels. As we explain further below, this process of accumulation materializes as growth, but also leads to systemic crises and 'contradictions' (ecological, financial, social, political, etc.) "0 As feminist and Global South critics emphasize, beyond the exploitation in the workplace (the 'hidden abode of production, to use Marx's famous term), capitalism is also fundamentally dependent on appropriation and the continuous colonization of a non-capitalist outside. This process of appropriating the non-capitalist 'outside, which following Rosa Luxemburg has been theorized as Landnahme (land grabbing), can be understood geographically (as colonialism), socially (as reproduction work, spheres of life not yet commodified), and in relation to nature.8' The crises resulting from this double dynamic of exploitation and appropriation inherent to the process of economic growth - so goes the core argument of the critique of capitalism - cannot be understood nor overcome without undoing the systemic logic and associated social relations of domination and exploitation of capitalist accumulation." The critique of capitalism is as old as capitalism itself. Even if, in parts of the degrowth discussion, the critique of capitalism is ignored, we consider it essential to understanding the growth society and to the possibility of changing it. The critique of growth, we argue, must also include a critique of capitalist accumulation. In the words of Elmar Altvater (who himself modified Max Horkheimer's statement about the connection between capitalism and fascism): 'They who will not speak of the accumulation of capital shall remain silent about growth:" From a degrowth perspective, growth can be analysed as a neces-sary consequence, but also as a condition, of capitalist accumulation. In addition to the critique of consumption and the external limits of growth, production and the mode of production must also be central to a critique of growth. This includes capitalism's tendency to enter into crises - and its continuous overcoming of them through transformations of the mode of production and further expansion to new frontiers - as well as class conflicts and the social institutions (property, corporations, banks, nation-states, the military, monopolies) involved in accumulation and growth processes. Since the limits of growth are also the limits of capitalism (which dynamically stabilizes itself through growth), it is not just economic growth that is under consideration but the capitalist system as such. For, without growth, capitalism threatens to further deteriorate into a refeudalized, miserable, unequal, and authoritarian system marked by strengthened borders and conflicts over resources. From the point of view of this criticism, degrowth necessarily also means post-capitalism and is therefore closely aligned with anti-capitalist movements and eco-socialism in particular."

Continuous accumulation process According to Marx, capitalism is a social structure and economic system which, first, is driven by capital being invested with the aim of earning more money, and in which, second, this accumulation dynamic - based on private ownership of the means of production, wage labour, and competitive markets - has a decisive influence on society. This is often explained using the formula M-C-M' (or: money-commodities-more money). Capitalists invest capital in commodities such as machinery, raw materials, and energy, but also in labour. The 'double character' of wage labour in capitalism creates a product that not only has a concrete use value, but also an abstract exchange value. Based on the exchange value, the commodity is worth more than the capital invested and is sold again on markets. This means that the amount of money (M) initially used is converted into a larger amount of money (M') through a metabolic exchange with nature and commodified work (that is, wage labour) that produces commodities (C)." If this were the whole story, capitalism would simply involve surplus being consumed privately or spent socially - whether through building palaces or churches or holding large feasts or parades. However, because of market competition, the productive forces moving forward through technological improvements, and the competitive need to accumulate capital, a large part of the profits must be reinvested into acquiring more capital. This creates a continuous accumulation process." The fact that the generated surplus value is constantly reinvested in the purchase of better and more modern machines, more or cheaper materials, or in the employment of more or more productive workers is not the result of the individual greed of the capitalist. Due to the competition for market shares and advances in productivity, investing is not an arbitrary decision, but a constraint that restricts all actions of owners of capital and dominates the entire economic system. The tremendous increase in productivity under capitalism goes back to this principle of competition - because those who lag behind in the pursuit of extra profits through better production methods, technical progress, or more efficient organization of work lose market share to the competition, lack the resources for updating their machinery to the newest standards, and thus sooner or later lose the basis of their business. The pressure on society as a whole to grow production also follows from this dynamic of accumulation. If there is no growth, average capitalists are stuck with unrealized values, unsold goods lose their exchange value, investments decline, and the entire supply chain slows or even comes to a standstill. And, since human life reproduces itself in capitalism through markets - on which provisioning basic necessities depends - every capitalist crisis is also a social crisis." As we discuss below, this capitalist process of accumulation is fundamentally based on inequality, domination, and various forms of social rule. The capitalist system has to be analysed as a social relationship, including class, racial, and gender relations, the post-colonial global world system, and a form of politics comprising states and parties. And capitalism has to be analysed as a biophysical system as well.'

Growth is the materialization of accumulation The capitalist economy is defined by the drive towards accumulation. Economic growth is the materialization of this process - a materialization that is biophysical and ecological as much as it is social, as we explored in chapter 2. Economic growth is the consequence of the compulsion to make a profit, a process resulting from accumulation. But economic growth is also a condition of accumulation - without growth and the related biophysical and social processes there can be no accumulation." Capital is necessarily excessive; it does not know boundaries; its only drive is to grow itself - which is characterized by the fact that it only refers to itself as quantity. People's needs play only a subordinate role: in exchange value-oriented production needs must be taken into account to the extent that they allow for meeting the conditions of extended production and reproduction of capital, and no more than that." That is, without workers being in a sufficiently healthy state to work, and without consumers being able and having the money to consume, capitalist accumulation would fail either to be profitable or to sell commodities, each of which is an essential condition of the continued process of accumulation and the capture of surplus value. The economy is thus driven by the pursuit of profits. Within this `monetary production economy, growth results from two interlinked but different forms of investments, both of which aim at expanding the capacity to produce and accumulate: 'Expansion can be the simple production of more machines, materials and labour power or this expansion can be the production of new forms of machines, materials and labour power, and the design of new, hitherto non-existent commodity forms:" While both extensive and intensive investments affect growth, it is in particular accumulation based on intensive investments that increases productivity and drives ever-expanding and changing consumer markets and permanently 'improving' products (for which advertisement creates the necessary demand). From the labour-centric, productivist perspective it is this latter drive which gives a historically 'progressive direction to capitalism. It is this logic of accumulation, driven by competition, which, following the rules of capitalism's development, brings about a perma-nent revolution of all conditions, has unfolded a previously unknown development of productive forces, and is expanding into ever-growing regions of the world but also into new areas of society. Many - including the productivist currents within the (Marxist) left - hope that capitalism will, through technical innovation, develop the productive forces to make a liberated, post-capitalist society possible." But it is also this dynamic of accumulation that underlies the crisis-like nature of capitalism, as we explore below.

Growth as perpetual crisis In a famous passage of Capital, Marx, writing about the continuous development of the means of production in agriculture and industry through innovation, technology, and the divide between city and coun-tryside, also discussed what has later been termed the 'metabolic rift:

Capitalist production collects the population together in great centres, and causes the urban population to achieve an ever-growing preponderance. This has two results. On the one hand it concentrates the historical motive force of society; on the other hand, it disturbs the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, i.e., it prevents the return to the soil of its constituent elements consumed by man in the form of food and clothing; hence it hinders the operation of the eternal natural condition for the lasting fertility of the soil ... But by destroying the circumstances surrounding that metabolism ... it compels its systematic restoration as a regulative law of social production, and in a form adequate to the full development of the human race ... All progress in capitalist agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the worker, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time is a progress toward ruining the more long-lasting sources of that fertility ... Capitalist production, therefore, only develops the techniques and the degree of combination of the social process of production by simultaneously undermining the original sources of all wealth - the soil and the worker."

#### Capitalism functions for the sake of growth

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Technological Paradigm,” Ch. 3.7, p. 119] SPark

Moreover, the current false ideological belief in infinite growth partly originates in the modern philosophical tendency to regard technology as a neutral phenomenon that need not question the values applied or the end it serves. The trauma of Einstein when he realized the manner in which the Pentagon was going to use the atomic bomb - largely made possible due to his discoveries - by launching it on Hiroshima and Nagasaki illustrates this ethical issue very well. Hence, the Pope’s ‘technocratic paradigm’ takes on precisely that supposedly neutral position of the technocrats of the economy in the face of social and environmental problems, in which the purpose of economic activity - serving human beings for the satisfaction of their basic needs - is not promoted and still less achieved. Competitiveness guides the performance of entrepreneurs seeking to maximize capital gain on pain of bankruptcy and market disappearance. As a result, capitalist economy functions for the sake of growth without values or purposes, as if it were a cyclist who does not know where he is going but must keep pedalling because if he stops the bike loses its balance and falls. But obviously, if the cyclist does not know where he is going, he risks falling into an abyss.

#### Viewing growth and accumulation as an end causes a litany of impacts

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Technological Paradigm,” Ch. 3.7, p. 122-123] SPark

Thus, if the ways in which a capitalist economy functions can be explained by a competitive desire to maintain an economic activity whose purposes (apart from the accumulation of capital and the distribution of profits to the shareholders of large companies) are not known, there is a clear necessity to reform the current world economy, which will be discussed further on in this book. For instance, if we selected some figures from world economic data and tried using them to assess global economic growth (guided by competitiveness and capital accumulation) using the classic category of the increase in per capita income at national level and on a global scale,15 according to experts we would find that personal income has increased from US $3,305 in 1960 to US $9,472 per capita in 2010 to reach US $14,000 in 2017 (Sachs 2017). From an axiological point of view (implicitly because economy technocrats do not base their decisions on ethical judgements), this would be considered something ‘good’ or ‘positive’. However, that would be an erroneous and incomplete (reductionist) perception because from the perspective of natural ecosystems or social welfare, in a world where nature is affected by waste and pollution as well as concentration of wealth with the consequent inequality, the increase in growth (GDP) and per capita income does not appear to have those positive connotations. This is because poverty and inequality result in a permanent social crisis at world level, as demonstrated by the massive increase in migratory flows, the proliferation of armed conflict, the intensification in the number of refugees and social turmoil, the surge of terrorism, organized crime and the like.16 It is clear from the pie chart of the World Bank regard

### 2NC -- Inequality

Cap causes systemic inequalities

[Roger W. **Ferguson** Jr.](https://www.cfr.org/expert/roger-w-ferguson-jr), 20**22** (Ferguson is a Steven A. Tananbaum distinguished fellow for international economics at CFR. He also has a PhD, JD and BA in economics. “Academic Webinar: The Future of Capitalism” Council on Foreign Relations, Feb. 23, 2022. <https://www.cfr.org/event/academic-webinar-future-capitalism>///MF)

[Roger W. Ferguson Jr.](https://www.cfr.org/expert/roger-w-ferguson-jr), Steven A. Tananbaum distinguished fellow for international economics at CFR, leads a conversation on the future of capitalism.

FASKIANOS: Welcome to today’s Winter/Spring 2022 CFR Academic Webinar Series. I’m Irina Faskianos, vice president of the National Program and Outreach at CFR.

Today’s discussion is on the record, and the video and transcript will be available on our website, CFR.org/academic. As always, CFR takes no institutional positions on matters of policy.

We’re delighted to have Roger Ferguson Jr. with us to talk about the future of capitalism. Roger Ferguson is CFR’s Steven A. Tananbaum distinguished fellow for international economics. Previously, he served as president and CEO of TIAA, and before that he was head of financial services for Swiss Re and chairman of Swiss Re America Holding Corporation.

He is the former vice chairman of the board of governors of the U.S. Federal Reserve System, and he currently serves on the board of several corporations and organizations, as a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and is an advisor with various private fintech companies.

So, Dr. Ferguson, thank you very much for being with us today to talk about the future of capitalism, and it is kind of astonishing that we are talking about the future of capitalism. Can you talk about this area and what you see the strengths are and weaknesses as well?

FERGUSON: So thank you very much, and I’m going to actually start with a quote. I think this is a quote from 1938 that roughly captures why we are talking about the future of capitalism. So this was from FDR, a famous U.S. president. In 1938, he said, “Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy”—or you might say capitalism—“but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity, of seeing their children hungry while they sat helpless in the face of government confusion and government weakness through lack of leadership in government.”

Now, that is a strong statement. It is not exactly where we are today. But there are a few points here that are relevant and resonant with where we are today. So the reason that we’re looking at and talking about this question of the future of capitalism is that there are many surveys that suggest that young people, in particular, are not sure that capitalism is the system that they want to use to organize their economic life.

We know that capitalism has been very successful in many ways. It has brought, literally, hundreds of millions, if not billions, of people around the world out of abject poverty. It has created some of the most iconic and successful companies that the world has ever known. We’ve seen dramatic transformations in our lives in terms of our ability to do everyday tasks using smart phones, and they’ve only been around twenty years or so. All these things are the outcome of a capitalist system that is very robust, that has created new entities, that has allowed other things to grow—business, et cetera.

Having said that, for many people, capitalism is still a bit of an enigma. They look around and they observe, at least here in the United States, that income has been gradually rising and inequality, starting, roughly, in the mid-1970s. They’ve seen very unexpected crises here in the U.S. and in other countries emanating from mysterious and misunderstood financial tools such as subprime mortgages.

They see longer-term challenges for many people around health inequities, which became very clear during the COVID-19 crisis that is still with us in some ways. And, obviously, there are for many people, the ongoing challenge of climate change with very extreme weather, and we’ve experienced that as well.

And so while capitalism is, I think, really recognized as the organizing force that has brought many people out of poverty, allowed new tools, new capabilities, a very comfortable lifestyle for many, it’s also seen as, perhaps, not doing everything it’s supposed to if you have increasing income inequality, increasing wealth inequality, and you look and see health inequalities and different outcomes, that they guess maybe the system should be somewhat better.

The second point I’d make is, for me, it’s really quite ironic because I grew up at a time when there was conflict between capitalism and communism, and then in late 1980s, early 1990s, communism disappeared. The Soviet Union fell apart. And since that time, capitalism is the way that almost all societies have organized themselves.

In the United States, we have capitalism that is regulated market capitalism, and Europe tends to be the kind of capitalism that leans a bit more towards social democratic norms. In Japan, there’s a kind of collective capitalism.

Even China, sometimes called communist China—when I was growing up called Red China—under Deng Xiaoping. He had this famous phrase, “It doesn’t matter if the cat is black or white as long as it catches a mouse,” and people took that to be a dramatic move towards a capitalist kind of system, even in communist China.

And so capitalism, for a period of time, was and still is the dominant way of organizing all—almost all of the major economies of the world. There are a few outliers. But the major economies have different versions of capitalism. There are five or six versions of capitalism. And now, suddenly, here we are in 2020, 2021, 2022, and we had an election in the United States when some of the candidates were talking about socialism. We see in China a reversion back to some skepticism about the kind of capitalism they had and the great wealth inequality that resulted. We see other surveys that suggest people around the world are less enamored of capitalism.

So it would seem to me a very important topic to say, well, what is the future capitalism? The system that was the dominant system in the world for, roughly, thirty years is under question in almost every location and why is that? And so, that is what we’re looking at.

Now, I know that we sent out some readings to the individuals who are joining us here—the academics, the students from around the country—and if you look at those readings you’ll see that we don’t really know the answers yet.

#### Cap causes inequalities

**Cudd**, 20**15** (Ann, American philosopher. “Is Capitalism Good for Women?” Journal of Business Ethics. <https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/stable/24702827?sid=primo&seq=1> ///MF)

In a recent book (Cudd and Holmstrom 2011), I argued that capitalism has brought about great changes in the quality and length of human life in the twentieth century: the income takeoff (the vast increase of per capita income of developed nations), the health transition (raising the life expectancy by upwards of 50 years), and the fertility transition (from an average of 6 children per woman to around 2). In this paper, I delve further into the question of whether capitalism is good for women. A major problem with capitalism is that it increases inequality, which is especially harmful to women and other vulnerable groups. Capitalism increases economic inequality in the first instance, but this in turn tends to create political and social inequalities. Inequality, I agree, needs to be controlled if capitalism is to be progressive and defensible. I defend such a controlled capitalism in two ways that are particularly relevant to feminism as a progressive social movement for human freedom. First, capitalism promotes innovation: it promotes technical innovation that tends to improve quality and length of life for everyone, but particularly for women. But more importantly for the feminist defense of capitalism, it promotes social innovation, in particular the destruction of harmful, patriarchal traditions. Thus, the second defense I will make of capitalism is that it opposes tradition fetishism and reduces the oppression of traditional societies that impose hierarchies of gender and case.

#### Inequality is inevitable in capitalism – the system must be reformed

Manish & Miller 21 (G. P. Manish is an Assistant Professor of Economics in the Sorrell College of Business and a member of the Manuel H. Johnson Center of Political Economy at Troy University, Stephen C. Miller is the Adams Bibby Chair of Free Enterprise and an Associate Professor of Economics in the Manuel H. Johnson Center for Political Economy at Troy University; Capitalism and Inequality: The Role of State and Market, 1 Capitalism, cronyism, and inequality, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020, pg.20//JL)

A second view is that inequality in capitalist economies is due to the economic and political elite conspiring to control the political system for their benefit, so the rules under which people interact are biased to favor the wellconnected few at the expense of the general public. Inequality is a product of the political system. This view, which refers to the system as crony capitalism or corporatism among other names, has adherents throughout the political spectrum, from political left to political right, and there is substantial support for this view in the academic literature in economics, political science, and sociology. Both of these views point toward normative policy recommendations, but different ones. If the private ownership of the means of production that characterizes capitalism inherently generates increasing inequality, and if capitalism assigns ownership of the means of production inequitably, then there is an equity argument that the capitalist system should be reformed. If government policy creates inequality because government power is controlled by elites who can design policy for their benefit at the expense of the masses, the political system rather than the economic system should be reformed. The academic literature, discussed in more detail by Holcombe (2015), offers substantial support for this second view – that inequality is generated as a product of the political process – and Nader (2015) notes strong support for this viewpoint throughout the left– right political spectrum. Despite agreement that this is a problem, the political left and right differ on how it should be remedied. The left argues that more government oversight over those with economic power is the solution, whereas the right argues that government interference with the economy is the cause of the problem and the remedy is less government, not more. Inequality is inevitable in a system that compensates people in proportion to the value they create for others, as the marginal productivity theory of income concludes. Even if people are compensated in proportion to the value they create for others, some will normatively conclude that income redistribution is desirable. Rawls (1971) is an example. The two views discussed here fall into a different category, however, because both argue that inequality arises because of inherently unfair procedures. One view argues that the private ownership of the means of production generates increasing inequality, and that ownership of the means of production is not determined fairly. The other view argues that the elite control the political process and design the rules of the game so that the economic system benefits them at the expense of the masses. In either case, the inequality created by capitalism is unjust. Regardless of whether inequality is the result of some people owning land (Ricardo), or institutions that unfairly give some ownership of capital (Marx, Piketty), or that the rules are slanted to favor some over others (Marx and Engels, Stiglitz, Stockman), inequality under capitalism is unjust. What are the policy alternatives?

#### The worker is subjected to the modes of production but often with below standards living, poverty conditions, and is often never paid right

**Leff 21** Leff, Deconstructing Capital and Territorializing Life, Enrique, Professor of Political Ecology at UNAM, pg 148-149 - IShone

What these citations of Marx disclose goes well beyond the fact that non-seasonal and not-working time that constitute conditions of the production process and for the reproduction of agricultural labor power is not adequately valued in the theory of value. They also reveal—and this is the crucial point of debate that poses the environmental question to Marxism—that the natural processes involved in the production of E. Leff commodities, in the value of the labor force in general and in the reproduction of peasants’ labor force in particular, are not valued. the problem is crystal clear: Nature contributes to production, but only socially necessary labor time—the labor-time necessary for production, and consequently for the reproduction of labor force—determined by technological progress, contributes to value formation and the establishment of the rate of surplus value! **the problem does not lie only in the fact that labor time fails to coincide with production time**, but more fundamentally in the fact that neither Nature’s contribution to production nor the destructive effects of production on Nature is valued. While the poor peasant survives through the articulation of modes of production—many times in extreme conditions of poverty as capital **does not pay for dignified, just, and egalitarian standards of living in the reproduction of its needed labor power**—Nature does not get paid at all for its contribution to the overall productivity of capitalist agriculture, nor to the global economy. Simply stated, Nature has been externalized by the economy; Nature contributes to production but does not determine value, not in the way that the concept of value and surplus value theory are structured in Marxist theory of value

#### Cap is the root cause/causes poverty

**VAP**, **no date** (VAP = Volunteering Against Poverty. “Introduction Capitalism: the root cause of global poverty” [http://www.ifm-sei.org/files/up/capitalism\_vap.pdf ///](http://www.ifm-sei.org/files/up/capitalism_vap.pdf%20///) MF)

Capitalism: The root cause of global poverty

Poverty is the biggest challenge of our time. Millions of people are denied access to resources and opportunities, impacting severely on their wellbeing and excluding them from full participation in society. The gap between rich and poor is widening rapidly, with some groups, such as young people and women, disproportionately affected. Poverty is often invisible, those living in poverty are ashamed to talk about it or lack the means to ensure their voices are heard. The Volunteering Against Poverty project aims to give the invisible a voice and challenge people to contribute to social change, emphasising that poverty is not caused by the poor, and individuals alone cannot be held responsible for the situations they find themselves in.

‘Someone must be choosing to let others live in poverty’.

The VAP group discussed the causes and consequences of poverty at length, finding that they always came back to one root cause: global capitalism. The capitalist system is held up by the rich and powerful who benefit from its maintenance resulting in increasing inequality and poverty. Connie from Denmark, portrayed in the documentary, put this in strong words: ”We have enough money in Denmark, so someone must be choosing to let others live in poverty. This is something I do not understand”. The group agreed on the following statement as the essence of their discussions and their perspective on the issue: “Poverty is everywhere. It has many different faces in many different places. If I am poor, you are poor. If you are poor, we are poor. The root of change lies in all our communities. We need to educate, empower and inspire people around the world to join the fight against the cause of poverty

### 2NC -- Democracy

#### Capitalism undermines democracy through redundancy and inefficiency – empirics

Cong ’18 [Wanshu; September 30; Faculty of Law at European University Institute - Department of Law (LAW), Global Academic Fellow at The University of Hong Kong; “Privacy and Data Protection: Solving or Reproducing the Democratic Crisis of the Neoliberal Capitalism?” p. 13-14] SPark

But the sort of democracy driven by financial capitalism cannot be more socially and politically-detached. Under financial capitalism, corporations compete no longer on the basis of their manufacturing capacities but their stock values, “immediately through gimmicks and trickery, but more basically through firing workers, moving production, and raiding pension funds”. 26 Connected to the expansion of the global value chains, manufacturing is outsourced to overseas and organized at a global level that further separates the labour supply and consumption. Financialized companies thrive fast and collapse even faster, unable to provide long-term employment and other benefits to the employees while benefiting the corporate managers who cannot consume their incomes and must reinvest the money. The pathology of the neoliberal, financial capitalism is a much-discussed subject. Suffice it to say here that the interdependent and reciprocal relationship between capitalist economy and people that gave favourable conditions for democracy is significantly undermined and reaches to a breaking point. The break of the positive and reciprocal interdependence further deprives people of the means of production and alienates people from the commodities that bear capital value, as the generation and accumulation of financial capital is largely independent from the work and consumption of the wage-labour. Without the need to rely on the masses, financial capitalism successfully removes its social-embeddedness and detaches itself from democratic regulatory frameworks.27 The change of the means and relationship of production has also profoundly weakened the bargaining power of the masses. 28 Furthermore, it is also increasingly difficult to form meaningful labour movements that push forward institutional changes for common good and public interest, as people in the neoliberal and consumerist age are left to take care of themselves, in the name of so-called self-development or self-entrepreneurship. 29

One consequence of the undermining of the reciprocal interdependence is the deepening of socioeconomic inequalities which neoliberal governments retreat from dealing with. Socioeconomic inequalities cause serious problem to democracy, as they lead to unequal political participation and more selective political representation. 30 That socioeconomic inequalities lead to political inequalities can be vividly testified by the turnout rates and demographics of the elections in the western countries of recent years.31 They also form the large social background of the recent scandals about cyber security breaches, data breaches and fake news in elections. It can therefore be argued that the current democratic crisis is deeply rooted in the economic structure and relationship of production of the neoliberal financial capitalism.

#### Capitalism makes true democracy impossible

Toney, 13, Simon Toney, University of Sydney, Department of Government and International Relations, Anti-Capitalism: A Beginner’s Guide, (PDF version:file:///C:/Users/foxct/Dropbox/PC%20(3)/Downloads/Anti-CapitalismBG\_FullText.pdf), Zapatismo and ‘post ideology’, pg. 133, - FT

As a post-ideological politics Zapatismo effectively renounces the superstructure of expectations that have informed political philosophy since Plato invented the Philosopher Kings. This is to say that it has forsaken the idea that knowledge or understanding can give a superior insight into issues concerning how we should live and, thus, that, for example, I as a political theorist with twenty or so years’ worth of heavy reading behind me, have the right or the role to ‘legislate’ on behalf of others. It means that what the intellectuals or the ‘vanguards’ say is simply one set of views to be considered (or not) alongside everyone else’s views – no matter how ridiculous, incomprehensible, outlandish or outrageous the latter may seem. Everyone’s voice has in this sense equal weight and an equal right to be heard. If this sounds quite a lot like a certain kind of democratic liberalism, then in a sense it is. But Marcos insistently poses the questions: which liberal is it that actually wants the unmediated voice to be decisive? Which liberal thinks that voices are more important than structures, institutions and constitutions? Which liberal is it that wants the ‘voice’ to be heard on every matter facing the community, whether it be the kind of crops to be sown or the direction of military strategy? Which liberal is really prepared to hear everyone’s voice, without the ‘convenience’ of representatives to give sense or ‘wisdom’ to them? Certainly not the neoliberals. The problem is that liberalism in practice is quite a different proposition to democratic liberalism in theory, which in turn explains the success of liberalism in establishing itself as the dominant or hegemonic idea of the modern world. They say they are listening, but are they really?

### 2NC -- Genocide

#### Causes structural genocide

Leech 13, Leech, Capitalism as a structural genocide and the socialist alternative, Garry, BA in political science from University of Nevada – Las Vegas and MA in Sociology at Arcadia University, pages 1-7, IShone

I intend to argue in this thesis that capitalism is inherently genocidal. But in order to argue that capitalism is inherently genocidal, it must first be shown that violence is inherent in the capitalist system. There are many examples throughout history of direct physical violence on a massive scale being utilized on behalf of capital—the annihilation of aboriginals in the Americas, the slave trade, World War One, etc.—but these can easily be dismissed as exceptions to the norm given the relatively sporadic nature of their occurrence. Therefore, to effectively argue that capitalism is inherently genocidal it is crucial to show that violence is: 1) inherent in the internal logic of capital; 2) that it is a permanent feature of the capitalist system and, therefore, is ‗intentional‘; and 3) that the form that the violence takes is structural. Furthermore, I will argue that structural violence is not only inherent in the capitalist system, but that it results in mass death on a genocidal scale, thereby constituting structural genocide. Over the past thirty years, I have travelled and worked extensively in Latin America. During this time I could not help but notice that significant portions of the population of Latin America endure degrees of poverty inconceivable to most people in the United States and Canada. Furthermore, in many places, the degree of poverty has not diminished over these decades, and inequality has actually increased. These observations from my time in Latin America led me to question why such disparities exist between the population in North America who are relatively wealthy and the large majority of people 2 in Latin America who continue to endure such hardship. After all, this disparity exists in a hemisphere—indeed, in a world—that contains more than a sufficient supply of resources to ensure that everyone‘s basic needs are met (Kapitza 2009:9). The conclusion I reached was that the structures prevalent under capitalism, while providing impressive opportunities for wealth generation, also ensure that the wealth generated remains in the hands of a small minority. I also came to realize that these structures contributed to the deaths of millions of people annually. But do these deaths constitute a form of genocide? In order to make my case that these deaths do indeed constitute structural genocide under the logic of capital, I will first examine the concept of structural violence. According to Johan Galtung (1969:175), social injustice and inequality, both in power and wealth, lie at the core of structural violence when they result from social structures that disproportionately benefit one group of people while preventing others from meeting their fundamental needs. Therefore, social structures that cause human suffering and even death constitute structural violence. David Roberts (2008:19) expands on this concept by arguing that the inequality caused by social structures does not have to be intentional. Even if this inequality that impedes peoples ability to meet their fundamental needs results ―indirectly and largely unintentionally‖ from social structures it still constitutes structural violence. This framework is key because it allows us analytically to separate violence and oppression from intentionality, and also allows us to see that social systems—managed by conscious individuals who make daily choices—can develop a pseudo-autonomy which makes it 3 appear that there is nowhere to go to demand accountability and, indeed, that no one is responsible. However, having stated this, I will also argue that structural violence that is an inevitably outcome of actions that adhere to the internal logic of a social system could be considered as an intentional outcome of those actions. I will then define structural genocide. In order to achieve this I will draw on the United Nations‘ Genocide Convention (United Nations 1951) and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (United Nations 1999) to demonstrate why the structural violence inherent in capitalism constitutes structural genocide. I will refer to the work of Beth van Schaack (1997) and Ervin Staub (2002) in order to argue for an expansion of the definition of genocide to include political groups and other collectivities. Ultimately, it is not necessary to argue that the capitalist system—or those managing the system—be held accountable in a court of law.1 Rather, the various definitions of genocide highlight the illegitimacy of a capitalist system in which structural violence constitutes an inherent component. The point is not to engage in polemics, but to argue that there are solid analytical and political reasons to use the term genocide due to the ongoing systematic— even routine—nature of the structural violence under capitalism and its sheer scale. While Galtung‘s concept of structural violence is crucial to the ideas examined below, it does not exist in a vacuum. If we are to examine structural violence in a particular social system, in this case the capitalist system, then we must understand some of the key features of this system and the power relations that ensure its continuity. For this purpose, the central argument is grounded in a critique of capitalism that draws on Karl Marx (1959; 1992; 1993; 1998) and on contemporary Marxist scholars such as Michael Lebowitz (2003; 2010), István Mészáros (2010), David Harvey (2005), Samir Amin (2011), Slavoj Žižek (2008; 2009) and Joel Kovel (2007). There are some broad themes that underpin the work of all of these scholars that will be useful to my analysis. They include, but are not limited to, a critique of the market economy and liberal democracy, or the ―alienated democracy,‖ as Amin (2011:180) calls it; the commodification of labour power and land, and by extension the person and nature; the inherently expansive and exploitative nature of capital in its drive for profit; the dispossession of increasing numbers of people from their land and livelihoods; and the ecological crisis that is inherent in capitalism. I will also draw on the work of Indian physicist and philosopher Vandana Shiva (2005b:45), who analyzes contemporary ‗enclosures‘ in the global South as a component of what she calls ―cowboy capitalism.‖ As history makes clear, there are analytical and ideological justifications for the capitalist system. Therefore, it is important to ground the critique of capitalism in a clear understanding of the perspectives that have dominated—and continue to dominate—the justifications for the contemporary social order. For this, I draw on authors such as Milton Friedman (2002), Friedrich Hayek (1962) and Ludwig von Mises (1996; 2006). Some broad thematic concerns will be explored such as why liberal democracy is the ideal, and only, form of democracy compatible with capitalism, and that capitalism can also function well in anti-democratic settings. And why, ultimately, the rights of the ‗citizen‘ are directly linked to a person‘s status as a ‗consumer‘ in a social system. governed by the logic of capital. These justifications are important because they continue to inform contemporary policy-making under neoliberal globalization, not only at the national level, but also within international institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Four case studies will be presented in order to illustrate how the structural violence inherent in capitalism impacts millions, even billions, of people at the beginning of the 21st century. The first case study shows how so-called free market policies implemented under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) have forcibly dispossessed almost two million Mexican farmers of their lands and livelihoods. The failure of Mexican farmers to compete with cheaper, subsidized agricultural imports from the United States has resulted in a flood of dispossessed peasants to urban areas in a desperate and often fruitless search for jobs. The structural violence that dispossessed farmers and others of their livelihoods has resulted in many becoming victims of the direct physical violence that has flourished in the midst of social breakdown and that has killed tens of thousands of people in recent years. This violence has most visibly manifested itself in the forms of turf wars between competing drug cartels and femicide in cities situated along the border with the United States. Many more dispossessed farmers and other impoverished Mexicans have become economic refugees, with thousands dying in their desperate attempts to illegally cross the border into the United States in search of a viable means of subsistence. The second case study examines farmer suicides in India. Under neoliberal globalization, millions of farmers in India began borrowing money in order to purchase genetically-modified (GM) and hybrid seeds patented under the WTO‘s intellectual property rights regime. These seeds were supposed to increase their yields and, by extension, their incomes, but when the promised increases in yields failed to materialize, Indian farmers were unable to pay off their debts and, in many cases, had to borrow more money to purchase new seeds in a desperate struggle to survive. The inability of Mexican farmers to compete with cheap imports from the United States eventually made them increasingly vulnerable to direct physical violence at the hands of others; the same structural violence has resulted in many Indian farmers also dying from direct physical violence—but often at their own hands. Since 1997, more than 200,000 Indian farmers have committed suicide; having seen no other honourable means of escaping the spiralling debts that resulted from global capitalist structures (Sainath 2010) The third case study illustrates how structural violence not only makes people increasingly vulnerable to direct physical violence—either at the hands of others or at their own hands—it also directly kills people. More than ten million people globally die every year from hunger and from preventable and treatable diseases such as malaria, diarrhoea, tuberculosis and AIDS, with Sub-Saharan Africa the region most seriously impacted (United Nations 2008). This structural violence is a direct consequence of policies that adhere to the logic of capital, which ensures food security for the global North and significant profits for agri-businesses and pharmaceutical companies, but fails 7 to see value in human beings whose labour power is not required and who are too poor to be consumers. The fourth and final case study examines how capitalism is unsustainable from an ecological perspective, and argues that this constitutes a form of structural violence against future generations. The logic of capital requires constant growth in order to accumulate wealth, but that growth is dependent on the destruction of nature. Inevitably, the drive to maximize profits that lies at the root of the logic of capital requires that essential natural resources be exploited in an unsustainable manner—to disproportionately benefit a wealthy minority at the expense of the basic needs of the majority. This process not only constitutes structural violence perpetrated by the haves against the have-nots today, it also represents structural violence against future generations who will not be able to meet their basic needs.

### 2NC -- Colonialism

#### Capitalism caused colonialism

Toney, 13, Simon Toney, University of Sydney, Department of Government and International Relations, Anti-Capitalism: A Beginner’s Guide, (PDF version:file:///C:/Users/foxct/Dropbox/PC%20(3)/Downloads/Anti-CapitalismBG\_FullText.pdf), the hows and whys of the thing called capitalism, pg. 13, - FT

To answer this question we need to make a link between wage labour and profit creation, for what has yet to be clarified is why anyone would want to work for someone else rather than work for themselves as, say, a subsistence farmer. Why do most of us work for someone else, and not for ourselves, or for our families, or relatives or friends and neighbours, or with whom we choose? Historically, the reason why most of us work for others is that we have very little choice but to do so. It is again a truism to note that in most parts of the world, the most important resource allowing a degree of independence to individuals, namely land, was conquered, invaded or otherwise taken from indigenous groups to serve the needs of royal families, conquistadores, colonial barons, imperial elites or states. In the UK the story of the creation of ‘masterless men’ – or future ‘employees’ – is one that concerns conquest of a particularly crude, and at times bloody, kind over the course of the previous three centuries, and this is to say nothing of ‘1066’ and the Norman conquest of Britain. It was crude in the case of the ‘enclosures’ of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This ensured that large chunks of the English countryside were hived off to the ‘great families’ in the name of ‘improving’ the land, that is making it available for agro-industrial development or building plots. It was bloody in the case of the ‘Highland clearances’ of the same period that ensured royal and noble control over the magnificent wilderness regions of Scotland. The effect was the same. Formerly independent ‘subsistence’ farmers were thrown off the land, in turn forcing them into the towns and cities to search for work. We can note that some of the very first ‘anti-capitalist’ protests and demonstrations were sparked off by such processes, and account in part for the sporadic resistances, sometimes violent, that punctuate modern British history, notwithstanding the insistence in ‘official’ history of the idea of Britain’s ‘peaceful’ historical development.

#### Capitalism emboldened the racist structures of colonialism and capitalism that encoded white supremacy

**Gerrard 21,** Gerard, Education and Racial Capitalism, Jessica, Chapter 2 - IShone

Racial capitalism, then, is a means by which to bring together the intersecting structures of racism, colonialism and capitalism that are differently configured across contexts. Capital has always depended on the appropriation of land and the labour of enslaved, indentured, and dispossessed people – which under transatlantic slavery and British colonialism became bound to the colonial expression of white supremacy. The racialised exploitation of land and labour under British settler colonialism enabled the creation of capital that encoded ‘white ownership’ into social, political and legal norms (Harris [1993](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449); Bhandar [2018](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449); Moreton-Robinson [2015](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)). Focused attention on the interwoven histories of capitalism and colonialism helps to see how racialisation is central to the divisions and categorisations of capitalism, which have sought to establish the classed, raced, and gendered social relations that enable capital accumulation. Analyses of racial capitalism, then, recognise race as a shifting signifier: race does not have ‘inherent’ or fixed meaning, rather it is an historically situated formation which articulates with systems and practices of domination to have profound material effects (Omi and Winant [2014](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449); Hall [1996](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)). Indeed, the long view we speak of here draws attention to the enduring practices of racialisation, and attending divisions, as constantly changing and diverse. Melamed ([2011](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)), for instance, identifies how post-WWII liberal multicultural, and even self-declared anti-racist, initiatives prompted changes in the orders of racial capitalism. Whilst significantly challenging the institutions and cultures of racial capitalism, ultimately these initiatives became a means for ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusion’ to become symbolic, performative and associated with feelings of ‘doing good’ without altering systems of oppression. The dynamic character of racial capitalism indicates the centrality of systems of education as sites for both social regulation and control and for struggle, contestation and renewal. Robinson ([2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)), for instance, draws on the example of 19th-century British colonial mission schools to demonstrate how education can both emblemise the colonial project of control and reveal its limit points. Mission schools were spaces of domination which aimed to eradicate Blackness and cultivate white supremacy, and yet, at the same time, colonised people’s survivance, insurgency and refusal through education showed that the project of education was neither all-determining nor complete (Robinson [2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449), pp 179–181).

#### Capitalism is fed by colonialism

Toney, 13, Simon Toney, University of Sydney, Department of Government and International Relations, Anti-Capitalism: A Beginner’s Guide, (PDF version:file:///C:/Users/foxct/Dropbox/PC%20(3)/Downloads/Anti-CapitalismBG\_FullText.pdf), towards a global (economic) village: interdependence and the transnationalisation of capitalism, pg. 18, - FT

It is no doubt true to say that capitalism has since its beginnings always been a world or ‘global’ system, in the sense that the rise of capitalism coincides with, and feeds upon, the rise of colonialism and inter-continental conquest. The markets of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were never in this sense merely markets for local produce, with local buyers and local sellers, but were supplemented with produce from colonies and overseas ‘possessions’ such as tobacco, wood and precious metals. But what is equally obvious is the degree to which, over the course of the development of the modern world, we see an ever-increasing interdependence between markets, producers and sellers. The ‘shopper’ in sixteenth-century Nottingham (where the author finds himself ...) would have been choosing goods that mostly came from the surrounding area, the odd pouch of tobacco notwithstanding. Today Nottingham’s shoppers are confronted by a vast array of goods from all over the world. Indeed the part of the world least represented on the shelves of the local shops would be Nottingham itself which, like so many other areas of post-industrial England, produces very little compared with even thirty years ago when it was known for the production of bicycles, lace, and cigarettes. The hero of Alan Sillitoe’s famous novel (and film) Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, set in the Nottingham of the 1950s, was an industrial factory worker living amongst other factory workers. Now he would be more likely to be a security guard or telesales operative. But what does this interdepend-ence actually mean? What does it mean to be increasingly interdependent apart from the fact that there is more stuff to buy in the shops?

### 2NC -- Alienation

#### A workers life in the capitalistic society is diminished by alienation and reduces humans to animalistic like actions

Swain 19 Swain, 2019, Dan, Professor of Life Studies at the University of Life Sciences Prague Alienation or Why Capitalism is Bad, Chapter 2, 322-343 - IShone

**These two aspects of alienation—from products and from the process of labor itself**—became interwoven in an important concept for Marx’s later economic theory: commodity fetishism. In a notoriously complex section of Capital, Marx described how the conditions of capitalist production and exchange lead to objects taking on a life of their own. Human beings relate to one another in the market as bearers of commodities—labor power on the one side and capital on the other. This means that, as I. [I. Rubin (1973](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-24):29) put it, “Production relations are not established only for things, but through things,” and as a result cooperative social activity appears as a kind of relationship between commodities. This leads to commodities acquiring a social significance over and above their specific use and purpose, appearing to have a life of their own. [Marx (1867](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-19): 165) here draws direct comparison with fetishistic worship of objects, which involves projecting human powers onto objects that do not possess them: “There the products of the human brain appear as autonomous figures endowed with a life of their own, which enter into relations both with each other and with the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men’s hands” ([Marx [1867] 1976](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-19):165). In the age of the smartphone, it has become almost a cliché to talk about people being ruled by their devices, seeing them not as useful products but as organizers of our lives. For Marx, this is simply the latest manifestation of a system where things dominate activity, not vice versa. Marx did not stop, however, at observing workers’ alienation from their product and from their labor itself. **He suggests that** **in separating workers from their labor, capitalist production also separates them from what makes them distinctively human—their “essence” or “species-being.”** This is the source of much controversy, some of which will be addressed in section [2](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-div1-2), but at its core is a claim that alienated labor is inhuman labor, since it denies the realization of distinctively human capacities (in later works, Marx talks about species powers, rather than species being). Marx identifies in humans a distinct capacity for consciously planning and reflecting on their activity: “**Man reproduces himself not only intellectually, in his consciousness, but actively and actually, and he can** therefore **contemplate himself in a world he** himself **has created**” ([1844]1975: 329). Alienated labor denies this capacity. Labor is frequently reduced to the status of merely reflexive and repetitive activity, and even when it is more creative or complex, it appears fundamentally as the plan of another and dominated by abstract labor time. (p. 365) Marx ultimately saw this as having devastating consequences for human well-being. The worker “does not confirm himself in his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not develop free mental and physical energy, but mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind.” ([Marx [1867] 1976](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-19):326). At worst, workers are reduced to mere appendages of a machine, with their bodies fundamentally marked by the kind of labor they perform. As John Berger vividly describes, “The repetition by which gesture is laid upon gesture, precisely but inexorably, the pile of gestures being stacked minute by minute, hour by hour is exhausting. The rate of work allows no time to prepare for the gesture, to demand effort from the body. The body loses its mind in the gesture.” ([Berger and Mohr, [1975] 2010](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-3):100). In Capital, [Marx ([1867] 1976](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-19):474) observed how this kind of specialization also has broader social consequences: this division of labor seizes upon not only the economic, but every other sphere of society, and everywhere lays the foundation for that specialization, that development in a man of one single faculty at the expense of all others, which already caused Adam Ferguson, the master of Adam Smith, to exclaim: ‘We make a nation of Helots, and have no free citizens.’ Thus, in narrowing down human activity to a particular form of abstractly and largely unconsciously expended labor, capitalism stunts human development, leading to “incomplete” human beings dominated by “animal” functions rather than human ones. Marx’s reference to the division of labor “seizing upon” every other sphere of society also indicates the importance of the broader social consequences of alienation—alienation from others. Those who engage in wage labor are alienated both from those they work for, and those they work with. As already discussed, the will of the capitalist appears as the dominating will of another, while other workers appear as much as potential competitors as cooperators. Workers are only capable of engaging in collective activity through the sale of their labor power, and so while in the workplace they appear as separate elements brought together only by the capitalist, outside they must compete with one another to get the best price for their labor. Moreover, to the extent this appears (through commodity fetishism) as first of all a relationship between things, it takes on a kind of false objectivity, in which such relationships appear “natural,” rather than historically specific. Relations of production and exchange take on the appearance of a natural force, like the weather, which can be understood and even manipulated but not ultimately transformed. In this sense, alienation is self-reinforcing, since it both gives rise to and depends on representing human activity as an external, dominating force.

#### Alienation is directed connected to capitalism, even if both the capitalist and the worker both experience it the worker is on the higher end

**Swain 19** Swain, 2019, Dan, Professor of Life Studies at the University of Life Sciences Prague Alienation or Why Capitalism is Bad, Chapter 4 - IShone

Marx did not see alienation, as some others have: as an inevitable product of modern technology or mass society**. Rather, he saw it as connected to a particular form of economic organization: capitalism**. He believed that it could be overcome, or at least minimized, in an alternative society. Moreover, he believed that alienated workers had an interest in confronting and challenging their alienation and that through this process such an alternative society might emerge. These points, too, provide fertile grounds for debate. We have already discussed the importance of the concept of alienation in the context of the Cold War and the debates concerning the nature of the official Communist regimes but more generally the notion of Communism as an unalienated, or at least less alienated, society can provide a touchstone for practical political debates. In particular, to the extent that alienation has its roots in forms of workplace organization, it suggests that alternatives that leave workplace hierarchies substantially intact are unlikely to be sufficient. It cautions against an overidentification of Communism with nationalization and state control, at the expense of sustained consideration of questions of social domination and empowerment. At the same time, Marx’s insistence **that lack of control at work is fundamentally rooted in capitalist relationships** of production and exchange provides a challenge to accounts that believe we can empower people while leaving such relations fundamentally intact. If a focus on alienation can tell us something important about alternatives to capitalism, it also suggests something about the process by which such a society comes to be. In particular, **it suggests an idea of** revolution as an activity of “**de-alienation**.” On this understanding, revolutionary transformation involves a process coming to recognize oneself in the world through the process of changing it: and in particular recognizing what appeared as alien, external forces as human activity. Marx seems to have believed that this kind of process took place to a certain extent “naturally” as workers are forced to organize to defend their own interests in necessarily antagonistic relationships with their exploiters. Here it is important to note that, while Marx sees both workers and capitalists as alienated, there is an important difference: **The worker stands on a higher plane than the capitalist from the outset,** since the latter has his roots in the process of alienation and finds absolute satisfaction in it whereas right from the start the worker is a victim who confronts it as a rebel and experiences it as a process of enslavement.

#### Theres only negatives to alienation, no positive alternative and it only further alienates workers -

Swain 19 Swain, 2019, Dan, Professor of Life Studies at the University of Life Sciences Prague Alienation or Why Capitalism is Bad, Chapter 2, pg. 276 - IShone

However, it is worth stepping back from these various debates to ask to what extent alienation really depends on a substantive idea of human nature or of the fully realized human. In Marx, **alienation appears** first and foremost not as a failure to live a certain way but **as a** kind of **pathological relationship to one’s own activity.** [Rahel Jaeggi (2014)](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-11) has recently argued for a reading of alienation as a kind of “relation of relationlessness.” On this reading, what is at stake is not a failure to realize any specific essence or core self but **a failure in the relationship of a subject to their own activity** in which activities appear unchosen: either as externally imposed or simply as natural and inevitable. This need not depend either on identifying a specific kind of human activity, or on the idea of a perfect recognition of all activity as one’s own—but merely the idea there is some activity that we could see as our own that we do not. While Jaeggi does not read Marx himself in these terms, it is possible to do so. Even in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, species being is represented not as some specific core of human activities but free, self-directed activity itself, strongly suggesting that the relationship to the (p. 369) activity was far more significant than the kind of activity. Moreover, Marx’s positive account of human nature generally appears as future oriented, often identified with the goal of Communist society itself (see [Ollman 1971](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12#oxfordhb-9780190695545-e-12-bibItem-23):111–120). In this sense, to the extent that Marx has an idea of essence or nature it can be seen as anticipatory, committed to the possibility that a richer relationship to our activity is possible without committing him to a particular (substantive or overdemanding) model of what this involved. Here, **alienation appears primarily as a negative concept**, as a failure; but **it does not** therefore **bring with it a** specific **positive alternative**. Alienation **thus describes an inhuman condition** but does not commit us to a narrow vision of the human condition. However, it does commit us to some claims about the human animal, namely that there exist certain pathological ways of relating to our own activity, that we are capable of recognizing them as such, and that these are connected to specific forms of organization of social life. These claims are controversial, but they are capable of scrutiny and analysis independent of the broader philosophical debates about essences and natures. Perhaps, then, it makes more sense to scrutinize these claims not purely as abstract philosophical ones but as empirical ones aimed at drawing links between specific social and psychological phenomena and capitalist relations of production. If these claims can be shown to contribute to an understanding of contemporary society and its condition, then it at least partially vindicates them.

### 2NC -- Racism

#### Capitalism causes racism

Iwelunmor, 22, Juliet Iewlunmor, Saint Louis University, Behavioral Science and Health Education, 5/14/2022, “Capitalism, not racism”, <https://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S0140-6736%2822%2900830-3> - FT

Richard Horton correctly states that, in efforts to construct a fairer world, “we need to undertake a more realistic and rigorous analysis of where power lies”. However, Horton’s Comment does not exhibit the required rigorous analysis. Citing the dubious work of Cheikh Anta Diop and Martin Bernal as authoritative commentary is precisely the type of shallow gesture that he correctly criticises as inadequate. Contrary to what Horton and Kehinde Andrews describe, the primary logic underpinning the western world order is not “that Black and Brown life is worth less”.¹ The primary logic of the world order is that profit is valued more than human needs. Although racist ideologies can and did acquire considerable autonomy, they developed in large part to justify rampant capitalist exploitation and imperialism. Racist ideologies are more than ideological superstructures, but they can only be understood fully in the context of the political economy of the world system. I declare no competing interests.. Decolonising global health: a Philippine perspective We read Richard Horton’s Offline1 with interest. We agree that “Medicine and global health continue to be entangled with colonial attitudes, structures, and practices.”1 That is, in systems of power. Horton concludes that “Decolonisation must mean much more.” We present perspectives from the Philippines. First, scientific journals, cooperative trial groups, and subspecialty governing bodies should make active efforts to include voices from low-income regions, which have substantial disparities in medical research. Labelling studies from these nations as global health simply maintains the western gaze.3 These voices need a seat at the table as equal contributors in advancing global health. Second, former (or current) colonial powers must acknowledge and act on past injustices and make amends. It is a little-known fact that the Philippines was a US colony (1898–1946) and that Manila was among the most devastated cities involved in World War 2. Genuine decolonisation of health would entail allocating resources to improve the health of people who are still impacted by the yoke of colonialism. Last, entities of power with genuine interest in decolonising global health should support and enable voices from communities—eg, patients, healthcare workers, and local researchers4 — and recognise that the genealogy of decolonisation includes scholars, such as José Rizal (1861–96), who have long sought to include local and indigenous voices in global academic discourse.5 Efforts should go beyond symbolic acts of inclusion that might only entrench the powers that be. Instead, it is imperative to empower—or pass power to—those they seek to serve. We declare no competing interests.

#### Capitalism fuels the division of races

**Gerrard 21** Gerrard, Education and Racial Capitalism, Jessica, The University of Melbourne, Chapter 2 - IShone

n his landmark text, Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition, Cedric Robinson ([2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)) traces how the processes of racialisation and capitalism are entwined. He states, ‘The historical development of world capitalism was influenced in a most fundamental way by the particularistic forces of racism and nationalism’ (Robinson [2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449), 9). ‘The tendency of European civilisation through capitalism’, Robinson ([2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449), 26) writes, was ‘not to homogenize but to differentiate – to exaggerate regional, subcultural and dialectical differences into ‘racial’ ones’. Robinson ([2000](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449), 27) argues that it was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that ‘race became largely the rationalization for the domination, exploitation, and/or extermination of non-“Europeans” (including Slavs and Jews)’. ‘Race’, then, is a part of capitalism’s requirement for categorical social divisions that can in turn support divisions in labour to create value; divisions which require subjugation from multiple axes – including notions of ‘ability’ and ‘capacity’ which have been central to education. As such, and as Jodi Melamed ([2015](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)) argues, the concept of racial capitalism ‘requires its users to recognise that capitalism is racial capitalism’. Melamed ([2015](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/13613324.2021.2001449)) goes on to explain: Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups—capitalists with the means of production/workers without the means of subsistence, creditors/debtors, conquerors of land made property/the dispossessed and removed. These antinomies of accumulation require loss, disposability, and the unequal differentiation of human value, and racism enshrines the inequalities that capitalism requires.

#### Capitalism’s framework is racist

**Gerrard 21,** Gerrard, Education and Racial Capitalism, The University of Melbourne, Chapter 2 - IShone

In the sections that follow, we put forward an analytic framework of racial capitalism that aims to extend its treatment within sociologies of education. Focusing on education in contexts of settler colonialism connected to British imperialism, our framing draws attention to three interrelated practices of education:

the practices of enclosing/dispossessing that stem from the capitalisation of Indigenous land, the containment of people and land, and the material construction of education systems and sites;

the practices of dividing labour that draw attention to how education rests upon racialised work in institutions and systems – cleaning, building, administration, teaching, caring, and so on; and

the extraction of value through education, whether through material infrastructures and commodities, hierarcised people and knowledge, or the outputs of education, including racial diversity itself.

These practices are both interdependent and accumulative: dividing labour relies upon the enclosure and dispossession of land and people, and the extraction of value occurs through divided labour. We suggest this three-fold framing provides a useful way to examine the role of education in the long history of capitalism and colonialism into the present. In addition to connecting contemporary analyses with histories of the racialising character of capitalism, these three practices offer important new directions for educational research. As we discuss below, an analytic focus on enclosing/dispossessing, dividing labour, and extraction of value brings much needed attention to aspects of educational practice that lie underneath the more common objects of educational research (e.g. curriculum, pedagogy, educational access, participation and outcomes, etc.). Racial capitalism orients educational research to a wider analysis to consider: the material bases of education on stolen land; the divisions in labour in the production of education; and the divisions in humanity that underpin the ‘value’ of education. While we gesture towards some examples below, we hope the conceptual framing we present can support sustained examinations of racial capitalism in future sociologies of education.

#### Communism reconstitutes class structure measured in different metrics, this is a paradox.

Lin 96, (林伟然, lin weiran was a PHD candidate at U of Wisconsin during his time of writing, this was his PHD thesis. 08/19/2022, “An Abortive Chinese Enlightenment - the cultural revolution and class theory, University of Wisconsin, Madison press, ["Lin, Weiran" : Catalog Search (2) - UW-Madison Libraries (wisc.edu)](https://search.library.wisc.edu/search/system/author?q=%22Lin%2C+Weiran%22))” - EM

What made "Origin Theory" so influential? In retrospect, Yu's article was a breakthrough on two crucial points. First, "Origin Theory" fully extended the condemnation of political injustice in the early stages of the Cultural Revolution to the condemnation of social inequality before the Cultural Revolution. Second, "Origin Theory" shattered an official myth by pointing out that before the Cultural Revolution it was not the people of "good” origins who were discriminated against, but rather it was those with "bad" family backgrounds who were subjected to the most discrimination. "The problem of family origins is a serious social problem of long standing," begins the article. It then pointed that it was the youth of black origins, not those of red origins who were subjected to discrimination before and during the Cultural Revolution due to the wrong class policy: Because of the influence of a reactionary line which is "left" in form but right in essence, they (youth of black origins) have often been unable to enjoy equal political treatment, particularly those youths from the so-called "seven black" origins, those "sons of bitches" who have already become objects of dictatorship. They are seen as "criminals" by birth. Under the influence of this line, family origins are used to decide nearly everything. Youths whose origins are not good are one cut below everybody, even to the point of being deprived of their rights to repudiate their families, to defend the Party center and Chairman Mao and to join the Red Guards. At this time, there are many innocent youths who are dying premature deaths, drowning in the deep waves of the "only origin theory." [That is, it overemphasizes family origin] In the face of this kind of serious problem, anyone who cares about the nation's fate cannot but confront and investigate the issue. Those view points which appear dispassionate and universally flexible are really callous and hypocritical. We must use the methods of unmasking and criticism to protect Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.451 However, at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution it was often argued that people of red origins were subjected to discrimination. "Origin Theory" directly confronted this artificial myth. It recalled: Remember the first stage of this movement. The problem of victimization was raised by some trendy individuals. . . Everybody was saying that they'd suffered at the hands of the revisionist clique. The revisionist clique was so reactionary that one could hardly count as a revolutionary if one had not only not been victimized but on the contrary had received favors from them. Thus even Tan Lifu said he'd been victimized. Economic victimization? During the period of hardship, he feasted on Dutch condensed milk. Political victimization? With a mind as reactionary as his, he still got into the Party. 452 The plain fact on the matter was, "Origin Theory" reminded its readers, If we think back to the period when the revisionist clique was in power, when university student enrollment was completed each year, the former Ministry of Higher Education always used to make a public announcement:

## Frontlines to External Impacts

### 2NC - AT: Cap Good - Innovation

#### **Innovation is simply a capitalist buzzword used to maintain the existing exploitative order.**

Leary ’19 [John Patrick Leary; high school teacher, author of Keywords: The New Language of Capitalism; 4-16-2019; The Innovation Cult; Jacobin; https://jacobin.com/2019/04/innovation-language-of-capitalism-ideology-disruption; 7-7-2022; SK]

The value of innovation is so widespread and so seemingly self-evident that questioning it might seem bizarre — like criticizing beauty, science, or penicillin, things that are, like innovation, treated as either abstract human values or socially useful things we can scarcely imagine doing without. And certainly, many things called innovations are, in fact, innovative in the strict sense: original processes or products that satisfy some human need.

A scholar can uncover archival evidence that transforms how we understand the meaning of a historical event; an automotive engineer can develop new industrial processes to make a car lighter; a corporate executive can extract additional value from his employees by automating production. These are all new ways of doing something, but they are very different somethings. Some require a combination of dogged persistence and interpretive imagination; others make use of mathematical and technical expertise; others, organizational vision and practical ruthlessness.

But innovation as it is used most often today comes with an implied sense of benevolence; we rarely talk of innovative credit-default swaps or innovative chemical weapons, but innovations they plainly are. The destructive skepticism of the false-prophet innovator has been redeemed as the profit-making insight of the technological visionary.

Innovation is most popular today as a stand-alone concept, a kind of managerial spirit that permeates nearly every institutional setting, from nonprofits and newspapers to schools and children’s toys. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines innovation as “the alteration of what is established by the introduction of new elements or forms.” The earliest example the dictionary gives dates from the mid-sixteenth century; the adjectival “innovative,” meanwhile, was virtually unknown before the 1960s, but has exploded in popularity since.

The verb “to innovate” has also seen a resurgence in recent years. The verb’s intransitive meaning is “to bring in or introduce novelties; to make changes in something established; to introduce innovations.” Its earlier transitive meaning, “To change (a thing) into something new; to alter; to renew” is considered obsolete by the OED, but this meaning has seen something of a revival. This was the active meaning associated with conspirators and heretics, who were innovating the word of God or innovating government, in the sense of undermining or overthrowing each.

The major conflict in innovation’s history is that between its formerly prohibited, religious connotation and the salutary, practical meaning that predominates now. Benoît Godin has shown that innovation was recuperated as a secular concept in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth, when it became a form of worldly praxis rather than theological reflection. Its grammar evolved along with this meaning. Instead of a discrete irruption in an established order, innovation as a mass noun became a visionary faculty that individuals could nurture and develop in practical ways in the world; it was also the process of applying this faculty (e.g., “Lenovo’s pursuit of innovation”).

Innovation as a count noun — that is, an innovation — was in turn the product of this process (e.g., “the new iPhone features innovations like a high-resolution camera”). But this new meaning evolved slowly. The concept’s old link to deceit and conspiracy shadowed its meaning into the twentieth century.

Joseph Schumpeter, who elaborated an influential theory of innovation three years before the debut of the Innovation tango in his 1911 book The Theory of Economic Development, treated it as both a process and a product, with no sense of the old conspiratorial connotation. Schumpeter used “innovation” to describe capitalism’s tendency toward tumult and transformation. Critical to his definition is the distinction Schumpeter makes between innovation as the refinement of a process or product, and invention, the creation of something entirely new.

While Schumpeter was suspicious of the mythology of the inventor, the innovator, a more complex figure, was fundamental to the process he was describing. He understood innovation historically, as a process of economic transformation, but for him this historical process relied upon a creative, private agent to carry it out. Schumpeter’s term for this agent was “the entrepreneur.” To innovate, Schumpeter wrote later, was to “revolutionise the pattern of production by exploiting an invention or, more generally, an untried technological possibility for producing a new commodity.”

In the second decade of the twentieth century, the word began to appear regularly in brand names and advertisements (and short-lived dance crazes) in its now familiar form: as a new, improved product or process. One of the first major products to be advertised as an innovation was the Innovation wardrobe trunk, which Gimbel’s department store offered in 1915 to appeal to customers’ desires for the chimera of the new. (The trunks, the innovative features of which seem to have been their durability and “roomy construction,” were so popular that an “innovation trunk” became a generic name for any trunk, like “Kleenex” is for tissues.)

Although innovation has been thoroughly rehabilitated and purged of subversion, it retains its old accent of individual prophetic vision, the talent of those who, as Hobbes said of “innovators” in 1651, “suppose themselves wiser than others.” It is not that innovation has lost its old moral connotation; instead, it has reversed. What we once regarded as deviant and deceitful is now praised as visionary.

In a 2011 reflection on the late Apple computer executive Steve Jobs, probably the archetypal hero-innovator of our time, a San Francisco Chronicle author praised his “constant desire to innovate and take chances.” Here, the verb is used intransitively, in the more modern sense — that is, there is no direct object — but it lacks even the faintest hint of a reference. Jobs is no longer innovating on or upon anything in particular, which can make “innovate” sound like a kind of mantra. “If you don’t innovate every day and have a great understanding of your customers,” a Denver processed cheese executive told the Denver Post in 2010, “then you don’t grow.” And when the author of a Wall Street Journal obituary for Jobs writes that the Apple executive was a “secular prophet” who made innovation “a perfectly secular form of hope,” it is apparent that the term has never really lost its old association with prophecy.

Other than mystifying creativity itself — which now looks more like an intuitive blast of inspiration, like an epiphany, and less like work — “innovation” gives creativity a specific professional, class dimension. It is almost always applied to white-collar and profit-seeking activities, although its increasing popularity in educational contexts only reflects the creeping influence of market-based models in this field. Quality organizations are supposed to cultivate it in their employees by giving them the freedom to work independently and creatively. Rarely do we hear of the innovative carpenter, plumber, or homemaker, in spite of the imagination, improvisation, and managerial skills required of each.

Business publications issue rankings of the “most innovative countries in the world,” a curious usage that describes a) a capacity constrained by national borders, as if creativity dissipates or increases when one leaves passport control; and at the same time b) an intrinsic human talent unconstrained by fields, industries, or media.

Another example of the term’s increasing mystification is the acceptability of the tautological construction “to innovate innovation.” “Who’s the Best at Innovating Innovation?” asks the Harvard Business Review; the same publication sponsors a lucrative prize called the “Innovating Innovation Challenge.” One can “innovate” without having to act upon any process or idea other than the act of innovation itself. One simply innovates in circles, forever.

Innovation is an example of the ways in which the production and circulation of commodities becomes imbued with fantastic and even theological properties detached from the labor that produces them, or in the case of many common uses of the verb “to innovate,” detached from any object. So when liberal politicians promote an “innovation agenda” that includes student debt forgiveness for “startup founders,” as Hillary Clinton did during her 2016 presidential campaign, it is unclear how this differs from any other form of corporate welfare. And when conservative politicians or CEOs lament how labor unions or public regulation of the private sector “impede innovation,” we can recognize this as both a ludicrous obfuscation but also another example of the bourgeois contempt for labor.

Innovation is thus a theological concept which became a theory of commodity production and which has lately become a commodity itself. The innovator, meanwhile, has always been identified with novelty and visionary charisma. But where the innovator’s visions were once widely feared as venal and destructive, now innovation is understood as the refinement of a technical process, in which creativity is turned to profit.

But as the mythic figure of Jobs makes clear, rather than replacing prophecy with procedure, modern celebrations of innovation supplement each with the other. From the business world to education and politics, innovation is simultaneously spiritual and technological, both an individual’s reaction against bureaucratic malaise and the spirit of anti-orthodox creativity to be cultivated by the same bureaucracy. Innovation, therefore, is a strangely contradictory concept, simultaneously grandiose and modest, saccharine and pessimistic.

The prophetic meaning embedded deep in its history allows innovation to stand in for nearly any kind of positive transformation, doing for the twenty-first century what “progress” once did for the nineteenth and twentieth. In the United States, innovation also suggests a high-tech update to the myth of “Yankee ingenuity” or “know-how” — the spirit of mechanical cleverness and entrepreneurial energy once associated with New England’s artisan class. Like the mythical inventors of the American industrial age — Alexander Graham Bell and Thomas Edison tinkering in their workshops — the innovator is a model capitalist citizen for our times.

But the object of most innovations today is more elusive: you can touch a telephone or a phonograph, but who can lay hands on an Amazon algorithm, a credit-default swap, a piece of proprietary Uber code, or an international free trade agreement? As an intangible, individualistic, yet strictly white-collar trait, innovation reframes the cruel fortunes of an unequal global economy as the logical products of a creative, visionary brilliance. In this new guise, the innovator retains both a touch of the prophet and a hint of the confidence man.

#### Capitalism undermines the goal for which technology and science is used

Pillay ’18 [Devan; 2018; Former trade unionist, Associate Professor and Former Head in Sociology, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, Co-editor of Labour and the Challenges of Globalization; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “CHALLENGING THE GROWTH PARADIGM: MARX, BUDDHA AND THE PURSUIT OF ‘HAPPINESS’,” Ch. 7, p. 152] SPark

In other words, science, technology and democratic freedoms can be decoupled from free-market capitalism – indeed, the self-regulated market undermines their essence. When scientific investigations are primarily geared towards market outcomes (i.e. the profit motive), it obscures their intrinsic value and compromises social priorities. As the state withdraws from public education, industry is increasingly engaged in funding university research, thus undermining its independence. A good example is the pharmaceutical industry, which invests heavily in cures for diseases of the rich, such as Viagra or weight loss, and much less for diseases of the poor, such as tuberculosis. There have been massive strides in private fossil fuel-based motor vehicle innovation, but much less in cost-effective public transport based on renewable energy. Investment in socially owned renewal energy innovation has not matched investments in fossil fuel energy systems, or nuclear power (although strides have been made by China and some north European countries in recent years). Democratic participation is undermined by the power of money, including the ownership and control of mass media, which ensures that the power elites control the political sphere.10

#### Capitalism destroys innovation – abuses the hard work of workers. Progress cannot be made until the abandoning of capitalism

Celine Qin 21 [Teen Convo Project, 7-5-2021, "Capitalism Does Not Breed Innovation. It Destroys It.," Medium, https://theteenconvoproject.medium.com/capitalism-does-not-breed-innovation-it-destroys-it-12211c2dd573, smarx, HHW]

This is a common argument. “Capitalism breeds innovation!” “There have been so many technological advancements under capitalism!” This idea better suits the era of late to post-feudalism, where the emergence of capitalism allowed the growth of newer ideas and industrial advancements, though the situation is different for life in late capitalism.

