## \*\*\*NEOLIB GOOD\*\*\*

### Neoliberalism Good – 1NC

#### Neoliberalism is key to value to life, it reduces poverty, and solves war and disease

Rockwell 2 Llewellyn H., President of the Mises Institute, The Free Market, “Why They Attack Capitalism”, Volume 20, Number 10, October, http://www.mises.org/freemarket\_detail.asp?control=418&sortorder-articledate

If you think about it, this hysteria is astonishing, even terrifying. The market economy has created unfathomable prosperity and, decade by decade, for centuries and centuries, miraculous feats of innovation, production, distribution, and social coordination. To the free market, we owe all material prosperity, all our leisure time, our health and longevity, our huge and growing population, nearly everything we call life itself. Capitalism and capitalism alone has rescued the human race from degrading poverty, rampant sickness, and early death. In the absence of the capitalist economy, and all its underlying institutions, the world’s population would, over time, shrink to a fraction of its current size, in a holocaust of unimaginable scale, and whatever remained of the human race would be systematically reduced to subsistence, eating only what can be hunted or gathered. And this is only to mention its economic benefits. Capitalism is also an expression of freedom. It is not so much a social system but the de facto result in a society where individual rights are respected, where businesses, families, and every form of association are permitted to flourish in the absence of coercion, theft, war, and aggression. Capitalism protects the weak against the strong, granting choice and opportunity to the masses who once had no choice but to live in a state of dependency on the politically connected and their enforcers. The high value placed on women, children, the disabled, and the aged— unknown in the ancient world—owes so much to capitalism’s productivity and distribution of power. Must we compare the record of capitalism with that of the state, which, looking at the sweep of this past century alone, has killed hundreds of millions of people in wars, famines, camps, and deliberate starvation campaigns? And the record of central planning of the type now being urged on American enterprise is perfectly abysmal.

#### Neoliberalism solves extinction and genocide.

Teune, 2, Henry, Political Science Department at the University of Pennsylvania, May, 2002 “Global Democracy”, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 581 Annals 22, Lexis

During the past three decades, social scientists and professional observers described an emerging global political economy, but without democracy. It took most of the 1990s to grasp that without democracy, globalization could not continue in a peaceful, orderly fashion. Democracy began to become the bedrock of the prosperity promised by globalization. It may well turn out to be the best invention for human survival and the betterment of everyday living. Indeed, in time, democracy in large-scale societies may be judged the most important discovery of the twentieth century since vaccines. Governments systematically killing their own peoples and nearly nonstop international wars of scale marked the first half of the twentieth century (Rummel 1996). The killing of masses of people by legitimate authorities may be the most important international fact of the first half of the twentieth century. But the most important fact of this era of globalization is that almost all governments, save one or two, stopped doing that around the century's end, following the spread of democracy.

### Neoliberalism Good - Environment

#### Neoliberalism solves the environment

Bast et al 94 (Joseph, pres Heartland Institute, Peter Hill, econ@Wheaton College, Richard Rue, EnergyWise CEO, Eco-Sanity, http://www.heartland.org/bin/media/publicpdf/23673b.pdf, accessed: 1 July 2011, JT)

The superior economic and environmental performance of capitalism is probably not what many environmentally conscious readers expected. The images that have stayed with us from grade school or college classes are of the industrial revolution’s smoky factories, sweatshops, violent strikes, child labor, and colonialism. A system that would allow such atrocities, we feel almost instinctively, cannot be trusted to protect the rights of workers or a fragile environment. Even a professional writer on economics, the aforementioned Frances Cairncross, writes: For it is only government that can decide how much society should value the environment, and how that value should be inserted into economic transactions. The market, that mechanism that so marvelously directs human activity to supply human needs, often has no way of putting a proper price on environmental resources, It is time to update our attitudes toward capitalism, and particularly our understanding of how it puts “a proper price on environmental resources.” Capitalism is based on a system of markets and private property rights. When rights are correctly defined and enforced, capitalism will protect the environment for four reasons: ti It creates incentives to do the right things; ti It generates and distributes needed information; ti It enables people to trade things or rights in order to solve problems that otherwise can’t be solved; and r/ It enables property rights to evolve over time. The free-enterprise system creates wealth, rewards efficiency, and \_ protects the environment better than any other system yet devised by man. The tireless campaign against this system by some quarters of the environmental movement is wrong-headed and counterproductive.

#### Environment collapse leads to extinction.

Diner ‘94—Major David, Judge Advocate General’s Corps, United States Army, Military Law Review, Winter, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." n79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, n80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

### Neoliberalism Good – Env - Ext

#### Neoliberalism solves environmental collapse.

Christmann and Taylor 1 American businessman and the head of a privately held multinational company, Professor Christmann specializes in research of the global economy (Petra and Glen, Globalization and the environment: Determinants of firm self-regulation in China. Journal of International business studies, 32(3), 439-458, ABI/INFORM) http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=277452]

In contrast, globalization proponents contend that lower barriers to trade and foreign investment encourage firms to transfer environmental technologies and managemement systems from countries with stricter environmental standards to developing countries, which lack access to environmental technologies and capabilities (Drezner, 2000). Governmental failure to protect the environment, it is suggested in this line of argument, might also be ameliorated through self-regulation of environmental performance by firms in developing countries. Self-regulation refers to a firm’s adoption of environmental performance standards or environmental management systems (EMS) beyond the requirements of governmental regulations. Globalization can increase self-regulation pressures in several ways. First, globalization increases MNEs’ investment in developing countries where their subsidiaries can be expected to self-regulate their environmental performance more than domestic firms do. MNEs can transfer the more advanced environmental technologies and management systems developed in response to more stringent regulations in developed countries to their subsidiaries. MNEs also face pressures from interest groups to improve their worldwide environmental performance. Second, globalization might contribute to environmental performance as a supplier-selection criterion, which also pressures domestic firms in developing countries to self-regulate environmental performance…Globalization does not necessarily have negative effects on the environment in developing countries to the extend suggested by the pollution-haven and industrial-flight hypotheses. Our study suggests that globalization increases institutional and consumer pressures on firms to surpass local requirements, even when they may be tempted by lax regulations and enforcement in countries offering themselves as pollution havens (Hoffman, 1999; Rugman and Verbeke, 1998).

#### Neoliberalism solves the environment – policies fail.

Chen, 2K, Jim, Professor of Law University of Minnesota Law School, November/December, 2000 Fordham International Law Journal, PAX MERCATORIA: GLOBALIZATION AS A SECOND CHANCE AT "PEACE FOR OUR TIME, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217, Lexis

"Across-the-board globalism" is the best way of coordinating free trade and environmental protection as "complementary" policies. Admittedly, simultaneously advocating free trade and environmental integrity typically earns a deluxe suite at the "very small hotel" that will be hosting the next "global convention of rabid free trade environmentalists." Yet this jarring juxtaposition is unavoidable in a world of falling frontiers. The creation of "transboundary communities" causes "environmental interconnection" and in turn the "inevitable" abandonment of "localism in all spheres." Strictly localist solutions will not suffice; "haphazard local encouragement" cannot replace coordinated responses to "diffuse, cross-jurisdictional" problems such as mobile source emissions and nonpoint-source runoff.

