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### Kritik

#### The affirmative’s dream of a technological paradise is written from the perspective of wealth first-world intellectuals. They ignore the physical reality of labor, and that the incessant production of technology is built on the backs of dehumanizes laborers

HS 13 [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “bare life, immaterial labour, foxconn. first draft” Human Strike Blog, July 24, 2013] AT

Jon Seltin makes a similar argument about transhumanists, those who dream of a post-human future in which we transcend the boundaries of our physical bodies and use technology to become immortal. They, too, ignore the physical reality of the machines they use, and the hidden labor that produces them. As he puts it: “The supposed fluidity, transcendence and liberation associated with digital technologies and hyperbolic post-human futures are structurally contingent on the cheap labour and dehumanisation of these other post-humans” (Seltin 2009, 53). Likewise, the fact that post-operaists can argue for a living wage and make the claim that we have almost approached communism, and need only rid ourselves of the parasitic phantom of financial capitalism, is predicated on ignoring the processes that produce the cognitive worker’s means of production: the bare life of the assembly-line worker making their iphones, and the bare life of the migrant domestic worker ensuring their reproduction. Seltin reminds us of “…those assembly workers whose integration with technologies and machines is marked not by liberation and transcendence but their absolute antitheses: by ~~crippling~~ poverty, an absolute lack of economic and personal security, and a complete alienation from the symbolic spaces that their labor produces. While many electronics assembly workers may have no access to the internet, their cheap labour provides the material basis upon which the dreams of digital disembodiment of transhumanists are based.” (2009, 53).

#### The aff’s vision of technological paradise is based in the narrow experiences of the first world consumer. *Where does your technology come from?* This is the fatal flaw in the affirmative’s logic that perpetuates hyper-exploitation and dehumanization along racial lines

HS 13 – modified for ableist language [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “Neoliberalism, Suzhi, and Bare Life” Human Strike Blog, MAY 21, 2013] AT

So, this value that is imbued in urban middle-class children in China or in well-off children in the United States who are groomed from a young age to be competitive, flexible, desirable, is derived from the reproductive labor of a highly regulated, super-exploited flexible class of migrant domestic workers. While this labor is paid, unlike the reproductive labor of the wife or mother in Fortunati’s formulation, I believe that the relation between obscured domestic work and the productive, “high-quality” bodies of cognitive laborers is the same. The former are portrayed as unskilled or, in Endnotes’ formulation, as merely a result of high income-differentials, and not productive of value, while the latter are seen as the true workers of our immaterial age. This ~~blindness~~ [ignorance] to the value-producing nature of racialized, gendered domestic work is comparable to the refusal to see women’s work as ‘real work’ by Marxists in the mid-twentieth century, and is, as I shall argue later, necessary to post-operaist discourses about immaterial labor and their subsequent arguments for social democracy. One last note before returning to the main current of this piece: Hairong tells us that employers see the malleability of domestic laborers as a ‘blank slate’ that can be shaped according to their own needs, while Anagost tells us that she observed in discourses of suzhi “nothing less than a substitution of bodies in which the extraction of value from one body was being accumulated in the other (2004, 191). She argues that the bare life of migrant workers, their pure potentiality–or in Hairong’s formulation the ‘blank slate’ of their subjectivity–is appropriated in order to form the ‘qualified life’ of middle-class, intellectual workers (Anagost 2004, 193). Here we can begin to see the relation between bare life and qualified life as sources of value, one hidden and obscured and one privileged through attention both from middle-class intellectual workers and supposedly critical anti-capitalists. In the next section, I will address more fully this notion of bare life and qualified life in domestic labor, industrial production, and cognitive labor, the omission of these nuances among contemporary post-operaists, and the effect of this lacuna on their analyses and political strategies. Bare Life and Qualified Life: Factories and Cognitive Labor According to Agamben, classical Greeks used two different terms to describe life: “zoē, which expressed the simple fact of living common to all living beings (animals, men, or gods), and bios, which indicated the form or way of living proper to an individual or group….what was at issue [in using bios] for both thinkers was not at all simple natural life but rather a qualified life, a particular way of life” (Agamben 1998, 1). He then offers us a framework for understanding both the historical and contemporary logic of sovereignty and biopolitics: “The fundamental categorical pair of Western politics is not that of friend/enemy but that of bare life/political existence, zoē/bios, exclusion/inclusion. There is politics because man is the living being who, in language, separates and opposes himself to his own bare life and, at the same time, maintains himself in relation to that bare life in an inclusive exclusion” (1998, 9). While I find Agamben’s framework extraordinarily important overall, I would like to focus particularly on the production of bare life and qualified life, zoē and bios, in the realms of production. The extraction of value from bare life is fundamental to contemporary capitalism, but there remains an important distinction between the extraction of value from bare life and from qualified life, even as those distinctions may be experienced by the same bodies. Thus while for the Western or urban cognitive worker value is extracted from their bare life, it is additionally extracted from their qualified life: they are subjectivized as both zoe and bios, in line with Agamben’s formulation of the inseparability of the two under contemporary sovereignty. However, the Chinese factory worker or the migrant domestic worker are subjected purely as zoē, as a source of bare life existing outside of the law and functioning only to produce value. I argue for this distinction in contrast to Marazzi, who sees bare life as interchangeable with the proletariat (Marazzi 2011, 41-42), even while unwittingly focusing on those forms of labor that are most qualified. What I take issue with is not the argument that the body is an exploited source of value for all subjects under contemporary capitalism, but the failure to recognize the dramatic differences in how that exploitation functions and is distributed according to race, gender, and geographical location. Christian Marazzi tells us, in his critique of financial capitalism, that “bio-capitalism produces value by extracting it not only from the body functioning as the material instrument of work, but also from the body understood as a whole.” (2011, 49). This may be correct, but let us examine the arenas in which this value extraction takes place in his work. Echoing our earlier discussion of the birth of neoliberalism, he tells us of “the emergence of atypical labor and of second generation autonomous labor, former employees who become self-employed” (2011, 50), and then of the massive value produced by our cooperative labor in the form of co-production: “These crowdsourcing strategies, leaching vital resources from the multitudes, represent the new organic composition of capital, the relationship between constant capital dispersed throughout society and variable capital as the whole of sociality, emotions, desires, relational capacities and a lot of ‘free labor’ (unpaid labor) dispersed in the sphere of the consumption and reproduction in the forms of life, of individual and collective imaginary” (2011, 115). Who are the “multitudes” in this formulation? Who are the productive workers, and is this value that is extracted from them extracted from their bare life or from qualified life? By seeing value as produced only through the collective intellectual work of those people who are plugged into the internet, into culture, into crowdsourcing, Marazzi casts those workers from excluded populations as irrelevant, as always already not part of the multitudes. From where does the productive capacity of these “multitudes” come? Are these creative subjects produced only through their own self-work? Do the physical tools that they use spring into existence from the general intellect? From where do their computers, their iphones, their network routers and servers come? I would like to return here to Anagost’s formulation of bare life and suzhi, and the notion of the qualified life, bios. The neoliberal subject is precisely not bare life, it is in fact an extraordinarily qualified life, imbued with values, qualities, and skills that make it so productive in Marazzi’s view. I do not think it entirely coincidental that suzhi translates into quality, and that Anagost and Hairong perceive the presence of migrant domestic workers in urban families as part of a process of investing in and increasing the suzhi of the children. This value that is extracted from domestic workers, the value that is transferred to children who will become cognitive laborers, computer programmers, entrepreneurs–Marazzi’s multitudes–is an accumulation of quality: the future entrepreneur becomes ‘qualified’ precisely by an extraction of value from the unqualified, bare life of the domestic worker. Anagost still sees bare life as fundamental to the experience of both: “it would seem that the body–or if not the body as such, then Agamben’s ‘bare life’–provides a common substrate that underlies both the Chinese state’s strategies for developing the latent potentialities of the masses and the absorption of the individual in technologies of the self, in which care of the body becomes an obsessive focus of bourgeois consumption–an intensification of the body as a site of investment” (2004, 200). However, even if the bare life of Marazzi’s multitude is extracted for value, they still exist as bios as well. The domestic workers, and, as we shall soon see, the industrial workers producing the very digital devices needed for co-production, exist entirely as excluded bare life, in a state of exception much more brutal than that which extracts value from our qualified life. Citing Agamben, Nicholas De Genova defines bare life as “what remains when human existence, while yet alive, is nonetheless stripped of all the encumbrances of social location and juridical identity, and thus bereft of all of the qualifications for properly political inclusion and belonging” (De Genova 2012, 133). It is hard to imagine describing the cognitive worker of the post-operaists’ multitudes as “stripped of…social location and juridical identity.” Indeed, it is precisely their social existence that makes them productive of value. Not so with the workers in China’s Foxconn factories or the Export Processing Zones of Southeast Asia. These workers exist in conditions of super-exploitation, working 12 hours daily and up to a month straight without time off during periods of high demand (China Labor Watch). They are the hands that assemble the ideas of Marazzi’s multitudes. Like the blank slate of the domestic worker, they are pure potentiality, desired for their malleability and their dexterity, performing repetitive actions as quickly as possible. Here there is no need for them to improve themselves; there is no entrepreneurship of the self, only a massive reserve army of labor that can be used and discarded as needed. Here is where value is truly extracted from bare life, from bodies “stripped of…social location and juridical identity.” Anagost again: In neoliberal economic logics, this latent potentiality of the body as a body for exploitation is unleashed by the positioning of the subject at the edge of a precipice, through the threat of a failure to be recognized as a body of value or even annihilation of the body’s very existence due to unsafe labor conditions. In other words, not only does potentiality define capacities that are expressed in the usual sense of being the product of education and training, but there is a superexploitation of the body through an expansion of what it can be made to tolerate in terms of work discipline and stress. (2004, 201, emphasis mine). De Genova agrees with this characterization of the migrant laborer as bare life: “to the extent that migrant labor commonly confronts territorially-defined ‘national’ states with the raw force and vital energies of human life—as labor-power–with no juridical sanction, we may recognize anew the figure of bare life, the negative, abject counterpart to human universality and pure potentiality, which sovereign power can only seek to banish” (De Genova 2012, 145). With this foundation, I would like to turn now to the concentration camp, to Agamben’s argument that the camp contains the logic of modern sovereignty, is the “nomos of the modern.” Specifically, I argue that those sites of production most ignored by theorists of cognitive labor–sweatshops in LA, Export Processing Zones in SE Asia, industrial centers in China–are camps in Agamben’s sense, states of exception where workers are reduced entirely to bare life. In describing the concentration camps of Nazi Germany and the subsequent extension of their logic into the heart of sovereign power in democracy, Agamben tells us that “[i]nsofar as its inhabitants were stripped of every political status and wholly reduced to bare life, the camp was also the most biopolitical space ever to have been realized, in which power confronts nothing but pure life, without any mediation” (1998, 169). Later: “if the essence of the camp consists in the materialization of the state of exception and in the subsequent creation of a space in which bare life and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of indistinction, then we must admit that we find ourselves virtually in the presence of a camp every time such a structure is created, independent of the kinds of crimes that are committed there and whatever its denomination and specific topography” (Agamben 1998, 174). Thus the Nazi concentration camps, the refugee camps into which refugees without political status are herded and held in a zone of indistinction, or, as I argue following Jon Seltin, the Export Processing Zones that exist specifically in a state of exception, are all part of the same logic of sovereignty and reduction of life to bare life. As Seltin tells us: “The EPZ is by its very definition a ‘state of exception’, the logic of which establishes the conditions for the production of instrumentalized bare life. The definitional feature of an EPZ is that the laws and policy framework governing its operations are ‘distinct from what applies elsewhere” (2009, 54). EPZs are granted exemptions from the labor laws of the countries in which they reside, tax breaks, and tariff relaxations; they are, literally, camps designed according to the needs of capital, in which the citizens of the countries of their geographical location are stripped of their juridical existence. We can see this logic at play in maquiladoras, in the EPZs of SE Asia, in the use of undocumented migrants in sweatshops in LA, and in the use of interns in Foxconn’s factories to circumvent minimum wage standards (Friends of Gongchao, 2013). The conditions of these camps, or industrial centers, are likewise characterized by their role as “the most biopolitical space to ever have been realized.” Seltin again: “The workers in EPZs are often subject to strict biopolitical regimes of control, regulation and observation….Wright [in an ethnographical study of Mexican electronics maquiladoras workers] describes how the female employees are expected to, very literally, ‘embody the very concept of flexibility’ in that they are regarded as incomplete subjects, as untrainable bare life whose bodies serve “merely a conduit for the supervisor’s knowledge.’ Thus the maquiladora floor-worker is produced through the utter differentiation of zoē and bios, that is, as a body which is governed and operated through what Wright describes as a ‘prosthetics of supervision” (2009, 54). If these industrial centers are the fundamental biopolitical space where bare life is put to work, it seems disingenuous to view the labor of cognitive workers in the United States and Western Europe through the same lens. While the logic of availability, total mobilization of one’s potentiality, and total subsumption under capital may be the same, the practical application is extraordinarily different. It is no coincidence that these divisions of labor are separated along racialized, gendered, and geographic lines; capitalism has depended on and continues to depend on an uneven population and uneven geographical development. It is also no coincidence, I believe, that those theorists of cognitive labor and the general intellect, those so concerned about the ways our affects are put to work and our creativity exploited, cast labor as universal and homogenous, with an enormous blindspot hovering over superexploited portions of the proletariat: migrants, workers in post-colonial or post-socialist countries, those cast as inferior by white supremacy and patriarchy. The social democrats and orthodox Marxists of yesteryear focused only on the formal industrial working class, dismissing domestic labor, reproductive work, or agricultural labor as unimportant, and dismissing the struggles of people of color or women as superfluous to the primary contradiction of labor and capital. Likewise, the social democrats of today, the self-appointed theorists of the multitude and global insurgency, see only that type of work that they themselves perform, and not the underlying labor that props them up. Jon Seltin makes a similar argument about transhumanists, those who dream of a post-human future in which we transcend the boundaries of our physical bodies and use technology to become immortal. They, too, ignore the physical reality of the machines they use, and the hidden labor that produces them. As he puts it: “The supposed fluidity, transcendence and liberation associated with digital technologies and hyperbolic post-human futures are structurally contingent on the cheap labour and dehumanisation of these other post-humans” (Seltin 2009, 53). Likewise, the fact that post-operaists can argue for a living wage and make the claim that we have almost approached communism, and need only rid ourselves of the parasitic phantom of financial capitalism, is predicated on ignor ing the processes that produce the cognitive worker’s means of production: the bare life of the assembly-line worker making their iphones, and the bare life of the migrant domestic worker ensuring their reproduction. Seltin reminds us of “…those assembly workers whose integration with technologies and machines is marked not by liberation and transcendence but their absolute antitheses: by crippling poverty, an absolute lack of economic and personal security, and a complete alienation from the symbolic spaces that their labor produces. While many electronics assembly workers may have no access to the internet, their cheap labour provides the material basis upon which the dreams of digital disembodiment of transhumanists are based.” (2009, 53) Anagost tells us, citing Spivak, that “capital ‘must provide itself with the mind of one class of human beings and the body of the other.’ The mind of the capitalist class is appropriated as the conscious bearer of the movement of capital–’capital personified and endowed with consciousness and a will’ (Marx). The body of the working class is appropriated for its superadequation, the surplus value it produces” (2004, 205). The general intellect of the post-operaists, the collective intelligence created by a global network of cognitive workers that they bemoan as a commons which is enclosed by capital, is perhaps instead the mind of capital, putting to work the bodies of migrants in China, migrant domestic workers, and women of color. We must be aware of the role that biopolitics plays in crafting us as subjects and extracting value from us, but we must also be aware that the global proletariat, or the ‘multitude’, is not a homogeneous mass that experiences exploitation in the same way, but a highly differentiated series of populations, some few of which are granted massive privileges at the expense of many others. Remembering this reminds us that a simple shift in government policies or a return to the welfare state won’t deliver us to communism, nor will individual practices of revolt and refusal through a solitary ‘human strike,’ but only a complete destruction of the current world and its subsequent re-imagining.

