# NU - Round 1 – Emory BW vs Michigan HM

## 1NC

### 1NC – Topicality (Clash)

#### Our interpretation is that the resolution should define the division ground. It was negotiated and announced in advance providing both teams a reasonable opportunity to prepare. Only a textual reading of the resolution provides a predictable basis for research.

#### This does not exclude performance, dictate evidence type, or assume the judge’s role – only that the topic should determine the debate’s subject matter.

#### USFG means the three branches.

OECD, 1987. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. *The Control and Management of Government Expenditure*. 179. Google Book.

1. Political and organizational structure of government

The United States America is a federal republic consisting of 50 states. States have their own constitutions and within each State there are at least two additional levels of government, generally designated as counties and cities, towns or villages. The relationships between different levels of government are complex and varied (see Section B for more information).

The Federal Government is composed of three branches: the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. Budgetary decisionmaking is shared primarily by the legislative and executive branches. The general structure of these two branches relative to budget formulation and execution is as follows.

#### ‘Resolved’ means to enact a policy by law.

Words and Phrases, 1964. Permanent Edition.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### They don’t defend a policy enacted by the USFG – vote neg –

#### 1. Competition – the Neg should win on average 50 percent of the time – any unfair advantage is a reason they should lose – their arguments are shaped by the drive to win, so presume their arguments are in bad faith.

#### 2. Clash – debate requires stasis to motivate research that develops third and fourth line responses – that’s key to politics and activism regardless of your personal beliefs – their interp explodes limits, makes the Aff conditional, and forces the Neg into concessionary ground.

## ---Boycott & Delete CP

THE U.S.F.G Should boycott Google and Youtube

### ---Solvency

#### Boycotting Google and YouTube solves

Bob Perry, 20. Writer, speaker, and teacher for True Horizon. Former Commercial Airline Captain. “Four Ways We Can Revolt Against Big Tech.” True Horizon blog. https://truehorizon.org/four-ways-we-can-revolt-against-big-tech/

**2. Use Alternatives**

Remember that the fuel for Big Tech behemoths is the revenue they generate by exploiting the personal data *you freely give them*. They use that data along with your social media interactions, internet searches, and browsing history to sell your information to companies that want it. It’s very simple:

***You are the product***

Knowing that tells you all you need to know about how to undermine Big Tech. Quit selling yourself. Stop fueling the Big Tech Engine that is trying to squash you.

**GOOGLE**

[As you can see](https://www.visualcapitalist.com/this-chart-reveals-googles-true-dominance-over-the-web/), Google (which also owns YouTube) accounts for more than 90% of the market share for internet searches. When you type in a search, Google collects, curates, and sells information about your search and browsing history to advertisers. So, here’s the complicated plan: Stop using Google, its Chrome browser, YouTube, and Gmail. The level of surveillance and data collection you allow them about your personal habits and interests is staggering. Every account or website login. Every message you send or receive. You will never be able to imagine how deeply embedded Google is in your life until you try to disentangle yourself from it all. [But there are plenty of other options](https://restoreprivacy.com/google-alternatives/).

**Browsers**: The [Brave web browser](https://brave.com/) is three times faster than Chrome and more secure. It doesn’t collect your private data or sell it to third parties. And it uses 35% less battery on mobile.

**Search Engine**: [Qwant](https://about.qwant.com/) and [Duck-Duck-Go](https://duckduckgo.com/) are powerful search engines that don’t save your IP address, don’t save your search results, and don’t sell your private data. They just search.

**Email**: Do your own research but I have found [Proton Mail](https://protonmail.com/) and [Tutanota](https://tutanota.com/) to get consistently good reviews. Each offers a free version. Getting more features may cost you $3-$5/month. But remember the big difference. This makes *them* the product, not *you*.

If enough of us changed *just these three things* it would have a significant financial impact on Big Tech’s most notorious culprit, Google.