### Neoliberalism Good – Famine / Food Prices

#### Only neoliberalism can respond fast enough to prevent famines

Lockitch 9 (Keith, fellow@ Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights, Energy & Environment, 20(5), http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/25905.pdf, accessed: 1 July 2011, JT)

Despite drought conditions severe enough to rate comparison with the 1930s Dust Bowl, Americans saw only minor economic losses and fluctuations in food prices. It is telling that the most that Weart could find to say was that the Midwest droughts showed up on “the front pages of newspapers and on television news programs.” Observe that they specifically did not “show up” at all on people’s waistlines and barely registered on their pocketbooks. Such resilience is testament to the adaptive flexibility of an industrialized economy and a (relatively) free market—to industrial capitalism’s ability to respond quickly when normal conditions are disrupted. While the other regions mentioned suffered a total failure of their food production and distribution systems, the United States donated surplus food supplies to Africa, sold food grains to India, and arranged a massive sale of wheat to the Soviet Union in late 1972. Contrast this to the helplessness before nature of India’s peasant farmers or the Sahel’s nomadic tribes. Why were they unable to benefit from the agricultural practices that empowered the American farmers—the irrigation of fields, the use of fertilizers and pesticides, and the application of sophisticated methods of agricultural management? What role did their primitive cultural traditions and their countries’ oppressive political systems play in suppressing the industrial development and free market mechanisms that made such advances possible? And in the case of the Soviet Union, should there really be any surprise that its state-owned collective farms were unable to cope with unfavorable weather conditions? Even under good conditions— and with the advantage of some of the most fertile agricultural land in the world—the central planners of the Soviet agricultural ministry were rarely able to coerce adequate food production.

#### Food shortages lead to World War III

Calvin 98. (William, theoretical neurophysiologist @ U Washington, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop”, Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 281, No. 1, January, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War -- but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### Neoliberalism Good - Poverty

#### Neoliberalism solves global poverty.

Bandow 1 senior fellow at the CATO Institute [Doug Bandow, , March 25th, 2001 Globalization Serves the World's Poor, http://www.cato.org/dailys/04-25-01.html]

Indeed, the problems of globalization must always be "compared to what?" Yes, factories pay low wages in Third World countries. But workers in them have neither the education nor the skills to be paid at First World levels. Their alternative is not a Western university education or Silicon Valley computer job, but an even lower-paying job with a local firm or unemployment. The choice is clear: according to Edward Graham of the Institute of International Economics, in poor countries, American multinationals pay foreign citizens an average of 8.5 times the per capita GDP. Overall, the process of globalization has been good for the poor. During the 1980s, advanced industrialized countries grew faster than developing states. In the 1990s, as globalization accelerated, poor nations grew at 3.6 percent annually, twice that of their richer neighbors. Despite the illusion of left-wing activists that money falls from the sky, poverty has been the normal condition of humankind throughout most of history. As even Marx acknowledged, capitalism is what eliminated the overwhelming poverty of the pre- industrial world. That remains the case today. Resource endowment, population level and density, foreign aid transfers, past colonial status none of these correlate with economic wealth. Only economic openness does. The latest volume of the Economic Freedom in the World Report, published by the Cato Institute and think tanks in 50 other countries, finds that economic liberty strongly correlates with economic achievement. Policies that open economies strongly correlate with economic growth. By pulling countries into the international marketplace, globalization encourages market reforms. With them comes increased wealth.

#### Statistics prove that neoliberalism dramatically decreases poverty

Chen, 2K, Jim, Professor of Law University of Minnesota Law School, November/December, 2k

Fordham International Law Journal, PAX MERCATORIA: GLOBALIZATION AS A SECOND CHANCE AT "PEACE FOR OUR TIME, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217, Lexis

The antiglobalization movement has made some extraordinary claims. Let us transplant a precept of natural science into this social realm: extraordinary claims demand extraordinary proof. From Seattle to Prague, protesters have argued that the organs of international economic law conspire with multinational corporations to sap national and local governments of legitimate power, to destabilize global security, and to poison workplaces as well as ecosystems. That case has not met even the most generous standard of proof. The antiglobalization movement has failed to refute the following: Dramatic improvements in welfare at every wealth and income level. Since 1820 global wealth has expanded tenfold, thanks largely to technological advances and the erosion of barriers to trade. The world economic order, simply put, is lifting people out of poverty. According to the World Bank, the percentage of the world's population living in extreme poverty fell from 28.3 to 23.4% between 1987 and 1998. n182 (The World Bank defines extreme and absolute poverty according to "reference lines set at $ 1 and $ 2 per day" in 1993 terms, adjusted for "the relative purchasing power of currencies across countries.") A more optimistic study has concluded that "the share of the world's population earning less than US$ 2 per day shrank by more than half" between 1980 and 1990, "from 34 to 16.6 percent." In concrete terms, "economic growth associated with globalization" over the course of that decade helped lift 1.4 billion people out of absolute poverty. Whatever its precise magnitude, this improvement in global welfare has taken place because of, not in spite of, flourishing world trade.

### Neoliberalism Good - War

#### Neoliberalism checks war through interdependence and democracy

Griswold 6 director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute [Daniel T. Griswold, , 2006 CATO Institute, Peace on earth? Try free trade among men, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)]

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

## \*\*\*Capitalism Impact Turns\*\*\*

### **Sustainability – 1NC**

#### **Capitalism is sustainable – market reforms solve their warrants for collapse**

Rogoff Professor of Economics at Harvard University 2011 Kenneth Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable Project Syndicate http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable-

In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt.

Will capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

### Sustainability - Ext

#### Free markets are sustainable – no spill over of financial crises

Sorrentino political consultant 2012 Nick Free Market Capitalism is Sustainable Against Crony Capitalism 6/13 http://www.againstcronycapitalism.org/2012/06/free-market-capitalism-is-sustainable/

Not only are free markets natural, they are sustainable and resilient. It is central planning which is inherently unstable.

If the world economy is made of millions or billions of little exchanges each part of a massive whole, but also limited because the exchange is one of a sea of exchanges, there is a fundamental stability to the system. If things go crazy in one part of the market for whatever reason (though a market “going crazy” is a matter of perspective) the possibility of contagion is limited. Because there is no one central hub (a central bank, a government, etc.) the likelihood of widespread “craziness” is mitigated.

#### Capitalism is key to sustainability

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

I make no apologies for believing in capitalism. I believe that the opportunity to generate and retain one's own wealth is a driving force for not only improving our environment, but also for individual and societal advancements. I believe that when businesses that are respectful of the environment and advancing of the human condition are profitable, we all benefit.

To me, that is the very essence of 'sustainability' -- creating and building that virtuous cycle so that the net gains outweigh the net costs of doing business.