#### This devaluation of life reproduces the zero point of the holocaust

Dillon 1999 (Michael, Prof of politics @ the University of Lancaster, Another Justice in Political Theory, Vol. 27, No. 2 april)

Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ulti-mately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality of required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economics of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism.” They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability. 35 Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. Once rendered calculable, however, units of account are necessarily submissible not only to valuation but also, of course, to devaluation. Devaluation, logi-cally, can extend to the point of counting as nothing. Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of the holocaust. However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable. Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life.

#### Turns case – a. capitalist relations depend on obscuring relations of exploitation

HS 13 [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “bare life, immaterial labour, foxconn. first draft” Human Strike Blog, July 24, 2013] AT

Our relationships are productive of value through their shift into the realms of Facebook and social networking; our interests are tracked through Google searches and sold to advertisers; our participation in crowdsourced production from beta testing to kickstarter is monetized without any compensation. The work that we do crafting ourselves, improving ourselves, caring for ourselves, is directly productive of surplus value. Our general intellect, the argument goes, is subsumed under and appropriated by capital. Our very lives are sources of value. These arguments, as salient as they may be, focus only on those lives that are seen as valuable, those lives which, in China, would be seen as having high suzhi (one could, perhaps, describe a life filled with suzhi, or quality, as a ‘qualified’ life. I will return to this later.) As in China, however, these productive lives are dependent on de-skilled, invisibilized, and highly regulated labor performed by migrants and people of color. The clothing that we wear to signify our hipness and individuality (that very individuality and culture that, it is argued, is the source of profit), is produced in sweatshops by migrant workers in Los Angeles. The parents who are too busy producing themselves (through work, through entrepreneurship, through recreation and clubs) must hire flexible domestic workers to raise their children. As in China, the very value or quality which characterizes urban workers and producers of culture is extracted, invisibly, from de-skilled, de-humanized rural and excluded workers seen as value-less. I do not mean to draw an impermeable distinction between privileged intellectual laborers and de-skilled superexploited workers, or to argue for a politics of guilt. I do, however, believe that a specific class composition with very determined divisions of labor is an integral part of contemporary capitalism, and that obscuring those relations is crucial to maintaining the current order and to recuperating radical politics. Further, there is a long tradition of communists ignoring or devaluaing certain types of labor in order to pursue their own political program free of untidy complications.

#### b. Accesses a stronger internal link to their oppression impact – the affirmative is an example of *precisely* what they criticize, imposing racial/gendered divisions to divide and conquer

#### The alt is to understand anti-capitalist revolution through a lens that accounts for positionality – this solves

Hs 13 [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “introduction” Human Strike Blog, April 24, 2013] AT

Finally, I will look at contemporary forms of struggle and resistance that are popularly cited by both anarchists and post-Operaists, from the banlieue riots of Paris in 2005 to the Arab Spring, the London lootings of 2011, and the turn in China towards rioting and destruction in labor conflicts in place of unionization or conventional strikes. I will suggest that there are fundamental similarities in biopolitical control, constant availability, and precarity that inform all of these forms of resistance, even while the manifestations of these forms of control and value extraction are applied very differently based on specific conditions After all, “global civil war still has its local specificities”. I will argue that it is no accident that certain characteristics of demandlessness, looting, and a lack of programmatism are found in common around the globe. However, I will also argue that both the post-Operaists’ fetishization of ‘democractic practices’ found in Occupy, the Arab Spring, and elsewhere, and the nihilists’ fixation on destruction without demands, are both based in limited perceptions of contemporary revolt. I will argue for a more nuanced, diverse, and specific understanding of contemporary global revolts against control, empire, and capital, and argue for the importance of considering material differences based on identity and positionality even while I find affinity for a rejection of identity and processes of subjectification. This is an ambitious project. It is, in fact, extraordinarily incomplete and fragmentary. I hope it will serve as a starting point for future conversations, as a way to work out some thoughts and ask more questions, and as a way to take the best of the post-Operaists and the nihilists while remaining critical of both of them. I hope to prioritize specificity and contemporaneity, and to remain critical and skeptical while rejecting both outright nihilism and fuzzy social democracy.

### Turns aff solvency

#### Their imagined revolution seems easy and clean because it leaves out the hyper-exploited worker, ignoring those *most subjected* by capitalism.

HS 13 [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “introduction” Human Strike Blog, April 24, 2013] AT

At last, I would like to examine the implications of these frameworks and their limited scope for strategies of resistance and revolt. First, I argue that the post-Operaist myopia of focusing only on certain forms of cognitive labor allows them to envision a technological paradise that is close at hand. The software engineers at Google and the precariously employed hipsters who create culture in their spare time, we are told, are indeed constantly working. However, because the work is engaging and interesting for them, it is possible to argue that we need only a basic guaranteed income and a little more democracy. This is based in a conception of a world that looks only like the Googleplex or hip, artist-friendly metropolitan areas. It is a logical extension of the social democratic project: worker’s self-management of production (which is today intellectual, affective, immaterial) rather than the abolition of work and production altogether. Further, it is based on an erasure of the drudgery of most forms of affective and service labor, and the existence of hyper-exploitative production conditions in industrial centers. Second, I would like to question the value of focusing on the permeation of work into every part of life without acknowledging dramatic divisions based on gender, race, and geography. I think it is possible that, by flattening these differences, we end up privileging those who appear like us as potentially revolutionary subjects, justifying individual practices of revolt and justifying our refusal to think critically about positionality. Further, I question whether the focus on individual revolt, molecular resistance, and a prioritizing of a voluntaristic participation in social struggle based on affinity is a legitimate response to the authoritarian party politics of the past century, or is a product of a neoliberal ideology that likewise spreads myths about individual agency and uniqueness. Here I will return to Foucault’s discussion of askesis, or self-work, and question whether the concept of the ‘entrepreneur of the self’ which is an essential part or neoliberal identity in the West has contaminated ideas of molecular resistance, just as modern, liberal conceptions of the sovereign individual tainted egoist and individualist anarchist ideas at the turn of the 20th century.

### Alt Solves Case

#### The alternative alone can access their impacts – capital relies on the racial and gendered division of labor and only recognizing that results in sound political strategies

HS 13 [(HumanStrike Blog, blog on neoliberalism, capitalism, and critical theory; cites Giorgio Agamben, prof of philosophy at Univ of Vienna, and Christian Mazzari, Director of Socio-Economic Research at the Scuola Universitaria della Svizzera Italiana) “bare life, immaterial labour, foxconn. first draft” Human Strike Blog, July 24, 2013] AT

Anagost tells us, citing Spivak, that “capital ‘must provide itself with the mind of one class of human beings and the body of the other.’ The mind of the capitalist class is appropriated as the conscious bearer of the movement of capital–’capital personified and endowed with consciousness and a will’ (Marx). The body of the working class is appropriated for its superadequation, the surplus value it produces” (2004, 205). The general intellect of the post-operaists, the collective intelligence created by a global network of cognitive workers that they bemoan as a commons which is enclosed by capital, is perhaps instead the mind of capital, putting to work the bodies of migrants in China, migrant domestic workers, and women of color. We must be aware of the role that biopolitics plays in crafting us as subjects and extracting value from us, but we must also be aware that the global proletariat, or the ‘multitude’, is not a homogeneous mass that experiences exploitation in the same way, but a highly differentiated series of populations, some few of which are granted massive privileges at the expense of many others. I do not want to suggest that the hipster working a precarious service sector job and spending the rest of her time in coffee shops ‘co-producing’ or making culture is in some way a capitalist, equivalent to Carnegie or Wells Fargo. Those of us in the United State or Western Europe with a certain amount of access to technology and flexible time are indeed separated from our inoperativity–we are always entrepreneurs of ourselves, always producing, whether we intend to or not. This is a horrifying and alienating position to be in. So when I suggest that the imprecisely defined ‘creative class’ is in some way the mind of capital, that is not to suggest that we are reaping the surplus value of those working in Shenzen, but that our minds are put to work, intensively, and that work is combined with the mindless manual labor of assembly lines. It is not a matter of who is privileged and who is not, but a matter of how capital is reorganizing labor in different parts of the globe and different segments of society. That said, the distinction is important, because our perceptions of what is work and what is not inform our political strategies and proposals. While the Marxists’ myopic focus on factory workers engaged in Fordist productive relations in the mid-twentieth century was extraordinarily reductionist, it would be equally absurd to argue that factory workers were unimportant, and that only the reproductive labor of women and informal domestic workers was relevant. The key is to recognize the way that labor is divided according to historical conditions or identities–that is, the way that it is still raced, gendered, and geopolitically determined–but also to recognize the common underlying logic to the way that surplus value is extracted from working bodies and minds. This ‘estrangement from our inoperativity’ is the contemporary condition, and it should be no surprise that riots and refusal, sheer negativity, continues to appear in places as diverse as rural China, Stockholm, and London. When we are robbed of our ability to not do, all that remains possible is destruction–of your self or of your surroundings.