While it is true that the capitalist system has curated the technology or devices we know today such as iPhone or various social medias, it would unveil a deeper and more complex analysis of this sort of innovation if we considered the component of human labor. The products we are familiar with were not created by businessmen and capitalists, but by **overworked and underpaid laboring bodies.**

Furthermore, if we look at the most common examples of commodities of global food, technology, social network, fashion, cosmetic, familyware, and other corporations, we begin to realize that innovation under capitalism was never the innovation created by the freedom of creativity or originality, but rather the “innovation” of repetition, of marketing and mass producing whatever is in demand, galloping after an endless cycle of finding newer and bigger ways to stockpile profit, at the **expense of devouring the planet and stealing from the working class.**

“Capitalism means production, getting rich, and prosperity!” is a fashionable argument. It masquerades through the assumption that the rate in which the wealth multiplies and accumulates in the hands of so few is equivalent to the conditions of the common people, as if to say, “The economy is doing splendid! Look how much money these ten or so white men that I adore for no reason have in their hands and how charismatically they exploit, extort, appropriate from workers and the poor, the Global South, cultures, colonial subjects, and the environment! They are helping society so much! This is exactly the very essential image of success and we should all fight each other to reach this destination we all so definitely and certainly will achieve!”

In reality, the massive accumulation of wealth by the upper ruling oligarchs depends on impoverishing the many exploited. In the same light, “innovation” under capitalism is not some grand motivation stimulated by friendly competition, but rather **greed**. What is authentically creative and original is excluded from the free market formula.

**Life loses its flavor**. Humans, who naturally breed creativity and are proven to prosper working together with the motivation of bettering society (instead of in oppressive class society controlled by the wealthy elite, go figure!), become controlled under the capitalist system. We exploit ourselves through mundane routines and oppressive work. The people’s desire to accomplish the capitalist image of success (climbing the corporate ladder, owning staggering amounts of capital, and achieving as much of a bourgeois lifestyle as possible while stepping on the backs of the poor) destroys our interpretation of the words “freedom” and “innovation.”

The debate around innovation sparks the question of whether or not rapid innovation is truly necessary. Would it be necessary, given that the incentive for profit, the supply and demand market, and the very need to compete for the sake of capital accumulation are all abolished, to have the degree of “innovation” as it is defined, 1500 brands of the same type of cereal?

As this type of capitalist “innovation” is provoked by nothing other than profit, this uncreative and unoriginal transnational trope would no longer need to exist if there was no such competition and no longer such as system that depends on the uneven distribution and hoarding of wealth and the destruction of equality.

Instead, it is not until achieving an egalitarian society, one in which the human race is no longer driven to climb the corporate ladder over the bodies of the impoverished, no longer controlled by Big Capital and wage labor, and no longer marginalized by class hierarchy, humans can be free to express creativity and work towards helping one another, cultivating a better world.

Universal access to resources, collective ownership, and collective work would benefit all. What is created and enjoyed by human hands would no longer have to serve as items that are “profitable” or “unprofitable”, or better put, “exploitable” or “unexploitable.”

#### AI development causes capitalist exploitation of AI tech

Calum, 16, Chase Calum, Macquarie University wrote numerous scholarly articles, 7/18/2016, “The Economic Singularity: Artificial Intelligence and the Death of Capitalism”, <https://onwork.edu.au/bibitem/2016-Chace,Calum-> The+Economic+Singularity+Artificial+Intelligence+and+the+Death+of+Capitalism/ - FT

"Read The Economic Singularity if you want to think intelligently about the future."Aubrey de GreyArtificial intelligence (AI) is overtaking our human ability to absorb and process information. Robots are becoming increasingly dextrous, flexible, and safe to be around (except the military ones). It is our most powerful technology, and you need to understand it. This new book from best-selling AI writer Calum Chace argues that within a few decades, most humans will not be able to work for money. Self-driving cars will probably be the canary in the coal mine, providing a wake-up call for everyone who isn't yet paying attention. All jobs will be affected, from fast food McJobs to lawyers and journalists. This is the single most important development facing humanity in the first half of the 21st century.The fashionable belief that Universal Basic Income is the solution is only partly correct. We are probably going to need an entirely new economic system, and we better start planning soon - for the Economic Singularity! The outcome can be very good - a world in which machines do all the boring jobs and humans do pretty much what they please. But there are major risks, which we can only avoid by being alert to the possible futures and planning how to avoid the negative ones.ENDORSEMENTS"The advance of automation, described with great care and accuracy in this book, will almost certainly constitute the substrate within which all other technological developments - be they biomedical, environmental or something else entirely - will occur, and thus within which they should be discussed as regards their value to humanity. Read "The Economic Singularity" if you want to think intelligently about the future."Aubrey de Grey - CSO of SENS Research Foundation; former AI researcher"Following his insightful foray into the burgeoning AI revolution and associated existential risks in Surviving AI, Calum focuses his attention on a nearer term challenge - the likelihood that intelligent machines will render much of humanity unemployable in the foreseeable future. Once again he proves a reliable guide through this complex yet fascinating topic."Ben Medlock, co-founder of Swiftkey, the best-selling app on Android"Calum Chace is an acknowledged expert on the likely impact of artificial intelligence on society. In his new book, he investigates the possibility that machine intelligence will, over the coming few decades, make it impossible for most people to find paid work. He arrives at some surprising and radical conclusions, which merit careful consideration."Hugh Pym, former chief economics correspondent, BBC News"The Economic Singularity is fascinating. I couldn't put this book down."Ben Goldsmith - Menhaden Capital"Chace does a good job answering the question whether robots will take our jobs."Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis - former director of the Artificial Brain Lab, Xiamen University, China"This fast-paced new book explains the challenge facing humanity: to navigate through a dramatic transition which he christens the economic singularity. Unexpectedly, it threatens the end of capitalism itself, and potentially the fracturing of the human species."David Wood - chairman, London Futurists"Unprecedented productivity gains and unlimited leisure-what could possibly go wrong? Everything, says Calum Chace, if we don't evolve a social system suited to the inevitable world of connected intelligent systems."Christopher Meyer, author of "Blur", "Future Wealth", and "Standing on the Sun""It's important that this book and others like it are written. Not because the future will necessarily happen exactly in the way described, but because it's important to be prepared if it does."Dr Stuart Armstrong, James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University

#### Capitalism isn’t sustainable and tech CAN’T solve that

Conor **Payne and** Chris **Stewart**, authors for MR online who talk against capitalism, Irish socialist party leaders, 2-7-2022, accessed on 6-17-2022, MR Online, "The end of growth? The capitalist economy & ecological crisis,” MR Online, <https://mronline.org/2022/02/07/the-end-of-growth/)-> FT

Karl Marx said that under capitalism: “Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole.”[2] This sums up the capitalist economy today. At the same time, of course, workers are still liable to pay the price when the system goes into recession. The reality is that at no stage in its cycle of boom and bust, does the capitalist economy operate in the interests of the working class. Conor While economic growth undoubtedly drives carbon emissions and all forms of environmental destruction, contraction on a capitalist basis does not deliver an equivalent let up in environmental intensity. According to one study, examining 150 countries over the period of 1960-2008, a 1% increase in GDP meant on average a 0.73% increase in carbon emissions, while a 1% decline in GDP meant only a 0.4% decrease in carbon emissions.[3] This is because the environmentally inefficient goods and infrastructure created during a boom generally continue in use during a downturn. Less consumption in itself can never deliver the necessary reduction in carbon emissions. Instead we need a fundamental change in how we produce. This means that without a planned transition to a sustainable means of life the tendency will be for ever increasing emissions. So the debate about growth and degrowth is useless unless linked to the need to bring an end to the chaos of the capitalist market. The purpose of the capitalist economy is to deliver increased profit for the bosses. The purpose of the economy under socialism would be to fulfill human need in a sustainable way. This means taking the key sectors of the economy out of the hands of big business and bringing them into public ownership, under democratic control. This means we can reorganize the energy industry, transport, agribusiness and production overall on a planned basis, in the interests of both people and the planet. Socialists want a better life for the vast majority on this earth. We know many, even in the richer countries, are in poverty or barely keeping their heads above water, do not have access to decent housing or healthcare, or have no economic security for the future. We believe this to be completely unjustifiable in a world of incredible abundance. For this reason, we reject attacks on working-class living standards, even those that are introduced with an environmental veneer, e.g. water charges, or carbon taxes. The vast majority of the world’s population is responsible for very little in terms of carbon emissions. A recent UN report shows that globally the top 1% of earners are responsible for a yearly per capita average of 74 tons of C02 per year. Meanwhile for the bottom 50% of earners the figure is 0.7 tons.[4] In much of the world a socialist system would need to increase production on a sustainable basis and redistribute wealth. Even in the wealthier capitalist countries many sectors that are not prioritized for capitalist investment would need to be expanded under a socialist system, not reduced–healthcare, housing, renewable energy for a start. At the same time, capitalist production involves enormous waste. We should not underestimate the extent of this: As we can see, the mountains of waste produced under capitalism are not a product mainly of the demands of consumers, but instead serve the needs of capitalist profiteering. The structure of capitalist society itself also partly conditions our consumer needs. Those who don’t live near reliable public transport “need” to buy cars, people on low incomes will “choose” to buy fast fashion etc. To create more and more products that aren’t needed or will be sent rapidly to landfill, or to generate more and more artificial demand is all “growth” in capitalist terms, but it isn’t human progress. A democratic, planned economy could do “more with less” as part of a planned ecological transition–retooling useless or destructive industries, eliminating duplication, overproduction and planned obsolescence, focusing on fulfilling needs not generating artificial wants and transforming agriculture, transport and energy production on a sustainable basis. In such a system whole industries, communities and cities would be planned democratically and on a completely different basis, putting an end to capitalist overproduction and waste and allowing for a more rational allocation of resources. Some argue that a simple transition to renewable energy will solve the ecological problems we face. This transition is both necessary and possible, but won’t be done under capitalism that will extract every source of fossil fuels down to the last, so long as there is profit to be made from them. But even if this were achieved, we would still face a range of looming ecological catastrophes. The fact is that capitalism is already exceeding a number of planetary boundaries for safeguarding a safe environment for human civilization on earth. These include species extinction, soil degradation and deforestation, to name only a few. Their common source is the increasing scale and intensity of humanity’s incursions into nature, which are now undermining the basis of our own existence on the planet. Nor will technological changes alone solve the problem of a sustainable relationship with nature. Under capitalism, the opposite is the case: while technological changes result in the more efficient use of energy, this then creates the basis for further expansion and so paradoxically technological development often results in a net increase in the amount of energy used.[10] While technology may alter to some degree what the limits are, we have to accept the reality that “you can’t have infinite growth on a finite planet”. Capitalism means an increasingly destructive and frantic search for resources that can be extracted and land which can be developed, with the benefits of this activity more and more concentrated in the hands of the few. Socialist planning can ensure the rational development of the quality of our lives without increasing environmental intensity. Only on this basis can we restructure our society around need, not profit, creating countless socially necessary jobs in pursuit of building a sustainable system. Socialists stand for massive investment in low carbon jobs and sustainable infrastructure, as well as the introduction of a four-day work-week with no loss of pay. This would not only solve the problem of permanent unemployment under capitalism by distributing work to all those who need it, but would also free workers up to participate in political and economic decision-making, and would achieve a better balance between work, our social lives and leisure. This will still pose complex questions about how products, industries and practices can be maintained, but these are best resolved on the basis of democratic discussion in a society founded on equality and solidarity.

#### Capitalism stifles innovation

Smith, 20, Tony Smith, Tony Smith is a professor of philosophy at Iowa State University and the author of Technology and Capital in the Age of Lean Production, 8/30/2022, “How Capitalism Stifles Innovation”, <https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/08/how-capitalism-stifles-innovation> - FT

The technological dynamism of capitalism has always been a powerful argument in its defence. But one of its secrets is that at the heart of this change we find neither bold entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, nor established firms. Investments pushing the frontiers of scientific knowledge are just too risky. The advances sought may not be forthcoming. Those that do occur may not ever be commercially viable. Any potentially profitable results that do arise may take decades to make any money. And when they finally do, there are no guarantees initial investors will appropriate most of the resulting windfall. There is, accordingly, a powerful tendency for private capital to systematically underinvest in long-term research and development. Despite popular perceptions that private entrepreneurs drive technological innovation, the leading regions of the global economy do not leave the most important stages of technological change to private investors. These costs are socialised. In the quarter-century after World War II, the high profits garnered by American corporations due to their exceptional place in the world market allowed corporate labs to engage in “[blue-skies research](http://scienceogram.org/in-depth/blue-skies-research/)” projects. But even then, public funding accounted for roughly two-thirds of all research and development expenditures in the United States, creating the foundations for the high-tech sectors of today. With the rise of competition from Japanese and European capital in the 1970s, private-sector funding of research and development increased. However, long-term projects were almost entirely abandoned in favor of product development and applied-research projects promising commercial advantages in the short-to-medium term. Basic research continued to be funded by the government, like the work in molecular biology that supported the move of agribusiness companies into biotechnology. The same was true for projects of special interest to the Pentagon — the developments associated with the [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency](http://www.darpa.mil/our_work/), for instance, which paved the way for modern global positioning systems — and other government agencies. But medium-to-long-term R&D in general was in great danger of falling into a “valley of death” between basic research and immediate development, with neither the government nor private capital providing significant funding for it. For all their rhetoric touting the “magic of the marketplace,” those in the Reagan administration recognised market failure when they saw it. They began to offer federal and publicly funded university laboratories various carrots and sticks to undertake long-term R&D for US capital. New programs were created to provide start-ups with resources to develop innovations prior to the “proof of concept” required by venture capitalists. Under Reagan, the [Small Business Innovation Development Act](https://www.sba.gov/offices/headquarters/oca/resources/6827) even mandated that federal agencies set aside a percentage of their R&D budget to fund research by small firms. These and other forms of public-private partnership have granted US capital enormous competitive advantages in the world market. It’s no surprise that Apple’s tremendously successful line of products — iPads, iPhones, and iPods — incorporate twelve key innovations. All twelve (central processing units, dynamic random-access memory, hard-drive disks, liquid-crystal displays, batteries, digital single processing, the Internet, the HTTP and HTML languages, cellular networks, GPS system, and voice-user AI programs) were developed by publicly funded research and development projects. It hasn’t been the dynamics of the market so much as active state intervention that has fueled technological change.

#### Technology harms society - unemployment, inequality, misery, and the loss of intellectual property are its results

Smith, 20, Tony Smith, Tony Smith is a professor of philosophy at Iowa State University and the author of Technology and Capital in the Age of Lean Production, 8/30/2022, “How Capitalism Stifles Innovation”, <https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/08/how-capitalism-stifles-innovation> - FT

Technology is more than just a weapon for inter-capitalist competition; it is a weapon in struggles between capital and labour. Technological changes that create unemployment, de-skill the workforce, and enable one sector of the workforce to be played against another shift the balance of power in capital’s favor. Given this asymmetry, advances in productivity that could reduce work time while expanding real wages lead instead to forced layoffs, increasing stress for those still employed and eroding real wages. Two ongoing technological developments further strengthen the power of capital. Advances in transportation and communication now enable production and distribution chains to be extended across the globe, allowing capital to implement “divide and conquer” strategies against labour to an unprecedented extent. Astounding new labour-saving machines are also becoming more and more inexpensive. An exhaustive study of over seven hundred occupations [concluded](https://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2014/08/18/robots-may-disrupt-half-of-all-us-jobs) that no less than 47 percent of employment in the United States is at high risk of being automated within two decades. Anything approaching this level of labour displacement will yield more misery, not progress, for ordinary workers. But the lower cost and higher capacities of machines have also led to change of a better sort. As the prices of computer hardware, software, and Internet connections have declined, many people can now create new “knowledge products” without working for big capitalists. Multitudes across the globe now freely choose to contribute to collective innovation projects of interest to them, outside the relationship of capital and wage labour. The resulting products can now be distributed as unlimited free goods to anyone who wishes to use them, rather than being scarce commodities sold for profit. It is beyond dispute that this new form of social labour has generated innovations superior in quality and scale to the output of capitalist firms. These innovations also tend to be qualitatively different. While technological developments in capitalism primarily address the wants and needs of those with disposable income, open-source projects can mobilise creative energies to address areas capital systematically neglects, such as [developing seeds](http://www.scidev.net/global/agriculture/news/open-source-seed-released-to-nurture-patent-free-food.html) for poor farmers or medicines for those without the money to buy existing medications. The potential of this new form of collective social labour to address pressing social needs across the globe is historically unprecedented. In order to flourish, however, open-source innovation requires free access to existing knowledge goods. Leading capital firms, hoping to extend their ability to privately profit from publicly supported research, have used their immense political power to extend the intellectual property rights regime in scope and enforcement, severely restricting the access open-source projects require. [Copyright](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2013/09/property-and-theft/), after all, was extended for twenty years at the turn of the century, just as internet access was starting to balloon. Despite these barriers, the success of open-source projects shows that intellectual-property rights are not required for innovation. Further evidence is provided by the fact that most scientific and technological workers engaged in innovation are forced to sign away intellectual property rights as a condition of employment. These rights actually hamper advancement by raising the cost of engaging in the production of new knowledge, and by diverting funds to unproductive legal costs.

#### Capitalism actively prevents development of new tech

Smith, 20, Tony Smith, Tony Smith is a professor of philosophy at Iowa State University and the author of Technology and Capital in the Age of Lean Production, 8/30/2022, “How Capitalism Stifles Innovation”, <https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/08/how-capitalism-stifles-innovation> - FT

The destructive effects examined above are not necessary features of technological change; they are necessary features of technological change in capitalism. Overcoming them requires overcoming capitalism, even if we only have a provisional sense of what that might mean. The pernicious tendencies associated with technological change in capitalist workplaces are rooted in a structure where managers are agents of the owners of the firm’s assets, with a fiduciary duty to further their private interests. But a society’s means of production are not goods for personal consumption, like a toothbrush. The material reproduction of society is an inherently public matter, as the technological development of capitalism itself, resting on public funds, confirms. Capital markets, where private claims to productive resources are bought and sold, treat public power as if it were just another item for personal use. They can, and should, be totally done away with. Large-scale productive enterprises should instead be acknowledged as a distinct type of public property, and exercises of authority within these workplaces as acts of public authority. The principle of democracy must then come into play: all exercises of this authority must be subject to the consent of those impacted by it. Though additional regulations would be needed if managers were elected and subject to recall by the workforce as a whole, technological advances in productivity would not typically result in the involuntary unemployment of some and the overwork of others, but rather in reduced work for all. We know this because workers say they want more time to spend with their families and friends, or on projects of their own choosing. With [democracy in the workplace](http://www.solidarityeconomy.net/2006/08/29/after-capitalism-economic-democracy-an-interview-with-david-schweickart/), the drive to introduce de-skilling technologies would be replaced with a search for ways to make work more interesting and creative. Suppose that decisions regarding the general level of new investment were also a matter for public debate, eventually decided by a democratic body. If there were pressing social needs, the overall rate of new investment could be increased; if this were not the case, it could be stabilised. These bodies could then set aside a portion of new investment funds to provide public goods free of charge, putting more useful goods and services outside the market’s reach. The public goods of scientific and technological knowledge resulting from basic research and long-term R&D would be decommodified, too, as would the fruits of open-source innovation. The latter could be unleashed by abolishing intellectual property rights and by providing an adequate [basic income](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2013/05/curious-utopias/) to all — enabling anyone who wished to participate in open-source projects to do so. If special incentives were required, generous prizes could be awarded to the first to solve important challenges. Remaining funds could then be distributed to other elected bodies at various geographical levels, each of which would determine what share would go to public goods in a region. The remainder would be distributed to local community banks charged with allocating them to worker enterprises. Various qualitative and quantitative measures could be employed to measure the extent to which those enterprises used technologies to meet social wants and needs effectively, with the results determining the income beyond the basic level received by their members (and the members of the community banks that allocated investment funds to them). Abolishing intellectual property rights would have the added benefit of ensuring that wealthy regions could not use technological knowledge as a weapon to create and reproduce inequality in the global economy. This danger would be all but eliminated if every region were granted a fundamental right to its per capita share of new investment funds. Finally, if workplaces used productivity advances to free up time for their workers rather than to increase the output of commodities, resources would be depleted and waste generated at a much lower rate. Abolishing capital markets and replacing them with democratic control over levels of new investment would free humanity from the “grow or die” imperative and the environmental consequences that follow from it. If enterprises were acknowledged as inherently matters of public concern, it would eliminate the obscene absurdity of having the fate of humanity rest on whether profit-driven oil companies have the political and cultural power to extract and sell an estimated $20 trillion of fossil-fuel reserves, as they clearly plan to do. If open-source innovation flourished, the creative energies of collective social labour across the planet could be mobilised to address environmental challenges. If poor regions with fragile ecologies were guaranteed their fair share of new investment funds, the pressure to sacrifice long-term sustainability for the sake of short-term growth would be overcome. Of course, all of these proposals are vague and provisional. Nonetheless, they show that the social consequences of technological change could be far different than they are today. We do not need private ownership of productive assets, or markets devoted to financial assets, to have a technologically dynamic society. With the necessary political shifts, technological change would no longer be associated with overaccumulation, financial crises, the stifling of open-source innovation, severe global inequality, or the increasingly palpable threat of environmental catastrophe. We need to unleash the full potential of human ingenuity. The way technology advances is already socialised in important, if restricted and inadequate ways. We can finish the job and make sure that its fruits are put to the benefit of ordinary people.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - Innovation - Green Cap

#### Green capitalism fails

**T**rotskyist **F**raction, 20**19** (“Capitalism Is Destroying the Planet – Let’s Destroy Capitalism!” September 15, 2019. <https://www.leftvoice.org/capitalism-is-destroying-the-planet-lets-destroy-capitalism/> /// MF)

Climate Denialism and “Green Capitalism”: Two Sides of the Same Coin

Faced with the catastrophic scenario that global warming entails, the powers of international capitalism waver between two strategies: On the one hand, there is a campaign to deny scientific evidence as a supposed ideology; on the other, there is a strategy to promote “green” or “sustainable” capitalism. Green capitalism defends farcical international agreements and proposes partial and limited changes to productive systems, while strengthening the model of capitalist accumulation and exploitation.

Among the climate denialists are Trump, the Republican Party and the Tea Party in the United States, Bolsonaro in Brazil, and a small minority of scientists. But its driving force is the multinational corporations that bear the greatest responsibility for emitting greenhouse gases that cause climate change. Yet while they are sponsoring climate denial campaigns, these large capitalist corporations are completely aware of the consequences of climate change and its socio-political effects, and they are preparing to respond to its implications in the fields of security and foreign policy. The most concentrated sectors of capital are proposing militarization as an instrument to adapt to climate change: more private armies and security forces that will eventually be able to defend the islands of prosperity in oceans of misery and decay.

On the other side is green capitalism, promoted by the U.S. Democratic Party, political leaders of the main European countries including Angela Merkel, Emmanuel Macron and Pedro Sánchez, and various green parties. This list includes many booming capitalist corporations, international organizations and even environmental NGOs. This is an exercise in synergy between neoliberalism and the “green economy.” They speak out against global warming and agree, in expensive climate summits, on environmental measures and big targets for emission reduction. In all cases, these have been nothing more than diplomatic documents without practical implications.

At the same time, they talk about fixing the environment. This would include limiting the production of toxic substances and the destruction of natural resources, while simultaneously developing new “gentle” technologies. They argue that this would be a new source of economic growth, since the capitalist corporations would extract hefty profits.

The Green Party in Germany, for example, proposes “saving the German economy” with measures for an ecological transition, while supporting the militarization of German imperialism (they called for intervention in the conflict with Iran under European leadership). This is a policy of “green imperialism” to solve the crisis of German capitalism.

One of the most recent measures of this kind, pushed forward by the Merkel government and the Green Party in Germany, but increasingly adopted by other governments and environmental groups, seeks to implement a tax on CO2 emissions. This would tax consumption of meat, gasoline and flights to finance the ecological transition of industry. This kind of tax would lead to a rise in prices and weaken the purchasing power of the working class, but it would not have a serious effect on emissions. In short, the neoliberal strategy of green capitalism ends up being a sort of light denialism.

Capitalism’s very essence is the expansion of profit and accumulation at any cost, even if this includes the material destruction of the planet. As China and the United States, together with the European Union, are producing most of the greenhouse gases that are annihilating the troposphere, and the capitalists waver between denial and powerless summits to manage the environmental crisis, the rest of the world continues to suffer the effects of climate change.

That is why green capitalism is a pipe dream. It claims to effectively eliminate the causes of the global environmental catastrophe that threatens us and promote a sustainable development of humanity and the species that populate the planet. But it can do no such thing. The solution to the global climate crisis cannot emerge from the system that created it.

There are a large number of environmental groups and NGOs in this field, including the IUCN, WWF, and even Greenpeace, that work together with the evangelists of capitalist ecological efficiency: oil companies like Shell and Exxon, mining corporations like Barrick Gold and huge behemoths like Walmart, Cargill and Monsanto. In this way, they provide a “green” cover for the plunder of natural resources all over the planet.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - War

#### Capitalism paves the path for proliferation and war

**Robinson, 22** William Robinson, PhD, 1-6-2022, Truthout, "Global Capitalism Has Become Dependent on War-Making to Sustain Itself", <https://truthout.org/articles/global-capitalism-has-become-dependent-on-war-making-to-sustain-itself/)-> FT

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has sparked fierce political debate on the geopolitical consequences of the conflict. But less noticed and equally as important, the war has paved the way for a more sweeping militarization of what was already a global war economy mired in deep political and economic crisis. Geopolitical tensions and international conflicts may be tragic for those caught up in conflagrations such as in Ukraine — but advantageous for those seeking to legitimize expanding military and security budgets and open up new opportunities for capitalist profit-making in the face of chronic stagnation and social discontent. In late March, the Biden administration, citing the Russian invasion, called for a $31 billion increase in the Pentagon budget over the previous year and on top of an emergency appropriation weeks earlier of $14 billion for Ukraine’s defense. Prior to the invasion, in late 2021, the U.S. government approved a nearly $800 billion military budget, even as, in the same year, it ended the war in Afghanistan. Almost overnight following the Russian invasion, the U.S., European Union, and other governments around the world allocated billions of dollars in additional military spending and sent streams of military hardware and private military contractors into Ukraine. Shares of military and security firms surged in the wake of the invasion. Two weeks into the conflict, shares of Raytheon were up 8 percent, General Dynamics up 12 percent, Lockheed Martin up 18 percent and Northrop Grumman up 22 percent, while war stocks in Europe, India, and elsewhere experienced similar surges in expectation of an exponential rise in global military spending. Russian President Vladimir Putin, in the words of the managing director of AeroDynamic Advisory, a Pentagon contractor, is “unquestionably the best F-35 salesman of all time,” in reference to a spike in U.S. government funding for the Lockheed Martin jet fighter. Said one consultant to Boeing, General Dynamics, Lockheed Martin and Raytheon Technologies: “For the defense industry, happy days are here again. When the defense budget rises it tends to lift all boats in the industry.” The Russian invasion — brutal, reckless and condemnable by any standard — has sparked debate on NATO’s proposed expansion into Ukraine and the role that it played in motivating the Kremlin. U.S. officials were keenly aware, in fact, that the drive to expand NATO to Russian borders would eventually push Moscow into a military conflict. “We examine a wide range of nonviolent measures that could exploit Russia’s actual vulnerabilities and anxieties as a way of stressing Russia’s military and economy and the regime’s political standing at home and abroad,” notes a 2019 study by the RAND Corporation, a Pentagon-affiliated think tank. “The steps we examine would not have either defense or deterrence as their prime purpose,” it states, but rather, “these steps are conceived of as elements in a campaign designed to unbalance the adversary, leading Russia to compete in domains or regions where the United States has a competitive advantage, and causing Russia to overextend itself militarily or economically.” But the provocation could not be reduced to geopolitical competition, however important, as most observers were keen to do. Missing from the larger picture was the centrality of militarized accumulation — of endless low- and high-intensity warfare, simmering conflicts, civil strife and policing — to the global political economy. Militarized accumulation refers to a situation in which a global war economy relies on the state to organize war-making, social control and repression to sustain capital accumulation in the face of chronic stagnation and saturation of global markets. These state-organized practices are outsourced to transnational corporate capital, involving the fusion of private accumulation with state militarization in order to sustain the process of capital accumulation. Cycles of destruction and reconstruction provide ongoing outlets for over-accumulated capital; that is, these cycles open up new profit-making opportunities for transnational capitalists seeking ongoing opportunities to profitably reinvest the enormous amounts of cash they have accumulated. There is a convergence in this process of global capitalism’s political need for social control and repression in the face of mounting popular discontent worldwide and its economic need to perpetuate accumulation in the face of stagnation. Wars provide critical economic stimulus. They have historically pulled the capitalist system out of accumulation crises while they serve to deflect attention from political tensions and problems of legitimacy. It took World War II to finally lift world capitalism out of the Great Depression. The Cold War legitimated a half century of expanding military budgets and the Iraq/Afghanistan wars, the longest in history, helped keep the economy sputtering along in the face of chronic stagnation in the first two decades of the century. From the anti-Communist fervor of the Cold War, to the “war on terror,” then the so-called New Cold War, and now the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the transnational elite, led by Washington, have had to conjure up one enemy after another to legitimate militarized accumulation and deflect crises of state legitimacy and capitalist hegemony onto external enemies and contrived threats. The events of September 11, 2001, marked the start of an era of a permanent global war in which logistics, warfare, intelligence, repression, surveillance and even military personnel are more and more the privatized domain of transnational capital. The Pentagon budget increased 91 percent in real terms between 1998 and 2011, while worldwide, total state military budget outlays grew by 50 percent from 2006 to 2015, from $1.4 trillion to more than $2 trillion. (This figure does not take into account the hundreds of billions of dollars spent on intelligence; contingency operations; policing; bogus wars against immigrants, terrorism and drugs; and “homeland security.”) During this time, military-industrial complex profits quadrupled. However, focusing just on state military budgets only gives us a part of the picture of the global war economy. As I showed in my 2020 book, The Global Police State, the various wars, conflicts and campaigns of social control and repression around the world involve the fusion of private accumulation with state militarization. In this relationship, the state facilitates the expansion of opportunities for private capital to accumulate through militarization, such as by facilitating global weapons sales by military-industrial-security firms, the amounts of which have reached unprecedented levels. Global weapons sales by the top 100 weapons manufacturers and military service companies increased by 38 percent between 2002 and 2016 and can be expected to escalate further in the face of a prolonged war in Ukraine. By 2018, private for-profit military companies employed some 15 million people around the world, while another 20 million people worked in private security worldwide. The private security (policing) business is one of the fastest-growing economic sectors in many countries and has come to dwarf public security around the world. The amount spent on private security in 2003, the year of the invasion of Iraq, was 73 percent higher than that spent in the public sphere, and three times as many persons were employed in private forces as in official law enforcement agencies. In half of the world’s countries, private security agents outnumber police officers. These corporate soldiers and police were deployed to guard corporate property, provide personal security for executives and their families; collect data; conduct police, paramilitary, counterinsurgency and surveillance operations; carry out mass crowd control and repression of protesters; run private detention and interrogation facilities; manage prisons and participate in outright warfare. Now, these same private military and security firms are pouring into Ukraine, with some mercenary companies offering between $1,000 and $2,000 a day for those with combat experience. The Russian invasion has accelerated but did not originate the ongoing surge in military spending around the world. It is notable that state military spending worldwide skyrocketed in the wake of the 2008 global financial collapse even beyond the post-9/11 spending hike, rising from about $1.5 billion in 2008 to over $2 trillion in 2022. The fact that this explosion in spending coincides perfectly with continued worldwide stagnation following the Great Recession suggests that the heightened militarization of the global economy is as much or more a response to this chronic stagnation than to perceived security threats. If bursts of militarized accumulation (such as that unleashed by 9/11, then by the 2008 financial collapse, and now by the Russian invasion) help offset the overaccumulation crisis further into the future, they are also high-risk bets that heighten worldwide tensions and push the world dangerously towards all-out international conflagration. This crisis of global capitalism is economic, or structural, one of chronic stagnation in the global economy. But it is also political: a crisis of state legitimacy and capitalist hegemony. The system is moving towards “a general crisis of capitalist rule” as billions of people around the world face uncertain struggles for survival and question a system they no longer see as legitimate. Historically, wars have pulled the capitalist system out of crisis while they serve to deflect attention from political tensions and problems of legitimacy. Economically, global capitalism faces what is known in technical language as “overaccumulation”: a situation in which the economy has produced — or has the capacity to produce — great quantities of wealth but the market cannot absorb this wealth because of escalating inequality. Capitalism by its very nature will produce abundant wealth yet polarize that wealth and generate ever greater levels of social inequality unless offset by redistributive policies. The level of global social polarization and inequality now experienced is without precedent. In 2018, the richest 1 percent of humanity controlled more than half of the world’s wealth while the bottom 80 percent had to make do with just 5 percent. The international development agency Oxfam reported in January that during the first two years of the coronavirus pandemic, the 10 richest men in the world more than doubled their fortunes, from $700 billion to $1.5 trillion, while 99 percent of humanity saw a fall in their income and 160 million more people fell into poverty. Such inequalities end up undermining the stability of the system as the gap grows between what is — or could be — produced and what the market can absorb. The extreme concentration of the planet’s wealth in the hands of the few and the accelerated impoverishment and dispossession of the majority means that the transnational capitalist class, or TCC, has increasing difficulty in finding productive outlets to unload enormous amounts of surplus it accumulated. In the years leading up to the pandemic, there was a steady rise in underutilized capacity and a slowdown in industrial production around the world. The surplus of accumulated capital with nowhere to go expanded rapidly. Transnational corporations recorded record profits during the 2010s at the same time that corporate investment declined. Along with militarized accumulation, the TCC has turned to unprecedented levels of financial speculation and to debt-driven growth to sustain profit-making in the face of the crisis. If left unchecked, overaccumulation results in crisis — in stagnation, recessions, depressions, social upheavals and war — just what we are experiencing right now. But there is a related dynamic at work in the global war economy: the need for dominant groups to suppress mass discontent and deflect the crisis of state legitimacy. International frictions escalate as states, in their efforts to retain legitimacy, seek to sublimate social and political tensions and to keep the social order from fracturing. All around the world, a “people’s Spring” has taken off. From Chile to Lebanon, Iraq to India, France to the United States, Haiti to Nigeria, South Africa to Colombia, Jordan to Sri Lanka, waves of strikes and mass protests have proliferated and, in some instances, appear to be acquiring an anti-capitalist character. Wars and external enemies allow the ruling groups to deflect attention away from domestic malaise in their effort to maintain a grip on power as the crisis deepens. In the U.S., this sublimation has involved efforts to channel social unrest towards scapegoated communities such as immigrants or other marginalized groups — this is one key function of racism and was a core component of the Trump government’s political strategy — or towards an external enemy such as China or Russia, which had clearly become a cornerstone of the Biden government’s strategy well before the Russian invasion of Ukraine. U.S. presidents historically reach their highest approval ratings when they launch wars. George W. Bush reached an all-time-high of 90 percent in 2001 as his administration geared up to invade Afghanistan, and his father George H.W. Bush achieved an 89 percent approval rating in 1991, right as the U.S. declared the end of its (first) invasion of Iraq and the “liberation of Kuwait.” It is unlikely that an increasing militarization of the world economy can in the long run offset either the economic or the political dimensions of the crisis of global capitalism. Global capitalism is emerging from the coronavirus pandemic with more inequality, more authoritarianism, more militarization, and more civic and political strife. In the U\.S., class struggle is heating up, with a wave of strikes and of unionization drives in Amazon, Starbucks, and elsewhere in the gig economy. The current inflationary spiral and the escalation of class struggle in the United States and around the world point to the inability of the ruling groups to contain the expanding crisis. The drive by the capitalist state to externalize the political fallout of the crisis increases the danger that international tensions and localized conflicts such as in Ukraine will snowball into broader international conflagrations of unforeseen consequences. As the Ukraine crisis continues to drag on and the global revolt escalates, there will be a radical reconfiguration of global geopolitical alignments to the drumbeat of escalating turbulence in the world economy that will feed new political upheavals and violent conflicts, making global capitalism all the more volatile. While it is hard to imagine a return to the status quo antebellum in Eastern Europe, in the larger picture, the Ukraine crisis is not the cause but a consequence of the general crisis of global capitalism. That crisis will only get worse. Fasten your seat belts; it will get much worse.

#### Capitalism doesn’t act as a deterrent

Meyerson, 2022 (Harold, editor at large at *The American Prospect*. “Old Lessons Learned Anew: Cross-Border Capitalism Doesn’t Deter Wars” The American Prospect, March 8, 2022. <https://prospect.org/blogs-and-newsletters/tap/old-lesson-learned-anew-cross-border-capitalism-doesnt-deter-war/> ///MF)

Among the terrible casualties of Russia’s war on Ukraine, there’s one—and so far as I can see, only one—that deserved to die: the myth that cross-border economic integration (or, more accurately, the creation of a global capitalist order of production, trade, and consumption) will deter wars. As my colleague Bob Kuttner [wrote](https://prospect.org/world/end-of-globalism/) in his Prospect column today, that idea has been violently dispelled in the past two weeks, much as it was in the summer of 1914.

As Bob also noted, the belief that the creation of cross-border European investment and culture in the first decade or so of the 20th century would deter future wars was profound. Norman Angell’s 1910 book The Great Illusion made that case very compelling to Europe’s elites. I’d stress, however, that it’s usually elites—those who either gain from cross-border investments, or those in a position to access the best of different nations’ cultures—that buy into this myth. In the late 19th and early 20th century, Wagner’s operas were viewed as a defining high point of European culture, notwithstanding their German nationalism and antisemitism. Indeed, as cultural historian Carl Schorske documented in his terrific history Fin-de-Siècle Vienna, it was Theodor Herzl’s love—not hate—of Wagner that helped inspire him to lead the Zionist cause. Just as improbable, the first production of Bernard Shaw’s Pygmalion—on, among other things, the class basis of differences in British speech—took place in 1913 in Vienna in German translation, one year before it first opened in English in London. (In later years, Shaw noted that it had been impossible to translate Pygmalion into Swedish, because Sweden’s economic egalitarianism had obliterated class differences in speech.)

[More from Harold Meyerson](https://prospect.org/topics/harold-meyerson/)

But then, cosmopolitanism and select cross-border cultural appropriation has historically been more of an option for the wealthy—note how Tolstoy’s Russian aristocrats speak French. As the 20th century progressed, that option spread among the well-educated and, in the 21st century, the well-wired. Today, the gap between more prosperous and cosmopolitan cities and more impoverished, provincial, and nationalistic rural areas increasingly defines politics throughout the world.

That said, the belief that we’re on the brink of some war-deterring global harmony has been, first and foremost, a claim made by international investors and their advocates, who also insisted that the coming of capitalism to Russia and China would mean that those nations would ipso facto become democracies. Whether the Wall Street bankers who most assiduously promoted this myth actually believed it or just felt it was politically necessary remains a somewhat unsettled question. By dint of their universal opposition to unions, none of them seem inclined even to tolerate a smidgen of democracy within the workplaces they control.

But a different species of globalization has also grown over more recent decades, as a common culture has taken root, chiefly among the urban young. Some of it is merely an immersion in capitalist consumer culture, but some of it is also a belief in liberal and democratic norms, which we see displayed among the anti-war demonstrators who keep coming out to the Red Squares of Moscow and other Russian cities despite their knowledge that they risk imprisonment. The globalization we have yet to see, alas, is the one that Marx called for in the closing line of the Manifesto, that of the workers of the world. Capital can easily cross borders, which has also become increasingly the case in recent decades for professionals. But once the production workers of Pittsburgh were pitted against the production workers of Shenzhen in the absence of global work standards and global worker rights, a proletarian we’re-all-in-this-together sensibility wasn’t likely to emerge. And it isn’t, so long as workers aren’t protected against the transnational arbitrage that is the very heart of global capitalism.

And now, as in 1914, we learn again that global capitalism not only facilitates a nationalist reaction among workers, but also is no deterrent to wars. So much for the Peace of the Action.

#### Development causes more conflict overseas - proxy wars and intervention

Gartzke ’07 [Erick; 2007; Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Peace and Security Studies (cPASS) at the University of California, San Diego; The Capitalist Peace; “Economic Development,” p. 172] SPark

While development decreases incentives for territo-rial aggrandizement, it greatly enhances the technological ability of states to project power. Nations with ships and aircraft can engage in distant disputes inconceivable for poor countries. Development may also lead to increased willingness to pursue policy conflicts. If development is clustered and neighbors no longer covet territory, capabil-ities can be devoted to pursuing the nation's secondary or tertiary interests. Distributed production networks and greater economic, social, or political integration natu-rally also create incentives to seek to influence the for-eign policies of other countries, sometimes through force. In contrast to the blanket assertion of classical politi-cal economists, I expect that development actually leads countries to be more likely to engage in conflicts far from home.35 Iraq invaded and occupied Kuwait in August 1990, intent on securing its "nineteenth province" and wresting Kuwaiti oil wealth from local leaders. The United States and its Coalition allies also invaded Kuwait, not to conquer and keep, but to return the Emirate to its previous lead-ers. While Coalition objectives were couched in moralistic rhetoric, the United States was clearly concerned about who governed Kuwait, while preferring not to govern the country itself. Similarly, European colonial powers have repeatedly intervened in Africa, Asia, and elsewhere to prop up or dethrone regimes, impose settlements, or oth-erwise meddle in the affairs of developing countries.

#### Cap has brought to the brink of nuc war, specifically with Russia

**Damon**, 20**22** (Andre, writer and editor with a focus on economics and geopolitics. “Capitalism normalizes death: From Covid-19 to the threat of nuclear war” WSWS. April 8, 2022. https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2022/04/09/pers-a09.html)

In 1963, Barry Goldwater, the future Republican Party nominee for President of the United States, published a book titled Why Not Victory? In it, he argued that the United States was insufficiently aggressive in confronting the Soviet Union because the American population was too fearful of nuclear war.

The 1953 "Grable" nuclear test conducted by the United States in Nevada.

“A craven fear of death is entering the American consciousness,” Goldwater wrote, “We want to stay alive, of course; but more than that we want to be free.”

In the following year’s presidential campaign, Democratic candidate Lyndon B. Johnson countered Goldwater’s slogan, “In your heart, you know he's right,” with the rhyme, “In your heart, you know he might”—implying that Goldwater might end human civilization by using nuclear weapons.

The Johnson campaign's 1964 "daisy" ad

The Johnson campaign ran the famous “daisy” political ad, showing a young girl picking petals from a flower and counting aloud, before cutting to a missile launch countdown and a nuclear explosion.

Commenting on Goldwater’s campaign, the American political theorist Richard Hofstadter wrote, “What had become clear by 1964, and what could not be undone in the campaign, was the public impression that Goldwater’s imagination had never confronted the implications of thermonuclear war.” Goldwater, Hofstadter wrote, “seemed strangely casual about the prospect of total destruction.”

More than half a century after the 1964 presidential race, the United States and Russia are engaged in a deadly proxy war over Ukraine, threatening to spill over into full-scale conflict. As the war spins out of control, significant sections of the US political establishment are again, to use Hofstadter’s phrase, “strangely casual about the prospect of total destruction.”

It is not merely Goldwater’s political progeny on the far right, but the entire political establishment that is flirting with the prospect of a nuclear apocalypse. With no input from the population or serious public discussion, the US government is taking a series of actions that threaten the most devastating consequences.

The present threat of nuclear war between the United States and Russia is, however, only the violent eruption to the surface of systematic preparations for nuclear war that have been years in the making.

With no public debate and with no opposition within the political establishment, three successive presidents have made sweeping, far-reaching preparations for using nuclear weapons in combat to target Russia and China.

In 2016, President Barack Obama initiated the most dramatic expansion and modernization of America’s nuclear forces since the end of the Cold War, at a projected cost of $1.2 trillion.

Obama’s nuclear arms race sparked what commentators at the time called the “second nuclear age.” In contrast to the Cold War’s doctrine of “mutually assured destruction,” this “second nuclear age” would, in the words of a 2016 report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, involve combatants “thinking through how they might actually employ a nuclear weapon, both early in a conflict and in a discriminate manner.”

To this end, Obama’s nuclear modernization program involved the construction of low-yield nuclear weapons that, in the hopes of US military theorists, could actually be used in combat without triggering a full-scale thermonuclear exchange.

In addition to making nuclear weapons smaller, lighter, less destructive and more portable, the corollary of making “usable” nuclear weapons was the scrapping of restrictions on shorter-range weapons.

In 2018, the Trump administration intensified the arms race initiated under Obama by unilaterally withdrawing from the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, freeing the United States to ring Russia and China with short-range nuclear weapons capable of hitting major cities in a matter of minutes. This was accompanied by the systematic expansion of the US nuclear modernization program, the cost of which subsequently ballooned to nearly $2 trillion.

The Biden administration has doubled down on the nuclear preparations of its predecessors, and Biden’s proposed 2023 budget calls for creating new versions of every single weapons system in the US nuclear “triad.” While Biden eschews the “fire and fury” rhetoric of his predecessor, his administration has been even more aggressive in provoking conflicts with Russia and China than either Obama or Trump.

In 2021, the White House signed the US-Ukraine Strategic Partnership, announced on September 1, 2021, which declared that the US would “never recognize Russia’s attempted annexation of Crimea.” The agreement was signed just months after Ukraine made the retaking of the Donbas official state doctrine, all but announcing a planned Ukrainian war against Russia.

At the same time, the administration has systematically worked to undermine the One China policy, with Biden pledging in a town hall meeting to defend Taiwan from China. Last year, the Nikkei published reports that the United States was working on plans to station nuclear weapons on the “first island chain,” including Japan and Taiwan.

But with the outbreak of war between Russia and Ukraine, the far-reaching plans for “great power conflict” prepared behind the backs of the population are now being put into effect, confronting humanity with the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Echoing the 1963 declaration by Barry Goldwater, Philip Breedlove, NATO’s former supreme allied commander in Europe, told Voice of America this week: “We have been so worried about nuclear weapons and World War III that we have allowed ourselves to be fully deterred. And [Putin] frankly, is completely undeterred.”

The inevitable conclusion is that the population must accept the threat of nuclear war and overcome its “craven fear of death.”

The utter casualness and total recklessness with which the US political establishment is treating the prospect of a war that threatens to escalate into a full-scale nuclear exchange is of a piece with the ruling class’s indifference to mass death in the pandemic.

One million Americans have died of COVID-19 since January 2020. In a typical month, 37,000 Americans lost their lives, the equivalent of twelve 9/11 attacks.

A significant attribute of media commentary on the pandemic in the United States was the claim that the struggle to preserve life, the first right enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, is synonymous with “fear.”

New York Times writer David Leonhardt has made this insinuation his specialty. In column after column prematurely declaring the pandemic over and claiming that COVID-19 is less harmful than the seasonal flu, Leonhardt has referred to “irrational Covid fears,” demanding to know, “Why do so many vaccinated people remain fearful?”

Commenting on the relationship between the pandemic and war, Bloomberg observed last year: “Yes, the U.S. has botched its response to COVID-19. At the same time, its experience shows that America as a nation can in fact tolerate casualties, too many in fact. It had long been standard Chinese doctrine that Americans are ‘soft’ and unwilling to take on much risk. If you were a Chinese war game planner, might you now reconsider that assumption?”

In other words, COVID-19 has cheapened life in America. One million people are dead, and the US media and political establishment simply ignore the death toll. Mass death is simply expected to become part of the background noise.

This paradigm shift is not being discussed, it is simply imposed upon the population through propaganda. Nowhere does anyone in the media ask: What would a nuclear war between the United States and Russia look like?

Earlier this year, James Stavridis, NATO’s former supreme allied commander in Europe, published a novel about a fictional future nuclear war. Describing an American nuclear attack on Shanghai, Stavridis wrote: “These many months later the city remained a charred, radioactive wasteland. The death toll had exceeded thirty million. After each of the nuclear attacks international markets plummeted. Crops failed. Infectious diseases spread. Radiation poisoning promised to contaminate generations. The devastation exceeded… capacity for comprehension.”

The American survivors of a Chinese nuclear attack on San Diego are left to live in “wretched camps,” where “cyclical outbreaks of typhus, measles, and even smallpox often sprouted from the unbilged latrines and rows of plastic tenting.”

Since the publication of his book, Stavridis has become a regular on the Sunday talk shows, where he expostulates on the crimes and cruelties of America’s enemies, whom he has dubbed the “butchers of Bucha.”

No one interrupts him to ask about the relevance of the description of nuclear war contained in his book to the growing threat of a Third World War. Rather, the news is full of war propaganda, designed to work upon the emotions of the population and incite it to support actions that threaten a war between the two largest nuclear powers.

The total devaluation of human life, the indifference to mass death in the pandemic and the recklessness with which American capitalism is rushing into conflict with Russia reflect the views and social character of the American ruling class. This parasitic oligarchy feasts upon the impoverishment and exploitation of the working population.

Living on financial speculation made possible by a credit bubble inflated by the Federal Reserve, fearing and hating the working population of America and the world, the American ruling class is as desperate and reckless as it is ruthless.

The central question is what will develop more quickly: the war drive of the capitalist oligarchy or the growing global rebellion of the working class.

Throughout the world, the surging prices of food and energy have produced outpourings of working class opposition, such as the mass demonstrations against the Rajapakse government in Sri Lanka. As workers enter into struggle, they must take up the demands of fighting to end the COVID-19 pandemic and opposing the war threats of the capitalist oligarchy.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - Space Col

#### Climate crisis comes first – prioritizing space col locks in extinction

Temmen 21 (Jens Temmen is an assistant professor at the American Studies department at Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf ,“WHY BILLIONAIRES IN SPACE ARE NOT GOING TO MAKE THE WORLD A BETTER PLACE”, 7/14/21, <https://blog.degruyter.com/today-space-is-virgin-territory-why-billionaires-in-space-are-not-going-to-make-the-world-a-better-place/>, accessed 6/26/22//JL)

The question ignores the fact that contrary to what the private space industry (and national space agencies, for that matter) wants us to believe, the exploration and colonization of outer space is a very terrestrial undertaking. Steeped in capitalism – a system that Branson, Musk and Bezos have mastered and thrived in – and the geopolitical stratagems of Earth’s nation-states, space exploration today is not so much driven by changing humanity as it goes into space, but rather by changing outer space to make it fit into the logics of profit and territorial control on Earth. And we are in the thick of it: Branson’s latest attempt to establish space travel as a new branch of the tourism industry is just one of many recent steps – including the establishment of US Space Force, the ratification of the Artemis Accords, and the signing on of Musk’s SpaceX as a contractor for NASA – to make outer space safe for capitalism. The point of the performative character of the billionaires’ space race, the images of grandeur and individualism, the bells and whistles, its alleged subscription to a more just future for humanity, is to distract, then. It is a shiny packaging that wraps-up and obscures the mundane fact that if colonizing outer space is allegedly about fundamentally changing societally structures that govern Earth and humanity, the New Space Entrepreneurs are certainly not the ones to bring about that change – it would simply be against their self-interest. In Earth’s past and present, the colonial language of virgin land and terra nullius served to obscure the human cost of colonization by dehumanizing colonized peoples. Space exploration, as imagined by Branson, Musk and Bezos, also has a cost. The wealth that all three of them have acquired through their business ventures, which puts them into the position to reach for the stars (and greater profits), builds on unleashed neoliberalism, capitalist exploitation, and, overall, less-than altruistic business models. Their vision of humanity in space is likewise designed for the few and wealthy, and built on the back of the many. And the cost could increase even further. While all of humanity is facing the unprecedented threat of climate change, which urges us to find sustainable solutions fast, Elon Musk and others offer us the seemingly quick fix of abandoning Earth altogether and to weather out the storm on Mars. In spite of being completely unfeasible from a scientific standpoint, the idea has still gained traction among technoliberalists, and is thus withdrawing attention and resources from communities mostly in the Global South for whom climate change is not a threat in the distant future. In addition, the noise and smoke created by the hyper-masculine performances of Branson, Musk and Bezos block our view of the tangible benefits that space exploration has to offer and that we should readily invest in. Current Mars exploration projects, for example, offer insights into how atmospheric changes impact planetary climates – information that could prove invaluable in our battle against climate change on Earth. All of this is a reminder that we should not abandon the idea altogether that space exploration can offer us new and vital insights. Space exploration is, however, not going to magically change humanity or how we live. If we want to continue to hope that space exploration will fulfill the promise of a better future for humanity, changing our perspectives on life on Earth must come first.

#### Space col is driving the rest of humanity into extinction – the billionaires must be stopped

Marx 20 (Paris Marx is a technology writer who has written frequently for NBC News, CBC News, Jacobin, Tribune, and OneZero, and speak internationally on the future of transport, “Billionaire Space Colonialism Is a Dead End”, 12/22/20, <https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/12/billionaire-space-colonialism-is-a-dead-end-for-humanity>, accessed 6/26/22//JL)

Between the climate crisis, various accelerating social crises, and the ongoing pandemic, humanity faces immense challenges that must be tackled in the coming decade. State power will be required to direct resources into building a sustainable economy, reconstructing the crumbling social infrastructure, and ensuring a good standard of living for all — but billionaires have no stake in any of those projects. Space colonisation will do nothing to address these crises, regardless of the promises of billionaires and luxury communists alike. When they talk about how asteroid mining will bring great wealth to be shared with all or to power the green technologies that are heralded as climate solutions free of sacrifice for Western consumers, they’re simply distracting us from the difficult work that must be done if we’re to truly address the social and environmental challenges of our time. We already know that emissions need to be cut in half by 2030. That means our societies need to be radically overhauled long before asteroid mining becomes feasible — if it ever does. Green capitalists like Musk are happy to sell us a false future of electric cars and solar-powered suburbia that allow them to profit in the short-term because they can simply seal themselves off from the rest of the population when the effects of a warming climate accelerate. The capitalist logic of infinite growth that’s driving the desire for space colonisation is the same one that’s created the very problems we so desperately need to solve in the first place, and doubling down on it would be a terrible mistake. We should be particularly wary of aligning ourselves with a coalition that includes billionaires and right-wing politicians who make explicit comparisons to past colonisation projects, too: Ted Cruz, for example, has promoted space as ‘as vast and promising a frontier as the New World was some centuries ago’. That’s not to say that humanity should turn away from the stars. We should continue funding space science, but the expansion of capitalism into space and the exploitation of extraterrestrial resources do not serve those goals. Justifying space colonisation through the need for a second planet is a self-fulfilling prophecy created by people who have little regard for the lives and wellbeing of the global working class — as the pandemic has demonstrated. Capitalism is driving billionaires toward space as it drives the rest of us toward extinction. They must be stopped before it is too late.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - Human Rights

#### Capitalism and the pursuit of profit are not compatible with the maintenance of human rights

Alexandra Smith 21 [Alexandra Smith, 4-26-2021, "Can Human Rights And Capitalism Ever Be Truly Compatible? — Human Rights Pulse," Human Rights Pulse, https://www.humanrightspulse.com/mastercontentblog/can-human-rights-and-capitalism-ever-be-truly-compatible, smarx, HHW]

When French economist Thomas Piketty declared the 21st century a new “gilded age” in his seminal work, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, he was acutely aware of the impact that mass wealth accumulation had on human rights and equality across the globe. While proponents of capitalism have long argued that, in its purest form, capitalism can bring about healthy competition, egalitarianism, and accessibility, the late-stage capitalism that, at present, dominates the global system, has instead become a means of **exploitation for those at the bottom**. In light of the ongoing pandemic and climate crisis, which have only further exposed the ills of capitalism and widened the disparities between the so-called “haves and have nots,” the entire system is due for serious re-evaluation.

CAPITALIST STRUCTURE

While capitalism comes in many forms, the central tenets that underpin capitalist systems are common amongst almost all market economies. The structure of capitalist economies is dependent upon the following: maximisation of profit, the existence of private property, free and accessible markets, market mechanisms that self-correct, and the free exchange of labour and services vis-à-vis the division of labour. Additionally, behavioral economists have emphasised the role of intangible elements like “self-interest,” which drive the market forward and push individuals toward innovation and competition. In today’s economy, this “self-interest” is realised in the spirit of entrepreneurship that supposedly bolsters the free exchange of goods and services. However, what the pandemic and current global system have revealed is something far more sinister. Without due and enforceable regulation, the most obvious of the aforementioned tenets, maximisation of profit has become a means of exploitation and exists to the detriment of human rights across the world and has forced the question: can human rights and capitalism coexist?

PROFIT PRINCIPLES

Perhaps the most central idea that upholds capitalist economies is the maximisation of profit. Human rights have taken a back seat as companies and individuals seek to maximise their financial gain and fulfill their corporate mandate to maximise shareholder profit. In a globalised economy, the **maximisation of profit has been linked to a “race to the bottom**,” wherein companies seek the cheapest labour possible and export primary production to countries typically located in the Global South where a **lack of enforced regulation on industry and labour leads to serious abuses**. This phenomenon produces the images we see today of overcrowded, unventilated garment factories and unsafe mining conditions across Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this system, abuses are not only tolerated but profitable.

**But, who profits? Certainly not workers**. According to the latest report by the International Labour Organization, millions of workers around the world reside in countries where no minimum wage exists and where **labour standards are either dismal or effectively nonexistent.**

#### Capitalism and human rights abuses go together like yin and yang – colonialism, expansion and violence all run rampant under capitalism

Alan Song 15 [Alan Song, 3-10-2015, "Capitalism and human rights abuses go together like yin and yang," New Internationalist, https://newint.org/blog/2015/03/10/capitalism-abuse, smarx, HHW]

When discrediting a social movement or a political entity, the powers-that-be will often point to how violent it is, as a way to delegitimize it.

A popular criticism of communism, which still lingers today, years after the fall of the Iron Curtain, is that it was inherently violent.

Anti-communist, pro-capitalist propagandists will point to the violent nature of Stalin’s five-year-plans or to Pol Pot’s social cleansing. ‘Look, it’s all well and good in theory, but in practice it’s the most violent system,’ they say. Capitalism, on the other hand, is the religion of peace.

This simplistic logic is not only grossly flawed but contributes to a convenient narrative to delegitimize any movement that is not pro-markets, which has been the status quo since the end of the Second World War.

In that period, capitalist economics have **become the modus operandi for the Western world** and have been (**violently) pushed onto the rest of the world**. This has become so accepted as the triumphant system over the evils of communism, that the end of the Cold War was famously (and incorrectly) regarded as ‘The End of History’ by US political scientist and economist Francis Fukuyama.

**What this narrative does, though, is whitewash the crimes of capitalism**, which is conveniently exonerated of its sins, while an association is made between violence and any alternative system, so as to continue to **position capitalism on higher moral and economic ground.**

On closer inspection, however, it is difficult to disagree with the fact that **capitalism is almost undoubtedly the most violent economic system of recent times**, responsible for more deaths and more social disruption than any other.

Even if in much of the industrialized and developed capitalist word there is the veneer of a state of peace, **capitalism, as a system, is maintained and upheld through violence,** both overtly and in more subtle ways.

Western expansion, slavery and colonialism are inherently tied to white, patriarchal, capitalist economics that are still in play today. Capitalism has claimed millions of lives and has led to violence as a result of structural adjustment programmes forced on former colonies by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. There was the Belgian Congo holocaust. Or what was essentially the **ethnic cleansing of an entire continent in South America** resulting from Spanish and Portuguese capitalist expansion during the colonial era.

Yet when we discuss capitalism we tend not to discuss the violence associated with it. In terms of death tolls, the **violence of colonialism cannot be over-stated. The slave trade, colonialism and neo-colonialism have contributed to untold numbers of dead.**

Even something such as the war in Iraq can be linked to capitalism when we look at the embedded nature of arms companies within the Western state apparatus, as well as the fact that access to oil resources was a motivating factor for invading.

**Capitalism and human rights abuses go together like yin and yang**. People might detach themselves from concern about how the chips in their iPhones are made, but in the Democratic Republic of Congo, human rights abuses are taking place on a daily basis so that Western firms can exploit cobalt resources.

### 2NC - AT: Cap Good - Biotech

#### Capitalism ruins biotech

Oakland, 19, Anthony Oakland, Writes for the socialist press, 7/23/2019, “Why Capitalism is Stunting Science”, <https://www.socialist.net/why-capitalism-is-stunting-science.html> - FT

Elsewhere, Cuba today has a [trailblazing biotechnology sector](https://nacla.org/article/cuba%E2%80%99s-pharmaceutical-advantage). This is thanks to massive state investment, guided by needs rather than profits, and a planned economy where companies do not compete and where oversight is centralised. As a result, Cuba has been able to pioneer vaccines against meningitis. Even capitalist governments recognise, in extreme circumstances, the superiority of such a model. This is illustrated by the SEMATECH consortium, established by the US government to foster a viable domestic semiconductor industry that could compete with that in Japan. Rather than race each other, its members shared their knowledge. This allowed them to “avoid duplicating research efforts” - thus reducing research expenditure while increasing its efficiency. However, given that capitalism is inimical to such collaboration, the US government needed to entice corporations to participate with an annual $100 million sweetener. Since 2011, the Cuban population has been able to [receive a vaccine against lung cancer free of charge](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2016/02/22/cuba-lung-cancer-vaccine_n_7267518.html). This is because Cuba also has a remarkable healthcare system: from primary care to high-tech vaccines - [everything is completely freely available to the population](https://theconversation.com/is-the-cuban-healthcare-system-really-as-great-as-people-claim-69526). The result is that Cubans have a life expectancy equal to that seen in the United States – an advanced capitalist country that spends fifteen times as much on healthcare per capita than that in Cuba. In fact, the US government spends as much money administering the mess of a private healthcare system (per person) as [Cuba spends on all healthcare-related costs](https://www.socialmedicine.org/2012/07/30/about/cuba-leads-the-world-in-lowest-patient-per-doctor-ratio-how-do-they-do-it/). Without the profit motive or intellectual property as obstacles, Cuba was the first country in the world to eliminate mother-to-child transmission of HIV, [which the WHO lauded](https://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2015/mtct-hiv-cuba/en/) as “one of the greatest public health achievements possible”.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - Gender

#### Capitalism reinforces the patriarchy – there is no country where men and women get equal pay

Comanne 20 – [Denise Comanne was an activist and leader in the Belgian section of the Fourth International (SAP-LCR) and in the Belgium-based Committee for the Annulation of the Third World Debt (CADTM); 5/28/20; “How Patriarchy and Capitalism Combine to Aggravate the Oppression of Women”; <https://www.cadtm.org/How-Patriarchy-and-Capitalism-Combine-to-Aggravate-the-Oppression-of-Women>; accessed: 7/7/22; Lowell-JL]

There is not yet a country in the world, even among the most advanced in this area, where women’s pay is equal to men’s. Indeed some industrialized countries are seriously losing ground in comparative terms of human development, regarding this criterion: Canada has slipped back from the 1st to the 9th place in world ranking, Luxemburg has fallen back twelve places, the Netherlands sixteen and Spain twenty-six (UNDP, 1995). Careers where women are in the majority in fields such as health care and education are devalued.

When capitalism is in crisis, austerity measures are introduced whereby women are the first to be excluded from social benefits such as unemployment benefits, for example, where they exist. Elsewhere, they are pushed into very poorly-paid jobs such as work in the free zones. In Mexico in this sector women’s salaries have collapsed from 80% to a mere 57% of men’s. They may also be won over by the idea of doing a good job for a pittance among the multitude of jobs in the informal sector, beyond the pale of “paralysing ” State regulations.

Women’s rights in the workplace are undermined by a thousand government tricks. There is of course the “choice” of working part-time which extends from half-time to the “zero” contract where the female worker remains at the boss’s disposal to work from zero to any number of hours as required; this despite the fact that practically all surveys show that the majority of working women would like a full-time job. The increasing reduction in services such as crèches and day-nurseries, or the privatisation of others such as rest-homes for the elderly, have led to a multiplicity of pitfalls for working women. “Equality at work” has had the negative effect of introducing more night-work for women. Of course it was right to establish equal working conditions for women in the security and health services, and so forth; but what was also at stake with these so-called egalitarian measures was to allow women to work on the line in night-shifts, for example. There is absolutely no vital imperative to build cars at night. The new measures establishing male-female equality should then have been – in clear-thinking feminist terms – to eliminate night-work for men. Moreover, for most women this night-work on the line, unacceptable on principle, makes life intolerably hard most of the time, in view of the work women still have to do in the domestic sphere.

The issue of women’s work in production, or the public sphere, is therefore just as central.

To manage this issue, capitalism uses patriarchy as a lever to attain its objectives, while at the same time reinforcing it.

#### Capitalism is NOT better for women – unequal pay, housework, and overworking

Comanne 20 – [Denise Comanne was an activist and leader in the Belgian section of the Fourth International (SAP-LCR) and in the Belgium-based Committee for the Annulation of the Third World Debt (CADTM); 5/28/20; “How Patriarchy and Capitalism Combine to Aggravate the Oppression of Women”; <https://www.cadtm.org/How-Patriarchy-and-Capitalism-Combine-to-Aggravate-the-Oppression-of-Women>; accessed: 7/7/22; Lowell-JL]

The fact that women are relegated – by patriarchy – to domestic tasks allows capitalists to justify their over-exploitation and under-payment of women with the argument that their work is less productive than men’s. They invoke weakness, menstruation, absenteeism for pregnancy and maternity leave, breastfeeding, and caring for sick children and older relatives. This is where the woman’s salary is denigrated as being “for extras”. Even today, with equal qualifications and for equal hours, women are paid about 20% less than men. This holds a double interest for capitalists. On the one hand, they have a cheaper, more flexible labour pool that can be used or laid off according to market fluctuations; on the other hand, this enables them to bring down rates of pay generally.