#### Deleting social media solves the aff

Bob Perry, 20. Writer, speaker, and teacher for True Horizon. Former Commercial Airline Captain. “Four Ways We Can Revolt Against Big Tech.” True Horizon blog. https://truehorizon.org/four-ways-we-can-revolt-against-big-tech/

**SOCIAL MEDIA**

I’m not going to enter the “you-should-disconnect-from-social-media” debate. There are plenty of fantastic practical, ethical, and psychological reasons to do that. Even those who were instrumental in *creating* social media giants agree to that. [They won’t let their own children have accounts on the platforms they created](https://www.netflix.com/title/81254224)!

But I’m not here to virtue signal. And I’m not here to convince you that that’s what you *should* do. My goal is to do my little part to defund Big Tech. So, if you don’t think deleting your social media accounts is realistic, at least move them away from the monopolistic thought police.

The fact is there are alternatives to Facebook ([MeWe](https://mewe.com/)), Twitter ([Parler](https://parler.com/)), YouTube ([Rumble](https://rumble.com/)), and Instagram ([VSCO](https://vsco.co/)) that will allow you to continue to participate in online “communities,” share things with one another, and interact much the same as you do now. The key is that using these alternatives takes the product (you) away from the Big Tech overlords. And the revenue you generate goes with it. These alternate platforms don’t collect or sell your data. They just provide a place to interact.

Most of them are still in their infancy. They don’t have as many features as the Big Guys. And right now, they are mostly populated by ideologues from the opposite point of view of their predecessors. But, as more and more of us abandon Big Tech, those alternatives will become more robust, diverse, and enjoyable. My point about the revolt against Big Tech is simply that we begin to strip it of its power. And this is a way to start doing that.

#### #1 thing you gotta do to defund big tech is delete your social media

Defundbigtech.info, 21. “Operation Faceitter,” January 10, 2021. https://defundbigtech.info/leaving-social-media/

By far, the #1 thing you can do to defund Big Tech is to simply leave them. The reason for this is that the likes of Google, Twitter, and Facebook give you their services, but only so that they can get your data. Then they sell your data. That’s the value exchange. But once you have reached that point where you see that they are getting all the data and then using it against you, then, well, it’s increasingly time to part ways. Because for those on the path to removing the socialist media apps from their lives, it’s no longer a matter of “if”, but rather “when” you will build up the courage to leave. So, the way we do that is to simply DELETE the account. Leaving it there still gives them access to your identity, as, chances are, you are connected to a slew of people. Once you sever all those ties, they are gone…and the “platform” no longer has an entity to target ads against. To put it another way, they can’t make money off of you. You are no longer their “product”. Leaving Facebook Now, we know that not everyone can just up and leave Facebook. No matter how much you might want to, there are just circumstances that make it rather unlikely, if not impossible, at this time. Thankfully, for every limiting factor, there are clever workarounds. For example: Family Ties: Severing ties can be painful. And there are some that just won’t appreciate your reasons. They will take it personally and it could permanently scar the relationship. Solution: In husband/wife situations, just pick one account to keep and merge the other one into that. So rather than John and Sue each having their own account, one account just becomes John & Sue. This will have another side benefit, which is forcing both to sit down and walk through each name to see which ones and be unfriended, blocked, or just hidden. We use this in our house and it’s glorious. Between the two of us, with both families and our real (emphasis on REAL) friends accounted for, we have 75 between us, of which only a handful are not hidden. Solution 2: If your family is close, circle small enough, and contempt for anti-American socialism and capitalism forever strong, make the removal of Facebook a family affair and migrate to better pastures, such as MeWe. Log in with Facebook: Some of your other services might use Facebook as the account logon. Solution: If it’s something as lame as a logon to the McDonald’s app, so what? Just log out of that app and come back in as a new account. Better anyway if you can use something like Sign in with Apple as it will hide your real email address for you. Marketplace: Facebook Marketplace is certainly quite popular, so for those addicted to shopping for previously owned clutter leaving FB cab be difficult as well. Solution: The single husband/wife account plan works wonders. As well, you can just ditch your existing FB account but then only create a new one that has no personalization for anyone to find you. Lock down all the privacy settings and they never will. So while you will technically have an account, the ad and market value to Facebook is pretty close to $0.00. Leaving Twitter Just delete your account. Seriously, just do it. You will immediately feel better and, from all we have spoken with, won’t really miss it. There are multiple other options out there and surely there will be more. Or maybe just don’t spend so much time where 95% of the time people are just trying to score political points.

