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#### Cap sustainable: green tactics solve environmental crisis

Weiss 09

(Marc, CEO of Global Urban Development, and chairman of the Climate Prosperity Project, served as special assistant to the HUD secretary in the Clinton administration, and was a professor of urban development and planning at Columbia University, “Climate Prosperity: Why Marx Was Wrong and Mother Nature Is Right,” Tikkun, Vol. 24, Issue 3, June 2009, Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

Fortunately it is not too late to create an even higher standard of living for every person and community throughout the world, by shifting from resource-wasting capitalism to resource-saving capitalism. In the twenty-first century, the only way to get richer is by becoming greener, and the only way to earn more money is by using fewer resources and reusing more. In other words, the global economy can significantly enhance prosperity and quality of life for people everywhere by treating Mother Nature as our good friend and one of our most precious assets, rather than as our enemy to be exploited and conquered. The main challenge is for each of us to acknowledge the ancient wisdom of two essential values: 1) new is not always better than old; and 2) more is not always better than less.

#### You’ve got it wrong- After a temporary decline in the Great Depression Fertility increased Without hope of economic Prosperity

Philipov 10

[Tomáš Sobotka, Vegard Skirbekk and Dimiter Philipov, “Economic recession and fertility in the developed world A literature review” February 2010 Vienna Institute of Demography, Google Scholar, \\wyo-bb]

As noted above, historical time series of economic and demographic indicators suggest that business cycle was positively linked with fertility swings in the past. The analysis of the Great Depression of the 1930s generally confirms this observation, although the Depression did not affect the long-term declining trend in birth rates in the ‘Western world’. Caldwell (2008: 430 and Table 1) suggested that fertility decline of the first demographic transition “bottomed out in the economic depression of the 1930s, probably later and at a lower fertility level than would have been the case without the depression.” When inspecting changes over 5-year period of time (1929-34) van Bavel (2007) did not find a convincing correlation between GDP change and net reproduction rate in 11 Western countries during the interwar period. A continuity of long-term fertility decline is also noted by Greenwood et al. (2006), who state that in the United States and Western Europe “it is hard to detect a structural break in fertility due to the Great depression” (p. 205). Moreover, fertility decline halted in many countries around 1933 without many signs of economic prosperity returning (Caldwell 2006); paradoxically, a long-term fertility increase often began at the time of massive poverty and unemployment when the economy has hardly began its recovery.

#### Democracy depends directly on economic growth.

Barro 99

(Robert, prof of econ @ Harvard U, “Determinants of Democracy”, *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 107:6 December 1999 Pg. 163, 179,182, JF)

Inspection of the cross-country data suggests that countries at low levels of economic development typically do not sustain democracy. For example, the political freedoms installed in most of the newly independent African states in the early 1960s did not tend to last. Conversely, nondemocratic places that experience substantial economic development tend to become more dramatic. Examples include Chile, South Korea, Taiwan, Spain, and Portugal. Moreover, the countries of central and eastern Europe—which have been reasonably advanced economically for some time, especially in terms of education—eventually became more democratic. Thus a casual view of the data seems to support the Lipset/Aristotle hypothesis. A surge of democratization since the late 1980s meant that many of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa became more democratic than predicted by 1995. This group includes Benin, Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Mali, Niger, and Zambia. In some of these cases, the democratization may be explicable from the pressures and rewards exerted by international organizations, such as the IMF and the World Bank. (The recent U.S. efforts in Haiti are analogous.) In any case, the regression analysis predicts that, as with the African experience of the 1960s, democracy that gets well ahead of economic development will not last. As a possible indicator of this process, Niger had a military coup in January 1996 and then became nondemocratic. The data for a large panel of countries conﬁrm the Lipset/Aristotle hypothesis, which says that a higher standard of living promotes democracy. This relation shows up when democracy is represented by electoral rights or civil liberties and when the standard of living is measured by per capita GDP, primary school attainment, the gap between male and female primary schooling (which enters negatively), and the importance of the middle class. Democracy does not relate signiﬁcantly to school attainment at the secondary and higher levels. For a given standard of living, democracy tends to fall with urbanization and a greater reliance on natural resources but has little relation to country size.