The general issue of women’s work in the private and public spheres thus reflects either their oppression, as for example when policies of the far right or religious fundamentalism force them to remain in the home; or their liberation, as in the case of progressive policies of equal pay, job creation and free public services.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

Having duly noted the importance of domestic work, the feminist current “class struggle” gives the following analysis [3] :

• The oppression of women preceded capitalism but the latter has profoundly modified it.

Housework, in its true sense, came into being with capitalism. By largely replacing small-scale commercial production in the domains of agriculture and the crafts with big industry, capitalism made the separation between the sites of production (the workplace) and of reproduction (the family) increasingly distinct, assigning to women the role of responsibility for the home. This new ideology of the housewife, which started in the bourgeoisie, bred disdain for the woman who “had” to go out to work, not having a husband to support her. This ideology was not confined to the bourgeoisie but also spread through and contaminated the emerging workers’ movement. However, contrary to popular belief, women in the lower classes never stopped working, caught in the web of contradictions linked to their tasks within the family and their difficult working conditions. This is why we feel that the articulation between capitalism and patriarchal oppression must be analysed as a single phenomenon.

#### Capitalism is worse for gender inequalities – women have to take care of both the workforce and family

Comanne 20 – [Denise Comanne was an activist and leader in the Belgian section of the Fourth International (SAP-LCR) and in the Belgium-based Committee for the Annulation of the Third World Debt (CADTM); 5/28/20; “How Patriarchy and Capitalism Combine to Aggravate the Oppression of Women”; <https://www.cadtm.org/How-Patriarchy-and-Capitalism-Combine-to-Aggravate-the-Oppression-of-Women>; accessed: 7/7/22; Lowell-JL]

Capitalism is a dynamic and aggressive mode of production which as such, penetrates all social relations. For example, capitalism did not hesitate to make mass calls for very cheap female and child labour in the early 19th century, in order to increase production and thus profits. Throughout the centuries, this quest for maximum profits has led capitalism to undermine (at least partially) paternal and marital authority, making working women “free” to sell their labour without their husband’s permission and to become fully-fledged consumers.

This call for women’s labour underwent new developments in the early ’Sixties and again in the present day on a global scale. With the delocalisation of traditional or cutting-edge industries, in North Africa, Latin America or Asia, employers, in search of new profits, recruit young women into the labour market. These young, exploited, working women have nevertheless been able to acquire a certain financial independence from the men of the family, leading them to demand freedom in many domains.

At the same time, in the developed capitalist countries, more and more of the activities previously kept within the family are externalized, taken care of in the first instance by public services such as schools and health institutions, or increasingly dealt with through the market: the making of clothes, meals, and so on.

• The oppression of women is useful to the capitalist system.

Capitalism, while favouring a certain emancipation of women for the sake of profit, nevertheless remains very attached to the traditional family institution. Why?

- In our societies, the family plays a fundamental role in reproducing the divisions, as well as the hierarchy, between the different social classes and genders to which different social and economic functions are assigned. In the name of the “maternal” function, women must take on all the tasks related to maintaining and reproducing the workforce and the family. As for men, they are always supposed to be the main economic purveyors. All this makes it possible, in the context of professional segregation and in the name of the so-called complementary roles, to carry on underpaying women on a discriminatory basis.

- Family also plays its part in “regulating” the labour market. In times of economic expansion, as was the case for about thirty years until the early 1970s, women are massively called upon as cheap labour in a number of manufacturing industries such as electronics, then as wage-earners in the service industry. But in times of economic recession, as over the last thirty years, employers and the State unrelentingly suggest that women should – partly or completely – withdraw from the labour market to devote themselves to their “natural” vocation as mothers. When there are signs of economic recovery (however short-lived), some collective investments are again considered, not with regard to gender equality, but in order to “release” female labour and subject it to flexible schedules.

#### It is impossible to achieve the liberation of women under a capitalist system

Comanne 20 – [Denise Comanne was an activist and leader in the Belgian section of the Fourth International (SAP-LCR) and in the Belgium-based Committee for the Annulation of the Third World Debt (CADTM); 5/28/20; “How Patriarchy and Capitalism Combine to Aggravate the Oppression of Women”; <https://www.cadtm.org/How-Patriarchy-and-Capitalism-Combine-to-Aggravate-the-Oppression-of-Women>; accessed: 7/7/22; Lowell-JL]

Therefore, contrary to what some feminists seem to believe, it is difficult to imagine how the liberation of women (of all women, not just of a tiny minority), could be achieved in a capitalist system. This is why we deem it necessary, whatever the conflicts involved, to bring together the struggle of women against patriarchal oppression and the struggle of wage-earners against capitalist exploitation. As an illustration of how difficult such convergence can be: some male trade unionists do not think it “proper” that women should be factory workers or are not ready to join a women’s struggle, arguing that it is through the “global” (i.e. men’s) struggle that women stand to make benefits. Moreover, some men still enjoy “ruling the roost” at home.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - Heritage

#### Heritage Foundation – a think tank full of bias

**Thomas 19** (Kendrick, Marxist activist and Pan Africanist, “The Illusion of Free Thought: How Think Tanks Shape Public Opinion”, <https://theforgenews.org/2019/08/29/the-illusion-of-free-thought-how-think-tanks-shape-public-opinion/>, ML)

One of the most funded think tanks is the Heritage Foundation. ($112.7 million in average yearly revenue). Funding from both conservatives and liberals have allowed the Heritage Foundation to influence foreign and domestic policy. The Heritage Foundation uses its platform to sway policymakers to boost military spending while convincing the public to fear foreign entities deemed threats to national security. In 2009, the Pentagon considered discontinuing the use of Lockheed Martin's F-22 raptor fighter jets due to there being little use for them. The Heritage Foundation used its lobbying power to reassure the Pentagon that the fighter jets were still needed for national security. Lockheed Martin is a longtime donor to the Heritage Foundation. A quick search for “Heritage Foundation China” will be filled with articles promoting fear of China with headlines such as “Everyone Finally Agrees China Can’t Be Allowed to Take Over the World” and “How China Is Taking Control of Hollywood”. Hundreds of people were given positions in Trump’s cabinet after they were chosen by the Heritage Foundation to ensure that his administration works in the interests of the organization’s foreign policy agenda. The Heritage Foundation is intertwined with corporate media platforms such as Forbes. According to Forbes contributor Alejandro Chafuen, no other think tank has had a bigger impact on social media in the past five years as the Heritage Foundation. Notable members/financial supporters: Steve Forbes, Marlboro cigarettes owner Altria Group, Lockheed Martin, Google, and Walton Family Foundation.

### 2NC -- AT: Cap Good - CATO

#### CATO institute can’t be trusted – evidence filled with bias

**Thomas 19** (Kendrick, Marxist activist and Pan Africanist, “The Illusion of Free Thought: How Think Tanks Shape Public Opinion”, <https://theforgenews.org/2019/08/29/the-illusion-of-free-thought-how-think-tanks-shape-public-opinion/>, ML)

The Cato Institute ($29.1 million in average yearly revenue) is a well-funded think tank that persuades politicians and the public to take conservative positions on issues such as climate change and welfare. The Cato Institute claims that there is ample time to resolve the environmental crisis despite the UN and scientists saying otherwise. They place blame on everyday people by publishing articles stating that people are not willing to combat climate change if it means raising their electric bill. The Cato Institute is known for encouraging politicians to make budget cuts to SNAP, Medicaid, WIC, energy assistance, and public schooling. The organization heavily studies low income black communities with the intent of pushing a conservative narrative. The organization blamed welfare for crimes committed by young black men. Their solution? Cut funding to welfare to dissuade young black girls from getting pregnant and looking to welfare as a crutch, eliminating the chance of giving birth to a low income black criminal. There are poor people who never heard of the Cato Institute yet have these exact same views. That is a testament to how far reaching this think tank’s impact is as a result of its massive yearly revenue. The Cato Institute defends the use of racial slurs, homophobic comments, and the use of the confederate flag because the institute claims that offensive speech opens for healthy dialogue. The institute adds that America would be tyrannical to punish people for expressing how they feel. Cato members’ outreach include television, radio, books, social media, and online interviews. They’re often cited in news articles too. They play a key role in educating leaders and policymakers. They frequently speak at Capital Hill and the Supreme Court. Notable members/financial supporters: Charles G. Koch, the late David Koch, Walton Family Foundation, FedEx, Google Inc., Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford Foundation, George Soros, and Whole Foods Market.

# Affirmative

# Framework

## Aff Framework

### 2ac – AT -Epistemology First

#### Epistemology is secondary to the plan’s harm reduction---the alt causes endless debates at the cost of material improvements in the day to day

Darryl Jarvis 2k, former Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sydney, “Continental Drift,” *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism*,University of South Carolina Press, pp 128-129

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly, it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations?

On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, “So what?” To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate.

### 1ar – AT- Epistemology First

#### Policy precedes Epistemology – We control the internal link to access material change – K’s of knowledge prevent tools of disenfranchised form changing policy, and prevent good, specific policies– that’s Jarvis

#### Specific Policy Internal Links come before and outweigh Epistemological claims – Bombs are material

Lipshutz, 2011- Prof of Politics at UC Santa Cruz, speaking after hearing a policy debate in which the affirmative read a straight up policy aff and the negative read a security criticism (Ronnie, Speaking about the final round at the California Round Robin, Feb 18, Accessed here: <http://nfltv.org/2011/02/24/cal-round-robin-policy/> JC)

RONNIE LIPSCHUTZ: Well, many many years ago, one day when I was reading the San Francisco chronicle I clipped a little phrase. I’ve never been able to find it, but it was something like, one of the emperor Fredrichs said the surest way to ruin your country is to put it under the charge of college professors. I have to say that I am now fully convinced of the truth of that statement. But since I have been charged here with taking on the philosophical side of things, I wanna make a few point about in particular the negative arguments but also I think about the the affirmative. I’m not a debater by the way, so I don’t quite understand what’s been going on. But what I think in particular is a problem is, first of all, we have sort of incommensurate conceptual sort of categories going on here that the affirmative is taking a farther narrow policy question and proposing a change to it. The negative then raises these questions of epistemology and ontology which in a way **are not** obvious **confronting the policy question which**, and I agree with Erin, **is very very narrowly construed**. I mean, there was no sort of question about, well, let me put it this way: that although there was a discussion of the virtues of the alliance with Japan, It was largely taken as a given and therefore of course that causes a problem, and by taking this sort of epistemological and ontological approach, its sort of, **its ships passing in the night.** And then of course the theory question came up, and that I thought was problematic for both sides. A couple of things I wanna say. The first one is that, **social constructions can kill.** And I think this is a very important sort of thing to remember that, threats can be socially constructed but threats, social constructions have material components, and they are aimed in particular directions. So the fact that something is a social construction or is epistemologically and ontologically questionable does not mean that there aren’t missiles being deployed, and that those missiles are not going to go off. These arguments are I think operating at a somewhat different space, it does raise a question of how is it that we judge what is a threat in the first place. And of course we have nuclear friends and nuclear enemies. You ought to ask the question, “Why is it that Great Britain has nuclear weapons and yet there is nobody, as far as I know, that is planning a war with Great Britain?”. Now I could be wrong about this, since the Pentagon probably has plenty of analysts who have nothing to do ERIN SIMPSON: They make power points LIPSHUTZ: Yeah, they make power points. So that, then, of course raises some of these epistemological questions. Which I think if you want to somehow deploy the stuff that it seems like, sadly, I have said somewhere that it is important to sort of take that much more carefully into account. The other thing that I am sort of struck by is that I’ve become in recent, in the last year ago a great fan of Pierre Bourdieu. All of these guys, all of my friends that you were citing, although I don’t consider Mearshimer a friend, as I listen to this I think, what, you know, what patent nonsense it is that they are basically spouting. But **this is the way that the academic realm goes**, you know. I mean its attack and counter-attack. And I think you have to be very careful again in interrogating, so If you’ve got to be critical, you should be very critical of those who are critical, you know, to ask what is the politics behind the critique. Because **there are politics in all of this.** Not just politics in the policy, okay, and interests and all kinds of deeply imbedded commitments, which are impossible to change. If you watch congress in action right now, you can see that. But also that there is a kind of, I mean its, **academics is more by other means**, I guess, to take a leaf from both Clausewitz and Foucault. Anyway, to go back to Bourdieu. Bourdieu, who’s a sociologist who died several years ago, has a sort of very interesting approach to some of these things which is oriented around practice. You know, what are the practices that groups, societies, engage in, and how do we understand those practices reinforcing normative beliefs and policies and approaches. Okay, and **If you really are interested in how do things change, you have to look at how practices change rather than intellectual arguments on the one hand or arming to the teeth on the other.** So perhaps I would encourage, you know, if you are to go on with debate, you should probably take a look at Bourdieu. I’m done.

### 2ac- AT: Ontology First

#### Extinction outweighs ontology.

Michelis, 17—University of Turin (Angela, “The roots of human responsibility,” Rev. Filos., Aurora, Curitiba, v. 29, n. 46, p. 307-333, jan./abr. 2017, dml)

The common elements making both phenomena paradigmatic and original are retraceable, according to Jonas, through the concepts of “totality”, “continuity” and “future” in relation to the existence and happiness of human beings. Human beings, like all other living beings, are ends in themselves; however, only human beings are able to carry out strategies which safeguard their being ends in themselves. Therefore, their very capacity for action implies an objective obligation in the form of external responsibility. For these reasons they can be defined as moral beings; that is, as capable of carrying out morally responsible or morally irresponsible behaviours33. Jonas reaffirms in any case that the archetype of every responsibility is that of human beings for human beings, in which the subject-object connection in the relationship of responsibility is irrefutable, and through this the responsibility for every living thing becomes clear.

The totality of responsibility may be characterized by the paradigmatic examples of parents and of the statesman, which combine as the opposite poles of the greatest particularity and the greatest generality. In particular, the educational sphere demonstrates how the responsibility of parents and of the State are related, and how the private and public spheres integrate reciprocally, encompassing all aspects of the life of human beings. As Jonas describes,

the education of the child includes socialization, beginning with speech and progressing with the transmission of the entire code of societal convictions and norms, through whose appropriation the individual becomes a member of the wider community. The private opens itself essentially to the public and includes it in its own completeness as belonging to the being of the person. In other words, the ‘citizen’ is an immanent aim of education, thus a part of parental responsibility, and this not only by force of the state’s enjoining it. From the other side, just as the parents educate their children ‘for the state’ (if for much more as well), so does the state assume responsibility for the education of the young. The earliest phase is left in most societies to the home, but everything after that comes under the supervision, regulation, and aid of the state – so that one can speak of a public ‘educational policy’.34

The continuity of responsibility depends on its own very nature since, for example, neither the care of parents nor the care of the government can cease, as they must respond to the ever new needs of life, which is rooted in the past and moves towards the future. Of course, political responsibility is greater in both temporal directions in relation to the greater duration of the historical community with respect to individual existence.

Responsibility is projected beyond the present and today’s care into the future, despite life’s unpredictability; therefore, responsibility must have the function of making possible more than determining the present. Jonas writes:

The object’s self-owned futurity is the truest futural aspect of the responsibility, which thus makes itself the guardian of the very source of that irksome unpredictability in the fruits of its labors. Its highest fulfillment, which it must be able to dare, is its abdication before the right of the never anticipated, which emerges as the outcome of its care […] In the light of such self-transcending width, it becomes apparent that responsibility as such is nothing else but the moral complement to the ontological constitution of our temporality35.

Thus, every total responsibility, such as that of a parent or that of statesman or stateswoman – beyond its specific and important duties – is always also the preservation of the future possibility of responsible actions and of politics itself.

Jonas affirms that by means of the difficult journey through the various regions of responsibility, he also found the answer to the question that at the beginning seemed to represent “the critical point of moral theory”: how to transform the will into the “ought”.

The transition is mediated by the phenomenon of power in its uniquely human sense, in which causal force joins with knowledge and freedom. [...] Only in man is power emancipated from the whole through knowledge and arbitrary will and only in man can it become fatal to him and to itself, his capacity is his fate, and it increasingly becomes the general fate. In him, therefore, and in him alone, there arises out of the willing itself the ‘ought’ as the self-control of his consciously exercised power36.

Human beings, as an epiphenomenon of nature capable of determining for itself the aims of actions and to carry them out autonomously, have reached even within nature the point at which their own self-destruction is possible. This imposes upon them the duty to pay special attention to not destroying, through irresponsible use, what exists, what has come about, and all the other living things, which are somehow in their power. Therefore, it is clear that, at the present time, human power not only requires the union of will and obligation, but also undeniably places responsibility at the centre of morality.

Ethics and politics are necessarily interwoven, and Hans Jonas – in a situation where survival is threatened, of emergency, owing to the exponential development of technological power, and in the conviction that human beings cannot adapt themselves to everything – declares: “For the moment, all work on the ‘true’ [hu]man must stand back behind the bare saving of its precondition, namely, the existence of [hu]mankind in a sufficient natural environment”37.

Responsible politics turns towards the future with the consciousness that it must guarantee the very possibility of responsible action and the existence of future generations, as well as the right to life of the world. It urges a limitation of technological development and the pursuit of a moderate and equitable use of resources.

### 2ac – AT: Positional Competition

#### Interpretation ---weigh the plan and perm's fiated implications against a competitive and legitimate alt

#### ---non-governmental fiated alternatives are unfair---fairness is the only impact AND inferior clash makes critical research useless

#### ---perms are key to test competition, prevent utopian counterplans, and check single and multi-actor fiat alternatives

#### ---debating a hypothetical movement by a group that doesn’t exist is bad ground

# Uniqueness

## Non Unique

### 2AC -- NonUnique

#### Capitalism is Non-Unique - systems of abuse and exploitation were always present throughout history

Velden ’21 [John van der and Rob White; 2017; Leader of Global Sales & Technology at Linde Engineering, former Vice President of Business development at Chicago Bridge and Iron company, former researcher at Unilever; The extinction curve : growth and globalisation in the climate endgame, “THE EXTINCTION CODE WITHIN THE CAPITALIST GROWTH PROTOCOL,” Ch. 3, p. 34] SPark

Also a factor is (possibly convenient) superficial universals relating to class structure, inequality and ecological degradation across previous historical periods and forms of economic organisation (from the ancient Holocene world through to post-capitalist Stalinisation). After all, why focus on capitalism as the primary problem when exploitation and ecological degradation have been features of our entire human history and across different forms of socio-economic organisation? The refrains are familiar: ‘Just look at the ecological catastrophes of the old Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China’! ‘Humans have always treated the planet instrumentally’! Such cries are not uncommon in both extended commentaries and short catchy tweets. In either case, our view is that the claims are simplistic and politically miss the main point, deliberately or otherwise

#### No need for revolution - changes are possible now

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Jared Diamond: Unsustainable Systems and Sustainability,” Ch. 4.9, p. 203-204] SPark

However, in the same book Diamond offers some glimmers of hope. In the US state of Montana, despite the fact that mining companies were forced to retreat and that both agriculture and livestock have decreased due to land being repurposed for recreational activities for wealthy people who do not reside in the state, the important point is that environmental protection now takes precedence over mining, agricultural and industrial activities. Furthermore, in a notable example of ‘social responsibility’, the transnational company StillwaterMining, owner of a platinum and palladium mine, came to an understanding with environmental groups (including a trout protection NGO named Trout Unlimited), and also reached agreements with the local community regarding employment, education, electricity and citizen services in exchange for ecologists and citizens not opposing the operations of the mining company. A similar scenario occurred when the transnational corporation BP (British Petroleum) bought a large copper mine formerly owned by Anaconda, and rejected the previous mine-owner’s traditional policies of refusing to clean up pollution, financing local support groups favourable to its interests, declaring bankruptcy and other similar measures. Instead, BP made a commitment to carry out clean-up work without shirking its responsibilities towards the environment.

In other meaningful cases, which are significant because they involve transnational corporations, Diamond cites the policies of companies such as the Chevron oil company in Papua New Guinea in the Kutubu oilfield that functions as a de facto national park. He further cites Chevron’s understanding with the Norwegian government in the North Sea; Rio Tinto in California; the American Dupont in titanium farms in the rutile-rich sands of Australian beaches; the proposed mining and sustainable development project in the United States (MMSD: Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development); and the experiences in the field of logging and the timber industry with the forest certification system established by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), to which companies such as Home Depot, Columbia Forest Products, the famous IKEA of Sweden, B & K of Great Britain, Anderson Corporation, Collins Pine, Lowe’s, Svea Skog and many others belong. This eco-labelling experiment (based on certificates) has also been adopted by the fishing industry under a similar name, the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), in which a range of companies from the World Wildlife Fund to companies such as Unilever, Marks & Spencer, Safeway, Young’s Bluecrest Seafood Co., Sainsbury’s, Safeway, Whole Foods, Migros, France Foods and several others are included. This is all based on the idea that while a company can maximize its benefits in the short term, it is in its long-term interest to adopt corporate social responsibility policies, not just to avoid causing harm to the environment and the population, and to ensure the adequate conservation of the forests and the fishing resources that provide them with their economic activity, but also to project a responsible image for the purposes of their commercial relations throughout the world.

Alongside the protection and forest conservation policies of the Scandinavian and European countries in general, among which Germany stands out, and also the conservationist policies that were put in place in countries such as Japan (since the Tokugawa dynasty in the sixteenth century),25 some developing countries should also be highlighted. The Dominican Republic is a particularly good example of a country which has embraced sustainable forest development. A third of its territory has been declared protected areas and there are seventy-four national parks. This occurred as a result of the happy coincidence between the interests of environmental groups and personalities and the support they received from Joaquín Balaguer, a dominant figure in Dominican history during the last four decades of the twentieth century. In contrast, unipersonal dictatorships, structural violence, and the disastrous policy of forest depredation in Haiti, the country with which the Dominican Republic shares the island, led the Haitians into a situation of conflict and violence that forced the United Nations to intervene in order to avoid the total collapse of the society and its State.

#### Capitalism is positively changing now - any change risks yanking the steering wheel in the wrong direction

King 21 (American writer, researcher, international consultant, and Cambridge PHD holder, 26th may, 2021, “Why the next stage of capitalism is coming”, BBC, [Why the next stage of capitalism is coming - BBC Future](https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20210525-why-the-next-stage-of-capitalism-is-coming#:~:text=Nearly%20250%20years%20ago%2C%20the,of%20human%20activity%3A%20industrial%20capitalism.)) - EM

In recent years, various ideas and proposals have emerged that aim to rewrite capitalism's social contract. What they have in common is the idea that businesses need more varied measures of success than simply profit and growth. In business, there's "[conscious capitalism](https://www.consciouscapitalism.org/)", inspired by the practices of so-called "ethical" brands. In policy, there's "[inclusive capitalism](https://www.inclusivecapitalism.com/)", advocated by both the [Bank of England](https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/speech/2014/inclusive-capitalism-creating-a-sense-of-the-systemic) and The Vatican, which advocates harnessing "capitalism for good". And in sustainability, there's the idea of "[doughnut economics](https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/)", a theory proposed by economist and author Kate Raworth, which suggests that [it's possible to thrive economically as a society](https://www.bbc.com/reel/video/p08hppxt/how-the-dutch-are-reshaping-their-post-pandemic-utopia) while also staying within social and planetary boundaries. Then there's the "[Five Capitals](https://www.forumforthefuture.org/the-five-capitals)" model articulated by Jonathan Porritt, the author of Capitalism “As If The World Matters”. Porritt calls for the integration of five pillars of human capital – natural, human, social, manufactured, and financial capital – into existing economic models. One tangible example of where companies are beginning to embrace the Five Capitals is the [B-Corporation movement](https://bcorporation.net/). Certified companies sign up to a legal obligation to consider "the impact of their decisions on their workers, customers, suppliers, community, and the environment". Their ranks now include major corporations such as Danone, Patagonia, and Ben & Jerry's (which is owned by Unilever). This approach has become increasingly mainstream, reflected in a 2019 statement released by over 180 corporate CEOs redefining "[the purpose of a corporation](https://opportunity.businessroundtable.org/ourcommitment/)". For the first time, CEOs representing Wal-Mart, Apple, JP Morgan Chase, Pepsi, and others acknowledged that they must redefine the role of business in relation to society and the environment. Their statement proposes that companies must do more than deliver profits to their shareholders. In addition, they must invest in their employees and contribute to the improvement of the human, natural and social elements of capital that Porritt refers to in his model, rather than the sole focus on financial capital. In a recent interview with Yahoo Finance on the future of capitalism, the executive chairman of Best Buy, Hubert Joly, said that "what has happened is that for 30 years, from the 1980s to 10 years ago, we’ve had this singular focus on profits that has been excessive and has caused a lot of these issues. We need to unwind a bit of these 30 years. If we have a refoundation of business, it can be a refoundation of capitalism as well... I think this can be done, this has to be done.” A new direction. More than three decades ago, the United Nations Brundtland Commission wrote in "[Our Common Future](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Our_Common_Future)" that there was ample evidence that social and environmental impacts are relevant and need to be incorporated into development models. It is now obvious that these issues must also be considered within the social contract underpinning capitalism, so that it is more inclusive, holistic and integrated with basic human values. Ultimately, it is worth remembering that citizens in a capitalist, liberal democracy are not powerless. Collectively, they can support companies aligned with their beliefs, and continuously demand new laws and policies which transform the competitive landscape of corporations so that they might improve their practices. When Adam Smith was observing nascent industrial capitalism in 1776, he could not foresee just how much it would transform our societies today. So it follows that we might be similarly blind to what capitalism could look like in another two centuries. However, that does not mean we should not ask how it might evolve into something better in the nearer term. The future of capitalism and our planet depend on it.

# AT: Link

### 2AC -- AT: General Link

### 2AC -- AT: State Link

#### State intervention is key to Sustainable Development

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The UN 2030 Agenda and the SDGs,” Ch. 5.5, p. 243] SPark

The implementation of the SDGs is a central issue of great difficulty and complexity. For instance, social development cannot be obtained via a magic trickledown of wealth from financial markets to the unemployed. State intervention is necessary to correct “market failures”. It is easy to imagine the obstacles and difficulties that the implementation of the SDGs involves and that range from the social sphere (poverty reduction, food security, health and education, gender equality) to the economy (energy, sustainable growth, urbanization, infrastructure, sustainable production and consumption, decent work) and the ecosystems (water and sanitation, climate change, oceans, seas and marine resources, terrestrial ecosystems, sustainable management of forests, stopping desertification, land degradation and loss of biodiversity) as they reach public policies. It seems to require the quadrature of the circle, among other reasons because the sphere of the environment is not linear (ecosystems are cyclical and therefore circular) and the intervention of the State in economy is (or used to be) the nemesis of the oligarchy, as demonstrated by Valdez (2015) in a book about the ideology of the ruling elites in Guatemala.

### 2AC -- AT: BioTech Link

#### Greed as a motive is a lie

**Bhalla**, 20**21** (Bag, author. “Biotechnology greed is prolonging the pandemic. It’s inexcusable.” ASBMB. Oct. 30, 2021. [https://www.asbmb.org/asbmb-today/opinions/103021/biotechnology-greed-is-prolonging-the-pandemic-it ///](https://www.asbmb.org/asbmb-today/opinions/103021/biotechnology-greed-is-prolonging-the-pandemic-it%20///)MF)

Did greed just save the day? That’s what British Prime Minister Boris Johnson claimed recently. “The reason we have the vaccine success,” he said in a private call to Conservative members of Parliament, “is because of capitalism, [because of greed.](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2021/mar/23/greed-and-capitalism-behind-jab-success-boris-johnson-tells-mps)”

Despite later backpedaling, Johnson’s remark reflects a widely influential but wildly incoherent view of innovation: that greed — the unfettered pursuit of profit above all else — is a necessary driver of technological progress. Call it the need-greed theory.

Among the pandemic’s many lessons, however, is that greed can easily work against the common good. We rightly celebrate the near-miraculous development of effective vaccines, which have been widely deployed in rich nations. But the global picture reveals not even a semblance of justice: As of May, low-income nations received [just 0.3 percent](https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/more-million-covid-deaths-4-months-g7-leaders-failed-break-vaccine-monopolies) of the global vaccine supply. At this rate it would take 57 years for them to achieve full vaccination.

This disparity has been dubbed “[vaccine apartheid](https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/g7-must-finance-global-covid19-vaccination-drive-by-gordon-brown-2021-06),” and it’s exacerbated by greed. A year after the launch of the World Health Organization’s Covid-19 Technology Access Pool — a program aimed at encouraging the collaborative exchange of intellectual property, knowledge, and data — “not a single company has [donated its technical knowhow](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/jun/17/covid-vaccine-nationalism-internationalist-approach),” wrote politicians from India, Kenya, and Bolivia in a June essay for The Guardian. As of that month, the U.N.-backed COVAX initiative, a vaccine sharing scheme established to provide developing countries equitable access, had delivered only about 90 million out of a promised 2 billion doses. Currently, pharmaceutical companies, lobbyists, and conservative lawmakers continue to oppose proposals for [patent waivers](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/6/29/explainer-what-are-covid-vaccine-patent-waivers) that would allow local drug makers to manufacture the vaccines without [legal jeopardy](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/05/05/993998745/biden-backs-waiving-international-patent-protections-for-covid-19-vaccines). They claim the waivers would [slow down existing production](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2021/05/07/patent-waivers-wont-impact-big-pharmas-bottom-line-but-could-slow-covid-vaccine-rollouts/?sh=7dc29a6c7862), “[foster the proliferation of counterfeit vaccines](https://www.phrma.org/Press-Release/PhRMA-Statement-on-WTO-TRIPS-Intellectual-Property-Waiver),” and, as North Carolina Republican Sen. Richard Burr said, “undermine the very [innovation we are relying](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/05/05/biden-waives-vaccine-patents/) on to bring this pandemic to an end.”

All these views echo the idea that patents and high drug prices are necessary motivators for biomedical innovation. But examine that logic closely, and it quickly begins to fall apart.

A great deal of difficult, innovative work is done in industries and fields that lack patents. Has the lack of patent protections for recipes led to any dearth of innovation in restaurants? An irritating irony here is that economists who espouse the need-greed theory themselves innovate for comparative peanuts. For instance, in 2018, the median compensation for economists was about [$104,000](https://www.aeaweb.org/resources/students/careers/earnings). The typical pharmaceutical CEO, meanwhile, earned a whopping [$5.7 million](https://www.biopharmadive.com/news/biotech-pharma-ceo-employee-pay/554283/) in total compensation that year. (The hands-on innovators aren’t the need-greeders here; the median compensation for pharmaceutical employees — including benefits — was about $177,000 in 2018.) Even in Silicon Valley, writes ever-astute technology insider Tim O’Reilly, "the notion that entrepreneurs will stop innovating if they aren’t rewarded with billions is a [pernicious fantasy](https://www.oreilly.com/radar/two-economies-two-sets-of-rules/)."

To be sure, it was not greed but rather a vast collaborative effort — funded largely with public dollars — that generated effective coronavirus vaccines. The technology behind mRNA vaccines such as those produced by Pfizer and Moderna took decades of work by University of Pennsylvania scientists you’ve likely never heard of. According to The New York Times, one of those scientists, Katalin Kariko, “[never made more than $60,000 a year](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/08/health/coronavirus-mrna-kariko.html)” while doing her innovative foundational research. The researchers at Oxford University who developed the technology behind AstraZeneca’s vaccine, which was mostly publicly funded, initially set out with the intention of “[non-exclusive, royalty-free](https://innovation.ox.ac.uk/technologies-available/technology-licensing/expedited-access-covid-19-related-ip/)” licensing for their vaccine. Only after pressure to work with a multinational pharmaceutical company from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, among others, did they [renege](https://khn.org/news/rather-than-give-away-its-covid-vaccine-oxford-makes-a-deal-with-drugmaker/) and license the technology solely to AstraZeneca.

It was astonishing, then, when Pascal Soriot, AstraZeneca’s CEO, said that intellectual property, or IP, “is a fundamental part of our industry and if you don't protect IP, then essentially there is no incentive for anybody to innovate.” The Oxford scientists whose work AstraZeneca licensed literally just innovated without the incentives Soriot claimed are essential. Why do journalists present need-greeder claims, [such as Soriot’s](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/patent-pool-potential-covid-19-products-nonsense-pharma-leaders/), without holding the specific role of profit seeking to account?

It’s no secret that innovators (and people generally) often aren’t necessarily greed-driven. For instance, as Walter Isaacson notes in his book about superstar biochemist Jennifer Doudna's work on Crispr gene manipulation technology, she was never motivated primarily by money. In fact, he reports that corporate maneuvering over her work made her "physically ill." Countless cases like hers show that innovations in science and technology typically aren’t the result of genius lightning strikes but rather of field-wide efforts with multiple teams circling the same goal. If anyone withdraws for lack of greed-gratifying incentives, no problem: They’re welcome to write themselves out of history. Others will gladly grasp the glory. And we, the public, lose nothing.

Perhaps Soriot meant, more generally, that reduced revenues would cut AstraZeneca’s overall research and development (R&D) spending. But even that claim is detectably dubious. When drug makers claim that high prices are essential for innovation, they are “[flat out lying](https://www.nakedcapitalism.com/2019/12/financialization-of-the-u-s-pharmaceutical-industry.html)” financial expert Yves Smith wrote in 2019. Smith cited data published with the Institute for New Economic Thinking showing that, between 2009 and 2018, 18 drug makers listed in the S&P 500 spent 14 percent more on stock buybacks and dividends than they did on R&D. These companies could easily ramp up investments in innovative drugs, the authors wrote, simply by reining in distributions to shareholders. (Don’t forget that share buybacks were effectively classified as [illegal market manipulation](https://www.vox.com/2018/8/2/17639762/stock-buybacks-tax-cuts-trump-republicanssi) until the Securities and Exchange Commission, under Reagan, relaxed the rules in 1982.)

Of the money that drug companies do invest in R&D, a significant amount for many goes not toward innovative research but to “finding ways to suppress generic and biosimilar competition while continuing to raise prices,” according to a [recent report](https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/COR%20Staff%20Report%20-%20Pharmaceutical%20Industry%20Buybacks%20Dividends%20Compared%20to%20Research.pdf) from the U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform. In these cases, executive and investor greed demonstrably impede innovation. A recent [Congressional hearing](https://twitter.com/RepKatiePorter/status/1394724627566391297?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1394724627566391297%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fthehill.com%2Fhomenews%2Fhouse%2F554329-katie-porter-brings-her-whiteboard-) dramatized this issue when Rep. Katie Porter, a California Democrat, grilled the CEO of AbbVie, a biopharmaceutical company which she said spent $2.45 billion on research and development, $4.71 billion a year on marketing and advertising, and [$50 billion on shareholder payouts](https://thehill.com/homenews/house/554329-katie-porter-brings-her-whiteboard-to-accuse-pharma-ceo-of-inflating-drug) between 2013 and 2018. She characterized the idea that R&D justified astronomical prices as “the Big Pharma fairy tale.”

Even if greed makes sense for some for-profit ventures, it would be unwise for us to rely only on for-profit enterprise to harness innovation for social goals. There are many things that we must do whether they are profitable or not, and the horrific fiasco over vaccine patents has shown us that biotech executives and other members of the “thinkerati” are not above putting profits ahead of saving lives. As White House adviser Anthony Fauci noted to [the Hill](https://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/551971-fauci-covid-19-vaccine-patent-waiver-should-not-be-off-the-table) earlier this year, America has a "moral obligation” to “make sure that the rest of the world does not suffer and die” from something that we can help to prevent. Our government is failing in its duty to act in the public interest if it allows “your money or your life” to pass as an acceptable business model.

As an open letter signed by more than a hundred intellectual property scholars [recently stated](https://research.kent.ac.uk/socril/ip-scholarship-trips-waiver/), IP rights (which includes patents) “are not, and have never been, absolute rights and are granted and recognized under the condition that they serve the public interest.” The scholars noted precedents like last year’s use of the Defense Production Act to increase production of medical supplies, and the U.S.’s commandeering of penicillin production during World War II. If Covid-19 vaccine makers refuse to make life-saving technology publicly available, governments should enact mandatory licensing or similar measures.

There are also compelling reasons to develop a standing, publicly operated rapid-response vaccine manufacturing capability. Pfizer’s CFO suggested that prices on vaccines will go up once we are out of the “[pandemic-pricing environment](https://www.fiercepharma.com/pharma/pfizer-eyes-higher-covid-19-vaccine-prices-after-pandemic-exec-analyst),” noting that the company can charge nearly nine times more than they have been (“$150, $175 per dose,” the CFO said, versus the $19.50 Pfizer is charging the U.S. in one supply deal). Even if those who haven’t received a single dose of the vaccine never do, that could mean roughly a $30 billion bonanza from U.S. booster shots alone. Patient advocates estimate that it would cost [just $4 billion](https://theweek.com/articles/981550/how-joe-biden-could-vaccinate-world) for the U.S. to set up a public-private operation capable of manufacturing enough mRNA vaccines to immunize the whole planet, with each shot costing $2. This would be a great way for America to show global leadership, and would surely be way cheaper, both individually and collectively, than being annually “Pfizered.” Plus, the usefulness of such a facility would long outlast the current pandemic, with climate change making zoonotic spillover events more likely (not to mention the risks of weaponized viruses). Covid-19 was our “[starter pandemic](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2020/10/coronavirus-election/616884/),” as Ed Yong usefully dubbed it.

If greed-driven companies fail to exercise their powers responsibly, they should face competition from the public sector. President Biden let the cat out of the bag when [he said](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/07/09/remarks-by-president-biden-at-signing-of-an-executive-order-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) that “capitalism without competition isn't capitalism; it's exploitation.” While many people applauded his sentiment, stop and think about the implication: The president was, in essence, saying that we expect corporations to exploit us if given half a chance.

We pay a huge price in blood and treasure when we give the need-greeders free rein to lie to and exploit the public with impunity. We must be clear-eyed about exactly when greed can help our collective interests and when it hinders them. During a crisis as dire as a global pandemic, greed won’t save us.

# AT: Impact

## AT: Impacts

### 2AC -- AT: Root Cause

#### The pessimistic approach of the K is the true reason for their impacts – the shortcomings of capitalism stem from doubt in the system

Mckenzie and Clark, 19 [Catalyst Editor William Mckenzie and Bush Institute-Smu Economic Growth Initiative Director Cullum Clark, in conversation with the American Enterprise Institute's Ryan Streeter and Brookings Institution's Richard Reeves, 2019, "Capitalism vs. Socialism is the Wrong Way to Frame Today's Economic Debate," Capitalism vs. Socialism is the Wrong Way to Frame Today's Economic Debate | Bush Center, https://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/capitalism/streeter-reeves-capitalism-vs-socialism.html, SMarx, JTong]

The term “socialism” is meaningful in the sense of what it is trying to express, but it is a horrible framing of the debate. No one in this debate seriously thinks the government should be taking command of the modes of production. Sometimes labels become unhelpful.

Streeter: I agree. The debate we are really having, but is overshadowed by the media’s attention on socialism v. capitalism, is about the institutions and structures of capitalism itself. That’s precisely why Denmark and the other Nordic countries don’t necessarily want to be called socialist. They view themselves as a hybrid between a highly-capitalist society and an economy that has very generous welfare systems. That’s not the same thing as socialism.

The debate we should be having is about what a free-market capitalist society looks like when it is struggling with certain inequities and injustices and trying to remedy those problems.

Reeves: I want to underline what Ryan said: Confidence in capitalism is really the issue, but it is a difficult problem. The psychological scars of the recession and sense of disappointment are greater than perhaps the economic loss. The real enemy of capitalism is not socialism; it is pessimism.

If you start to lose the sense that the future is going to be better largely as a result of your own effort and investment, then you don’t do the things to make it better. You don’t invest in your education, you don’t move, and you don’t risk starting a business. You become more fatalistic and pessimistic. That is really what we are talking about here.

I also want to underscore Ryan’s point about the growing geographical inequality. We used to have a more centrifugal capitalism. The opportunity to expand was quite well dispersed spatially because you moved to where it was cheaper to do business.

Today, we are seeing the opposite, a centripetal capitalism. More power is being concentrated in specific companies and areas. That’s why you get this sense of people who are being left behind. Instead of thinking about the distributional aspects of capitalism across income, the more important distributions today are across firms and communities.

Are the lives of young adults all that different from what went before? High student debt and high housing prices are two objective measurements. But what is different about the world that is shaping these attitudes in new ways?

Streeter: First, I do think some of the reporting about the pessimism among young adults about America’s future is a bit exaggerated. In our survey research, young adults — Millennials, Gen Xers, and Gen Zers — are a little more bullish on whether or not they are going to achieve the American Dream, however they define it, than has been recorded.

Having said that, people entering the workforce after the Great Recession suffered a collective psychological trauma. That has reduced confidence in institutions that typically support things like entrepreneurship and playing by the rules and working hard so you will have a better life than your parents. A pervasive timidity exists.

#### **Capitalism is used as a scapegoat for the root of all the world’s problems because of flawed logic and emotional ignorance.**

Terzi 5/24 [Alessio Terzi; Writer for Harvard University Press, Economist at the European Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, Affiliate Fellow at the think tank Bruegel and a Fulbright Scholar at the Harvard Kennedy School, PhD from the Hertie School with a thesis on economic growth, MPA in economic policy from the London School of Economics, and a BSc in international economics from Bocconi University; 5-24-2022; Growth for Good; De Gruyter; https://www-degruyter-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/doi/10.4159/9780674276338/html\; SK]

As Francesco Boldizzoni has shown, the charges leveled against capitalism are as old as capitalism itself. Whether the problem is poverty or excessive affluence, imperialism or delocalization, globalization, war, human rights infringement, inner-city poverty, lack of affordable housing, climate change, environmental degradation, loss of morality, long working hours, misogyny, white supremacy, or some other wrong, fingers inevitably point to the usual culprit. The push for “unnecessary economic growth” is no exception, as degrowth sympathizers see behind it the evil juggernaut of capitalism. Blaming something on an abstract concept, or on its vaguely identified supporters (“capitalists”) can surely feel liberating, in the way that attacking a generic “establishment” does. It allows the blame to shift outward, releasing individuals from personal responsibility. In the words of degrowth guru Jason Hickel, “People are victims of the system.”1

At the same time, such an approach is highly unhelpful, because it prevents engagement in deeper inquiry. We saw when we delved into the mechanics of capitalism in Chapter 2 that, while there are some inbuilt features such as competition among firms which feed the growth imperative, our economic system could in principle be just as compatible with zero growth if this were what consumers desired. Along similar lines, we saw in Chapter 3 how ecosocialism could in principle be made to work if a “less is more” ideology were embraced at once by the entire population of a country (or, ideally, all of humanity).

Typically, however, such lines of thinking are not developed very far before the critics of capitalism throw up their hands in helpless gestures. Going back to square one, capitalism is portrayed as the puppet master forcing human beings to act in ways they would not choose, for example by generating “artificial scarcity” to drive levels of consumption they do not even enjoy. Consumers are presented as behaving contrary to the wishes of humans, despite these being the same population.2 Even John Kenneth Galbraith, fine economist that he was, fell back on this defenseless posture, arguing that people kept consuming more only because they were victims of advertising. And capitalism has more arrows than advertising in its quiver. From spurring shoppers with sales promotions to conjuring up new gift-giving traditions, it has untold ways to generate unnecessary purchases. Worst of all, perhaps, is that prime suspect: planned obsolescence.3

#### Cap not root cause

**Haque**, 20**19** (Umair, British economist and author. “The Three Causes of the World’s Four Big Problems” Eudaimonia and Co. April 22, 2019. https://eand.co/the-three-causes-of-the-worlds-four-big-problems-e9fe49d89e3d)///MF

It was a perfect spring day. I was trying to get home to Camden Lock from Oxford Circus, after meeting a few friends for coffee downtown. A siren’s blare cut through the noisy crowds. Soon enough, police had shut down Regent Street — and massed protesters, cheering, shouting, rebelling, thronged London’s busiest intersection, shutting it down.

I don’t know if you’ve heard elsewhere, but London’s seen protests day after day now — of a new kind. Organized by a group called Extinction Rebellion, the subject of these protests isn’t authoritarianism, fascism, extremism, Wall Street — it’s climate change.

[Extinction Rebellion](https://www.google.com/search?q=extinction+rebellion&client=safari&rls=en&source=lnms&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwipgMi2neThAhWHWhUIHSnhBnoQ_AUICSgA&biw=1324&bih=939&dpr=2) is, by my reckoning, the world’s first significant series of global protests about climate change. The first one to shut down a major city, to galvanize a people, to cut through the noise of capitalist mass media — and do what protests should do: make some noise.

Thus, if you ask me, these protests matter — and they matter a very great deal. Even if I myself am the one inconvenienced by them. What matters more, after all — me getting the bus on time, or having a planet? And yet they matter in a way so deep that I think we scarcely know it. After all, these days — as things seem to fall apart by the day…who has time to process much?

So there we were, watching Extinction Rebellion roll by. And one of my American friends remarked to me, “it’s not a surprise these — the first real climate change protests — are happening in London. They’d never happen back home.” She rolled her eyes. Was she right? I thought so. It’s hardly a surprise that Extinction Rebellion was made in England. London is still the world’s most progressive city — with competition, perhaps from Barcelona and Paris — by a very long way. It would never happen in America. Americans don’t protest like Europeans do. The Parisians protest, the old joke goes, at the drop of a hat. The Brits, a little more staid, do it more rarely. But Americans protest the least and last of all.

Protests like Extinction Rebellion matter intensely, in many ways. You see, the world this century has four Big Problems — inequality, fascism, stagnation, and climate change. So far, the world isn’t just making little progress on all these problems. The grim truth is that it’s making regress. Why is that? Have you ever wondered?

2018 saw the highest emissions, ever. But it also saw the highest inequality. It saw the hardest stagnation — middle incomes in Europe flatlined, in the beleaguered Anglo world, Britain and America, they fell, and in places like China and India, they failed to keep pace with the cost of living. And as a result of all that, fascism swept the globe like wildfire. Sure, we can be polite about it, and call it “Trumpism” or “Orbanism” or “Bolsonarism.” But the future isn’t going to care about how polite we were — it will just be astounded that while fascism rose, we were too foolish and weak to even call it that.

So protests like these tell us which countries are taking which of the Big Four Problems seriously. So far, I have to tell you, nearly no country is taking any of them seriously. How else would they continue to mount to epic proportions? Yet Extinction Rebellion, for example, tells us Britain is beginning to take climate change seriously.

When I say “take the Big Problems seriously”, I don’t mean it like not just at the level of drab policy that nobody really cares about except Ezra Klein and Nate Silver. That’s yesteryear’s approach — technocracy — and its failed dismally. The technocratic approach to all these problems imagines that we can solve them without any active involvement from people — simply engineer them away with enough wonkery. The result is bizarre schemes like America’s “healthcare marketplace”, or a global system of emissions caps that’s just not working fast or well enough. Technocracy isn’t going to fix the great problems of the 21st century — in the same way that technology isn’t — because they can’t be solved from the top down.

Taking the Big Problems seriously means that societies begin a project of social, cultural, and psychological transformation. That people begin to change from inside — as we’d say in Econo-speak, that their preferences and expectations and risk tolerances begin to shift. People themselves must begin to say, “the risks of a burned out planet, of an economy left stagnant by predators, of democracies raped by fascists, of societies torn apart by inequality — all these are risks too great to bear.”

It’s a good sign, therefore, that Extinction Rebellion shut London down. I suspect I’m one of many, many Londoners who thinks to themselves, seeing the buses and tubes shut and bridges shut down — “Christ, what a pain. Jesus, what a great and wonderful pain to have to have.” I’d bet far more people are sympathetic — even if, like me, they’re hardly die-hard activists or protestors. And that, my friends, is the idea of cultural transformation in a nutshell.

My feeling is that deep transformation is going to be the great difference between societies that can adapt in the 21st century, and those that can’t. But deep transformation is painful. And some societies, it seems, just can’t manage it. Take America, for example. We’d never see, as my friend aptly observed, Extinction Rebellion there. But Americans don’t seem to care very much about any of the Big Four. There are no protests about inequality, fascism, climate change, stagnation — except occasionally. There are no Gilet Jaunes shutting Washington DC down. And who can blame Americans? Capitalism has them in a perfect trap — working so hard just to make ends meet, they never have time or energy left to change the system. And yet I can’t help but feel that if in any European country, people were dying without insulin, protests would shut it down overnight,.

Perhaps you see my point. Some societies are more capable of deep transformation than others. Take Germany. It couldn’t be more different now than a century ago. It’s a true social democracy, where people treat one another with respect, granting one another basic rights to healthcare, education, retirement, and so on. But America’s never really changed — it was built on capitalism, patriarchy, and supremacy — and those things, those cancers, grew to the point that they debilitated it, then left it a zombie state. And that comparison — between America, and everyone else, really — teaches us a great lesson, too. In what “deep transformation” really means.

If there are four Big Problems in the 21st century — climate change, inequality, stagnation, and fascism — then those four problems also have three handmaidens: capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy.

Take the example of climate change. We call it “anthropgenic climate change”, but its more accurate to call it CCCC, or capitalism-caused climate change — social democracies are the ones reducing their emissions, and capitalist countries are the ones unable to. But climate change wouldn’t exist, also, without supremacy — the idea that some people are superior to others, which implies, necessarily, that they must be superior to plants, trees, rivers, and minerals, too — all those things are just there for the supreme to exploit, abuse, and pillage, just like slaves were once. And just as patriarchy was a key mechanism in the survival of slavery — you inherited your father’s slaves — so too climate change wouldn’t exist without patriarchy. It’s the values of toxic masculinity, after all — dominance, control, power, abusiveness, acquisitiveness, possessiveness — that leads us to literally rape the earth, like a female body without a will, without the ability to consent.

You could do the same analysis for any of the Four Big Problems — they all trace back to the same three root causes. Inequality is obvious caused by capitalism. But it’s also the result of supremacy, which embeds it in social structures — which is why black wealth in America is in fact less today than during the dawn of desegregation. And it’s also the result of patriarchy — which is how wealth is passed down and inherited in thoroughly unreasonable ways, now resulting in neo-dynasties of billionaire families. The point is that the world’s Four Big Problems in the 21st century all share the same three root causes — capitalism, supremacy, patriarchy. They are the bitter fruit of the same twisted tree of violence, greed, and ruin.

These three ideologies — capitalism, supremacy, patriarchy — aren’t simple things, or new things. They’re the toxic waste of millennia. The residue of all the mistakes we’ve ever made as a species, really. They are the ghosts that still haunt humankind — the phantasms of war, greed, plunder, empire, the clowns of folly, the banshees of hate. The Big Four won’t go away without tackling the Deep Three.

So when I say that those societies who can make a psychological, cultural, social transformation are going to be the ones that prosper this century, I mean it in a precise way. Those societies which can transcend the old ways of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy are going to rise and rise and rise. They already are, in fact. The happiest and wealthiest societies in the world — from Scandinavia to Barcelona — are all pioneers in exactly this way: they are much (much) further the road of deep transformation than others, having done more to transcend capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy.

Conversely, those societies which can’t kick the habits of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy, are already going down the tubes. Witness America, for example. Britain’s not far behind — which is why it’s a refreshing surprise to see Extinction Rebellion happen in the land of Brexit.

If you need to understand all that in a visceral way, just think of it like this.

Who can you think of that’s the personification of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy? Trump, of course. Do you think Trump cares about the Four Big Problems of inequality, climate change, stagnation, and fascism? LOL, of course not. He embodies them. He hopes to profit off them. Donald Trump is where centuries of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy led squarely to: the most corrupt, idiotic, selfish, abusive, imbecile…for the most important job in the world.

Do you see the point? The ages of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy are over — the harder we cling to them, the more regress we will make. Their die-hard adherents — like America’s bizarre ultraconservatives, and Britain’s imbecilic Brexiteers — won’t let them go. But the rest of us have work to do. The work of understanding how and why these ideologies failed, led to dead ends, are badly obsolete, how to leave them behind. Capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy don’t add up to freedom, equality, and justice..they just add up to Donald Trump.

So if you remember one thing this year, one thought, I think it should be this: centuries of capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy led us to a dead end in human progress — a dystopian hellscape made of inequality, stagnation, fascism, and climate change. America exemplifies it. To make progress this century, we are going to have to transcend those old ways, those old ideologies, those tired, weary, and failed mindsets. You can sum that thought up this way: C,P,S → predatory, exploitative collapse — of ecologies, economies, democracies, societies. C,P,S → collapse of any system they govern.

We are going to have to win our freedom from those old, failed, dead, stupid ways, my friends. It won’t be an easy fight. Let us then take a little inspiration from Extinction Rebellion — and begin in whatever tiny ways that we can.

#### Cap is not root cause – psychology = rc (3)

**Brooks,** 20**20** (Mike, PhD psychologist and author. “What’s the Root Cause of Many of the World’s Problems?” Psychology Today. September 4, 2020. [https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202009/whats-the-root-cause-many-the-worlds-problems ///](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202009/whats-the-root-cause-many-the-worlds-problems%20///) MF)

As discussed in my previous blog, we often perceive the world to be more negative than it is as part of a negativity [bias](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/bias). This bias manifests us to be hyper-vigilant to potential threats because this helped our ancestors survive. This is why, even stretching back to the beginning of civilization, it always feels [like it's the end of the world as we know it.](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202008/why-it-feels-the-end-the-world-even-when-its-not)

On its own, our negativity bias is not a bad thing. The way that natural selection works, it was necessary for a negativity bias to distort the way in which our ancestors saw the world for them to survive as a species. As cognitive psychologist Donald Hoffman describes in [The Case Against Reality: Why Evolution Hid the Truth From Our Eyes](https://www.amazon.com/Case-Against-Reality-Evolution-Truth/dp/0393254690/ref=sr_1_1?dchild=1&keywords=case+against+reality&qid=1599000664&sr=8-1&pldnSite=1), fitness beats reality. That is, survival is more important than the truth, so, through natural selection, perceptual distortions of reality naturally emerge when it helps the organism survive and reproduce.

Thank goodness our hominid ancestors distorted reality because otherwise, we wouldn't be here! But as we look back at history and see the problems of war, genocides, religious persecution, slavery, misogyny, oppression, and so on, it has often been a rough road indeed! While we have made much progress over time, many of these same problems persist to this day. Ironically, part of our suffering that we have experienced and continue to experience is a by-product of the evolution that got us here in the first place. How is this so?

[T](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202008/why-it-feels-the-end-the-world-even-when-its-not)he Explanatory Power of Evolutionary Mismatch

Our highly evolved brains have helped us to master fire, invent the wheel, and to develop language, writing, agriculture, intricate social structures, monetary and political systems, vaccines, plumbing, computers, smartphones, blogging for Psychology Today, and so on. Yet, herein lies a big part of our problem. Our evolved brains have allowed us to escape the simplicity of the hunter-gatherer environments from which they originated. This very progress has left the door open for problems to creep in because we cannot easily escape our evolutionary heritage.

The legacy of our hunter-gatherer brains and bodies lives on in us. Biological evolution cannot keep pace with cultural and technological evolution. The problems caused by the discrepancies between our ancestral and modern living environments is known as an [evolutionary mismatch](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/darwins-subterranean-world/201701/evolutionary-mismatch-and-what-you-can-do-about-it). Simply put, we did not evolve to live in the world in which we now live. While we are adaptive creatures, we cannot so easily liberate ourselves from the adaptations that evolved over the millennia to help our ancestors survive in a world that is very discrepant from our own. In a manner of speaking, we perceive the modern world through ancient eyes.

Oh, What a (Wicked) World!

An evolutionary mismatch does not, of course, explain all of the world's problems. The world is extremely complicated, and we can't point to a single cause to the myriad of problems in life. Strangely enough, this tendency to search for simple answers to complex problems can be viewed as another manifestation of evolutionary mismatch.

article continues after advertisement

We are drawn toward more concrete answers because our ancestors evolved in a world in which more short-term, casual thinking was adaptive. That's primarily the type of thinking that our ancestors needed for survival. Find food, water, shelter, a mate, and stay alive. Life was so simple in those “good old days!”

A way of looking at the difficult challenges in this modern world comes from the work of [Dr. Robin Hogarth and his colleagues.](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0963721415591878) In their research, they proposed that there are kind and wicked learning environments. Importantly, "kind" does not mean "good," and "wicked" does not mean "evil" in this context. Rather, kind learning environments are simple, straight-forward cause-and-effect relationships—if I do this, then that will happen. Feedback in these kind learning environments is quick and accurate. Hunting and gathering food were conducted by our ancestors in kind learning environments.

In contrast, wicked learning environments are complicated ones. Cause-and-effect relationships are hard to see, and predictions are difficult to make. Feedback is infrequent, inconsistent, and often delayed in time. Moreover, in wicked learning environments, the feedback can be mismatched with the outcomes. This can result in us learning the wrong lessons.

The Evolution of a Quandary

Our magnificent brains evolved over hundreds of thousands of years to solve problems and challenges to increase our survival in a kind but often brutal world. Our ancestors didn’t have to wrestle with wicked problems, such as geopolitical instability, improving the quality of national health care systems, the impact of lifestyle decisions on [the environment](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/environment) over time, saving for [retirement](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/aging), managing global pandemics, determining the most equitable and functional taxation system, and resolving international trade disputes. Our brains evolved to help us to adapt, survive, and pass on our [genes](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/genetics). They’ve succeeded at this, in part, through the creation of these wicked learning environments (e.g., political and monetary systems) that are very discrepant from our evolutionary origins. Paradoxically, these wicked learning environments are filled with complicated problems that can confound our poor noggins.
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"And he puzzled and puzzled 'till his puzzler was sore.” —The Grinch, From the Grinch Who Stole Christmas

Our Biases in a Wicked World

Psychologists have identified scores of [cognitive biases](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/bias) that affect our perceptions and judgments. From one perspective, these biases distort reality, but they do this (largely) because fitness beats reality. They are an [unconscious](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/unconscious) way of reducing complexity in [decision-making](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/decision-making) that is rooted in our ancestral, kind learning environments. Cognitive biases exist because they serve fitness (survival) over reality. They are like mental shortcuts that allow an organism to make decisions more quickly to navigate potentially life-or-death situations.

Yet, because the modern world is so wickedly complicated and mismatched with that of our ancestors, cognitive biases contribute to some troublesome problems. It is as if our brains are trying to solve the challenges of wicked learning environments with the same cognitive biases that helped our ancestors survive.

This begs the question: What was most critical for our survival as a species in our ancestral world? The answer is one another. Our ancestors were able to evolve because they learned how to work together in groups. A strong tribal community meant survival. A contentious, dysfunctional tribe, or a life in isolation, meant death.

The problem is that our ancestors [evolved in tribes of 100-150 people](https://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/social-media-affect-math-dunbar-number-friendships). In our wickedly complex world, we are still "wired" to be tribal, but our modern world is so vastly different from those small, nomadic hunter-gatherer groups. This big evolutionary mismatch is the root of some major problems we are seeing in America and across the world now. Much of the hatred, the vitriol, the polarization, and the "us vs. them" mentality in our [politics](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/politics) is an outgrowth of mismatched tribalism.

"A house divided against itself will not stand." —Jesus, Matthew 12:25 of the New Testament

When it comes down to it, tribalism trumps reality. This is not a "left" or "right" problem. It is a human problem. Importantly, we need to transcend the toxic levels of political division, or we will suffer even more of the painful consequences. I will tackle this in my next series of blogs, so please join me!

### 1AR -- AT: Root Cause

#### Cap is not root cause – psychology = rc

**Brooks,** 20**20** (Mike, PhD psychologist and author. “What’s the Root Cause of Many of the World’s Problems?” Psychology Today. September 4, 2020. [https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202009/whats-the-root-cause-many-the-worlds-problems ///](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202009/whats-the-root-cause-many-the-worlds-problems%20///)MF)

As discussed in my previous blog, we often perceive the world to be more negative than it is as part of a negativity [bias](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/bias). This bias manifests us to be hyper-vigilant to potential threats because this helped our ancestors survive. This is why, even stretching back to the beginning of civilization, it always feels [like it's the end of the world as we know it.](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202008/why-it-feels-the-end-the-world-even-when-its-not)

On its own, our negativity bias is not a bad thing. The way that natural selection works, it was necessary for a negativity bias to distort the way in which our ancestors saw the world for them to survive as a species. As cognitive psychologist Donald Hoffman describes in [The Case Against Reality: Why Evolution Hid the Truth From Our Eyes](https://www.amazon.com/Case-Against-Reality-Evolution-Truth/dp/0393254690/ref=sr_1_1?dchild=1&keywords=case+against+reality&qid=1599000664&sr=8-1&pldnSite=1), fitness beats reality. That is, survival is more important than the truth, so, through natural selection, perceptual distortions of reality naturally emerge when it helps the organism survive and reproduce.

Thank goodness our hominid ancestors distorted reality because otherwise, we wouldn't be here! But as we look back at history and see the problems of war, genocides, religious persecution, slavery, misogyny, oppression, and so on, it has often been a rough road indeed! While we have made much progress over time, many of these same problems persist to this day. Ironically, part of our suffering that we have experienced and continue to experience is a by-product of the evolution that got us here in the first place. How is this so?

[T](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/tech-happy-life/202008/why-it-feels-the-end-the-world-even-when-its-not)he Explanatory Power of Evolutionary Mismatch

Our highly evolved brains have helped us to master fire, invent the wheel, and to develop language, writing, agriculture, intricate social structures, monetary and political systems, vaccines, plumbing, computers, smartphones, blogging for Psychology Today, and so on. Yet, herein lies a big part of our problem. Our evolved brains have allowed us to escape the simplicity of the hunter-gatherer environments from which they originated. This very progress has left the door open for problems to creep in because we cannot easily escape our evolutionary heritage.

The legacy of our hunter-gatherer brains and bodies lives on in us. Biological evolution cannot keep pace with cultural and technological evolution. The problems caused by the discrepancies between our ancestral and modern living environments is known as an [evolutionary mismatch](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/darwins-subterranean-world/201701/evolutionary-mismatch-and-what-you-can-do-about-it). Simply put, we did not evolve to live in the world in which we now live. While we are adaptive creatures, we cannot so easily liberate ourselves from the adaptations that evolved over the millennia to help our ancestors survive in a world that is very discrepant from our own. In a manner of speaking, we perceive the modern world through ancient eyes.

Oh, What a (Wicked) World!

An evolutionary mismatch does not, of course, explain all of the world's problems. The world is extremely complicated, and we can't point to a single cause to the myriad of problems in life. Strangely enough, this tendency to search for simple answers to complex problems can be viewed as another manifestation of evolutionary mismatch.

article continues after advertisement

We are drawn toward more concrete answers because our ancestors evolved in a world in which more short-term, casual thinking was adaptive. That's primarily the type of thinking that our ancestors needed for survival. Find food, water, shelter, a mate, and stay alive. Life was so simple in those “good old days!”

A way of looking at the difficult challenges in this modern world comes from the work of [Dr. Robin Hogarth and his colleagues.](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0963721415591878) In their research, they proposed that there are kind and wicked learning environments. Importantly, "kind" does not mean "good," and "wicked" does not mean "evil" in this context. Rather, kind learning environments are simple, straight-forward cause-and-effect relationships—if I do this, then that will happen. Feedback in these kind learning environments is quick and accurate. Hunting and gathering food were conducted by our ancestors in kind learning environments.

In contrast, wicked learning environments are complicated ones. Cause-and-effect relationships are hard to see, and predictions are difficult to make. Feedback is infrequent, inconsistent, and often delayed in time. Moreover, in wicked learning environments, the feedback can be mismatched with the outcomes. This can result in us learning the wrong lessons.

The Evolution of a Quandary

Our magnificent brains evolved over hundreds of thousands of years to solve problems and challenges to increase our survival in a kind but often brutal world. Our ancestors didn’t have to wrestle with wicked problems, such as geopolitical instability, improving the quality of national health care systems, the impact of lifestyle decisions on [the environment](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/environment) over time, saving for [retirement](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/aging), managing global pandemics, determining the most equitable and functional taxation system, and resolving international trade disputes. Our brains evolved to help us to adapt, survive, and pass on our [genes](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/genetics). They’ve succeeded at this, in part, through the creation of these wicked learning environments (e.g., political and monetary systems) that are very discrepant from our evolutionary origins. Paradoxically, these wicked learning environments are filled with complicated problems that can confound our poor noggins.
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"And he puzzled and puzzled 'till his puzzler was sore.” —The Grinch, From the Grinch Who Stole Christmas

Our Biases in a Wicked World

Psychologists have identified scores of [cognitive biases](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/bias) that affect our perceptions and judgments. From one perspective, these biases distort reality, but they do this (largely) because fitness beats reality. They are an [unconscious](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/unconscious) way of reducing complexity in [decision-making](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/decision-making) that is rooted in our ancestral, kind learning environments. Cognitive biases exist because they serve fitness (survival) over reality. They are like mental shortcuts that allow an organism to make decisions more quickly to navigate potentially life-or-death situations.

Yet, because the modern world is so wickedly complicated and mismatched with that of our ancestors, cognitive biases contribute to some troublesome problems. It is as if our brains are trying to solve the challenges of wicked learning environments with the same cognitive biases that helped our ancestors survive.

This begs the question: What was most critical for our survival as a species in our ancestral world? The answer is one another. Our ancestors were able to evolve because they learned how to work together in groups. A strong tribal community meant survival. A contentious, dysfunctional tribe, or a life in isolation, meant death.

The problem is that our ancestors [evolved in tribes of 100-150 people](https://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/social-media-affect-math-dunbar-number-friendships). In our wickedly complex world, we are still "wired" to be tribal, but our modern world is so vastly different from those small, nomadic hunter-gatherer groups. This big evolutionary mismatch is the root of some major problems we are seeing in America and across the world now. Much of the hatred, the vitriol, the polarization, and the "us vs. them" mentality in our [politics](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/politics) is an outgrowth of mismatched tribalism.

"A house divided against itself will not stand." —Jesus, Matthew 12:25 of the New Testament

When it comes down to it, tribalism trumps reality. This is not a "left" or "right" problem. It is a human problem. Importantly, we need to transcend the toxic levels of political division, or we will suffer even more of the painful consequences. I will tackle this in my next series of blogs, so please join me!