#### No sustained movements to transform capitalism

Ghosh professor of economics at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 2012 Jayati “The Emerging Left in the 'Emerging' World” Economic & Political Weekly 6/16 page lexis

But even as resistance to global capitalism builds up in both the South and the North, it tends to be accompanied by gloomy perceptions that grand socialist visions of the future are no longer possible. Indeed, much of the popular protest that is evident today in various places is still essentially about "resistance" rather than "transformation", and involves rearguard action to stem the tide of brutal fiscal austerity measures that deny the social and economic rights of citizens within the existing economic system, rather than conceiving and putting in place alternative systems. A basic lack of confidence in anything other than capitalism as a way of organising economic life still permeates popular protests in Europe and the United States, such that the purpose of the left is seen to be to somehow exert a restraining influence on the worst excesses of current capitalism - the left as a civilising and moderating force, not so much a transformative (much less revolutionary) force.

### Capitalism Good – Internal Link

#### Capitalism requires neoliberalism as a political idelogy

Levidow 2 (Les, U of Sussex, “Terrorising Dissent: the Neoliberal 'Anti-terrorist' Strategy”, http://www.commoner.org.uk/02-6groundzero.htm#uno)

How does political protest become terrorism? Answer: whenever governments say that it is. They increasingly do so because capitalism has no alternative to neoliberal globalization and new enclosures. This agenda can be imposed only by terrorizing dissent -- in the name of protecting the public from terrorism, of course. In this way, 'counter-terrorism' is redefining or even replacing politics. As this article argues, effective resistance becomes inseparable from a struggle against new enclosures and for new commons.

### Capitalism Good - War

#### Only economic centralization 🡺 collapse and war

Sorrentino political consultant 2012 Nick Free Market Capitalism is Sustainable Against Crony Capitalism 6/13 http://www.againstcronycapitalism.org/2012/06/free-market-capitalism-is-sustainable/

Prices find their own level. Usually the biggest problems in the economy happen when this tendency of prices is restricted in some way, usually for political purposes. When things collapse, as they always do when prices are restricted, at some point needless damage is wreaked in the lives of economic participants and upon the Earth. One only need look at China to see what economic planning does to the planet.

Yes the fact that many of China’s rivers are ribbons of chemicals and waste is because of the huge run up in development they have seen over the last 30 years. But it is because this development was planned to a large extent by Beijing and because there is no real system of property rights in China that piles of noxious externalities find their way into the South China Sea and into the lungs of Chinese children. It is because the planners control the levers that China is building dozens of coal fired power plants every year.

Central planning is a destroyer. It is from central planning that we get wars, and things like Chernobyl.

#### Capitalism is key to peace – markets decrease the potential for war

Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11/15/2005 Doug, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets.

The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism.

But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets.

An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems.

Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq.

But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states.

Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor.

The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.

Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

#### Capitalism is key for peace – business prevents conflict

Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11/15/2005

Doug, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war.

Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

#### Imperial wars pre-date capitalism by centuries, war is illogical under capitalism because it destroys wealth

MacKenzie 2003 graduate student in economics at George Mason University Does Capitalism Require War? Monday, April 07, 2003 http://www.mises.org/fullstory.asp?control=1201