#### Democracy prevents extinction

Diamond in ‘95

(Larry, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990s”, December, http://www.carnegie.org//sub/pubs/deadly/dia95\_01.html)

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness.

## Cap

#### Scenario planning is good. In a catastrophe-ridden world—it’s vital to make predictions about the future.

Kurasawa, 2004

[Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology at York University, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention

and the Work of Foresight.” 2004, Constellations, Vol. 11, No. 4]

Independently of this room for maneuver and the chances of success. Humanitarian, environmental, and techno-scientific activists have convincingly shown that we cannot afford not to engage in preventive labor. contractualist justification, global civil society actors are putting forth a number of arguments countering temporal myopia on rational grounds. They make the case that no generation, and no part of the world, is immune from catastrophe. Complacency and parochialism are deeply flawed in that even if we earn a temporary reprieve, our children and grandchildren will likely not be so fortunate unless steps are taken today. Similarly, though it might be possible to minimize or contain the risks and harms of actions to faraway places over the short-term, parrying the eventual blowback or spillover effect is improbable. In fact, as I argued in the previous section, all but the smallest and most isolated of crises are rapidly becoming globalized due to the existence of transnational circuits of ideas, images, people, and commodities. Regardless of where they live, our descendants will increasingly be subjected to the impact of environmental degradation, the spread of epidemics, gross North-South socioeconomic inequalities, refugee flows, civil wars, and genocides. What may have previously appeared to be temporally and spatially remote risks are ‘coming home to roost’ in ever faster cycles. In a word, then, procrastination makes little sense for three principal reasons: it exponentially raises the costs of eventual future action; it reduces preventive options; and it erodes their effectiveness. With the foreclosing of long-range alternatives, later generations may be left with a single course of action, namely, that of merely reacting to large-scale emergencies as they arise. We need only think of how it gradually becomes more difficult to control climate change, let alone reverse it, or to halt mass atrocities once they are underway. Preventive foresight is grounded in the opposite logic, whereby the decision to work through perils today greatly enhances both the subsequent Moreover, I would contend that farsighted cosmopolitanism is not as remote or idealistic a prospect as it appears to some, for as Falk writes, “[g]lobal justice between temporal communities, however, actually seems to be increasing, as evidenced by various expressions of greater sensitivity to past injustices and future dangers.”36 Global civil society may well be helping a new generational self-conception take root, according to which we view ourselves as the provisional caretakers of our planetary commons. Out of our sense of responsibility for the well-being of those who will follow us, we come to be more concerned about the here and now.

#### Capitalism sustainable and inevitable: empirically proven to adapt to any conditions

Farndale 12

(Nigel, The Daily Telegraph, “CAPITALISM: We can rebuild it REPORT First we blamed bankers for the financial collapse, and now the system itself is under attack. But do economists have any better ideas?” January 15, 2012, ProQuest//wyo-mm)

Adam Fergusson's book When Money Dies: the Nightmare of the Weimar Hyperinflation, has become a modern classic. I ask for Fergusson's take. "I don't think there are any serious alternatives to capitalism," he says, "not if we hope for growth and recovery, because capitalism represents the competition and enterprise that produces these things. The events of the past three or four years will have taught those who practise capitalism some big lessons." Does his blood run cold at mention of quantitative easing? "Absolutely. It hasn't worked with us. It hasn't worked in America. The danger is of losing control. If it doesn't work you try harder with more, and it if it does work you increase the amount. It's like drug addiction." And anyway, a shortage of money is not the problem. The problem is that the money is in the wrong place. It's in China where people, for reasons that seem enigmatic to us, like to - say it in a whisper - save. What we are witnessing, then, is the "creative destruction" of the heavily indebted Western economies by the emerging economies of the East. Darwinism at its purest. And a very capitalist idea. What, after all, is capitalism about if not competition and survival of the fittest? Capitalism, like the poor, will always be with us, because trade is how society operates. Trade is the human condition. As the philosopher Michel Onfray has said: "Is this the end of capitalism? Absolutely not. Capitalism has been through antiquity, feudalism, the industrial era, it has worn the guise of fascism and now it's wedding itself to the ecology cause. After this latest event, it will take on a new form. It is indestructible and works like the Hydra of Lerne, cut off one head and another grows in its place."