### 2AC -- AT: Cap causes Genocide

#### Other factors causes genocide, not cap

**Williams**, 20**16** (Timothy, research fellow at the Centre for Conflict Studies at Marburg University. “Why Genocide Occurs” October 6, 2016. [https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs ///](https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs%20///) MF)

Abstract.  
Why do genocides occur? This paper applies qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to revisit this question, and analyses 139 cases of genocide and non-genocide. The paper demonstrates the importance of both priming, contextual conditions which provide a political opportunity structure conducive to genocide, as well as triggering, more proximate conditions which constitute immanent motivations. Most centrally, sufficiency is demonstrated for genocide occurrence when an autocratic regime and the salience of an elite's ethnicity are present, and are combined with either an exclusionary ideology or political upheaval. As such, the autocratic nature of the state provides an opportunity structure allowing genocide to occur, while the salience of elite ethnicity can serve as a motivation. Finally, the ideology and the political upheaval serve as an additional motivation or opportunity structure, respectively. While political upheaval can play a part in causing genocide, its role is much more understated than is suggested in previous literature.

Introduction

Why genocides occur has been one of the central debates within the study of genocide over previous decades and has been informed by studies from a range of disciplines. It is an important research endeavour as it is pivotal to identify the conditions under which genocide occurs if there is ever to be any possibility of preventing genocide from occurring. In an attempt to shed fresh light on the debate this paper conducts a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of the 40 genocide cases and 100 non-genocidal incidents which occurred between 1955 and 1998. The data used here builds on data from the Political Instability Task Force’s State Failure Problem Set as is common in much of the emerging quantitative genocide literature and in Barbara Harff’s seminal statistical paper "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955."1 While drawing on the same dataset as several papers before, this paper takes the dataset further and interrogates the cases from a new methodological perspective, QCA. With this alternative method which is based on set-theory it is possible to tease out deeper insights from the data and allow for a richer analysis of why genocides occur.

Specifically, QCA provides a method for capturing the general patterns of genocide occurrence while also allowing for complexity better than other methods used hitherto, constituting a significant step forward in the understanding of the causes of genocides. Although genocide is a complex phenomenon, this paper suggests ways of breaking down central conditions which coalesce across certain subsets of categories by applying an alternative methodology thus far not used to address this question. This paper demonstrates that QCA – which is neither traditionally qualitative nor quantitative – is a suitable and possibly preferential methodology for studying genocide occurrence as it uses Boolean algebra to identify multiple pathways to genocide with different combinations of conditions acting as causes of genocide in different cases. QCA systematically provides different profiles of condition combinations which provoke genocide outbreak, thereby identifying necessary and sufficient conditions. This paper demonstrates that sufficient and necessary causes can be found when examining genocides. The findings are less parsimonious than previous statistical results but offer a more realistic picture of the complex conditions that can be seen as sufficient or necessary for genocide to occur. This research, thus, has the potential of providing a framework for policy makers and civil society actors for anticipating when genocidal situations are more likely to arise, providing configurations of conditions of when genocide has occurred in the past.

This paper will first clarify some issues around the concept of genocide, before presenting a theoretical framework of different determinants emphasised in previous research and explaining the merits of the chosen QCA approach. Subsequently, the case and condition choice will be explained in detail, as well as their respective operationalisations. Finally, the results of the QCA will be presented and expanded in an empirical analysis, before bringing together these results to identify the central determinants of genocide and demonstrate how these results are a step forward for the study of genocide occurrence.

Why Do Genocides Occur?

This section will discuss various conditions identified previously as central to causing genocide occurrence. It is helpful to split them into two types of categories: priming, contextual conditions and motivating, triggering conditions. The first priming conditions provide a context which is opportune for genocide, and suggest conditions can help to overcome certain societal or international restrictions; these conditions should as such not suffice to cause genocide, but instead they necessitate a triggering conditions, something about why key actors want genocide to occur and thus instigate it. In the following discussion of various conditions, the presence of an autocratic regime and an economically autarkic economy can be seen as setting the context, while an exclusionary ideology has a more triggering character; other conditions could play into both categories to varying degrees. It is to be expected that any situation of genocide arises out of a context conducive to it, combined with triggering motivations. Thus, the QCA solutions are expected to combine several of the following conditions to create individually sufficient pathways to genocide. Genocide is taken here to mean "the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents—or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities—that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group."2 This definition of genocides and politicides is the foundation of Harff’s comprehensive list of genocides and politicides which underlies the dataset used in this paper.

#### Most commonly cited cause of genocide is political upheaval

**Williams**, 20**16** (Timothy, research fellow at the Centre for Conflict Studies at Marburg University. “Why Genocide Occurs” October 6, 2016. [https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs ///](https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs%20///) MF)

Political Upheaval

The most commonly cited determinant of genocide occurrence, in both qualitative and quantitativestudies, is political upheaval and direct threats to governments which also finds a prominent position in Harff’s study.3 Harff defines political upheaval as "an abrupt change in the political community caused by the formation of a state or regime through violent conflict, redrawing of state boundaries, or defeat in international war."4 In this context, Melson and Krain emphasise the importance of revolutions,5 but it is also a category in which decolonisation or other radical system changes or collapses would equally be well placed. The logic behind all these is that political upheaval provides a context and a political opportunity structure which is conducive to starting genocide. With the constraints of a previous system removed, the legitimacy of the political community and its identity (including which groups constitute it) can be called into question.6 Political upheaval provides the opportunity to re-define the demos, the circle of people included as constituents of the state, in a deinstitutionalised setting.7 In the context of political upheaval, rules of conduct between the state and its population can become re-defined and enable a regime intent on genocide to implement a new eliminationist policy. The period of transition, and the often concurrent chaos, can also serve as a smokescreen for action against the targeted group, given that internal and external observers could be distracted by other macro-political transformation processes. Besides providing a contextual background, political upheaval can also be a motivational impulse and thus trigger genocide. In the throes of political upheaval, reigning elites may feel particularly threatened by certain groups they believe could try to exploit the upheaval to topple them, and thus desire to have these groups removed. The empirical founding of the impact of political upheaval since World War II is immense and Harff finds a significant impact on the risk of genocide occurrence, while Krain suggests that extra-constitutional changes (a similar concept) have a significant impact on this likelihood.8

#### Genocide is caused by war

**Williams**, 20**16** (Timothy, research fellow at the Centre for Conflict Studies at Marburg University. “Why Genocide Occurs” October 6, 2016. [https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs ///](https://kh.boell.org/en/2016/10/06/why-genocide-occurs%20///) MF)

War

A further condition often associated with genocide occurrence is war,9 and for Krain a country’s involvement in civil war is the single most significant determinant of genocide occurrence in his statistical study.10 War is here defined as "a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths."11 War can be seen as a contextual condition which – as suggested above for political upheaval – provides a conducive opportunity structure for genocides to emerge: war allows the destruction of a population to happen as other policy options are closed off or the state becomes increasingly autonomous from other internal social forces, such as public opinion.12 Moreover, war provides the opportunity to scapegoat certain unwanted groups and portray them as internal enemies of the state who are coalescing with the external enemies one is fighting militarily in the war, triggering a genocide against them. Also, in particular in the context of guerrilla wars, wars can motivate governments to include genocide in military strategy as rebels are particularly dependent on their local populations for support and security.13

Both political upheaval and war thus encompass a political opportunity structure founded on an exceptional situation which removes the standard constraints of government from the political elites. However, there are two key differences between war and political upheaval in the mechanics of how they affect genocide occurrence. First, political upheaval can be nonviolent, while war inherently brings with it the internal mobilisation of arms, minimally through the secondment of military troops, oftentimes also in the armament of civilian defence groups, paramilitaries or similar groups. This expansion of available weapons and their distribution to wider circles of the population make it possible to then implement a genocidal policy quickly and effectively, particularly if these civilian or paramilitary groups are encompassed in a strong military or other hierarchy of authority; furthermore, such armament and genocidal operations can go largely unnoticed in the more general context of military war action. Second, war – both civil and international – tends to strengthen the political elites’ hold on power (in the areas under their control) as security fears in the population can increase popular support and facilitate rallying around the leadership in order to avert a military defeat; further, war is normally fought between two or more clearly demarcated parties, while political upheaval can include struggles for power between unclear and diffuse constellations of actors. Both these aspects differ fundamentally from political upheaval in which the political elites wanting to pursue genocide capitalise on political uncertainty and destabilisation.

### 2AC -- AT: Cap causes Racism

#### Structural causes to racism, capitalism isn’t one of them

**Bailey**, Feldman and Bassett **et al,** 20**21** (Zinzi D., social epidemiologist, affiliated with the University of Miami. Justin M., Health and Human Rights Fellow at Harvard. Mary T., Commissioner of the New York State Department of Health. “How Structural Racism Works – Racist Policies as a Root Cause of U.S. Racial Health Inequalities” Feb. 25, 2021 [https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396 ///](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396%20///) MF)

In the 5 years since one of us published “#BlackLivesMatter — A Challenge to the Medical and Public Health Communities” in the Journal,[1](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) we have seen a sea change in the recognition of racism as a durable feature of U.S. society and of its high cost in Black lives. Elected officials, corporate leaders, and academics alike use the slogan “Black Lives Matter,” which has also been widely adopted by members of the public, who by the millions protested the extrajudicial killing of George Floyd.[2](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) With this change comes growing recognition that racism has a structural basis and is embedded in long-standing social policy. This framing is captured by the term “structural racism.”

There is no “official” definition of structural racism — or of the closely related concepts of systemic and institutional racism — although multiple definitions have been offered.[3-7](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) All definitions make clear that racism is not simply the result of private prejudices held by individuals,[8](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) but is also produced and reproduced by laws, rules, and practices, sanctioned and even implemented by various levels of government, and embedded in the economic system as well as in cultural and societal norms.[3,8](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Confronting racism, therefore, requires not only changing individual attitudes, but also transforming and dismantling the policies and institutions that undergird the U.S. racial hierarchy.

As a legacy of African enslavement, structural racism affects both population and individual health in three interrelated domains: redlining and racialized residential segregation, mass incarceration and police violence, and unequal medical care. These examples, among others, share certain cardinal features: harms are historically grounded, involve multiple institutions, and rely on racist cultural tropes.

Redlining and Racialized Residential Segregation

In 1933, the federal government established the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) to expand homeownership as a part of recovery from the Great Depression.[8](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) To guide determinations of mortgage-worthiness, HOLC created maps of at least 239 U.S. cities. Using racial composition as part of its assessment, HOLC staff literally drew red lines (hence “redlining”) around communities with large Black populations, flagging them as hazardous investment areas whose residents would not receive HOLC loans. Redlining made mortgages less accessible, rendering prospective Black homebuyers vulnerable to predatory terms, thereby increasing lender profits, reducing access to home ownership, and depriving these communities of an asset that is central to intergenerational wealth transfer. Federal mortgages were declined regardless of home loan officers’ racial views; it was not personal.

This government-sanctioned practice validated other racist maneuvers, such as restrictive covenants that barred Blacks from home ownership by means of legal agreements set up by previous owners, undervaluing of real estate in Black neighborhoods, and mob violence against Blacks who moved into White neighborhoods. Although redlining officially ended with the Fair Housing Act of 1968, its impact is seen today in the social geography of cities. Residential segregation formed a platform for broad social disinvestment, especially in neighborhood infrastructure (e.g., green space, housing stock, and roads), services (e.g., transport, schools, and garbage collection), and employment.

Residential racial segregation remains a powerful predictor of Black disadvantage.[3,5,9](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) There is a direct legacy of redlining in health and well-being — preterm birth, cancer, tuberculosis, maternal depression, and other mental health issues occur at higher rates among residents of once-redlined areas.[3-5](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Plausible mechanisms for the continued health impact of redlining deserve further study, taking into account exposure to environmental toxins (teratogens, carcinogens, air pollutants, etc.) and the sustained physical impact of concentrated psychosocial stressors.[5,9-11](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Better HOLC neighborhood grades are associated with lower levels of airborne carcinogens and higher levels of tree-canopy coverage (which mitigates air pollutants and heat).[12](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Predominantly White neighborhoods generally have lower air-pollution levels,[13](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) while higher exposures contribute to asthma and low-birth-weight outcomes in Black communities.[14](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Redlining required the cooperation of government; the banking, credit, and real estate industries and private developers; as well as homeowners. Together, these parties helped stoke cultural beliefs that Blacks made bad neighbors whose presence would lower real-estate values and increase crime. Furthermore, the structural racism that enables and sustains segregation facilitates structural racism in other forms, including mass incarceration and police violence and the unjust distribution of high-quality health care.

Police Violence and the Carceral State

The United States has the world’s highest incarceration rate, and U.S. police kill civilians far more often than do police in other wealthy countries.[15,16](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) A large body of scientific research documents both racially unequal outcomes and racial bias in virtually all aspects of the criminal legal system, with Black people experiencing harsher outcomes in relation to police encounters, bail setting, sentence length, and capital punishment than White people.[17,18](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) The history of courts, prisons, and police as institutions that maintain racial hierarchy is key to understanding the deeply punitive and racially unequal nature of the U.S. criminal legal system, with important and persisting implications for the health of Black communities.

Contemporary U.S. policing has roots in slave patrols, which were first established in 18th-century colonial Virginia in an effort to capture runaways and quell uprisings. After the abolition of slavery and the short-lived progress of the Reconstruction Era, police and prisons served as key institutions for reasserting White dominance, especially in the South. Law enforcement sanctioned, enabled, and participated in the lynching of Black people, which White mobs typically carried out under the pretext of punishment for crime; in reality, lynching often had broader economic and political motives.[19](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Southern White people also used police and prisons to enforce vagrancy laws and the convict-leasing and sharecropping systems in order to compel formerly enslaved people to return to the fields — “slavery by another name,” as one author famously put it.[20](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

By the time Congress passed the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, lynching had become rare and the convict-leasing system had been long abandoned. But just months later, President Lyndon Johnson declared a “War on Crime,” which was followed in the next decade by President Richard Nixon’s “War on Drugs,” both of which appealed to fears about supposed Black criminality. These developments portended a sevenfold increase in the size of the incarcerated population, with Black people incarcerated at five times the rate for White people.[21,22](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) As in the post-Reconstruction era, the development of mass incarceration also had economic dimensions — for example, the expansion of prisons provided employment in White, deindustrialized rural areas.[23](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

The late 1960s also saw a massive spike in police killings of Black men,[24](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) and it was not until the 1980s that the U.S. Supreme Court placed even modest restrictions on police use of force — for instance by declaring it unconstitutional for police to shoot a civilian who is fleeing a crime scene but poses no harm to others.[25](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Policing has long been entangled in other structures that reproduce racism, such as residential segregation. Police once enforced racial restrictions in “sundown towns” that excluded Black people outside working hours; they now disproportionately target Black people who enter White neighborhoods.[26](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) The police activity that resulted in Breonna Taylor’s fatal shooting by police in Kentucky has been tied to an “urban revitalization” plan.[27](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Policing and incarceration have profound adverse consequences for the health of Black people. Some of these consequences are direct — police use of force kills hundreds of Black people each year and nonfatally injures many thousands more. Incarcerated people — who are disproportionately Black — face a high risk of death after release,[28](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) and prisons and jails have been major sites of disease transmission during the Covid-19 pandemic.[29](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) There are also indirect effects — for instance, police violence can harm mental health for entire communities through constant surveillance and threat of violence,[30](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) and the churn in and out of incarceration can result in community spread of sexually transmitted infections or other infectious diseases, such as Covid-19.[31](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

The notion that police reform alone will solve police violence is incomplete and misleading. A structural racism lens allows us to see how policing and prisons have served their intended purpose of social control of the Black population, which has long been enforced by violence. For effective change, we must determine which sectors (such as mental health and social services) should be involved in equitably addressing public safety without necessarily requiring a police response.

Unequal Health Care

Modern American medicine has historical roots in scientific racism and eugenics movements. Scientific racism reified the concept of race as an innate biologic, and later genetic, attribute using culturally influenced scientific theory and inquiry.[32](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) American scientists, such as Samuel Morton, continued this tradition, using anatomical features such as skull size and volume to categorize races in ways that enshrined White superiority.[32,33](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) The modern eugenics movement swept through the United States in the early 20th century, leading to laws prohibiting “miscegenation” and the forced sterilization of undesirable “races” in an effort to create a better, more intelligent, Whiter nation.[32](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Well-respected medical doctors cast Blacks as innately diseased and dehumanized their suffering, using scientific arguments to provide the illusion of neutrality and objectivity. For instance, in 1851, Southern physician Samuel Cartwright described “drapetomania,” a “mental illness” that he claimed caused enslaved Africans to run away from their confinement; he argued that it could be prevented by keeping Black people in submission and could be cured by whippings.[34](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Cartwright also “discovered” dysaesthesia aethiopica, a “disease” in Black people characterized by reduced intellectual ability, laziness, and partial insensitivity of the skin.[34](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Similarly, physician J. Marion Sims, who was hailed as the father of modern gynecology, owed his signal accomplishment of vesicovaginal fistula repair to repeated operations performed, without anesthesia, on enslaved Black women — women for whom informed consent had no meaning.[35](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Racialized conceptions of susceptibility to disease persist to this day. In its 2003 report Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care, the Institute of Medicine reviewed more than 100 studies and concluded that bias, prejudice, and stereotyping contributed to widespread differences in health care by race and ethnicity.[36](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) That call to action went largely unheeded. Fifteen years later, the 2018 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report documented that Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander patients continued to receive poorer care than White patients on 40% of the quality measures included, with little to no improvement from decades past.[37](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) This unequal treatment is based, at least in part, in enduring racist cultural beliefs and practices. For instance, in a 2016 study to assess racial attitudes, half of White medical students and residents held unfounded beliefs about intrinsic biologic differences between Black people and White people. These false beliefs were associated with assessments of Black patients’ pain as being less severe than that of White patients and with less appropriate treatment decisions for Black patients.[38](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

It would be short-sighted to think that individual prejudice and discrimination alone drive substandard care. The systematic disinvestment in public and private sectors within segregated Black neighborhoods has resulted in underresourced facilities with fewer clinicians, which makes it more difficult to recruit experienced and well-credentialed primary care providers and specialists and thereby affects access and utilization.[3](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) Black communities became medical training grounds and a source of profit, reinforcing the American medical caste system that we have today. Regardless of intent, actions by parties ranging from medical schools to providers, insurers, health systems, legislators, and employers have ensured that racially segregated Black communities have limited and substandard care.[3](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Acceptance of this inequitable treatment as “normal” is historically rooted in and supported by the belief that Black people are intrinsically disease-prone and, implicitly or explicitly, not deserving of high-quality care. As with policing, dismantling structural racism’s impact on health care is not an issue of “a few bad apples”; we must reflect on the ways our everyday, accepted practices reify race — that is, treat the social construct of race as an intrinsic biologic difference — thereby exemplifying and contributing to a broader system of structural racism.

Our Role in Dismantling Structural Racism

Structural racism reaches back to the beginnings of U.S. history, stretches across its institutions and economy, and dwells within our culture. Its durability contributes to the perception that Black disadvantage is intrinsic, permanent, and therefore normal. But considering structural racism as a root cause is not a modern analogue of the theory that disease is caused by “miasmas” — something that’s “in the air,” amorphous and undifferentiated. Structural racism functions to harm health in ways that can be described, measured, and dismantled. Actions to dismantle racism necessarily involve the whole of society. Moving beyond individual education and personal insight to change policy and social norms will require the engagement of many institutions, but the medical and public health communities can contribute directly in at least four key areas.

The first is embracing the intellectual project of documenting the health impact of racism. Despite the long and ongoing history of racism, empirical research showing its impact on health is rarely published in major medical journals. Although we find the evidence of the health effects of structural racism to be convincing, and supported by more than a century of wide-ranging theoretical and empirical scholarship, it remains marginalized and eclipsed by other research priorities.[3-6,39](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) When leading medical journals address structural racism, it is often confined to commentaries and editorials, as though these topics are suitable for discussion but not discovery. Broad agreement is needed — by funders, editors, and reviewers — that racism and inequities in social determinants of health more generally are topics as valid for research as biologic markers (and certainly the two can be combined).

Next, the availability of data that include race and ethnicity must improve, and efforts to develop and improve measurement of structural racism need to be supported, particularly those using available administrative databases. Such work is under way, and we believe it should be widely encouraged.[6,40-44](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Third, the medical and public health communities need to turn a lens on themselves, both as individuals and as institutions. Faculty and students need a more complete view both of U.S. history and of the ways in which medicine and public health have participated and continue to participate in racist practices. Reflection includes recognition of harms arising from the uncritical use of racial categories, which reinforces implicit assumptions that racial differences are genetic in origin. Furthermore, it includes measuring the success of interventions in terms of how well they narrow inequitable gaps in health (here, between Black people and White people) instead of focusing solely on the overall population. Rigorous, clear standards for publishing research on racial health inequities have been proposed.[45](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396)

Meanwhile, addressing the growing underrepresentation of Black students in medical school,[46](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) and the disadvantage Black researchers face in seeking awards from the National Institutes of Health[47](https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMms2025396) should not wait. We should call into question claims that there is an inadequate pool of qualified Black applicants to recruit, hire, and promote.

Fourth, we should acknowledge that structural racism has been challenged, perhaps most successfully, by mass social movements. Change will require policies that restructure the chances for a healthy life for people of color, righting the wrongs done by the foundational racial hierarchy that continue to shape everyday life. Organized medicine and public health have a long history of opposing desegregation and broader access to care (e.g., Medicare), of barring Black physicians, of championing scientific racism, and of enshrining race as a biologic variable. Our fields have much to regret, and we have much still to offer to right our historical wrongs. Let’s not sit on the sidelines.

### 2AC -- AT: Cap causes Colonialism

#### Colonialism did not related to capitalism

Sennholz 1956 – [Hans F. Sennholz taught economics at Grove City College and was a noted writer and lecturer on economic, political and monetary affairs; “The Myth of Capitalist Colonialism”; <https://fee.org/articles/the-myth-of-capitalist-colonialism/>; accessed 7/7/22; Lowell-JL]

Colonies Acquired under Mercantilism and Nationalism

The existence of colonies, i.e., underdeveloped territories dependent on a ruling power, is not a phenomenon of capitalism, as its enemies so ardently contend, but of the very absence of it. The colonial empires of the Western nations were built in periods of mercantilism or rising nationalism. During the short intervening age of capitalism, colonies were considered in herited burdens to be disposed of sooner or later. “Our colonies are millstones around our necks,” said the British stateman, Disraeli, in 1852 when Great Britain was about to embark upon her famous open-door policy.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries England, Holland, France, and Spain were the foremost colonial powers. That was the age of mercantilism. And mercantilist ideas led governments to acquire dependent territories. Every nation endeavored to be self-sufficient through tariffs, other import restrictions, and acquisition of colonies. The balance-of-trade theory prevailed and the notion that one nation’s prosperity is another nation’s loss and misery determined international relations. Europe was always fighting or preparing to fight.

The adherent of capitalism need not defend the acts of mercantilist governments, for capitalist philosophers and economists have exploded and opposed the doctrines of mercantilism since the beginning of the eighteenth century. Even today they are the bitter enemies of the modern expressions of mercantilist international relations.

The hostile attitude of the fathers of capitalism toward the existence of colonies can easily be recognized by the role they played in the American War of Independence. They were the friends of the colonists and insisted that colonial independence should be granted and maintained even after the War of 1812. Furthermore, has there ever been a more devastating critique of colonialism written than the one by Adam Smith in his famous Wealth of Nations? To attach colonialism to capitalism is an obvious absurdity.

## Cap Good

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - War

#### Capitalist countries have 0.1% chance of going to war

Gartzke ’07 [Erick; 2007; Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Peace and Security Studies (cPASS) at the University of California, San Diego; The Capitalist Peace; “Economic Development,” p. 179-180] SPark

How many wars occur between "capitalist" countries? It is not obvious how to condense the bundle of factors discussed above into a single variable. Still, IMF FIN. OPEN. (Low) is probably the best candidate for such a test. Let me arbitrarily define capitalist dyads as those where the lower IMF FIN. OPEN score is at least six. This is the closest ordinal value on the scale to a value at least two standard deviations above the mean (3.006 + 2 x (1.627) = 6.26). It also produces a subsample of capitalist dyads that is about 6.9% of the available sample of observations, not much different from that for democratic dyads (R = 0.1491 for the two dummy variables). Interestingly, there are no wars in the capitalist dyads either, though the smaller sample of cases for which data on financial openness are available means that only about a quarter of the wars are accounted for in the sample (54 wars, x 2 = 4.0, Pr= 0.045). To extend this very crude test a bit further, I add zeros to round out missing observations so that the capitalist and democracy samples are the same size and all 222 wars appear in the sample. When I do this, the capitalist dyads again contain no wars and the relationship is highly significant (0.1%). Thus, both democracies and capitalist dyads appear never to fight wars. Still, determining more about these relation-ships, and their relative impact on war, requires that we move beyond cross tabs.

#### Development prevents war - increased deterrence and lower gains from conflicts ensure peaceful relationships \*\*

Gartzke ’07 [Erick; 2007; Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Peace and Security Studies (cPASS) at the University of California, San Diego; The Capitalist Peace; “Economic Development,” p. 172] SPark

If, on the other hand, the value of resources in dis-pute is small or varies with ownership, then states can be disinclined to fight. Nations have historically used force to acquire land and resources, and subdue foreign pop-ulations. War or treaties that shifted control of territory changed the balance of resources, and power. Sovereigns, and to a lesser extent citizens, prospered as the state ex-tended its domain. Development can alter these incen-tives if modern production processes de-emphasize land, minerals, and rooted labor in favor of intellectual and financial capital (Brooks 1999, 2005; Rosecrance 1996). If the rents from conquest decline, even as occupation costs increase, then states can prefer to buy goods rather than steal them.31 As the U.S. invasion of Iraq illustrates, occupying a reluctant foreign power is extremely labor intensive. If soldiers are expensive, then nations can be better off "outsourcing occupation" to local leaders and obtaining needed goods through trade.32 At the same time that development leads states to prefer trade to theft, developed countries also retain pop-ulations with common identities, cultural affinities, and political, social, and economic ties. These states may be reluctant to conquer their neighbors, but they are equally opposed to arbitrary contractions of their borders. Resi-dents of Gibraltar, for example, prefer British rule, even while Spain, which has fought over this lump of rock for centuries, is today unwilling to provoke a war.33 The com-bination of a lack of motive for territorial expansion and continued interest in serving and protecting a given pop-ulation ensures a decline in conflict among states with developed economies, especially where developed coun-tries are geographically clustered (Gleditsch 2003). Since most territorial disputes are between contiguous states (Vasquez 1993), I hypothesize that developed, contiguous dyads are more powerful than either developing or noncontiguous dyads.34

HI: Development leads contiguous dyads to be less likely to experience conflict.

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - War

#### Capitalism precedes democracy in the cause of peace

Gartzke ’07 [Erick; 2007; Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Peace and Security Studies (cPASS) at the University of California, San Diego; The Capitalist Peace; “Economic Development,” p. 180-182] SPark

This study offers evidence suggesting that capitalism, and not democracy, leads to peace. Additional research is needed to corroborate, extend, and even refute the find-ings reported here. One must be circumspect in question-ing a body of evidence as large and as carefully constructed as that on the democratic peace. Still, economic liberals have long seen in free markets and prosperity the potential to discourage war. A century ago, the "conventional wisdom" looked more like this study and less like that of democratic peace researchers. While past arguments were clearly simplistic and overblown, there does now seem to be grounds for reconsidering liberal economic peace theory.

One can reasonably differ with my version of classical arguments, or can plausibly challenge the assumptions on which my version of the capitalist peace is built. The statis-tical models I develop, and the findings that I present, can be altered, possibly in ways that again show that democ-racy matters. For now, I hope that the claims of this study are coherent, empirically plausible, and at the very least intellectually provocative. What is the "larger" relation-ship between development, capitalism, and democracy? It might be that democracy actually lies behind the appar-ent impact of capitalism on peace. Still, the world was not always made up of a large proportion of democracies. Lit-tle attempt has been made to rule out the possibility that democracy and peace have common causes, or that, as has long been argued, development and capitalism lead both to freer politics and to a more peaceful planet. A logical extension of this study is the exploration of determinants of political and economic liberalism, though resolving these more complex causal arrows would seem to require a level of understanding about the determinants of cap-italism and democracy that is still under construction in comparative politics, economics, and other fields.

#### Capitalism prevents war - transitioning away from it removes economic de-incentives and sparks war

Beauchamp’15 [Zack; June 4; MSc from the London School of Economics in International Relations; Vox, “Steven Pinker explains how capitalism is killing war,” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/4/8725775/pinker-capitalism>] SPark

Steven Pinker: Yes, it's one of the causes. It's the theory of the capitalist peace: when it's cheaper to buy things than to steal them, people don't steal them. Also, if other people are more valuable to you alive than dead, you're less likely to kill them. You don't kill your customers or your lenders, so the arrival of the infrastructure of trade and commerce reduces some of the sheer exploitative incentives of conquest.

This is an idea that goes back to the Enlightenment. Adam Smith and Montesquieu extolled it; it was on the minds of the founders when they built incentives for free trade into the Constitution.

I don't think it's the entire story of the decline in war. But I do think it's part of the story. There was a well-known study from [Bruce Russett and John Oneal](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~plam/irnotes07/RussettandOneal2001.pdf) showing statistically that countries that engage in more trade are less likely to get into militarized disputes, and countries that are more integrated into the world economy are less likely to get into trouble with their neighbors.

#### **Capitalist Peace Theory proves that capitalism constrains aggressive governments and reduces conflict.**

Schneider 5/18 [Gerald Schneider; Chair in International Relations on the Faculty of Public Administration at the University of Konstanz, Germany. Director and Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Bern in Switzerland, Editor of EU Politics; 5-18-2022; Capitalist Peace Theory: A Critical Appraisal; Oxford Politics; https://oxfordre-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-314; SK]

Capitalist peace theory (CPT) has gained considerable attention in international relations theory and the conflict literature. Its proponents maintain that a capitalist organization of an economy pacifies states internally and externally. They portray CPT either as a complement to or a substitute for other liberal explanations, such as the democratic peace thesis, but disagree about the facet of capitalism that is supposed to reduce the risk of political violence. Key contributions have identified three main drivers of the capitalist peace phenomenon: the fiscal constraints that a laissez-faire regimen puts on potentially aggressive governments, the mollifying norms that a capitalist organization creates, and the increased ability of capitalist governments to signal their intentions effectively in a confrontation with an adversary. CPT should be based on a narrow definition of capitalism and should scrutinize motives and constraints of the main actors more deeply. Future contributions to the CPT literature should pay close attention to classic theories of capitalism, which all considered individual risk taking and the dramatic changes between booms and busts to be key constitutive features of this form of economic governance. Finally, empirical tests of the proposed causal mechanism should rely on data sets in which capitalists appear as actors and not as “structures.” If the literature takes these objections seriously, CPT could establish itself as central theory of peace and war in two respects: First, it could serve as an antidote to “critical” approaches on the far left or far right that see in capitalism a source of conflict rather than of peace. Second, it could become an important complement to commercial liberalism that stresses the external openness rather than the internal freedoms as an economic cause of peace and that particularly sees trade and foreign direct investment as pacifying forces.

#### **Capitalism is an anti-imperialist force that uses financial incentives to avoid wars.**

Schneider 5/18 [Gerald Schneider; Chair in International Relations on the Faculty of Public Administration at the University of Konstanz, Germany. Director and Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Bern in Switzerland, Editor of EU Politics; 5-18-2022; Capitalist Peace Theory: A Critical Appraisal; Oxford Politics; https://oxfordre-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-314; SK]

In the eyes of the various CPT approaches, such conjectures underestimate the costs of radical political change and especially of using force to enact it. Most causal mechanisms that have been developed to turn capitalism and other facets of open economies into a force of peace, rather than a warmongering culprit, stress what economists call “opportunity costs” (Schneider, 2014b). In the context of war and peace, these costs represent the foregone profits of entrepreneurs and investors in times of war. Opportunity cost reasoning is found in the early writings of Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter (1918–1919, p. 3) at the end of World War I and shortly before he became, for a very brief period, Minister of Finance in the Republic of German-Austria.2 Setting the stage for what would become the “capitalist peace” thesis, he distanced himself sharply from the contributions by Hilferding and Luxemburg to Marxian thinking, dismissing imperialism as “the objectless disposition of a state to expand violently.” Capitalism is, in the Schumpeterian perspective, an anti-imperialist force that allows economic agents to accumulate wealth and that constrains the desire of atavistic states to start colonial wars.

During the protectionist interwar years and after the student radicalization of the 1960s, overt admiration of capitalism and its potentially beneficial consequences, most famously summarized in Schumpeter’s notion of “creative destruction,” remained quite unpopular despite Rummel’s (1983) daring libertarian interpretation of peace. It therefore took the weakening of the Soviet Empire and the new wave of globalization in the 1980s and 1990s before analysts dared to openly analyze the positive externalities of capitalism. Some of the initial contributions were inspired by rent-seeking theory, which transformed development policymaking in this period (Tullock, 1980). Condemning excessive state regulation, advocates of this liberal approach recommend internal and external economic openness as one of the key precepts of gaining economic strength. The policy recommendations culminated in the pro-austerity “Washington Consensus,” which lenders like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) officially followed from the 1970s to the end of the 2000s in their conditional financial aid packages but often did not fully implement (Kentikelenis et al., 2016).

It was also in this period that academics started to systematically explore the security implications of economic openness. Most of these contributions, with the partial exception of the encompassing argument by Weede (1995), focused on economic interdependence as a source of peace and not internal economic freedom (Barbieri & Schneider, 1999; for recent reviews see Schneider, 2014a, 2014b, 2017). This situation started to change in the 2000s when a continuation of stock market record highs seemed to prove the superiority of the loose regulatory schemes associated with capitalism over more restrictive forms of economic governance. Since the controversial era that paved the way to the Great Recession, proponents of CPT have debated why open market economies should be more peaceful internally and externally and why the proposed causal mechanisms outshine the explanatory power of other liberal research programs.

Small States, Norms, and Signaling Capacities

An influential literature in comparative political economy contends that there is a “variety of capitalisms” to the effect that different political arrangements shape open market economies (Hall & Soskice, 2001). Without paying attention to these contributions, CPT proponents stress specific aspects of capitalism as the ultimate economic force of peace. Three schools of thought are associated with the contributions that economists Hayek, Keynes, and Spence made to the understanding of market economies. The causal mechanisms that have been proposed all go beyond simple opportunity cost reasoning and stress the pacifying impact of small states, capitalist norms, and enhanced signaling capacities.

The Hayekian Perspective

McDonald (2009) developed an institutional argument that drew at least partly on Friedrich Hayek’s libertarian classic The Road to Serfdom (1944/1971). Speaking of a Smithian “invisible hand of peace,” Hayek expected that “governments possessing access to large quantities of public property are more likely to engage in military conflict than governments overseeing more privatized economies” (p. 17). According to this logic, high public spending and extensive public property allow governments to insulate themselves from the demands of society. This fiscal cushion reduces the risk of being punished for adventurous policymaking and allows governments to pursue aggressive foreign policies or arms build-up programs for which the taxpayer ultimately has to foot the bill. Private property and the pressure from international competitors, conversely, limit the abilities of executives to chase unproductive ends. McDonald’s (2009, 2010) expectation that small states create peace echoed Hayek’s (1944/1971, p. 242) vision that “we shall all be the gainers if we can create a world fit for small states to live in.”

Weede’s (1995, 2003, 2010, 2021) and McDonald’s (2009, 2010) Hayekian contributions differed with respect to the role attributed to other liberal forces. McDonald (2009) suggested that the pacifying impact of internal economic openness dwarfs the corresponding effects of democratic political competition and trade, while Weede saw these forces as interrelated and, to some extent, as complements of each other. In Weede’s (1995, p. 524) view, “free trade promotes peace via prosperity and democracy.” Economic growth can, in his adaption of rent-seeking theories, be best achieved through the slashing of state monopolies and other instruments through which vested interests try to maximize their income. The detrimental role that special interest groups can play was identified by Tullock (1980) and others and was further developed by Olson (1993, 2000). Security can, in this perspective, be provided by what Olson calls “stationary” rather than by “roving” bandits. While the latter rulers rob everything they can get without considering the long-term implications of the predation, the former must limit their rapacity and start to provide public goods.

#### Capitalism acts as a deterrent for nuc war

**Blechman,** Siebson and Sisson **et al,** 20**20** (Barry, PhD in international relations from Georgetown and published author. James, M. A. in international affairs. Melanie, PhD in political science and M.A. in international affairs. Military Coercion and US Foreign Policy: The Use of Force Short of War Chpt 1 ///MF)

The eruption of violent, radical Islamist backlash in the early 2000s, however, and its continuation today demonstrates that socio-political diffusion cuts both ways. So, too, does China’s international rise call into question the extent to which values, ideology, and identity will drive national strategies in the coming decades. China’s influence in the Indo-Pacific region, after all, has been won not with a galvanizing socio-political message, but rather through the creation of financial structures and trade regimes with, and direct investments in, the economies of growth-hungry neighbors, both regionally and those more far-flung.

The United States, too, uses the integration of its economy with those of others through trade, finance, and investment for political purposes. Opportunity to export to the large US market, to import its goods, and to access its services are sizable inducements, while exclusion and, especially, expulsion from them can impose considerable pain. Economic sanctions in particular have increasingly become a tool of influence – while not new, their use has grown steadily since World War II, and accelerated markedly after the end of the Cold War (Figure 1.1). [4](javascript:void(0)) Indeed, in the 44 years between 1946 and 1990 the United States initiated at least 191 sanctions on 74 states; in the 27 years between 1991 and 2018, those numbers increased to 252 sanctions on 101 states.

Economic power, of course, also is the foundation of conventional and nuclear military capabilities, the development, maintenance, and application of which are dependent upon a robust industrial base and healthily stocked government coffers. Although it is possible that technological advancements may change the nature of weapons such that this relationship is attenuated over time, for now, expensive, sophisticated and integrated systems, powerful platforms, large quantities of planes and ships and servicemembers, and the skills and abilities needed to use them effectively are essential for states seeking to compete successfully.

All of these tools are necessary, and none alone will be sufficient, for the United States to succeed in structuring international political life to prioritize its interests over the coming century. It will be the ability to use socio-political, economic, and military instruments in concert with one another, as integrated components of wise foreign policy managed deftly and with discipline, that will differentiate the rule-setter from the rule-follower, and that will separate peace from war.

#### Cap has been statistically proven to be successful conflict deterrent

**Blechman,** Siebson and Sisson **et al,** 20**20** (Barry, PhD in international relations from Georgetown and published author. James, M. A. in international affairs. Melanie, PhD in political science and M.A. in international affairs. Military Coercion and US Foreign Policy: The Use of Force Short of War Chpt 1 ///MF)

With this context established, the book then examines the set of publicly reported non-routine, coercive military actions used to achieve specific goals, relative to specific actors, during the period 1991–2018. These roughly 100 instances of US efforts to deter and compel others are analyzed statistically to reveal relationships between US military actions, targeted actors, the interests under dispute, the economic and political context, and whether the United States achieved its goals. The analyses generate sometimes unexpected findings about combinations of US military, political, and economic actions that proved more, or less, successful in achieving US objectives in different contexts. This information can provide useful points of comparison for decision-makers contemplating whether or how to use the armed forces as part of coercive strategies today and into the future.

#### Capitalist peace is key to prevent conflicts

Hegres ’14 [Håvard; 2014; Department of Peace and Conflict Research; Uppsala University & Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO); Democracy and Conflict, Does Democracy cause Peace, p. 165] SPark

Gartzke (2007) argues that the liberal peace really is a ‘capitalist peace’. The rhetoric value of this term is greater than its precision. In effect, Gartzke’s argument draws on several of the effects of socio-economic development reviewed above. Interdependence and mobility of assets are equally important as the particular economic freedoms and financial structures traditionally associated with ‘capitalism’. Echoing Rosecrance, Gartzke (2007: 172) argues that development ‘leads states to prefer trade to theft’, but does not weaken their resolve to defend their borders. At the same time, developed states are typically militarily powerful and are able to wage wars over long distances. Since many wars are fought over non-territorial issues (e.g. to defend a particular political system in another state, or to prevent the development of nuclear capabilities), developed states are willing to fight long-distance wars where conquest is not the motivation. This leads Gartzke to expect that development leads contiguous dyads to be less likely to experience militarized interstate disputes and non-contiguous dyads to be more likely to do so. He finds support for both these hypotheses, and finds that the terms representing the democratic peace are non-significant when controlling for the ‘capitalist’ factors. Gartzke & Hewitt (2010) obtain similar results for international crises.

### 2AC -- Ext: Cap Good - Democracy

#### Cap promotes democracy

**Blechman,** Siebson and Sisson **et al,** 20**20** (Barry, PhD in international relations from Georgetown and published author. James, M. A. in international affairs. Melanie, PhD in political science and M.A. in international affairs. Military Coercion and US Foreign Policy: The Use of Force Short of War Chpt 1 ///MF)

Between 1991 and 2018, the United States was the world’s dominant power. With a productive economy and a federal government willing to spend generously on a military already well-advantaged relative to other countries, the United States “enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain.… The US could generally deploy forces when we wanted, assemble them where we wanted, and operate how we wanted.”[1](javascript:void(0)) Indeed, the US armed forces during this period undertook a breadth, depth, tempo, and duration of overseas activities that was historically unprecedented. These activities were component parts of national security strategies designed by a sequence of presidential administrations to protect the US homeland, to defend US strategic interests overseas, and to promote abroad the liberal values of individual rights and democracy.

In 2018, the US Government asserted that this post-Cold War era of primacy was over. What had in preceding years been diffuse prognosticating about an ascending China and an aggrieved and risk-acceptant Russia coalesced in the codification of these states as near-peer rivals in the 2018 National Security Strategy and National Defense Strategy. This energized preparation for a new era of long-term competition, in which the United States is anticipated to contend increasingly, and more directly, with the interests of other states also in possession of considerable military and economic might.

### 2AC -- Ext: Cap Good - Disease

#### Capitalism singlehandedly fights off diseases

Allysia Finley 21 [Allysia Finley, 3-19-2021, "Opinion," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/capitalism-is-what-will-defeat-covid-11616192690, smarx, HHW]

Behold the paradox of this pandemic moment: Large corporations are political villains, derided on the left and right. Yet the main, and perhaps **only, reason the Covid-19 scourge is easing is vaccines developed by Big Pharma.**

Few are more acutely aware of this paradox than Alex Gorsky, CEO of Johnson & Johnson, the healthcare device, pharmaceutical and consumer-goods company best known for products like Band-Aids and Tylenol. Politicians have vilified his industry over prescription-drug prices, and trial lawyers for using talc in its baby powder, which it discontinued in North America in 2020. But now J&J is a household name in the best way for developing its single-shot Covid vaccine, which the Food and Drug Administration approved for emergency use last month. The vaccine is increasing the U.S. supply of shots at a critical time and will enable a billion people world-wide to be vaccinated this year.

J&J’s road to the vaccine—from failure to life-saving success, from investment write-off to breakthrough—is a little-known story about science, **business risk and innovation**. There are also **lessons for those who think capitalism is merely about rapacious profit**.

“We would never be in the position where we are today if we had not invested billions of dollars over decades so that we could respond,” Mr. Gorsky, 60, says in an interview the Monday morning after the FDA authorized its Covid vaccine. The U.S. Army veteran had been up since 3:30 a.m., getting in one of his early-morning workouts before meetings. J&J’s Covid-19 vaccine development over the last year has been a sprint, but the process that led to it has been a decades-long marathon.

Vaccines such as those for polio, MMR (measles, mumps and rubella) and seasonal flu have been made from weakened or inactivated viruses. But patients often produce a weak immune response to the inactivated viruses, and shots that use weakened viruses can make immunocompromised people sick. The manufacturing process is also laborious.

Scientists over the past couple of decades have been studying a potentially more efficient and effective method known as a “vector vaccine”: using genetically engineered viruses to prime the immune system by delivering parts of a pathogen’s genetic code into human cells. Our cell machinery then manufacturers the dopplegangers. The harmless look-alikes trigger an immune reaction, marshaling antibodies and white blood cells. When the real pathogen invades, the immune system is prepared.

“Your body has multiple layers of response in these situations. There’s the immediate response, and there’s the longer term response,” Mr. Gorsky says. “Your body recognizes the virus and begins producing antibodies, as well as T-cell and B-cell response.”

B-cells produce antibodies that act like sentinels and prevent infection. T-cells provide backup if a virus penetrates the antibodies’ frontline defense and help enlist white blood cells into action. Antibodies can fade after a few months, but T-cells stick around longer and have something of a photographic memory. Some people who were infected with SARS in 2002-04 were found to have T-cells that remembered the virus a decade later.

J&J’s vaccine was found to be 72% effective at preventing moderate to severe Covid symptoms (meaning two or more symptoms that don’t require hospitalization) in U.S. trials. That’s less than the 95% of the Moderna and Pfizer -BioNTech vaccines, which received emergency-use authorization earlier, and which are followed by a booster a few weeks after the initial shot. But the trials aren’t directly comparable. For one thing, J&J’s trial occurred later, in the fall and early winter, when more virus variants were circulating. Some variants with changes to their spike protein, which helps the virus infiltrate human cells, appear to partly elude the antibody response.

T-cells aren’t as easily tricked. One reason scientists are excited about J&J’s vaccine is that its one shot induces a robust T-cell response. This means immunity is likely to last longer—how long remains to be seen—and less likely to be defeated by new variants.

Mr. Gorsky attributes the strong multilayered immune response from J&J’s vaccine to its **innovative** adenovirus-vector platform, AdVac, which it has developed over a decade.

Adenoviruses like those that can cause the common cold—so named because they were first isolated in human adenoids—are easy to manipulate because they have a large genome. They also don’t integrate their genes into our own. This makes them an ideal tool for vector-vaccines. The problem is that many people have pre-existing antibodies to adenoviruses from prior infections, so their immune systems may try to shoot down the vaccine as if it were a cold.

In 2007 a promising Merck HIV vaccine, which used the adenovirus-5, or Ad5, failed to prevent infection in the later stages of a clinical trial. Worse, data indicated that people who tested positive for Ad5 antibodies were more susceptible to HIV infection than people who received a placebo, a phenomenon known as vaccine-induced enhancement. A 2008 article in the Journal of Experimental Medicine was titled “The failed HIV Merck vaccine study: a step back or a launching point for future vaccine development?”

It was the latter. Merck’s HIV-vaccine failure prodded more study of other adenoviruses like Ad26—the vector for J&J’s Covid-19 vaccine. The Dutch biotech company Crucell had been experimenting with Ad26 in a vaccine to prevent malaria and other infectious diseases. Unlike with Ad5, antibodies to Ad26 didn’t appear to sabotage the vaccine. In 2009, J&J entered into a partnership with Crucell to develop a vaccine it hoped could someday prevent infection from all influenza strains. Two years later, J&J bought Crucell for $2.4 billion.

“At that time we had little to no experience in vaccines,” Mr. Gorsky says. **But capitalism entails risk**: Many Crucell vaccine studies failed, and “we ended up writing down a very significant portion of our initial investment.” Still, Crucell brought along “two really important technologies that gave seed to what we’re doing today.”

One was the AdVac platform. The other was the PER.C6 manufacturing technology, capable of mass-producing vaccines quickly and cheaply. Despite earlier failures, J&J continued to work on vaccines for Ebola, HIV, Zika and respiratory syncytial virus, all of which are prevalent in developing countries.

The company has enrolled more than 150,000 patients in vaccine trials for these diseases, and last summer the European Medicines Agency approved its Ebola vaccine. Mr. Gorsky says the trials for other diseases have made the company confident that its vaccine platform is safe, even among people who have pre-existing immunity to its Ad26 vector.

Conducting trials in the developing world also gave the company’s scientists confidence and knowledge to run global trials for its Covid vaccine. Most participants in J&J’s Covid vaccine trial lived outside the U.S.—12.7% in South Africa, 17.3% in Brazil and 23.3% in five other Latin American countries. Trials in South Africa and Brazil showed that J&J’s vaccine could prevent severe illness and deaths even against new variants.

“When we were debating clinical trial sites, and we asked could they logistically do this, some of our scientists had personally visited them and said, ‘They can absolutely do this, and I can vouch and validate that they can,’ ” Mr. Gorsky says. “That’s ultimately what put us in a position to be able to do such a high-quality trial at that particular moment, even in the face of those kinds of challenges.”

J&J was a couple of months behind some other vaccine manufacturers, in part because its scientists had to make trade-offs to create a single-shot vaccine that could be mass-produced and rapidly distributed, including in developing countries. A single dose needed to produce a robust immune reaction, but not a reaction so strong that it caused severe side effects.

“We developed more than a dozen different permutations,” Mr. Gorsky says, “and then we put them through some initial testing and selected our one candidate that we felt we could get the optimal balance.” J&J’s vaccine works by using its AdVac platform to transport the DNA that codes for the spike protein on the surface of the coronavirus into human cells.

J&J then worked closely with the FDA and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, another federal agency, on clinical trials and distribution. Mr. Gorsky says that in his 30 years working in the pharmaceutical industry, he has never seen as much collaboration between drug makers and government, with which “we were sharing information in real time.” Drug makers have also teamed up: “We all knew that, while we competed in the marketplace, the **real competition here is the coronavirus.”**

Merck recently agreed to produce J&J vaccines in its factories. In January Merck stopped development of its two Covid-19 vaccine candidates after early clinical trials showed weak immune responses. Merck’s vaccines used different virus vectors than J&J’s, but one had shown success against Ebola.

J&J’s vaccine is the third to obtain FDA approval, but preliminary results from trials on AstraZeneca and Novavax suggest they are also highly effective. All these Covid-19 vaccines use innovative technologies that have been developed and tested over decades on other diseases. AstraZeneca’s vaccine is similar to J&J’s, but uses a chimpanzee adenovirus as a vector. The Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines inject the virus’s genetic code via mRNA, which instructs human cells to produce pseudo-spike proteins, which in turn prompts an immune response. Novavax’s vaccine uses re-engineered spike-protein clones.

About 85% of vaccine candidates fail in trials, and those that succeed have historically taken 10 to 15 years to develop. It seems like an incredible stroke of luck and science that we have so many Covid-19 vaccines so soon. **But it’s more than that**. Credit years of research and investment by drug makers, as well as government collaboration during the pandemic, which Mr. Gorsky hopes will outlast the pandemic.

“I think this is a golden moment, not only for Johnson & Johnson, but the biopharmaceutical industry,” he says. “We fundamentally believe that **having a market-based, innovation-based, biopharmaceutical as well as a medical-technology environment, is critical long term to produce the best overall outcomes for healthcare.”**

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - Space Col

#### Capitalism is key for space colonization

**Grindlinger, 22** (Brooke Grindlinger, PhD and chief science officer at the New York Academy of Sciences, 2-11-2022, nyas, "Big Questions for Our Journey to Mars | The New York Academy of Sciences", <https://www.nyas.org/news-articles/academy-news/big-questions-for-our-journey-to-mars/)-> FT

“The return on investment is worth it because we're going to get new technologies or access to resources that you don't have here on Earth,” posited Nesvold. “But you have to make sure that those benefits are actually being distributed equitably.” When asked to comment on the billionaire-driven space ecosystem that we see flourishing today, Nesvold responded: “A big issue with the space program since its creation has been that it had to survive off of taxpayer money. If you can make the space sector profitable it becomes self-sustaining…. Profit-seeking is a big part of what's supporting this industry and helping it move forward. Capitalism brings innovation, and innovation is what we need for space. The problem is that capitalism also roots a lot of misery and inequality. The trick is figure out how to get the innovation without increasing inequality and environmental destruction.”

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - Space Col

#### Capitalism and privatization of space colonization lead to the most benefits

Daniel Pryor 22 [Daniel Pryor, 2-10-2022, "Privatize space to boost discovery and alleviate poverty — Adam Smith Institute," Adam Smith Institute, https://www.adamsmith.org/news/privatize-space-to-boost-discovery-and-alleviate-poverty, smarx, HHW]

International treaty outlawing property rights in space is unfit for modern world

Recent technological progress makes space ownership debate more pressing

The time has come to shift away from a national to an individual focus in space

A clear system of property rights in space would present vast benefits to humanity

A new report, Space Invaders: Property Rights on the Moon, from the Adam Smith Institute (ASI) argues that creating a clear system of property rights in space could turbocharge scientific discovery and **give all of humanity a greater stake in space exploration.**

The 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty (OST), which remains in place as the vanguard of space regulation, forbids 'national appropriation' and also, by effect, individual appropriation in space. Although major players in space exploration have recently called for change—with some nations pushing unilaterally for it through domestic legislation—there has been little movement on the ownership question since the OST first came into effect.

Report author Rebecca Lowe takes inspiration from renowned English philosopher John Locke and American political economist Henry George in setting out a detailed framework for how property rights could best be applied to celestial bodies. In an extended case study, the paper explains how rents paid on plots of moon land could be leveraged to benefit the whole of humanity through alleviating poverty on Earth, as well as democratising space travel.

Under the proposed system, individuals would compete against each other for plots of land on the moon (that have most likely been initially acquired by, or assigned to, particular nations). This competition would consist in paying ‘rent’ for such plots at a rate determined by supply and demand. Rent rebates could be given for improving the condition of land or providing for urgent human needs. Governance would currently depend on international agreement.

The paper concludes by arguing that proceeds from moon rents could be used to democratise space travel, meet current urgent needs and **fund future space exploration**. It also offers a way of addressing traditional concerns with property rights such as the ‘first come, first served’ problem and the overriding moral priority of addressing urgent human needs.

Rebecca Lowe, report author and former director of FREER, said:

“A clear, morally-justified, and efficient system for assigning and governing property rights in space would present vast benefits that go beyond financial rewards for people who would become owners. Such a system would incentivise responsible stewardship of space, as well as opportunities for new scientific discovery, democratised space exploration, and much more. The creation of such a system is long overdue—progress on this issue is frozen amidst complex legalistic uncertainty. It’s time to find innovative ways to move beyond that.”

Daniel Pryor, Head of Research at the Adam Smith Institute, said:

“Property rights play a key role in boosting living standards, innovation and human dignity here on Earth. The same would be true if we applied this logic to space, which presents a unique opportunity to start afresh when designing effective rules of ownership. With more countries and companies competing in the space race than ever before, it’s vital for us to move past the outdated thinking of the 1960s and tackle the question of extraterrestrial property rights sooner rather than later.”

#### Capitalism K2 Space Exploration + State bad

Capitalism ’21 [Capitalism.com; October 4; Capitalism.com, “Space Flights Now Boarding, Thanks to Capitalism,” <https://www.capitalism.com/space-flights-now/>] SPark

Sometimes, the government can get things done. They got a man on the moon. But the government also often makes matters worse. There's bureaucracy and red tape, not to mention a substantial number of people involved in every decision. This makes the process expensive, inefficient, and time-intensive.

Bring in big business and private entities, and the scope and reach increases many times over. They can get stuff done quickly. They own a problem and come up with creative solutions. Capitalists think outside the box, bringing funding and resources to develop new technologies. Unlike the government, individual companies can make faster progress to the same goals, and beyond.

NASA started by investing in several American businesses. They targeted the fields of space transportation and supportive systems. That includes launch vehicles, abort systems, environmental control systems, life support systems, emergency detection devices, and more.

The initial investment money went to companies such as:

Alliant Techsystems, Inc.

Blue Origin

Boeing

Excalibur Almaz, Inc.

Sierra Nevada Corporation

United Launch Alliance

SpaceX

The enormous amount of money put forth to further space endeavors not only created new ways to make progress to the stars. It also spurred economic growth.

Approximately 200 people work for the CCP at NASA alone. That doesn't account for the thousands of other employees required to run each program at the different companies involved.

#### **Communism rejects scientific objectivity and hampers humanity’s ability to explore space – empirics prove.**

Specific to Communism Alt \*\*

Costa 3/4 [Ettore Costa; phD in Contemporary History at the University of Rome, La Sapienza with a research on the Socialist International; 3-4-2022; The Western European Left and the First Moon Landing: The Fall of Scientific Enthusiasm and the Ebb of Socialism; Taylor & Francis; <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07075332.2022.2046129>; SK]

Cini, a physicist, had been a key figure for the science policy of the PCI, but by 1969 he had become more heterodox and he was expelled in 1970 for cooperating with the Manifesto journal — a group of left-wing communists expelled for demanding that the PCI take a more revolutionary line in alliance with the student movement. Cini matured a systematic critique of scientism, by combining Thomas Kuhn and Marxism: he rejected scientific objectivity and neutrality and affirmed the social determination of the practice and epistemological content of science.63

Cini wrote a rebuttal to Sereni’s editorial and criticised the positive coverage of the first Moon Landing by Unità.64 Cini saw in the astroculture promoted by NASA a tool of capitalism and subverted this interpretation with his own array of images that stressed the capitalist and imperial character of space exploration. He mocked the landing as an empty religious ritual that hid the division of oppressors and oppressed. After all, it was just by mere chance that the three astronauts were not in Vietnam, dropping napalm on women and children. Cini argued that the Apollo Programme was complementary not alternative to the military complex. No different from Nero’s panem et circenses, the space programme served just to strengthen the economic and military power of capitalism — a point also made by Marcuse.65 The Apollo programme was ‘an ignoble deception’ to convince common people of ‘the idea that this [technological] progress will solve or at least begin to solve their problems’66 without dismantling capitalism — an open challenge to technological fixes.

Cini wrote additional articles for the Manifesto journal, challenging the idea that space research would produce either expanded knowledge or beneficial technologies. He argued that the US and Soviet space programmes produced not scientific progress but military technology: intercontinental nuclear missiles and satellites for surveillance and communication.67 Economically, the space programme only strengthened industries tied to the military. Even the ideological character of Apollo — bravery, fame, spirit of exploration — were linked to the bourgeois system of values. satellites, these Cini dismissed the idea that spin-offs justified the space programme — even war produced spin-offs. While space technology contributed to micro-electronics, computers and communication technologies were luxuries for the rich. To satisfy the basic needs of the poor, the money should have been spent on researching medicine and agriculture: ‘Then, it is not rhetorical to argue that those who have chosen to send two men on the moon condemned to death million other people with that choice.’68 Scientific research was still to be judged not on its own merit but on its technological output.

Cini advanced a Marxist interpretation of technology different from Sereni’s. Under capitalism, consumption could not keep up with rising productive capacity because the labour value of the workers was appropriated for profit and not turned into wages. In order to postpone the crisis of insufficient demand, the capitalist state stimulated unproductive expenditure, such as scientific research or superfluous consumption for the privileged minority. Cini argued it was a mistake to distinguish between productive forces and relations of production to argue for the neutral character of science or to believe that promoting scientific progress — thus technological progress and production — would hasten the revolution. Cini said that science was part of capital and oppressed the workers. Capitalism did not simply ‘use’ science, it ‘shaped’69 science by selecting its priorities and methods; without capitalism, scientific research would have been different:

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - Environment

#### Capitalism is Sustainable - Data proves

Zitelmann ’22 [Rainer; April 19; Historian and author of the books "The Power of Capitalism" and "The Rich in Public Opinion"; The Daily Telegraph, “Capitalism is not to blame for climate change; Despite Extinction Rebellion's claims, environmental damage is worse in countries where the state holds most power over economy,” <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2022/04/18/extinction-rebellion-wrong-capitalism-not-blame-climate-change/>] SPark

Index of Economic Freedom, which has been measuring economic freedom around the globe since 1995. The Index, which is also referred to as the capitalism index, analyses the level of economic freedom in 178 countries.

The Heritage Foundation's researchers compared the two indices, Yale University's Environmental Performance Index and their own Index of Economic Freedom. They found that the countries with the highest levels of economic freedom - and thus the most capitalist countries - also had the highest EPI scores, averaging 69.8, while the "mostly free" countries averaged 66.8.

There is then a big gap to the "moderately free" countries, which were rated much lower (49.3 points) for their environmental performance. The "mostly unfree" and "repressed" countries, namely those that are least capitalist, registered by far the worst environmental performance (37.5 and 36.6 points in the EPI, respectively). If an economic order based on private property, competition, and freely set prices were the cause of environmental pollution, then, logically, there would have to be less 'No other industrial civilisation for so long poisoned its land, air and people's pollution in countries that do not have these, which is not the case.

Anti-capitalist climate activists such as Naomi Klein want to establish an economic order in which the state has disproportionately greater power than under capitalism. In her book This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs The Climate, Klein writes about the need for government guidelines on "how often we drive, how often we fly, whether our food has to be flown to get to us".

The anti-capitalist prescription for dealing with climate change and pollution is more state planning. However, in countries where the state has held the most power over the economy, levels of environmental degradation were not lower.

On the contrary, they were far higher than in any other countries. Divided Germany provided a solid basis for comparison, with a market economy system in the West and a planned economy system in the East. The German historian Hubertus Knabe, a leading expert on GDR history, observed: "One of the world's biggest climate killers was, in fact, a country that had abolished capitalism - the GDR." In 1989, the GDR emitted more than three times as much CO2 for each unit of GDP than the Federal Republic.

Other comparisons also confirm that abolishing capitalism leads to more rather than less environmental degradation. In 1988, the GDR emitted 10 times as much sulphur dioxide per square mile as the Federal Republic (124.5 tonnes vs. 12 tonnes per square mile).

The worst environmental destruction occurred in non-capitalist countries. In their book Ecocide in the USSR, Murray Feshbach and Alfred Friendly Jr conclude that "no other industrial civilisation so systematically and so long poisoned its land, air, and people".

Many people will concede that socialism is even worse for the environment than capitalism, but they are still left with reasonable doubts: isn't economic growth in general bad for the environment? There is one argument that seems logical, at least at first glance. Because the earth's raw materials are finite, infinite growth is impossible. This leads many to conclude that, somehow, growth must be curtailed.

But based on numerous data series, the American scientist Andrew McAfee proves in his book More from Less that economic growth has decoupled itself from the consumption of raw materials. Companies are constantly looking for new ways to produce more efficiently, ie to get by with fewer raw materials. And innovation, another characteristic of capitalism, has promoted a trend we call dematerialisation.

One example of this trend is the smartphone.

Just consider how many devices are in your smartphone (a telephone, camera, calculator, voice recorder etc) and how many raw materials they used to consume. There is a very strong argument that, even in terms of climate change and environmental degradation, capitalism is not the problem - it's the solution.

#### **Capitalist growth is sustainable – the dichotomy between growth and a green transition is false.**

Terzi 5/24 [Alessio Terzi; Writer for Harvard University Press, Economist at the European Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, Affiliate Fellow at the think tank Bruegel and a Fulbright Scholar at the Harvard Kennedy School, PhD from the Hertie School with a thesis on economic growth, MPA in economic policy from the London School of Economics, and a BSc in international economics from Bocconi University; 5-24-2022; Growth for Good; De Gruyter; https://www-degruyter-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/doi/10.4159/9780674276338/html; SK]

As our intellectual journey approaches its end, it is worth looking back at the long way we have come. We started off by identifying the origins of the current disenchantment with capitalism and, by extension, with the benefits of economic growth. Over several chapters, we saw how the concept of growth is tightly intertwined with progress, well-being, liberal democracy, science and innovation, human cultural evolution, relations among groups in society, and relations among countries. In Chapter 8, we explored how the pressing need to decarbonize society, dictated by climate science, can be made compatible with the meta-institutional holy trinity of Western societies: capitalism, democracy, and national sovereignty. In the process, we have seen that the required green structural transformation will lead to an upheaval in production, consumption, transportation, energy generation, food choices, trade patterns, and geopolitics. Inevitably, this innovation wave will generate winners and losers. Some products and sectors will experience exponential growth, such as renewable energies, electric vehicles, battery manufacturers, and exports of critical raw materials. At the same time, if some other employment categories and regions (such as coal-mining country) are not supported, there are real risks of economic depression and heightened resentment among affected workers toward the rest of society.

One fundamental question remains unanswered: What will a green transition imply for jobs, and the economy more broadly, over the coming decade? Could it be that a policy agenda designed to make capitalism green would inadvertently precipitate the end of economic growth? To conclude this book, we will look to the future of growth in a world of climate change, mitigation, and adaptation.

Growing green

In the early 1990s, around the same time of the UN’s first Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, William Nordhaus was the first to sketch an integrated model of the climate and the economy: economic activity produces greenhouse gases, these cause climate change, and the damage from that change exerts a drag on economic activity, closing the circle. Nordhaus’s Dynamic Integrated Climate-Economy Model quickly became the workhorse model for many policymakers, including the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and, in the United States, the Obama administration. Work with the original version of the model suggested that climate mitigation would damage the economy in the short term, while the costs of climate change would materialize only in the long term and be somewhat contained. This led to the conclusion that an efficient climate policy should tolerate global warming of up to 3.5 degrees Celsius.1 This early, overly optimistic analysis would later be significantly revised, but its ramifications were far-reaching.

Nordhaus’s model set the tone for an economic conversation that, since then, has focused squarely on the cost side of the equation. Because the overall costs of climate change would reveal themselves only in the very long term, scores of macroeconomists then zoomed in on the short term, analyzing in isolation the impacts of specific climate mitigation policies on, for example, gross domestic product or employment. What would the introduction of carbon pricing do to GDP? Crudely, in a basic economic model, carbon pricing is a tax on production and therefore likely to be recessionary, especially in the short run, just like a hike in value-added tax. In a more sophisticated model—one that allows for, say, a zero-carbon innovative sector to emerge and assumes that extra tax revenues generated by carbon pricing will be fully used for some growth-enhancing purpose like lowering income taxes—the impact is more nuanced.