#### CP solves privacy

Callum Tennent, 21. Site Editor @Top10VPN | Privacy, security, and anonymity. Former consumer technology journalist @WhichTech | VPN Expert & Member @PrivacyPros. “2021: The year privacy went mainstream.” July 29, 2021. https://blog.mozilla.org/en/internet-culture/deep-dives/2021-the-year-privacy-went-mainstream/

Looking back to 2018 when the Cambridge Analytica / Facebook scandal broke, digital privacy was on life support, hanging on by a thread. That shocking moment proved to be the tipping point when many people looked up to see a less private and less secure reality, one which they didn’t want. Since then, many tech companies have found themselves firmly in the sights of a Congress looking to take them down a peg or two. States, led by California, began enacting consumer privacy legislation. Meanwhile in Europe, the introduction of GDPR has been an opening salvo for what strong international consumer privacy protections can look like. Countries like India and Kenya have also begun to consider a data protection law, impacting the privacy of over a billion users on the internet. But what can we do to demand more for our digital privacy? A good place to start is by using alternatives to big tech platforms like Google, Facebook and Amazon. Switching from Google Chrome to a privacy-focused browser like Mozilla Firefox is a good first step, and maybe it’s time you considered deleting Facebook for good. Until these platforms clean up their act, we can take action by avoiding them all together. We can also ask our local senators and representatives to vote for legislation that will safeguard us online, such as the Fourth Amendment is Not for Sale Act. The Electronic Frontier Foundation runs numerous campaigns online to help us do this and you can get involved via their Action Center.

## K

### L - Performance

#### Their faith in performance and conceptual rupturing as an act of emancipation trades off with structural analysis and puts false place in subjectivity

Wilderson 2010

Unfortunately, cultural studies that theorizes the interface between Blacks and Humans is hobbled in its attempts to (a) expose power relationships and (b) examine how relations of power influence and shape cultural practice. Cultural studies insists on a grammar of suffering which assumes that we are all positioned essentially by way of the symbolic order, what Lacan calls the wall of language—and as such our potential for stasis or change (our capacity for being oppressed or free) is overdeter-mined by our "universal" ability or inability to seize and wield discursive weapons. This idea corrupts the explanatory power of most socially engaged films and even the most radical line of political action because it produces a cinema and a politics that cannot account for the grammar of suffering of the Black—the Slave. To put it bluntly, the imaginative labor5 of cinema, political action, and cultural studies are all afflicted with the same theoretical aphasia. They are speechless in the face of gratuitous violence. This theoretical aphasia is symptomatic of a debilitated ensemble of questions regarding political ontology. At its heart are two registers of imaginative labor. The first register is that of description, the rhetorical labor aimed at explaining the way relations of power are named, categorized, and explored. The second register can be characterized as prescription, the rhetorical labor predicated on the notion that everyone can be emancipated through some form of discursive, or symbolic, intervention. But emancipation through some form of discursive or symbolic intervention is wanting in the face of a subject position that is not a subject position—what Marx calls "a speaking implement" or what Ronald Judy calls "an interdiction against subjectivity." In other words, the Black has sentient capacity but no relational capacity. As an accumulated and fungible object, rather than an exploited and alienated subject, the Black is openly vulnerable to the whims of the world, and so is his or her cultural "production." What does it mean—what are the stakes—when the world can whimsically transpose one's cultural gestures, the stuff of symbolic intervention, onto another worldly good, a commodity of style? Frantz Fanon echoes this question when he writes, "I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object in the midst of other objects." He clarifies this assertion and alerts us to the stakes which the optimistic assumptions of film studies and cultural studies, the counterhegemonic promise of alternative cinema, and the emancipatory project of coalition politics cannot account for, when he writes: "Ontology—once it is finally admitted as leaving existence by the wayside—does not permit us to understand the being of the black."6 This presents a challenge to film production and to film studies given their cultivation and elaboration by the imaginative labor of cultural studies, underwritten by the assumptive logic of Humanism; because if everyone does not possess the DNA of culture, that is, (a) time and space transformative capacity, (b) a relational status with other Humans through which one's time- and space-transformative capacity is recognized and incorporated, and (c) a relation to violence that is contingent and not gratuitous, then how do we theorize a sentient being who is positioned not by the DNA of culture but by the structure of gratuitous violence? How do we think outside of the conceptual framework of subalternity—that is, outside of the explanatory power of cultural studies—and think beyond the pale of emancipatory agency by way of symbolic intervention? I am calling for a different conceptual framework, predicated not on the subject-effect of cultural performance but on the structure of political ontology, a framework that allows us to substitute a culture of politics for a politics of culture. The value in this rests not simply in the way it would help us rethink cinema and performance, but in the way it can help us theorize what is at present only intuitive and anecdotal: the unbridgeable gap between Black being and Human life. To put a finer point on it, such a framework might enhance the explanatory power of theory, art, and politics by destroying and perhaps restructuring the ethical range of our current ensemble of questions. This has profound implications for non-Black film studies, Black film studies, and African American studies writ large because they are currently entangled in a multicultural paradigm that takes an interest in an insufficiently critical comparative analysis— that is, a comparative analysis in pursuit of a coalition politics (if not in practice then at least as a theorizing metaphor) which, by its very nature, crowds out and forecloses the Slave's grammar of suffering.