### 2AC K2 Space

#### Capitalism is key to space exploration and development

Blundell, 04

John Blundell, director general of the Institute for Economic Affairs, 2004 (“Mission to Mars must go private to succeed,” February 2, http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=news&ID=166)

What we need is capitalists in space. Capitalism needs property rights, enforcement of contracts and the rule of law. The ideological tussle does not cease once we are beyond the ionosphere. With the exception of Arthur C Clarke, none of us imagined the entertainment potential from satellites. Geostationary lumps of electronic gadgetry beam us our BSkyB television pictures. I remain in awe that Rupert Murdoch can place a device in the skies above Brazil that sends a signal to every home in each hemisphere. Who could have foreseen that mobile phones could keep us chattering without any wiring, or that global position techniques could plot where we all are to within a metre? These are business applications. Business is already in space. Markets detect and apply opportunities that are not envisaged by even the most accomplished technicians. I’m not saying Murdoch has special competences. I imagine he is as baffled by digital miracles as I am. The point is that companies define and refine what public bodies cannot achieve. Lift the veil of course and all those satellite firms are an intricate web of experts supplying ideas and services. We have an infant space market. What use will the Moon be? Is there value on Mars other than the TV rights? The answer is nobody can know. We can only make some guesses. The Spanish ships that set off for the US thought they would get to India. The Portuguese knew they’d reach China. The English followed them westwards seeking gold. In fact, they got tobacco. Events always confound expectations. The arguments for putting men on Mars are expressly vague from President Bush. Perhaps he was really bidding for votes. From my reading the best results may be medical. Zero, or low, gravity techniques may allow therapies of which we are ignorant. It seems facetious to suggest tourism may be a big part of space opportunity but as both the North and South poles are over-populated and there is a queue at the top of Mount Everest, a trip to the Sea of Tranquility may prove a magnet for the wealthy. Instead of NASA’s grotesque bureaucracy it may be Thomas Cook will be a greater force for exploration. NASA could be a procurement body. It need not design and run all space ventures. It could sub-contract far more extensively. Without specialised engineering expertise it is not easy to criticise projects such as the shuttle. It seems to be excessively costly and far too fragile. There are private space entrepreneurs already. They are tiddlers up against the mighty NASA. Yet Dan Goldin, the NASA leader, says he favours the privatisation of space: "We can’t afford to do solar system exploration until we turn these activities over to the cutting edge private sector..."Some may say that commercialising portions of NASA’s functions is heresy. Others may think we are taking a path that will ruin the wonders of space. I believe that when NASA can creatively partner, all of humankind will reap the benefits of access to open space". Is it possible the Moon has a more noble future than merely a branch office of NASA? Is it tolerable that Mars could be a subsidiary of the USA? Could it be nominally a further state of the union? These are not silly questions. In time space will be defined by lawyers and accountants as property rights will need to be deliberated. One possibility may be that both environments are so hostile that Mars and the Moon will never be more than token pockets for humanity. On the evidence so far it is the orbiting satellites that have made us see the Earth through new eyes. We can survey and explore the planet better from 200 miles up than stomping on the surface. The emerging commercial body of space law is derived from telecommunications law. It is perplexing and contrary to our immediate senses. How can you own or exchange something as intangible as digital messages bouncing off satellites? Yet we all pay our mobile phone bills. Many of the business results of space exploration are unintended consequences of NASA’s early adventures. Computer development would probably have been slower but for the need for instrumentation for Apollo. Are there prospects for Scottish firms in space? The prizes will not go to only the mega corporations. Perhaps Dobbies, the Edinburgh garden centre group, can create new roses by placing pots beyond gravity. Edinburgh University laboratories, or rather their commercial spin offs, could patent new medicines. Is it possible the genetic magicians at the Bush could hitch a ride into space and extend their discoveries? NASA is a monopolist. All monopolies are bad for business. They only stunt opportunities. They blunt alternatives. By opening space to entrepreneurship we will be starting on what FA Hayek memorably describes as "a discovery procedure". Science is an open system. So is capitalism.