Integrating these various policy measures in their large-scale, macro models, several international organizations have concluded that, if appropriately crafted, Green Deal packages would at best have muted impacts on GDP and employment. Estimates of such impacts edge only slightly above or slightly below zero.2 The main variable that differs between the marginally positive and marginally negative scenarios has been the assumption of what other countries would do—in particular, whether or not they would also simultaneously implement carbon pricing. If the assumption is that they wouldn’t, climate mitigation policies are projected to yield worse economic outcomes, because those companies that were environmentally regulated would lose international competitiveness. As carbon pricing started to be implemented in certain jurisdictions, skillful econometricians worked to tease out the effect of these policies and concluded that the impact on GDP and employment was generally muted and occasionally marginally positive.3

On employment, estimates generally tend to be slightly more benign, mostly for two reasons. First, greenhouse gas intensity in an economy is quite concentrated in a small number of industries. For instance, the ten most carbon-intensive industries in the EU-25, while accounting for only 14 percent of total employment, emit almost 90 percent of the CO2.4 Taking these facts into account, modeling exercises predict that the direct job losses from taxing CO2 emissions will be rather modest for the wider economy. Second, renewable activities are more labor-intensive at the moment than carbon-intensive ones. Studies conducted in the United States, for instance, show that the expansion of clean energy creates three jobs for each job lost in the fossil-fuel sector. For each $1 million shift from fossil fuels to clean energy, five additional jobs are created.5 Bringing findings like these together, the UN’s International Labor Organization concluded in 2018 that, if the goal of the Paris Agreement were fully respected, fighting climate change would create more jobs than it destroyed.6 A circular economy designed for extensive reuse, recycle, and repair of goods could also create many new jobs worldwide.

Evidence like this persuades many that the green transition will be broadly economically neutral. As climate-policy expert Simone Tagliapietra likes to say, the green transition should be characterized as a shift from fossil-fuel production to carbon neutrality—no more, no less.7 This might rein in the political tendency on both sides of the Atlantic to present Green Deals as a new growth strategy—a claim that should be recognized as analytically unsound, bound to raise citizens’ expectations only for them to be disappointed.

The Green Deal economy

All these modeling approaches take too narrow a perspective to answer questions on the future of economic growth. For starters, as hinted earlier, most of the economics literature has concentrated its efforts on carbon pricing, reducing climate mitigation packages to a mere shift in taxation, away from labor income and toward carbon emissions. Chapter 8, one hopes, left you convinced that Green Deal packages are much more encompassing than this single policy element. Measures to accelerate climate mitigation will catalyze forces in the economy across the board to launch a large investment wave, designed to kick-start a total turnaround of economic production.8 At least in the short and medium term, such a policy package can be expected to boost jobs and domestic demand. Green Deal policies are also highly targeted and sectorial, however, which brings us to a main point of contention.

Green Deals will push early-adopting countries toward developing comparative advantages in advanced green technologies.9 Mastering technological know-how in the production methods of the future will inevitably have important rebalancing effects on competitiveness across the globe.10 And as climate mitigation agendas radically modify production and the very structure of the economy, standard macroeconomic models will prove to be poor tools for assessing their overall impact.11

As a result of changing production and consumption patterns, Green Deals will redraw the map of trade and investment relations among countries, influence geopolitics, and redefine economic winners and losers. For instance, countries specializing in fossil-fuel exports, like Russia or OPEC members, will likely be on the losing side, unless they manage to diversify their economic models.12 The green transition will recast completely the map of knowhow, as basically every production process must be adapted or reimagined to be climate-neutral and have low environmental impact, in line with a circular economy. Any countries and companies currently basing their growth strategies on cheap production of textiles and fast fashion, for instance, will have to think again; circular economy principles discourage such practices.13 As production and consumption changes, comparative advantages will shift, and the wealth of nations will be defined and contended on a new technological terrain, which includes the green and digital dimension.

Another issue with current estimations is that, with few exceptions, macroeconomic and advanced climate models are still not well integrated. Macro models without a climate dimension are fine if we assume that climate change and its catastrophic damage are extremely far off in the future—say, a century away, but more problematic if we are already observing their consequences today. Macroeconomic models operating in a vacuum tend to compare two scenarios: climate mitigation versus a general baseline, meaning a continuation of business as usual. The key, however, is to understand that business as usual is a nonexistent scenario. There are only two scenarios ahead of us: successful climate mitigation, and catastrophic damage from climate change. These are the two scenarios that must be compared. And when that is done, it becomes evident that investment in mitigation, and even more so adaptation, carry huge comparative boosts to future growth. When climate and economic models are appropriately integrated, as they are in the 2020 October World Economic Outlook issued by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), it becomes apparent that the long-term economic growth associated with climate mitigation represents a huge boost over the baseline scenario.14

Looking more specifically at advanced economies, a large investment wave, such as the one envisioned by the Green Deal, could permanently jolt rich countries out of the negative equilibrium of low growth, low inflation, and low interest rates that afflicted them before Covid-19. A green exit from secular stagnation is a possibility that the IMF acknowledges—without, however, accounting for it in its recent macro-climate modeling exercise. Once that is taken into account, the GDP boost for green early adopters would likely be magnified.15

For emerging economies, the path ahead is typically presented as an odious choice between development and greening. This is a false dichotomy built on a wrong premise that there is a feasible development scenario ahead based on polluting production and exports. Moreover, as advanced economies press ahead with the green transition and globalize climate efforts through measures such as carbon border taxes, the window for development based on polluting products will rapidly close. The real choice now is to catch the green development train, or else risk being locked into technologies and products that will soon be outdated. Making large-scale brown investments today would be like pouring more money into horse carriages in the early twentieth century, at the dawn of the automotive era.

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - Environment

#### Capitalism helps protect the environment

Nicolas Loris 19 [Nicolas Loris, 10-23-2019, "Breathe Free: Capitalism Helps Protect the Environment," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/breathe-free-capitalism-helps-protect-the-environment, HHW]

Arecent Rasmussen poll found 20% of voters feel we should eliminate capitalism to protect the environment. **That’s like saying we should eliminate teachers to improve education.**

Truth be told, **capitalism has helped cleanse our planet** — improving living standards while protecting the environment. Rather than eliminate capitalism, **policymakers need to unleash it**.

**Markets incentivize efficiency by rewarding people for coming up with ways to do more or do better with less.** People choose — and businesses make — more efficient products because it saves them money while delivering what customers want.

Over the past decade, market forces have driven a massive transition within the energy industry. In 2008, coal provided roughly half of the country’s electricity generation. Now, coal’s share is about a quarter. Increased production of natural gas has driven energy bills and emissions downward.

In direct response to cheap gas, the Nuclear Energy Institute organized nuclear power plants nationally to find operating efficiencies that have reduced costs by 19%, saving consumers $1.6 billion and keeping emissions-free electricity in the marketplace.

The energy industry is far from the only sector that has made positive economic and environmental contributions. For instance, the cement industry is collaborating with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to explore how to refine its processes in ways that will improve resiliency, reduce emissions and save lives. Investments in cement, steel, plastic and other building materials will make our houses and highways sturdier and our products more durable — with a **smaller environmental footprint.**

All of these activities result directly from free enterprise — companies providing consumers with the goods and services they want **while using fewer resources and emitting fewer unwanted emissions.**

As a country prospers, its citizens are better able to care for the environment and reduce pollutants emitted from industrial growth. In fact, The Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom and Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index show a strong correlation between a country’s environmental performance and economic freedom (i.e., its embrace of capitalism).

#### Capitalism is sustainable – mainstream media pressures companies to go green. The neg ignores recent developments and assumes the worst of the outcomes

Etchart 1/12 – [Linda Etchart a lecturer in Human Geography at the University of Kingston, London, UK, and a regular contributor to the Latin America Bureau, she is a lifelong social activist and environmentalist; “Sustainable Funds and “Cuddly Capitalism””; 1/12/22; <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-81519-6_7#Sec13>; Lowell-JL]

Ethical investment had expanded in the 1990s, with the foundation of the non-profit Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES) investor advisory network in Boston, Massachusetts, following the Exxon Valdez oil tanker disaster in 1989 (CERES 2020). CERES created the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which established environmental, social, and governance (ESG) standards for private companies. By 2020, the GRI had been adopted by 13,400 companies, mainly in the USA (CERES 2020). CERES was also one of the founder members of industry-centred Climate Action 100+1 in 2017. By 2021, Climate Action 100+ was supported by more than 570 investment management companies, with more than US$54 trillion in assets under management (Climate Action 100+ 2021). This level of enthusiasm indicated that ethical investments had become mainstream and that any company that did not avowedly embrace ESG guidelines was risking being left behind or being called out for unethical practices in both social and mainstream media. Such that, the largest investment management companies, the foremost being BlackRock, followed by State Street (US$3.9 trillion in assets under management in 2021) were the main drivers putting pressure on company directors to give priority to environmental concerns, for financial or altruistic motives. By the Global Sustainable Investment Alliance’s calculations, funds managing US$31trillion—one-quarter of the world’s total—were applying some form of ESG screen to their investments in 2020 (Edgecliff-Johnson and Mooney 2019). The reason for the change was that not only were reputations at stake, but the risks of investing in fossil fuels were becoming greater than investing in ethical funds, whose returns were beginning to outperform investment in traditional sectors. Companies began to reposition themselves, creating compensation incentives for executives to adhere to ESG standards and to set ESG goals. As millennials (those born between 1981 and 1996) began to populate climate change campaigns and mobilizations, it also became imperative for investment management companies to continue to appeal to the pool of graduates from whom they were choosing the next generation of employees, who would also be future investors. Similarly, over the same period, gathering pace in the second decade of the twenty-first century, trade union leaders, workers’ pension fund holders, and student unions across the globe began to ally themselves with divestment campaigns targeted at university endowment and pension fund managers with the goal of achieving a just transition to greener economies (International Trade Union Congress 2020).

#### Capitalism solves for the environment

**Loris**, 20**19** (Nicolas, former deputy director at the Thomas A. Roe Institute and economist focused on issues regarding the environment, energy and regulations. “Breathe Free: Capitalism Helps Protect the Environment” The Heritage Foundation. October 23, 2019. https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/breathe-free-capitalism-helps-protect-the-environment)///MF

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Rather than eliminate capitalism, policymakers need to unleash it.

As a country prospers, its citizens are better able to care for the environment and reduce pollutants emitted from industrial growth.

When America and the rest of the world embrace policies rooted in economic freedom, both prosperity and the environment flourish.

A recent Rasmussen poll found 20% of voters feel we should eliminate capitalism to protect the environment. That’s like saying we should eliminate teachers to improve education.

Truth be told, capitalism has helped cleanse our planet — improving living standards while protecting the environment. Rather than eliminate capitalism, policymakers need to unleash it.

Markets incentivize efficiency by rewarding people for coming up with ways to do more or do better with less. People choose — and businesses make — more efficient products because it saves them money while delivering what customers want.

Get exclusive insider information from Heritage experts delivered straight to your inbox each week. [Subscribe to The Agenda >>](https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/breathe-free-capitalism-helps-protect-the-environment#MEC-Embedded-Ask)

Over the past decade, market forces have driven a massive transition within the energy industry. In 2008, coal provided roughly half of the country’s electricity generation. Now, coal’s share is about a quarter. Increased production of natural gas has driven energy bills and emissions downward.

In direct response to cheap gas, the Nuclear Energy Institute organized nuclear power plants nationally to find operating efficiencies that have reduced costs by 19%, saving consumers $1.6 billion and keeping emissions-free electricity in the marketplace.

>>>[The Right Way to Ensure a Cleaner Environment](https://www.heritage.org/environment/heritage-explains/the-right-way-ensure-cleaner-environment)

The energy industry is far from the only sector that has made positive economic and environmental contributions. For instance, the cement industry is collaborating with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to explore how to refine its processes in ways that will improve resiliency, reduce emissions and save lives. Investments in cement, steel, plastic and other building materials will make our houses and highways sturdier and our products more durable — with a smaller environmental footprint.

All of these activities result directly from free enterprise — companies providing consumers with the goods and services they want while using fewer resources and emitting fewer unwanted emissions.

As a country prospers, its citizens are better able to care for the environment and reduce pollutants emitted from industrial growth. In fact, The Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom and Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index show a strong correlation between a country’s environmental performance and economic freedom (i.e., its embrace of capitalism).

The bigger problem, typically, is that Washington can’t keep up. Policy and regulations significantly lag behind the pace of innovation, market trends and consumer preferences. Thus, government ends up retarding economic and environmental progress.

A significant obstacle to investment in producing or switching to cleaner energy sources is the lack of infrastructure needed to deliver the energy to would-be customers. Natural gas offers a cheaper, cleaner alternative to home heating oil; however, pipeline capacity is lacking in America’s Northeast. Of the 5.7 million American households still relying on oil heat, 85% are in the Northeast, where nimbyism and opposition to any carbon-based fuel run strong.

The obstructionism isn’t limited to conventional fuels, either. Efficiently siting and permitting new transmission lines could expand the consumption of renewable power from, say, Canada, which enjoys a surplus of hydroelectric power. Additional infrastructure would also allow energy-intensive manufacturing processes, like the cement industry, to switch to cleaner, cheaper fuel.

Another sound policy would be to make immediate expensing a permanent of fixture of the tax code. This would allow newer equipment to come online faster, improving energy efficiency and the overall economy. The current system of depreciation raises the cost of capital and discourages companies from hiring more workers and increasing wages for existing employees.

Too often, we use phrases like “balancing economic growth and environmental protections.” This suggests that more growth necessarily degrades the environment. But the two aren’t mutually exclusive.

When America and the rest of the world embrace policies rooted in economic freedom, both prosperity and the environment flourish. In this instance, you really can have your cake and eat it, too.

#### [Capitalism solves climate change](https://www.forbes.com/advisor/travel-insurance/best-travel-insurance/?utm_source=forbes&utm_medium=recirc&utm_campaign=tirecircnov)

Silverstein, 22, Ken Silverstien, winner of national awards, writes about fossil fuels, renewables, and climate change, 5/4/2022, “Why Capitalism Can Make a Big Impact on Climate Change”, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2022/05/04/why-capitalism-can-make-a-big-impact-on-climate-change/?sh=32400cb11128> - FT

Major power generation companies are capitalizing on this shift: ABB[ABB](https://www.forbes.com/companies/abb) [+2.3%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/abb), Electricite de France, General Electric[GE](https://www.forbes.com/companies/general-electric) [+4.7%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/general-electric), Invenergy, The Tata Power Company, and Xcel Energy[XEL](https://www.forbes.com/companies/xcel-energy) [+1.9%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/xcel-energy). And on the consumer side, there’s Apple[AAPL](https://www.forbes.com/companies/apple) [+2.5%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/apple), which is already reporting its climate risks, and Microsoft[MSFT](https://www.forbes.com/companies/microsoft) [+3.4%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/microsoft) Corp., which is vowing to be carbon neutral by 2030 by buying offsets — credits that go toward planting trees and saving the [rainforests](https://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2022/04/27/when-it-comes-to-cutting-carbon-the-rainforests-do-the-heavy-lifting/?sh=390643595666). JANSCHWALDE, GERMANY - NOVEMBER 24: A loan wind turbine spins as exhaust plumes from cooling towers ... [+] GETTY IMAGES Ballentine points to Tesla[TSLA](https://www.forbes.com/companies/tesla) [+4.5%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/tesla), which went a long time without making a profit. Still, Wall Street highly valued the carmaker because it got out ahead of the climate dilemma by ushering in quality electric vehicles. The lesson for others is that they, too, want to be on the side of climate change. Markets will view climate-conscious corporate leaders as competent — ones with a strategy to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and mitigate risks. Those shakers are also recruiting executives and engineers with an eye toward the future, realizing they must attract and retain a qualified workforce by building sustainable businesses. “Climate change is not waiting for political change,” says Ballentine, who also served as Chairman of the White House Climate Change Task Force under President Clinton. “Any company that is not managing these risks will lose to companies that are.” It’s an urgent need: Temperatures hit 115 degrees in Siberia last summer, and there’s been a 400 percent increase in the number of natural disasters since 1980. “There’s a certain amount of carbon we can emit in 30 years,” says Ballentine. “The bad news is we are on pace to empty that in 10 years.” What now? He sees the insurance sector as having a significant role to play. Europe’s four biggest insurers have now placed restrictions on coal. Allianz, Generali, and Zurich Insurance Group are the continent's biggest carriers, and they are proactive. Meantime, Reinsurance giants Swiss Re, Munich Re, and SC[SC](https://www.forbes.com/digital-assets/assets/siacoin-sc/) [-1.5%](https://www.forbes.com/digital-assets/assets/siacoin-sc/)OR have underwriting restrictions on heavy emitters. Industry losses are in the hundreds of billions. The green movement now eyes the biggest banks, pressuring them to quit lending money to coal companies and get the major pension funds to sell off their shares of coal companies. Already, Bank of America[BAC](https://www.forbes.com/companies/bank-of-america) [+0.7%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/bank-of-america) Corp., Citigroup[C](https://www.forbes.com/companies/citigroup) [+3.3%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/citigroup) Inc., Goldman Sachs Group[GS](https://www.forbes.com/companies/goldman-sachs-group) [+5.8%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/goldman-sachs-group), Morgan Stanley[MS](https://www.forbes.com/companies/morgan-stanley) [+5.2%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/morgan-stanley), and Wells Fargo[WFC](https://www.forbes.com/companies/wells-fargo) [+7.5%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/wells-fargo) have altered their lending practices. Most of those are also disclosing their climate risks, and so are Barclays, Lloyds Banking, and TD Bank Group. “To prosper over time, every company must not only deliver financial performance but also show how it makes a positive contribution to society,” says Larry Fink, chair of BlackRock[BLK](https://www.forbes.com/companies/blackrock) [+3.7%](https://www.forbes.com/companies/blackrock), which manages $6 trillion for pension and investment funds. Succumbing to short-term profit goals will result in inferior returns, and a failure to be sustainable could impact the brand.

#### Capitalism necessary to create incentives for protecting the environment

Block, 2021, [Walter, Endowed Chair in Economics at the School of Business at Loyola University, Free Enterprise Environmentalism, Private Property Rights and Environmentalism, 145-146, HHW]

We operate under a free enterprise economic system that produces plastic milk jugs and redwood picnic tables. The market is therefore responsible for such environmental problems as too much plastic trash and too little conservation of forests. **So goes a common belief, anyway**. In fact, it is governmental failure to maintain and defend the institutions of a free market that is responsible for the environmental damage caused by private businesses. In the case of solid-waste management, plastic companies and their customers escape from the cost of disposing of plastic after the consumer is finished with it. This is because most garbage collection is organized through the public sector. The cost of disposing of the plastic and the other waste is undertaken by the government, and a citizen is typically taxed without regard to the amount of trash he generates.

Once the citizen pays his taxes, he has **no incentive to choose environmentally sound goods because disposal costs are in effect free to him.** If, instead, there were complete privatization of the garbage disposal industry, those who generate trash would directly pay for disposal costs. The owner of a private dump tends to charge tipping fees that vary with different kinds of trash. The price will be significantly higher for material that creates toxic waste because the dump owner will be liable for any harmful leaks from his site. The hauling firm, which collects the garbage from the homeowner and must pay the tipping fee, will pass the price onto consumers. Consumers, knowing that they will have to pay more for the disposal of more plastic, will tend to substitute toward less costly, and thus more environmentally sound, containers. In the jargon of economists, the negative externality will disappear; the cost of trash disposal will be internalized, brought to bear on the responsible parties. It is clear from this example that the negative externality currently related to solid-waste management is a governmental failure, rather than a market failure. **By not allowing the free market to operate, the government pushes the costs of waste disposal onto the taxpayers**. In a free market the price system accurately enables us to **compare resources to determine which courses of actions are most economically and ecologically sound**. Critics argue that the market fails to consider environmental concerns. In Making Peace With the Planet , Barry Commoner insists that the free market system conflicts with a social concern for environmental quality, and thus argues that ecologically sound production decisions must be implemented through planning. Commoner fails to realize that when we turn away from the market, we are unable to compare resources and their values. Nor does he realize that the incentive structure in the political sector fosters an **economically unsound approach to the environment**. The distorted incentives that operate in the public sector are responsible for many of our forest removal and logging problems. The difficulty stems from the fact that 42 percent of all U.S. land is owned by government. The public forestry services do not operate by maximizing the value of their resources. Rather, they subsidize special interest groups who in turn support public ownership. For example, the **U.S. Bureau of Land Management** (BLM) uses a method known as chaining, which uproots trees, leaving holes and unsightly tracks, to remove trees from grazing lands. Although this costly method is seldom practiced in the private sector, the **BLM has no incentive to minimize costs**. It maximizes its budget by providing subsidized grazing rights for ranchers who in turn lobby for BLM expenditures. The U.S. Forestry Service subsidizes logging companies to cut down trees on public lands by building logging roads for them. The private firms thereby shift some of the costs of logging onto the public.

Again, **prices do not reflect the full costs of environmental destruction**. Certainly if the business firms actually owned the land, they would better care for it because abusing it would reduce their prospects for future income. Government ownership of so much land artificially encourages logging for another reason as well. Private firms with large landholdings are discouraged from using them for hunting or recreational purposes; the government provides parks for these purposes at a zero or nominal price. In the national forest surrounding Yellowstone National Park, the Forest Service charges no user fee for elk hunting. This reduces the value of elk resources on private land and discourages private firms from devoting their forests to hunting rather than logging. The low level of private development of recreational land is likewise due to the minimal prices the federal government charges for the use of its recreational facilities. Unfortunately, because the federal government owns the land, environmental groups generally have to work through the political sector. They lobby to persuade the government to preserve land, in conflict with the opposing special interests of logging, ranching, and extraction industries. If the demand for environmental amenities were instead channeled through the marketplace, **tremendous progress would be possible.**

#### Capitalism leads to the best environmental conditions – lack of capitalism causes environmental crisis

Block, 2021, [Walter, Endowed Chair in Economics at the School of Business at Loyola University, Free Enterprise Environmentalism, Private Property Rights and Environmentalism, 143-145, HHW]

“**Private enterprise leads to pollution**.” Before we can determine whether or not this statement is true, we have to define our terms. Pollution is relatively easy. This refers to a private property border crossing: waste matter is transported from one person’s holdings to that of another, either directly or indirectly. It is important that we interpret pollution in this manner; otherwise, it can easily be confused with something that superficially resembles it but is actually quite different, namely waste disposal. In the latter case, the byproducts of the processing of goods or services are retained by the firm which created them. It disposes of them without negatively impacting others ’ rights. In this case there is no “ spillover ” effect nor “ externalities ” affecting third parties. The definition we are considering here, then, is a legal definition, not a physical one. As far as chemical analysis is concerned, it is impossible to distinguish pollution from waste disposal. In both cases, the waste material may well consist of identical chemical compounds. The simplest example of pollution using this terminology is when Mr. Jones dumps his garbage on Mr. Smith ’ s front lawn. That would be a case of direct pollution. The indirect version occurs when there is an intermediary between Jones and Smith, such as air or water. Here, Jones first incinerates his refuse, and prevailing winds carry the same material over to Smith, his lawn, and his lungs. Alternatively, Jones could dump this material into a river, negatively impacting Smith who lives downstream and is forced to use the now polluted water for drinking, irrigation, and washing.

Non-polluting waste disposal occurs when baseball fans leave the stadium littered with peanut shells and beer cans. **There is no “border crossing**” in this case, since ticket prices reflect the cleanup costs. The management voluntarily disposes of the detritus. Another example would be hiring a maid to clean one ’ s home. There may be garbage strewn all over the place, but this is not pollution; the maid has agreed to do the cleaning for the owners. What, then, is a private enterprise? This is not a system where government grants special privileges (subsidies, protection from competition) to business concerns. Far from it. On the contrary, free enterprise is a system based firmly on the premise of private property rights. Trespassing and theft are **absolutely incompatible with the free market system**. The market is the concatenation of all voluntary trades (employment, barter, purchase, rental, sale, etc.) between mutually consenting parties. Under pure and unadulterated laissez-faire capitalism, the only function of government is to protect person and property against physical attack from outsiders. We are now ready to put these two elements together. Pollution, we have seen, is in effect a bombardment, an infringement of one person ’ s rights by another. But the **essence of private enterprise is precisely to prevent such goings-on. It can therefore be stated, without fear of contradiction that private enterprise does not lead to pollution.** But this way of putting matters is far too understated. Actually, **“ market pollution ” is a contradiction** in terms. To the extent that there is private enterprise, there cannot be pollution; it is against the law. To the extent that pollution exists, this is prima facie evidence that the legal underpinnings of capitalism have been breached; that the law of trespass is not being upheld; that private property rights are not being defended. Pollution is a trespass or border crossing; the sole **function of a free enterprise government is to prevent this** (and other) violations of property rights. **Therefore, the two are entirely incompatible**. Now it is of course true that many countries, in many areas of the world, in many time periods, have been considered to be based on free enterprise principles, and yet suffered from pollution. This only attests to the inaccuracy of language. Let us consider one such example, the United States in the nineteenth century. Up until approximately 1830, the courts had based their decisions in “ nuisance cases ” (we would now call them environmental litigation) on a reasonably close approximation to a free enterprise legal system. If a farmer could show that the railroad engine was spewing forth sparks and setting his haystacks on fire, he could collect damages. If the housekeeper complained that factory fumes were dirtying the clean laundry she hung on her clothesline, she would typically be granted a cease-and-desist order. Injunctions were invariably granted to downstream users victimized by upstream waste dumping.

Under these conditions, it was clear that manufacturers had to take into account third-party effects. There were strong incentives to use cleaner burning but more expensive anthracite coal instead of the dirtier but cheaper high sulfur variety; to install smoke prevention devices; to engage in research and development aimed at abating nuisances. There was even an “environmental forensics” industry in the making, dedicated to determining guilt for pollution. And when all else failed, the railroad, the factory owner, and the “upstreamer” could pay their victims to the latter’s satisfaction, thus converting pollution into waste disposal, and “internalizing” the externalities. But in the 1850s and thereafter, a new philosophy began to permeate the legal fraternity. It was determined that the “public good” required economic progress. In the view of an increasing preponderance of judges, this could only be attained by supporting manufacturing. So when the aggrieved victim of pollution next appeared before the bench, they said, in effect, “Our primary goal is to facilitate a rising GNP. In order to do so, we must give carte blanche to polluters. Your selfish private property rights are in the way of the greater good for the greater number, and must be swept aside.” Under this condition, all market-oriented environmental incentives came to an abrupt halt. Previously, environmentally sound acts resulted from both selfishness and benevolence. Now, only the latter could operate, the one that Adam Smith saw as far less reliable. After all, why should the profit-seeking firm use clean fuel, or worry about smoke prevention, when it was not legally responsible for damages? The few businessmen who did so in any case, perhaps on moral grounds, put themselves at a competitive disadvantage; they became more liable to bankruptcy. The resulting environmental crisis was due **not to free enterprise, but to its very opposite**.

#### Criticisms of capitalist system are unfounded – the environment does best under capitalism

Block, 2021, [Walter, Endowed Chair in Economics at the School of Business at Loyola University, Free Enterprise Environmentalism, Private Property Rights and Environmentalism, 6-7, HHW]

According to the mainstream economic analysis, libertarianism is wrong. The problem of airborne pollution is not due to a failure of government to protect private property rights. Instead, this comes about because of “ market failure, ” a basic flaw in free enterprise. Pigou (1912, p. 139) gives the **classic statement of this view**: Smoke in large towns, which inflicts a heavy loss on the community, . . . comes about because there is no way no to force private polluters to bear the social cost of their operations. Samuelson (1936, 1970) conveys the same sentiment in terms of the divergence between private and social costs. Lange and Taylor (1938, p. 103) are yet additional socialists who make the complementary point: A feature, which distinguishes a socialist economy from one based on private enterprise, is the comprehensiveness of the items entering into the socialist price system. In other words, for some strange dark mysterious reasons, capitalists, under laissez faire, are excused from even considering the physical harm they do to the property of others through the emissions of their smoke particles. Under socialism, in contrast, the central planner of course takes this into account, nipping the problem of pollution in the bud. There is **so much wrong with this scenario it is hard to know where to begin a refutation**. Perhaps we may best start with an empirical observation. If this criticism of the market were true, one would expect that, even if the Soviets couldn’t successfully run an economy, they could at least be trusted as far as the environment is concerned. In actual point of fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Exhibit “ A ” is perhaps the disappearance of the Aral and Caspian Seas, due to massive and unchecked pollution, overcutting of trees, and consequent desertification. Then there is Chernobyl, which caused hundreds, if not thousands of deaths. 12 For ferryboats in the Volga River, it is forbidden to smoke cigarettes. This is not for intrusive paternalistic health reasons as in the West, but because this river is so polluted with oil and other flammable materials that there is a great fear that if a cigarette is tossed overboard**, it will set the entire body of water on fire**. Furthermore, under communism, there was little or no waste treatment of sewage in Poland, the gold roof in Cracow ’ s Sigismund Chapel dissolved due to acid rain, there was a dark brown haze over much of East Germany, and the sulfur dioxide concentration in Czechoslovakia were eight times levels common in the United States (DiLorenzo, 1990A). Nor was it a matter merely of the absence of democracy in the USSR. The ecological record of the U.S. government, where democracy is the order of the day, is none too savory. The Department of Defense has dumped 400,000 tons of hazardous waste, more than the five largest chemical corporations combined. The Rocky Mountain Arsenal carelessly disposed of nerve gas, mustard shells, the anti-crop spray TX, and incendiary devices. And this is to say nothing of the infamous Yellowstone Park forest fire, which the authorities refused to put out, citing ecological considerations; 13 nor the TVA ’ s 59 coal-fired power plants; nor the underpricing and overuse of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management; nor the fact that the government subsidizes forest overcutting by building logging roads. These are not examples of market failure. Rather, they are instances of government failure: direct controls and inability or unwillingness to uphold private property rights.

#### Capitalism needs to have a larger role – without it, the ocean environment suffers

Block, 2021, [Walter, Endowed Chair in Economics at the School of Business at Loyola University, Free Enterprise Environmentalism, Private Property Rights and Environmentalism, 6-7, HHW]

**Currently, devastating environmental conditions exist in the ocean because no one owns the property** and, therefore, no one has a stake in what happens to this resource that houses an array of valuable assets — fish, oil, minerals, transportation, recreation, and so on. Governments cause this wreckage by not recognizing private ownership of this wealth, except the few miles they own off the coast for military protection. 1 If private property were established, it would improve the environmental problems that occur in the ocean such as endangered species, wetlands devastation, and pollution. 2 In the ocean, many fish that are near extinction are specifically the ones seafood eaters love the most, like Atlantic cod, Atlantic and Pacific salmon, marlin, swordfish, snappers, tuna, sharks, and Alaskan king crabs (DeMont, 2003). No one owns the ocean or the commodities in it, so the incentive, which is similar to the incentive for forest devastation on government land, is for people to fish as much as possible. Therefore, others should not be amazed that these fish are on the verge of extinction, because they are free-floating assets. The same result would happen if there were gold nuggets dispersed in the local public parks. Eventually, people will collect virtually every piece. History serves as a lesson, which is seen in the near extinction of the buffalo. No one owned this animal and, so it fell victim to a tragedy of the commons due to excessive hunting. 3 On the other hand, the cow that was privately owned and existed at the same time as the buffalo was not subjected to overhunting and has lasted until this day. This is because cow owners invest money in buying, feeding, and protecting their cows. Therefore, when one of their cows is killed, the owner faces a cost: loss of the animal in the future. But if the owner kills a buffalo, he faces no such cost. Both these animals are of value for their meat and hides, but, consequently, only one was almost wiped out because of the lack of private ownership.

#### Capitalism creates incentives for environmental preservations.

White 20 (Jane Gleeson-White, is an adjunct lecturer at UNSW Canberra and author, 2020-04-28, “Six Capitals Updated Edition”, Allen & Unwin publisher, [ProQuest Ebook Central - Detail page (umich.edu)](https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lib/umichigan/detail.action?docID=6175764), ) - EM

In 2010, the World Bank launched its own initiative to develop natural capital accounting. Called Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES), it was designed to promote sustainable development by encouraging natural capital accounting, and to help develop ecosystem accounts, in the belief that they would ensure that both development planning and governments consider natural resources. By 2013, eight countries— Costa Rica, Botswana, Colombia, Madagascar, the Philippines, Guatemala, Indonesia and Rwanda— had signed up to WAVES and were developing natural capital accounts for resources like forests, water and minerals. Since then, Zambia, Uganda, Myanmar, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Vietnam have joined the program. At the national level, natural capital accounting has spawned its own world of complex environmental– economic transactions. Among them is a system called ‘payments for ecosystem (or environmental) services’ (PES), a broad term for a wide range of economic arrangements that attempt to assign a price to ecosystem or environmental services in order to conserve them. PES was devised to offer landowners incentives to manage their land to provide an environmental service, such as maintaining forest cover. The longest-running ecosystem services scheme is the Conservation Reserve Program in the United States, which dates to the 1950s. Under this scheme, the US government pays out over US$1.5 billion a year to landowners to encourage them to protect endangered wildlife habitats and environmentally sensitive land. Like so many of these initiatives designed to account for nature, it appears to work in nature’s favor, as does the experience of Costa Rica (which I discuss below).

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - Innovation

#### Capitalism sustainable – competitive pressure leads to innovation, solves every issue.

Steve Wilhite 22 [Steve Wilhite, 4-19-2022, "Is Capitalism Sustainable?," Schneider Electric Blog, <https://blog.se.com/sustainability/2022/04/19/is-capitalism-sustainable/>, smarx, HHW]

Like most of us in the sustainability field, I’ve come to anticipate the publication of CEO of Blackrock Larry Fink’s annual letter. Over the past several years, Fink’s missive (and its downstream impact on Blackrock’s growing emphasis on ESG) has revolved around responsible business and the role of the investor to encourage corporate responsibility.

2022 was no different. Fink’s letter (here, if you haven’t read it yet) continued to emphasize the importance of environmental and social issues in corporate governance. But this year, Fink deviated slightly from his previous years’ message by reinforcing the importance of capitalism.

Those who know me know I’m a dyed-in-the-wool capitalist. I believe, strongly, that the straightest and most efficient path towards innovation, growth, resource allocation, and yes, profits, is through the free market. Competitive pressure has shaped our human culture for thousands of years, and capitalism continues shaping it today. Without capitalism, many of the things we have and use and the quality of life we take for granted today may have never become a reality.

As the emphasis on corporate responsibility has grown over the past decade, however, capitalism as a sustainable, resilient economic system has been called into question. At the heart of the matter is the so-called Friedman doctrine, Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman’s theory that the social responsibility of a business is to increase its profits. Commonly, the soundness of the Friedman doctrine is pitted against another economic theory, the tragedy of the commons, in which individual pursuit of personal gain comes at the detriment of society.

Part of what is at issue is the matter of economic growth. A common understanding in sustainability is that infinite economic growth (as supported by capitalist doctrine) is at odds with a planet of finite resources. We already consume nearly 1.5 Earth’s worth of resources every year, far overshooting our available natural resources. If anything, we must scale back this consumption to operate within our planetary boundaries.

But can we do that – and remain capitalists?

On this point, Larry Fink and I resoundingly agree. **The answer is yes**. In fact, Fink argues, capitalism is a road to sustainability, but it will require the reimagining of how we do business and generate profits today.

The only way we can maintain infinite growth with finite resources is through innovation, and through circular innovation specifically. Stewardship of our natural resources is becoming a form of significant capital, and that capital is increasingly at risk. It is, therefore, the fiduciary responsibility of all leaders to protect natural resources to de-risk business.

This, Fink concludes, means decarbonizing. One of the greatest risks to our collective natural resources (including people) is climate change. The faster we can decarbonize, the more rapidly we reduce this risk.

But it doesn’t stop there; we must also innovate, knowing that how we do business today will not survive a resource-constrained and risk-laden future. The business models that served us 100, or even 50, years ago must be overhauled. We must ascribe value to concepts and ideas that we may have devalued in the past. We must invest, heavily, in the development of digital solutions and services that advance our very human aims of survival while simultaneously supporting our economic ambitions of growth.

Through this lens, I’d argue that capitalism itself is, in fact, sustainable. It is the competitive market pressures of the next decade that will help us to succeed through the efficient allocation of scarce resources. In fact, in an April 2022 report, BlackRock noted that it expects 75% of its corporate investments to have net-zero goals by 2030. It is the spirit of exploration and the promise of potential profit that will drive some of our most talented entrepreneurs and inventors, and it is the work of those individuals that will create new, resilient, sustainable, and circular business models that will allow us to drive profitability and growth in the face of finite resources.

#### **Abandoning capitalism and economic growth results in chaos and instability.**

Terzi 5/24 [Alessio Terzi; Writer for Harvard University Press, Economist at the European Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, Affiliate Fellow at the think tank Bruegel and a Fulbright Scholar at the Harvard Kennedy School, PhD from the Hertie School with a thesis on economic growth, MPA in economic policy from the London School of Economics, and a BSc in international economics from Bocconi University; 5-24-2022; Growth for Good; De Gruyter; https://www-degruyter-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/doi/10.4159/9780674276338/html; 6-22-2022; SK]

In this chapter we have gained more reason to doubt that, faced with the threat of catastrophic climate change, the right move is to curtail economic growth. That recommendation is predicated on the delusional principle that, under the pressure of bounded resources, people will come together and share peacefully what is available. In the history of past human experience with climate and environmental stress, and in the principles of evolutionary anthropology and cognitive science, there is no evidence that world peace and humanity-wide sharing would be the most likely outcome.

Abandoning economic growth would weaken the scope for innovation, exacerbate perceived scarcity, and reduce resilience—and do so just as climate change was beginning to unleash its powerful effects. It would, in the face of scarcity and heightened uncertainty, set off a scramble for limited resources as people retreated for protection to their nation state in-groups. We can chastise all this as offensive to morality, but ignoring these human traits and historical lessons will most likely take us where we do not want to go. On the other hand, in my view, our moral compass should guide us all to try and avoid at all costs a return to a zero-sum world and a hyperconflictual foreign relations scenario. History shows how, when the climate and environment start changing, what we should be most afraid of is intergroup conflict. And the only difference today, with respect to the past, is that human weapons are much more deadly.

As societies find themselves between a rock and a hard place—facing catastrophic climate change on one side, and catastrophic conflict over bounded resources on the other—the escape route is narrow but, given the alternative, must be pursued.71 In abstract terms, it involves using technological innovation and human ingenuity to shift away from the logic that salvation can only come with national sacrifice for the global good, or fairshare valuations, to the logic that casts decarbonization efforts as investment opportunities.

In practical terms, under this new logic, industrialized countries can be expected to act enthusiastically as early adopters for green technologies, attracted by the prizes of being at the forefront of the next industrial revolution and able to set its standards for years to come. In turn, this industrial revolution will reverberate through the world, following the standard paths of capitalism and globalization, propelled by the deep-rooted mechanics of emulation, and financed in part by foreign aid.

This is a race against the clock, and the stakes are as high as world peace. The full power of capitalism must be harnessed and driven toward achieving speedy decarbonization, and it is evident that this will require an extensive set of policies. In the words of evolutionary biologist David Sloan Wilson, the mission is to “direct the process of cultural evolution toward planetary sustainability.”72 In practice, this means seizing the viable middle ground between ineffective laissez-faire policies and illiberal command-and-control solutions. Chapter 8 lays out an economic strategy to jump-start the greening of capitalism, and the societal overhaul that will go with it.

#### Capitalism is the root cause of innovation – key to economic prosperity

Baumol, 2007 [William, former junior economist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Freedom and capitalism in early modern Europe: mercantilism and the making of the modern economic mind, Capitalism: The Different Types and Their Impacts on Growth, 87-89, HHW]

With rare exceptions, **truly innovative entrepreneurs can only be found in capitalist economies**, where the risk of doing something new—and spending time and money to make it happen—can be handsomely rewarded and the rewards safely kept (these are key preconditions for entrepreneurial capitalism, which we will discuss in chapter 5). Given the importance of innovation, the virtue of a free-market, opportunity-maximizing economy is that it taps the talents of the many. Such an economy is open to continual brainstorming and experimentation, which pays off be- cause the people at large—vast numbers of them, having a diverse mix of skills and different kinds of knowledge—are more likely to come up with and implement good ideas than any group of planners or experts. Thus, the very “un-plannedness” of a **free-market economy, which might seem to be a great weakness, turns out to be a great strength.** One of us (Baumol) has offered several reasons why radical innovations seem to emanate from entrepreneurs rather than large firms (at the same time being careful to note that most entrepreneurs are replicative rather than radical).15 For one thing, successful radical innovation, if undertaken by the entrepreneur, promises what might be called “mega-prizes”—hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars of wealth. Nothing comparable awaits the radical innovator in a large firm, who might get a special recognition award and a onetime bonus. Beyond this, paradoxically, studies have found (for the United States at least) that the typical entrepreneur earns less monetary compensation than her employee counterpart. Why then do so many entrepreneurs willingly engage in what is inherently risky activity? Because the additional psychic rewards—being one’s own boss, pride in self-accomplishment, and so forth—**make the entrepreneurial endeavor worthwhile** even if the entrepreneur does not gain the mega-prize. This, in turn, helps explain why entrepreneurs have a comparative advantage relative to large companies in attempting to discover and commercialize breakthrough innovations. Because a not insignificant portion of the entrepreneur’s “income” from her activity is psychic, the entrepreneur is the low-cost provider of radical innovation. Often, therefore, it is more economical for the large firm to wait for entrepreneurs to develop the radical innovations and then buy them out. Large Firms and the Contagion of Innovation Why then does this low-wage competitive advantage of the independent innovator-entrepreneur not extend also to less radical innovations, the cumulative incremental improvements that are specialties of large firms? Part of the answer lies in the greater complexity and capital cost of incremental innovation. A Boeing 777 obviously is far more com- plicated than the primitive airplane developed by the Wright brothers. It has taken Boeing a century to continually refine the original airplane into the complex and rather amazing piece of machinery that is today’s modern airplane. Boeing has accomplished this feat by amassing an army of engineers and designers and spending billions of dollars—money the Wright brothers did not have. This, too, is not accidental. By its very nature, the original revolutionary invention known as the airplane, like so many that came before and after it, grew ever more complex as it was repeatedly modified and improved. In this respect, the independent innovator-entrepreneur was at a marked disadvantage in the financing of the incremental improvements that have led to the modern airplane. None of this is to imply that large firms are incapable of radical innovation or that they never achieve it. The fact is that even in America, entrepreneurs have not had a monopoly on all radical innovation, and large second-generation firms are essential to ensure that radical innovations take root. For example, Bell Laboratories, which was perhaps the most successful research arm of any major corporation (when it was owned by AT&T), was responsible for two of the more important big-firm radical innovations in recent decades: the transistor and then the semiconductor. These were seminal breakthroughs indeed, but it is also noteworthy that they helped to launch a wave of innovation by newer, entrepreneurial firms. In 1958, when American scientists were scrambling to catch up to the Soviet Union’s successful launching of Sputnik, Jack Kilby at Texas instruments expanded on the Bell Labs work by conceiving an integrated circuit, a silicon chip containing transistors along with other circuit elements. Building upon these two innovations, others brought to market a series of new consumer and business goods, from transistor radios to pocket calculators and, eventually, personal computers—which were developed and commercialized in the 1970s by entrepreneurs at a time when existing firms did not yet see the value of PCs (an industry launched by another entrepreneur, Steve Jobs, the founder of Apple). **Innovation didn’t stop there**. The PC industry, in turn, gave a huge boost to the fledgling software industry that also had been launched by cadres of independent entrepreneurs. Even the legendary start and growth of Microsoft into one of the world’s largest and most profitable companies, as the pioneer of PC operating systems, thereafter provided a market for other computer application software. Advances in computing, in turn, have enabled advances in biotechnology, a new field started by university researchers experimenting with recombinant DNA, which was developed into an industry by entrepreneurs and venture capitalists. Computing and biotech have since played instrumental roles in the emergence of nano- technology—miniature devices no larger than molecules—that may revolutionize medicine and other fields in ways that cannot yet be imagined. **No one could have planned these events**. No one even foresaw them. **Yet they led to entirely new industries employing millions and benefiting hundreds of millions (if not billions) more.** Other countries have witnessed these remarkable developments and are learning from them. As we discuss in later chapters, such countries as Ireland, Israel, and the United Kingdom have or are in the process of shedding the guiding role of the state in their economies and putting their bets on entrepreneurs, with growing and **even remarkable success**. India, a long- time practitioner of state-guided capitalism, has embraced entrepreneur- ship, more by accident than design, in a small but growing corner of its economy: call-in centers and software design. China, formerly the world’s largest centrally planned economy, has developed a new form of semi-state- guided entrepreneurship that has helped make that economy the world’s fastest growing of the last decade.

#### Capitalism’s incentive to work creates innovation and improves living standards

Baumol, 2007 [William, former junior economist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Freedom and capitalism in early modern Europe: mercantilism and the making of the modern economic mind, Capitalism: The Different Types and Their Impacts on Growth, 85-87, HHW]

Entrepreneurial Capitalism Finally, we come to our fourth category: entrepreneurial capitalism, the capitalist system in which large numbers of the actors within the economy not only have an unceasing drive and **incentive to innovate** but also undertake and commercialize radical or breakthrough innovations. These innovations are bolder than the incremental innovations that characterize big-firm capitalism. Together, these innovations, as improved and refined by the entrepreneurs themselves or by other existing firms, have improved living standards beyond anything our ancestors could have believed. Examples include the automobile and the airplane; the telegraph, which led to the telephone and eventually the Internet; the generation of electricity, which has transformed the way we work and live; and the air conditioner, which has permitted massive migrations of peoples from colder climates to warmer climates, not just in the United States but around the world, and **increased worker productivity by no small amount along the way**. This is just a small sample of the radical innovations that have trans- formed our lives and have spawned entire industries around them. They either become “platforms” on which other products or technologies are built (electricity or personal computer operating systems, for example), or “hubs” that help create and support many “spokes” (automobiles and their supplier industries). The industries spawned by these radical innovations in turn **enhance productivity** and thereby **contribute to economic growth**, both nationally and within regions where new firm formation is especially strong (Acs and Plummer, 2005; Acs and Armington, 2004).14 Or, as David Audretsch and his colleagues at the Max Planck Institute have argued, “entrepreneurship makes an important contribution to economic growth by **providing a conduit for the spillover of knowledge that might otherwise have remained uncommercialized**” (Audretsch et al. 2006, 5). New Firms and Breakthrough Innovations But where do these radical, breakthrough innovations come from? The answer is that transformational technologies, and hence entrepreneurial capitalism, would not exist without entrepreneurs, who recognize an opportunity to sell some thing or service that hadn’t been there before and then act on it. Radical breakthroughs tend to be disproportionately developed and brought to market by a single individual or new firm, al- though frequently, if not generally, the ideas behind the breakthroughs originate in larger firms (or universities) that, because of their bureaucratic structures, do not exploit them (Moore and Davis, 2004, 32). As Jean Baptiste Say noted at the beginning of the nineteenth century, without the entrepreneur, “[scientific] knowledge might possibly have lain dormant in the memory of one or two persons, or in the pages of literature” (Say, 1834, 81). Although the finding is now somewhat dated, one thorough statistical study has found that smaller, younger firms produce substantially more innovations per employee than larger, more established firms (Acs and Audretsch, 1990).

#### Capitalism is the only system that cultivates and fosters innovation

Shiller 20 [Robert Shiller, 11-2-2020, "Capitalism promotes innovation in a free market economy," No Publication, https://www.parlia.com/a/capitalism-promotes-innovation, smarx, HHW]

**Capitalism promotes innovation in a free market economy**

A free market encourages innovation because people have incentives to work harder, which leads to higher productivity. Innovation allows societies to develop rapidly and gives people a better quality of life.

Capitalism promotes and rewards innovation from people and companies. Innovation is encouraged for both goods and services at all levels.

Companies invest in research and development in an effort to create better products so that they can sell more and increase their profits. This leads to huge advances, especially in fields like medicine and technology.

The system also rewards companies for constantly making improvements to already existing products and technologies.[1]

Capitalism creates an incentive for companies to constantly strive to keep improving because that is how they can earn the most money. **These continual improvements benefit consumers** because it leads to more choices of goods.

Due to the competitive nature of capitalism, citizens also have an **incentive to work harder**. People know that with creativity and hard work (the backbone of innovation) they can become the next Bill Gates or Jeff Bezos.

This **results in a culture of productivity** that increases overall efficiency**, allowing for civilizations to develop rapidly** as new technological advancements are being made.

#### Efficiency and innovation through capitalism protect the environment

Nicolas Loris 19 [Nicolas Loris, 10-23-2019, "Breathe Free: Capitalism Helps Protect the Environment," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/breathe-free-capitalism-helps-protect-the-environment, HHW]

Arecent Rasmussen poll found 20% of voters feel we should eliminate capitalism to protect the environment. **That’s like saying we should eliminate teachers to improve education.**

Truth be told, **capitalism has helped cleanse our planet** — improving living standards while protecting the environment. Rather than eliminate capitalism, **policymakers need to unleash it**.

**Markets incentivize efficiency by rewarding people for coming up with ways to do more or do better with less.** People choose — and businesses make — more efficient products because it saves them money while delivering what customers want.

Over the past decade, market forces have driven a massive transition within the energy industry. In 2008, coal provided roughly half of the country’s electricity generation. Now, coal’s share is about a quarter. Increased production of natural gas has driven energy bills and emissions downward.

In direct response to cheap gas, the Nuclear Energy Institute organized nuclear power plants nationally to find operating efficiencies that have reduced costs by 19%, saving consumers $1.6 billion and keeping emissions-free electricity in the marketplace.

The energy industry is far from the only sector that has made positive economic and environmental contributions. For instance, the cement industry is collaborating with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to explore how to refine its processes in ways that will improve resiliency, reduce emissions and save lives. Investments in cement, steel, plastic and other building materials will make our houses and highways sturdier and our products more durable — with a **smaller environmental footprint.**

All of these activities result directly from free enterprise — companies providing consumers with the goods and services they want **while using fewer resources and emitting fewer unwanted emissions.**

As a country prospers, its citizens are better able to care for the environment and reduce pollutants emitted from industrial growth. In fact, The Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom and Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index show a strong correlation between a country’s environmental performance and economic freedom (i.e., its embrace of capitalism).

#### **Capitalism leads to economic success and sustainability – a switch away would condemn our future. Capitalism is the only way to provide incentive for entrepreneurship**

Baumol, 2007 [William, former junior economist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Freedom and capitalism in early modern Europe: mercantilism and the making of the modern economic mind, The Care and Maintenance of Entrepreneurial Capitalism, 228-89, HHW]

For roughly a century, the United States has been the leading economic power in the world. Part of the reason for its success is that the **United States has been the quintessential exemplar of a mixture of entrepreneurial and big-firm capitalism**. But can Americans, and others in the world who are now emulating the U.S. model, safely assume that the American economy will continue to be as successful as it has been in the past? Or is the United States—like other once-great civilizations (ancient Rome and Greece come to mind)—doomed in the foreseeable future to fall or at least stagnate? We make no claim to be prophets, but we believe that while there is much to be optimistic about, there also are dangers ahead. In this chapter, we will celebrate the former and call attention to the latter in the hope that current and future policy makers will take steps to help us avoid the fate to which the dangers could condemn us. Put in a nutshell, we will suggest in this chapter that one of the most immediate perils facing the U.S. economy is the possibility of transforming into a much less entrepreneurial big-firm regime, one characterized by ossification, limited incentives, and a paucity of breakthrough inventions. There is no simple formula for preventing such an outcome, but the analysis of this book suggests the importance of two key principles: provide incentives for productive entrepreneurship and discourage diversion of entrepreneurial talent into unproductive or destructive sources of wealth. In this closing chapter, we will provide a number of suggestions about how best to maintain the critical balance of big-firm and entrepreneurial capitalism, in part by simply bringing together the observations of the two pre- ceding chapters.

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - Innovation

Cap sustainable especially with emerging technologies

[Klaus **Schwab**](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/authors/klaus-schwab), Thierry Malleret and Michio Kaku **et al**, 20**22** (Schwab is the founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum. The WEF is a non-profit organization that is not affiliated with any other organizations. He has also received 17 honorary doctorates, other national medals of honour and published a book discussing long-term economic theory.\* Malleret is the co-founder of the Monthly Barometer. He also holds both as Masters and PhD in economics. Kaku is an author, theoretical physicist and professor of theoretical physics at CUNY “Michio Kaku says physics could create a perfect capitalism” World Economic Forum, Jan. 14 2022 <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/01/michio-kaku-says-physics-will-create-a-perfect-capitalism/>//MF)

\*He is also a knight! (Not really a qualification/not something I would include in a cite but I found it interesting)

Michio Kaku, Professor, City University of New York, US, says that precedent has shown that physics can drive industrial revolutions and is the future of wealth.

Perfect capitalism relies on innovation and people, and social systems can adapt to the fallout that comes with advancing technology.

This interview served as input for [The Great Narrative](https://www.amazon.com/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/ref=sr_1_1?crid=XG9MK76MYX42&keywords=great+narrative&qid=1642415934&sprefix=great+narrativ%2Caps%2C139&sr=8-1%20), a new book by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret.

The dedication of Michio Kaku's life work to the theory of everything merged with his fascination with science fiction when he realized that physics and the future were one and the same.

He argues that wealth is a derivative of physics, that ever-evolving and perfect capitalism is dependent on innovation, and technology will be largely linked to our brains.

The below interview with Michio Kaku served as one of 50 inputs from global thought leaders for The Great Narrative, the new book by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret that describes how we can create a more resilient, inclusive and sustainable future post-COVID-19.

Have you read?

[Mariana Mazzucato on rethinking the state to improve partnerships](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/01/mariana-mazzucato-on-rethinking-the-state)

Could you share with us something about yourself that we won’t find on the web?

On Wikipedia, you won’t find what happened when I was eight years old – something happened which changed my life completely. A great scientist had just died; the newspapers printed a picture of his desk with the unfinished manuscript of his greatest work, and the caption read something like this: The greatest scientist of our time could not finish this book.

I was fascinated by this story. What could be so hard that a great scientist couldn’t finish it? Why didn’t he ask his mother? Why didn’t he look up the answer at the library?

So I went to the library and found out this man was Albert Einstein. And that book was the unfinished unified field theory (the theory of everything), an equation that would allow us to “read the mind of God.” It was an equation, perhaps no more than one inch long, that would summarise and unify all the laws of the universe. I was hooked. I wanted to dedicate my life in pursuit of this equation.

Well, that’s what I do for a living. The leading theory today is called string theory. All the hundreds of sub-atomic particles are nothing but musical notes on a tiny, vibrating string. So physics is the harmony one can make on vibrating strings. Chemistry is the melody one can play on strings. The universe is a symphony of strings. And the “mind of God” is cosmic music resonating through hyperspace.

One version of that equation, string field theory, is my creation. My equation is one-inch-long and it allows you to summarise all laws of nature. It’s not the final theory; we now know there are membranes in addition to strings.

But when I was eight, I was also fascinated by science fiction, the Flash Gordon series. I saw starships, monsters, aliens, cities in the sky and antigravity beams. But years later, I realized that the two passions of my life, physics and the future, were the same: if you want to understand the future, you have to understand physics.

You must understand it at the atomic, molecular and cosmic level, and that gives us deep insight into what’s possible, impossible and plausible. Sometimes, when I see predictions made by my colleagues, I shake my head: they don’t understand the laws of physics. Certain things are harder, and some are much easier than what most futurists project. I like to put the weight of real science behind all my predictions.

Industrialisation is driven by physics

When you say that if you want to understand the world and think about the world tomorrow, you need to learn physics, you’re not talking about the physical world, are you? You’re talking about the social and economic world, our societies.

To understand economics, you must understand where wealth comes from. If you talk to an economist, the economist might say, “Wealth comes from printing money.” A politician might say, “Wealth comes from taxes.” I think they’re all wrong – the wealth of society comes from physics.

For example, we physicists worked out the laws of thermodynamics in the 1800s, which gave us the Industrial Revolution, the steam engine, and the machine age. This was one of the greatest revolutions in human history. Then we physicists solved the mystery of electricity and magnetism, which gave us the electric revolution of dynamos, generators, radio, and television, and then we worked out the laws of the quantum theory, which gave us the transistor, computers, the internet, and laser. The three great revolutions of the past all came from physics.

We’re now talking about how physics is creating the fourth great revolution at the molecular level: artificial intelligence, nanotechnology and biotechnology. That’s the fourth wave, but we can also see outlines of the fifth wave beyond that. That one is driven by physics at the atomic level, e.g. quantum computers, fusion power and brain-net (when the human mind is merged with computers). So when you look towards mid-century, we’ll be in the fifth wave, and what drives all these waves? Physics. And how is it manifested? Through the economy.

So, taxes and printing money are not where wealth comes from. Those things massage, distribute, and manipulate wealth, but they don’t create it. Wealth comes from physics.

You’ve had a rich career. What’s your big, main idea?

I have two things to say about this. First, physics is the origin of all wealth. Second, where is that wealth going to? It’s going to create something I call perfect capitalism. What is capitalism? It’s private ownership where prices are set by supply and demand, but that doesn’t explain where the direction of capitalism is going in the future.

In the future, capitalism will have infinite knowledge of supply and demand. For example, the internet will be in your contact lens and, when you blink, you’ll see the prices of every object around you. You’ll know the laws of supply and demand infinitely precisely; you’ll know who’s cheating you, what the prices are really like, the profit margins, who the middlemen are and where to find the bottlenecks.

Why is Jeff Bezos one of the richest men in the world? Because he digitized the middleman, part of the friction of capitalism and eliminated in perfect capitalism. That’s why people like Jeff Bezos, whatever you think of him morally, are part of perfect capitalism. He’s making capitalism more perfect by eliminating middlemen – unnecessary, redundant layers, bottlenecks and friction. Perfect capitalism is where it’s all headed.

Artificial intelligence and computers have just accelerated that trend. The trend is towards perfect capitalism, where all the middlemen, layers and choke points are eliminated, giving us direct contact between supply and demand. (This, of course, says nothing about the morality and ethics created by perfect capitalism, only that perfect capitalism is the inevitable byproduct of these technological revolutions.)

In the future, capitalism will have infinite knowledge of supply and demand.

—Michio Kaku, Professor, City University of New York, USA

But if we’re heading towards a world that’s totally transparent, doesn’t it risk also becoming a dystopian world? Is there a risk of everything being accessible to everybody? Can it be useful for nefarious purposes, for example?

There will always be hiccups because we’re human beings, and because we’re human beings, we’ll use laws and social media to stop the march towards perfect capitalism by saying it’s unfair to others, for example, the middlemen, like brokers. But stockbrokers no longer sell stock – you can buy stock on your wristwatch. So why do you go to a stockbroker? Because you want something that a computer can’t give you. Computers cannot give you what human stockbrokers can: experience, savvy, the inside story, analysis, gossip, i.e. intellectual capital.

We forget that computers today are just sophisticated adding machines, lacking creativity, innovation, analysis, and leadership, etc. So middlemen, like stockbrokers, can survive and even flourish under perfect capitalism if they provide what computes cannot, intellectual capital.

Now, privacy is another problem, but it’s a social problem because mores change with time. People must decide how far they want to go to embrace a digital lifestyle and in the process expose their life and personal finances to potential criminals on the internet; that’s a social problem. This is a universal problem. For example, Mother Nature has spent 3 billion years combatting viruses. Nature is in a constant, never-ending battle with viruses. Similarly, we will also be in a perpetual battle with viruses. But how far we are willing to go to stop hacking, viruses, malware, etc. depends mainly on the political climate, not technology.

So, I’m talking about the big picture – we’re heading towards perfect capitalism, where middlemen, to survive, must sell intellectual capital. We’re making the transition from commodity capital to intellectual capital. That’s the big transition in the marketplace. Commodity capital includes oil and gold, but that’s the wealth of the past. The big billionaires today don’t make their billions on gold – they make it on data because that’s the new wealth of the future.

And that gets us to another question; how far will the robotic revolution go?

There are three types of jobs that robots cannot replace. The first is they can’t do semi-skilled blue-collar work. Robots can’t fix a broken toilet, pick up random garbage or hammer a nail, and they can barely open a door. Garbage men, plumbers, carpenters and construction workers will have jobs in the future. Semi-skilled, non-repetitive blue-collar work will flourish in the future – to see this, talk to the Pentagon.

The Pentagon has been trying to perfect the robot soldier for decades, but they failed miserably because of problems with pattern recognition and manual dexterity. The second thing robots can’t do is conduct human interaction; robots can’t be lawyers, counsellors, professors or people involved with human relations. Only a lawyer can talk to a judge and a jury; robots can’t do that at all because they don’t understand human mores and changing values.

And third, robots can’t be intellectual capitalists – the people who make the economy work because of innovation, leadership, new ideas, new energies and imagination. Robots have none of the above. That’s where humans will come into play. It will be a human-machine partnership. But certain jobs that are repetitive will be eliminated. We don’t have blacksmiths anymore, but we don’t cry about that because the automobile worker replaced the blacksmith. And automobile workers will have to be educated to become semi-skilled, blue-collar non-repetitive workers or human-relation workers or intellectual capitalists.

Lasting capitalism requires innovation

The perfect capitalism model applies to the United States and Western democracies, but capitalism is currently in retreat. In fact, a model of autocratic capitalism is prevalent in Asia and China. Do you see perfect capitalism as a global phenomenon or something that will be confined to democracies in the West?

One reason for the Soviet Union’s collapse was because many people realised that prices were based on a fiction – a simple bureaucrat was saying, “Eeny, meeny, miny, moe, what is the price of this object?” It totally disregarded the marketplace or what reality would create in the black market. The black market was more aligned with supply and demand because that’s, of course, where criminals made their money.

Governments don’t care about supply and demand.

China has a hybrid system where they realise they must have the capitalists’ technology. What do they do? They beg, borrow and steal; they absorb whatever technology they can get from established venues, as long as they are in control.

But that’s not a permanent solution because it doesn’t create new value and new industries. It simply steals, replicates or copies existing value and doesn’t create new ideas. The process of creating new industries and technology from virtually nothing but an idea is called lowering entropy.

To lower entropy requires an enormous amount of freedom to concentrate imagination, creativity, and brainpower. The Chinese system works because they’ve mastered one art: copying. They do not create entirely new industries, which requires lowering entropy. And as long as they copy, they’ll be at the forefront of the economy only because they have a lot of labour to go behind it.

But capitalism requires more than that, otherwise, it stagnates or ends up as what the Soviet Union became – a stagnated economy where prices had no relationship to actual demand in the society itself.

So, your vision is that this future of perfect capitalism will engulf the world because only capitalist countries can innovate properly.

How does physics create wealth? By creating two important things: energy and information. Physicists are masters of the two because we created new forms of energy and information. In a system like China’s, they can’t generate new forms of energy or information; they can copy it at the speed of light by borrowing, begging or stealing it, but they can’t create entirely new industries.

Now, the Chinese aren’t stupid. They have a hybrid system, but they always want to be in control; the supremacy of the Communist Party is of paramount concern. As long as they are on top, they’ll tolerate a lot, but the bottom line is they won’t innovate if it endangers their control, and that creates a huge problem if they want to become a cutting edge leader in technology.

In other words, to be a technological leader and not a follower requires freedom of ideas and concepts, something which the Chinese government is reluctant to tolerate. This lack of freedom and innovation will become more acute as they try to become leaders in the world economy, not just followers.

The big billionaires today don’t make their billions on gold – they make it on data because that’s the new wealth of the future.

—Michio Kaku, Professor, City University of New York, USA

What’s the major change that will make the world a better place? In fact, if I hear what you’re saying, it’s to let innovation flourish, correct?

One thing that will happen is brain-net. The future of the internet is not digital – it’s neural. We’re in the process of digitising the human brain so that we’re compatible with the internet. We can already record memories and send them on the internet. These are simple memories – memories in mice; now we’re recording memories in primates.

The formation of memories takes place in the hippocampus of the brain, and they can be encoded and put on the internet. In fact, at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, they’ve created false memories, which leads to all sorts of legal and philosophical problems. Next will be Alzheimer’s patients; we’ll create a brain chip and, with a push of a button, memories will flood into their minds. And the US Pentagon will pay for it because of all the GIs who returned from Iraq and Afghanistan with spinal cord injuries and were paralysed.

Eventually, the internet will become the brain-net. You will think and your thoughts will control the world around you. Already people who are totally paralysed can type on a computer screen, exchange and write an email; anything you can do on a computer they can also do with certain limits. For example, the 2014 World Cup in Brazil was opened in São Paulo by a person who was paralysed. He wore an exoskeleton yet could still kick a football. A billion people saw a paralysed man start the World Cup games.

This will revolutionize communications. Why will you watch TV or go to the movies? They’re nothing but two-dimensional screens with sound – who wants that? In the future, you’ll want emotions, feelings and memories, and you’ll want to be one with the actor or actress.

Look at Charlie Chaplin. He was one of the most famous men in the world until we physicists and engineers perfected mechanical sound. Well, out went silent movies because who wants to see an actor just dance? You want to see them sing or talk. In the future, you’ll want to see actors feel as well. That’s also going to reduce borders between people.

Sometimes when someone says that certain people are suffering, one response is to say, “Yeah, I don’t believe it.” But if you could feel the suffering of other people and realize that it’s genuine, that will change the way we view human relations. This will also affect the fate of nations. Children already play video games with people from another country or continent. They may feel more affinity with a neighbour in a different continent than with someone in their neighbourhood. And when they grow up, they will feel differently about people in other countries than adults today.

Think of what teenagers might also do: instead of putting a happy face at the end of every sentence, they’ll put an emotion, a memory of their first date, first kiss, first prom, first dance. This is big. No wonder Elon Musk is checking this out – he’s not stupid.

We, physicists, have been working on this for decades. MRIs allow us to scan thoughts in the human brain. If you’re looking at me, I can extract the image of myself from your brain using an MRI scan; the MRI machine can decompose your brain into 30,000 pixels and reassemble them into a human face. We’ll also be able to record dreams in the future.

The first dreams are being recorded as we speak at [the University of California at Berkeley – I’ve seen the pictures (which, I admit, are very crude). But the very fact we can talk like this is amazing.

Have you read?

[Like your brain, but smaller: what are neural networks?](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/05/like-your-brain-but-smaller-what-are-neural-networks)

[Artificial intelligence is learning to interact with the world the way humans do](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/12/artificial-intelligence-that-understands-object-relationships)

I was going to ask you about what makes you optimistic, and it seems to be the fifth wave. When will the fifth wave occur?

By mid-century, we should have an operating fusion reactor and a workable quantum computer entering the marketplace. Brain-net will take a few decades more to get off the ground, but investors are already jumping into it.

Let me end on this note: I disagree with most futurists. Most will say technology is morally neutral – a hammer is morally neutral, a sword can cut against your enemy or against you. Most futurists will say there’s no moral direction. I would disagree. Because of computers and the internet, there’s a moral direction since the internet spreads information, spreading empowerment. People realize they don’t have to live like this. Why should they tolerate a dictator? Or poverty? When other countries have dealt with and solved these questions, it energizes people in poverty-stricken countries to promote democracy.