#### The impact is structural, objective vertigo, which paradigmatically outweighs the affs subjective vertigo impacts

**Wilderson 11** (Frank, PhD, Associate Professor, African American Studies Dept., UC Irvine, “The Vengeance of Vertigo: Aphasia and Abjection in the Political Trials of Black Insurgents”, InTensions, Vol 5, 2011) http://www.yorku.ca/intent/issue5/articles/pdfs/frankbwildersoniiiarticle.pdf

[3] Subjective vertigo is vertigo of the event. But the sensation that one is not simply spinning in an otherwise stable environment, that one’s environment is perpetually unhinged stems from a relationship to violence that cannot be analogized. This is called objective vertigo, a life constituted by disorientation rather than a life interrupted by disorientation. **This is structural** as opposed to performative violence. Black subjectivity is a crossroads **where vertigoes meet**, the intersection of performative and structural violence.

[4] Elsewhere I have argued that the Black is a sentient being though not a Human being. The Black’s and the Human’s disparate relationship to violence is at the heart of this failure of incorporation and analogy. The Human suffers contingent violence, violence that kicks in when s/he resists (or is perceived to resist) the disciplinary discourse of capital and/or Oedipus. But Black peoples’ subsumption by violence is a **paradigmatic necessity, not just a performative contingency**. To be constituted by and disciplined by violence, to be gripped simultaneously by **subjective and objective vertigo**, is indicative of a political ontology which is radically different from the political ontology of a sentient being who is constituted by discourse and disciplined by violence when s/he breaks with the ruling discursive codes. vi When we begin to assess revolutionary armed struggle in this comparative context, we find that Human revolutionaries (workers, women, gays and lesbians, post-colonial subjects) **suffer subjective vertigo** when they meet the state’s disciplinary violence with the revolutionary violence of the subaltern; **but they are spared objective vertigo**. This is because the most disorienting aspects of their lives are induced by the struggles that arise from intra-Human conflicts over competing conceptual frameworks and disputed cognitive maps, such as the American Indian Movement’s demand for the return of Turtle Island vs. the U.S.’s desire to maintain territorial integrity, or the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional’s (FALN) demand for Puerto Rican independence vs. the U.S.’s desire to maintain Puerto Rico as a territory. **But for the Black, as for the slave, there are** no cognitive maps, **no conceptual frameworks of suffering and dispossession which are analogic with the myriad maps and frameworks which explain the dispossession of Human subalterns**.