#### Space solves multiple existential threats –key to survival

Pelton 03

(Joseph, Director of the Space and Advanced Communications Research institute at George Washington University and Executive Director of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation, “COMMENTARY: Why Space? The Top 10 Reasons”, September 23, http://www.space.com/news/commentary\_top10\_030912.html)

Actually the lack of a space program could get us all killed. I dont mean you or me or my wife or children. I mean that Homo sapiens as a species are actually endangered. Surprising to some, a well conceived space program may well be our only hope for long-term survival. The right or wrong decisions about space research and exploration may be key to the futures of our grandchildren or great-grandchildren or those that follow. Arthur C. Clarke, the author and screenplay writer for 2001: A Space Odyssey, put the issue rather starkly some years back when he said: The dinosaurs are not around today because they did not have a space program. He was, of course, referring to the fact that we now know a quite largish meteor crashed into the earth, released poisonous Iridium chemicals into our atmosphere and created a killer cloud above the Earth that blocked out the sun for a prolonged period of time. This could have been foreseen and averted with a sufficiently advanced space program. But this is only one example of how space programs, such as NASAs Spaceguard program, help protect our fragile planet. Without a space program we would not know about the large ozone hole in our atmosphere, the hazards of solar radiation, the path of killer hurricanes or many other environmental dangers. But this is only a fraction of the ways that space programs are crucial to our future. He Continues… Protection against catastrophic planetary accidents: It is easy to assume that an erratic meteor or comet will not bring destruction to the Earth because the probabilities are low. The truth is we are bombarded from space daily. The dangers are greatest not from a cataclysmic collision, but from not knowing enough about solar storms, cosmic radiation and the ozone layer. An enhanced Spaceguard Program is actually a prudent course that could save our species in time.

### 2AC K2 Envtm

#### Capitalism key to environmental protection

Taylor, 03

director of natural resource studies at CATO, Aprill 22, 2003

[Jerry, *Happy Earth Day? Thank Capitalism*, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=3073]

Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities, after all, are luxury goods. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between $3,500 and $15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammeled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it. Meanwhile, capitalism rewards efficiency and punishes waste. Profit-hungry companies found ingenious ways to reduce the natural resource inputs necessary to produce all kinds of goods, which in turn reduced environmental demands on the land and the amount of waste that flowed through smokestacks and water pipes. As we learned to do more and more with a given unit of resources, the waste involved (which manifests itself in the form of pollution) shrank. This trend was magnified by the shift away from manufacturing to service industries, which characterizes wealthy, growing economies. The latter are far less pollution-intensive than the former. But the former are necessary prerequisites for the latter . Property rights -- a necessary prerequisite for free market economies -- also provide strong incentives to invest in resource health. Without them, no one cares about future returns because no one can be sure they'll be around to reap the gains. Property rights are also important means by which private desires for resource conservation and preservation can be realized. When the government, on the other hand, holds a monopoly on such decisions, minority preferences in developing societies are overruled (see the old Soviet block for details). Furthermore, only wealthy societies can afford the investments necessary to secure basic environmental improvements, such as sewage treatment and electrification. Unsanitary water and the indoor air pollution (caused primarily by burning organic fuels in the home for heating and cooking needs) are directly responsible for about 10 million deaths a year in the Third World, making poverty the number one environmental killer on the planet today. Capitalism can save more lives threatened by environmental pollution than all the environmental organizations combined.