## Disad

### Employment DA

#### Minimum wage laws cause rampant unemployment and collapses the economy – this disproportionately affects the worst off – every credible study goes neg

Wilson 12 [(Mark, Principal at Applied Economic Strategies, 25 years of economic policy experience, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards Administration at the U.S. Department of Labor, Research Fellow at The Heritage Foundation specializing in workplace policy and tax issues) “The Negative Effects of Minimum Wage Laws” Policy Analysis, No. 701 June 21, 2012] AT

Despite the use of different models to understand the effects of minimum wages, all economists agree that businesses will make changes to adapt to the higher labor costs after a minimum wage increase. Empirical research seeks to determine what changes to variables such as employment and prices firms will make, and how large those changes will be. The higher costs will be passed on to someone in the long run; the only question is who. The important thing for policymakers to remember is that a decision to increase the minimum wage is not cost-free; someone has to pay for it. The main finding of economic theory and empirical research over the past 70 years is that minimum wage increases tend to reduce employment. The higher the minimum wage relative to competitive-market wage levels, the greater the employment loss that occurs. While minimum wages ostensibly aim to improve the economic well-being of the working poor, the disemployment effects of a minimum wages have been found to fall disproportionately on the least skilled and on the most disadvantaged individuals, including the disabled, youth, lower-skilled workers, immigrants, and ethnic minorities.16 Based on his studies, Nobel laureate economist Milton Friedman observed: “The real tragedy of minimum wage laws is that they are supported by well-meaning groups who want to reduce poverty. But the people who are hurt most by higher minimums are the most poverty stricken.”17 In a generally competitive labor market, employers bid for the most productive workers and the resulting wage distribution reflects the productivity of those workers. If the government imposes a minimum wage on the labor market, those workers whose productivity falls below the minimum wage will find few, if any, employment opportunities. The basic theory of competitive labor markets predicts that a minimum wage imposed above the market wage rate will reduce employment.18 Evidence of employment loss has been found since the earliest implementation of the minimum wage. The U.S. Department of Labor’s own assessment of the first 25-cent minimum wage in 1938 found that it resulted in job losses for 30,000 to 50,000 workers, or 7 The greatest adverse impact will generally occur in the poorer and lower-wage regions. In those regions, businesses have to take more dramatic steps to adjust to the higher costs. 10 to 13 percent of the 300,000 covered workers who previously earned below the new wage floor.19 It is important to note that the limited industries and occupations covered by the 1938 FLSA accounted for only about 20 percent of the 30 million private sector, nonfarm, nonsupervisory, production workers employed in 1938. And of the roughly 6 million workers potentially covered by the law, only about 5 percent earned an hourly rate below the new minimum.20 Following passage of the federal minimum wage in 1938, economists began to accumulate statistical evidence on the effects. Much of the research has indicated that increases in the minimum wage have adverse effects on the employment opportunities of low-skilled workers.21 And across the country, the greatest adverse impact will generally occur in the poorer and lower-wage regions. In those regions, more workers and businesses are affected by the mandated wage, and businesses have to take more dramatic steps to adjust to the higher costs. As an example, with the original 1938 imposition of the minimum wage, the lower-income U.S. territory of Puerto Rico was severely affected. An estimated 120,000 workers in Puerto Rico lost their jobs within the first year of implementation of the new 25-cent minimum wage, and the island’s unemployment rate soared to nearly 50 percent.22 Similar damaging effects were observed on American Samoa from minimum wage increases imposed between 2007 and 2009. Indeed, the effects were so pronounced on the island’s economy that President Obama signed into law a bill postponing the minimum wage increases scheduled for 2010 and 2011.23 Concern over the scheduled 2012 increase of $.50 compelled Governor Togiola Tulafono to testify before Congress: “We are watching our economy burn down. We know what to do to stop it. We need to bring the aggressive wage costs decreed by the Federal Government under control. . . . Our job market is being torched. Our businesses are being depressed. Our hope for growth has been driven away.”24 In 1977 ongoing debate about the minimum wage prompted Congress to create a Minimum Wage Study Commission to “help it resolve the many controversial issues that have surrounded the federal minimum wage and overtime requirement since their origin in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.”25 The commission published its report in May 1981, calling it “the most exhaustive inquiry ever undertaken into the issues surrounding the Act since its inception.”26 The landmark report included a wide variety of studies by a virtual ‘‘who’s who’’ of labor economists working in the United States at the time.27 A review of the economic literature amassed by the Commission by Charles Brown, Curtis Gilroy, and Andrew Kohen found that the “time-series studies typically find that a 10 percent increase in the minimum wage reduces teenage employment by one to three percent.”28 This range subsequently came to be thought of as the consensus view of economists on the employment effects of the minimum wage. It is important to note that different academic studies on the minimum wage may examine different regions, industries, or types of workers. In each case, different effects may predominate. A federal minimum wage increase will impose a different impact on the fast-food restaurant industry than the defense contractor industry, and a different effect on lower-cost Alabama than higher-cost Manhattan. This is why scholarly reviews of many academic studies are important. In 2006 David Neumark and William Wascher published a comprehensive review of more than 100 minimum wage studies published since the 1990s.29 They found a wider range of estimates of the effects of the minimum wage on employment than the 1982 review by Brown, Gilroy, and Kohen. The 2006 review found that “although the wide range of estimates is striking, the oft-stated assertion that the new minimum wage research fails to support the traditional view that the minimum wage reduces the employment of low-wage workers is clearly incorrect. Indeed . . . the preponderance of the evidence points to disemployment effects.”38 Some employers will replace their lowest-skilled workers with somewhat higherskilled workers in response to increases in the minimum wage. Nearly two-thirds of the studies reviewed by Neumark and Wascher found a relatively consistent indication of negative employment effects of minimum wages, while only eight gave a relatively consistent indication of positive employment effects. Moreover, 85 percent of the most credible studies point to negative employment effects, and the studies that focused on the least-skilled groups most likely to be adversely affected by minimum wages, the evidence for disemployment effects were especially strong. In contrast, there are very few, if any, studies that provide convincing evidence of positive employment effects of minimum wages. These few studies often use a monopsony model to explain these positive effects. But as noted, most economists think such positive effects are special cases and not generally applicable because few low-wage employers are big enough to face an upward-sloping labor supply curve as the monopsony model assumes

#### Their advantage concedes the link – minimum wage laws mean workers are replaced by robots rather than receiving pay increases. I’ll concede this argument – it proves my impact

#### Economic collapse causes competition for resources and instability that triggers hotspots around the globe

Harris and Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions**.** It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### Race Intersection

#### Their evidence proves the aff is worse for poverty – it’s the lowest-wage workers that will be replaced by robots. Independently, this is a link to the kritik – unemployment impacts minorities the most, and the aff’s willingness to accept this as the price to be paid proves they only value minorities as a means to an end

Jonny 13 [(blogger, cites economists Walter Williams and Thomas Sowell) “Minimum Wage: Economically And Morally Bankrupt” Mar 10] AT

As the competition for union work has been historically offered by low-skilled racial minorities, minimum-wage laws have been, and continue to be, as Walter Williams describes, “…one of the most effective tools in the arsenal of racists everywhere around the world.” Williams describes how the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931, for example, was used to price blacks out of the labor market on federally financed or assisted construction projects. Similarly, minimum-wage laws have been used to discriminate against the employment of blacks in South Africa. A report from the South African Economic and Wage Commission of 1925 stated that: “…while definite exclusion of the Natives from the more remunerative fields of employment by law has not been urged upon us, the same result would follow a certain use of the powers of the Wage Board under the Wage Act of 1925, or of other wage-fixing legislation. The method would be to fix a minimum rate for an occupation or craft so high that no Native would be likely to be employed.” More recently, we see that the unemployment rate of blacks in the United States is still much higher than it is for whites: in 2012 it was 13.8% vs. 7.2%. One might argue that a minimum wage should be established to prevent racist employers from paying their black workers a lower wage than their white ones, but intentions count for very little when the outcome is that the black workers don’t have a job to speak of.

## Case – AI Bad

### Case – impact turns

#### 1. AI causes extinction, which we should take special caution to avoid – arms races limit caution, treaties can’t check arms races, and malevolent intentions are undetectable. AI also wrecks nuclear deterrence

Shulman 11 [Carl Shulman (Singularity Institute of Artificial Intelligence) and Stuart Armstrong (InhibOx, an organization dedicated to developing and delivering the best services and technologies in computer-aided drug discovery ). “Singularity Hypotheses: A Scientific and Philosophical Assessment.” April 13th, 2011] AJ