So, the democratization of the planet is being driven by the internet, good or bad (there are bad aspects of it too, of course). But there is a moral direction. When brain-net comes along, you can feel the joy and suffering of other people and realise they aren’t faking it. If they’re suffering, there’s a reason for it, and people can share this common experience, which will bring us closer together.

Lastly, let me say that one of the keys to creating a bright future is to educate your people. When I was a child, I learned something called “the sick man of Asia.” China and India, I was told, would be perpetually poor because of their huge population. But today, we learn that China and India could become superpowers in the future. What happened? An ignorant, uneducated peasant is indeed a burden on society, but once they become educated, they can change the destiny of the world.

This interview served as input for The Great Narrative, the new book by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret that encapsulates the Davos Vision, and explores how we can shape a constructive, common narrative for the future.

The book is on sale now on Amazon. You can order a Kindle or paperback copy in the [Amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_w=Hit57&pf_rd_p=29505bbf-38bd-47ef-8224-a5dd0cda2bae&pf_rd_r=5WHFSEQRC2RQNF25KK0V&pd_rd_r=43f2acf0-1d28-42a8-8add-f94f31be5fa5&pd_rd_wg=cg3aK&ref_=pd_gw_ci_mcx_mr_hp_atf_m), [Amazon.fr](https://www.amazon.fr/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-English-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/ref=sr_1_1?__mk_fr_FR=%C3%85M%C3%85%C5%BD%C3%95%C3%91&crid=2LV46P1YRB53Q&keywords=the+great+narrative&qid=1641222941&sprefix=the+great+narrative%2Caps%2C61&sr=8-1), [Amazon.de](https://www.amazon.de/Great-Narrative-Klaus-Schwab/dp/2940631301/ref=sr_1_1?__mk_de_DE=%C3%85M%C3%85%C5%BD%C3%95%C3%91&crid=3R8VU8E6NTNPS&keywords=the+great+narrative&qid=1641222965&sprefix=the+great+narrative%2Caps%2C68&sr=8-1), [Amazon.co.uk](https://www.amazon.co.uk/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/ref=sr_1_3?crid=2J6JIJAN9V5JG&keywords=the+great+narrative&qid=1641222993&sprefix=the+great+narrativ%2Caps%2C107&sr=8-3), [Amazon.ca](https://www.amazon.ca/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/ref=sr_1_1?crid=3ARUC63C9BBJJ&keywords=the+great+narrative&qid=1641223022&sprefix=the+great+narrativ%2Caps%2C126&sr=8-1), [Amazon.com.au](https://www.amazon.com.au/Great-Narrative-Reset-Book-ebook/dp/B09PC4FQRZ/ref=sr_1_16?crid=3FS8V90KW0HZN&keywords=the+great+narrative&qid=1641223064&sprefix=the+great+narrativre%2Caps%2C187&sr=8-16) and any Amazon store around the world. It is the second instalment in The Great Reset series.

#### Cap good – solves their impacts through spillover of technological innovations

Baumol 4 [William J. Baumol, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, The Free-Market Innovation Machine : Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism, The “Somewhat Optimal” Attributes of Capitalist Growth: Oligopolistic Competition and Routinization of Innovation, Princeton University Press, 40-41 , SMarx, JTong]

We are left with the following account of the production and distribution of technology in the capitalist growth process. First, continued investment in innovation is ensured by the arms-race character of competition in the high-tech oligopoly industries that will be explored in the following chapter. Such competition also forces firms to routinize the innovation process as a means to reduce their risks. These incentives are enhanced, not undermined, by technology trading and licensing— primarily because those processes serve, via the access (license) fees, partially to internalize the externalities of innovative activity. Second, innovative activity by the firm is stimulated by the requirement for success in technology-exchange negotiations that a negotiating party have something of value to offer to the firm whose technology it hopes to acquire. Because of licensing and technology trading, innovations are now disseminated with historically unprecedented rapidity. Rather than benefiting just a severely limited subsector of the industry and the economy, leaving other producers to fend with obsolete techniques and products, the advantages of technical advances are quickly made available to all. This, too, can be expected to make a significant contribution to economic growth.

These conclusions suggest that the by some efficiency properties that do literature. Although it cannot be denied significant imperfections, that still leaves innovation process may be characterized not seem to be widely recognized in the that the activity is beset by a number of the free-market economies with a flow of innovations of unprecedented magnitude. And even the efficiency-handicapping spillovers of innovation offer a valuable tradeoff between naked productive efficiency and acceptable division of its benefits. By distributing the benefits of technical progress widely among the population, spillovers enhance the economic health of society and surely add social value to the growth accomplishments of the free-market economy.

#### Capitalism is key to innovation – incentivizes investment

Baumol 4 [William J. Baumol, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, The Free-Market Innovation Machine : Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism, The “Somewhat Optimal” Attributes of Capitalist Growth: Oligopolistic Competition and Routinization of Innovation, Princeton University Press, 40-41 , SMarx, JTong]

Finally, the very profitability of licensing or technology trading is an incentive for investment in innovation. That is, the firm that participates in this market has an incentive for innovative effort that is lacking for the firm that does not. The obvious case is the firm that specializes in the creation and licensing of innovations. Such an innovation factory will clearly drive itself out of business if it runs out of innovative products to offer for rental. An extension of this argument shows that this inducement applies to all firms for which licensing is a profitable activity. Similarly, companies that participate in a technology-exchange consortium must have a supply of new products and processes that they can offer to the other members in order to induce them to reciprocate with their own new inventions. This will be demonstrated rigorously in the next chapter. Here, again, one must not overstate the claim. A group of colluding firms may conceivably agree to mutual disarmament— to simultaneous reduction in the amount they invest in innovation. In the absence of such an agreement, however, the market forces can confidently be expected to run the other way, to induce the firms that license or exchange their technology profitably to spend more on innovation than they would have otherwise.  
The conclusion, once more, is that the market mechanism has influences not obviously available to non-capitalist economies. These tend to make it profitable to engage simultaneously in the innovation “arms race” and licensing of any new inventions obtained in the process. Imperfect though mechanism may be, it still seems remarkably effective (see figures and that are make it in the this 6.1 6.2 again), and is yet another of the features that differentiate the free-market growth process from any other that we know of.

#### Capitalism improves the quality of life for everyone – Industrial Revolution proves

Baumol 4 [William J. Baumol, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, The Free-Market Innovation Machine : Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism, The “Somewhat Optimal” Attributes of Capitalist Growth: Oligopolistic Competition and Routinization of Innovation, Princeton University Press, 40-41 , SMarx, JTong]

Returning, finally, to the central point of this chapter, the crucial fact is that most of us do recognize the beneficial spillovers that innovation has contributed and we all seem to agree that this enhancement of living standards is very desirable. In other words, perhaps without realizing that we were discussing the spillovers of innovation, we have concluded that they are a very good thing. It follows immediately that, even if zero spillovers were possible and did increase innovation, they would certainly be far from optimal.

Here, the standard reaction of many economists— that disinterested academicians cannot take a stand on income distribution on any basis of rigorous analysis, whatever their personal feeling— just will not do. Of course, no one aspires to a world in which innovators receive incomes in the trillions of dollars (putting Mr. Gates’ income into the shade), while the remainder of the community languishes in seventeenth-century poverty. But if this is so, then we must also go on to reject the conclusion that spillovers are incompatible with optimality in the growth process. Once that is recognized, the remainder is a matter of haggling about the degree of deviation from zero. My own value judgment on this issue is summed up by George Bernard Shaw’s dictum that there is no crime greater than poverty, which leads me to believe that the most desirable value of S is very much large than zero. For, surely, it is widely and appropriately accepted that the main benefit of the Industrial Revolution is the remarkable increase in average per capita incomes and, more particularly, in real wages.

Of course, those innovations that have never been born do constitute a loss to society. But the point in the analysis here is that there is an in-escapable tradeoff between two desirable phenomena: further increases in innovative activity versus diversion of the benefits to bring society out of poverty, to spread education and health care, and to finance the better life not just for the fortunate few but for the population as a whole. Given such a tradeoff, we are back in the realm in which economists are most comfortable. In Lionel Robbins’ justly noted words, we are back at the allocation of scarce resources among competing (and desirable) ends. And the analysis of such tradeoffs is the meat and potatoes of our professional activity.

#### Only the process of capitalism promotes innovation and development

Baumol 4 [William J. Baumol, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, The Free-Market Innovation Machine : Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism, The “Somewhat Optimal” Attributes of Capitalist Growth: Oligopolistic Competition and Routinization of Innovation, Princeton University Press, 40-41 , SMarx, JTong]

This brings us to the end of the discussion of the reasons for the unprecedented growth record of the capitalist economies. Undoubtedly there are both contributory influences and impediments that have been omitted. But the five elements that I have stressed seem by themselves sufficient to make this performance less puzzling: oligopolistic competition that uses innovation as a weapon and engages in an innovation arms race, that routinizes the innovation arms race to reduce its uncertainties, and that engages in systematic innovation exchange and licensing for profit. Together, these plausibly constitute a large part of the story. The relative decline in the opportunities for destructive and rentseeking entrepreneurship as compared with productive entrepreneurial activity, along with the emergence of the rule of law from the struggles between the kings and their nobles, arguably also played a particularly critical role in the rise of capitalism. They continue to be important today. Finally, the socially beneficial side of the spillovers from innovation serves as a very valuable offset to any resulting disincentive to innovative activity. All of these features are, in part or in their entirety, attributes of the free-enterprise economies that other types of economy either do not share or do so to a very limited degree. That is, I believe, a persuasive explanation of why even the most inventive of non-capitalist societies has fallen so short in terms of innovation.

#### Capitalism facilitates itself – innovation increases the efficiency and amount of resources

Baumol 4 [William J. Baumol, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, The Free-Market Innovation Machine : Analyzing the Growth Miracle of Capitalism, The “Somewhat Optimal” Attributes of Capitalist Growth: Oligopolistic Competition and Routinization of Innovation, Princeton University Press, 40-41 , SMarx, JTong]

I turn next to yet another way in which innovation facilitates innovation, one that is also not widely recognized. Ultimately, one of the prospective impediments to innovation is the finite character of the economy’s natural resources that are critical to utilization of the new products and processes that innovation provides. Thus, it may well be suspected that, in a world in which the economy’s finite natural resources can only be depleted, this will raise problems for innovation that will grow more serious with the passage of time. After all, most inventions must be embodied at least partly in concrete material objects, requiring metals, fuels, and other scarce resources for their utilization, and this may well become an impediment to innovation— both to its production and to its contribution to the economy’s output. However, it can be argued that, in an important sense, the available quantities of the economy’s natural resources can be expanded and, indeed, that this has actually happened. This notion may seem bizarre, yet the fact that, over the decades, the real prices of so many of these resources have not been increasing, and that at least some of them have actually declined, must surely suggest that there is something to this notion. And there is a straightforward explanation. Suppose that inventions constantly decrease the percentage of petroleum that is lost in the process of extraction from a well, and that another stream of inventions constantly increases the number of miles a given quantity of petroleum will enable a vehicle to travel. Suppose both of these developments move far faster than the rate at which the earth’s fixed physical stock of oil is used up. Then it should be clear that the inventory of prospective miles of transportation by petroleum-driven vehicles can actually have been expanded. The intellectual input will, in effect, have served to increase the supply of the physical input in the one sense that really counts: the still available capacity of that input to contribute to future output of the economy.

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - Human Rights

#### Their criticism of Capitalism is wrong - statistics prove the “degree of capitalism” is irrelevant to the upholding of human rights

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “Human Mobility in the Context of Hegemonic Capitalist Globalization,” Ch. 6.7, p. 315] SPark

Each State should then begin by promoting reforms to their national legislation on migration and, to be worthy of the name and to make them truly genuine, they should forsake hypocritical policies that keep the front door of the house open to the wealthy, while the poor are only allowed access through the service door. All of this happens while undocumented migrants remain under the Damocles sword threat of flash detentions and deportations separating them from their family and children, as happens in the US at the times of Trump. This is a threat that also serves as a cruel formula for exploitation and de facto restriction of human rights and labour benefits, as it leaves employees absolutely defenseless before their employers. However, if we examine specific situations and compare migratory policies of the EU with that of the US, it is evident that Europeans have tried to stay within the margins of their own legality and political correctness. Despite the European economic crisis and the waves of refugees fleeing from the armed conflicts in Syria and sub-Saharan Africa, it is undeniable that European policies are by far less intolerant and have better standards of compliance with human rights.

#### Capitalism is uniquely key to promoting public and private good.

Jim Balsillie, 21 [Jim Balsillie, 12-15-2021, "The Capitalist Manifesto: Capitalism allows the individual to shape society for the better and it needs to be protected," financialpost, https://financialpost.com/technology/the-capitalist-manifesto-capitalism-allows-the-individual-to-shape-society-for-the-better-and-it-needs-to-be-protected, smarx, HHW]

**Capitalism has created more prosperity and progress for more people than any system in human history**. On the 30th anniversary of the official end of the Soviet Union, join the National Post and Financial Post in a series saluting the unfashionable yet awesome power of the free-market system. I believe that capitalism in a liberal democratic society is **by far the best system to** **promote human flourishing**. It’s the **best economic system for the generation of new wealth**, which is why even authoritarian states like China have embraced it. The generation of new wealth is a critical first step for any debate on redistribution or expanding publicly funded social services.

As a tech entrepreneur who did not come from economic privilege, capitalism has provided me with opportunities to generate public and private wealth on a global stage. The shift 40 years ago from an industrialized, production-based economy to a knowledge-based economy provided innovative individuals with more power to assert into existing markets or to create new markets.

When entrepreneurs have access to capital, they can channel their ideas into products and services that can improve the lives of fellow citizens, industry and even governments. No other economic system allows a single individual to profoundly shape society for the better and to **simultaneously create public and private good — this is why capitalism is worth protecting**.

#### Capitalism is the most ethical system – state-controlled systems aren’t moral

Matt Michel 22 [Matt Michel, 6-23-2022, "Ten Reasons Why Capitalism Is Morally Superior," No Publication, https://www.contractingbusiness.com/residential-hvac/article/20868486/ten-reasons-why-capitalism-is-morally-superior, smarx, HHW]

Capitalism Promotes Freedom

The most basic freedom is the freedom to make choices. Capitalism promotes choice. It promotes the ability of people to decide what they want to buy, how much they want to buy, where they want to live, where they want to work, and so on**. With statism, choices are limited**. The government decides, for example, what kind of light bulb is available, how much water a toilet can use, the minimum factory efficiency of an air conditioning system, and more.

The removal of simple choices reduces freedom. The removal of all choices is slavery. The direction of statism is towards slavery. **The direction of capitalism is towards freedom. Capitalism is morally superior.**

Capitalism Promotes Cooperation

If I want a new air conditioning system installed in my home, I call a contractor. We have to agree on a price where I consider it better to own the new comfort system than to keep the money it costs. Likewise, the contractor considers it better to take the money paid than to keep the equipment in inventory (or pick it up from the supply house) and perform the installation. We have to voluntarily cooperate and agree on the price.

Next, the contractor must elicit the labor of his employees to perform the installation, in return for compensation. Then, he must cooperate with the supply house or distributor regarding the purchase of the material and equipment. The distributor must buy it in turn from a manufacturer who builds the equipment as the outcome of thousands of acts of cooperation upstream.

An excellent video describing the cooperation that results from free markets and capitalism is I Pencil: The Movie, based on the essay by Leonard E. Read. Take a few minutes to watch it.

Statism denies cooperation. **Central planners make decisions that are forced on people.** Statists eschew cooperation because left on their own, people make decisions the statists disagree with. An example is the imposition of any type of wage and price controls like the minimum wage.

If you want to hire a high school student for a few hours after school to clean your shop and help stock your trucks at the end of the day, you and the high school student should be able to agree amongst yourselves on the right compensation. Because the high school student hasn’t learned good work habits, has no experience, and will require close supervision, you may decide that the student is not worth the required minimum. Because the state forces you to pay more than you can justify, you must find another way to get the work done and the student is denied both pocket money and the more valuable work experience that will lead to greater pay in the future.

Cooperation is more moral than force. Capitalism is again, the more moral economic system.

Capitalism is More Optimistic

Capitalists live in a world of opportunity. They constantly survey the landscape looking for possibilities to gain, to build, to expand, to create. Statists, on the other hand, focus on scarcity. They see a world of limited resources, which gives them reason to ration and allocate.

What the **statists overlook is the unlimited power of human ingenuity**. Time and time again, statists have predicted the world would be unable to feed itself. Yet, agricultural innovations result in more food production on the same or less land. Statists scared the public with peak oil and limited fossil fuels, yet thinks to the combination of horizontal drilling and fracking, the U.S. alone sits on a 200 year supply of oil.

There is a moral aspect in play. Focusing on limits and living within them becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy. The statist suppresses man’s hopes and prospects. Capitalism again, is more moral.

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - Human Rights

#### Capitalism is the best and most inclusive system for promoting human rights

Novak 15 [Michael Novak, 3-23-2015, "Capitalism Is the Most Moral of a Bad Lot of Economic Systems," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2014/06/25/has-capitalism-become-incompatible-with-christianity/capitalism-is-the-most-moral-of-a-bad-lot-of-economic-systems, smarx, HHW]

In answering the question, much depends on what you mean by capitalism. I like the definition offered by Pope John Paul II: "an economic system which recognizes the fundamental and positive role of business, the market, private property and the resulting responsibility for the means of production, as well as free human creativity in the economic sector ... circumscribed within a strong juridical framework which places it at the service of human freedom in its totality.''

With a polity and a culture that honor and promote the creativity and flourishing of humankind, **capitalism is the most moral of a bad lot of economic systems known to humans.**

First, **no other system has so quickly and so globally lifted the poor out of poverty**. If you look at a chart of population and income since the beginning of the Christian era, the line of growth is nearly flat for 18 centuries, and then with the introduction of invention and discovery it shoots upward.

Second, no other system has so deeply grasped that the cause of the wealth of nations is, as John Paul II said, “the possession of know-how, technology and skill,” “disciplined and creative human work and, as an essential part of that work, initiative and entrepreneurial ability.”

Third, no other system has so depended both on law – to set clear rules and to protect and guide liberty – and on moral virtues, a concrete vision of how to improve the common good by discovery and invention. It **requires the willingness to make sacrifices for gains only future generations will see,** to persist through many setbacks and to surrender many pleasures in exchange for disciplined, self-adapting work.

Fourth, in the two centuries since the birth of capitalism the average life expectancy has risen from 26 to 67. Earth is teeming with human life as never before. In 1800, there were fewer than one billion humans on the planet; today there are over seven billion. In at least that sense, **capitalism has vastly expanded the domain of life.**

Pope Francis decries an “economy of exclusion.” Similarly, John Paul II emphasized the moral obligation to include every woman and man in “the circle of development.” To include all of the forgotten people of Latin America (let alone Africa and Asia), some 20 million new small businesses need to be formed, each employing three to six workers at decent wages. In many jurisdictions this would mean changing laws, to allow new small businesses to be registered at minimal cost and without the need to pay bribes to officials. It would also mean building new organizations to specialize in micro-loans for small businesses – and also in providing practical advice so that new businesses more easily succeed.

Nearly the whole world is much in favor of this inclusion. No one should be excluded from the global circle of development.

#### Cap good – the way society is structured enables us to harness capitalist endeavors for the benefit of everyone

Boix 19 [Carles Boix, American political scientist specializing in comparative politics, currently teaching at Princeton University, 2019, Democratic Capitalism At The Crossroads: Technological Change And The Future Of Politics," Princeton University Press, SMarx, JTong]

In this book, I take a different approach. The consequences of today’s technological changes, I will claim, are not set in stone. They will work their way into the economy through their direct (although, at this point, still uncertain) impact on the demand for different types of labor and on the cost and ownership of capital. Yet they will also depend on the institutional and political strategies we follow in response to those technological transformations. During the last two hundred years, in their quest for profits and wealth, the entrepreneurs and industrial captains of modern capitalism have always pushed for the rationalization and automation of production. That “process of industrial mutation”, to employ Schumpeter’s renowned words, “incessantly revolutionize[d] the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one”—modifying the relationship between capital and labor, the patterns of employment, and the distribution of income over time (Schumpeter 1950, 83). In doing so, it periodically generated a (changing) number of critical political challenges that were then met with a particular set of policy responses. The same logic applies to today’s technological innovations. Because they have already heightened economic inequality and may result in an even more extensive robotization of substantial numbers of (low- and semiskilled) jobs, they could put an end to the broad social consensus around democracy and capitalism that prevailed during most of the twentieth century—particularly in the advanced world. That does not necessarily mean, however, that they will—and that they will make us travel back in time to the nineteenth century, when the industrial capitalism invented in Manchester and its cotton factories turned out to be incompatible with the construction of fully democratic institutions. The reason is simple. The growing economic and political tensions we are witnessing today are happening in very affluent societies: their average per capita incomes are more than ten times higher than at the beginning of the first Industrial Revolution. So much wealth, jointly with the presence of stable democratic institutions and relatively well structured bureaucracies, should give us much more maneuvering room than any generations before us ever had to respond to the technological and economic challenges of today. Therefore, the task ahead of us is to think about how to harness those economic and institutional assets to the advantage of the many. With that goal in mind, we should understand, first, how technology has shaped capitalism and, second, when and how the latter has coexisted, sometimes in a delicate, uneasy balance, with democracy. I explain this, necessarily in a sketchy manner, in this introduction by describing how modern capitalism has evolved in terms of its structure of production (i.e., the level of automation and the role of labor) and its relationship to politics—from the first Industrial Revolution born in Manchester through the twentiethcentury capitalism invented in Detroit’s assembly plants up to the new information era that emerged in Silicon Valley. In the rest of the book, I develop that argument more extensively, mainly focusing on the nature of twentieth-century democratic capitalism and, above all, on the challenges and opportunities brought about by today’s technological revolution.

### 2AC -- Turn: Cap Good - Inequality

#### Capitalism and the free-market have created today’s prosperity

Kim, 18, Anthony Kim, Anthony B. Kim researches international economic issues at The Heritage Foundation, with a focus on economic freedom and free trade, 8/22/2018, “Communicating Capitalism to the Next Generation”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/communicating-capitalism-the-next-generation> - FT

He couldn’t be more right. Prosperity has not arisen from the beneficence of some good king or a benign technocracy of experts, let alone socialism. Rather, it is the result of the hard work and innovative entrepreneurship of those who have demanded and exercised the fundamental freedom to decide for themselves how to live their lives under free market capitalism. The free-market capitalist system, whose growth is so well documented in The Heritage Foundation’s [Index of Economic Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/index), has empowered countless individuals around the world by giving them more choices and opportunities. Reforms that enhance economic freedom have enabled hundreds of millions to escape poverty and countless others to enjoy levels of prosperity never before seen.

#### Capitalism has led to increased wages and increased longevity over the past century.

Rubin ’16 [Jennifer Rubin; ; 5-24-2016; Opinion: Things have never been better?; Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2016/05/24/things-have-never-been-better/; SK]

Bombarded by negative news stories (is there any other kind?) and a reprehensible presidential campaign, it is, to put it mildly, easy to lose perspective. Two data points should give us plenty of perspective — and cause for optimism.

First, Deirdre McCloskey writes:

Two centuries ago, the average world income per human (in present-day prices) was about $3 a day. It had been so since we lived in caves. Now it is $33 a day—which is Brazil’s current level and the level of the U.S. in 1940. Over the past 200 years, the average real income per person—including even such present-day tragedies as Chad and North Korea—has grown by a factor of 10. It is stunning. In countries that adopted trade and economic betterment wholeheartedly, like Japan, Sweden and the U.S., it is more like a factor of 30—even more stunning.

A second data point, not unrelated to the first, comes from the World Health Organization’s new report on longevity:

Life expectancy increased by 5 years between 2000 and 2015, the fastest increase since the 1960s. Those gains reverse declines during the 1990s, when life expectancy fell in Africa because of the AIDS epidemic and in Eastern Europe following the collapse of the Soviet Union. The increase was greatest in the African Region of WHO where life expectancy increased by 9.4 years to 60 years, driven mainly by improvements in child survival, progress in malaria control and expanded access to antiretrovirals for treatment of HIV. . . .

Global life expectancy for children born in 2015 was 71.4 years (73.8 years for females and 69.1 years for males), but an individual child’s outlook depends on where he or she is born. The report shows that newborns in 29 countries – all of them high-income — have an average life expectancy of 80 years or more, while newborns in 22 others – all of them in sub-Saharan Africa — have life expectancy of less than 60 years.

No one is saying poverty has been eradicated or that great challenges and inequality do not exist. (The bottom five countries in life expectancy are all in sub-Saharan Africa.) Shockingly, 5.9 million children still die before their fifth birthday, for example. Nevertheless, it helps to remember that the planet’s population on average has never been richer or lived longer.

McClosky posits that it is the success and spread of “‘liberalism,’ in its original meaning of ‘worthy of a free person,’” that is responsible for this unprecedented explosion in wealth, which in turn can be put to good uses such as reducing child mortality. This is what the American Enterprise Institute’s Arthur Brooks calls the moral case for capitalism: It has helped bring a billion people out of poverty and is helping the world be healthier and, yes, happier. (It’s hard to be happy when weighed down by poverty and/or illness.)

We’d be remiss, however, if we did not acknowledge that wealth creation alone does not automatically result in healthier and richer people around the globe. It takes both public efforts such as George W. Bush’s President’s Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief, which has saved millions of lives, and private efforts such as those of the Gates Foundation, which invests in “vaccines to prevent infectious diseases—including HIV, polio, and malaria—and support[s] the development of integrated health solutions for family planning, nutrition, and maternal and child health.”

Small-L liberalism that helps produce wealth (for the United States as a whole and Bill and Melinda Gates personally) and values in support of human dignity underwrite the phenomenal advances we see. We should be wary of demagogues who would dismantle or severely hinder the economic system that creates such prosperity (yes, we are talking to you, Bernie Sanders) or who trash U.S. global leadership and small-D democratic values (as Donald Trump does). Perhaps if more people understood the historic gains made in just this past generation, they’d be less inclined to tear down the architecture that produced such progress.

#### Cap good – benefits democracy and uplifts the poor

Mccloskey 19 [Mccloskey, Deirdre Nansen, Distinguished Professor of Economics, History, English, and Communication at the University of Illinois, 2019, "Why Liberalism Works : How True Liberal Values Produce A Freer, More Equal, Prosperous World For All.," Yale University Press, SMarx, JTong]

And it came to pass. What I call the Great Enrichment is the chief sci- entific finding of economic history. The poorest people in the developed econ- omies and billions in the poor countries have been the biggest beneficiaries of liberal economic growth. The rich became richer, true. But the poor have gas heating, cars, smallpox vaccinations, indoor plumbing, cheap travel, rights for women, low child mortality, adequate nutrition, taller bodies, doubled life expectancy, schooling for their kids, newspapers, a vote, a shot at uni- versity, and respect. Never had anything remotely similar happened, not in the glory of Greece or the grandeur of Rome, not in ancient Egypt or medi- eval China. Yet you will have heard recently that our biggest problem is inequality, and that we must make men and women all equal. No, we should not—at least, not if we want to lift up the poor. Ethically speaking, the true liberal should care chiefly about whether the poorest among us are moving closer to having enough to live with dignity and to participate in a democracy. They are. Even in already rich countries, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, the real income of the poor has recently risen, not, as one hears daily, stagnated—if, that is, income is correctly measured to include better health care, better working conditions, more years of education, longer years of retirements, and, above all, the rising quality of goods and services—better autos and better medicine. Admittedly it is rising at a slower pace than in the 1950s. But that era of rising prosperity was a catch-up from the wretched set- backs of the Great Depression and the War.

### 1AR -- Ext: Cap Good - Inequality

#### No impact – the negative effects of capitalism are over-hyped by the media

Stossel 21 [John Stossel, 6-16-2021, "People Love To Criticize Capitalism. Here's Why They're Wrong.," Reason, https://reason.com/2021/06/16/people-love-to-criticize-capitalism-heres-why-theyre-wrong/, SMarx, JTong]

Everywhere, people trash capitalism.

But what they think they know about capitalism is usually wrong.

My new video debunks some myths about capitalism.

"No one ever makes a billion dollars," complains Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D–N.Y.). "You take a billion dollars." In other words, capitalists get rich by taking money from others.

That's nonsense, and Myth Number One.

People believe that myth if they think that when one person wins, someone else must lose. It's natural to believe that if you think there is a finite amount of money in the world. But there isn't.

Free markets increase total wealth. Competition encourages entrepreneurs to find new ways to release more value from both people and resources.

Because capitalism is voluntary and consumers have choices, the only way capitalists can get rich is to offer us something that we believe is better than we had before.

That creates new wealth.

Steve Jobs became a billionaire. But by creating Apple, he gave us more: millions of jobs and billions of dollars added to our economy.

Research shows that entrepreneurs only keep 2.2 percent of the additional wealth they generate. "In other words, the rest of us captured almost 98 percent of the benefits," says economist Dan Mitchell of the Center for Freedom and Prosperity.

"I hope that we get 100 new super billionaires," he adds, "Because that means 100 new people have figured out ways to make the rest of our lives better off."

But former Labor Secretary Robert Reich says we should "abolish billionaires." He wants some form of wealth tax to hold their wealth down. "Entrepreneurs like Jeff Bezos would be just as motivated by $100 million or even $50 million," Reich claims.

But Mitchell points out that if their income is limited, "maybe they just take it easy…retire…sail a yacht around the world…consuming instead of saving and producing."

I want them saving and producing! Billionaires have shown that they're good at cutting prices or improving products or both.

As Michell puts it, "I'm not giving Jeff Bezos any money unless he's selling me something that I value more than that money."

Even if they don't—even if they run out of ideas—their wealth is useful.

One reader called me "a complete moron" for saying that. He argues that "more money in the richest hands means money sitting in the bank doing nothing."

But that's an ignorant view of banks. Because banks loan that money out, they enable other people to buy homes, start new businesses, and get educated.

Still, I hear that "the rich are getting richer, while the poor get poorer!"

That's Myth Number Two. Yes, the rich got lots richer, but the poor and middle class got richer, too.

"The economic pie grows," says Mitchell. "We are much richer than our grandparents, and our grandparents were much richer than their grandparents."

For thousands of years, the world had almost no wealth creation. Only when some countries tried capitalism did gross domestic product grow.

Capitalists helped everyone, including the poor.

The media suggest that today's wealth gap proves that's no longer true. But they are wrong. Capitalism's gradual progress continues. Census Bureau data shows that the average family today is almost a third richer than 40 years ago (yes, adjusted for inflation).

The media also say, "The middle class is in decline."

It's true, Mitchell points out. "It's shrinking because more people move into upper-income quintiles! The rich get richer in a capitalist society. But guess what? The rest of us get richer as well."

#### Capitalism solves the wealth gap

Edwards, 20, Lee Edwards, PhD author or editor of 25 books, 5/21/2020, “The Case for Capitalism”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/the-case-capitalism> - FT

They are right about one thing: the rich are becoming richer. There are now nearly 19 million millionaires in America, two-fifths of all the millionaires in the world. We have 621 billionaires, one-fourth of all the billionaires globally. They are rich because the United States rewards the entrepreneurial spirit. American capitalism has also produced the largest and most affluent middle class in the world, with a per capita GDP of more than $65,000. By contrast, Communist China’s per capita GDP is an estimated $10,900, one-sixth of ours. But it is also true that the poor are getting richer. Measured by consumption, according to economist Bruce Meyer of the University of Notre Dame, [the percentage of the poor](https://www.aei.org/research-products/report/annual-report-on-us-consumption-poverty-2018/) fell from 13 percent in 1980 to 2.9 percent in 2018, while the official poverty rate fell by only 1.2 percentage points to 12.3 percent. A major reason for the discrepancy is that the official poverty measure is based on cash income only, which fails to include all the resources available to a family including tax credits and in-kind transfers. The reality is that the average “poor” American owns a car, enjoys air conditioning, has access to the Internet, and has at least one TV. The official poverty line for a family of four is $25,465. Capitalism benefits all, as seen by the lessening of historical racial and gender disparities. From 2013-2018, the five metropolitan areas with the largest black population—New York, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, and Washington, D.C.—saw black median household income increase significantly from rates of 7 percent in Washington, D.C., to 21 percent in Atlanta. In 2019, blacks maintained their lowest unemployment rate ever of 5.5 percent. The jobless rate for Hispanics hit a record low of 3.9 percent. The 11.6 million women-owned firms in America represent 39 percent of all private businesses. No other nation comes close to matching this level of female entrepreneurship.

#### Capitalism solves poverty

Edwards, 20, Lee Edwards, PhD author or editor of 25 books, 5/21/2020, “The Case for Capitalism”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/the-case-capitalism> - FT

Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” is everywhere. Capitalism, not socialism, is responsible for a global economic miracle: The number of people living in poverty around the world has declined every year since 1990 while the global population has risen. Free-market capitalism, in the words of the Pew Research Center, has for the first time “allowed [billions of] people to decide for themselves what they value and what type of life they wish to pursue.”

#### Capitalism improves the quality of life – life expectancy, poverty levels, basic essentials

Redd ND [Ivey Redd, "Capitalism, the Greatest Economic System Ever," yipinstitute, https://www.yipinstitute.com/articles/capitalism-the-greatest-economic-system-ever, SMarx, JTong]

How does capitalism improve lives? This question can easily be answered by simply looking back in time. In 1820, over 90 percent of the world lived in extreme poverty. In 1990 around 30 percent of the world lived in extreme poverty. Today, less than 10 percent of the world's population lives in extreme poverty. Before the industrial revolution, the poor were lucky to find anything to eat. These individuals lacked running water, shelter, and basic sanitation. On the other hand, today the poor and rich both have access to and enjoy these basic necessities. People all across the world now have access to education, food, heating and cooling, travel, cars, vaccinations, etc. Many people bring up the income inequality argument. I believe that the true inequality is materialistic. For instance, individuals may not have access to what they believe is good food, good housing, nice cars, and cool clothes, but still have access to all of these goods even when they do not believe these goods are the nicest levels they can get. Poverty levels around the world have dropped rapidly. Thanks to improvements in healthcare and living standards brought about by capitalism, almost every country has an average life expectancy of over 70. This can be accredited to the free markets.

### 2AC – Turn: Cap Good - Gender

#### Cap good – solves for gender inequalities

**Cudd**, 20**15** (Ann, American philosopher. “Is Capitalism Good for Women?” Journal of Business Ethics. <https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/stable/24702827?sid=primo&seq=1> ///MF)

Abstract This paper investigates an aspect of the question of whether capitalism can be defended as a morally legitimate economic system by asking whether capitalism serves progressive, feminist ends of freedom and gender equality. I argue that although capitalism is subject to critique for increasing economic inequality, it can be seen to decrease gender inequality, particularly in traditional societies. Capitalism brings technological and social innovations that are good for women, and disrupts traditions that subordinate women in materially beneficial and socially progressive ways. Capitalism upholds the ideology of individual rights and the ideal of mutual advantage. By institutionalizing mutual advantage through the logic of voluntary exchange, progressive capitalism promotes the idea that no one is to be expected to sacrifice their interests with no expectation of benefit. Thus capitalism opposes the traditional, sexist ideal of womanly self-sacrifice.

### 1AR – Ext: Cap Good - Gender

#### Cap is good for women – innovation and destruction of norms

**Cudd**, 20**15** (Ann, American philosopher. “Is Capitalism Good for Women?” Journal of Business Ethics. <https://www-jstor-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/stable/24702827?sid=primo&seq=1> ///MF)

In a recent book (Cudd and Holmstrom 2011), I argued that capitalism has brought about great changes in the quality and length of human life in the twentieth century: the income takeoff (the vast increase of per capita income of developed nations), the health transition (raising the life expectancy by upwards of 50 years), and the fertility transition (from an average of 6 children per woman to around 2). In this paper, I delve further into the question of whether capitalism is good for women. A major problem with capitalism is that it increases inequality, which is especially harmful to women and other vulnerable groups. Capitalism increases economic inequality in the first instance, but this in turn tends to create political and social inequalities. Inequality, I agree, needs to be controlled if capitalism is to be progressive and defensible. I defend such a controlled capitalism in two ways that are particularly relevant to feminism as a progressive social movement for human freedom. First, capitalism promotes innovation: it promotes technical innovation that tends to improve quality and length of life for everyone, but particularly for women. But more importantly for the feminist defense of capitalism, it promotes social innovation, in particular the destruction of harmful, patriarchal traditions. Thus, the second defense I will make of capitalism is that it opposes tradition fetishism and reduces the oppression of traditional societies that impose hierarchies of gender and case.

# AT: Alternatives

### 2AC/1AR -- General AT: Alt

#### Alt fails - lack of a cohesive blueprint and ignorance of true inequalities render the alt impossible to acheive

Roberts, 19, Michael Roberts, author of numerous articles about capitalism and socialism, 10/12/2019, “Capitalism — Not so Alone” , <https://thenextrecession.wordpress.com/2019/10/12/capitalism-not-so-alone/> - FT

So Milanovic’s dichotomy between ‘liberal democracy’ and ‘political capitalism’ seems false. And it arises because, of course, Milanovic starts with his premise (unproven) that an alternative mode of production and social system, namely socialism, is ruled out forever. In Global Inequality, Milanovic concluded that the idea of a united global proletariat making a worldwide revolution is out of the door because now the real inequalities are between Americans and Africans, not between capitalists and workers everywhere. Trotsky’s international proletarian revolution is out of date: “This was the idea behind Trotsky’s “permanent revolution”. There were no national contradictions, just a worldwide class contradiction. But if the world’s actual situation is such that the greatest disparities are due to the income gaps between nations, then proletarian solidarity doesn’t make much sense. Proletarian solidarity is then simply dead because there is no longer such a thing as global proletariat. This is why ours is a distinctly non-Marxian world.” And yet the working class, both industrial workers and those in so-called ‘service’ industries, has never been larger in human history. Globally, there were 2.2bn people at work and producing value back in 1991. Now there are 3.2bn. The global workforce has risen by 1bn in the last 20 years. Globally, the industrial workforce has risen by 46% since 1991 from 490m to 715m in 2012 and will reach well over 800m before the end of the decade. Indeed, the industrial workforce has grown by 1.8% a year since 1991 and since 2004 by 2.7% a year, which is now a faster rate of growth than the services sector (2.6% a year)! Globally, the share of industrial workers in the total workforce has risen slightly from 22% to 23%. Capitalism is not alone; it has a gravedigger, the proletariat. Milanovic dismisses this. In his new book, “I do believe, to a large extent, [capitalism] is sustainable. Even if all of inequality continue[s] to be the way that [it is], unchecked. It is sustainable, largely, because we don’t have a blueprint for an alternative system. However, something being sustainable, something being efficient, something being good, are two different things.” Milanovic does not like capitalism, but to use Margaret Thatcher’s phrase in referring to her neoliberal policies for capitalism: he reckons there is no alternative (TINA). So the aim must be, just as Keynes argued in the 1930s: “to make capitalism more sustainable. And that’s exactly what I think we should do now”. The trouble is that Milanovic’s policies to reduce the inequality of wealth and income in capitalist economies and/or allow people to leave their countries of poverty for a better world seem to be just as (if not more) ‘utopian’ a future under capitalism than the ‘socialist utopia’ he rules out.

#### No united movements - self interest checks

Gao 06 (Gao is a Chinese-Australian professor of [Chinese studies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_studies), who is also the director of Confucius Institute in the University of Adelaide, 11/8/2006, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, “[China and capitalism: If market capitalism is good for the West, Why is capitalism with Chinese characteristics bad?: Critical Asian Studies: Vol 37, No 3 (tandfonline.com)](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14672710500200581), DOA July4 2022” - EM

We really need to problematize the assumption that there is such a thing as the international proletariat class. The trouble with the traditional style of the socialist movement today is that for most working-class people, “holistically” speaking, they only care about now and me, because to them, “in the long run we will all be dead.” Workers all over the world have never united and will probably never do so. Colonial historical evidence shows that in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, workers and laborers were among the fiercest opponents of poor Chinese migrants. Take the example of Australia during the nineteenth century. It was workers and trade union activists who opposed Chinese settlers on the grounds that the Chinese coolies’ willingness to work for lower wages was an obstacle to the creation of an equal society. This ideology fits well with the then prevalent social Darwinism and the Yellow Peril paranoia. Thus the first act of the Australian federation in 1901, the first nation-building act of the first parliament, was an immigration exclusion act against the colored races. This act, in the name of democracy and equality (everyone is equal but some are more equal than others) pushed forward the White Australian policy that remained in full force until the 1960s. To avoid any misunderstanding, let me state categorically that I have no problems with Hart-Landsberg and Burkett’s criticisms of China’s development and growth model. My concern is that we may be barking up the wrong tree. China’s development and growth model has to be examined within the international context of the Western dominance of material wealth and lifestyle. For one and a half centuries, the Chinese have been seeking the secret of making China as wealthy as a Western country and of living the lifestyle of a Westerner. They tried Gao / China Roundtable 471 democracies (though only briefly), and they tried what they understood to be socialism (for thirty years).

#### Opposition comes from inside the movement

**Tooze**, 20**21** (Adam, PhD, LPE@Columbia, Ecological Leninism Adam Tooze on Andreas Malm’s post-pandemic climate politics 11-18. [https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism ///](https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism%20///)MF)

But, as Malm points out, the climate movement’s appropriation of history has been one-sided. How can one treat the suffragette movement seriously without emphasising its use of direct action and sabotage? Even more grotesque is the representation of the abolition of slavery as if it were achieved through the high moralism of Quaker ‘NGOs’, rather than slave rebellion or the radical example of militant abolitionists.

By ruling out direct action, the climate movement robs itself, in Malm’s view, of its only serious means of leverage. What’s needed, he argues, is not the slow shift of public opinion and electoral results, but a more encompassing ‘theory of change’:

Here is what this movement of millions should do, for a start: announce and enforce the prohibition. Damage and destroy new CO2-emitting devices. Put them out of commission, pick them apart, demolish them, burn them, blow them up. Let the capitalists who keep on investing in the fire know that their properties will be trashed. ‘We are the investment risk,’ runs a slogan from Ende Gelände, but the risk clearly needs to be higher than one or two days of interrupted production per year. ‘If we can’t get a serious carbon tax from a corrupted Congress, we can impose a de facto one with our bodies,’ Bill McKibben has argued, but a carbon tax is so 2004. If we can’t get a prohibition, we can impose a de facto one with our bodies and any other means necessary.

Malm is aware that such tactics risk alienating support, inviting media denunciation and provoking massive repression. As he admits, ‘climate militancy would have to be articulated to a wider anti-capitalist groundswell, much as in earlier shifts of modes of production, when physical attacks on ruling classes formed only minor parts of society-wide reorganisation. How could that happen? This cannot be known beforehand. It can be found only through immersion in practice.’ These are the words of a revolutionary cadre hedging his bets.

Given how remote the goal of comprehensive decarbonisation is, it is less the aim than the manner of politics that matters. Given the reality of the underlying conflict, division and strife are not to be regretted, but embraced – an essential Leninist lesson. To adopt an antagonistic stance is to do no more than respond adequately to the situation. As Malm and the collective conclude in White Skin, Black Fuel, ‘if nothing else, the anti-climate politics of the far right should shatter any remaining illusion that fossil fuels can be relinquished through some kind of smooth, reasoned transition ... A transition will happen through intense polarisation and confrontation, or it will not happen at all.’ From this point of view, the question isn’t whether liberal activists do or don’t want to engage in sabotage. If we keep to our current course, sabotage is coming. If it isn’t directed from the top, it will bubble up from below. The question is whether the mainstream climate movement can ready itself for the agonising dilemmas to come. Can it sustain its coherence and momentum in the face of crisis, violence, division and, quite likely, defeat?

It is at this point that the dramas of 20th-century European history return to haunt Malm’s vision of the future – not as an inspiration to revolution, but as a way of giving meaning to resistance that may ultimately be in vain. Imagine that we are no longer in the world of school strikes and UN conferences. Imagine that, after the melting of the ice caps and a dramatic civilisational collapse, a huddle of people are eking out an existence in northern latitudes. What will they tell their children about the disaster? Will they say that ‘humanity brought about the end of the world in perfect harmony? That everyone willingly queued up for the furnaces? Or that some people fought like Jews who knew they would be killed?’

The ‘Jews’ Malm evokes are the resistance fighters of the Warsaw ghetto and the camps who engaged in heroic but doomed uprisings against the Nazis. And he means this extraordinary analogy seriously: ‘If it is too late for resistance to be waged within a calculus of immediate utility, the time has come for it to vindicate the fundamental values of life, even if it only means crying out to the heavens.’ He cites Alain Brossat and Sylvie Klingberg’s Revolutionary Yiddishland: ‘Their combat was for history, for memory ... This affirmation of life by way of sacrifice and combat with no prospect of victory is a tragic paradox that can only be understood as an act of faith in history.’ ‘Better to die blowing up a pipeline,’ Malm concludes, ‘than to burn impassively.’ Thus the image of blowing up a pipeline returns, not now as an act of sabotage but one of self-sacrifice. At this intersection of a monumental past and a dark future, we reach a dead end.

#### Movements fail

**Tooze**, 20**21** (Adam, PhD, LPE@Columbia, Ecological Leninism Adam Tooze on Andreas Malm’s post-pandemic climate politics 11-18. [https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism ///](https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism%20///)MF)

Earlier in How to Blow up a Pipeline, Malm gestures at an alternative. Imagine, he writes, that the mass mobilisations of the latest cycle of protest become impossible to ignore.

The ruling classes feel themselves under such heat – perhaps their hearts even melting somewhat at the sight of all these kids with handwritten placards – that their obduracy wanes. New politicians are voted into office, notably from green parties in Europe, who live up to their election promises. The pressure is kept up from below. Moratoriums on fresh fossil fuel infrastructure are instituted. Germany initiates immediate phase-out of coal production, the Netherlands likewise for gas, Norway for oil, the US for all of the above; legislation and planning are put in place for cutting emissions by at least 10 per cent per year; renewable energy and public transport are scaled up, plant-based diets promoted, blanket bans on fossil fuels prepared.

If this were to transpire, Malm concedes, ‘the movement should be given the chance to see this scenario through.’

The majority of climate activists put their hope in this reformist vision: we should indeed hold on to it. But let us also admit that although those lines were printed only months ago, they already seem out of date. And Malm soon provides us with a vision much closer to the way the world looks today. Imagine that ‘a few years down the road, the kids of the Thunberg generation and the rest of us wake up one morning and realise that business-as-usual is still on, regardless of all the strikes, the science, the pleas, the millions with colourful outfits and banners ... What do we do then?’

The centrist will counsel patience. Anything we can actually do, we can afford, Keynes said. By the same token, he added in a radio talk delivered in the spring of 1942, we can afford anything we can actually do, provided we remain patient and take the necessary time. That is a telling qualification. As Malm remarks, it is a fundamental assumption of social democracy that it has history and time on its side. But to imagine that is still the case, to talk as if we can safely distinguish between the short, medium and long term, is one of the most insidious forms of soft denial at work today. We should no longer indulge in it.

As Malm points out, neoliberalism has repeatedly found ways of jumping over its own shadow to meet a crisis at the scale and pace demanded by the situation. The response to the pandemic has provided just such a demonstration of flexibility. But trusting to that kind of politics when it comes to climate change is a recipe for planetary disaster. Malm forces us to face a crucial question: what are the social democratic politics of emergency? If his version of ecological Leninism is to be refused, what is our logic of action in the face of disaster? What are our political options when there is every reason to think that we have very little time left? As Daniel Bensaïd reminds us, in an essay quoted by Malm, in 1914 Lenin made a note in the margins of Hegel’s The Science of Logic: ‘Breaks in gradualness ... Gradualness explains nothing without leaps. Leaps! Leaps! Leaps!’

#### Capitalism is uniquely key to promoting public and private good.

Jim Balsillie, 21 [Jim Balsillie, 12-15-2021, "The Capitalist Manifesto: Capitalism allows the individual to shape society for the better and it needs to be protected," financialpost, https://financialpost.com/technology/the-capitalist-manifesto-capitalism-allows-the-individual-to-shape-society-for-the-better-and-it-needs-to-be-protected, smarx, HHW]

**Capitalism has created more prosperity and progress for more people than any system in human history**. On the 30th anniversary of the official end of the Soviet Union, join the National Post and Financial Post in a series saluting the unfashionable yet awesome power of the free-market system. I believe that capitalism in a liberal democratic society is **by far the best system to** **promote human flourishing**. It’s the **best economic system for the generation of new wealth**, which is why even authoritarian states like China have embraced it. The generation of new wealth is a critical first step for any debate on redistribution or expanding publicly funded social services.

As a tech entrepreneur who did not come from economic privilege, capitalism has provided me with opportunities to generate public and private wealth on a global stage. The shift 40 years ago from an industrialized, production-based economy to a knowledge-based economy provided innovative individuals with more power to assert into existing markets or to create new markets.

When entrepreneurs have access to capital, they can channel their ideas into products and services that can improve the lives of fellow citizens, industry and even governments. No other economic system allows a single individual to profoundly shape society for the better and to **simultaneously create public and private good — this is why capitalism is worth protecting**.

#### No spill-up, individuals don’t have enough power

**T**rotskyist **F**raction, 20**19** (“Capitalism Is Destroying the Planet – Let’s Destroy Capitalism!” September 15, 2019. <https://www.leftvoice.org/capitalism-is-destroying-the-planet-lets-destroy-capitalism/> /// MF)

In broad sectors of the movement, the dominant logic is that the key to solving the ecological crisis is changes in individual consumption, focusing their attention on “irresponsible consumption.” Obviously, capitalist production, which generates consumption cycles that span the globe, molds “consumers.” In this way, individual human behavior contributes to the ecological crisis, and it is desirable to encourage new forms of consumption by creating environmental consciousness.

Yet changing individual behavior often has only a negligible effect on capitalism’s environmental consequences. Its effect is, moreover, highly unequal. An Oxfam report from 2015 showed that the richest 10% of the planet causes half of CO2 emissions, while the poorest 50% (3.5 billion people) is responsible for only 10%.

The logic of focusing the environmental movement on changes in individual behavior implies two strategic problems. First, it encourages an individualist conception, blurring or directly obscuring the “center of gravity” that needs to be attacked, namely imperialist capitalism, the big corporations and the capitalist states. Second, it strengthens the reactionary argument that “the people are responsible for the crisis,” which leads to measures that force the working class and the poorest sectors of society to pay for the environmental crisis. This argument preserves the system and benefits the capitalists, and it prevents the one social force that could confront capitalism from joining the struggle.

One of the lessons provided by the Yellow Vest movement in France—an immense social movement triggered by an increase in the gasoline tax—is that the “ecological transition” cannot fall on the shoulders of the working class and poor masses. In the context of the ecological crisis, the central problem is not the “division” between those who pollute and those who do not, but rather between the social majority that is already paying the costs of the crisis and the capitalists that caused it.

The only way to confront the global environmental crisis caused by capitalism is for the majority of the population to join the struggle, with the working class at the forefront. This is because the contradiction between capital and labor is not just one of capitalism’s many contradictions; it is the contradiction that structures capitalism itself. If the relationship between society and nature is mediated by production, it is only by revolutionizing production that the metabolism with nature can be rationally regulated. That is why the working class, which is the only authentically productive class in society, can knit together a social alliance that can pull the “emergency break” on the coming disaster.

There are important examples of unity between the environmental movement and sectors of the working class. That was the case with the Harland and Wolff shipyard in Ireland, where the Titanic was built. That shipyard was declared bankrupt, but the workers took over the plant demanding its nationalization in order to produce clean energy. There have also been calls by workers for the unions to call a climate strike, for example, in Portugal, Germany and Spain.

These initiatives are extremely important. In an intuitive yet correct way, they point to the “social subject” that can hegemonize the struggle for an alternative to environmental destruction: the working class.

The need for the working class to join this movement with its own demands and its own methods of struggle (strikes, blockades and pickets) is vital for developing the movement. It is necessary to help break down the prejudices that exist in wide sectors of the working class about the environmental movement—prejudices often justified by policies supposedly in “defense of the environment” that attack the working class, equating it with the polluting bosses and worsening its living conditions.

Above all, it is necessary to confront the reactionary role played by the majority of the bureaucratized trade unions. Especially in the sectors of heavy industry and energy, the union bureaucracies act as the capitalists’ best partners. Many times they oppose any measures for ecological transition, however superficial they may be, under the slogan of “saving jobs.” What they are really saving is the capitalists’ profits, tying the destiny of the working class to the success of the bosses.

Facing the Climate Strike, the unions in Europe and the United States mostly oppose it—or in some cases, such as in Germany, they support it demagogically while refusing to organize any actions that would supposedly be “illegal.” That is why, alongside the broadest self-organization of the youth, it is necessary to denounce the reactionary positions of the bureaucratic unions, which for decades have ignored or played down ecological problems. We must demand that they call a strike and put their organizations in the service of the struggle against the capitalists responsible for the looming catastrophe that threatens us all.

The declaration in Germany by a group of rank-and-file trade union activists called [ver.di aktiv](http://verdi-aktiv.de/) (which is supported by RIO, the Revolutionary Internationalist Organization) has received more than 500 signatures from trade unionists across the country and from different sectors. It demands that the large trade unions call for a strike. This is a small but significant expression of that policy.

### 2AC -- AT: Vague Alt Solvency

#### Alt fails - The alt fails to guide human action

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The need for a change of paradigm,” Ch. 5.2, p. 217] SPark

Therefore, what we know about the economy is mediated by what is thought to be the main purpose of this human activity, namely individual enrichment, which is what really matters for average individuals who want to accumulate capital within the framework of the market economy. The opposite sustainable development paradigm, which would regard the satisfaction of human needs as the purpose of the economy, must take into account the concrete situations of societies that are generally stratified and unequal. Hence work, production and economic exchanges do not occur in any ideal market, and require legal and political regulations to try to achieve an elusive and difficult common good for the majority of the population. Such a paradigm, with a humanistic purpose, does not guide human actions in practice, as it does not correspond to the prevailing ideas, which consist of extreme individualism and selfishness. Thus it is problematic when solutions like the SDGs are proposed, based on a paradigm that is not pursued in practice because decision-makers are under the influence of the ideology of personal enrichment and neoliberalism.

### 1AR -- Ext: Vagueness

#### Ecological Leninism is incredibly vague, the revolution is either global or nothing.

Tugal 20 – [Cihan Tugal PhD is a professor of sociology at the University of California, Berkeley; “Leninism without the working class? The missing subject in Malm’s ecological revolution”; 10/27/20; <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/leninism-without-the-working-class-the-missing-subject-in-malms-ecological-revolution/>; Lowell-JL]

Remarkably, Malm discusses factory takeovers without bringing workers in. Oil companies indeed need to be nationalized, as he asserts, and their resources turned into carbon capture facilities, machines, and personnel. When capital does anything to approximate the carbon capture which scientists argue is required at a global level, it circulates the carbon back into the atmosphere. Not selling it would not be profitable, Malm demonstrates: businesses will not produce something they would afterwards have to sink into the ground. Only the state can sink carbon into the ground globally. However, the book does not include one mention of organizing or mobilizing the workers of these companies to carry out the necessary nationalizations. It appears that “we” are burdened with the nationalization. But who is going to run these companies after “we” nationalize them?

Ironically, Malm introduces the section where he discusses oil nationalization with an anti-bureaucracy, pro-democracy quote from Lenin, yet comes to rely so much on the state as his prose unfolds. Without any articulation of the social actors who could take on nationalization processes, the talk of democracy will be just talk. It might be objected that workers are so complicit in pollutant capitalism that they can’t be counted on. But negating that option goes nowhere towards nailing down an effective social replacement.

Then, there is the problem of the winter palace itself. Grabbing control of a second rate empire granted the Bolsheviks the chance to start a socialist experiment on a huge scale. But they knew everything would go to ruin if their institutions did not spread beyond Russia. Malm is incautiously sanguine that a revolutionary takeover might not produce similar bottlenecks today. But he is unspecific regarding the international form war communism will assume.

The eco-revolution is either global or it is nothing, but how do you accomplish global war communism in a world of a few imperial powers, perhaps a dozen effective nation-states, and many state-like yet ineffective entities? How many of these would you have to storm to even initiate a global process? There can be no immediate answer to this question, but it has to be confronted. And confront similar questions Lenin did, even if without any resolution.

### 2AC -- AT: Corporate Action

#### Corporate action fails

Guerrero ’18 [Dorothy Grace; 2018; Head of Policy and Advocacy of Global Justice; Climate Crisis, The: South African and Global Democratic Eco-Socialist Alternatives, “THE LIMITS OF CAPITALIST SOLUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CRISIS,” Ch. 2, p. 39] SPark

Climate change will not be solved through negotiations dominated by corporate interests. The governments that are supposed to lead in climate change solutions are also the ones pushing corporate trade deals like the TTIP that will benefit the fracking industry and support big agribusiness companies that undermine the ability of farmers to adapt to climate change, as well as various free trade agreements and bilateral investment treaties.

### 2AC -- AT: Non-Democratic Alts

#### Democracy is key to sustainability - distance form it makes effective decision making and ecological development impossible

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of  World Geopolitics  at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Origins of Human and Sustainable Development as UN Paradigms,” Ch. 4.4, p. 175] Spark

Any development worthy of the description ‘sustainable’ implies the existence of a democratic political system that ensures the effective participation of citizens in decision-making to help redistribute surpluses in an equitable manner while simultaneous ly negotiating solutions to the inevitable conflicts that result from social inequalities.6 Democracy is also essential to ensure that the productive apparatus respects the obligation to preserve the ecological basis of development and does not go against the ability of governments to sustain and preserve natural resources. Furthermore, in order to reduce carbon emissions, democratic governments must promote the search for new technological alternatives - mainly in the field of renewable energy - while establishing intrinsically flexible administrative procedures which are capable of self-reform and correction while promoting sustainable trade and financing patterns.

#### Democracy is key to sustainability

Padilla ’21 [Luis-Alberto; 2021; president of the board of the Guatemalan International Relations & Peace Research Institute (IRIPAZ), member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), former Secretary General of the Latin American Council on Peace Research (CLAIP), Director of the Diplomatic Academy, Former Vice Minister, former ambassador in Chile, former permanent representative to the United Nations at the Vienna International Centre, former ambassador to Austria, former ambassador to the Russian Federation, former ambassador to the Netherlands, permanent representative to the UN in Geneva, and professor of the Seminar of World Geopolitics  at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Catholic University Rafael Landivar (URL) of Guatemala; Sustainable Development in the Anthropocene, “The Origins of Human and Sustainable Development as UN Paradigms,” Ch. 4.4, p. 181-182] Spark

Democratizing development could also be the emblematic leitmotiv of sustainable development because the transition from the status of ‘object’ to ‘subject’ can only be achieved as the processes of citizen participation deepen. This ‘deepening’ is understood here as an increase in participatory democracy and not merely in the formal aspects like competitive elections or political parties, which are necessary but not sufficient on their own. Participatory democracy also implies greater citizen awareness, less paternalism and fewer guidelines imposed from ‘above’, and greater conscious involvement of citizens in the decision-making of all matters that directly concern them through referendums or direct democracy.11 In short, sustainable human development that contains this new paradigmatic vision of development also entails transforming the international system in order to reach sustainability in the midst of a dense network of new local economic micro-orders that are based on social solidarity and collective cooperation and not on individual greed and desire for personal enrichment.

### 2AC -- AT: Communism

#### Communist regimes likes environmental degradation

Dellapenna 10 (Joseph W. Dellapenna, Professor of Law, Villanova University; B.B.A., Univ. of Mich. (1965); J.D., Detroit College of Law (1968); LL.M. in International and Comparative Law, George Washington Univ. 02/2010, Villanova University School of Law, “Behind the Red Curtain: Environmental Concerns and the End of Communism”, SSRN-id1555141.pdf) - EM

In many of these countries, something more turned out to be the environment. Communism had a dismal record on the environment.11 By 1989, sulfurous skies were killing people across the Soviet bloc. Single Russian factories were producing more pollution than all of Scandinavia.12 Immediately after the end of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation classified one sixth of its territory as uninhabitable because of pollution—yet the inhabitants had nowhere to go.13 Rivers were poisoned beyond anything found in western countries,14 while Lake Baikal had become a paradigm of how not to manage a precious natural resource.15 The Aral Sea, in Central Asia, had become the prime example of “ecocide.”16Communism performed so conspicuously poorly regarding the environment for six reasons. First, Marxism carried forward the western tradition of treating nature solely as providing resources for human consumption. As Vaclav Havel explained, Marxism saw humans as the “productive force” and nature as a “production tool,” destroying the necessarily intimate relationship between the two.17 This concept was succinctly captured in the “labor theory of value” that denied economic value to natural resources as such when consumed in productive processes because no human labor was expended in creating the natural resources.18 A second feature of Marxism reinforced the effect of the labor theory of value—its denial of individual responsibility. As a result, no one felt responsibility for the natural environment, leading to reckless disregard of environmental consequences.19 Thirdly, the socialist goal of “transforming the world” led easily to “gigantomania”—a desire for the largest and most grandiose technological feats.20 Gigantomania is also found in western countries, but structural features of Communism prevented effective counter-pressure that, at least sometimes, stopped some of the most substantial. excesses in the west.21 This introduces a fourth factor—structural features rooted in Marxist ideology and the conspiratorial nature of Communism’s rise to power—that are perhaps the most important. The “dictatorship of the proletariat” brooked no countervailing power centers.22 The Communist obsession with secrecy often kept problems hidden from both the public and the central authorities until catastrophe made the problem obvious to all.23 Fifth, the determination to keep environmental problems secret was reinforced by the belief that such problems could not arise under Communism, which, after all, represented the most progressive ordering of society and the economy; to admit to environmental failings was to admit that Communism had failed in at least one important respect.24 Finally, there was the importance of “fulfilling the plan.” Success and promotion for officials—and all major economic decisions were made by officials— came only from fulfilling the plan, which generally was measured solely through quantitative achievements, resulting in pervasive poor quality production.25 New construction is what the plan called for, not maintenance, while cost, in any rational sense, simply was not a factor.26

#### Communism fails

**Perry**, 20**16** (Mark, American economist and professor of economics and finance at UoM-Flint “Why Socialism Always Fails” AEI March 22 2016. <https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/why-socialism-always-fails/> ///MF)

Slightly more than 20 years, I wrote the article “[Why Socialism Failed](http://fee.org/articles/why-socialism-failed/)” and it appeared in 1995 in The Freeman, the flagship publication of the [Foundation for Economic Education](http://fee.org/). I think it was the first essay or op-ed I wrote for a general audience following graduation in 1993 from George Mason University with a Ph.D. in economics. Note that the title of the article (“failed”) implied the past tense, as if I perhaps assumed the failures of socialism were so apparent and obvious (I called it the Big Lie of the 20th century) that it would be forever considered only as a discredited system of the past, and never as a viable option going forward into the future! Of course, at the time many parts of the world were moving away from collectivism and central planning and towards free market capitalism – the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the Berlin Wall came down in 1989, and China was opening up its economy and re-established the Shanghai Stock Exchange in 1990, etc.

Given the recent resurgence of socialism, especially as it is now being embraced by young Americans, I thought it might be a good time to re-visit my 1995 essay to review why socialism: a) failed in the 20th century, b) is failing in the 21st century (e.g. Venezuela, see photo above), and c) will always fail. And that’s because it’s a flawed system based on completely faulty principles that aren’t consistent with human behavior and can’t nurture the human spirit.

Here’s are some excerpts of my 1995 essay “Why Socialism Failed”:

1. Socialism is the Big Lie of the twentieth century. While it promised prosperity, equality, and security, it delivered poverty, misery, and tyranny. Equality was achieved only in the sense that everyone was equal in his or her misery.

In the same way that a Ponzi scheme or chain letter initially succeeds but eventually collapses, socialism may show early signs of success. But any accomplishments quickly fade as the fundamental deficiencies of central planning emerge. It is the initial illusion of success that give government intervention its pernicious, seductive appeal. In the long run, socialism has always proven to be a formula for tyranny and misery.

A pyramid scheme is ultimately unsustainable because it is based on faulty principles. Likewise, collectivism is unsustainable in the long run because it is a flawed theory. Socialism does not work because it is not consistent with fundamental principles of human behavior. The failure of socialism in countries around the world can be traced to one critical defect: it is a system that ignores incentives.

In a capitalist economy, incentives are of the utmost importance. Market prices, the profit-and-loss system of accounting, and private property rights provide an efficient, interrelated system of incentives to guide and direct economic behavior. Capitalism is based on the theory that incentives matter!

Under socialism, incentives either play a minimal role or are ignored totally. A centrally planned economy without market prices or profits, where property is owned by the state, is a system without an effective incentive mechanism to direct economic activity. By failing to emphasize incentives, socialism is a theory inconsistent with human nature and is therefore doomed to fail. Socialism is based on the theory that incentives don’t matter!

2. The strength of capitalism can be attributed to an incentive structure based upon the three Ps: (1) prices determined by market forces, (2) a profit-and-loss system of accounting and (3) private property rights. The failure of socialism can be traced to its neglect of these three incentive-enhancing components.

3. By their failure to foster, promote, and nurture the potential of their people through incentive-enhancing institutions, centrally planned economies deprive the human spirit of full development. Socialism fails because it kills and destroys the human spirit–just ask the people leaving Cuba in homemade rafts and boats [and those waiting in long lines today in Venezuela struggling, and often failing, to buy food].

4. The temptress of socialism is constantly luring us with the offer: “give up a little of your freedom and I will give you a little more security.” As the experience of this century has demonstrated, the bargain is tempting but never pays off. We end up losing both our freedom and our security.

Socialism will remain a constant temptation. We must be vigilant in our fight against socialism not only around the globe but also here in the United States.

The failure of socialism inspired a worldwide renaissance of freedom and liberty. For the first time in the history of the world, the day is coming very soon when a majority of the people in the world will live in free societies or societies rapidly moving toward freedom.

Capitalism will play a major role in the global revival of liberty and prosperity because it nurtures the human spirit, inspires human creativity, and promotes the spirit of enterprise. By providing a powerful system of incentives that promote thrift, hard work, and efficiency, capitalism creates wealth.

The main difference between capitalism and socialism is this: Capitalism works.