#### Environmental collapse causes extinction

Cross apply our AFP card

### 2AC solves war

#### Capitalism solves global war

Bernstein 2002

(Andrew, Senior Writer for the Ayn Rand Institute and Ph.D. in Philosophy, “The Nobel Peace Prize Should Go to Those Who Really Support Peace”, October 11, <http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5453>)

If one admires men who cause war, one will ignore or vilify men who promote peace. Those who respect and support individual rights and political/economic freedom are the only true lovers of peace. Private capitalists and businessmen are outstanding examples. Business requires the barring of the initiation of force. Businessmen deal with one another peacefully, by means of trade, persuasion and voluntary contracts and agreements. Because businessmen respect the rights of all individuals, they have helped liberate the best minds to innovate, invent and advance, and thereby helped produce great general prosperity and peace. By helping to spread free trade across the globe, they have created peaceful relations among the individuals of many nations. Yet perversely, capitalists are denounced as exploiters of man. If we sincerely seek to attain the inestimable value that is world peace, it is individual rights and therefore capitalism that we must endorse. Capitalism is the only political-economic system that protects individual rights by banning the initiation of force. As Ayn Rand observed, it was capitalism that gave mankind its longest period of peace--an era in which there were no wars involving the entire civilized world--from the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 to the outbreak of World War I in 1914. If we truly want to recognize and promote the cause of peace, let us award a peace prize to Capitalism.

#### Capitalism makes military conflict less likely: private property discourages initiation of conflict.

McDonald 10

(Patrick, University of Texas at Austin, International Interactions, “Capitalism, Commitment, and Peace,” April 1, 2010, Taylor and Francis Group accessed via Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

The monadic and directed dyadic tests demonstrate that high levels of public property in one state heighten the risks of military conflict between states. Large quantities of state-owned assets encourage governments to initiate military conflict and heighten the risks that they will be targeted in military conflict. Conversely, high levels of private property, one of the institutional hallmarks of capitalist economies, make military conflict less likely both in terms of initiating and targeting behavior.

### Perm

#### Perm do both: the best way to understand different cultural contexts is through an a more open knowledge production.

Mezzadra 11

(Sandro, Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, “Bringing capital back in: a materialist turn in postcolonial studies?” 2011//wyo-mm)

How can we develop a methodology capable of grasping this hallmark (and more generally the common characteristics of global capitalism) while at the same time allowing us to remain sensitive to the specificity of local contexts and differences that has been so important for the development of cultural studies? This is a question I asked myself listening to Pun Ngai’s (2010) talk at the Crossroads Conference in Hong Kong, and particularly reflecting upon her impressive description of the ‘dormitory labor system regime’ in contemporary China. There is of course a lot of comparative work to be done here: as Pun (2009) herself writes in a recent article, ‘the dormitory use for labor has a long history both in a western or eastern context of industrialization’. Nevertheless I think that comparative analysis, although important, is not enough. There is something else to be done, a strategy of knowledge production that, as far as I am concerned, I learned in an ongoing conversation with my friends of the ‘colectivo situaciones’, 6 based in Buenos Aires. I will call this, for want of a better definition, letting concepts and images ‘resonate’ in contexts different from the ones where they have been forged, without losing the sense of their historical and geographical specificity but remaining open to the (often unforeseen) effects precisely produced by their ‘resonating’ in different situations. At stake in my discussions with the ‘colectivo situaciones’ has been, for instance, the possibility of making the experiences of the Argentinean unemployed movement politically productive in the European discussion on ‘precarity’, and vice versa. But from a more theoretical point of view, my idea of ‘resonating’ is surprisingly close to what Kuan-Hsing Chen calls the method of ‘inter-referencing’ – and to what he has done in his recent book reading Partha Chatterjee’s analysis of ‘political society’ through the lens of mínjian, and once again vice versa.