II. An AI arms race may be “winner-take-all” The threat of an AI arms race does not appear to be primarily about the direct application of AI to warfare. While automated combat systems such as drone aircraft have taken on greatly increased roles in recent years (Singer, 2009; Arkin, 2009), they do not greatly disrupt the balance of power between leading militaries: slightly lagging states can use older weapons, including nuclear weapons, to deter or defend against an edge in drone warfare. Instead, the military impact of an intelligence explosion would seem to lie primarily in the extreme acceleration in the development of new capabilities. A state might launch an AI Manhattan Project to gain a few months or years of sole access to advanced AI systems, and then initiate an intelligence explosion to greatly increase the rate of progress. Even if rivals remain only a few months behind chronologically, they may therefore be left many technological generations behind until their own intelligence explosions. It is much more probable that such a large gap would allow the leading power to safely disarm its nuclear-armed rivals than that any specific technological generation will provide a decisive advantage over the one immediately preceding it. If states do take AI potential seriously, how likely is it that a government's “in-house” systems will reach the the point of an intelligence explosion months or years before competitors? Historically, there were substantial delays between the the first five nuclear powers tested bombs in 1945, 1949. 1952, 1960, and 1964. The Soviet Union's 1949 test benefited from extensive espionage and infiltration of the Manhattan Project, and Britain's 1952 test reflected formal joint participation in the Manhattan Project. If the speedup in progress delivered by an intelligence explosion were large, such gaps would allow the leading power to solidify a monopoly on the technology and military power, at much lower cost in resources and loss of life than would have been required for the United States to maintain its nuclear monopoly of 1945-1949. To the extent that states distrust their rivals with such complete power, or wish to exploit it themselves, there would be strong incentives to vigorously push forward AI research, and to ensure government control over systems capable of producing an intelligence explosion. In this paper we will discuss factors affecting the feasibility of such a localized intelligence explosion, particularly the balance between internal rates of growth and the diffusion of or exchange of technology, and consider historical analogs including the effects of the Industrial Revolution on military power and nuclear weapons. III. Accidental risks and negative externalities A second critical difference between the nuclear and AI cases is in the expected danger of development, as opposed to deployment and use. Manhattan Project scientists did consider the possibility that a nuclear test would unleash a self-sustaining chain reaction in the atmosphere and destroy all human life, conducting informal calculations at the time suggesting that this was extremely improbable. A more formal process conducted after the tests confirmed the earlier analysis (Konopinski, Marvin, & Teller, 1946), although it would not have provided any protection had matters been otherwise. The historical record thus tells us relatively little about the willingness of military and civilian leaders to forsake or delay a decisive military advantage to avert larger risks of global catastrophe. In contrast, numerous scholars have argued that advanced AI poses a nontrivial risk of catastrophic outcomes, including human extinction. (Bostrom, 2002; Chalmers, 2010; Friedman, 2008; Hall, 2007; Kurzweil, 2005; Moravec, 1999; Posner, 2004; Rees, 2004; Yudkowsky, 2008). Setting aside anthropomorphic presumptions of rebelliousness, a more rigorous argument (Omohundro, 2007) relies on the instrumental value of such behavior for entities with a wide variety of goals that are easier to achieve with more resources and with adequate defense against attack. Many decision algorithms could thus appear benevolent when in weak positions during safety testing, only to cause great harm when in more powerful positions, e.g. after extensive self-improvement. Given abundant time and centralized careful efforts to ensure safety, it seems very probable that these risks could be avoided: development paths that seemed to pose a high risk of catastrophe could be relinquished in favor of safer ones. However, the context of an arms race might not permit such caution. A risk of accidental AI disaster would threaten all of humanity, while the benefits of being first to develop AI would be concentrated, creating a collective action problem insofar as tradeoffs between speed and safety existed. A first-pass analysis suggests a number of such tradeoffs. Providing more computing power would allow AIs to either operate at superhumanly fast timescales or to proliferate very numerous copies. Doing so would greatly accelerate progress, but also render it infeasible for humans to engage in detailed supervision of AI activities. To make decisions on such timescales AI systems would require decision algorithms with very general applicability, making it harder to predict and constrain their behavior. Even obviously risky systems might be embraced for competitive advantage, and the powers with the most optimistic estimates or cavalier attitudes regarding risk would be more likely to take the lead. IV. Barriers to AI arms control Could an AI arms race be regulated using international agreements similar to those governing nuclear technology? In some ways, there are much stronger reasons for agreement: the stability of nuclear deterrence, and the protection afforded by existing nuclear powers to their allies, mean that the increased threat of a new nuclear power is not overwhelming. No nuclear weapons have been detonated in anger since 1945. In contrast, simply developing AI capable of producing an intelligence explosion puts all states at risk from the effects of accidental catastrophe, or the military dominance engendered by a localized intelligence explosion. However, AI is a dual-use technology, with incremental advances in the field offering enormous economic and humanitarian gains that far outweigh near-term drawbacks. Restricting these benefits to reduce the risks of a distant, novel, and unpredictable advance would be very politically challenging. Superhumanly intelligent AI promises even greater rewards: advances in technology that could vastly improve human health, wealth, and welfare while addressing other risks such as climate change. Efforts to outright ban or relinquish AI technology would seem to require strong evidence of very high near-term risks. However, agreements might prove highly beneficial if they could avert an arms race and allow for more controlled AI development with more rigorous safety measures, and sharing of the benefits among all powers. Such an agreement would face increased problems of verification and enforcement. Where nuclear weapons require rare radioactive materials, large specialized equipment, and other easily identifiable inputs, AI research can proceed with only skilled researchers and computing hardware. Verification of an agreement would require incredibly intrusive monitoring of scientific personnel and computers throughout the territory of participating states. Further, while violations of nuclear arms control agreements can be punished after the fact, a covert intelligence explosion could allow a treaty violator to withstand later sanctions. These additional challenges might be addressed in light of the increased benefits of agreement, but might also become tractable thanks to early AI systems. If those systems do not themselves cause catastrophe but do provide a decisive advantage to some powers, they might be used to enforce safety regulations thereafter, providing a chance to “go slow” on subsequent steps. V. Game-theoretic model of an AI arms race In the full paper, we present a simple game-theoretic model of a risky AI arms race. In this model, the risk of accidental catastrophe depends on the number of competitors, the magnitude of random noise in development times, the exchange rate between risk and development speed, and the strength of preferences for developing safe AI first. VI. Ethical implications and responses The above analysis highlights two important possible consequences of advanced AI: a disruptive change in international power relations and a risk of inadvertent disaster. From an ethical point of view, the accidental risk deserves special attention since it threatens human extinction, not only killing current people but also denying future generations existence. (Matheny, 2007; Bostrom, 2003). While AI systems would outlive humanity, AI systems might lack key features contributing to moral value, such as individual identities, play, love, and happiness (Bostrom, 2005; Yudkowsky, 2008). Extinction risk is a distinctive feature of AI risks: even a catastrophic nuclear war or engineered pandemic that killed billions would still likely allow survivors to eventually rebuild human civilization, while AIs killing billions would likely not leave survivors. (Sandberg & Bostrom, 2008). However, a national monopoly on an AI intelligence explosion could also have permanent consequences if it was used to stably establish its position. Permanent totalitarianism is one possibility (Caplan, 2008). We conclude by discussing some possible avenues for reducing these long-term risks.

#### a. Deterrence solves space weapons

Maginnis 11 [(Robert, retired Army lieutenant colonel, and a national security and foreign affairs analyst for radio and television) ‘CATASTROPHIC’ DEFENSE CUTS SEEN AS TIPPING POINT OF U.S. MILITARY SUPREMACY, 10/20/11, Human Events] AT

Our nuclear deterrence could diminish. Cuts would undermine our nuclear triad—our ability to detect and defend against missile attack, nuclear weapons inventories, and satellite space-launch capabilities. These cuts could cause allies and adversaries to question our ability to provide a nuclear response to an attack, concludes the Republican staff. Military infrastructure and the industrial base could suffer a serious blow. Shipyards could be closed, long-planned military construction projects may be scuttled, and a new round of Base Realignment and Closure would be necessary. Much of the armed services’ equipment modernization and recapitalization could be put on hold or canceled, including the Joint Strike Fighter and the much-needed aerial refueling tanker. Defense spending may be discretionary, but constitutionally national security is government’s top responsibility. We live in a dangerous world which demands a significant armed force to protect America across all domains—air, land, sea, space and cyberspace. America must get its fiscal house in order, and defense should share the burden. But providing national security on the cheap to avoid cutting social programs to help Democrats’ political fortunes is wrongheaded, and may in fact create a tipping point for America as the world’s leading military power.

#### Space weaponization causes Extinction – biggest risk

Mitchell 1 [Gordon Mitchell et al, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Pittsburg, 7/2001. ISIS Briefing on Ballistic Missile Defense no. 6] AT

A buildup of space weapons might begin with noble intentions of 'peace through strength' deterrence, but this rationale glosses over the tendency that '… the presence of space weapons…will result in the increased likelihood of their use'.33 This drift toward usage is strengthened by a strategic fact elucidated by Frank Barnaby: when it comes to arming the heavens, 'antiballistic missiles and anti-satellite warfare technologies go hand-in-hand'.34 The interlocking nature of offense and defense in military space technology stems from the inherent 'dual capability' of spaceborne weapon components. As Marc Vidricaire, Delegation of Canada to the UN Conference on Disarmament, explains: 'If you want to intercept something in space, you could use the same capability to target something on land'. 35 To the extent that ballistic missile interceptors based in space can knock out enemy missiles in mid-flight, such interceptors can also be used as orbiting 'Death Stars', capable of sending munitions hurtling through the Earth's atmosphere. The dizzying speed of space warfare would introduce intense 'use or lose' pressure into strategic calculations, with the spectre of split-second attacks creating incentives to rig orbiting Death Stars with automated 'hair trigger' devices. In theory, this automation would enhance survivability of vulnerable space weapon platforms. However, by taking the decision to commit violence out of human hands and endowing computers with authority to make war, military planners could sow insidious seeds of accidental conflict. Yale sociologist Charles Perrow has analyzed 'complexly interactive, tightly coupled' industrial systems such as space weapons, which have many sophisticated components that all depend on each other's flawless performance. According to Perrow, this interlocking complexity makes it impossible to foresee all the different ways such systems could fail. As Perrow explains, '[t]he odd term "normal accident" is meant to signal that, given the system characteristics, multiple and unexpected interactions of failures are inevitable'.36 Deployment of space weapons with pre-delegated authority to fire death rays or unleash killer projectiles would likely make war itself inevitable, given the susceptibility of such systems to 'normal accidents'. It is chilling to contemplate the possible effects of a space war. According to retired Lt. Col. Robert M. Bowman, 'even a tiny projectile reentering from space strikes the earth with such high velocity that it can do enormous damage — even more than would be done by a nuclear weapon of the same size!'. 37 In the same Star Wars technology touted as a quintessential tool of peace, defence analyst David Langford sees one of the most destabilizing offensive weapons ever conceived: 'One imagines dead cities of microwave-grilled people'.38 Given this unique potential for destruction, it is not hard to imagine that any nation subjected to space weapon attack would retaliate with maximum force, including use of nuclear, biological, and/or chemical weapons. An accidental war sparked by a computer glitch in space could plunge the world into the most destructive military conflict ever seen.

#### b. Nuclear deterrence solves three unique scenarios for nuclear war – allied proliferation, hostile aggression, and crisis escalation

Williams 10 [(David, Major in U.S. Air Force) “A Review of U.S. First-Strike Ambiguity and the Triad Nuclear Force,” Defense Threat Reduction Journal 10 October] AT

The Case for Continuity The case for the continuity of current U.S. nuclear policies and structure involves consideration of their benefits in terms of security, international prestige, domestic politics, and technology. 8 From a security perspective, nuclear weapons ensure security because the potential usage of nuclear weapons during a conflict raises the cost of war to an unacceptable level. 9 Scott Sagan notes that: Nuclear declaratory policy is meant to enhance deterrence of potential adversaries by providing a signal of the intentions, options and proclivities of the U.S. government in different crisis and war-time scenarios. 10 I would argue, however, that an ambiguous U.S. first use policy of nuclear weapons creates valuable uncertainty on the part of potential adversaries. This uncertainty, coupled with U.S. nuclear and conventional superiority, makes overt state aggression against the U.S. or its’ allies a very uncertain and potentially disastrous proposition, thus not likely to happen. After all, no state has started a war with the U.S. since it acquired nuclear weapons. No part of the U.S. nuclear triad can be eliminated without creating an adverse impact on deterrence. This is the case because each element of the triad fills a unique role that makes U.S. nuclear forces lethal, survivable, and visible. Submarines offer the greatest degree of survivability, but the lowest degree of accuracy and become vulnerable upon surfacing. Bombers are the most accurate and only recallable option, but they are vulnerable to defensive counter-air missions and groundbased anti-aircraft fire. ICBMs are the most reliable means of delivery and the only sovereign launched option, yet are all located at known, stationary sites that are easily targeted by enemy ICBM forces, special operations teams, or terrorist surrogates. One may not consider the visibility of nuclear forces to be desirable, but the visibility of bombers and ICBMs allows for clear signaling to potential adversaries about U.S. intentions during a crisis. Take the Cuban Missile Crisis for example: President Kennedy used naval and air forces in order to signal his intent toward Premier Khrushchev. This signaling ensured there were no doubts about U.S. willingness to go to war to prevent Soviet missiles from being placed in Cuba. Future conflicts may require signaling of a similar nature to prevent deadly exchanges. For example, if Kim Jong Il were notified that the U.S. was uploading nuclear-armed bombers in response to North Korean deployments of nuclear-armed missiles, he might reconsider his actions. From the perspective of international prestige, other powers are retaining and in some cases enhancing their nuclear capability, yet as Younger points out, the U.S. is not modernizing any aspect of its inventory. 11 Instead, the U.S. is relying on mathematical projections and estimations regarding the reliability of its systems and deploying them well beyond what most states would consider a reasonable service-life. Further reductions in strategic nuclear forces could be seen as evidence of retrenchment on the part of the U.S. by ambitious rising or reemerging powers, thus increasing the risk of war. The U.S. could be characterized as a declining power by rising powers who are seeking either initial or enhanced nuclear technology. Rising powers, after all, will work to realign the international balance of power in their favor: one way of doing so is through countering U.S. military capabilities. If the U.S. were to reduce its capability by eliminating portions of the triad, then it would essentially be making it easier for other powers to challenge the current U.S. position. Further, without the potential threat of a nuclear first strike, U.S. allies might feel less secure about U.S. security commitments, especially in light of current troop commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such insecurity has the potential to lead these allies to pursue nuclear capabilities of their own, as well as embolden hostile states to gamble on a lack of U.S. retaliation for WMD usage or conventional aggression. For example, when the U.S. considered reducing troop levels in South Korea, the government in Seoul signaled a potential shift in policy toward a nuclear capability to protect itself from possible North Korean aggression. 12 This threat resulted in very quick U.S. reassurances about troop levels and its commitment to defending South Korea

#### 2. Robots will out-compete humans and drive us to extinction

Jones 14 [Rory Cellan-Jones, Technology correspondent “Stephen Hawking warns artificial intelligence could end mankind” BBC 2 December 2014] AT

Prof Hawking says the primitive forms of artificial intelligence developed so far have already proved very useful, but he fears the consequences of creating something that can match or surpass humans. "It would take off on its own, and re-design itself at an ever increasing rate," he said. "Humans, who are limited by slow biological evolution, couldn't compete, and would be superseded."