#### Vote negative to reject thinking through the possibility of an antiblack future

## Case

### ---Big Tech Inevitable

#### The plan isn’t a long-term fix - there is no alternative to Big Tech companies

Sunil Jain, 20. Jain was Managing Editor at Financial Express. He was an acclaimed journalist. He died in 2021. “Why breaking up the Big Tech a bad idea.” October 12, 2020. https://www.financialexpress.com/opinion/why-breaking-up-the-big-tech-a-bad-idea/2103217/

While stories of Google favouring its advertisers are legion, it is not clear whether the solutions the House report proposes will necessarily work. Nor do all the findings appear consistent. Amazon is supposed to have “monopoly power over many small- and medium-sized businesses”, but, the report adds, “that do not have a viable alternative to Amazon for reaching online consumers … Amazon has 2.3 million active third-party sellers on its marketplace …” Surely Amazon giving small sellers access to markets is a good thing? The report comes down on Apple for its high fees of 30% of what apps make—PayTM chief Vijay Shekhar Sharma makes a similar point about Google’s Play Store—but as Apple argues, 84% of apps distributed on its App Store pay nothing, and the 30% commission is lower than what was charged by brick-and-mortar retailers that dominated the market in the pre-App Store days. As this newspaper has argued in the context of Google, apart from the commission applying to just a small fraction of apps, this is really a payment for a big distribution—and billing/collection—network that the app stores provide. Certainly, checks are required to ensure dominant positions are not abused, and there are several instances of this; shockingly, the report says, “of Facebook’s nearly 100 acquisitions, the Federal Trade Commission engaged in an extensive investigation of just one acquisition: Facebook’s purchase of Instagram in 2012.” If competition authorities are asleep, anyone will abuse dominance. Search-neutrality has to be ensured in the case of a Google, and if an Amazon uses consumer data that others don’t have to fine-tune its production strategy, this is worrying. But breaking up tech firms is not going to fix this. Zachary Karabell (bit.ly/2GN2zom) argued in Wired that previous attempts at breaking up monopolies—in telecom, oil—ended up with market power remaining as concentrated after a few decades; indeed, the House panel report itself says “certain features of digital markets—such as network effects, switching costs, the self-reinforcing advantages of data, and increasing returns to scale—make them prone to winner-take-all economics.” In which case, is the solution to keep breaking up tech giants every few years? Indeed, the talk of how these big tech firms have wielded their dominance to “erode entrepreneurship, degrade Americans’ privacy online, and undermine the vibrancy of the free and diverse press” suggests several issues are getting conflated with the problems associated with social media and fake news and election-manipulation on platforms like Facebook. But, as Infosys co-founder Nandan Nilekani argues, this may have to do with the fact that, unlike media firms, social media is not held responsible for what is posted on it; start treating/suing Facebook like a traditional media firm and some of this may start changing. The last line of the Rajan paper is worth keeping mind: “it is dangerous to apply twentieth century economic intuitions to twenty first century economic problems”. Antitrust is a 20th century institution. In fact, taking its cue from this, the House panel also speaks of interoperability and data portability as solutions to the issue of dominance.

#### Breaking up big tech fails, just makes the rich richer.

Zachary Karabell, 20. WIRED contributor and president of River Twice Research. “Don't Break Up Big Tech.” January 23, 2020. https://www.wired.com/story/dont-break-up-big-tech/