Perhaps the oddest aspect of these various, but similar, claims is that their proponents appeal so often to historical examples. They often claim that history shows how capitalism is imperialistic and warlike or at least benefits from war. Capitalism supposedly needs a boost from some war spending from time to time, and history shows this. Robert Higgs demonstrated that the wartime prosperity during the Second World War was illusory[i]. This should come to no surprise to those who lived through the deprivations of wartime rationing. We do not need wars for prosperity, but does capitalism breed war and imperialism anyway? History is rife with examples of imperialism. The Romans, Alexander, and many others of the ancient world waged imperialistic wars. The Incan Empire and the empire of Ancient China stand as examples of the universal character of imperialism. Who could possibly claim that imperialism grew out of the prosperity of these ancient civilizations? Imperialism precedes modern industrial capitalism by many centuries. Uneven wealth distribution or underconsumption under capitalism obviously did not cause these instances of imperialism. Of course, this fact does not prove that modern capitalism lacks its own imperialistic tendencies. The notion that income gets underspent or maldistributed lies at the heart of most claims that capitalism either needs or produces imperialistic wars. As J.B. Say argued, supply creates its own demand through payments to factors of production. Demand Side economists Hobson and Keynes argued that there would be too little consumption and too little investment for continuous full employment. We save too much to have peace and prosperity. The difficulty we face is not in oversaving, but in underestimating the workings of markets and the desires of consumers. Doomsayers have been downplaying consumer demand for ages. As demand side economist J.K. Galbraith claimed, we live in an affluent society, where most private demands have been met. Of course, Hobson made the same claim much earlier. Earlier and stranger still, mercantilists claimed that 'wasteful acts' such as tea drinking, gathering at alehouses, taking snuff, and the wearing of ribbons were unnecessary luxuries that detracted from productive endeavors. The prognostications of esteemed opponents of capitalism have consistently failed to predict consumer demand. Today, consumers consume at levels that few long ago could have imagined possible. There is no reason to doubt that consumers will continue to press for ever higher levels of consumption. Though it is only a movie, Brewster's Millions illustrates how creative people can be at spending money. People who do actually inherit, win, or earn large sums of money have little trouble spending it. Indeed, wealthy individuals usually have more trouble holding on to their fortunes than in finding ways to spend them. We are never going to run out of ways to spend money. Many of the complaints about capitalism center on how people save too much. One should remember that there really is no such thing as saving. Consumers defer consumption to the future only. As economist Eugen BÃ¶hm-Bawerk demonstrated, people save according to time preference. Savings diverts resources into capital formation. This increases future production. Interest enhanced savings then can purchase these goods as some consumers cease to defer their consumption. Keynes' claim that animal spirits drive investment has no rational basis. Consumer preferences are the basis for investment. Investors forecast future consumer demand. Interest rates convey knowledge of these demands. The intertemporal coordination of production through capital markets and interest rates is not a simple matter. But Keynes' marginal propensities to save and Hobson's concentration of wealth arguments fail to account for the real determinants of production through time. Say's Law of Markets holds precisely because people always want a better life for themselves and those close to them. Falling interest rates deter saving and increase investment. Rising interest rates induce saving and deter investment. This simple logic of supply and demand derives from a quite basic notion of self interest. Keynes denied that the world worked this way. Instead, he claimed that bond holders hoard money outside of the banking system, investment periodically collapses from 'the dark forces of time and uncertainty, and consumers save income in a mechanical fashion according to marginal propensities to save. None of these propositions hold up to scrutiny, either deductive or empirical. Speculators do not hoard cash outside of banks. To do this means a loss of interest on assets. People do move assets from one part of the financial system to another. This does not cause deficient aggregate demand. Most money exists in the banking system, and is always available for lending. In fact, the advent of e-banking makes such a practice even less sensible. Why hoard cash when you can move money around with your computer? It is common knowledge that people save for homes, education, and other expensive items, not because they have some innate urge to squirrel some portion of their income away. This renders half of the market for credit rational. Investors do in fact calculate rates of return on investment. This is not a simple matter. Investment entails some speculation. Long term investment projects entail some uncertainty, but investors who want to actually reap profits will estimate the returns on investment using the best available data. Keynes feared that the dark forces of time and uncertainty could scare investors. This possibility, he thought, called for government intervention. However, government intervention (especially warfare) generally serves to increase uncertainty. Private markets have enough uncertainties without throwing politics into the fray. The vagaries of political intervention serve only to darken an already uncertain future. Capital markets are best left to capitalists. Nor is capital not extracted surplus value. It comes not from exploitation. It is simply a matter of people valuing their future wellbeing. Capitalists will hire workers up to the point where the discounted marginal product of their labor equals the wage rate. To do otherwise would mean a loss of potential profit. Since workers earn the marginal product of labor and capital derives from deferred consumption, Marxist arguments about reserve armies of the unemployed and surplus extraction fail. It is quite odd to worry about capitalists oversaving when many complain about how the savings rate in the U.S. is too low. Why does the U.S., as the world's 'greatest capitalist/imperialist power', attract so much foreign investment? Many Americans worry about America's international accounts. Fears about foreigners buying up America are unfounded, but not because this does not happen. America does have a relatively low national savings rate. It does attract much foreign investment, precisely because it has relatively secure property rights. Indeed, much of the third world suffers from too little investment. The claims of Marxists, and Hobson, directly contradict the historical record. Sound theory tells us that it should. The Marxist claim that capitalists must find investments overseas fails miserably. Larry Kudlow has put his own spin on the false connection between capitalism and war. We need the War as shock therapy to get the economy on its feet. Kudlow also endorses massive airline subsidies as a means of restoring economic prosperity. Kudlow and Krugman both endorse the alleged destructive creation of warfare and terrorism. Kudlow has rechristened the Broken Window fallacy the Broken Window principle. Kudlow claims that may lose money and wealth in one way, but we gain it back many time over when the rebuilding is done. Kudlow and Krugman have quite an affinity for deficits. Krugman sees debt as a sponge to absorb excess saving. Kudlow see debt as a short term nuisance that we can dispel by maximizing growth. One would think that such famous economists would realize that competition does work to achieve the goal of optimum growth based on time preference, but this is not the case. While these economists have expressed their belief in writing, they could do more. If the destruction of assets leads to increased prosperity, then they should teach this principle by example. Kudlow and Krugman could, for instance, help build the economy by demolishing their own private homes. This would have the immediate effect of stimulating demand for demolition experts, and the longer term affect of stimulating the demand for construction workers. They can create additional wealth by financing the reconstruction of their homes through debt. By borrowing funds, they draw idle resources into use and stimulate financial activity. Of course, they would both initially lose wealth in one way. But if their thinking is sound, they will gain it back many times over as they rebuild. The truth is that their beliefs are fallacious. Bastiat demonstrated the absurdity of destructive creation in his original explanation of the opportunity costs from repairing broken windows. Kudlow is quite clear about his intentions. He wants to grow the economy to finance the war. As Kudlow told some students, "The trick here is to grow the economy and let the economic growth raise the revenue for the war effort"[ii]. Kudlow also praises the Reagan Administration for growing the economy to fund national defense. Here Kudlow's attempts to give economic advice cease completely. His argument here is not that capitalism needs a shot in the arm. It is that resources should be redirected towards ends that he sees fit. Kudlow is a war hawk who, obviously, cannot fund this or any war personally. He instead favors using the state to tax others to fund what he wants, but cannot afford. He seems to think that his values matter more than any other's. Why should anyone else agree with this? Kudlow tarnishes the image of laissez faire economics by parading his faulty reasoning and his claims that his wants should reign supreme as a pro-market stance. Unfortunately, it is sometimes necessary to defend capitalism from alleged advocates of liberty, who employ false dogmas in pursuit of their own militaristic desires. Capitalism neither requires nor promotes imperialist expansion. Capitalism did not create imperialism or warfare. Warlike societies predate societies with secure private property. The idea that inequity or underspending give rise to militarism lacks any rational basis. Imperialistic tendencies exist due to ethnic and nationalistic bigotries, and the want for power. Prosperity depends upon our ability to prevent destructive acts. The dogma of destructive creation fails as a silver lining to the cloud of warfare. Destructive acts entail real costs that diminish available opportunities. The idea that we need to find work for idle hands in capitalism at best leads to a kind of Sisyphus economy where unproductive industries garner subsidies from productive people. At worst, it serves as a supporting argument for war. The more recent versions of the false charges against capitalism do nothing to invalidate two simple facts. Capitalism generates prosperity by creating new products. War inflicts poverty by destroying existing wealth. There is no sound reason to think otherwise.

### Capitalism Good – Poverty

#### Capitalism decreases poverty – we’ll be the only ones with uniqueness because poverty is rapidly decreasing in the world of globalization

Norberg, author of In Defense of Capitalism, 2003

Johan, September 15, http://www.cato.org/special/symposium/debate.html

This is the revolution that is transforming the world today. As the United Nations Development Programme has observed, in the last 50 years global poverty has declined more quickly than in the previous 500. If we allow globalization to continue, this trend will continue as well. The World Bank has calculated that a substantial free trade agreement would add as much as $520 billion to global incomes by 2015, lifting 144 million people out of poverty.

### Capitalism Good – Quality of Life

#### Capitalism improves living conditions

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

Individual wealth creation -- the ability to earn and retain capital -- is a tremendous force for change and demonstrates the concept of a virtuous cycle through the overlap between these three (human, ecological and economic) sets of assets. Critics are all too eager to point out that successful capitalism changes the way the environment looks; as anyone who has seen a factory and the environs nearby can attest.

But they may be too quick to overlook the many benefits that are associated with that same operation, including increasing quality of homes that people live in, the schools that can afford to pay qualified teachers, the influx of skilled labor opportunities to support the operation -- and the community -- and the medical professionals that serve to improve the health and well being of everyone.

Another benefit of a wealth-generating population is the link between individual and public gain. Companies that are profitable pay more in taxes, as do individuals. That allows for improvements to the infrastructure and the general living conditions of everyone in the community. Schools, roads, transportation linkage to other towns and cities are all tremendous benefits to the community at large.

#### Capitalism is key to freedom

Friedman Co-founder and vice chair of the board, Sustainable Business Network of Washington 2012 John In Defense of Capitalism: Profit Is Not a Dirty Word Huffington Post 1/26 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-friedman/profit-is-not-a-dirty-word\_b\_1222417.html

There is another major benefit of capitalism -- freedom. It is important to note that capitalism is an economic, not a political model. However, the ability to earn and retain one's earnings is hugely empowering for anyone seeking a better situation in life. Immigrants who could afford even the cheapest passage came to America in droves on ships to escape religious, political and/or economic oppression. The phrase 'the land of opportunity' describes the optimism that spurred them across the open seas to an unknown future.

Today the ability to earn and retain the financial fruits of one's own labors continues to be a driving force that changes lives and societies. It may be a factor in the low marriage and high divorce rates in the United States, as women no longer rely on a 'breadwinner' they can stay independent longer, and are not tied economically to stay in oppressive marriages. As those fiscal pressures ease, societal norms change. While it is true that we still have a long way to go to achieve economic parity, the roles of gender in the workplace and our society have transformed radically since the days of World War 2, when the men went off to fight and women first entered the workforce in massive numbers.