#### 3. Err neg. AI can’t be controlled and the risk of destroying the human race is high. Impact turns their offense – removing jobs makes us obsolete, robots would not keep us alive. AI can’t be uninvented.

Miles 14 [(Kathleen, journalist) “Artificial Intelligence May Doom The Human Race Within A Century, Oxford Professor Says” Huffington Post 08/22/2014] AT

There are two ways artificial intelligence could go, Bostrom argues. It could greatly improve our lives and solve the world's problems, such as disease, hunger and even pain. Or, it could take over and possibly kill all or many humans. As it stands, the catastrophic scenario is more likely, according to Bostrom, who has a background in physics, computational neuroscience and mathematical logic. "Superintelligence could become extremely powerful and be able to shape the future according to its preferences," Bostrom told me. "If humanity was sane and had our act together globally, the sensible course of action would be to postpone development of superintelligence until we figure out how to do so safely." Bostrom, the founding director of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, lays out his concerns in his new book, Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies. His book makes a harrowing comparison between the fate of horses and humans: Horses were initially complemented by carriages and ploughs, which greatly increased the horse's productivity. Later, horses were substituted for by automobiles and tractors. When horses became obsolete as a source of labor, many were sold off to meatpackers to be processed into dog food, bone meal, leather, and glue. In the United States, there were about 26 million horses in 1915. By the early 1950s, 2 million remained. The same dark outcome, Bostrom said, could happen to humans once AI makes our labor and intelligence obsolete. It sounds like a science fiction flick, but recent moves in the tech world may suggest otherwise. Earlier this year, Google acquired artificial intelligence company DeepMind and created an AI safety and ethics review board to ensure the technology is developed safely. Facebook created an artificial intelligence lab this year and is working on creating an artificial brain. Technology called "deep learning," a form of artificial intelligence meant to closely mimic the human brain, has quickly spread from Google to Microsoft, Baidu and Twitter. And while Google's Ray Kurzweil has long discussed a technological "singularity" in which AI replaces humans, a giant in the tech world recently joined Kurzweil in vocalizing concern. Elon Musk, co-founder of SpaceX (space transport) and Tesla (electric cars), tweeted earlier this month: Hope we're not just the biological boot loader for digital superintelligence. Unfortunately, that is increasingly probable I spoke with Bostrom about why he's worried and how we should prepare. You write that superintelligent AI could become dangerous to humans because it will seek to improve itself and acquire resources. Explain. Suppose we have an AI whose only goal is to make as many paper clips as possible. The AI will realize quickly that it would be much better if there were no humans because humans might decide to switch it off. Because if humans do so, there would be fewer paper clips. Also, human bodies contain a lot of atoms that could be made into paper clips. The future that the AI would be trying to gear towards would be one in which there were a lot of paper clips but no humans. Could we program the AI to create no more than 100 paper clips a day for, say, a total of 10 days? Sure, but now the AI is trying to maximize the probability that it will make exactly 100 paper clips in 10 days. Again, you would want to eliminate humans because they could shut you off. What happens when it's done making the total 1,000 paper clips? It could count them again or develop a more accurate counting apparatus -- perhaps one that is the size of the planet or larger. You can imagine an unlimited sequence of actions perhaps with diminishing returns but nonetheless some positive values to the AI that would even increase by a tiny fraction the probability of reaching the goal. The analogy extends to any AI --- not just one programed to make paper clips. The point is its actions would pay no heed to human welfare. Could we make its primary goal be improving the human condition, advancing human values -- making humans happy? Well, we'd have to define then what we mean by being happy. If we mean feeling pleasure then perhaps the superintelligent AI would stick electrodes onto every human brain and stimulate our pleasure centers. Or you could take out the body altogether and have our brains bathing in a drug the AI could design. It turns out to be quite difficult to specify a goal of what we want in English -- let alone in computer code. Similarly, we can't be confident in our current set of human values. One can imagine what would have happened if some earlier human age had had the opportunity to lay down the law for all time -- to encode their understanding of human values once and for all. We can now look back and see they had huge moral blind spots. In the book, you say there could be one superintelligent AI -- or multiple. Explain. In one scenario, you have one superintelligent AI and, without any competition, it has the ability to shape the future according to its preferences. Another scenario is multipolar, where the transition to superintelligence is slower, and there are many different systems at roughly comparable level of development. In that scenario, you have economic and evolutionary dynamics coming into play. In a multipolar scenario, there's the danger of a very rapid population explosion. You could copy a digital mind in a minute, rather than with humans, where it takes a couple of decades to make another adult. So the digital minds could increase so quickly that their incomes drop to subsistence level -- which would probably be lower than for a biological mind. Then humans would no longer be able to support themselves by working, and, most likely, would die out. Alternatively, if social structures somehow continue to hold, some humans could gain immense capital returns from superintelligence that they could use to buy more computer hardware to run more digital minds. Are you saying it's impossible to control superintelligence because we ourselves are merely intelligent? It's not impossible -- it's extremely difficult. I worry that it will not be solved by the time someone builds an AI. We're not very good at uninventing things. Once unsafe superintellignce is developed, we can't put it back in the bottle. So we need to accelerate research of this control problem.

### Unpredictable

#### Risk analysis goes neg – AI is unpredictable, err against it to ensure caution

RT 14 [(RT news, cites Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla, and other experts) “‘Summoning the devil’: Elon Musk warns against artificial intelligence” RT October 27, 2014] AT

Elon Musk, the chief executive of Tesla, has warned of the danger of artificial intelligence, saying that it is the biggest existential threat facing humanity. Musk who was speaking at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Aeronautics and Astronautics department’s Centennial Symposium said that in developing artificial intelligence (AI) “we are summoning the demon.” Fiction, for example in films like The Terminator and the Matrix, has for many years demonized the perils of AI where technology starts to dominate and manipulate the human minds that created it. “In all those stories where there’s a guy with the pentagram and the holy water, it’s like yeah he’s sure he can control the demon. Didn’t work out,” he said. Musk was asked if AI was anywhere close to being a reality and he replied that he thought we were already at the stage where there should be some regulatory oversight. “I’m increasingly inclined to think there should be some regulatory oversight maybe at the national and international level, just to make sure that we don’t do something very foolish,” he said. The technology magnate, inventor and investor who is CEO of Tesla, Solar City and SpaceX warned in August that AI could be more dangerous than nuclear weapons. Musk is no stranger to the power of technology. In 2002 when he launched SpaceX, some doubted his ability to make it a success, ten years on it became the first private company to launch a vehicle into space and bring it back to earth and now has a major contract with NASA. But Musk does not appear to believe that space exploration will change the future of humanity. “It’s cool to send one mission to Mars, but that’s not what will change the future for humanity. What matters is being able to establish a self-sustaining civilization on Mars, and I don’t see anything being done by SpaceX. I don’t see anyone else even trying,” he said. But Musk himself has invested in companies developing AI, he says “to keep an eye on them.” “I wanted to see how artificial intelligence was developing. Are companies taking the right safety precautions?” he told CNN. Musk is not the only one worried about AI. A group of scholars from Oxford University wrote in a blog post last year that “when a machine is 'wrong,', it can be wrong in a far more dramatic way, with more unpredictable outcomes, than a human could. Simple algorithms should be extremely predictable, but can make bizarre decisions in 'unusual' circumstances." Dr. Stuart Armstrong, from the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University, also warned that AI may have other damaging implications such as uncontrolled mass surveillance and mass unemployment as machines and computers replace humans.

### 2N Impact Calc – Deterrence

#### The DA outweighs the case:

#### ( ) Inevitability – even if the aff solves the scenario in the 1AC, some other conflict is inevitable – that non-uniques their impacts.

Layne 9 [(Chris, Gates Chair in Intel at Texas A&M) “The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics,” 2009, Pg 317] AT

The international system’s polarity affects extended deterrence’s efficacy. During the Cold War, the bipolar nature of the U.S.-Soviet rivalry in Europe stabilized the superpower relationship by demarcating the continent into U.S. and Soviet spheres of influence that delineated the vital interests of both superpowers. Each knew it courted disaster if it challenged the other’s sphere. Also, the superpowers were able to exercise control over their major allies to minimize the risk of being chain-ganged into a conflict. In the early twenty-first century, however, the international system will be multipolar and, arguably, less stable and more conflict prone than a bipolar international system. Spheres of influence will not be delineated clearly. In addition, because other states will have more latitude to pursue their own foreign and security policy agendas than they did during the Cold War, the risk will be much greater that the United States could be chain-ganged into a conflict because of a protected state’s irresponsible behavior.

#### ( ) But deterrence solves all causes of war – this also means there is no risk of extinction in the neg world since the arsenal solves their impacts

Morgan and Paul 9 [Patrick and Tom. Proliferation Experts. Complex Deterrence: Strategy in the Global Age, 2009, Pg 9-10] AT

Among the great powers (the five permanent members of the UNSC), nuclear weapons are largely seen as a hedge against the emergence of great-power conflict in the future. The great-power relationships in the post-cold war era are characterized by "recessed general deterrence", or dissuasion, in which states do not expect immediate militarized conflict, but weapons are kept in the background as insurance given the inherent uncertainties of world politics. The end of the cold war witnessed substantial changes in the deterrence dynamics involving great powers and, as a result, general deterrence and dissuasion became operational concepts. Although they do maintain large arsenals, neither the United States nor Russia is presumed to hold automatic launch-on-warming attack plans anymore, although some of the elements of the previous era are continuing. In addition, they have reduced the number of weapons they possess, although the numbers still exceed a minimum nuclear deterrence posture. The three other old nuclear powers - china, the UK, and France, - also have been maintaining smaller arsenals, but this might change as Chinese nuclear force modernization plans come to fruition in the coming decades. The logic behind the maintenance of nuclear capabilities is that the great powers want to be prepared in case their relations deteriorate in the future. Nuclear capability can also be construed as an assurance against the expansionist pathologies of great powers as described in perspectives such as offensive realism. Moreover, uncertainties in Russia and China give pause to Western nuclear powers while, for Moscow, the fear of American influence in its former spheres in Eastern Europe and Central Asia is the cardinal source of anxiety. For the rising power, China, nuclear weapons offer a major insurance against direct assault on its strategic sphere, allowing it to rise peacefully. Nuclear weapons also offer a limited but crucial deterrent against potential conflict escalation between the US and China involving Taiwan. The great-power deterrence calculations are thus based on "recessed general deterrence" as well as "existential deterrence": no immediate expectations of war exist among them. However, as Patrick Morgan states, "if serious conflicts emerge again, then deterrence will be in vogue - if not, at least for a lengthy period, then deterrence will operate offstage, held in reserve, and will not be the cornerstone of security management for the system." This does not mean that the relations in the US-Russia and US-China dyads would remain the same in the long run. Power transition has invariably been turbulent in the international system, and herein lies the role that nuclear weapons may play in deterring a transition war. US-Russia relations could deteriorate, and deterrence could become even more relevant if tensions build up over the establishment of missile defenses in Eastern Europe and over Russian efforts to repudiate major arms control agreements in its effort to regain its lost superpower status. As discussed in Morgan and Paul's chapter in this volume, nuclear deterrence in this context has offered the major powers greater maneuverability. It has allowed the major power states to sustain their credentials as system managers and has prevented the emergence of active security dilemmas among them that can be caused by conventional arms races and technological breakthroughs. Absent the fear of existential wars, the potentially rival states have engaged in greater economic interactions. The increasing trade relations between the United States and China and China and India, an emerging power, suggest that general nuclear deterrence may offer economic spin-off benefits. To some extent, the stability in relations among the great powers, with no war in sight between them, points to the pacifying role that nuclear weapons may be playing, although other causes are present as well. In that sense, nuclear weapons may act as crucial factors in preventing a power-transition war akin to those that the world experienced in the 19th and 20th centuries. For Russia, the superpower that declined, nuclear deterrence offers an opportunity not to be excessively alarmed by the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

### 2N Impact Calc - Space Wep

#### Extend Mitchell – space weaponization causes extinction – couple reasons it outweighs----

#### ----A) Instability – fast space weapons prolif undermines stable deterrence and causes miscalculation making war more likely – it introduces use or lose pressures – nuclear weapons have stable deterrence since countries already have them

#### ----B) Deterrence breakdowns­ – false alarms are more likely since orbiting weapons can be destroyed by space debris – even a paper clip can trigger accidental global wars in space

Ritchie 82 (David, IT Business Relationship Manager at SELEX S&AS, Spacewar, http://spacedebate.org/evidence/1768/)

Perhaps the greatest danger posed by the militarization of space is that of war by accident. At any given time, several thousand satellites and other pieces of equipment -- spent booster stages and the like -- are circling the earth, most of them in low orbit. The space immediately above the atmosphere has begun to resemble an expressway at rush hour. It is not uncommon for satellites to miss each other by only a kilometer or two, and satellites crashing into each other may explain some of the mysterious incidents in which space vehicles simply vanish from the skies. One civillian TV satellite has been lost in space; it never entered its intended orbit, and no signals were heard from it to indicate where it might have gone. Collision with something else in space seems a reasonable explanation of this disappearance. Even a tiny fragment of metal striking a satellite at a relative velocity of a few kilometers per second would wreck the satellite, ripping through it like a Magnum slug through a tin can. Now suppose that kind of mishap befell a military satellite -- in the worst possible situation, during a time of international tension with all players in the spacewar game braced for attacks on their spacecraft. The culpable fragment might be invisible from the ground; even something as small and light as a paper clip could inflict massive damage on a satellite at high velocity. Unaware of the accident, a less than cautious leader might interpret it as a preconceived attack. Wars have begun over smaller incidents.