#### Perm do both

#### Marx was wrong: capitalism can exist in an efficient and beneficial state that focuses on resource efficiency, sustainable development, and democratic principles; paving the way for increase standards of living and poverty reduction. Reason perm solves best

Weiss 09

(Marc, CEO of Global Urban Development, and chairman of the Climate Prosperity Project, served as special assistant to the HUD secretary in the Clinton administration, and was a professor of urban development and planning at Columbia University, “Climate Prosperity: Why Marx Was Wrong and Mother Nature Is Right,” Tikkun, Vol. 24, Issue 3, June 2009, Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

Global Urban Development (the group that I lead) is coordinating the Climate Prosperity Project, whose core belief is that "innovation, efficiency, and conservation in the use and reuse of all natural and human resources is the best way to increase jobs, incomes, productivity, and competitiveness." The projects main purpose is to creatively use business sustainability concepts taken from Paul Hawken, Amory and Hunter Lovins, Peter Senge, Karl-Henrik Robert, William McDonough, Daniel Esty, and the McKinsey Global Institute, as applied by companies such as GE, IBM, Toyota, IKEA, DuPont, Google, Nike, and Apple. This model has three key elements: Green Savings — reducing waste and cutting costs; Green Opportunities — expanding jobs and businesses by raising revenues and increasing market share; Green Talent — investing in fundamental assets including technology, infrastructure, and most importantly, modern entrepreneurial and workforce skills, because people are now the world's most vital economic resource. Through state, regional, and local Climate Prosperity Strategies, places like Silicon Valley and the State of Delaware are now using the three-part business sustainability model to promote economic development that saves money, creates jobs, raises incomes, and keeps us all safe from environmental harm. This spring the International Economic Development Council will publish the Climate Prosperity Guidebook, describing the various strategies and explaining how to develop and implement such approaches most effectively. Currently there is talk of a Climate Prosperity Agreement that will be part of the United Nations Copenhagen Treaty in 2009, with developed countries committing to invest 1 trillion dollars in developing countries over the next decade to build renewable energy and clean technologies, enabling living standards to rise and poverty to be eliminated through sustainable innovation and resource efficiency. These investments will generate substantial economic and employment growth for every nation throughout the world. The bottom line is that Marx and Engels were wrong, because the real three-phase historical dialectic is as follows: Phase 1 Pre-industrial sustainability Phase 2 Resource-wasting industrialization Phase 3 Innovative, efficient, sustainable, inclusive, democratic, resource-saving industrialism Now that we can envision a healthier, more peaceful, and prosperous future in harmony with Mother Nature, let's all thank her for showing us the one and only path that can definitely ensure our grandchildren will thrive.

### Alt fails-

#### Capitalism sustainable and inevitable: empirically proven to adapt to any conditions

Farndale 12

(Nigel, The Daily Telegraph, “CAPITALISM: We can rebuild it REPORT First we blamed bankers for the financial collapse, and now the system itself is under attack. But do economists have any better ideas?” January 15, 2012, ProQuest//wyo-mm)

Adam Fergusson's book When Money Dies: the Nightmare of the Weimar Hyperinflation, has become a modern classic. I ask for Fergusson's take. "I don't think there are any serious alternatives to capitalism," he says, "not if we hope for growth and recovery, because capitalism represents the competition and enterprise that produces these things. The events of the past three or four years will have taught those who practise capitalism some big lessons." Does his blood run cold at mention of quantitative easing? "Absolutely. It hasn't worked with us. It hasn't worked in America. The danger is of losing control. If it doesn't work you try harder with more, and it if it does work you increase the amount. It's like drug addiction." And anyway, a shortage of money is not the problem. The problem is that the money is in the wrong place. It's in China where people, for reasons that seem enigmatic to us, like to - say it in a whisper - save. What we are witnessing, then, is the "creative destruction" of the heavily indebted Western economies by the emerging economies of the East. Darwinism at its purest. And a very capitalist idea. What, after all, is capitalism about if not competition and survival of the fittest? Capitalism, like the poor, will always be with us, because trade is how society operates. Trade is the human condition. As the philosopher Michel Onfray has said: "Is this the end of capitalism? Absolutely not. Capitalism has been through antiquity, feudalism, the industrial era, it has worn the guise of fascism and now it's wedding itself to the ecology cause. After this latest event, it will take on a new form. It is indestructible and works like the Hydra of Lerne, cut off one head and another grows in its place."