#### Communism fails - divisions and friction undermine the party

Wike et al 19 ([RICHARD WIKE](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/richard-wike), [JACOB POUSHTER](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/jacob-poushter), [LAURA SILVER](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/laura-silver), [KAT DEVLIN](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/kat-devlin), [JANELL FETTEROLF](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/janell-fetterolf), [ALEXANDRA CASTILLO](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/alexandra-castillo) AND [CHRISTINE HUANG](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/christine-huang), Wike is director of global attitudes research at Pew Research Center. He conducts research and writes about international public opinion on a variety of topics, such as America’s global image, the rise of China, democracy, and globalization. October 15, 2019, “European Public Opinion Three Decades After the Fall of Communism”, Pew Research Center, [Public Opinion in Europe 30 Years After the Fall of Communism | Pew Research Center](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2019/10/15/european-public-opinion-three-decades-after-the-fall-of-communism/)) - EM

Those in Central and Eastern European nations that joined the European Union generally believe membership has been good for their countries, and there is widespread support in the region for many democratic values. Still, even though most broadly embrace democracy, the intensity of people’s commitment to specific democratic principles is not always strong. When asked about the shifts to multiparty democracy and a market economy that occurred following the collapse of communism, former Eastern Bloc publics surveyed largely approve of these changes. For instance, 85% of Poles support the shifts to both democracy and capitalism. However, support is not uniform – more than a third of Bulgarians and Ukrainians disapprove, as do roughly half in Russia. These questions about democracy and a market economy were [first asked in 1991](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/1991/09/17/1991-pulse-of-europe/), and then again in 2009. In a few nations – Hungary, Lithuania and Ukraine – support for both declined between 1991 and 2009 before bouncing back significantly over the past decade. Russia is the only country where support for multiparty democracy and capitalism is down significantly from 2009. The varying levels of enthusiasm for democracy and free markets may be driven in part by different perspectives about the degree to which societies have made progress over the past three decades. Most Poles, Czechs and Lithuanians, and more than four-in-ten Hungarians and Slovaks, believe the economic situation for most people in their country today is better than it was under communism.

### 2AC -- AT: Socialism

#### Socialism doesn’t give any freedom – Cuba and Venezuela prove

Lee Edwards 22 [Lee Edwards, 1-13-2022, "Dismantling the Myths of the Socialist Paradise," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/progressivism/commentary/dismantling-the-myths-the-socialist-paradise, smarx, HHW]

Radical progressives are trying to convince Americans, especially young Americans, that socialism is the solution to America’s socio-economic problems. **They are banking on millennial ignorance** of the repeated failures of socialism and the proven ability of free enterprise to produce opportunity and prosperity for the greatest number.

To camouflage their intent, progressives speak of "democratic" socialism. They promise a tranquil land of collective ownership and equal distribution. But in every case, for more than a century, the **socialist "paradise" has turned out to be a centralized state** administered by political elites.

For a realistic understanding of socialism, educators must first dismantle the most egregious myths about this pernicious system.

**Myth** #1: Karl Marx, the founder of socialism, was one of the great thinkers of the 19th century.

In truth, Marx was wrong about nearly **everything**. Nearly 200 years after "The Communist Manifesto" was published, the nation state has not withered away and **capitalism rules most of the global economy**. Workers have preferred to turn into entrepreneurs rather than revolutionaries, to their great benefit. Private property is a cornerstone of every prosperous country (including the Nordic countries). As the respected economist Paul Samuelson has written: **Marx’s "scientific socialism" is "colossally useless."**

**Myth** #2: Socialism places power in the hands of the people.

In truth, socialism cedes power to the government and the political elites who run it. After more than 60 years, the Cuban people are still waiting for the free and open elections that Fidel Castro promised. According to a leading Latino economist, Venezuela’s economic catastrophe—brought on by its experiment in socialism--"dwarfs" any in U.S., European or Latin American history. **Socialism has so devastated this once prosperous country that, today**, **90% of Venezuelans live in poverty**.

#### Capitalism is empirically superior and more effective than socialism.

James ’18 [Kay C. James; ; 10-26-2018; Socialism vs. Capitalism: One Clear Winner; Heritage Foundation; https://www.heritage.org/international-economies/commentary/socialism-vs-capitalism-one-clear-winner; 6-26-2022; SK]

There's a reason that Amazon gives plenty of space for customer reviews on its site: People naturally want to make sure a product is good before they buy it.

Well, if that's the case when it comes to books, stereos, refrigerators and thousands of other items, shouldn't it also apply to something as important as your form of government?

I can't help but think about that whenever I read about some poll indicating that a large number of Americans prefer socialism to capitalism. To me, it begs the question: Do they really know the "product" they're touting, or have they been fooled by some vapid slogans?

Take Venezuela. I'm curious, for example, how many of the pro-socialism crowd are familiar with what's happened to that oil-rich nation over the last two decades.

Looking at it today - plagued by empty store shelves, chronic hyperinflation, widespread looting, and severe shortages of food and medicine - you'd never know that before 1999, it was one of the wealthiest countries in South America. When The Heritage Foundation published its first edition of the Index of Economic Freedom in 1995, Venezuela scored two points above the worldwide average.

So what happened? According to The Atlantic:

"The experiment with '21st-century socialism' as introduced by the late President Hugo Chavez, a self-described champion of the poor who vowed to distribute the country's wealth among the masses, and instead steered the nation toward the catastrophe the world is witnessing under his handpicked successor (Nicolas) Maduro, has been a cruel failure."

That's putting it mildly. And the track record elsewhere isn't much better. From Albania and Angola to Vietnam and Yemen, socialism has produced little but violence, starvation and misery.

Some defenders point to Norway and other Scandinavian countries that enjoy a degree of prosperity well above the ones already mentioned. But as columnist David Harsanyi points out, you can hardly call countries that are "operating generous welfare states programs propped up by underlying vibrant capitalism" poster children for socialism.

The fact remains that wherever unalloyed socialism has been tried, the result has been disastrous for the citizens it's inflicted on. Take any economy run by an all-powerful state, and it's only a question of when, not if, it winds up being run completely into the ground.

Take another example much closer to home: Cuba. The vibrant, modern island nation that existed prior to 1959 stands in stark contrast to the Cuba of 2018, a brutally repressive regime where struggling workers who don't even earn a living wage can be thrown in jail for saying something that offends the ruling elite.

Contrast that with the experience of those who live in capitalist societies, where rights are protected, life spans are longer, and people enjoy a higher standard of living.

The Index of Economic Freedom, which has graded every country in the world annually for nearly 25 years, bears this out. Again and again, it finds per capita incomes are much higher in nations that are more economically free.

Economies rated "free" or "mostly free" in the latest edition enjoy incomes more than double the average levels in other countries, and more than five times higher than the incomes of people living in "repressed" economies such as Venezuela and Cuba.

The evidence is hard to refute. Consider what Bono, humanitarian and rock singer, says he's learned in the course of spearheading numerous anti-poverty initiatives over the years:

"As a person who's spent nearly 30 years fighting to get people out of poverty, it was somewhat humbling to realize that commerce played a bigger job than development. I'd say that's my biggest transformation in 10 years: understanding the power of commerce to make or break lives."

By "power of commerce," of course, he means capitalism.

But should we be surprised that it has socialism beat when it comes to generating human health and wealth? When people are free to make their own decisions and follow their dreams, it's only natural that their everyday life is better than that experienced by people under the thumb of a dominating, all-controlling state.

If you doubt that, remember the many people who have risked their lives and even died trying to escape Cuba. They flee to America. It's never the other way around.

#### Socialism always fails – history and empirics prove

Lee Edwards 22 [Lee Edwards, 1-13-2022, "Dismantling the Myths of the Socialist Paradise," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/progressivism/commentary/dismantling-the-myths-the-socialist-paradise, smarx, HHW]

**Myth** #3: Socialism is working in Denmark and the other Scandinavian countries.

In truth,**Denmark has a free-market economy**—and it is capitalism that enables the Danish government to finance a bountiful welfare state through top-to-bottom personal income and VAT taxes. A frustrated Danish prime minister told a shocked Washington audience, "I would like to make one thing clear …. **Denmark is a market economy**." Denmark (along with the other Nordic countries) has relatively few business regulations and no minimum wage, leading one economist to say, "**Denmark is probably more capitalist than the United States**."

Myth #4: Socialism has never failed because it has never been truly tried.

In fact, **socialism has failed everywhere it has been attempted** for over a century, from the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 to present-day Chavez-Maduro socialism in Venezuela. Nowhere has democratic socialism been more faithfully practiced and then rejected by public demand than in Israel, India and the United Kingdom following the end of World War II.

Israel’s first settlers sought to create an economy in which market forces were controlled for the benefit of all. Socialism worked until Israel suffered its first major recession despite extensive government controls. The **government reversed course and adopted a market economy**. A high-tech revolution swept the country, transforming Israel into a **major global player in technology.**

Following independence in 1948, India adhered strictly to a socialist ideology. But wars, drought and the oil price crisis of 1973 shook the country—half of the population lived in poverty. The government abandoned socialism and India’s **middle class expanded enormously**, becoming the largest in the free world. Never before in recorded history, wrote an Indian journalist, have so many people risen so quickly.

After three decades of socialism, the United Kingdom experienced a socio-economic revolution in the 1980s with the election of Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Privatization was a core Thatcher reform. The government sold off government-owned airlines, airports, utilities, and phone, steel and oil companies. Turning from Keynes to Hayek, the once "sick man of Europe" quickly responded, **recovering robust economic health.**

Whether it was a small Middle Eastern country, a large agricultural country with a population of 1.3 billon, or the nation that sparked the industrial revolution, **capitalism topped socialism every time.**

This is the true story of socialism, a pseudo-religion posing as a pseudo-science and run by political elites. It could only be adopted in America if we repudiated every principle of the founding, did away with federalism, regulated the 33 million small businesses that produce nearly half the jobs in America, and heavily taxed everyone, not just the top 1%, to pay for the government needed to run the lives of 330 million Americans from the cradle to the grave.

Millennials do have a choice: the suffocating embrace of socialism, under which individual freedom and responsibility are surrendered, or the freedom of democratic capitalism,**under which people of all colors and classes can work to be whatever they want to be.**

#### Socialism’s ignoring of incentives causes it to be doomed to failure

Perry 22 [Mark J., 6-22-2022, "Why Socialism Failed," No Publication, https://fee.org/articles/why-socialism-failed/, smarx, HHW]

Socialism is the Big Lie of the Twentieth century. While it promised prosperity, equality, and security, it delivered poverty, misery, and tyranny. Equality was achieved only in the sense that everyone was equal in his or her misery.

In the same way that a Ponzi scheme or chain letter initially succeeds but eventually collapses, socialism may show early signs of success. But any accomplishments quickly fade as the fundamental deficiencies of central planning emerge. It is the initial illusion of success that gives government intervention its pernicious, seductive appeal. In the long run, **socialism has always proven to be a formula for tyranny and misery.**

**Socialism Ignores Incentives**

A pyramid scheme is ultimately unsustainable because it is based on faulty principles. Likewise, collectivism is unsustainable in the long run because it is a flawed theory. Socialism does not work because it is not consistent with fundamental principles of human behavior. The failure of socialism in countries around the world can be traced to one critical defect: it is a **system that ignores incentives**.

Under socialism, **incentives either play a minimal role or are ignored totally**.

In a capitalist economy, incentives are of the utmost importance. Market prices, the profit-and-loss system of accounting, and private property rights provide an efficient, interrelated system of incentives to guide and direct economic behavior. Capitalism is based on the theory that incentives matter!

Under socialism, incentives either play a minimal role or are ignored totally. A centrally planned economy without market prices or profits, where property is owned by the state, is a system without an effective incentive mechanism to direct economic activity. By failing to emphasize incentives, socialism is a theory inconsistent with human nature and is therefore **doomed to fail**. Socialism is based on the theory that incentives don’t matter!

### 1AR -- AT: Socialism

#### Socialism has never worked – 3 examples

Lee Edwards 19 [Lee Edwards, 10-16-2019, "Three Nations That Tried Socialism and Rejected It," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/progressivism/commentary/three-nations-tried-socialism-and-rejected-it, smarx, HHW]

Socialists are fond of saying that socialism has never failed because it has never been tried. But in truth, **socialism has failed in every country in which it has been tried,** from the Soviet Union beginning a century ago to three modern countries that tried but ultimately rejected socialism—Israel, India, and the United Kingdom.

While there were major political differences between the totalitarian rule of the Soviets and the democratic politics of Israel, India, and the U.K., all three of the latter countries adhered to socialist principles, nationalizing their major industries and placing economic decision-making in the hands of the government.

The Soviet failure has been well documented by historians. In 1985, General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev took command of a bankrupt disintegrating empire. After 70 years of Marxism, Soviet **farms were unable to feed the people, factories failed to meet their quotas**, people lined up for blocks in Moscow and other cities to buy bread and other necessities, and a war in Afghanistan dragged on with no end in sight of the body bags of young Soviet soldiers.

The economies of the Communist nations behind the Iron Curtain were similarly enfeebled because they functioned in large measure as colonies of the Soviet Union. With no incentives to compete or modernize, the industrial sector of Eastern and Central Europe became a monument to bureaucratic inefficiency and waste, a “**museum of the early industrial age**.” As the New York Times pointed out at the time, Singapore, an Asian city-state of only 2 million people, exported 20 percent more machinery to the West in 1987 **than all of Eastern Europe.**

And yet, socialism still beguiled leading intellectuals and politicians of the West. They could not resist its siren song, of a world without strife because it was a world without private property. They were convinced that a bureaucracy could make more-informed decisions about the welfare of a people than the people themselves could. They believed, with John Maynard Keynes, that “the state is wise and the market is stupid.”

Israel, India, and the United Kingdom all adopted socialism as an economic model following World War II. The preamble to India’s constitution, for example, begins, “We, the People of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic . . .” The original settlers of Israel were East European Jews of the Left who sought and built a socialist society. As soon as the guns of World War II fell silent, Britain’s Labour Party nationalized every major industry and acceded to every socialist demand of the unions.

At first, socialism seemed to work in these vastly dissimilar countries. For the first two decades of its existence, Israel’s economy grew at an annual rate of more than 10 percent, leading many to term Israel an “economic miracle.” The average GDP growth rate of India from its founding in 1947 into the 1970s was 3.5 percent, placing India among the more prosperous developing nations. GDP growth in Great Britain averaged 3 percent from 1950 to 1965, along with a 40 percent rise in average real wages, enabling Britain to become one of the world’s more affluent countries.

But the government planners were **unable to keep pace with increasing population and overseas competition**. After decades of ever **declining economic growth and ever rising unemployment**, all three countries abandoned socialism and turned toward capitalism and the free market. The resulting prosperity in Israel, India, and the U.K. vindicated free-marketers who had predicted that socialism would inevitably fail to deliver the goods. As British prime minister Margaret Thatcher observed, “the problem with socialism is that you **eventually run out of other people’s money.”**

#### Alt fails – history proves socialism increases human suffering

Muravchik 19 [Joshua Muravchik, 4-9-2019, "Socialism Fails Every Time," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/socialism-fails-every-time-11554851786, SMarx, JTong]

Self-described socialist Bernie Sanders has become a favorite of young voters by posing as an apostle of daring new ideas. Socialism, however, is anything but new. It’s hard to think of another idea that has been tried and failed as many times in as many ways or at a steeper price in human suffering.

The term “socialism” was coined by followers of Robert Owen (1771-1858), whom Karl Marx would label a “utopian socialist.” In 1825 Owen founded New Harmony, an Indiana commune, to demonstrate the superiority of what was first called the “social system.” The same year, Owen explained his experiment to a joint session of Congress attended by Supreme Court justices, President James Monroe and President-elect John Quincy Adams. Although Owen poured his fortune into it, New Harmony collapsed in disarray and recrimination within two years.

Owen’s son Robert Dale Owen salvaged the community by implementing what he called “a policy the very reverse” of socialism: “giving each respectable citizen every facility and encouragement to become (what every adult ought to be) a landed proprietor.”

Undeterred, others founded some 40 to 50 similar communes during the 19th century, and all collapsed quickly. New Harmony’s two years proved to be their median lifespan.

Based on the uniformly dismal results, the idea of socialism might have died a quiet death were it not for Marx (1818-83), who transformed socialism from an experiment—tried, tested and failed—into a prophecy, “the riddle of history solved.” Ironically, he called his vision “scientific socialism.”

Inspired by the dream of proletarian revolution overthrowing capitalist immiseration, socialist parties sprouted across Europe. Yet instead of growing poorer, workers in industrialized countries saw improvement in their living standards; and instead of disappearing, middle classes expanded—all disproving Marx.

It took Vladimir Lenin’s “vanguard” and the horrors of World War I to give socialism new life. In Russia, Lenin pioneered modern communism, which in the 20th century was imposed on 18 countries and one-third of mankind. Repression was justified by socialism’s purported economic benefits, but the actual trade-off entailed economic misery and the snuffing out of as many as 100 million lives.

Today Communist parties rule six countries. Most follow the lead of China, where the party redefined itself to include entrepreneurs. A 2012 Wall Street Journal report identified 160 people with an average net worth of more than $1 billion holding high government or party seats. No Chinese Bernie Sanders rails against them.

“Social democrats” and “democratic socialists” rejected Lenin’s methods. But their goals remained transformational. As British Labour Party leader Clement Attlee, who became prime minister in 1945, explained: “Our policy was not a reformed capitalism but progress toward a democratic socialism.” Labour sought to bring “main factors in the economic system”—including banks, mining and energy—under “public ownership and control.” Nationalization worked so badly, however, that Attlee soon beat a retreat and was voted out in 1951.

In 1981 Socialist François Mitterrand was elected president of France promising a clean “rupture” with capitalism. The results of his spending and nationalizations were so alarming that in 1982 Mitterrand reversed course and implemented austerity measures, which he dubbed “socialist rigor” to save face. “The aim is to bring about a real reconciliation between the left and the economy,” explained Socialist Party chief Lionel Jospin.

American socialists like Mr. Sanders, while often defending the likes of Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega, Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro, prefer to point to Scandinavia as a model. But Scandinavian social democrats learned to settle for dense social safety nets underwritten by remarkably free, capitalist economies. On the World Bank’s Ease of Doing Business scale, Denmark ranks third of 190 countries, Norway seventh and Sweden 12th.

Still other forms of socialism arose in the Third World. Encouraged by United Nations development experts, virtually all newly decolonized states adopted “African Socialism,” “Arab Socialism” or other variants. The result was years of economic stagnation until the successful models of East Asia began to reverse their thinking.

Successful socialism has been created in only one place on earth, the kibbutzim of Israel. They were democratic and egalitarian; sharing possessions, meals, even child rearing. But once the Jewish state was securely on its feet, kibbutzniks chose to switch to private enterprise. Socialism, they learned to their surprise, was not a happy way to live.

Socialism has failed everywhere it’s been tried—even where it succeeded. Surely today’s young people can create their own ideas and make their own mistakes rather than repeat those that darkened the times of their parents, grandparents and the generations before.

#### Socialism causes environmental deterioration, only capitalism can sustain a clean environment by making more with less

Regan 19 [Shawn Regan, 5-17-2019, "Socialism Is Bad for the Environment," https://www.perc.org/2019/05/17/socialism-is-bad-for-the-environment/,smarx, HHW]

How can this be? “Environmental deterioration was not supposed to occur under socialism,” Cuban-American researchers Sergio Díaz-Briquets and Jorge Pérez-López wrote in a detailed study of Cuba’s environmental legacy. “According to conventional Marxist-Leninist dogma, **environmental deterioration was precipitated by the logic of capitalism and its relentless pursuit of profits**.” Socialism, on the other hand, would avoid capitalism’s excesses. “Guided by ‘scientific’ principles, socialism’s goal was a classless and bountiful society,” they explained, “populated by men and women living in harmony with each other and the environment.”

But this was clearly not the case in the Soviet empire. Nor was it in Cuba, whose environmental record after decades of socialist control was described by Díaz-Briquets and Pérez-López as “far different from the utopian view.” The West, meanwhile, had not only the consumer goods that socialist societies lacked but **also a cleaner environment**.

One explanation for the disparity is that central planners, unlike markets, **grossly misallocate resources**, as a matter of routine. Energy prices, for example, were highly subsidized in the socialist economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. As a result, **industrial production was far more energy-intensive** throughout the socialist world than in Western European economies—five to ten times higher, according to one estimate—leading to more pollution. A 1992 World Bank study found that more than half of the air pollution in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe could be attributed to subsidized energy pricing during this period.

A related problem was the **fixation of socialist planners on heavy industry at the expense of the environment.** “The singular dominant fact of the Soviet economic strategy,” Jeffrey Sachs has noted, “was the subordination of all human and economic goals to the development of heavy industry.” Industrial pollution from factories in Eastern Europe was so bad that Time described it as the region “where the sky stays dark.” Acid rain in Krakow severely damaged the city’s historic structures and buildings, some of which required renovations, and even corroded the faces of many centuries-old statues.

Of course, industry behind the Iron Curtain was anything but efficient, and central planning caused **excessive use of natural resources**. A 1991 study by Mikhail Bernstam found that market economies used about one-third as much energy and steel per unit of GDP as did socialist countries. Likewise, Polish economist Tomasz Zylicz found that the non-market economies of Central and Eastern Europe required two to three times more inputs to produce a given output than did Western European economies. (The former Soviet world, as well as China, also emitted several times more carbon per unit of GDP than the United States did—a trend that continues today.) Simply put, **market economies make more with less and are therefore better for the environment.**

#### Environmental degradation under socialism is inevitable

Thomas DiLorenzo 22 [Thomas J., 7-1-2022, "Why Socialism Causes Pollution," No Publication, https://fee.org/articles/why-socialism-causes-pollution/, smarx, HHW]

The Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union there was a vast body of environmental law and regulation that purportedly protected the public interest, but these constraints have had no perceivable benefit. The Soviet Union, like all socialist countries, **suffered from a massive "tragedy of the commons**," to borrow the term used by biologist Garrett Hardin in his classic 1968 article. Where property is communally or governmentally owned and treated as a free resource, **resources will inevitably be overused** with little regard for future consequences.

The Soviet government’s imperatives for economic growth, combined with communal ownership of virtually all property and resources, caused **tremendous environmental damage**. According to economist Marshall Goldman, who studied and traveled extensively in the Soviet Union, "The attitude that nature is there to be exploited by man is the very essence of the Soviet production ethic."

A typical example of the environmental damage caused by the Soviet economic system is the exploitation of the Black Sea. To comply with five-year plans for housing and building construction, gravel, sand, and trees around the beaches were used for decades as construction materials. Because there is no private property, "no value is attached to the gravel along the seashore. Since, in effect, it is free, the contractors haul it away. This practice caused massive beach erosion which reduced the Black Sea coast by 50 percent between 1920 and 1960. Eventually, hotels, hospitals, and of all things, a military sanitarium collapsed into the sea as the shoreline gave way. Frequent landslides–as many as 300 per year–have been reported.

**Water pollution is catastrophic**. Effluent from a chemical plant killed almost all the fish in the Oka River in 1965, and similar fish kills have occurred in the Volga, Ob, Yenesei, Ural, and Northern Dvina rivers. Most Russian factories discharge their waste without cleaning it at all. Mines, oil wells, and ships freely dump waste and ballast into any available body of water, since it is all one big (and tragic) "commons."

Only six of the 20 main cities in Moldavia had a sewer system by the late 1960s, and only two of those cities made any effort to treat the sewage. Conditions are far more primitive in the countryside.

The Aral and Caspian seas have been gradually disappearing as large quantities of their water have been diverted for irrigation. And since untreated sewage flows into feeder rivers, they are **also heavily polluted.**

Some Soviet authorities expressed fears that by the turn of the century the Aral Sea will be nothing but a salt marsh. One paper reported that because of the rising salt content of the Aral the remaining fish will rapidly disappear. It was recently revealed that the **Aral Sea has shrunk by about a third**. Its shore line "is arid desert and the wind blows dry deposits of salt thousands of miles away. The **infant mortality rate [in that region] is four to five times the national average."**

The declining water level in the Caspian Sea has been catastrophic for its fish population as spawning areas have turned into dry land. The sturgeon population has been so decimated that the Soviets have experimented with producing artificial caviar. Hundreds of factories and refineries along the Caspian Sea dump **untreated waste into the sea**, and major **cities routinely dump raw sewage**. It has been estimated that one-half of all the discharged effluent is carried in the Volga River, which flows into the Caspian Sea. The concentration of oil in the Volga is so great that steamboats are equipped with signs forbidding passengers to toss cigarettes overboard. As might be expected, fish kills along the Volga are a "**common calamity**."

Lake Baikal, which is believed to be the oldest freshwater lake in the world, is also one of the largest and deepest. It is five times as deep as Lake Superior and contains twice the volume of water. According to Marshall Goldman, it was also "the best known example of the misuse of water resources in the USSR."

Factories and pulp mills have been dumping hundreds of millions of gallons of effluent into Lake Baikal each year for decades. As a result, animal life in the lake has been cut by more than 50 percent over the past half century. Untreated sewage is dumped into virtually all tributaries to the lake.

Islands of alkaline sewage have been observed floating on the lake, including one that was 18 miles long and three miles wide. These "islands" have **polluted the air around the lake as well as the water** in it. Thousands of acres of forest surrounding the lake have been denuded, causing such erosion that dust storms have been reported. So much forest land in the Lake Baikal region has been destroyed that some observers reported shifting sands that link up with the Gobi Desert; there are fears that the desert may sweep into Siberia and destroy the lake.

In other regions the fact that no compensation has to be paid for land that is flooded by water projects has made it easy for government engineers to submerge large areas of land. "As much land has been lost through flooding and salination as has been added through irrigation and drainage in the Soviet Union."

**These examples of environment degradation in the Soviet Union are not meant to be exhaustive but to illustrate the phenomenon of Communist pollution**. As Goldman has observed, the great pollution problems in Russia stem from the fact that the government determined that economic growth was to be pursued at any cost. "Government officials in the USSR generally have a greater willingness to sacrifice their environment than government officials in a society with private enterprise where there is a degree of public accountability. There is virtually a political as well as an economic imperative to devour idle resources in the USSR."

#### Alt fails – Capitalism is the only way to give power to the people

Redd No Date [Ivey Redd, "Capitalism, the Greatest Economic System Ever," yipinstitute, https://www.yipinstitute.com/articles/capitalism-the-greatest-economic-system-ever, SMarx, JTong]

The right to choose is one of the core characteristics of a free market economy. Within a free market, an individual has the freedom to choose what producer they will purchase a good or service from, who they will conduct business with, where to live, what to do with your career, etc. Individuals are able to freely choose how to go about their lives. This creates a vast and prosperous marketplace because many careers and skills are flowing in from all over the place. Consumers are able to choose who to buy from which forces the producer to create the best good or service possible.The state does not force its citizens to do anything, so capitalism allows individuals to participate in actions within the market based upon their own interests and beliefs. Why should the state choose how we live our lives or only allow us to consume state produced goods? The state should not do this because every person has different needs, wants, and goals. The freedom of choice allows us to buy what we want and what careers to pursue which brings out the best of individuals. The freedom of choice represents the right of the individual person to be themselves in relationships, to make their own decisions, to be free from the author­ity of others, and to be able to choose how they wish to use their services or property rather than others.

Shall We Not Forget

As many in history have experienced, capitalism is the ideal economic system for people around the world. Again, capitalism produces wealth and innovation, improves the lives of individuals, and gives power to the people. If it wasn’t for capitalism, you wouldn’t be able to read this article right now. Capitalism is and will always be better than socialism.

#### Alt solves poverty and climate – eco-socialism in China combined poverty alleviation with ecological development

Huan and Huan 2022 (Qingzhi Huan is professor of comparative politics at Peking University in China, Xincong Huan is a professor of comparative politics in Peking University, 4/12/22, A Frugal Eco-Innovation Policy? Ecological Poverty Alleviation in Contemporary China from a Perspective of Eco-Civilization Progress, <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/8/4570>, //JL)

Poverty relief or anti-poverty has been a long-term policy target of the CPC and government over the past decades [42,43]. After its reform and opening-up in 1978, China successfully organized and implemented a large-scale strategic action of development-oriented poverty alleviation, and the implementation of “the Seven-Year Program for Lifting 80 Million People out of Poverty (1994–2000)” marked the beginning of a crucial stage of China’s poverty alleviation efforts. Notably, this seven-year program described overcoming ecological imbalance as one of the main tasks in the process of poverty alleviation and proposed to “speed up re-vegetation, combat wind and desertification, reduce forest resource consumption and improve ecological environment” [44] (p. 783). Since the beginning of the 21st century, combining poverty alleviation and sustainable development gradually evolved as the guiding principle for China’s poverty alleviation and development. For example, “the Outline for China’s Rural Poverty Alleviation and Development (2001–2010)” issued by the State Council clearly expounded the policy measures of sustainable development in poverty alleviation and development. This program emphasizes that “all solutions to the poverty problem should be based on the principle that it is conducive to improving and protecting ecological environment and achieving sustainable development” [45] (p. 1880). Ten years later, the Central Committee of CPC and the State Council jointly released “the Outline for China’s Rural Poverty Alleviation and Development (2011–2020)”. This new program explicitly describes the improvement of the ecological environment as one of the main tasks in the new stage of poverty alleviation and development, requiring “to combine poverty alleviation and development with ecological restoration and environmental protection, give full play to the advantages of resources in poverty-stricken areas, develop environmentally friendly industries, enhance disaster prevention and reduction capabilities, promote a healthy and scientific lifestyle, and boost the coordination between economic development and population, resources and environment” [46] (pp. 357–358). Another milestone in the evolution of China’s poverty alleviation strategy is the 18th National Congress of the CPC in 2012. The ambitious national goal of “building a moderately prosperous society in all aspects” was approved at this congress, which includes several index requirements such as substantially reducing the impoverished population, achieving an overall improvement in the people’s living standards and enhancing the stability of ecosystems [26]. In 2013, Xi Jinping, the Secretary-General of the CPC, proposed his idea of “targeted poverty alleviation” for the first time, which emphasizes the importance of combining poverty alleviation, development and ecological environment protection. In 2015, he further elaborated a package plan of five-key-measures for poverty alleviation and development; “relocation” and “ecological compensation” are included, stressing that “We can explore a new path of ecological poverty alleviation by integrating environmental protection and governance with poverty alleviation” [47] (p. 65). Shortly after that, the Central Committee of the CPC and the State Council jointly issued “the Decision on Winning the Tough Battle against Poverty”, which prioritizes ecological protection in poverty alleviation and development and systematically expounds the policy requirements for realizing poverty alleviation through improving ecological environment protection [48]. In the working report to the 19th National Congress of CPC in 2017, “targeted poverty alleviation” was defined as one of “the three tough battles” to secure a decisive victory in finishing the building of a moderately prosperous society in all aspects [27] (pp.27–28). On this basis, at the beginning of 2018, the National Development and Reform Commission [49] together with five other ministries jointly formulated “the Work Plan for Ecological Poverty Alleviation”. This document highlights the notion of eco-civilization progress that “lucid waters and lush mountains are invaluable assets”, and enumerates manifold policy tasks and initiatives to increase farmers’ income and ecological progress such as implementing ecological conservation projects, ecological public-welfare compensation and ecological industries development, strengthening the coordination between poverty alleviation, ecological environment protection and the mutual promotion between poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Later that year, “the National Strategy for Revitalizing the Rural Areas (2018–2022)” was jointly issued by the Central Committee of the CPC and the State Council, calling for “fully implementing the national strategy of targeted poverty alleviation and building a new pattern of rural development in which man and nature coexist in harmony” [50] (p. 4). In short, after more than two decades, “ecological poverty alleviation” as a policy tool has gradually developed into an integral part of China’s national strategy of “targeted poverty alleviation” as well as a practical approach full of political imagination for advancing eco-civilization progress in the New Era.

#### Socialism guarantees government overreach and takes away human freedom

Edwards, 20, Lee Edwards, PhD author or editor of 25 books, 5/21/2020, “The Case for Capitalism”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/the-case-capitalism> - FT

Although a prosperous economy is good in itself, it is no less significant for its contribution to America’s first principle of ordered liberty. In the words of the cultural historian Russell Kirk, economic production (or capitalism) is the means “to raise man above the savage level, to make possible the leisure which sustains civilization and to free man from the condition of being a simple drudge.” Private ownership of property is not greed, Kirk argued, but “one of the most powerful instruments for teaching … responsibility.” The Nobel economists Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman both recognized that private property encourages wise decisions and requires individuals to accept the consequences of their choices. Capitalism puts a premium on industry, thrift, honesty, and ingenuity. It is not capitalism that is ruthless, wrote the economist John Attarian, but socialism, which makes a society ruthless by denying individuals the ability to make their own decisions and turning government into the master. Nowhere is the stark difference between socialism and capitalism more evident than in a photograph of the Korean peninsula at night. As Acton Institute president Robert Sirico, among others, [has pointed out](https://books.google.com/books?id=Sh9PUmSyStoC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false), South Korea (the lower half) is a glittering Christmas tree that offers a vision of what the world looks like under freedom. North Korea (the upper half) is a dark wilderness, suggesting what the world might look like were “the torch of human liberty to sputter out, casting civilization into darkness.”

#### Capitalism is the only system that works

Kim, 18, Anthony Kim, Anthony B. Kim researches international economic issues at The Heritage Foundation, with a focus on economic freedom and free trade, 8/22/2018, “Communicating Capitalism to the Next Generation”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/communicating-capitalism-the-next-generation> - FT

Indeed, history manifestly shows that neither socialism nor other alternative economic systems—and many have been tried—come close to the record of free-market capitalism in promoting peace and growth, as well as improving the overall human condition. We live in a golden age of [economic progress](https://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2017/book/chapter1.pdf). People today enjoy longer lives, significantly better health, and a level of living standards that would have been unimaginable just a few generations ago. Billions around the world have escaped poverty. Things that people [take for granted](https://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2018/book/foreword.pdf)—antibiotics, the iPhone, air travel—would have seemed like magic to our great-grandparents. Bono knows this as well as anyone. The lead singer for U2 has led poverty-fighting initiatives for decades, and in those efforts, he has come to a telling realization. In his [own words](https://nypost.com/2014/10/13/rock-star-capitalism/):

#### Capitalism and the free-market have created today’s prosperity

Kim, 18, Anthony Kim, Anthony B. Kim researches international economic issues at The Heritage Foundation, with a focus on economic freedom and free trade, 8/22/2018, “Communicating Capitalism to the Next Generation”, <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/commentary/communicating-capitalism-the-next-generation> - FT

He couldn’t be more right. Prosperity has not arisen from the beneficence of some good king or a benign technocracy of experts, let alone socialism. Rather, it is the result of the hard work and innovative entrepreneurship of those who have demanded and exercised the fundamental freedom to decide for themselves how to live their lives under free market capitalism. The free-market capitalist system, whose growth is so well documented in The Heritage Foundation’s [Index of Economic Freedom](http://www.heritage.org/index), has empowered countless individuals around the world by giving them more choices and opportunities. Reforms that enhance economic freedom have enabled hundreds of millions to escape poverty and countless others to enjoy levels of prosperity never before seen.

### 2AC -- AT: Democratic Socialism

#### Alt fails despite being democratic – even if it starts out democratic, communist parties don’t last that way

**Somin 17** (Ilya, 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", “Lessons from a century of communism”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/>, ML)

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 that plagues modern democracy.

### 2AC -- AT: Redistribution of Wealth

#### Alt fails – taking money away from the rich does nothing

Mccloskey 19 [Mccloskey, Deirdre Nansen, Distinguished Professor of Economics, History, English, and Communication at the University of Illinois, 2019, "Why Liberalism Works : How True Liberal Values Produce A Freer, More Equal, Prosperous World For All.," Yale University Press, SMarx, JTong]

What does not matter ethically are the routine historical ups and downs of the Gini coefficient, a measure of inequality, or the vulgar excesses of the 1 percent of the 1 percent, of a sort one could have seen on display three centuries ago in Versailles, or thirty centuries ago in Egypt. There are not enough really rich people to make expropriating them serve any purpose ex- cept stoking envy. If we seized all the assets of the eighty-five wealthiest people in the world to make a fund to give annually to the poorest half, it would raise their spending power by less than 10 cents a day. 3 The assets of the wealthiest eighty-five persons were reported in 2014 by Oxfam to total $1.7 trillion. (There is, by the way, something screwy about Oxfam’s number here, because the world’s interest-bearing assets are on the order of scores of trillions, and if including the assets of human capital, too, they are on the order of hundreds of trillions. But let’s go with Oxfam’s figure for the nonce.) If a fund of that size earned a robust 7 percent annual return, there would be $119 billion a year, which is only $326 million a day, to distribute among the poorest half, 3.6 billion people—or 9 cents per person. All the foreign aid to Africa or South and Central America, to give an- other example of how redistribution does not accomplish a great deal, is dwarfed by the amount that nations in such areas would gain if the people of Europe or the United States abandoned tariffs and other protections for their already rich agriculture.4 The way to help the poor, in short, is to let the Great Enrichment proceed by commercially tested betterment, as it has widely since 1800 and especially in the past forty years. Charity or expropriation is not efficacious, particularly considering that the charity in foreign aid or the ex- propriation by military coup has flowed into Swiss bank accounts, not into the subsistence of the poor. A high market price for the poor farmer, by con- trast, goes to his children. Commerce works better than theft.

### 2AC -- AT: Alternative Economic Systems

#### Capitalism is the only system that works – any other economic system is doomed to failure

Matt Barnes 14 [Matt Barnes, 8-26-2014, "Capitalism: The worst economic system, except for all the others," Pitt News, https://pittnews.com/article/5424/opinions/capitalism-the-worst-economic-system-except-for-all-the-others/, smarx, HHW]

As the new year begins, students will again be exposed to minds that assert the dangers and evils of capitalism. These thinkers have every right to put forth such beliefs — that is what America is all about. But be weary of such cynicism. Instead, try thinking of the world’s predominant economic system in both a personal and rational manner. Then you will **understand its true value.**

As an American, I am incredibly fortunate to live in a nation whose economic tradition centers around capitalism. It has made this nation prosperous and provided me with opportunities unrealized in centrally planned economies — a thriving free market in which I am free to use my earned money as I wish, enroll in the university I wish to attend and lead the life I wish to lead — unburdened by the dictates of inefficient and ineffective central planning. All of this stems from the economic freedom and choice that capitalism, not socialism or Marxism, provides.

In a speech on Nov. 11, 1947, Sir Winston Churchill reminded the UK’s House of Commons that “democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those others that have been tried.” In a similar fashion, **capitalism is the worst economic system, except for all the others**.

Capitalism is no different from anything else in this world. It is imperfect because imperfect men created it. Humans are not perfect, nor are they capable of perfection. Avarice and greed are not unique to capitalism. They were present in the USSR, and they will be present in any man-made system.

Since the fall of the Soviet Union, free market systems have been implemented in numerous former Soviet States. Perhaps nowhere better illustrates capitalism’s success in post-Iron Curtain Europe than in the country of Estonia.

On Oct. 21, 1992, Mart Laar became Prime Minister of the newly independent nation. He was only 32 years old. Upon entering office, Laar’s economic knowledge consisted of one book: 20th century free market economist Milton Friedman’s Free to Choose, a personal statement advocating for the **immense value of economic freedom.**

The young prime minister was so impressed that he implemented many of Friedman’s ideas, such as free markets and free trade. Rather than borrowing huge amounts of money from international institutions, Estonia sought to attract foreign investment. The most northern Baltic nation prioritized real, natural growth over shallow, artificial growth. Because of this, Estonia successfully transitioned from a poverty-stricken nation with a planned economy to a flourishing capitalist society. In fact, by the latter half of the 1990s, Estonia received more foreign investment per capita than any other central or eastern European country. Therefore, because of free markets and private investment — not central planning and public intervention — new workplaces formed, old factories were reconstructed and new knowledge and technology were acquired, making Estonia authentically modern and increasingly competitive.

In 1992, Estonia’s GDP per capita (in dollars) was $2,823. In only 20 years, GDP per capita increased dramatically, totaling $17,041 in 2012.

Leaving Estonia and entering China, one will find more corroboration for the case for economic freedom.

Globally, capitalism is responsible for lifting nearly one billion individuals out of poverty in the past 20 years alone. China is responsible for three-fourths of this achievement. Moreover, extreme poverty is disappearing. Between 1981 and 2010, China elevated 680 million people out of poverty and reduced its extreme poverty rate from 84 percent in 1980 to 10 percent today.

Like Estonia, China has experienced great economic liberalization leading to a vast influx of foreign investment — producing remarkable domestic growth and opportunity.

As evidently displayed in practice, nations that have focused on economic freedom, such as Estonia and China, have significantly grown and developed. Regimes that focus purely on abstract and utopian ideology, as those of Soviet Russia and Maoist China did, fail to provide true progress and sustainability.

As Friedman once said, “**A society that puts equality before freedom will get neither. A society that puts freedom before equality will get a high degree of both**.”

#### Capitalism is the only working system – no alternative

Lucy Turnbull 10 [Lucy Turnbull, 8-9-2010, "Capitalism is still the only system that works," Sydney Morning Herald, https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/capitalism-is-still-the-only-system-that-works-20100808-11q55.html, smarx, HHW]

The past three years have seen the most concerted questioning of the merits of capitalism since the Great Depression. The global financial crisis destroyed trillions of dollars of wealth and left taxpayers on the hook for vast losses accumulated by banks. In many countries, that debt will not be repaid for generations. The economic downturn left millions without work in North America and western Europe. Unemployment rates on both sides of the Atlantic remain near double digits.

Little wonder there has been a deluge of criticism of what came to be seen as the best way to organise an economy: the deregulated, open, privatised and market-focused approach that spread from English-speaking countries to much of the world after 1980.

The global financial crisis revealed deep flaws in our contemporary version of capitalism - in particular the instability and excesses it can generate. But nobody has proposed any credible alternative model of economic organisation. The huge public debt created by the global financial crisis will only be paid off when there has been enough private sector wealth created to pay the taxes to repay it.

While many called for changes to regulation, nobody argues the fundamentals of liberal capitalism - price signals, free exchange, open markets - be replaced with central planning or centralised resource allocation.

While some question the relative weight societies place on economic and non-economic objectives, nobody (other than the deepest-green greens) argues material prosperity doesn't matter. **Growth remains the best known remedy for poverty.**

And while many argued for governments to temporarily step in when private confidence and activity were weak, nobody can deny one lesson from the downturn is there are limits to what governments (and government borrowing) can achieve.

In the end, capitalism is the only viable system we have for organising our economy. It alone harnesses the reality of human nature - our continual striving for progress and our competitive instincts to do our best. It alone is compatible with political and democratic freedoms. And it alone has proven results - **advances in material wellbeing over sustained periods, lifting hundreds of millions of our fellow humans out of grinding poverty.**

Humans are curious, competitive and infinitely varied. The genius of capitalism is it disaggregates power and decision-making, allowing people to choose their own road. These different priorities, choices, ideas and values **allow humanity as a whole to progress.**

Adam Smith famously observed that unfettered individual self-interest was collectively beneficial: "**By pursuing his own interest, he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he intends to promote it."**

We need only think about how difficult it was for centrally planned economies such as the former Soviet Union before 1991 or China before 1978 (or Cuba to this day), to foster innovation and growth to understand the role of economic incentives and freedoms in progress.

### 2AC -- AT: Green Transition (resource)

#### The Green Transition is NOT sustainable - causes rising inequalities and geopolitical frictions

Adamantiadis ’22 [Christos; April 13; CEO of Marsh Middle East and Africa; Arabian Business, “A disorderly climate transition will exacerbate inequalities,” <https://www.arabianbusiness.com/opinion/a-disorderly-climate-transition-will-exacerbate-inequalities>] SPark

A green-energy transition is at the core of the net-zero agenda. Yet shifting away from carbon-intense industries, which currently employ millions of workers in developing economies and fill government coffers, can trigger economic volatility, deepen unemployment and increase societal and geopolitical tensions.

Inaction is also not an option: in the mid-to-long term, those same countries risk losing competitive advantage through a higher cost of carbon, reduced resilience, failure to keep up with technological innovation and limited leverage in trade agreements.

To complicate matters further, the hasty adoption of new environmental policies and technologies could have unintended consequences for nature and there are still many unknown risks from deploying untested biotechnical and geoengineering technologies.

Additionally, a lack of public support for land use transitions or new pricing schemes risks creating political complications that further slow action.

Geopolitical risks

These new uncertainties about achieving energy security and equity whilst transitioning to renewables represent a mounting risk of a disorderly climate transition, slowed by social, political and economic complexities.

It is an intricate set of dynamics that risks creating a kaleidoscope of energy-transition trajectories, each with different speeds and complications.

If there is a sustained lack of coordination between countries, we will likely see profound geopolitical implications, with rising friction between strong decarbonisation advocates and those who oppose quick, decisive action.

A transition that fails to account for societal implications may only exacerbate inequalities within and between countries, heightening geopolitical frictions. And the impact of geopolitical frictions is brought starkly into focus as the Russia-Ukraine conflict plays out.

### 2AC -- AT: Revolutions

#### There is no revolution

Han, 15, Byung-Chul Han, Korean-born German philosopher Byung-Chul Han teaches philosophy and cultural studies at Berlin's University of the Arts (UdK). His recent books include [The Expulsion of the Other](http://politybooks.com/bookdetail/?isbn=9781509523054), published in English by Polity in 2018, 10/23/2015, Why revolution is no longer possible <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/transformation/why-revolution-is-no-longer-possible/> - FT

In disciplinary and industrial society, system-preserving power was repressive. Factory workers were brutally exploited by factory owners. Such violent exploitation of others’ labor entailed acts of protest and resistance. There, it was possible for a revolution to topple the standing relations of production. In that system of repression, both the oppressors and the oppressed were visible. There was a concrete opponent — a visible enemy —and one could offer resistance. The neoliberal system of domination has a wholly different structure. Now, system-preserving power no longer works through repression, but through seduction — that is, it leads us astray. It is no longer visible, as was the case under the regime of discipline. Now, there is no longer a concrete opponent, no enemy suppressing freedom that one might resist. Neoliberalism turns the oppressed worker into a free contractor, an entrepreneur of the self. Today, everyone is a self-exploiting worker in their own enterprise. Every individual is master and slave in one. This also means that class struggle has become an internal struggle with oneself. Today, anyone who fails to succeed blames themselves and feels ashamed. People see themselves, not society, as the problem. The subjugated subject is not even aware of its subjugation Any disciplinary power that expends effort to force human beings into a straitjacket of commandments and prohibitions proves inefficient. It is significantly more efficient to ensure that people subordinate themselves to domination on their own. The efficacy defining the system today stems from the fact that, instead of operating through prohibition and privation, it aims to please and fulfill. Instead of making people compliant, it endeavors to make them dependent. This logic of neoliberal efficiency also holds for surveillance. In the 1980s, to cite one example, there were vehement protests against the German national census. Even schoolchildren took to the streets. From today’s perspective, the information requested therein— profession, education levels, and distance from the workplace — seem almost laughable. At the time, people believed that they were facing the state as an instance of domination wresting data from citizens against their will. That time is long past. Today, people expose themselves willingly. Precisely this sense of freedom is what makes protest impossible. In contrast to the days of the census, hardly anyone protests against surveillance. Free self-disclosure and self-exposure follow the same logic of efficiency as free self-exploitation. What is there to protest against? Oneself? Conceptual artist Jenny Holzer has formulated the paradox of the present situation: “Protect me from what I want.” It is important to distinguish between power that posits and power that preserves. Today, power that maintains the system assumes a “smart” and friendly guise. In so doing, it makes itself invisible and unassailable. The subjugated subject does not even recognize that it has been subjugated. The subject thinks she is free. This mode of domination neutralizes resistance quite effectively. Domination that represses and attacks freedom is not stable. The neoliberal regime proves stable by immunizing itself against all resistance, because it makes use of freedom instead of repressing it. Suppressing freedom quickly provokes resistance; exploiting freedom does not. After the Asian financial crisis, South Korea stood paralyzed and shocked. The IMF intervened and extended credit. In return, the government had to assert its neoliberal agenda by force. This was repressive, positing power — the kind that often proves violent and differs from system-preserving power, which manages to pass itself off as freedom. According to Naomi Klein, the state of social shock following catastrophes such as the financial crisis in South Korea — or the current crisis in Greece — offers the chance to radically reprogram society by force. Today, there is hardly any resistance in South Korea. Quite the opposite: a vast consensus prevails — as well as depression and burnout. South Korea now has the world’s highest suicide rate. People enact violence on themselves instead of seeking to change society. Aggression directed outward, which would entail revolution, has yielded to aggression directed inward, against oneself. Today, no collaborative, networked multitude exists that might rise up in a global mass of protest and revolution. Instead, the prevailing mode of production is based on lonesome and isolated self-entrepreneurs, who are also estranged from themselves. Companies used to compete with each other. Within each enterprise, however, solidarity could occur. Today, everyone is competing against everyone else — and within the same enterprise, too. Even though such competition heightens productivity by leaps and bounds, it destroys solidarity and communal spirit. No revolutionary mass can arise from exhausted, depressive, and isolated individuals. Neoliberalism cannot be explained in Marxist terms. The famous “alienation” of labor does not even occur. Today, we dive eagerly into work — until we burn out. The first stage of burnout syndrome, after all, is euphoria. Burnout and revolution are mutually exclusive. Accordingly, it is mistaken to believe that the Multitude will cast off the parasitic Empire to inaugurate a communist society.

#### Movements don’t lead to revolution – typically non-violent

**Tooze**, 20**21** (Adam, PhD, LPE@Columbia, Ecological Leninism Adam Tooze on Andreas Malm’s post-pandemic climate politics 11-18. [https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism ///](https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v43/n22/adam-tooze/ecological-leninism%20///) MF)

It is against the backdrop of this portrait of societies in deadlock that we should read Malm’s latest provocation, How to Blow up a Pipeline. Though the book makes a general argument for militant action it is best understood as an intervention at a specific conjuncture. The German movement Ende Gelände, whose protests Malm participated in, had remarkable success between 2015 and 2018 in mobilising direct action against Germany’s brown coal mines and smoke-belching power stations. But the movement suffered a serious setback when the Merkel government stitched up a deal with the coal industry and trade unions to delay the exit from coal until 2038, a ridiculous horizon entirely out of line even with the modest commitments of the Paris Agreement. This was a turning point for the climate movement in Germany.

The militant activists of Ende Gelände had been trained in the direct action techniques of the anti-nuclear movement, but now it was the mobilisation of schoolchildren, inspired by Greta Thunberg and Fridays for Future, that led the way. A school strike 1.4 million strong – the largest co-ordinated youth protest in history – took place on 15 March 2019. This was closely followed by a series of protests across the UK by Extinction Rebellion. By September 2019, the Friday strike movement numbered four million protesters worldwide, a third of them in Germany. But to the frustration of Malm and many in the Ende Gelände movement, Fridays for Future showed no interest in direct action. The protesting schoolchildren stuck to the tradition of noisy street demonstrations. In the UK, as Malm observes, XR followed recent mobilisations in the US by positioning itself against violent action.

The question that drives How to Blow up a Pipeline is why the new movements of protest in 2019, despite their scale and dynamism, refused to adopt the techniques of physical obstruction and disruption successfully modelled by Ende Gelände. Part of the answer is moral. The US movement, in particular, has imbibed a commitment to non-violent methods. Some argued that attacks on property would only produce a painful and repressive backlash, and indeed, this summer, Jessica Reznicek, who with Ruby Montoya mounted a sabotage campaign against the Dakota Access pipeline, was sentenced to eight years in federal prison. But, as Malm argues, these familiar tactical concerns have been reinforced in the current phase of the climate movement by a peculiar reading of history, in which the power of self-control and non-violence is fetishised. The new movements, he writes, look to ‘historical precedents – people winning against hopeless odds, great evil suddenly put to an end – that can break the hold of apathy’:

If they could prevail, the reasoning goes, so can we. If they changed the world by all means but violent ones, so we shall save it. Analogism has become a prime mode of argumentation and the main source of strategic thinking, most visibly in XR, the rare organisation that defines itself as a result of historical study. Note that the argument is not that violence would be bad at this particular moment – say, because the level of class struggle is so low in the global North that adventurist actions would only rebound and suppress it further: words that would never pass XR lips – nor that it might be expedient only under conditions of severe repression. Instead, analogist strategic pacifism holds that violence is bad in all settings, because this is what history shows. Success belongs to the peaceful. The roster of historical analogies begins with slavery.

#### “Revolutionary” ideas are misleading

Clive L **Spash**, 20**22** (Spash is in the Department of Socioeconomics at the Institute for the Multi-Level Governance & Development at WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna, Austria **“**Apologists for growth: passive revolutionaries in a passive revolution” Globalizations, Volume 18, Issue 7, pgs 1123-1148. 2018 https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.1080/14747731.2020.1824864///MF)

Popular authors and international organizations recommend transformation to a ‘new economy’. However, this is misleadingly interpreted as radical or revolutionary. Two problematic positions are revealed: being pro-growth while seeking to change the current form of capitalism (e.g. Ha-Joon Chang), and being anti-growth on environmental grounds but promoting growth for poverty alleviation and due to agnosticism about growth (e.g. Tim Jackson and Kate Raworth). Both positions involve contradictions and an evident failure to address, or perhaps even a denial of, the actual operations of capital accumulating economies. Thus, economists ostensibly critical of capitalism turn out to be apologists for growth who conform to the requirements of a top-down passive revolution, that leaves power relations undisturbed and the economic structure fundamentally unchanged. The growth economy is shown to include technocracy, productivism associated with eugenics, inequity disguised as meritocracy, competition concealing militarism and imperialism, imposition of development as progress, and financialization and commodification of Nature.

### 2AC -- AT: Eco-Socialism

#### Alt Fails - Kovel’s Model has many holes (Kovel)

Johns 2 [David Johns, School of Government, Portland State University, 2002, "Slaying the Growth Monster," Zed Books, <https://conbio.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01735.x>, SMarx, JTong]

Kovel de-votes one paragraph to human pop-ulation, and his discussion of the re-lationship of technology to hierarchyis extremely limited.Kovel does briefly look into deep time, but his command of the an-thropological literature is poorer than his command of the biological. His understanding of the origins ofhuman hierarchy is archaic andshows no familiarity with the enor-mous literature on the subject. His claim that we are innate gardenersalso is puzzling given horticulture’s relatively recent origin. For most ofour species’ history we have col-lected, gathered, and hunted.Finally, although Kovel speaks of the intrinsic value of nature, it is notat all clear what this means in the face of the priority he gives to the human need to engage nature bytransforming it ( production ). Heclaims for human nature what David Ehrenfeld ( 1978 ) describes as hubrisin the Arrogance of Humanism, a belief that our destiny is to managen ature and that we can manage it successfully. Many biologists ( and there are few of them in Kovel’s bibliography ) would challenge this belief on the evidence that humansmake poor ecosystem dominants.We cannot successfully manage na-ture because it is too complex tomodel adequately. That leaves aside the question of whether we possessthe requisite wisdom to do so. The historical and prehistorical record suggests that we do not. Kovel’secosocialism seems to have no placefor vast areas of self-willed land ( i.e.,wilderness ), something that manywide-ranging species and top preda-tors require for survival. And he sug-gests no criteria for resolving future conflicts between non-alienated hu-mans and the needs of other speciesfor survival.Despite Kovel’s criticism of thoseleftists who have tried to latch on to environmental and conservation is-sues in order to ride the wave of pub-lic interest and concern, seems to be in that tradi-tion. There is no doubt that Kovel isgenuine in his concern for nature,but he tries to fit ecological processesand problems into categories longused to describe human society.Conservation biology, with its fo-cus on direct protection as a re-sponse to the extinction emergency,often fails to look beyond immediate threats, despite an awareness thatthe threats to nature are not recentin origin or superficial in terms ofhuman predispositions. Conserva-tion biologists need to better under-stand the dynamics of human societ-ies and the ways in which these dynamics make direct protection possible or difficult in the near term and the long haul. Conservation is needed to better understand which ob-stacles to conservation are struc-tural, requiring systemic change, and which are matters of individual or group discretion. Kovel offers valuable insight into these matters.Without a good understanding of these issues, successful strategies can-not be crafted and alliances will not succeed. The results of failure are too terrible for most of us to contem-plate. Kovel’s analysis is one with which conservationists should be fa-miliar, and although his answers are wanting in many respects, he is ask-ing many of the right questions

### 2AC -- AT: Eco-Leninism

#### Alt fails – their author misquotes Lenin and replacement isn’t possible (Dean and Heron)

Woody 20 [Gus Woody, 12-18-2020, "Revolutionary Reflections," rs21, https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/, SMarx, JTong]

The diversity of perspectives on Lenin found among these authors necessarily poses a question – what exactly is ecological Leninism? By looking at each of their accounts, it becomes clear that each writer finds something different within the corpus of Leninism. Furthermore, there is much to still be developed if ecological Leninism is to grow into a distinct approach to planetary breakdown. Given the development of such a system of thought will require more than one author or piece, this article aims to reflect on several concerns which may become the bedrock of an ecological Leninism: the state, the party and movements, imperialism, and the philosophical underpinnings of Leninist materialism. The arrival of an ecological Leninism ultimately presents an opportunity to build on the analysis of ecological Marxists concerned with metabolisms and similar accounts of capitalism, and to concern ourselves with organising for revolutionary change.

The state of the party – Dean and Heron

Starting with Dean and Heron’s account, ecological Leninism is crucial to challenging dead ends in the environmental movement’s strategies. To do this, they attempt to disentangle the contradictions present within the variety of contemporary Green New Deal (GND) proposals. In general terms, these aim through state-led investment to repurpose national economies towards decarbonisation and redistributive policies. Surveying plans from either side of the Atlantic, Dean and Heron point out that many GNDs still refuse to nationalise the industries necessary for large-scale decarbonisation. Furthermore, they point out that many retain a nationalist politics of growth, focused on creating new industries which may provide opportunities for employment, ignoring the continued extraction from the global majority such proposals seem to require.

Many GND organisers recognise these contradictions but adopted an attitude of critical support, particularly while the Sanders and Corbyn movements were seeking election on GND platforms. Dean and Heron don’t advocate complete rejection, nor a falling in line with a social-democratic GND. Instead they argue we need to organise for revolutionary socialism whilst recognising the necessity of seizing control of the state for decarbonisation implicit within many left-wing GNDs. Or as they phrase it – ‘stripping the policy’s reformist content away from its revolutionary form.’ In their view, the GND’s image of the state being used to finally confront the global emissions crisis requires a revolutionary leap which takes it away from its often-limited policy content.

By thinking through these issues around the GND, Dean and Heron affirm the need for environmentalists to abandon ‘state phobia’ and seriously engage with the possibility of a ‘state-led, centrally planned, and global response’ to the climate crisis—the ‘old’ Leninist revolutionary seizure of state power. They end by arguing for the need to build a revolutionary Leninist party, which is willing to seize the state for the working class and to use this apparatus to tackle climate breakdown. For Dean and Heron then, ecological Leninism centres on party building and the seizure of the state.

There is much to disagree with in their interpretation. Most notably, in their argument for the importance of the state, they point to an extract where Lenin states the ‘apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed’, [4] using this to suggest the importance of seizing the state for a top down centralized response to climate change. As Gareth Dale has pointed out, their use of Lenin’s argument against wrecking the state is a serious misquoting. [5] If one reviews the quotation, the apparatus in question which Lenin is talking about is the particular ‘accounting apparatus’ in the form of the state bank and similar bodies. Despite the use of this quote to side-line wrecking, there is still the issue of smashing the rest of the state apparatus and its replacement. What is left underexplored in this article by Dean and Heron, though they certainly believe in it, is this difficult task of replacing the bourgeois state with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Herein we encounter a conundrum of ecological Leninism – how do we square the need for rapid changes to tackle climate change with the simultaneous need to smash the state and replace it with organs of workers’ control?

#### Alt fails – movements aren’t strong or sufficient (Malm)

Woody 20 [Gus Woody, 12-18-2020, "Revolutionary Reflections," rs21, https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/, SMarx, JTong]

War communism – Malm

This leads us to Malm, whose ecological Leninism is focused predominantly on the period of War Communism and the struggles of the early Bolshevik regime to establish itself. Rather than Roosevelt’s New Deal period in the 1930s, to which GND organisers look for historical analogy, Malm argues decarbonisation would look more akin to the War Communism of the 1920s. Here, the Bolsheviks were surrounded by both imperialist powers and the forces of capital, as well as considering how to transform production. Today, any attempt at staving off climate breakdown will require a fight against fossil capitalists and imperialist states keen to pollute, as well as the struggle to wrest control of production.

In Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency Malm identifies three principles of Ecological Leninism as a political project. Firstly, ‘turning the crisis of symptoms into a crisis of the causes.’ In simple terms, just as the Bolsheviks sought to turn the imperialist World War One into a crisis for capitalism more generally, today ecological Leninism requires turning the chronic emergencies of climate disaster and zoonotic diseases into a general crisis for the capitalist system. In the face of escalating symptoms, there is a need to rapidly build for a revolutionary preservation of life.

This leads to the second principle of ecological Leninism – ‘speed as paramount virtue.’ We all know the 12 years to avert climate catastrophe projection made by the IPCC 1.5 report two years ago. If the atmosphere is like a bathtub rapidly filling with carbon which will remain there unless removed, ecological Leninism understands the urgency of reducing and ultimately reaching negative emissions; it demands revolutionaries who understand every second counts in the fight against barbarism.

Finally, Malm argues that the last principle of ecological Leninism, in a similar vein to Dean and Heron, consists of leaping ‘at any opportunity to wrest the state in this direction’ and turn society away from catastrophe towards direct public control. Crucially, his vision of this is not in line with the more optimistic vision of progressive GND proposals, or ‘luxury Communisms’. Instead, the idea of War Communism, of the Bolshevik state attempting to lead a transformation of Russian society whilst facing war, famine, and fuel shortage, reflects the sort of dire circumstances that any ecological Leninist regime would face. Attempting to mitigate and adapt will not be pretty, it may bring emancipation but will be hard work in difficult conditions. Here, Malm’s argument resembles similar sentiments expressed by Salvage’s editorial collective:

The earth the wretched would – will – inherit, will be in need of an assiduous programme of restoration. While we may yearn for luxury, what will be necessary first is Salvage Communism. [6]

In this Communism, caught between salvage and war, Malm goes further than Dean and Heron. Where their arguments against state-phobia lead them towards the necessity of the state apparatus’ growth, Malm rejects the Leninist doctrine of demolishing and replacing the state altogether. In his words – ‘all we have to work with is the dreary bourgeois state, tethered to the circuits of capital as always.’

War Communism here shifts to a violent pessimism, where all we can do is mobilise a variety of strategies to cut these tethers. Malm seems deeply sceptical about the possibility of the formation of alternative institutions of dual power. Ecological Leninism, contra Dean and Heron, need not imply a party or ‘any actual Leninist formations capable of seizing power and implementing the correct measures.’ The possibility – the urgent necessity – of building such formations is not really discussed, despite the very same pages recognising that these years of chronic emergency ‘can be expected to usher in pronounced political volatility.’

Malm attempts to have his ‘Lenin cake’ and eat it: he argues ecological Leninism should raise the consciousness of spontaneous movements and route them towards the drivers of breakdown, whilst he avoids really discussing how to approach Leninist organisation and the formation of working class power to rival the state. Malm falls into the trap of creating a dichotomy between waiting for revolution and acting within existing social movements to pressure the bourgeoise state. The possibility of working class agency that bucks these two categories is foreclosed.

This points to an absence at the heart of Malm’s ecological Leninism. It is a Leninism without a revolution of 1917, focused instead on the difficulties of the Bolshevik government during the Civil War and on Lenin’s wagers during the First World War. It has little to say about the act of building movements capable of intervening in revolutionary situations, tipping them towards revolutionary outcomes. At the same time, as Tugal has eloquently pointed out, Malm’s ecological Leninism is without a revolutionary subject. [7] Rarely in his book does Malm speak of the role of working class struggle within any ecological Leninist project, and as a result he seems pessimistic about the formation of working class power which could rival the state, laying the bedrock for a Leninist project. As Max Ajl points out:

One thumbs in vain through this book for any mention of the people who are not hypothetical, who are struggling in small, desperate, sincere, and hopeful ways for a better world. On this big, beautiful, desperate, poor, devastated planet are there no social forces which meet Malm’s standards for the subject or agent of ecological revolution or ecological Leninism? [8]

Ultimately, if climate Leninists are to retain the desire to smash and replace the bourgeois state, there is a need to analyse how actually existing working class and peasant movements may organise to build the institutions necessary for a situation of dual power. The question is how to build these bodies whilst simultaneously mobilising for maximum climate action in the present. Malm’s otherwise engaging work requires these insights to flesh out a programme of ecological Leninism suitable for our times.

#### No one consensus on what ecological Leninism is

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

Given the necessity of systemic change in the face of climate breakdown, it was only a matter of time before thinkers would look to the Russian revolution for insights. Over the last year, ecological Leninism has burst onto the scene in the works of several authors. Andreas Malm’s latest book Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency focuses on the concept, [[1]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn1) Jodi Dean and Kai Heron have written of a ‘climate Leninism’, [[2]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn2) and Derek Wall has written of Lenin’s importance to environmental movements in his latest book, Climate Strike. [[3]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn3)

The diversity of perspectives on Lenin found among these authors necessarily poses a question – what exactly is ecological Leninism? By looking at each of their accounts, it becomes clear that each writer finds something different within the corpus of Leninism. Furthermore, there is much to still be developed if ecological Leninism is to grow into a distinct approach to planetary breakdown. Given the development of such a system of thought will require more than one author or piece, this article aims to reflect on several concerns which may become the bedrock of an ecological Leninism: the state, the party and movements, imperialism, and the philosophical underpinnings of Leninist materialism. The arrival of an ecological Leninism ultimately presents an opportunity to build on the analysis of ecological Marxists concerned with metabolisms and similar accounts of capitalism, and to concern ourselves with organising for revolutionary change.