IN THE SHADOW of impeachment, the push to break up Big Tech continues to build. Last week, the House of Representatives held a hearing that saw the industry accused of bullying and oligopolistic practices. “They have come to use the scope of their platforms and their overwhelming dominance in certain markets to unfairly disadvantage competitors and squelch potential competition,” said the CEO of wireless speaker company Sonos, which is suing Google for patent infringement. The same sentiment has fueled a movement that now comprises investigations by multiple federal agencies and most state attorneys general. It has also been embraced by leading Democratic candidates for president. Last May, Joe Biden called antitrust enforcement against Big Tech “something we should take a really hard look at.” The progressive wing is more emphatic: In a December interview with The New York Times, Bernie Sanders said of the big technology companies, “I think we should be breaking them up.” Elizabeth Warren has been arguing since last spring that the concentration of power in Big Tech has “bulldozed competition, used our private information for profit, and tilted the playing field against everyone else.” The escalating animus toward Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google—fueled by the conviction that these megacompanies imperil not just consumers and competition but privacy and democratic discourse—is one of the few areas of American life that can be considered truly bipartisan. It enjoys polling support not just among a majority of Democrats but in similar proportions of both Republicans and independents. That makes it all the more regrettable that, should these forces coalesce after the presidential election of November 2020, the use of antitrust laws to break up Big Tech would almost certainly fail to satisfy their goals. “Break them up” is an easy slogan, and an appealing one; but like so many easy things, it will solve little. In the absence of a far more sweeping program to amend our laws and rethink the nature of information technology, such efforts will be worse than useless. As I argued in WIRED last year, technology companies have been largely in denial of some very real concerns. The current landscape of technology has left consumers with little privacy even as their data is converted into vast corporate profit. The marketplace for online services is bereft of meaningful competition, and it is potentially corrosive of democracy. Faced with mounting criticism over these issues and the potential for bad regulations to address them, Big Tech might have taken matters into its own hands. The companies could have preemptively broken themselves up, and forestalled clumsy government interventions even as they made more aggressive efforts at reform. Instead they dithered while the regulatory wave grew larger. Now “break them up,” for all its faults, may soon become a tsunami. The problems fueling “break them up” are valid; breaking them up is not the solution. To begin with, antitrust enforcement has been romanticized well in excess of its accomplishments. The breakup in 1984 of the monopolistic AT&T into eight companies unleashed competition for a time, lowering prices and improving services. Eventually, however, as landlines gave way to wireless, the industry reconsolidated and regulators relaxed. Today telecom is dominated by a reconstituted AT&T along with Verizon, with Sprint as a distant third (yet still immense) player. The court-mandated breakup of Standard Oil in 1911 was the culmination of the most significant antitrust action ever, but the company’s dozens of offshoots eventually recombined into massive oil companies that maintain tremendous power. (ExxonMobil and Chevron are the two most notable.) That breakup also made the wealthy Rockefeller family even wealthier, as their shares in one company became shares in many—almost all of which doubled quickly and then continued their upward trajectory from there.

### Need USFG

#### To solve, they need to use the USFG –

Barendregt, et. al, 21. Wolmet, Christoph Becker, EunJeong Cheon, Andrew Clement, Pedro Reynolds-Cuéllar, Douglas Schuler, and Lucy Suchman. "Defund Big Tech, Refund Community." *Tech Otherwise* (2021).

II Defunding Big Tech

In the spirit of the anti-racist defund campaign, we propose to extend the project of resource redistribution to the domain of public infrastructures, and more specifically to the processes through which vital information and communication technologies are developed. In keeping with Ron Deibert’s (2020) and Cory Doctorow’s (2020) recent calls to restrain the forces of surveillance capitalism, we focus first on curtailing the power of Big Tech, while recovering resources currently contributing to its hold on our information and communications infrastructure (defund), which can then be redirected to community-oriented services (refund). These changes will require initiatives on the part of multiple actors, starting with Big Tech itself.

Big Tech (and other tech businesses):

The major tech companies need to take seriously the legitimate concerns about their excessive power and harmful impacts increasingly being voiced by actors across the social, political and economic spectrum. In particular, Big Tech companies need to:

– Pay their fair share of taxes. Lost revenues through tax avoidance by Silicon Valley’s largest companies (Facebook, Apple, Amazon, Netflix, Google and Microsoft) exceed $100bn globally over the past ten years.

– Stop secretive lobbying and other behind-the-scenes efforts to prevent regulation. While some degree of lobbying is legitimate, it must be conducted in full public view.

– Provide public transparency regarding privacy policy, surveillance practices, data trafficking, political campaigning on social media, and environmental impacts (energy consumption and sources).

– Offer API (Application Programming Interface) access to core functions compliant with open standards to enable interoperability with alternate service providers.

– Support the right to repair. If we cannot sustain the functioning of our devices, we cannot ensure they are used to the full.

History has proven that Big Tech will not take these measures simply on their own initiative. Collective action on the part of civil society and government will be required to exert the pressure and regulatory force that can reshape Big Tech priorities and modes of operation.