#### Resistance and alternatives to capitalism are inevitably co-opted by marketing systems making the system worse: forecloses effective critique

Hickel and Khan 12

(Jason, London School of Economics and Political Science, Arsalan, University of Virginia, “The Culture of Capitalism and the Crisis of Critique,” Anthropological Quarterly, Volume 85, No. 1, Winter 2012, Project Muse//wyo-MM)

As indicated in the title of this piece, we seek to do two things in the following pages. First, we attempt to explain the cultural logic that underwrites neoliberal capitalism today, tracing its origins from the countercultural [End Page 205] movement that came out of Berkeley in the late 1960s. We note that there was a certain strand of thinking located within the New Left that was generative of the neoliberal ethos, and that this strand has now come to dominate the politics of American progressives in particular. Second, we try to show how progressive politics today partake of and perpetuate that very same cultural logic: that the logic of capitalism and the logic of resistance against capitalism have converged. In other words, we seek to show how the critique from the left not only accepts the basic terms of neoliberal capitalism, but actually promotes “alternatives” that ultimately advance its cause. This is the effect of a double process: over the past few decades, marketing strategies have managed to co-opt dissent and package rebellion as a consumer commodity at the same time as questions of poverty and inequality have been thoroughly depoliticized by the discourse of “development.” We will demonstrate the structural parallels between these two processes, both of which—as with Stewart and Obama—tend to mystify the

#### Capitalism is the best empirical model: Marxism not only fails, but guarantees genocides worse than committed by Hitler

Farndale 12

(Nigel, The Daily Telegraph, “CAPITALISM: We can rebuild it REPORT First we blamed bankers for the financial collapse, and now the system itself is under attack. But do economists have any better ideas?” January 15, 2012, ProQuest//wyo-mm)

But capitalism has come a long way. Speaking in its defence recently, the former Tory Cabinet minister, Michael Portillo, asked: "Is there any other system that could lift so many people out of poverty and create societies rich enough to provide welfare, health and education services?" When you put it like that, the anti-capitalists look like Monty Python's People's Front of Judea. "Apart from those capitalists who made us rich and provided welfare, health and education, what have the capitalists ever done for us?" Marx decreed that capitalism carried the seeds of its own destruction. But as the philosopher Karl Popper argued, the communism that Marx thought would replace it was even more doomed to failure - because it required the arrival of a "New Man", one who would embody freedom. And this New Man would be the end that justified the means, which, in the case of Stalinist and Maoist communism, meant not only denying freedom but committing genocide on a scale that would have made even Hitler gasp. But if capitalism's supposed nemesis failed, were there any worthwhile ideas that could be rescued from its ashes? Well, one post-communist movement is called Participatory Economics. Parecon, as it is known, has four elements: solidarity, self-management, diversity and equity. Solidarity means encouraging people to work for the benefit of others as well as themselves. Self-management means that everyone has a say in decisions which affect them. Diversity means giving people more options for how they work and what they consume. And equity is about fairness and equality - nobody should have substantially more wealth or power than anyone else. See what they did there? It all sounded reasonable, right up until equity, which is back-to-basics communism. But the other three perhaps amount to a new, more responsible capitalism, and this idea is very much in the air. David Cameron's Big Society is, after all, barking up the same tree. I ask Paul Ormerod, author of The Death of Economics, where he stands on this. "The capitalism we have today is not the same as capitalism in 1910," he says. "Then there wasn't the same idea of a welfare state or state intervention, except for defence. The great strength of capitalism is that it is not static, it's dynamic. It evolves."