## \*\*\*IMPACT FRAMING\*\*\*

### Consequentialism Good

#### Evaluation of consequences is the utmost ethical act – their ethic allows infinite violence

Williams Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth 2005 Michael The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations p. 174-176

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what Schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in International Relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful Realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful Realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the Realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and uncritical stances of abstract moralism or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, Realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 Objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will. But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful Realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the precondition for freedom. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 But it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

#### Their ideological stance is too reductionist – the world does not conform to their criticism – only an ethic of consequences can evaluate a more complicated set of impacts

Williams Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales—Aberystwyth 2005 Michael The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations 178-179

This commitment to the construction of an ethic of responsibility in a world without foundations is also illustrated in the very idea of objective enquiry. Why, for example, should analysts be committed to objectivity given wilful Realism’s scepticism toward a science of international politics? Why, as Morgenthau so pointedly asked, should it be a ‘calling’ to seek ‘truth’ and not just ‘power’, when it is so often and so clearly advantageous to speak the truth which power wants to hear? Would not a Realist appreciation of power lead its most astute practitioners to tell power whatever it wanted to hear in order to gain power themselves? Within the wilful Realist tradition, this is again a question of responsibility and, importantly, of will. It is a responsible choice, itself beyond ultimate ground of objectivity. The capacity to recognise the lack of a naïvely ‘objective’ standpoint is necessary for an objective (realistic) understanding of the social world and, vitally, is a condition of the construction of an ethic of responsibility within it. Responsibility in wilful Realism does not entail a simple support for, and acquiescence to, dominant political realities and a consequential analysis of their implications. On the contrary, it is a condition of responsible scepticism toward dominant political claims. Power, in this vision, wants continually to claim that there is no gap between its understandings and actions and truth. The commitment to objectivity in wilful Realism is to demonstrate the inevitably partial nature of these claims, to uncover the ethical and practical limitations and forms of domination that they seek to disguise, and to subject these to ruthless and ongoing criticism. If political success is a matter of continually ensuring that truth bends to the needs of power, responsibility entails consistently challenging this dynamic. The commitment to truth does not emerge from an external reality: it is a responsible element and expression of self-mastery, autonomy, and freedom. Rather than being the outcome of some naïve, disembodied, positivist ideal, or of the uncritical pursuit of some Modernist utopia, it is an expression of will, of creative self-assertion and moral commitment fully conscious of the limits of knowledge. To give oneself over fully to the demands of prevailing structures of power — in the form of either a servile ascription to dominant forms of knowledge or political obligation — or retreat wholly from such commitments in the name of the inescapability of some soporific ‘relativism’, is precisely to forfeit one’s autonomy and to abdicate one’s responsibility.

#### Political responsibility requires a consideration of consequences

Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University, Bloomington, Spring 2002, Dissent, vol. 49, no. 2

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

### AT: Quality of Life

#### Even their focus on quality of life must put questions of survival before the consideration of the aff

Fried professor of law @ Harvard 2002 Charles Fried “Right and Wrong as Absolute.” P. 76-77 in Absolutism and its Consequentialist Critics, edited by Jorem Graf Haber.

Even within such boundaries we can imagine extreme cases where killing an innocent person may save a whole nation. In such cases it seems fanatical to maintain the absoluteness of the judgment, to do right even if the heavens will in fact fall. And so the catastrophic may cause the absoluteness of right and wrong to yield, but even then it would be a non sequitur to argue (as consequentialists are fond of doing) that this proves that judgments of right and wrong are always a matter of degree, depending on the relative goods to be attained and harms to be avoided. I believe, on the contrary, that the concept of the catastrophic is a distinct concept just because it identifies the extreme situations in which the usual categories of judgment (including the category of right and wrong) no longer apply. At the other end of the spectrum, there is the concept of the trivial, the de minimis where the absolute categories do not yet apply. And the trivial also does not prove that right and wrong are really only a matter of degree. It is because of these complexities and because the term absolute is really only suggestive of a more complex structure, that I also refer to the norms of right and wrong not as absolute but as categorical.\*) When we say that one must not grievously harm an innocent person, that one must not lie, these are categorical prohibitions in the sense that (within limits) no amount of good can justify them. But they are not absolute in the sense that we may never be justified in doing acts which have these very results—the death of an innocent person, the propagation of false beliefs—as a consequence. They are absolute in the sense that they point out certain acts we must not perform. They are not absolute in the consequentialist's sense; they do not state that a certain state of the world is of such supreme importance that the value of everything else must be judged by its tendency to produce that state. So here we see a complex relation between deontological judgments on what we do and evaluative (axiological) judgments on states of the world—with which we are also concerned. We must indeed be concerned with producing good in the world, but without violating the absolute norms of right and wrong).

### AT: Apocalyptic Rhetoric

#### Apocalyptic scenario-planning is not pointless: It solves their offense, because it’s self-reflexive; and, It boosts valuable participation for the audience.

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

This discussion has largely been focused on the historical precedents for a secular tradition of writing about human extinction. Although literary studies may seem outside of the scope of futures studies, authors like Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, and Margaret Atwood present compelling visions of the future and generate discussions about the imagination of human extinction and the art of writing its scenarios. Furthermore a literary analysis of the apocalyptic mode of writing offers new insights into the reasons why the narrative of human extinction is so powerful and provides background texts that might help shape and inspire future extinction scenarios. D.H. Lawrence once asked: ‘‘What does the Apocalypse matter, unless in so far as it gives us imaginative release into another vital world? After all, what meaning has the Apocalypse? For the ordinary reader, not much’’ [28]. The goal of this edition is to address D.H. Lawrence’s questions and to prove to the ordinary reader that thinking about human extinction an integral step toward changing the present state of the world.

#### Apocalyptic rhetoric is key to policy making

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (1797–1851) is most well known for her first novel, Frankenstein, which was published in 1818 and is considered , among other things, the first piece of science fiction in English literature [1]. In 1826, she published her third novel entitled The Last Man [2] an epic narrative about the destruction of the human race. This book, which is the subject of this essay, was among the first literary works to explore the apocalypse. MWS’s human extinction scenario was one of the most percipient and path breaking and therefore should be required reading for futurists. During the course of the novel, humanity is extinguished by the Plague1 and the main character Lionel Verney suffers the loss of all that humankind had accomplished: art, music, literature, and politics. This profound sense of cultural loss rarely makes it into our current policy discussions about climate change, pandemics and other threats to humanity. It should, though, in order to remind us of the stakes involved in protecting the future of the human race. This paper provides a synopsis of the novel, observations about how this literary work is relevant to futurists today, and a literary analysis of this and other similar apocalyptic writings.

#### Apocalyptic scenario planning is good: Even if the predictions are off, the process remedies powerlessness and does help mobilize against real danger.