Governments and Policymakers:

Government has the primary responsibility to promote the public interest, as well as being the only institution with enough legitimacy, authority and resources to hold Big Tech to account, especially to the degree that it works in concert with civil society. Elected public bodies must act decisively and collaboratively across jurisdictions to regulate Big Tech, require those corporations to pay fair taxes, and through their procurement and contracting powers foster a tech sector that sustainably meets people's information and communication needs. In particular, governments and policymakers need to:

– Revive antitrust laws to break up monopolies and uncouple anti-competitive mergers, to enable more competitive markets and rein in excessive political influence.

– Designate large tech platforms as ‘Platform Utilities,’ prohibiting Big Tech from owning and monetizing both the platform and its users.

– Require platform interoperability, including to facilitate ‘identity portability’ to enable alternative business models, including non-profit ones, to emerge without holding users captive.

– Extend producer responsibility to mitigate environmental harms and to support repair versus planned obsolescence.

– Establish and enforce a reasonable tax regime based on out-sized corporate profits or financial transactions or both, as well as other approaches that refund community.

– Roll back mass state surveillance, particularly where it depends on secret and unaccountable government access to personal data held by platform providers.

– Establish strong international privacy and other digital rights regimes, robust enough to effectively protect individuals as well as to help abolish the surveillance capitalism business model.

– Reduce dependence of public institutions on Big Tech. Across several sectors, notably defense, government services and education, governments have come to rely heavily on Big Tech services, making it harder to rein in their excesses. Instead, public institutions could leverage their collective power in order to develop their own services, or support the development of alternative community-governed services that are not controlled by Big Tech.

– Consult and collaborate with professional organizations, like the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), workers and organized labor, advocacy and human rights groups, environmental groups and others to ensure that all voices are heard and that important local knowledge is considered when developing tech policy.

– Consult and collaborate with other governmental bodies, including towns, cities, and regional as well as national, international, and supranational bodies to help ensure that fair, prudent, and non oppressive digital policies are not just enjoyed by a privileged few.

### ---1NC – Warming

#### Big tech key to solve climate change

Amy Harder, 20. Amy Harder was an energy and climate change reporter at Axios. She was the author of the weekly Harder Line column and covered the industry’s biggest news stories. “Big Tech takes the climate change lead.” Axios, September 19, 2020. https://www.axios.com/big-tech-climate-change-a341b6b0-b3e7-4e91-8598-b790da1b72e6.html

The tech industry is playing a **growing role in fighting climate change**, from zero-carbon commitments to investments in startups and pushing for the use of data to encourage energy efficiency. Why it matters: Big Tech is already dominating our economy, politics and culture. Its leadership in helping to address climate change — and reckon with its role in contributing to it — could have similarly transformative impacts. Driving the news: Amazon and Shopify revealed the first recipients of their investment funds this week, comprising $2 billion and $5 million, respectively. Microsoft has a similar fund of $1 billion. CarbonCure Technologies, which makes climate-friendly concrete, announced investments this week from Amazon and Microsoft (among others). Shopify is backing the firm by buying offsets, credits of CO2 stored in the concrete made by its technology. Other startups receiving tech money this week include Pachama, which uses artificial intelligence to preserve forests, and TurnTide Technologies, which makes more efficient motors for a range of purposes, including HVAC and refrigerators. Amazon isn't disclosing the exact amounts of the investments, but they range "from hundreds of thousands in seed and early-stage investments to multi-million dollar investments," spokesperson Luis Davila said. "Each one has something very different to offer," Kara Hurst, Amazon's global lead on sustainability, said at a virtual Axios event Thursday. "But, there is a unifying theme that they are driving decarbonization and they have the potential to lower our carbon footprint." The big picture: Tech firms have been leading investors into energy startups since 2016, according to the International Energy Agency. But, but, but: Tech giants are under pressure from their employees and the public about their own carbon footprints, and especially their deals with oil and gas companies helping them extract more fossil fuels. In what is likely at least a partial acknowledgement of that pressure, Microsoft announced this week it was partnering with BP to help the oil giant cut its emissions. BP would also supply renewable energy for the tech giant as it evolves away from oil. “What you’ll see is a lot of the partnerships that we announce moving forward will have significant components to a net zero transformation as part of them," Lucas Joppa, Microsoft's chief sustainability officer, said in a recent interview with Axios. Google announced this week that it's aiming to run all of its data centers and corporate campuses around the world on 100% carbon-free power by 2030. It said earlier this year it was not inking new deals with oil and gas firms (though it didn't have much business to begin with). Between the lines: The amount of money the firms are investing is tiny compared to their bottom lines. PR concerns about corporate social responsibility is likely a driving factor too. But “I don’t care about their motivations if it does some good,” says Nick Johnstone, chief statistician at the IEA.