The state of the party – Dean and Heron

Starting with Dean and Heron’s account, ecological Leninism is crucial to challenging dead ends in the environmental movement’s strategies. To do this, they attempt to disentangle the contradictions present within the variety of contemporary Green New Deal (GND) proposals. In general terms, these aim through state-led investment to repurpose national economies towards decarbonisation and redistributive policies.  Surveying plans from either side of the Atlantic, Dean and Heron point out that many GNDs still refuse to nationalise the industries necessary for large-scale decarbonisation. Furthermore, they point out that many retain a nationalist politics of growth, focused on creating new industries which may provide opportunities for employment, ignoring the continued extraction from the global majority such proposals seem to require.

Many GND organisers recognise these contradictions but adopted an attitude of critical support, particularly while the Sanders and Corbyn movements were seeking election on GND platforms. Dean and Heron don’t advocate complete rejection, nor a falling in line with a social-democratic GND. Instead they argue we need to organise for revolutionary socialism whilst recognising the necessity of seizing control of the state for decarbonisation implicit within many left-wing GNDs. Or as they phrase it – ‘stripping the policy’s reformist content away from its revolutionary form.’ In their view, the GND’s image of the state being used to finally confront the global emissions crisis requires a revolutionary leap which takes it away from its often-limited policy content.

By thinking through these issues around the GND, Dean and Heron affirm the need for environmentalists to abandon ‘state phobia’ and seriously engage with the possibility of a ‘state-led, centrally planned, and global response’ to the climate crisis—the ‘old’ Leninist revolutionary seizure of state power. They end by arguing for the need to build a revolutionary Leninist party, which is willing to seize the state for the working class and to use this apparatus to tackle climate breakdown. For Dean and Heron then, ecological Leninism centres on party building and the seizure of the state.

There is much to disagree with in their interpretation. Most notably, in their argument for the importance of the state, they point to an extract where Lenin states the ‘apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed’, [[4]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn4) using this to suggest the importance of seizing the state for a top down centralized response to climate change. As Gareth Dale has pointed out, their use of Lenin’s argument against wrecking the state is a serious misquoting. [[5]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn5) If one reviews the quotation, the apparatus in question which Lenin is talking about is the particular ‘accounting apparatus’ in the form of the state bank and similar bodies. Despite the use of this quote to side-line wrecking, there is still the issue of smashing the rest of the state apparatus and its replacement. What is left underexplored in this article by Dean and Heron, though they certainly believe in it, is this difficult task of replacing the bourgeois state with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Herein we encounter a conundrum of ecological Leninism – how do we square the need for rapid changes to tackle climate change with the simultaneous need to smash the state and replace it with organs of workers’ control?

War communism – Malm

This leads us to Malm, whose ecological Leninism is focused predominantly on the period of War Communism and the struggles of the early Bolshevik regime to establish itself. Rather than Roosevelt’s New Deal period in the 1930s, to which GND organisers look for historical analogy, Malm argues decarbonisation would look more akin to the War Communism of the 1920s. Here, the Bolsheviks were surrounded by both imperialist powers and the forces of capital, as well as considering how to transform production. Today, any attempt at staving off climate breakdown will require a fight against fossil capitalists and imperialist states keen to pollute, as well as the struggle to wrest control of production.

In Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency Malm identifies three principles of Ecological Leninism as a political project. Firstly, ‘turning the crisis of symptoms into a crisis of the causes.’ In simple terms, just as the Bolsheviks sought to turn the imperialist World War One into a crisis for capitalism more generally, today ecological Leninism requires turning the chronic emergencies of climate disaster and zoonotic diseases into a general crisis for the capitalist system. In the face of escalating symptoms, there is a need to rapidly build for a revolutionary preservation of life.

This leads to the second principle of ecological Leninism – ‘speed as paramount virtue.’ We all know the 12 years to avert climate catastrophe projection made by the IPCC 1.5 report two years ago. If the atmosphere is like a bathtub rapidly filling with carbon which will remain there unless removed, ecological Leninism understands the urgency of reducing and ultimately reaching negative emissions; it demands revolutionaries who understand every second counts in the fight against barbarism.

Finally, Malm argues that the last principle of ecological Leninism, in a similar vein to Dean and Heron, consists of leaping ‘at any opportunity to wrest the state in this direction’ and turn society away from catastrophe towards direct public control. Crucially, his vision of this is not in line with the more optimistic vision of progressive GND proposals, or ‘luxury Communisms’. Instead, the idea of War Communism, of the Bolshevik state attempting to lead a transformation of Russian society whilst facing war, famine, and fuel shortage, reflects the sort of dire circumstances that any ecological Leninist regime would face. Attempting to mitigate and adapt will not be pretty, it may bring emancipation but will be hard work in difficult conditions. Here, Malm’s argument resembles similar sentiments expressed by Salvage’s editorial collective:

The earth the wretched would – will – inherit, will be in need of an assiduous programme of restoration. While we may yearn for luxury, what will be necessary first is Salvage Communism. [[6]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn6)

In this Communism, caught between salvage and war, Malm goes further than Dean and Heron. Where their arguments against state-phobia lead them towards the necessity of the state apparatus’ growth, Malm rejects the Leninist doctrine of demolishing and replacing the state altogether. In his words – ‘all we have to work with is the dreary bourgeois state, tethered to the circuits of capital as always.’

War Communism here shifts to a violent pessimism, where all we can do is mobilise a variety of strategies to cut these tethers. Malm seems deeply sceptical about the possibility of the formation of alternative institutions of dual power. Ecological Leninism, contra Dean and Heron, need not imply a party or ‘any actual Leninist formations capable of seizing power and implementing the correct measures.’ The possibility – the urgent necessity – of building such formations is not really discussed, despite the very same pages recognising that these years of chronic emergency ‘can be expected to usher in pronounced political volatility.’

Malm attempts to have his ‘Lenin cake’ and eat it: he argues ecological Leninism should raise the consciousness of spontaneous movements and route them towards the drivers of breakdown, whilst he avoids really discussing how to approach Leninist organisation and the formation of working class power to rival the state. Malm falls into the trap of creating a dichotomy between waiting for revolution and acting within existing social movements to pressure the bourgeoise state. The possibility of working class agency that bucks these two categories is foreclosed.

This points to an absence at the heart of Malm’s ecological Leninism. It is a Leninism without a revolution of 1917, focused instead on the difficulties of the Bolshevik government during the Civil War and on Lenin’s wagers during the First World War. It has little to say about the act of building movements capable of intervening in revolutionary situations, tipping them towards revolutionary outcomes. At the same time, as Tugal has eloquently pointed out, Malm’s ecological Leninism is without a revolutionary subject. [[7]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn7) Rarely in his book does Malm speak of the role of working class struggle within any ecological Leninist project, and as a result he seems pessimistic about the formation of working class power which could rival the state, laying the bedrock for a Leninist project. As Max Ajl points out:

One thumbs in vain through this book for any mention of the people who are not hypothetical, who are struggling in small, desperate, sincere, and hopeful ways for a better world. On this big, beautiful, desperate, poor, devastated planet are there no social forces which meet Malm’s standards for the subject or agent of ecological revolution or ecological Leninism? [[8]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn8)

Ultimately, if climate Leninists are to retain the desire to smash and replace the bourgeois state, there is a need to analyse how actually existing working class and peasant movements may organise to build the institutions necessary for a situation of dual power. The question is how to build these bodies whilst simultaneously mobilising for maximum climate action in the present. Malm’s otherwise engaging work requires these insights to flesh out a programme of ecological Leninism suitable for our times.

Building the base – Wall

Wall’s writings on Lenin and the environmental movement might be seen as filling this gap in Malm’s work. In his recent Climate Strike and in other writings, Leninist strategic thinking is central. [[9]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn9) In particular, the necessity of building bases of working class power, seen as essential preconditions of dual power. Wall’s is a practical account of Lenin; it looks to the ways in which Leninist thinking suggest revolutionaries should organise in the here and now.

In Climate Strike, Wall argues for a focus on building grassroots institutions that enable working class communities to come together – tenants unions, local food sovereignty groups, and more. Contra Dean and Heron’s need for a party, contra Malm’s need for speed, Wall argues for the slow construction of spaces of working class power. There are no shortcuts to revolution, and Wall argues this to its limit.

Wall’s ecological Leninism is focused on creating collectives able to oppose capitalism and the state, as well as adapt to climate change’s effects. Let us take tenants organising as an example of this ‘base-building.’ By organising renters, it creates a new formation of working class power capable of resisting landlords as well as producing a core of individuals who have grown in both militancy and organising skill. As these institutions grow, not only do they hopefully build a base of working class revolutionaries, but they create spaces where the working class can come together to discuss how climate change and capitalism effects their housing. The ideal situation is that through the long work of building these institutions it lays the bedrock of working class alternates to the state necessary for the Leninist project. Wall thus rejects the binary between revolution today or popular pressure on reformist institutions, arguing for the constant need to build for revolution.

There is still much work to be done on this particular aspect of ecological Leninism, not least because Wall often insists on applying it with the Green Party in view, despite the class composition of its supporters and its refusal to identify working class self-activity as the vehicle of revolutionary change. Furthermore, as Holmes has argued, Wall fails to specify the context under which this strategy could be adopted. This results in an elasticity to the concept of base-building, which allows it to become a hold-all term for any form of community organising.

Whilst Wall has a slower conception of ecological Leninism, focused on the hard slog of organising, it doesn’t entirely repudiate the need for urgent action, which requires more specificity around the practicalities of building for dual power over the coming years. A strategy geared to base-building risks becoming a new form of economism, as Lenin might have put it. There is a balance that must be struck, but Wall’s intervention is crucial in pointing to the dearth of institutions here in the UK at least which could be considered bases of working class power.

Three shades of Ecological Leninism

Each of these authors reads Lenin in different ways. Dean and Heron emphasise the party and state, Malm for speed and struggle under conditions of hardship, Wall for constant strategic organising. Each has shortcomings, but all are contributing to a useful development of—or rupture in—ecological theory and practice.

How should we reconsider Lenin’s corpus in these bad times? Just as John Bellamy Foster and others have excavated the concept of the metabolic rift from Marx, [[10]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn10) is there a conceptual well to be found untapped in Lenin? I think not. It is not enough to find some kernel of an ecological worldview in Lenin, as much as his devotees love to talk of his reverence for nature. [[11]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn11) If Leninism is an attempt to put theory into practice, the same must apply to its ecological variant. Ecological Leninism must be more than a theoretical extension of ecological Marxism, it must indicate the practices which a revolutionary eco-socialist movement are to adopt. Crucially, it also requires getting involved in actually existing movements, as there is no such thing as armchair Leninism.

To kick the glass case off Lenin’s corpse, dust him off, and dip him in green paint is hardly enough. If we are to not only build Leninism, but an ecological programme aimed at tackling the climate crisis, a synthesis must be achieved between Lenin’s thought and other relevant thinkers on Marxism and ecology. The pieces I’ve discussed above leave open the construction of many aspects of such a programme. Malm, Dean and Heron, and Wall have opened the space by which we may move towards it.

To begin developing a wider conception of ecological Leninism, to build on the excellent interventions of these authors, I wish to suggest several areas of Lenin’s thought which might be worth reinterrogating with an ecological view – the state, the relationship between movement, workers, and party, the centrality of imperialism, and finally wider concerns for the philosophy of nature and science. The elaboration and development of Marxist ecology in these areas may provide the bedrock for a revolutionary ecosocialist movement, and it should certainly not be left to one writer. As a result, the following is an attempt to indicate potential directions of travel that will build on Malm, Dean and Heron, and Wall, and hopefully furnish our society with something that can face the coming crisis.

#### Ecological Leninism can’t solve for climate change

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

Given the necessity of systemic change in the face of climate breakdown, it was only a matter of time before thinkers would look to the Russian revolution for insights. Over the last year, ecological Leninism has burst onto the scene in the works of several authors. Andreas Malm’s latest book Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency focuses on the concept, [[1]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn1) Jodi Dean and Kai Heron have written of a ‘climate Leninism’, [[2]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn2) and Derek Wall has written of Lenin’s importance to environmental movements in his latest book, Climate Strike. [[3]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn3)

The diversity of perspectives on Lenin found among these authors necessarily poses a question – what exactly is ecological Leninism? By looking at each of their accounts, it becomes clear that each writer finds something different within the corpus of Leninism. Furthermore, there is much to still be developed if ecological Leninism is to grow into a distinct approach to planetary breakdown. Given the development of such a system of thought will require more than one author or piece, this article aims to reflect on several concerns which may become the bedrock of an ecological Leninism: the state, the party and movements, imperialism, and the philosophical underpinnings of Leninist materialism. The arrival of an ecological Leninism ultimately presents an opportunity to build on the analysis of ecological Marxists concerned with metabolisms and similar accounts of capitalism, and to concern ourselves with organising for revolutionary change.

The state of the party – Dean and Heron

Starting with Dean and Heron’s account, ecological Leninism is crucial to challenging dead ends in the environmental movement’s strategies. To do this, they attempt to disentangle the contradictions present within the variety of contemporary Green New Deal (GND) proposals. In general terms, these aim through state-led investment to repurpose national economies towards decarbonisation and redistributive policies.  Surveying plans from either side of the Atlantic, Dean and Heron point out that many GNDs still refuse to nationalise the industries necessary for large-scale decarbonisation. Furthermore, they point out that many retain a nationalist politics of growth, focused on creating new industries which may provide opportunities for employment, ignoring the continued extraction from the global majority such proposals seem to require.

Many GND organisers recognise these contradictions but adopted an attitude of critical support, particularly while the Sanders and Corbyn movements were seeking election on GND platforms. Dean and Heron don’t advocate complete rejection, nor a falling in line with a social-democratic GND. Instead they argue we need to organise for revolutionary socialism whilst recognising the necessity of seizing control of the state for decarbonisation implicit within many left-wing GNDs. Or as they phrase it – ‘stripping the policy’s reformist content away from its revolutionary form.’ In their view, the GND’s image of the state being used to finally confront the global emissions crisis requires a revolutionary leap which takes it away from its often-limited policy content.

By thinking through these issues around the GND, Dean and Heron affirm the need for environmentalists to abandon ‘state phobia’ and seriously engage with the possibility of a ‘state-led, centrally planned, and global response’ to the climate crisis—the ‘old’ Leninist revolutionary seizure of state power. They end by arguing for the need to build a revolutionary Leninist party, which is willing to seize the state for the working class and to use this apparatus to tackle climate breakdown. For Dean and Heron then, ecological Leninism centres on party building and the seizure of the state.

There is much to disagree with in their interpretation. Most notably, in their argument for the importance of the state, they point to an extract where Lenin states the ‘apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed’, [[4]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn4) using this to suggest the importance of seizing the state for a top down centralized response to climate change. As Gareth Dale has pointed out, their use of Lenin’s argument against wrecking the state is a serious misquoting. [[5]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn5) If one reviews the quotation, the apparatus in question which Lenin is talking about is the particular ‘accounting apparatus’ in the form of the state bank and similar bodies. Despite the use of this quote to side-line wrecking, there is still the issue of smashing the rest of the state apparatus and its replacement. What is left underexplored in this article by Dean and Heron, though they certainly believe in it, is this difficult task of replacing the bourgeois state with the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Herein we encounter a conundrum of ecological Leninism – how do we square the need for rapid changes to tackle climate change with the simultaneous need to smash the state and replace it with organs of workers’ control?

War communism – Malm

This leads us to Malm, whose ecological Leninism is focused predominantly on the period of War Communism and the struggles of the early Bolshevik regime to establish itself. Rather than Roosevelt’s New Deal period in the 1930s, to which GND organisers look for historical analogy, Malm argues decarbonisation would look more akin to the War Communism of the 1920s. Here, the Bolsheviks were surrounded by both imperialist powers and the forces of capital, as well as considering how to transform production. Today, any attempt at staving off climate breakdown will require a fight against fossil capitalists and imperialist states keen to pollute, as well as the struggle to wrest control of production.

In Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency Malm identifies three principles of Ecological Leninism as a political project. Firstly, ‘turning the crisis of symptoms into a crisis of the causes.’ In simple terms, just as the Bolsheviks sought to turn the imperialist World War One into a crisis for capitalism more generally, today ecological Leninism requires turning the chronic emergencies of climate disaster and zoonotic diseases into a general crisis for the capitalist system. In the face of escalating symptoms, there is a need to rapidly build for a revolutionary preservation of life.

This leads to the second principle of ecological Leninism – ‘speed as paramount virtue.’ We all know the 12 years to avert climate catastrophe projection made by the IPCC 1.5 report two years ago. If the atmosphere is like a bathtub rapidly filling with carbon which will remain there unless removed, ecological Leninism understands the urgency of reducing and ultimately reaching negative emissions; it demands revolutionaries who understand every second counts in the fight against barbarism.

Finally, Malm argues that the last principle of ecological Leninism, in a similar vein to Dean and Heron, consists of leaping ‘at any opportunity to wrest the state in this direction’ and turn society away from catastrophe towards direct public control. Crucially, his vision of this is not in line with the more optimistic vision of progressive GND proposals, or ‘luxury Communisms’. Instead, the idea of War Communism, of the Bolshevik state attempting to lead a transformation of Russian society whilst facing war, famine, and fuel shortage, reflects the sort of dire circumstances that any ecological Leninist regime would face. Attempting to mitigate and adapt will not be pretty, it may bring emancipation but will be hard work in difficult conditions. Here, Malm’s argument resembles similar sentiments expressed by Salvage’s editorial collective:

The earth the wretched would – will – inherit, will be in need of an assiduous programme of restoration. While we may yearn for luxury, what will be necessary first is Salvage Communism. [[6]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn6)

In this Communism, caught between salvage and war, Malm goes further than Dean and Heron. Where their arguments against state-phobia lead them towards the necessity of the state apparatus’ growth, Malm rejects the Leninist doctrine of demolishing and replacing the state altogether. In his words – ‘all we have to work with is the dreary bourgeois state, tethered to the circuits of capital as always.’

War Communism here shifts to a violent pessimism, where all we can do is mobilise a variety of strategies to cut these tethers. Malm seems deeply sceptical about the possibility of the formation of alternative institutions of dual power. Ecological Leninism, contra Dean and Heron, need not imply a party or ‘any actual Leninist formations capable of seizing power and implementing the correct measures.’ The possibility – the urgent necessity – of building such formations is not really discussed, despite the very same pages recognising that these years of chronic emergency ‘can be expected to usher in pronounced political volatility.’

Malm attempts to have his ‘Lenin cake’ and eat it: he argues ecological Leninism should raise the consciousness of spontaneous movements and route them towards the drivers of breakdown, whilst he avoids really discussing how to approach Leninist organisation and the formation of working class power to rival the state. Malm falls into the trap of creating a dichotomy between waiting for revolution and acting within existing social movements to pressure the bourgeoise state. The possibility of working class agency that bucks these two categories is foreclosed.

This points to an absence at the heart of Malm’s ecological Leninism. It is a Leninism without a revolution of 1917, focused instead on the difficulties of the Bolshevik government during the Civil War and on Lenin’s wagers during the First World War. It has little to say about the act of building movements capable of intervening in revolutionary situations, tipping them towards revolutionary outcomes. At the same time, as Tugal has eloquently pointed out, Malm’s ecological Leninism is without a revolutionary subject. [[7]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn7) Rarely in his book does Malm speak of the role of working class struggle within any ecological Leninist project, and as a result he seems pessimistic about the formation of working class power which could rival the state, laying the bedrock for a Leninist project. As Max Ajl points out:

One thumbs in vain through this book for any mention of the people who are not hypothetical, who are struggling in small, desperate, sincere, and hopeful ways for a better world. On this big, beautiful, desperate, poor, devastated planet are there no social forces which meet Malm’s standards for the subject or agent of ecological revolution or ecological Leninism? [[8]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn8)

Ultimately, if climate Leninists are to retain the desire to smash and replace the bourgeois state, there is a need to analyse how actually existing working class and peasant movements may organise to build the institutions necessary for a situation of dual power. The question is how to build these bodies whilst simultaneously mobilising for maximum climate action in the present. Malm’s otherwise engaging work requires these insights to flesh out a programme of ecological Leninism suitable for our times.

Building the base – Wall

Wall’s writings on Lenin and the environmental movement might be seen as filling this gap in Malm’s work. In his recent Climate Strike and in other writings, Leninist strategic thinking is central. [[9]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn9) In particular, the necessity of building bases of working class power, seen as essential preconditions of dual power. Wall’s is a practical account of Lenin; it looks to the ways in which Leninist thinking suggest revolutionaries should organise in the here and now.

In Climate Strike, Wall argues for a focus on building grassroots institutions that enable working class communities to come together – tenants unions, local food sovereignty groups, and more. Contra Dean and Heron’s need for a party, contra Malm’s need for speed, Wall argues for the slow construction of spaces of working class power. There are no shortcuts to revolution, and Wall argues this to its limit.

Wall’s ecological Leninism is focused on creating collectives able to oppose capitalism and the state, as well as adapt to climate change’s effects. Let us take tenants organising as an example of this ‘base-building.’ By organising renters, it creates a new formation of working class power capable of resisting landlords as well as producing a core of individuals who have grown in both militancy and organising skill. As these institutions grow, not only do they hopefully build a base of working class revolutionaries, but they create spaces where the working class can come together to discuss how climate change and capitalism effects their housing. The ideal situation is that through the long work of building these institutions it lays the bedrock of working class alternates to the state necessary for the Leninist project. Wall thus rejects the binary between revolution today or popular pressure on reformist institutions, arguing for the constant need to build for revolution.

There is still much work to be done on this particular aspect of ecological Leninism, not least because Wall often insists on applying it with the Green Party in view, despite the class composition of its supporters and its refusal to identify working class self-activity as the vehicle of revolutionary change. Furthermore, as Holmes has argued, Wall fails to specify the context under which this strategy could be adopted. This results in an elasticity to the concept of base-building, which allows it to become a hold-all term for any form of community organising.

Whilst Wall has a slower conception of ecological Leninism, focused on the hard slog of organising, it doesn’t entirely repudiate the need for urgent action, which requires more specificity around the practicalities of building for dual power over the coming years. A strategy geared to base-building risks becoming a new form of economism, as Lenin might have put it. There is a balance that must be struck, but Wall’s intervention is crucial in pointing to the dearth of institutions here in the UK at least which could be considered bases of working class power.

Three shades of Ecological Leninism

Each of these authors reads Lenin in different ways. Dean and Heron emphasise the party and state, Malm for speed and struggle under conditions of hardship, Wall for constant strategic organising. Each has shortcomings, but all are contributing to a useful development of—or rupture in—ecological theory and practice.

How should we reconsider Lenin’s corpus in these bad times? Just as John Bellamy Foster and others have excavated the concept of the metabolic rift from Marx, [[10]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn10) is there a conceptual well to be found untapped in Lenin? I think not. It is not enough to find some kernel of an ecological worldview in Lenin, as much as his devotees love to talk of his reverence for nature. [[11]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn11) If Leninism is an attempt to put theory into practice, the same must apply to its ecological variant. Ecological Leninism must be more than a theoretical extension of ecological Marxism, it must indicate the practices which a revolutionary eco-socialist movement are to adopt. Crucially, it also requires getting involved in actually existing movements, as there is no such thing as armchair Leninism.

To kick the glass case off Lenin’s corpse, dust him off, and dip him in green paint is hardly enough. If we are to not only build Leninism, but an ecological programme aimed at tackling the climate crisis, a synthesis must be achieved between Lenin’s thought and other relevant thinkers on Marxism and ecology. The pieces I’ve discussed above leave open the construction of many aspects of such a programme. Malm, Dean and Heron, and Wall have opened the space by which we may move towards it.

To begin developing a wider conception of ecological Leninism, to build on the excellent interventions of these authors, I wish to suggest several areas of Lenin’s thought which might be worth reinterrogating with an ecological view – the state, the relationship between movement, workers, and party, the centrality of imperialism, and finally wider concerns for the philosophy of nature and science. The elaboration and development of Marxist ecology in these areas may provide the bedrock for a revolutionary ecosocialist movement, and it should certainly not be left to one writer. As a result, the following is an attempt to indicate potential directions of travel that will build on Malm, Dean and Heron, and Wall, and hopefully furnish our society with something that can face the coming crisis.

### 1AR --AT: Eco-Leninism

#### State backlash

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

1: The State

A century on from The State and Revolution, the capitalist state which Lenin spoke of is different in many ways. [[12]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn12) Over the 20th century, countries like the UK saw a massive rise in state ownership and the provision of services like the NHS. Conversely, since the 1970s many nations have seen a continued rise in privatisation, with ‘public-private partnerships’ between business and the state reaching their sickly zenith in the UK, with the cronyism of key coronavirus contracts outsourced to the friends and family of Conservative MPs. Furthermore, the rise of global supply chains and new international bodies for capitalist states to interact has created a world where states are increasingly entangled and co-dependent, creating challenges for any revolutionary theory which aims for global impact. [[13]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn13) There is therefore an urgent need to analyse the class nature of modern capitalist states and identify where and how the revolutionary working class are best to organise against it.

Luckily, Marxist theorising around the state has not stayed still since Lenin’s day. There has been Althusser, [[14]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn14) Gramsci, [[15]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn15) and the Miliband-Poulantzas debate about the class character of the state, [[16]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn16) as well as the emergence of Open Marxist approaches. [[17]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn17) As a result, in the words of Khachaturian, ‘Marxist state theory is largely an open-ended and intellectually pluralistic research framework.’ [[18]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn18) Whilst I do not intend to comment on these different theories, I wish to point to certain considerations which suggest the urgency of an ecological Leninist theory of the state.

Firstly, the point pushed by both GND proponents and the ecological Leninist authors already discussed – the state apparatus has significant potential to be used as an instrument for rapid decarbonisation.

However, and this is where previous accounts still have direction to travel, there is the importance of understanding the state as a product of irreconcilable class antagonism. With Dean and Heron’s article not exploring the need to wreck the state, and Malm rejecting it outright, the question of what form proletarian control takes is crucial. Ecological Leninism requires focus on the transitional stage – the dictatorship of the proletariat, which as Lenin stated, ‘will create democracy for the people, for the majority, along with the necessary suppression of the minority.’

In the period of rapid decarbonisation which ecological Leninism aims to deliver, there is the twofold problem of creating worker control over society as well as the difficulty of ensuring the forces of fossil capital cannot exert influence. On the first, expanding proletarian democracy, there is much the Leninist tradition must learn from the Bolshevik experiment and the ways in which traditions of worker control like council communism have been critical of it. This is a valuable endeavour if used to move environmentalism away from the liberal conception of ‘climate assemblies’ towards climate councils and soviets of workers. Herein is why Wall and other Marxists’ work on base-building is crucial, as those who seriously talk about building institutions of worker control. Ultimately, ecological Leninism means learning from the failure of previous revolutions in creating institutions capable of wresting responsibility from the bourgeois state and dismantling it through practical and theoretical explanations of contemporary struggles where we see worker control emerging.

On the second issue of suppression, socialists must recognise that if a revolutionary movement seized state power, without continued international mobilisations, any decarbonisation effort will face new enemies of global capitalism – the IMF, the World Bank, etc. Studying how these institutions have been mobilised against socialist and social democratic states is crucial, as in addition to imperialist armies and governments, these bodies will attack any ecological Leninist regime. International eco-socialist solidarity is crucial, as repression from the enemies of a revolutionary eco-socialism risks making an ecological Leninist regime an island in a hostile sea. In this situation, the need for stability in the transitional period may lead Leninists to not only suppress their exploiters, but also any left-wing element which demands more from the regime, becoming a snake eating its own tail. In short, how to prevent violent autarky whilst regimes build for global eco-socialist revolution is a pressing issue.

Ultimately, the importance of an ecological Leninist understanding of the state will be to effectively draw a line between revolutionary socialists and compromise elements within the wider environmental movement who need to be won over to the revolutionary cause.[[19]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn19) In the UK and the US, the past years have seen left environmentalists compromise with movements pursuing election to state power in the hope of action on the climate crisis. The failure of these movements indicates the foreclosure of the electoral route to climate action within bourgeoise state institutions, this demands a reckoning with the class character of the state. Given the need for Malm’s speed as a paramount virtue, Leninists must build on these experiences to begin elaborating their own programme’s confrontation with the beast that is the state apparatus.

#### Divisions within the party

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

This points to a further urgent issue when moving towards an ecological Leninism, one that the preceding authors vary on– the organisation of revolutionary socialists and its relationships with mass movements. In particular, the ecological Leninists are split on the question of the party. Dean and Heron are open in their desire for an ecological Leninist party, Malm reads ecological Leninism as a collection of principles not implying an actually existing party, Wall is focused on the need for grassroots organising rather than any formal party. This reflects a wider crisis among revolutionary socialists, one that has extended through the long 20th century into the 21st, that of the ‘Leninist party’ and the different organisational models proposed for revolutionaries.

Outside of Dean and Heron’s calls for a party, both Wall’s Climate Strike and Malm’s upcoming How to Blow up a Pipeline focus on engaging with the variety of strategies environmentalists can take to disrupt fossil capital. Whilst both are certain to be crucial contributions, just as Lenin railed against the economist and terrorist strategies of simply organising around workplace conflicts or conducting isolated violent actions, there is still the tricky problem of creating an organisational form with the strategic acumen to transcend the limits of both.

Contra Malm, who in Chronic Emergency talks of ‘popular pressure brought to bear’ on the state, there is a need to think through how this ‘popular pressure’ is not co-opted by opportunist forces and remains revolutionary, international, and eco-socialist in its content and form. Just as Lenin in What is to be Done? points to the need for Marxists to organise to ensure that economic struggle is not seen as subservient for the need to organise and agitate for revolutionary socialism, today simply hoping for rising radicalism from ecological struggle is insufficient. Only through attempts to agitate and organise as a body of revolutionary socialists can these struggles be converted into a confrontation with fossil capital. But if we reject the reading of Lenin as party builder, as many contemporary eco-socialists do, where does this leave us?

Here, there is an urgent need for ecological Leninists to critically engage with the organisational failures of the groups that have adopted the Bolshevik banner in the long century since 1917. With a century where the centralist aspects of democratic centralism have been all too brutally wielded, now more than ever is a time for the comradely but disciplined development of revolutionary socialist organisation. Or in the words of Gittlitz, reflecting on the strange case of the Posadist International:

The challenge, then, is neither to recreate the revolutionary movements of the past, nor to totally revise their history, but to salvage the functional truth of their mission for the struggle ahead. [[20]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn20)

It would be remiss of any ecological socialist to ignore the pioneering work of early anti-capitalist environmentalists like Bookchin, whose social ecology was deeply critical of Leninist, Trotskyist and other socialist party formations as they emerged in the US. [[21]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn21) Bookchin of course, was just as comfortable critiquing anarchist organisational forms, attempting to steer a course between Marxism and Anarchism. Just as the Paris Commune was instructive to Marx and Lenin, modern ecological Leninists should consider the organisation of the revolution and state in Rojava, inspired by Bookchin and Ocalan. [[22]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn22) Rojava contains within it lessons on striking a balance between the need for direct democracy and having a disciplined cadre, pointing to the many ways in which these needs are not necessarily contradictory. This is just one of many ‘ecological regimes’ which are attempting to grow today, and they should be used to inspire and develop contemporary Leninism.

Given the often-rapid nature of rebellion and wider social change, the difficulty of how any Leninist organisation relates itself to the spontaneous actions of the working class and other social formations rears its head. What has prevented analysis of this question in many quarters is the wider tendency of environmentalists being uncomfortable using class analysis in proposing key agents for a revolutionary movement. One of the first eco-socialist thinkers, Andre Gorz, famously said Farewell to the Working Class, as did Bookchin in his own way in Listen Marxist! [[23]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn23) This reflected the reality that the ‘industrial working class’, a stereotypical creation of both left and right, has fractured and reformed in the increasingly global economy.

Yet recognising that the working class and peasants of 1917 are different from the working class and peasants of 2020 should not cow Leninists, it should inspire the further development of Marxist thought and our programme. Today we have traditions of racial capitalism, social reproduction theory and more to explain and identify revolutionary potential across the global working class. With this come new spaces to intervene, agitate, and form solidarity to organise a global revolutionary movement. Ecological struggle provides an opportunity to reformulate alliances between peasants, workers, land defenders, students and others exploited peoples, creating new avenues to analyse and shift the balance of class forces necessary for a revolutionary situation.

We see glimpses of this in what Naomi Klein calls ‘Blockadia’, the coalitions of students, leftists, and often Indigenous land defenders who oppose new fossil fuel infrastructure. [[24]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn24) Transforming this opposition to particular pieces of fossil fuel infrastructure into a total and international opposition to fossil capitalism is crucial. Recent instructive work in this area is that of Arboleda, whose studies of Chile’s mining supply chains point to the emergence of revolutionary potential across peasants being proletarianized by mining, extractive workers racialized and faced with outsourcing, and wider movements for Indigenous sovereignty. [[25]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/#_edn25)

There are no easy answers to the questions of revolutionary agents and revolutionary organisations, which Leninists of various stripes have tackled with mixed results over the last hundred years. However, rather than rejecting the concern or falling back onto the old cry of ‘the party’, ecological Leninists must work through the contradictions of organising in a warming world, with the weight of a thousand failed projects on our head. Perhaps the best summation of this project has been made by Mohandesi:

I suggest we think of the “party” as an organization among others, one defined by its articulating function, as that which unites disparate social forces, links struggles over time, and facilitates the collective project of building socialism beyond the state. [[26]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn26)

#### Existing imperial ideas

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

Perhaps the largest parallel between Lenin’s thinking and the needs of modern ecological Marxism left under-analysed by existing accounts is the theory of imperialism. Lenin’s Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism presents an account of the imperialist states which powerfully analysed the causes and contradictions of their death project – World War One. [[27]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn27) Today, the analysis of modern imperialism should aim to do the same, to turn the guns of ecological imperialism into the faces of global fossil capitalism.

Again, just as the form of the capitalist state has changed since 1917, so too has the emergence and form of imperialism. Imperialism as national acts of military expansion to secure resources has been joined by an array of techniques by which global capitalism secures its resource frontiers. In particular, the mechanisms by which international bodies like the World Bank and IMF reinforce and intensify core-periphery extraction have been studied extensively by Marxist geographers and ecologists. These insights need to be brought into the analyses of environmentalists and socialists alike.

At the same time, Marxists and revolutionaries in the years since have had to grow our thinking in the face of imperialist projects. Just as Lenin pointed out how capitalism in the early 20th century could not be analysed without an account of finance capital and imperialism, any eco-socialism is intellectually bankrupt without an account of how global fossil capital and climate breakdown depends on resource imperialism. Marxists can draw on Jason Moore’s historical accounts of resource frontiers, [[28]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn28) Nick Estes’ writings on settler colonialism, [[29]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn29) Fanon, [[30]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn30) Sivanandan [[31]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn31) – the list could go on. These works make clear that we cannot account for the climate crisis without accounting for the colonial project of frontier expansion and extraction. With a century of anti-colonial struggle and thought inspired by Marxists, there is no excuse for modern eco-socialists not to centre and build on these experiences in their analysis of climate breakdown.

As conflicts over certain resources, territories, and technologies emerge across the warming world, so too can we expect new forms of climate imperialism, which will pose challenges to an eco-socialist left. We see glimpses of this in demands to send European armies into the Amazon to prevent its burning, or in the increasingly complex geopolitics of Lithium mining for batteries and other renewable tech. Taking inspiration from Lenin and ensuring an account of modern imperialism is central to explaining environmental breakdown prevents socialists, particularly those in the Global North, falling for an imperialist environmentalism. Otherwise, ecological regimes could see themselves continuing extractive violence across the world. Such is the case with many accounts of the Green New Deal, which may talk of the exciting potential of batteries and electric transitions, but talk little of global empire’s continued extraction of rare earth minerals through violence and exploitation in the Global South.

This may require engagement with the thorny questions of degrowth and climate debt, which far too many so-called eco-socialists reject with strawman arguments. Certainly, within the varied literature on degrowth there is some utopian hot air, but there is also attention to its links to decolonisation and anti-imperialism. Global eco-socialist solidarity will require massive programs of repair and restoration to the damage caused by core nations to the periphery. There is a space open to develop an ecological Leninist degrowth, which looks like a fundamental reorganisation of the production and extraction which fuels destruction in the core, towards the reversal of core-periphery metabolic flows. Such a politics opens up a space to link up revolutionaries in the core with those in the periphery, united in their commitment to ending the politics of national growth and its often-inevitable extractivism.

Taking a lead from Martin Arboleda’s work on the political economy of mining, Planetary Mine, ecological Leninism should attempt to understand how the relations of global capitalism are determining the form and content of imperialism, and what our responses might be across the world. Through extensive analysis of the global mining supply chains and extraction on the ground in Chile, Arboleda is able to discuss the ways in which capitalist nations are interacting with each other, and how the theory of imperial powers which Lenin analysed must be updated to understand the different ways in which nations secure resource extraction. By expanding on work accounting for the effects and causes of contemporary imperialism like Planetary Mine and making it a core aspect of ecological Leninism, anti-imperialism can become a necessary feature of any transitional ecological Leninist regime.

#### D.Scientific issues

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

A final question is that of the wider ways of approaching concerns like ‘nature’ and ‘science’ in ecological Leninism. After all, in his extensive philosophical work Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin attempted to sketch out an approach to matter, science and similar philosophical concerns which could be brought in line with Marxism. [[32]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn32) In part a crude rebuke to rivals like Bogdanov, the work also became foundational to questions of science and philosophy within the Soviet Union, an important issue given the status of ‘scientific socialism’ Marxism-Leninism garnered. [[33]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn33)At the same time, the wider translation of Lenin’s Philosophical Notebooks presented a wider and more nuanced approach to questions of dialectics, nature, and science, the developments of which should be crucial to ecological Leninism. [[34]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn34)

Of course, the relations of science within nations like the USSR have been critically analysed in several spaces. Most notably, Loren Graham, [[35]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn35) Helena Sheehan, [[36]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn36) and others have pointed out how Lenin’s philosophy and its further bowdlerisation into the doctrines of ‘dialectical materialism’ influenced the scholarship and work of scientists across the world. Whilst this saw many leading scientific lights attempting to integrate Marxist philosophy with science studies, such as the British Social Relations of Science Movement in the 1930s, [[37]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn37) it also saw controversies like the Lysenko affair. [[38]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn38)

Whilst Marxists have gone back and forth on these particular historical incidents, there have been significant developments around the critical philosophies of nature and science during the 20th century. Histories of the social construction of nature and science, and how these categories are subsumed in processes of domination such as patriarchy, racism, and colonialism have exploded on the scene. Donna Haraway’s theories of cyborgs and situated perspectives, [[39]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn39) with its own approach to theory and the partiality of viewpoints is a critical challenge to those constructing totalising theory today. At the same time, the critical realism of Bhaskhar also emerged as an approach to the gordian knot of knowledge and science. [[40]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn40) These histories and philosophies should be counterposed and read with Lenin’s philosophical works, to tease out the revolutionary kernels which can be salvaged.

Ultimately, it must be recognised that the necessity of these interventions is due in part to the failures of the crudest readings of Empirio-Monism and other Marxist writings on science. As new discoveries in science and matter emerged across the last century, so too did nuances have to be developed against official accounts of Leninist philosophy. Such themes are most explicitly adopted in Caudwell’s Crisis in Physics, [[41]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn41) but today even philosophy factories like Zizek [[42]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn42) have produced works considering how dialectical materialism or any ‘Leninist’ account of matter, science and nature can keep up with the new discoveries of physics and science. Quantum mechanics, geo-engineering, biotechnology – all these disrupt interpretations of science and nature, which poses a problem to an ecological scientific socialism. Lenin’s turn to dialectics and his Philosophical Notebooks, given their traditional counterposing to Empirio-Monism, may be the space to square these new developments with a Leninist philosophical outlook.

With the rise of climate change, an ecological Leninism is forced to seriously grapple with these questions of science, nature, and the wider social ontology. Whilst this may seem a distraction compared to the above questions, I would suggest the very opposite. In questions of ecology, a binary has emerged between techno-optimist and techno-critical schools with regards to mitigation and adaptation. Let us paint crude pictures. One side focuses on a vision of eco-modernism, where technologies bring the potential for luxury and a restructuring of production towards liberatory and greener horizons. The other, adopts a wider rejection of technologies’ potentials, arguing instead for the necessity of a crude degrowth or in some case primitivism.

Now these are caricatures, but a good ecological Leninist theory should be able to steer a course between these two poles, rejecting their fundamentally misguided assumptions. Rather than focusing on the necessity or problem of science and its relationship with nature, ecological Leninism should return to questions of the social relations of science and nature. Technology is neither inherently liberatory or oppressive, instead it is the social relations of its production and implementation which determine its social effect. In short, contemporary ecological Leninism should, whilst adopting some form of critical realism in line with the broad thrust of Empirio-Monism, focus on how capitalism develops and mobilises forms of science and nature to the detriment of humanity. Starting from Lenin here, despite the many exceptional thinkers who have come since, is crucial precisely because Lenin sought to furnish Marxism with a wider philosophical foundation which could complement militant struggle. An ecological Leninism needs an underpinning which not only can explain the historic development of science and nature, but which can comfortably take lines in the current struggle.

Thus far, debates on the philosophical underpinnings of ecological Marxism have focused on the frustrating topic of dualisms and metabolisms. The volley of shots between scholars in this area, which don’t deserve rehashing, are a side distraction when it comes to the meat of an ecological Marxist worldview. Ultimately the response must be designing a historical and dialectical materialism which incorporates the insights of thinkers who have pointed to the role of a racialised and gendered capitalism in constructing certain sciences, technologies, and natures.

#### Ecological Leninism has structural issues/prior questions

**Woody**, 20**20** (Gus. “Revolutionary Reflections: Moving towards an ecological Leninism” rs21. December 18, 2020. https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/ ///MF)

Conclusion

The introduction to Bellamy Foster and Burkett’s Marx and the Earth highlights what may be termed the ‘three stages’ of ecosocialist thought. [[43]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn43) Put simply, the first consisted of the rejection of aspects of Marxism, to be supplemented by Green theory. The second saw the return of Marx: the excavation of his ecological thought in the metabolic theory championed by John Bellamy Foster and others. Finally, the third wave points to those who apply metabolic theory and its insights to specific situations and developments, the unleashing of the metabolism.

If we are to take seriously Marx’s 11th thesis on Feuerbach, ‘philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it’, then we need to put the theory of the metabolism to practical use. [[44]](https://www.rs21.org.uk/2020/12/18/revolutionary-reflections-moving-towards-an-ecological-leninism/" \l "_edn44) Being able to explain particular ecological problems through Marxist metabolic theory still requires consideration of how to build a seriously revolutionary force. Metabolic theory may point to nodes, points, and flows in the metabolism where the proletariat can intervene, but it tells us little about how to get there. To put it crudely, there remains the absent question of ‘What is to be Done?’

I would suggest an ecological Leninism is the shift here. The fourth wave of ecological Marxism. One which speaks of aiming to seize power, moving swiftly to tackle the climate crisis, and doing so as revolutionaries. The preceding comments are brief dips into the pandora’s box opened by this term. But to summarise the potential directions of travel:

What is an ecological Leninist understanding of and approach to the capitalist state? What does the ecological dictatorship of the proletariat look like?

What is the organisational form of ecological Leninism? What are the strategic priorities and programmes adopted by such a body towards mass movements?

What is the ecological Leninist conception of modern imperialism? How does this analysis contribute to the development of global ecological revolution?

What is bedrock of ecological Leninism’s worldview? How does ecological Leninism approach the gordian knots of ‘nature’ and ‘science’ in ways that promote the transition to an ecological society?

Finally, the thread that runs through all the above questions. How does an ecological Leninism learn from the successes and failures of past Leninist analyses and projects? How does ecological Leninism seriously attempt a synthesis between traditional Leninism, the changing nature of the world, and the insights on these question since Lenin’s death?

There is a chance that any ecological Leninism, if it does answer the above questions and build on the insights of the 100 years since War Communism, would be unrecognisable to the Bolsheviks. Perhaps this is for the better. But the project of putting ecological Marxism into practice, of building an ecological movement which moves from tackling specific symptoms towards a revolutionary strategy, may as well start with Lenin.

### 2AC -- Ext: Transition Fails

#### Transition away from capitalism locks in climate change

**Thornett**, 20**21** (Alan “A Reckless Short Cut” February 11, 2021. <https://anticapitalistresistance.org/a-reckless-short-cut/> ///MF)

When I first saw the title of this book – How to Blow up a Pipeline – I could hardly believe it was serious. Unfortunately, it is. It is a vigorously argued appeal for the environmental movement to break from its past and make violent direct action, short of the loss of life, against the fossil fuel infrastructure, central to its strategy to defend the planet.

It calls for a direct action wing the climate movement to be established to carry this out. Targets would include oil pipelines and refineries, coal mines, power stations and privately owned high pollution vehicles such as SUVs. This, Malm argues, is the only real route to revolutionary change.

In my view, such a change would not only be wrong but disastrous. As I suspect, one of the few on the radical left who has been trained by the British Army in the use of high explosives in order to sabotage railway lines and blow up bridges I am appalled that such a method is being advocated on the Marxist left today in the struggle against climate change.

Anyone taking the title of this book seriously could find a large team of armed police kicking down their door at 4 am if they’ve been discovered researching online how to destroy industrial infrastructure. Possession of the materials needed to build an explosive device will get you a lengthy jail sentence. Making an explosive device will get you 10-15 years in a high-security prison, assuming you don’t blow yourself up in the process. Discussing with others how to procure explosives will get you a lengthy sentence for a conspiracy charge.

In terms of avoiding loss of life, the worst mass killings committed by Irish Republicans were attacks against property that went wrong such as the La Mon fire or Belfast in which 12 people were burned to death and many other horribly disfigured of Bloody Friday in which five civilians were blown apart.

Andreas Malm has been an environmental activist and writer for many years. He took his doctorate with a dissertation on the history of coal-fired steam power in Britain that was published by Verso as a book – Fossil Capital the rise in steam power and the roots of global warming – in 2016 and which received the Isaac and Tamara Deutscher Memorial Prize before the end of the year. He has a teaching post at Lund University in his native Sweden.[i]

He starts the book by recalling his participation in a mass protest in 1995, in Berlin, at COP1 – the first of the UNs annual climate summits that still take place today. From there he traces the struggle against climate change through three key phase – mostly in the global North.

The first, he argues, was in Britain between 2006 and 2009, when activists organised a series of climate camps next to airports and power stations which culminated in a massive People’s Climate Summit at COP15 in Copenhagen in 2009.[ii]

The second was in the USA between 2011 and 2016 after Obama approved new pipeline projects in the USA. Activists launched sit-ins protests against the Keystone XL pipeline, gathered in New York for the “People’s Climate March,” and camped to oppose the Dakota Access Pipeline. The election of Donald Trump brought this to an abrupt end.

The third was global in summer 2018 when Greta Thunberg sat down in front of the Swedish parliament and was global. What emerged was the most remarkable strike movement in defence of the planet the world had ever seen. Soon after Extinction Rebellion (XR) shut down central London by seizing bridges and road junctions is a spectacular display on non-violent direct action that was to continue until the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic.[iii]

Despite all this, he concludes, the problem is now worse. More carbon had been released into the atmosphere in the 25 years since COP1 than in the 75 years before. Activists may have temporarily shut down a mine or forced a government to deny an extraction permit, but the problem has continued unabated. We march, he says, we block, we chain ourselves to things, we remain peaceful, and nothing happens.[iv]

Time for a rethink

It is time, he decided, for a rethink. When he asks, “will we escalate the struggle?” When do we start physically attacking the things that consume our planet and destroy them with our own hands? “Is there a good reason we have waited this long?” He backs this up with from an article by the British novelist and essayist John Lanchester, published by the London Review of Books in 2007, which asks the same question:

“It is strange and striking that climate change activists have not committed any acts of terrorism. After all, terrorism is for the individual by far the modern world’s most effective form of political action, and climate change is an issue about which people feel just as strongly about as, say, animal rights. This is especially noticeable when you bear in mind the ease of things like blowing up petrol stations or vandalising SUVs… Say (in a city) fifty people vandalised four cars every night for a month… these cars would soon be disappearing from our streets”.[v]

Malm blames “moral” or “strategic” pacifism for this inertia – which, he argues, has taken over the movement. He points in particular to the veteran American journalist and environmental campaigner Bill McGibben – who was the driving force behind opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and the 350.org environmental network – who, he says, took it from Gandhi and Martin Luther King.[vi][vii]

He saves his strongest criticism, however, for XR – which he says has codified the idea of non-violent direct action most thoroughly. He quotes Roger Hallam (the co-founder of XR) in this regard:

“There are two types of disruption: violent and non-violent. Violence is a traditional method. It is brilliant at getting attention and creating chaos and disruption, but it is often disastrous when it comes to creating progressive change. Violence destroys democracy and the relationship with opponents which are vital to creating peaceful outcomes to social conflict… In fact, it almost always leads to fascism and authoritarianism. The alternative then is non-violence.”[viii]

Malm responds that slavery would not have been abolished without violent direct action by the slaves themselves. It was also used successfully by the suffragettes.

Violence, however, is the antithesis of building the biggest and broadest mass movement of progressive forces the world has ever seen on a socially inclusive and democratic basis – which is the strategic task we face today. Building support in the unions is difficult now but it would be many times more difficult once the bombs started going off.

It’s true that violence can’t be ruled out in all circumstances – for example in defence of life or in opposition to extreme brutality. It would, however, as Hallam points out, be a disaster for the climate movement which needs to build the biggest and most diverse movement the world has ever seen if it is to successfully defend the planet. From this perspective both Hallam’s model of non-violent direct action and the Malm model of embracing violence short of the loss of life is elitist and an abandonment of the Marxist method of engaging the largest possible number of people in political activity.

Malm is proposing an ecological version of pseudo-Marxist terrorist organisations like the Red Army Faction or the Red Brigades, groups born from despair at the ability of the working class to change society. They may have been motivated by some sort of idealism and hope for a better world, but they contributed nothing to the development of mass movements. They were crushed by the state and their members spent decades in prison, committed suicide or were killed by the police.

These organisations had training from the PLO and Stalinist states. What military background would Malm’s eco-terrorists have? They’d be in prison within days.

Malm has supported non-violent direct action in the past. He recalls how he was involved in the deflation the tyres of SUVs in an affluent neighbourhood of Stockholm in July 2007. SUV owners, he says, awoke to find their cars “reclining on the asphalt.”

On their windshields, was a leaflet. “We have deflated one or more of the tyres on your SUV,”. “Don’t take it personally. It’s your SUV we dislike.” The leaflet pointed out how much fuel SUVs burned and the impact this would have on the planet. At the same time, the saboteurs published a statement exhorting others to copy their work and making available a “simple manual” for how to release the air from a tyre.[ix]

The proposal he makes in this book, however, is of a very different order. The climate movement, he proposes – if it can’t get a prohibition of all new sources of greenhouse gas emissions agreed by governments – should announce a prohibition unilaterally and be prepared to enforce it “with our bodies and any other means necessary.”

We should, he says, put such new emissions out of commission: “demolish them, burn them or blow them up. Let the capitalists who keep on investing in such emissions know that their properties will be trashed”.[x] Later he points out: “Pipelines are very easily sabotaged. A simple explosive device can put a critical section of the pipeline out of operation for weeks, the Pipeline and Gas journal lamented in February 2005.”[xi]

The illusion of a shortcut.

The climate movement should reject Andreas Malm’s appeal and his bid for a shortcut. It reflects, I suspect – apart from political disorientation – a frustration compounded by the lack of a socially just exit strategy from fossil energy.

There are, unfortunately, no shortcuts available with the prospect of a progressive outcome. Either a mass movement will be built with progressive forces within it that can play a global role in the event of the kind of societal and ecological breakdowns that we will be facing if global warming and pollution of the planet are not stopped – or the future will be bleak indeed.

Forcing major structural change against the will of the capitalist system will need a mass movement, and not just amongst environmental activists but amongst the wider population as it is impacted by the crisis.

There is, however, no common view in the wider movement on an exit strategy from fossil energy, nor is there an adequate discussion on it. The proposal with the most support – and the proposal that I support – would transfer the fees levied on carbon emissions directly into people’s bank accounts on a heavily progressive basis is James Hansen’s fee and dividend proposal.

This could produce a big reduction in emissions in the short time we have available and would be capable of commanding the popular support necessary to generate the mass movement necessary to defend the planet. This would need to go alongside a crash programme of renewable energy generation to meet the demand that these new incentives would create.

Interestingly, Noam Chomsky supported Hansen recently in a New Year interview entitled Where the Left Goes After Trump[xii] – which dealt with how to halt to global warming and climate change.

“If you have a carbon tax don’t do it as Macron did it in France – which led to the yellow vests movement – which was a carbon tax that hits the working class. If you do that you are going to get an uprising. You can have a carbon tax in which the revenue is returned to the public in a progressive manner which then benefits the working class. Yes, you pay a bit more for gas but you get a lot more in return.”

I strongly agree with Chomsky on this. Cutting emissions this way is, in the end, the only progressive way of doing it since it can be carried through within an overall taxation framework that is socially and economically progressive. The other alternatives, often advanced by the left, such as production cuts by government decision or rationing do not work and indeed can have serious negative consequences.

Andreas Malm has been a big asset to the movement – he should, however, think again before making any further attempts to take the movement down what could be a very dangerous road.

### 2AC -- Ext: Transition Wars

#### Transition away from capitalism leads to war which goes global – extinction.

Nafeez Ahmed 19 [Nafeez Ahmed, 2-22-2019, "The “Disintegration” of Global Capitalism Could Unleash World War 3, Warns Top EU Economist," Resilience, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2019-02-22/the-disintegration-of-global-capitalism-could-unleash-world-war-3-warns-top-eu-economist/, smarx, HHW]

A senior European Commission economist has warned that a Third World War is an extremely “high probability” in coming years due to the disintegration of global capitalism.

In a working paper published last month, Professor Gerhard Hanappi argued that since the 2008 financial crash, the global economy has moved away from “integrated” capitalism into a “**disintegrating” shift** marked by the same sorts of trends which preceded **previous world wars**.

Professor Hanappi is Jean Monnet Chair for Political Economy of European Integration — an European Commission appointment — at the Institute for Mathematical Models in Economics at the Vienna University of Technology. He also sits on the management committee of the Systemic Risks expert group in the EU-funded European Cooperation in Science and Technology research network.

In his new paper, Hanappi concludes that global conditions bear unnerving parallels with trends before the outbreak of the first and second world wars.

Key red flags that the world is on a slippery slope to a global war, he finds, include:

the inexorable growth of military spending;

democracies transitioning into increasingly authoritarian police states;

heightening geopolitical tensions between great powers;

the resurgence of populism across the left and right;

the breakdown and weakening of established global institutions that govern transnational capitalism;

and the relentless widening of global inequalities.

These trends, some of which were visible before the previous world wars, are reappearing in new forms. Hanappi argues that the defining feature of the current period is a transition from an older form of “integrating capitalism” to a new form of “disintegrating capitalism”, whose features most clearly emerged after the 2008 financial crisis.

For most of the twentieth century, he says, global capitalism was on an “integrating” pathway toward higher concentrations of transnational wealth. This was interrupted by the outbreaks of violent nationalism involving the two world wars. After that, a new form of “integrated capitalism” emerged based on an institutional framework that has allowed industrialised countries to avoid a world war for 70 years.

This system is now entering a period of disintegration. Previously, fractures within the system between rich and poor were overcome “by distributing a bit of the gains of the tremendous increase of the fruits of the global division of labour to the richer working classes in these nations.” Similarly, international tensions were diffused through transnational governance frameworks and agreements for the regulation of capitalism.

But since the 2008 financial crisis, wealth distribution has worsened, with purchasing power for the middle and working classes declining as wealth becomes even more greatly concentrated.

Growth in the Western centres of transnational capital has slowed, while formerly sacrosanct international trade agreements are being torn to shreds. This has fuelled a reversion to nationalism in which global and transnational structures have been rejected, and ‘foreigners’ have been demonised. As global capital thus continues to disintegrate, these pressures escalate, particularly as its internal justification depends increasingly on intensifying competition with external rivals.

While integrated capitalism depended on a transnational institutional framework that permitted “stable exploitation on a national level”, Hanappi argues that “disintegrating capitalism” sees this framework become disaggregated between the USA, Europe, Russia and China, each of which pursues new forms of hierarchical subordination of workers.

Disintegrating capitalism, he explains, will resort increasingly to “direct coercive powers supplemented by new information technologies” to suppress internal tensions, as well as a greater propensity for international hostilities: “The new authoritarian empires need confrontation with each other to justify their own internal, inflexible command structure.”

**Great power conflict**

Hanappi explores **three potential scenarios for how a new global conflict could unfold**. In his first scenario, he explores the prospect of a war between the three most prominent military powers: the US, Russia and China.

All three have experienced large increases in military spending since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Despite a dip for the US since 2011, President Trump has ushered in a new spike, while Russian spending has plateaued and Chinese expenditures are rapidly increasing. All three countries have also experienced an authoritarian turn.

Drawing on game theory, Hanappi argues that the calculus that none of these countries would be capable of ‘winning’ a world war may be changing in the perceptions of the leaderships of these countries. By one estimate, China has the highest probability of survival at 52 per cent, followed by the US at 30 per cent, and Russia at 18 per cent. This calculus suggests that of all the three powers, China might be the most inclined to escalate direct hostile military activities that challenge its rivals if it perceives a direct threat to what it sees as its legitimate interests.

The US and Russia in contrast might transfer the focus of their military activities on more covert, indirect and proxy mechanisms. In the US case, Hanappi points out:

“… the military strategy of Trump seems to include the possibility to delegate part of local operational responsibility to close vassals, which receive massive weapon support from the US, e.g. Saudi Arabia and Israel in the Middle East. Turkey, one of the strongest NATO branches in the area is a special case. It seems to have been allowed to destroy an emergent state of the Kurdish population, which would have been closer to the European style of governance.”

There are growing signs of heightened great power tensions which could erupt entirely by accident or unanticipated provocation into a **global conflict** that nobody wants.

The **US-China trade war is escalating**, while both powers tussle over technology secrets and argue over China’s growing military footprint in the South China Sea. Meanwhile Trump’s massive expansion of the US Navy and Air Force point to preparations for a major potential conflict with either China or Russsia.

Both the US and Russia have jettisoned a critical nuclear treaty established since the Cold War opening the way to a nuclear arms race. North Korea remains unrepentant about its ongoing nuclear weapons programme while Trump’s tearing up of the nuclear agreement with Iran disincentivises that country from complying with disarmament and reporting terms.

Early last year, a statistical study of the frequency of major wars in human history found that the so-called 70 years of ‘long peace’ is simply not an unusual phenomenon indicating an unprecedented period of peace. The study concluded that there was no reason to believe that the **70 year period so far would not give way to another major war.**

#### Revolution against capitalism bad – leads to war and chaos for years

Calnitsky 21 [David Calnitsky, University Of Western Ontario, Canadacorresponding Author, 8-8-2021, "The Policy Road to Socialism," SAGE Journals, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/08969205211031624#\_i13, SMarx, JTong]

Now perhaps the revolutionaries have persuaded us that negative outcomes are far-fetched, that we are very confident that revolution will usher in, eventually, the land of milk and honey. It is still the case that in this model the promised land will only be reached after a social breakdown of unknown duration: A complete overhaul in the organization of production will lead to some middle period of deteriorating material welfare as capitalists rapidly exit the economy. This means chaos and uncertainty, but it could also mean war. The interregnum could last a year, but it might last two decades, and however optimistic we are about the end point, we cannot in advance know how long this interim phase will persist. In the meantime, revolutionary enthusiasm will wane, erstwhile supporters will decamp, a “stay-the-course” electoral strategy will be outflanked by competitor parties promising a return to normalcy, and the desire to consolidate gains will make the authoritarian impulse greater. From a materialist perspective, the uncertain passage through what Przeworski (1986) calls the “transition trough” makes the journey less appealing.26

To my mind, these factors explain why all working classes in all developed democracies have been decidedly reformist in orientation. The reason why revolutionary socialism has always been marginal in rich capitalist economies—and will always be outflanked by reform-oriented socialism—is that only the latter consistently deliver high (and usually increasing) standards of living and low (and usually decreasing) levels of risk. As long as the Mad Max world of catastrophic collapse can be avoided, reform-oriented parties will always better capture the enthusiasm of poor and working people.

Thus, when we try to explain the non-revolutionary attitudes of our working-class friends and family, we do not need to lean on the false consciousness account, for there is a more parsimonious materialist explanation. As such, any case for revolution must be non-materialist in character: You can be a materialist or a revolutionary, but not both.

This is the dilemma the revolutionaries must consider: Revolution is only possible when the forces of production are underdeveloped, but it can only be successful when they are sufficiently developed to make socialism (or communism) objectively viable.27 As Elster (1986) has argued, the circumstances under which revolutions spark and succeed never coincide.

What about the capitalists? Under these circumstances, it is reasonable to expect that they will fight far harder against a revolution than they would against reformist drives. Indeed, ignoring the response from capitalists violates Elster’s first law of political rationality: Never assume your opponent is less rational than you. If revolution were the alternative, employers would grant every imaginable reform, from far higher taxes to the rejiggering of power relations in the workplace. In a mugging, most people will surrender their wallet before their life.

### 1AR -- Ext: Transition Wars

#### Transitions will cause war; Even socialists are skeptical of the states ability to run a socialist state.

Sunday Trust 5/15 – [Sunday Trust is a publication from Abuja, Nigeria published by Media Trust Limited. The newspaper exclusively provides the news related to business, politics, health and sports in Kaduna, Nigeria; “CHINA IS RETOOLING THE CAPITALIST PARADIGM”; 5/15/22; [https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/teaserdocument/?pdmfid=1516831&crid=6926f703-12f0-450d-84f2-9871b117ccbf&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A65FR-V801-JCH9-G475-00000-00&pddocid=urn%3AcontentItem%3A65FR-V801-JCH9-G475-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=416518&pdteaserkey=h2&pditab=allpods&ecomp=szznk&earg=sr0&prid=5bdf5f66-4d67-4d1c-b181-1de543b6b568#](https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/teaserdocument/?pdmfid=1516831&crid=6926f703-12f0-450d-84f2-9871b117ccbf&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A65FR-V801-JCH9-G475-00000-00&pddocid=urn%3AcontentItem%3A65FR-V801-JCH9-G475-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=416518&pdteaserkey=h2&pditab=allpods&ecomp=szznk&earg=sr0&prid=5bdf5f66-4d67-4d1c-b181-1de543b6b568); Lowell-JL]

Russia's war on Ukraine both reflects and deepens a global split that should remind us of Karl Marx's famous remark: 'No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society.' Britain has already lost its particular social order - its empire - and the United States is now losing its. Despite differences, both of these social orders shared a mostly private form of capitalist relations of production (the organisation of enterprises centred on private employers and employees). That social order has given way to a different, mostly public form of capitalist relations of production where state officials are major employers. The latter form of capitalism is developing most dramatically in China. As defined by its core productive relation of employer/employee, capitalism is now developing its productive forces and its GDP growth faster in China's public form of capitalism than in the US's private form of capitalism. The role of the state is central to this decline of capitalism in one area and form and its ascent in another area and form. In the West, the relation between capitalism, and especially its defenders and ideologues, on one side, and the actuality of the state apparatus, on the other, is hypocritical. Part of China's embrace of a strong state emerged from its affiliations with the Soviet Union and the history of socialism in the 19th and 20th centuries. Most socialists then subscribed to one or another version of the idea that the transition from capitalism to socialism required the workers to seize the state via ballots or bullets. The state became key to this transition to a socialist system. Many socialists advocated strong state apparatuses on the basis of what they hoped such states might then do, namely make the social transition to socialism beyond capitalism, that is beyond the employer/employee production relationship. Yet those states, where and when socialists achieved power, proved to be limited. They never accomplished that transition beyond short-lived experiments. Ever since, socialists have analysed and debated the lessons of those experiments.

#### Transition wars are inevitable in the change from capitalism

**Okishio 22** (Nobuo Okishio was a Japanese Marxian economist and emeritus professor of Kobe University, The Theory of Accumulation: A Marxian Approach to the Dynamics of Capitalist Economy, 1.2 Various Issues Today, Springer, 2022, pg. 5//JL)

In state-monopoly capitalism, the role of the organs of the state is immensely significant in the economy. If workers can fill posts in the state organs and go on intervening in national policies, will they also be able to change the foundations of the capitalist economy gradually? Such a question is derived from the fact that the fundamental character of the state in state-monopoly capitalism, as well as the essential qualities of the privately owned means of production in monopoly capital, are not sufficiently recognized. Monopoly capitalists hold the fundamental right to determine production plans of their privately owned means of production. The role of the state is to support and strengthen such rights. This is not something to be changed, even if working class representatives have power in government organs, as they would be converted to serving members of the organs of the monopoly capitalist state. For the state to wield its position to deprive the decision-making power of production from private monopolies, the state’s power must be transferred to the people led by the working class. In this case, it is necessary that the internal activities of the state organs must cooperate with the revolutionary movements led by the working class. In any case, it is impossible to hope that the character of the state will gradually change and that the foundations of the capitalist economy will be destroyed without a struggle for state power.

#### Transition wars occur---counterrevolutionary rebels spring up as a result of anti-capitalist revolutions

Laia Balcells and Stathis Kalyvas 22, Laia works at Georgetown University, Stathis works at Oxford, 4/13/2022, PDF, “Revolution in Civil War: The ‘Marxist Paradox’”, file:///C:/Users/foxct/Dropbox/PC%20(3)/Downloads/SSRN-id4055392.pdf/) - FT

Research on civil wars has paid scant attention to a key (and variable) dimension of rebel political identity: some rebels are revolutionaries seeking to reshape their societies in radical ways. We study the most common strain of revolutionary rebels: revolutionary socialist or Marxist-inspired rebels; we find that despite ideological and contextual differences, they were “high capacity” actors in civil wars, able to rise against stronger regimes. Civil wars fought with revolutionary socialist rebels took the form of irregular or guerrilla wars, lasted longer, and produced more battlefield fatalities on average. At the same time, we also find that these rebels’ higher capacity failed to translate into victories. They were defeated at a rate that was no different from other rebels--hence a “Marxist Paradox.” We make sense of this paradox by pointing to the dynamic and world-systemic nature of civil wars: powerful revolutionary challenges engendered equally powerful and often successful counter-revolutionary reactions. An implication that follows from our analysis is that during the Cold War, revolutionary civil wars had a state-building rather than state-failing effect.