#### ----C) Empirics – Nuclear war hasn’t ever happened even through all the tensions in the past – empirically disproves your scenario – space weaponization is the only unique cause of war – Mitchell says it the most destructive since it makes draw-in and accidental war inevitable

#### ----D) Magnitude – future weapons are more destructive than nuclear weapons – they’re capable of far greater destruction; also this forces countries to retaliate with larger weapons; my impacts uniquely cause all-out launch of the entire arsenal – countries won’t show restraint

### 2N Prolif Impact

#### Extend Mazurak – cuts in the arsenal means allies don’t perceive the US arsenal as enough to protect them anymore, causing them to proliferate for self-defense.

#### Prolif risks war and nuclear terrorism

Roberts 99 [Brad, Institute for Defense Analyses, Fall 1999, Nonproliferation Review] AT

But the standard answers don’t really take us very far into this problem any more. To grasp the full stake requires a broader notion of stability—and an appreciation of the particular historical moment in which we find ourselves. It is an accident of history that the diffusion of dual-use capabilities is coterminous with the end of the Cold War. That diffusion means that we are moving irreversibly into an international system in which the wildfire-like spread of weapons is a real possibility. The end of the Cold War has brought with it great volatility in the relations of major and minor powers in the international system. What then is at stake? In response to some catalytic event, entire regions could rapidly cross the threshold from latent to extant weapons capability, and from covert to overt postures, a process that would be highly competitive and risky, and which likely would spill over wherever the divides among regions are not tidy. This would sorely test Ken Waltz’s familiar old heresy that “more may be better”7—indeed, even Waltz assumed proliferation would be stabilizing only if it is gradual, and warned against the rapid spread of weapons to multiple states. At the very least, this would fuel NBC terrorism, as a general proliferation of NBC weaponry would likely erode the constraints that heretofore have inhibited states from sponsoring terrorist use of these capabilities. Given its global stature and media culture, America would be a likely target of some of these terrorist actions.

## Case – Link D generic

### No total replacement

#### The aff won’t cause a full robot revolution – only a partial increase in robots that displaces poor workers.

#### Robots are expensive and not totally effective; they also require expensive repairs and are short in supply, whereas human labor is much cheaper and more reliable. Capitalists will replace only a few jobs with robots.

#### AI is many years away, and research incentives and grants mean it’ll happen regardless of minimum wage laws. At best, the aff accelerates development only slightly.

#### There’s only an incentive to replace some low wage jobs – robots still can’t replace more complex human jobs like driving and service, let alone intellectual labor, so there won’t be a full shift from capitalism.

### No Job Replacement

#### 1. Robots boost job growth – they don’t eliminate jobs

Neal 13 - Neal, Meghan. "Relax, a Minimum Wage Hike Won't Bring on the Robot Overlords." Motherboard. N.p., n.d. Web. 04 July 2014. GC

No doubt, society’s cruising toward an automated future, but let's not get ahead of ourselves. The dystopian (or utopian, depending who you ask) future robot workforce hasn’t completely emerged from the realm of sci-fi yet. For one, where are the robots coming from? Someone has to manufacture and program them, which means jobs. Also, there are still plenty of menial tasks a computer can't handle. A touch screen can't clean tables, mop floors, or flip burgers—and they’re terrible at customer service. What's more, there’s no proof that more robots equal less jobs. As a [New York Times editorial](http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/08/24/how-technology-wrecks-the-middle-class/?hp&_r=0) pointed out this week, there isn’t a finite amount of labor. Tasks that require problem-solving, dexterity, and certain skills—even if not higher education—are still outside the realm of what machines can easily replace.  "Labor-saving technological change necessarily displaces workers performing certain tasks—that’s where the gains in productivity come from—but over the long run, it generates new products and services that raise national income and increase the overall demand for labor,” wrote the Times. So far, so true, mounting research suggests. Michael Reich, coauthor of a study by the National Employment Law Project told Slate,  “Technology has been increasing restaurant productivity for some time—think of computerized ordering of supplies, Open Table and Yelp and electronic ovens—but that has not translated into lower employment in the aggregate. Indeed, employment in restaurants has been growing along with the use of technology.”

#### Outweighs

#### The advantage is inevitable – AI development will occur regardless since strong research incentives and funding drives innovation. Even if it happens sooner, the aff is a minor incentive to make robots, so the time frame difference is minimal and outweighed by econ offense

#### Growth generates money for tech development which forces workers into other jobs. The aff has no link.

#### 2. Non-unique – Minimum wage laws exist now, so businesses want to use AI to cut costs regardless. There’s no evidence the living wage is the brink that incentivizes AI development.

## Case – Cap Link D

### Case – internal link D

#### All their ev asserts robot revolution puts into place the conditions necessary for communism, such as abundance – it won’t ACTUALLY result in that. Revolutionary change won’t happen – no incentive

Jeff GOODWIN Sociology @ NYU ‘3 “Finding the Revolutionary in Revolution” in *The Future of Revolutions* ed. John Foran p 70-71

Democracy may be an especially powerful barrier to revolution in an age of corporate globalization. And globalization, in turn, may help underpin democracy. Certainly, the unprecedented speed and mobility of capital in the current era hang like the sword of Damocles over those on both the left and right who would disrupt predictable business climates and 'investor confidence'. In the new world order, the fear of capital flight or boycott may stay the hand of would-be Pinochets as well as that of would-be Lenins. Globalization, in other words, notwithstanding its often disastrous socioeconomic effects on working people, may actually help undermine authoritarianism and preserve democratic and quasi-democratic regimes. This may explain the striking coincidence of globalization and democratization, which many analysts view as contradictory, during the past two decades. Elisabeth Wood, for example, has shown how globalization facilitated democratization - and defused revolutionary challenges - in El Salvador and South Africa: the integration of domestic markets into the global economy and 'the growing hegemony of neoliberal economic policies made it unlikely that postconflict states would have the capacity to implement confiscatory redistributive policies that would threaten elite interests. Deviation from the neoliberal model would be punished by capital movements' (Wood 2000: 15). Globalization thus provided an incentive for previously authoritarian economic elites finally to accept the full political inclusion of subordinate classes, since the latter would have limited means to threaten elite interests. In effect, elites accepted democracy, while their opponents accepted capitalism. Today, the former revolutionaries of EI Salvador's Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) and South Africa's African National Congress (ANC) seek at most to reform capitalism, not to overthrow it. Capital mobility also haunts the 'parliamentary road' to revolutionary change. For the reasons previously discussed, this is not a well-trodden path. (And the best example of it, the Popular Unity government in Chile, suggests how truly treacherous it can be.) Those tempted to take this path to revolution will face the same threats as erstwhile revolutionaries in EI Salvador and South Africa: capital flight, capital boycott and the economic nightmare that would predictably follow**.** In fact, the moret ightly a national economy (to the extent that this concept still makes sense) is integrated into global circuits of capital, the greater the economic costs of any anti-capitalist political program. Some of these costs might be avoided if a whole bloc of countries simultaneously enacted such a program, but this scenario - so ardently hoped for by Trotsky, Lenin and the old Bolsheviks after the Russian revolution - seems no more probable than in the past. On the other hand, it would presumably be the 'parliamentary road' to revolution which would be taken if and when masses of people in a democracy - ideally, a substantial majority - became convinced that radical socioeconomic change was the only solution to their most urgent, everyday problems. In the midst of a very severe economic crisis, such a possibility certainly cannot be ruled out. Yet revolutionaries would no doubt have to compete for popular support in this context with reformists and populists of various types, including proponents of authoritarian 'solutions'. Even severe capitalist crises, history teaches us, do not guarantee radical, let alone revolutionary, change.

### Specific Authors- Worstall

#### [WORSTALL 1 and 3] 1. This assumes increases in labor reduce prices, but empirically this isn’t the case. Corporations pay low wages and keep the surplus as profit – their control of markets means they will artificially keep prices high

#### 2. If employing robots would bankrupt capitalists, they wouldn’t employ robots. Markets are self-regulating – capitalists will use robots only until they started losing money

#### 3. This is a fantasy. Worstall is a random blogger, not a qualified author.

#### [WORSTALL – COMMUNISM] 1. This turns itself – once humans are disemployed by robots, they will merely be used as labor somewhere else, which proves labor is inevitable

#### 2. This assumes a net increase in production resulting from robots. All my econ disproves this and turns the case. Only increasing economic abundance can allow for communism; collapsing the economy only entrenches cap more. They don’t cite any empirics that this would boost production.

### Specific Author - LRNA

#### 1. The warrant here disproves Worstall 1 – it says capitalist decrease the cost of production to increase profit, which proves lower productions costs increase profits and don’t drive down costs, which their Worstall 1 evidence asserts

#### 2. Robots increase surplus value. They’re paid ZERO wages so 100% of the value from their labor is given to the capitalists, which boosts capitalists’ stolen value even more.

#### 3. Worstall 2 turns this. Cutting profits to capitalists would reduce economic productivity, making impossible to achieve the abundance necessary for communism. If workers stopped buying goods, the aff would cause massive poverty and economic destruction, making communism impossible.

## Case Hardt and Negri

### Case - Hardt and Negri

#### Computerized labor subjects human laborers to commodification. Even if robots take over physical labor, humans will still produce value through immaterial labor, subjecting us to capitalist exploitation

Hardt and Negri 1 [Michael Hardt (American literary theorist and political philosopher) and Antonio Negri (Ph.D., is an Italian Marxist sociologist, scholar, revolutionary philosopher and teacher). “Empire.” 2001. Harvard University Press] AT