Bruce Tonn – Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee, and Jenna Tonn, Department of the History of Science, Harvard University – Futures 41 (2009) 760–765 – obtained via Science Direct

As we have seen, human extinction scenarios today fit into a long secular and religious history of writing about the apocalypse. The question then becomes: what makes people use the narrative model of the apocalypse as seen in the Old and New Testaments to tell their own stories? A number have scholars have discussed this question. David Ketterer, who studies the apocalyptic mode in American literature, believes that ‘‘apocalyptic literature is concerned with the creation of other worlds which exist, on the literal level, in a credible relationship (whether on the basis of rational extrapolation and analogy or of religious belief) with the ‘real’ world, thereby causing a metaphorical destruction of that ‘real’ world in the reader’s head’’. Furthermore, W. Warren Wagar, a historian and futures scholar who published many books including A Short History of the Future, wrote ‘‘that eschatological fictions help us cope with the fear of death and compensate us for our powerlessness’’. Wagar’s work on the apocalypse relates closely to the subject of MWS’s novel. He argued ‘‘The last man, or one of a handful of last men, is a figure of immeasurable power and importance’’ [18]. David Seed, the editor of an anthology of articles on apocalypse theory, cites Frank Kermode’s The Sense of an Ending in his discussion of the usefulness of apocalypse narratives. According to Seed, Kermode believes that the ‘‘apocalypse depends on a concord of imaginatively recorded past and imaginatively predicted future, achieved on behalf of us, who remain ‘in the middest’’’. Kermode’s ‘‘central insight’’ into apocalypse theory is that the ‘‘apocalypse [is] a narrative, one of the fictions which we employ to make sense of our present’’. Furthermore, ‘‘there is a necessary relation between the fictions by which we order our world and the increasing complexity of what we take to be the ‘real’ history of the world’’ Relating to this point, Lois Parkinson Zamora writes that ‘‘the apocalyptist assigns to event after event a place in a pattern of historical relationships that. . .presses steadily towards culmination’’ [19]. Thus, the apocalypse is a literary device that humans turn to both to comprehend more fully their place in the world and to impress upon others the conditions of the ‘‘real’’ world which must be changed to ensure the future of humanity.

## \*\*\*EDUCATION CP\*\*\*

### Repeal NCLB CP – 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should repeal Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and reallocate the funds toward non-charter, primary and secondary education.

#### NCLB is based upon neoliberal ideals to transform the education sector into a privatized and profitable business.

Hursh 8 [David Hursh is an Associate Professor in the Warner School of Education at the University of Rochester and author., “Neoliberalism and the control of teachers, students, and learning: The rise of

standards, standardization and accountability in the United States,” May/June 2008, p.1, <http://www.rougeforum.org/CSSE2008/HurshCSSE2008.pdf>,]

An exemplar of Neoliberal thinking is Thomas Friedman (of the world is flat fame), who in an earlier book, The Lexus and the Olive Tree (1999), argues that globalization requires free market capitalism The driving force behind globalization is free market capitalism--- the more you let market forces rule and the more you open up your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient your economy will be. Globalization means the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every corner of the world. Therefore, globalization also has its own set of economic rules--- rules that revolve around opening, deregulating and privatizing your economy, in order to make it more competitive and attractive to foreign investment. (p. 9) Such ideas are also reflected in President Bush’s public pronouncements, where he has used globalization to defend NCLB, an act that aims to have public schools compete for students in an educational market, in which students and schools are evaluated by scores on standardized tests, and if the schools are found to be failing (and the way in which Adequate Yearly Progress is determined ensures that initially many and eventually most schools are found to be failing) face having their administration and other services, such as tutoring, privatized, and eventually turned into a publicly funded private schools.

#### Repealing No Child Left Behind and increasing federal funds to public education pushes out the private sector.

Saltman 07 (Kenneth J., professor of Social and Cultural Foundations in Education at DePaul University, “Schooling in Disaster Capitalism: How the Political Right Is Using Disaster to Privatize Public Schooling”, Teacher Education Quarterly, Volume 34 (2), Pg 134-135, Spring 2007)

A study of the Great Lakes region of the U.S. by educational policy researchers found that 85% - 95% of schools in that region would be declared “failed” by NCLB AYP measures by 2014.14 These implications are national. Under NCLB, “The entire country faces tremendous failure rates, even under a conservative estimate with several forgiving assumptions.” 15 Under NCLB, in order for Illinois, for example, to get much needed federal Title I funds, the school must demonstrate “adequate yearly progress,” AYP. Each year Illinois has to get higher and higher standardized test scores in reading and math to make AYP. Illinois schools, and specifically Illinois schools already receiving the least funding and already serving the poorest students, are being threatened with: (1) losing federal funds; (2) having to use scarce resources for under-regulated and often unproven (SESs) supplemental educational services (private tutoring) such as Newton, a spin-off company of the much criticized for profit Edison Schools; or (3) being punished, reorganized, or closed and reopened as a “choice” school (these include for-profit or non profit charter schools that do not have the same level of public oversight and accountability, that often do not have teachers unions, and that often have to struggle for philanthropic grants to operate). Many defenders of public education view remediation options 2 and 3 under NCLB as having been designed to undermine those public schools that have been underserved in the first place in order to justify privatization schemes. 16 Public schools need help, investment, and public commitment. NCLB is setting up for failure not just Illinois public schools but public schools nationally by raising test-oriented thresholds without raising investment and commitment. NCLB itself appears to be a system designed to result in the declaration of wide-scale failure of public schooling to justify privatization. 17 Dedicated administrators, teachers, students, and schools are not receiving much-needed resources along with public investment in public services and employment in the communities where those schools are situated. What they are getting instead are threats. The theoretically and empirically dubious underlying assumption of NCLB is that threats and pressure force teachers to teach what they ought to teach, force students to learn what they ought to learn. In terms of conventional measures of student achievement, Sharon Nichols, Gene Glass, and David Berliner found in their empirical study, High-Stakes Testing and Student Achievement: Problems for the No Child Left Behind Act, that “there is no convincing evidence that the pressure associated with high-stakes testing leads to any important benefits for students’ achievement . . . [the authors] call for a moratorium on policies that force the public education system to rely on high-stakes testing.” 18 These authors find that highstakes testing regimes do not achieve what they are designed to achieve. However, to think beyond efficacy to the underlying assumptions about “achievement” it is necessary to raise theoretical concerns. Theoretically, at the very least, the enforcement-oriented assumptions of NCLB fail to consider the limitations of defining “achievement” through high-stakes tests, fail to question what knowledge and whose knowledge constitute legitimate or official curricula that students are expected to master, fail to interrogate the problematic assumptions of learning modeled on digestion or commodity acquisition (as opposed to dialogic, constructivist, or other approaches to learning), and such compartmentalized versions of knowledge and learning fail to comprehend how they relate to the broader social and political realities informing knowledge-making both in schools and in society generally.

### Solvency - Ext

#### Neoliberalism was created to produce inequalities and education is the key internal link to solving.

Hursh and Martina 3 [David Hursh is an Associate Professor in the Warner School of Education at the University of Rochester and author. He and his colleague Camille Martina have conducted an in depth analysis of the politics of testing in New York State., Camille Martina is a doctoral student at the Warner School of Education at University of Rochester, English teacher in the Rochester City School District, and, along with David Hursh, active in the Coalition for Common Sense in Education. One focus of her doctoral research is the politics of high-stakes testing, of which her co-authored paper, Resisting the Tyranny of Tests: The Battle for New York, is one outcome. “Neoliberalism and schooling in the U.S.” October 2003, http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=12, Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies v.1 n.2.]