# 1ar

#### C02 emissions cause warming

Nilsson & Pitt ‘94

[Sten & David, fellows, Alp Action, Bellerive Foundation. Protecting the Atmosphere: The Climate Change Convention and It’s Context, p. 3]

The most important greenhouse gas (about 56 percent) is CO2, mainly a byproduct of burning fossil fuels such as oil and coal. Normally absorbed in the oceans and forests, this gas has increased dramatically as the natural sinks are unable to cope and as the use of energy increases exponentially. This is not necessarily a new phenomenon. The analysis of trapped bubbles of CO2 in the ice cores has revealed that over millions of years rises in CO2 are directly associated with temperature increases.

#### Dedev fails – fascist industrialists take over after the rev

Lewis 92

(Martin, prof in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke U, “Green Delusions”, p.170-171)

While an explosive socioeconomic crisis in the near term is hardly likely the possibility certainly cannot be dismissed. Capitalism is an inherently unstable economic system, and periodic crises of some mag¬intude are inevitable. An outbreak of jingoistic economic nationalism throughout the world, moreover, could quickly result in virtual economic collapse. Under such circumstances we could indeed enter an epoch of revolutionary social turmoil. Yet I believe that there are good reasons to believe that the victors in such a struggle would be radicals not of the left but rather of the right. The extreme left, for all its intellectual strength, notably lacks the kind of power necessary to emerge victorious from a real revolution. A few old street radicals may still retain their militant ethos, but today’s college professors and their graduate students, the core marxist contingent, would be ineffective. The radical right, on the other hand, would present a very real threat. Populist right-wing paramilitary groups are well armed and well trained, while establishment-minded fascists probably have links with the American military, wherein lies the greatest concentration of destructive power this planet knows. Should a crisis strike so savagely as to splinter the American center and its political institutions, we could well experience a revolutionary movement simi¬lar to that of Germany in the 1930.

#### EXTINCTION OF THE SPECIES IS THE MOST HORRIBLE IMPACT IMAGINEABLE, PUTTING RIGHTS FIRST IS PUTTING A PART OF SOCIETY BEFORE THE WHOLE

Schell 1982

(Jonathan, Professor at Wesleyan University, *The Fate of the Earth*, pages 136-137 uw//wej)

Implicit in everything that I have said so far about the nuclear predicament there has been a perplexity that I would now like to take up explicitly, for it leads, I believe, into the very heart of our response-or, rather, our lack of response-to the predicament. I have pointed out that our species is the most important of all the things that, as inhabitants of a common world, we inherit from the past generations, but it does not go far enough to point out this superior importance, as though in making our decision about ex- tinction we were being asked to choose between, say, liberty, on the one hand, and the survival of the species, on the other. For the species not only overarches but contains all the benefits of life in the common world, and to speak of sacrificing the species for the sake of one of these benefits involves one in the absurdity of wanting to de- stroy something in order to preserve one of its parts, as if one were to burn down a house in an attempt to redecorate the living room, or to kill someone to improve his character. ,but even to point out this absurdity fails to take the full measure of the peril of extinction, for mankind is not some invaluable object that lies outside us and that we must protect so that we can go on benefiting from it; rather, it is we ourselves, without whom everything there is loses its value. To say this is another way of saying that extinction is unique not because it destroys mankind as an object but because it destroys mankind as the source of all possible human subjects, and this, in turn, is another way of saying that extinction is a second death, for one's own individual death is the end not of any object in life but of the subject that experiences all objects. Death, how- ever, places the mind in a quandary. One of-the confounding char- acteristics of death-"tomorrow's zero," in Dostoevski's phrase-is that, precisely because it removes the person himself rather than something in his life, it seems to offer the mind nothing to take hold of. One even feels it inappropriate, in a way, to try to speak "about" death at all, as. though death were a thing situated some- where outside us and available for objective inspection, when the fact is that it is within us-is, indeed, an essential part of what we are. It would be more appropriate, perhaps, to say that death, as a fundamental element of our being, "thinks" in us and through us about whatever we think about, coloring our thoughts and moods with its presence throughout our lives.