Toyotism is based on an inversion of the Fordist structure of communication between production and consumption. Ideally, according to this model, production planning will communicate with markets constantly and immediately. Factories will maintain zero stock, and commodities will be produced just in time according to the present demand of the existing markets. This model thus involves not simply a more rapid feedback loop but an inversion of the relationship because, at least in theory, the production decision actually comes after and in reaction to the market decision. In the most extreme cases the commodity is not produced until the consumer has already chosen and purchased it. In general, however, it would be more accurate to conceive the model as striving toward a continual interactivity or rapid communication between production and consumption. This industrial context provides a first sense in which communication and information have come to play a newly central role in production. One might say that instrumental action and communicative action have become intimately interwoven in the informationalized industrial process, but one should quickly add that this is an impoverished notion of communication as the mere transmission of market data.16 The service sectors of the economy present a richer model of productive communication. Most services indeed are based on the continual exchange of information and knowledges. Since the production of services results in no material and durable good, we define the labor involved in this production as immaterial labor—that is, labor that produces an immaterial good, such as a service, a cultural product, knowledge, or communication.17 One face of immaterial labor can be recognized in analogy to the functioning of a computer. The increasingly extensive use of computers has tended progressively to redefine laboring practices and relations, along with, indeed, all social practices and relations. Familiarity and facility with computer technology is becoming an increasingly general primary qualification for work in the dominant countries. Even when direct contact with computers is not involved, the manipulation of symbols and information along the model of computer operation is extremely widespread. In an earlier era workers learned how to act like machines both inside and outside the factory. We even learned (with the help of Muybridge’s photos, for example) to recognize human activity in general as mechanical. Today we increasingly think like computers, while communication technologies and their model of interaction are becoming more and more central to laboring activities. One novel aspect of the computer is that it can continually modify its own operation through its use. Even the most rudimentary forms of artificial intelligence allow the computer to expand and perfect its operation based on its interaction with its user and its environment. The same kind of continual interactivity characterizes a wide range of contemporary productive activities, whether computer hardware is directly involved or not. The computer and communication revolution of production has transformed laboring practices in such a way that they all tend toward the model of information and communication technologies.18 Interactive and cybernetic machines become a new prosthesis integrated into our bodies and minds and a lens through which to redefine our bodies and minds themselves. The anthropology of cyberspace is really a recognition of the new human condition. Robert Reich calls the kind of immaterial labor involved in computer and communication work ‘‘symbolic-analytical services’’—tasks that involve ‘‘problem-solving, problem-identifying, and strategic brokering activities.’’19 This type of labor claims the highest value, and thus Reich identifies it as the key to competition in the new global economy. He recognizes, however, that the growth of these knowledge-based jobs of creative symbolic manipulation implies a corresponding growth of low-value and low-skill jobs of routine symbol manipulation, such as data entry and word processing. Here begins to emerge a fundamental division of labor within the realm of immaterial production. We should note that one consequence of the informatization of production and the emergence of immaterial labor has been a real homogenization of laboring processes. From Marx’s perspective in the nineteenth century, the concrete practices of various laboring activities were radically heterogeneous: tailoring and weaving involved incommensurable concrete actions. Only when abstracted from their concrete practices could different laboring activities be brought together and seen in a homogeneous way, no longer as tailoring and weaving but as the expenditure of human labor power in general, as abstract labor.20 With the computerization of production today, however, the heterogeneity of concrete labor has tended to be reduced, and the worker is increasingly further removed from the object of his or her labor. The labor of computerized tailoring and the labor of computerized weaving may involve exactly the same concrete practices—that is, manipulation of symbols and infor- mation. Tools, of course, have always abstracted labor power from the object of labor to a certain degree. In previous periods, however, the tools generally were related in a relatively inflexible way to certain tasks or certain groups of tasks; different tools corresponded to different activities—the tailor’s tools, the weaver’s tools, or later a sewing machine and a power loom. The computer proposes itself, in contrast, as the universal tool, or rather as the central tool, through which all activities might pass. Through the computerization of production, then, labor tends toward the position of abstract labor. The model of the computer, however, can account for only one face of the communicational and immaterial labor involved in the production of services. The other face of immaterial labor is the affective labor of human contact and interaction. Health services, for example, rely centrally on caring and affective labor, and the entertainment industry is likewise focused on the creation and ma- nipulation of affect. This labor is immaterial, even if it is corporeal and affective, in the sense that its products are intangible, a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, or passion. Categories such as ‘‘in-person services’’ or services of proximity are often used to identify this kind of labor, but what is really essential to it are the creation and manipulation of affect. Such affective production, exchange, and communication are generally associated with human contact, but that contact can be either actual or virtual, as it is in the entertainment industry. This second face of immaterial labor, its affective face, extends well beyond the model of intelligence and communication defined by the computer. Affective labor is better understood by beginning from what feminist analyses of ‘‘women’s work’’ have called ‘‘labor in the bodily mode.’’21 Caring labor is certainly entirely immersed in the corporeal, the somatic, but the affects it produces are nonetheless immaterial. What affective labor produces are social networks, forms of community, biopower. Here one might recognize once again that the instrumental action of economic production has been united with the communicative action of human relations; in this case, however, communication has not been impoverished, but produc- tion has been enriched to the level of complexity of human inter- action. In short, we can distinguish three types of immaterial labor that drive the service sector at the top of the informational economy. The first is involved in an industrial production that has been informationalized and has incorporated communication technologies in a way that transforms the production process itself. Manufacturing is regarded as a service, and the material labor of the production of durable goods mixes with and tends toward immaterial labor. Second is the immaterial labor of analytical and symbolic tasks, which itself breaks down into creative and intelligent manipulation on the one hand and routine symbolic tasks on the other. Finally, a third type of immaterial labor involves the production and manipulation of affect and requires (virtual or actual) human contact, labor in the bodily mode. These are the three types of labor that drive the postmodernization of the global economy. We should point out before moving on that in each of these forms of immaterial labor, cooperation is completely inherent in the labor itself. Immaterial labor immediately involves social interaction and cooperation. In other words, the cooperative aspect of immaterial labor is not imposed or organized from the outside, as it was in previous forms of labor, but rather, cooperation is completely immanent to the laboring activity itself.22 This fact calls into question the old notion (common to classical and Marxian political econom- ics) by which labor power is conceived as ‘‘variable capital,’’ that is, a force that is activated and made coherent only by capital, because the cooperative powers of labor power (particularly immaterial labor power) afford labor the possibility of valorizing itself. Brains and bodies still need others to produce value, but the others they need are not necessarily provided by capital and its capacities to orchestrate production. Today productivity, wealth, and the creation of social surpluses take the form of cooperative interactivity through linguistic, communicational, and affective networks. In the expression of its own creative energies, immaterial labor thus seems to provide the potential for a kind of spontaneous and elementary communism.

### Extra link cards

#### The technological economy makes capital mobile and fluid, expanding its domination

Hardt and Negri 1 [Michael Hardt (American literary theorist and political philosopher) and Antonio Negri (Ph.D., is an Italian Marxist sociologist, scholar, revolutionary philosopher and teacher). “Empire.” 2001. Harvard University Press] AT

The first geographical consequence of the passage from an industrial to an informational economy is a dramatic decentralization of production. The processes of modernization and the passage to the industrial paradigm provoked the intense aggregation of productive forces and mass migrations of labor power toward centers that became factory cities, such as Manchester, Osaka, and Detroit. Efficiency of mass industrial production depended on the concentration and proximity of elements in order to create the factory site and facilitate transportation and communication. The informatization of industry and the rising dominance of service production, however, have made such concentration of production no longer necessary. Size and efficiency are no longer linearly related; in fact, large scale has in many cases become a hindrance. Advances in telecommunica- tions and information technologies have made possible a deterritori- alization of production that has effectively dispersed the mass facto- ries and evacuated the factory cities. Communication and control can be exercised efficiently at a distance, and in some cases immaterial products can be transported across the world with minimal delay and expense. Several different production facilities can be coordinated in the simultaneous production of a single commodity in such a way that factories can be dispersed to various locations. In some sectors even the factory site itself can be done away with as its workers communicate exclusively through new information technologies.23 In the passage to the informational economy, the assembly line has been replaced by the network as the organizational model of production, transforming the forms of cooperation and communication within each productive site and among productive sites. The mass industrial factory defined the circuits of laboring cooperation primarily through the physical deployments of workers on the shop floor. Individual workers communicated with their neighboring workers, and communication was generally limited to physical proximity. Cooperation among productive sites also required physical proximity both to coordinate the productive cycles and to minimize the transportation costs and time of the commodities being produced. For example, the distance between the coal mine and the steel mill, and the efficiency of the lines of transportation and communication between them, are significant factors in the overall efficiency of steel production. Similarly, for automobile production the efficiency of communication and transportation among the series of subcontractors involved is crucial in the overall efficiency of the system. The passage toward informational production and the network structure of organization, in contrast, make productive cooperation and efficiency no longer dependent to such a degree on proximity and centralization. Information technologies tend to make distances less relevant. Workers involved in a single process can effectively communicate and cooperate from remote locations without consideration to proximity. In effect, the network of laboring cooperation requires no territorial or physical center. The tendency toward the deterritorialization of production is even more pronounced in the processes of immaterial labor that involve the manipulation of knowledge and information. Laboring processes can be conducted in a form almost entirely compatible with communication networks, for which location and distance have very limited importance. Workers can even stay at home and log on to the network. The labor of informational production (of both services and durable goods) relies on what we can call abstract cooperation. Such labor dedicates an ever more central role to communication of knowledges and information among workers, but those cooperating workers need not be present and can even be relatively unknown to one another, or known only through the productive information exchanged. The circuit of cooperation is consolidated in the network and the commodity at an abstract level. Production sites can thus be deterritorialized and tend toward a virtual existence, as coordinates in the communication network. As opposed to the old vertical industrial and corporate model, production now tends to be organized in horizontal network enterprises.24 The information networks also release production from territorial constraints insofar as they tend to put the producer in direct contact with the consumer regardless of the distance between them. Bill Gates, the co-founder of the Microsoft Corporation, takes this tendency to an extreme when he predicts a future in which networks will overcome entirely the barriers to circulation and allow an ideal, ‘‘friction-free’’ capitalism to emerge: ‘‘The information highway will extend the electronic marketplace and make it the ultimate go-between, the universal middleman.’’25 If Gates’s vision were to be realized, the networks would tend to reduce all distance and make transactions immediate. Sites of production and sites of consumption would then be present to one another, regardless of geographical lo- cation. These tendencies toward the deterritorialization of production and the increased mobility of capital are not absolute, and there are significant countervailing tendencies, but to the extent that they do proceed, they place labor in a weakened bargaining position. In the era of the Fordist organization of industrial mass production, capital was bound to a specific territory and thus to dealing contrac- tually with a limited laboring population. The informatization of production and the increasing importance of immaterial production have tended to free capital from the constraints of territory and bargaining. Capital can withdraw from negotiation with a given local population by moving its site to another point in the global network—or merely by using the potential to move as a weapon in negotiations. Entire laboring populations, which had enjoyed a certain stability and contractual power, have thus found themselves in increasingly precarious employment situations. Once the bargain- ing position of labor has been weakened, network production can accommodate various old forms of non-guaranteed labor, such as freelance work, home work, part-time labor, and piecework.26

#### Technology is a strategy of biopolitical capitalism

Hardt and Negri 1 [Michael Hardt (American literary theorist and political philosopher) and Antonio Negri (Ph.D., is an Italian Marxist sociologist, scholar, revolutionary philosopher and teacher). “Empire.” 2001. Harvard University Press] AT

One could nonetheless object at this point that even while being virtual and acting at the margins, the process of constructing imperial sovereignty is in many respects very real! We certainly do not mean to deny that fact. Our claim, rather, is that we are dealing here with a special kind of sovereignty—a discontinuous form of sovereignty that should be considered liminal or marginal insofar as it acts ‘‘in the final instance,’’ a sovereignty that locates its only point of reference in the definitive absoluteness of the power that it can exercise. Empire thus appears in the form of a very high tech machine: it is virtual, built to control the marginal event, and organized to dominate and when necessary intervene in the break- downs of the system (in line with the most advanced technologies of robotic production). The virtuality and discontinuity of imperial sovereignty, however, do not minimize the effectiveness of its force; on the contrary, those very characteristics serve to reinforce its apparatus, demonstrating its effectiveness in the contemporary historical context and its legitimate force to resolve world problems in the final instance. We are now in the position to address the question whether, on the basis of these new biopolitical premises, the figure and the life of Empire can today be grasped in terms of a juridical model. We have already seen that this juridical model cannot be constituted by the existing structures of international law, even when under- stood in terms of the most advanced developments of the United Nations and the other great international organizations. Their elaborations of an international order could at the most be recognized as a process of transition toward the new imperial power. The constitution of Empire is being formed neither on the basis of any contractual or treaty-based mechanism nor through any federative source. The source of imperial normativity is born of a new machine, a new economic-industrial-communicative machine—in short, a globalized biopolitical machine. It thus seems clear that we must look at something other than what has up until now constituted the bases of international order, something that does not rely on the form of right that, in the most diverse traditions, was grounded in the modern system of sovereign nation-states. The impossibility, however, of grasping the genesis of Empire and its virtual figure with any of the old instruments of juridical theory, which were deployed in the realist, institutionalist, positivist, or natural right frameworks, should not force us to accept a cynical framework of pure force or some such Machiavellian position. In the genesis of Empire there is indeed a rationality at work that can be recognized not so much in terms of the juridical tradition but more clearly in the often hidden history of industrial management and the political uses of technology. (We should not forget here too that proceeding along these lines will reveal the fabric of class struggle and its institutional effects, but we will treat that issue in the next section.) This is a rationality that situates us at the heart of biopolitics and biopolitical technologies.