In order to restore higher rates of profit, the U.S. and other developed countries implemented monetarist and neo-liberal policies (Gill, 2003, p. 7) that would support corporations over workers. In the US monetarist policies restored the power of capital by inducing a recession to deflate wage demands, escalate the scarcity of jobs and reverse the growth of social spending. Such policies were instituted with the intent of reducing the living standards of all but wealthy Americans. In 1979 Paul Volcker, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, provided the following rationale for the recession: “The standard of living of the average American has to decline. I don’t think you can escape that” (Parenti, 1999, p. 119). Such monetarist policies were soon linked with neo-liberal policies that emphasize "the deregulation of the economy, trade liberalization, the dismantling of the public sector [such as education, health, and social welfare], and the predominance of the financial sector of the economy over production and commerce" (Vilas, 1996). In particular, the consequences for education are similar to that for all public goods and services. Tabb (2002) writes that neo-liberalism stresses the privatization of the public provision of goods and services—moving their provision from the public sector to the private—along with deregulating how private producers can behave, giving greater scope to the single-minded pursuit of profit and showing significantly less regard for the need to limit social costs or for redistribution based on nonmarket criteria. The aim of neoliberalism is to put into question all collective structures capable of obstructing the logic of the pure market. (p. 7) Efforts to privatize public services, then, are occurring world wide, partly in response to the U.S. dominated World Bank and International Monetary Fund requirement that national governments develop economic policies that emphasize economic growth and property rights over social welfare and personal rights. In some countries, such a Chile, social security, health care, higher education and, to some extent, elementary and secondary education have been highly privatized (Collins and Lear, 1995). Such global changes led Stephen Gill to conclude that “[t]he social settlements and forms of state created after World War II have been transformed and in some respects destroyed” (Gill, 2003, p. 9). Efforts to dismantle the public sector have significant implications for educational policy. While some policy makers may desire to reduce funding for education, education remains significant as a means of developing productive workers and legitimizing current inequalities. As Roger Dale (Fall, 2000) notes, government policies need to support continued economic expansion while “providing a basis for legitimation of the system as a whole” (437).

#### Neoliberalization of education is a result of lacking federal investment and causes racism.

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

In the United States, the neoliberal restructuring of education is deeply racialized. It is centered particularly on urban African American, Latino, and other communities of color, where public schools, subject to being closed or privatized, are driven by a minimalist curriculum of preparing for standardized tests. The cultural politics of race is also central to constructing consent for this agenda. As Stephen Haymes argues, the “concepts ‘public’ and ‘private’ are racialized metaphors. Private is equated with being ‘good’ and ‘white’ and public with being ‘bad’ and ‘Black.’”9 Disinvesting in public schools, closing them, and opening privately operated charter schools in African-American and Latino communities is facilitated by a racist discourse that pathologizes these communities and their public institutions. But “failing” schools are the product of a legacy of educational, economic, and social inequities experienced by African Americans, Latinos/as, and Native Americans.10 Schools serving these communities continue to face deeply inequitable opportunities to learn, including unequal funding, curriculum, educational resources, facilities, and teacher experience. High stakes accountability has often compounded these inequities by narrowing the curriculum to test preparation—producing an exodus of some of the strongest teachers from schools in low-income communities of color.11

#### Neoliberalism is repressing education systems which are the *only* mechanisms to break away from the turbo capitalism, racism and jingoism.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>)

What is crucial to grasp at the current historical moment is that the fate of democracy is inextricably linked to a profound crisis of contemporary knowledge, characterized by its increasing commodification, fragmentation, privatization and a turn toward racist and jingoistic conceits. As knowledge becomes abstracted from the rigors of civic culture and is reduced to questions of style, ritual and image, it undermines the political, ethical and governing conditions for individuals to construct those viable public spheres necessary for debate, collective action and solving urgent social problems. As public spheres are privatized, commodified and turned over to the crushing forces of turbo capitalism, the opportunities for openness, inclusiveness and dialogue that nurture the very idea and possibility of a discourse about democracy cease to exist. The lesson to be learned in this instance is that political agency involves learning how to deliberate, make judgments and exercise choices, particularly as the latter are brought to bear on critical activities that offer the possibility of change. Civic education as it is experienced and produced throughout an ever-diminishing number of institutions provides individuals with opportunities to see themselves as capable of doing more than the existing configurations of power of any given society would wish to admit. And it is precisely this notion of civic agency and critical education that has been under aggressive assault within the new and harsh corporate order of casino capitalism.

#### Education is inextricably linked to savage capitalism and authoritarian ideals.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism)

Indeed, many institutions that provide formal education in the United States have become co-conspirators with a savage casino capitalism, whose strength lies in producing, circulating and legitimating market values that promote the narrow world of commodity worship, celebrity culture, bare-knuckle competition, a retreat from social responsibility and a war-of-all-against-all mentality that destroys any viable notion of community, the common good and the interrelated notions of political, social and economic rights. University presidents now make huge salaries sitting on corporate boards, while faculty sell their knowledge to the highest corporate bidder and, in doing so, turn universities into legitimation centers for casino capitalism.(34) Of course, such academics also move from the boardrooms of major corporations to talk shows and op-ed pages of major newspapers, offering commentary in journals and other modes of print and screen culture. They are the new traveling intellectuals of casino capitalism, doing everything they can to make the ruthless workings of power invisible, to shift the blame for society's failures onto the very people who are its victims and to expand the institutions and culture of anti-intellectualism and distraction into every aspect of American life. Across all levels, politics in the United States now suffers from an education deficit that enables a pedagogy of distraction to dictate with little accountability how crucial social problems and issues are named, discussed and acted upon. The conservative re-education machine appears shameless in its production of lies that include insane assertions such as: Obama's health care legislation would create death panels; liberals are waging a war on Christmas; Obama is a socialist trying to nationalize industries; the founding fathers tried to end slavery; and Obama is a Muslim sympathizer and not a US citizen. Other misrepresentations and distortions include: the denial of global warming; the government cannot create jobs; cuts in wages and benefits create jobs; Obama has created massive deficits; Obama wants to raise the taxes of working- and middle-class people; Obama is constantly "apologizing" for America; and the assertion that Darwinian evolution is a myth.(35) Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney continues spinning this spider web of lies unapologetically, even when members of his own party point out the inconsistencies in his claims. For instance, he has claimed that, "Obamacare increases the deficit,"(36) argued that Obama has "increased the national debt more than all other presidents combined" and insisted that Obama has lied about "his record on gay rights." He has falsely claimed that, "Obama promised unemployment below eight percent,"(37) dodged the truth regarding "his position on climate change" and blatantly misrepresented the truth in stating that, "he pays a 50% tax rate."(38) Diane Ravitch has recently pointed out that in making a case for vouchers, Romney has made false claims about the success of the DC voucher program.(39) The politics of distraction should not be reduced merely to a rhetorical ploy used by the wealthy and influential to promote their own interests and power. It is a form of market-driven politics in which educational force of the broader culture is used to create ideologies, policies, individuals and social agents who lack the knowledge, critical skills and discriminatory judgments to question the rule of casino capitalism and the values, social practices and power formations it legitimates. Politics and education have always mutually informed each other as pedagogical sites proliferate and circulate throughout the cultural landscape.(40) But today, distraction is the primary element being used to suppress democratically purposeful education by pushing critical thought to the margins of society. As a register of power, distraction becomes central to a pedagogical landscape inhabited by rich conservative foundations, an army of well-funded anti-public intellectuals from both major parties, a growing number of amply funded conservative campus organizations, increasing numbers of academics who hock their services to corporations and the military-industrial complex, and others who promote the ideology of casino capitalism and the corporate right's agenda. Academics who make a claim to producing knowledge and truth in the public interest are increasingly being replaced by academics for hire who move effortlessly among industry, government and academia. Extreme power is now showcased through the mechanisms of ever-proliferating cultural/educational apparatuses and the anti-public intellectuals who support them and are in turn rewarded by the elites who finance such apparatuses. The war at home is made visible in the show of force aimed at civilian populations, including students, workers, and others considered disposable or a threat to the new authoritarianism. Its most powerful allies appear to be the intellectuals, institutions, cultural apparatuses and new media technologies that constitute the sites of public pedagogy, which produce the formative culture necessary for authoritarianism to thrive.

#### The market for private education encourages racism and classism and results in violence.

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

Across African-American communities, the mayoral-appointed school board has closed schools on the grounds of low achievement. Others, particularly in gentrifying Latino/a communities, have been closed for low enrollment, despite evidence to the contrary. The board has replaced neighborhood schools with charter schools or selective enrollment schools that most neighborhood children are unable to attend. School closings have resulted in increased mobility, spikes in violence, and neighborhood instability as children are transferred to schools out of their neighborhoods.24 Moreover, Renaissance 2010 has not increased educational opportunities for most students, with 80 percent of displaced students attending schools no better than the ones that were closed.25

### CP 1st

#### The CP is a prerequisite to the case-education unlocks all other social spheres.

Giroux 6/19 (Henry A., Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977, professor of education at Boston University professor of education and renowned scholar at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University, Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies, currently holds the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism”, Truth Out, June 19th, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>)

While a change in consciousness does not guarantee a change in either one's politics or society, it is a crucial precondition for connecting what it means to think otherwise to conditions that make it possible to act otherwise. The education deficit must be seen as intertwined with a political deficit, serving to make many oppressed individuals complicit with oppressive ideologies. As the late Cornelius Castoriadis made clear, democracy requires "critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question.... while simultaneously creating the conditions for individual and social autonomy."(41) Nothing will change politically or economically until new and emerging social movements take seriously the need to develop a language of radical reform and create new public spheres that support the knowledge, skills and critical thought that are necessary features of a democratic formative culture. Getting beyond the big lie as a precondition for critical thought, civic engagement and a more realized democracy will mean more than correcting distortions, misrepresentations and falsehoods produced by politicians, media talking heads and anti-public intellectuals. It will also require addressing how new sites of pedagogy have become central to any viable notion of agency, politics and democracy itself. This is not a matter of elevating cultural politics over material relations of power as much as it is a rethinking of how power deploys culture and how culture as a mode of education positions power. James Baldwin, the legendary African-American writer and civil rights activist, argued that the big lie points to a crisis of American identity and politics and is symptomatic of "a backward society" that has descended into madness, "especially when one is forced to lie about one's aspect of anybody's history, [because you then] must lie about it all."(42) He goes on to argue "that one of the paradoxes of education [is] that precisely at the point when you begin to develop a conscience, you must find yourself at war with your society. It is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person."(43) What Baldwin recognizes is that learning has the possibility to trigger a critical engagement with oneself, others and the larger society - education becomes in this instance more than a method or tool for domination but a politics, a fulcrum for democratic social change. Tragically, in our current climate "learning" merely contributes to a vast reserve of manipulation and self-inflicted ignorance. Our education deficit is neither reducible to the failure of particular types of teaching nor the decent into madness by the spokespersons for the new authoritarianism. Rather, it is about how matters of knowledge, values and ideology can be struggled over as issues of power and politics. Surviving the current education deficit will depend on progressives using history, memory and knowledge not only to reconnect intellectuals to the everyday needs of ordinary people, but also to jumpstart social movements by making education central to organized politics and the quest for a radical democracy.

### AT No Spillover

#### Education is the mechanism for social homogenization and capitalist indoctrination. We have to solve the root of the problem.

Hill 09 (David, Professor at Middlesex University and is Visiting Professor of Critical Education Policy and Equality Studies at the University of Limerick, Ireland, *Global Neoliberalism and Education and Its Consequences*, Taylor and Francis 2009, pg. 209-210)

The first of the four claims-“the development of the person and his or her potential”-formulates, in an obscure language and with a touch of Christian “personalism” (though there are other versions), the idea that a pupil has to become what is expected of him: a social being with the necessary knowledge, skills, norms and attitudes for its future life. This “socialization” function is probably the least obscure in the ideological rhetoric.

The second claim-“to create free and responsible citizens”-barely conceals its deeper meaning: education has the function of ensuring the ideological cohesion of society by explicitly defending its economic and political organization and by justifying social inequalities through selection mechanisms.

The “equal opportunities” dogma is designed to legitimize true inequality: hierarchical social selection constitutes the third “function” of the capitalist school system. Given that “opportunities” for social advancement are believed to be equal, inequality in social achievement is perceived as the logical outcome of differences in merit or individual talents.

Finally, behind all those promises of access to employment lies the necessity of providing the economy with sufficient numbers of workers and consumers to meet current requirements.

#### The privatization of education is the root cause of community-level neoliberalization

Lipman 11 (Pauline, professor of Educational Policy Studies and Director of the Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education at the University of Illinois-Chicago, “Neoliberal Education Restructuring”, Monthly Review, Volume 63 (03), July 2011, http://monthlyreview.org/2011/07/01/neoliberal-education-restructuring)

This policy eliminates schools that are anchors in their communities, contributing to further disinvestment. In gentrifying areas, closing neighborhood schools and replacing them with schools branded for the middle class facilitates the displacement of working-class families. Chicago, like New Orleans, is an example of the intertwining of education policy and neoliberal urban development. Real estate development is a pivotal sector in urban economies, and closing neighborhood public schools in disinvested areas to open up elite, selective-enrollment public schools or prestigious charter schools is part of the neoliberal restructuring of urban space.26 This nexus of education policy and real estate development is located in the spatial logics of capital—the physical location of production facilities, the built environment of cities, and places of consumption are devalued and selectively rebuilt in order to establish a “new locational grid” for capital accumulation.27 In other disinvested, low-income neighborhoods, students attending under-resourced and struggling public schools are a ready consumer base for the proliferation of charter schools, particularly large charter school chains that target these areas.