### Impact - Empire

#### The decline of the nation-state and the concentration of power in supranational institutions signals a new global empire. This grounds sovereignty in a smooth machine of power that is constantly shifting and expanding to envelop the whole world

Hardt and Negri 01 [Michael Hardt (American literary theorist and political philosopher) and Antonio Negri (Ph.D., is an Italian Marxist sociologist, scholar, revolutionary philosopher and teacher). “Empire.” 2001. Harvard University Press] AJ

Many argue that the globalization of capitalist production and exchange means that economic relations have become more autonomous from political controls, and consequently that political sovereignty has declined. Some celebrate this new era as the liberation of the capitalist economy from the restrictions and distortions that political forces have imposed on it; others lament it as the closing of the institutional channels through which workers and citizens can influence or contest the cold logic of capitalist profit. It is certainly true that, in step with the processes of globalization, the sovereignty of nation-states, while still effective, has progressively declined. The primary factors of production and exchange— money, technology, people, and goods—move with increasing ease across national boundaries; hence the nation-state has less and less power to regulate these flows and impose its authority over the economy. Even the most dominant nation-states should no longer be thought of as supreme and sovereign authorities, either outside or even within their own borders. The decline in sovereignty of nation-states, however, does not mean that sovereignty as such has declined.1 Throughout the contemporary transformations, political controls, state functions, and regulatory mechanisms have continued to rule the realm of economic and social production and exchange. Our basic hypothesis is that sovereignty has taken a new form, composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule. This new global form of sovereignty is what we call Empire. The declining sovereignty of nation-states and their increasing inability to regulate economic and cultural exchanges is in fact one of the primary symptoms of the coming of Empire. The sovereignty of the nation-state was the cornerstone of the imperialisms that European powers constructed throughout the modern era. By "Em- pire," however, we understand something altogether different from "imperialism." The boundaries defined by the modern system of nation-states were fundamental to European colonialism and economic expansion: the territorial boundaries of the nation delimited the center of power from which rule was exerted over external foreign territories through a system of channels and barriers that alternately facilitated and obstructed the flows of production and circulation. Imperialism was really an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their own boundaries. Even- tually nearly all the world's territories could be parceled out and the entire world map could be coded in European colors: red for British territory, blue for French, green for Portuguese, and so forth. Wherever modern sovereignty took root, it constructed a Leviathan that overarched its social domain and imposed hierarchical territorial boundaries, both to police the purity of its own identity and to exclude all that was other. The passage to Empire emerges from the twilight of modern sovereignty. In contrast to imperialism, Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a decentered and deterriformalizing apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers. Empire manages hybrid identities, flexible hier- archies, and plural exchanges through modulating networks of command. The distinct national colors of the imperialist map of the world have merged and blended in the imperial global rainbow. The transformation of the modern imperialist geography of the globe and the realization of the world market signal a passage within the capitalist mode of production. Most significant, the spatial divisions of the three Worlds (First, Second, and Third) have been scrambled so that we continually find the First World in the Third, the Third in the First, and the Second almost nowhere at all. Capital seems to be faced with a smooth world—or really, a world defined by new and complex regimes of differentiation and homogenization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. The construction of the paths and limits of these new global flows has been accompanied by a transformation of the dominant productive processes themselves, with the result that the role of industrial factory labor has been reduced and priority given instead to communicative, cooperative, and affective labor. In the postmodernization of the global economy, the creation of wealth tends ever more toward what we will call biopolitical production, the production of social life itself, in which the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another.

## Cap – Impact D

### Case - Cap Defense

#### Status quo is improving – no try or die for the aff

Drezner 13 12/27/13—professor of international politics at Tufts University's Fletcher School (Daniel, “The Year of Living Hegemonically”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/12/27/the_year_of_living_hegemonically>, dml)

These sorts of trends tend to give U.S. strategists the heebie-jeebies. A staple of international relations thinking for decades has been that U.S. hegemony is the mainstay of global order. According to this "theory of hegemonic stability," peace and prosperity are only likely to persist when a liberal superpower is prepared to act to keep markets open and stamp out brewing conflict. If Mead or Robert Kagan are correct, then a United States that is both unwilling and unable to stabilize the rest of the world really should be a source of concern. Here's the thing, though: at the same time that commentators were bemoaning U.S. decline, the world was looking up. I suspect that ThinkProgress and Britain's Spectator magazine would agree on very little in politics, but this month they both ran features pointing out something important: 2013 was "the best year in human history." Their data is incontrovertible. If you look at human development indicators, all of the key metrics -- infant mortality, infectious diseases, per capital income -- are trending in the right direction. By the end of 2013, the smallest fraction of the world's population will be living in poverty. Both traditional and human security measures reveal the same trend. Whether it's violent crime, discrimination, civil or interstate war, the aggregate data shows a more peaceable world. Or, as the Spectator put it: "Every day in every way, the world grows richer, safer and smarter." If you don't believe political partisans, then buy Angus Deaton's The Great Escape and you'll discover the same message. Despite the post-2008 trend of predicting that the global order is crumbling and the world is going to hell, the opposite is transpiring. How and why can this be happening when American power is on the wane? Those fearful of disorder have made two fundamental errors in judgment. First, they assume that China, Iran, and others want to rewrite the global rules of the game. Not so. To be sure, these countries want to preserve their sovereignty and expand their sphere of influence -- and on these issues, they will clash with the United States. On the other hand, contra Mead, they will also clash with each other as well. Furthermore, Beijing, Moscow, and Tehran very much want to participate in the global economy. Indeed, the reason Rouhani is trying to negotiate a nuclear deal is to get Iran out from under the dead weight of crippling economic sanctions. And contra what everyone expected in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, emerging markets are not eager to topple the existing global order. Indeed, the recent trade deal in Bali suggests that, if anything, they want to reinforce the existing rules of the game. The bigger error, however, has come from analysts confusing a U.S. reluctance to use military force in the Middle East with a decline in American power and influence. The truth is that the United States still wields considerable power, which is one reason why 2013 turned out to be such a good year. Whether one looks at global capital flows or the use of the dollar as a reserve currency, the data point in the same direction: the resilience of American economic power. And even as the sequester hits, the United States also continues to possess an unparalleled edge in military capabilities. It is true that Syria continues to hemorrhage lives and livelihoods. Even there, however, it was the threat of American force that triggered an agreement to remove Syria's chemical weapons. U.S. military power has also helped to tamp down conflict in the Central African Republic, as well as deliver massive humanitarian relief to the Philippines. Indeed, given the depths of its domestic political dysfunction, one can only imagine what America's rivals must think. In 2013 alone, the federal government couldn't evade a stupid, counterproductive budget sequester, a government shutdown, and brinksmanship with the debt ceiling. There was no agreement on immigration reform, much less on policies such as climate change, education, or infrastructure. Despite mounting gridlock and policy own goals, however, the United States ends 2013 with a rapidly declining federal budget deficit, a surging energy sector, and accelerating growth in the economy and employment. President Obama was justified in noting that 2014 could be a breakthrough year for the United States. The most brilliant strategists living in Moscow, Beijing, or Tehran can't displace the structural strengths of the United States. Which means that for those capitals, 2014 will prove to be a very frustrating year.

#### They don’t solve oppression – as long as profit-making systems are in place there’s an incentive to create oppressive divisions. They only tinker with the structure of profit-making to make it more equitable

#### What cap values isn’t relevant. Only material consequences matter.

Sam Harris 2010. [CEO Project Reason; PHD UCLA Neuroscience; BA Stanford Philosophy]. The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values.”

Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: all questions of value (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc.—all talk of value is empty. Therefore, to say that an act is morally necessary, or evil, or blameless, is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures (whether actual or potential). I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes [and] that it is possible to suffer their wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

#### Checks on capitalism are growing – solves the worst parts of cap

César Rodríguez-GARAVITO Director, Programa de Justicia Global y Derechos Humanos. Facultad de Derecho. Universidad de los Andes ET AL ‘8 “Utopia Reborn?” in *The New Latin American Left* eds. Barrett, Chavez & Rodríguez-Garavito p.20-24

The path followed by several 'progressive' governments suggests that the reconstitution of the Latin American left is no longer defined by radical changes in institutional politics and macroeconomic policies, but by the implementation of social reforms. This apparent new left 'agenda' takes for granted the basic principles of market economics, while promoting reforms such as the implementation of welfare programmes for the poorest members of society (such as the Fame Zero in Brazil or the Panes in Uruguay), a renewed concern for public security, a more active role for the state as regulator and mediator between capital and labour, the expansion and improvement of public services, and the introduction of a more progressive tax regime.7 Despite making a positive difference in the lives of the citizens affected by these policies, they do not add up to a comprehensive alternative model to neo-liberalism. Moreover, these and other post-neo-liberal experiences are far from consolidated, and the political actors themselves promote them in an atmosphere of considerably greater uncertainty than that which drove the ideology and programmes of the old left. Indeed, it bears noting that in all the countries governed by the left, we observe the existence of actors that are not simply anti-neo-liberal but also anti-capitalist and have thus positioned themselves to the left of the progressive parties in government. This implies growing pressure from both sides of the political spectrum and a much more complex equilibrium than the bipolar left- right contradiction hegemonic throughout the region. In this context, we see the left both in government and against the government, with the line separating supporters and opponents not always clear. As seen in Brazil and Venezuela with the re-election of Lula and Chavez, the poor tend to support the government, whereas those with higher levels of formal education tend to adopt a more critical stance. At the same time, the economic policies implemented by some of the progressive governments analysed in this volume are endorsed by social and economic sectors that not long ago were at the forefront of resistance to the left. In short, the very same governments are seen by some critics as 'sold out to market forces' and neo-capitalists, whilst others perceive them as not market-friendly enough. For all these reasons, Latin America is at this moment a privileged laboratory for analysing the identity and future evolution of the left and progressive left politics in and beyond the region. In one important respect, the uncertainty characterising the contemporary Latin American left may be seen as an advance over the old left. Indeed, as Atilio Boron contends in Chapter 9, the construction of economic and social alternatives never proceeds in accordance with a manual or a pre-conceived model. Rather, it is a historical, dialectical and ultimately unpredictable process with multiple possible outcomes.8 The inflexible pursuit of a pre-conceived model is therefore more likely to serve as a hindrance to the construction of an alternative than as a reliable guide. Similarly, in an essay exploring the problems of the transition to socialism, Erik Olin Wright (2004: 17) contends that such a transition is best conceived as moving in a general direction, rather than toward a specific institutional destination. This approach, he asserts, is like: leaving for a voyage without a map of the journey, or a description of the destination, but simply a navigation rule that tells us if we are going in the right direction and how far we have travelled. This is obviously less satisfactory than a comprehensive roadmap, but it is better than a map whose destinations are constructed through wishful thinking and which give a false sense of certainty about where we are headed. From this broader perspective, an extensive range of proposals, programmes and experiments becomes visible, and it becomes possible to analyse and evaluate the extent to which the actors on the left today offer alternatives to neo-liberalism. Thus, rather than a fixed destination, a more useful analytical criterion consists of determining to what extent these economic initiatives go in the direction of the values widely recognised by the left itself, such as decreasing inequality between classes and countries, economic democracy and environmental sustainability. In other words, these aspirations constitute the essential points of reference on the left's navigation rule.

#### No environment impact

Maier 12 [Donald S. Maier- Moral and Environmental Philosopher Aristotle & Company. “What’s So Good About Biodiversity?”. The International Library of Environmental, Agricultural and Food Ethics VOLUME 19 (August 2012).] NM

The component set of species has undergone transformation due to human influences. The component set of ecosystems has been concomitantly transformed. This is a matter of humanity’s transformation of “the lay of the land” and of its biogeochemistry. It is the major point of the concept of anthropogenic biomes (mentioned in Sect. 5.3 , The moral force of biodiversity), none of which existed 70,000 years ago. The biomes from that past time are now extinct, like many of the species that occupied them, and partly on account of the extinction of those species. In other words, whatever biological conditions have sustained life over the last 200,000 years have also sustained so many changes in life that the planet now is hard to recognize as a later biotic and environmental version of its former self. This is a serious blow to the supposition that biodiversity, just as it was at some point arbitrarily selected within the interval of human tenure, was essential to sustaining life from that point onward.