**Unchecked climate change causes extinction.**

Bill **McKibben 19**. Schumann Distinguished Scholar at Middlebury College; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; holds honorary degrees from 18 colleges and universities; Foreign Policy named him to their inaugural list of the world’s 100 most important global thinkers. "This Is How **Human Extinction** Could Play Out." Rolling Stone. 4-9-2019. https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/bill-mckibben-falter-climate-change-817310/

Oh, it could get **very bad**.

In 2015, a study in the Journal of Mathematical Biology pointed out that if the world’s **oceans** kept warming, by 2100 they might become hot enough to “**stop oxygen production** by **phyto-plankton** by disrupting the process of photosynthesis.” Given that **two-thirds** of the **Earth’s oxygen** comes from phytoplankton, that would “likely result in the **mass mortality of animals and humans**.”

A year later, above the Arctic Circle, in Siberia, a heat wave thawed a reindeer carcass that had been trapped in the permafrost. The exposed body released anthrax into nearby water and soil, infecting two thousand reindeer grazing nearby, and they in turn infected some humans; a twelve-year-old boy died. As it turns out, **permafrost** is a “very good preserver of **microbes** and **viruses**, because it is cold, there is no oxygen, and it is dark” — scientists have managed to revive an eight-million-year-old bacterium they found beneath the surface of a glacier. Researchers believe there are fragments of the **Spanish flu virus**, **smallpox**, and **bubonic plague** buried in Siberia and Alaska.

Or consider this: as ice sheets melt, they take weight off land, and that can **trigger earthquakes** — seismic activity is already increasing in Greenland and Alaska. Meanwhile, the added weight of the new seawater starts to bend the Earth’s crust. “That will give you a **massive increase in volcanic activity**. It’ll activate faults to create earthquakes, submarine landslides, tsunamis, the whole lot,” explained the director of University College London’s Hazard Centre. Such a landslide happened in Scandinavia about eight thousand years ago, as the last Ice Age retreated and a Kentucky-size section of Norway’s continental shelf gave way, “plummeting down to the abyssal plain and creating a series of **titanic waves** that roared forth with a vengeance,” **wiping all signs of life** from coastal Norway to Greenland and “drowning the Wales-sized landmass that once connected Britain to the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany.” When the waves hit the Shetlands, they were sixty-five feet high.

There’s even this: if we keep raising carbon dioxide levels, we may not be able to think straight anymore. At a thousand parts per million (which is within the realm of possibility for 2100), human cognitive ability falls 21 percent. “The largest effects were seen for Crisis Response, Information Usage, and Strategy,” a Harvard study reported, which is too bad, as those skills are what we seem to need most.

I could, in other words, do my best to scare you silly. I’m not opposed on principle — changing something as fundamental as the composition of the atmosphere, and hence the heat balance of the planet, is certain to trigger all manner of horror, and we shouldn’t shy away from it. The dramatic uncertainty that lies ahead may be the most frightening development of all; the physical world is going from backdrop to foreground. (It’s like the contrast between politics in the old days, when you could forget about Washington for weeks at a time, and politics in the Trump era, when the president is always jumping out from behind a tree to yell at you.)

But let’s try to occupy ourselves with the most likely scenarios, because they are more than disturbing enough. Long before we get to tidal waves or smallpox, long before we choke to death or stop thinking clearly, we will need to concentrate on the most mundane and basic facts: everyone needs to eat every day, and an awful lot of us live near the ocean.

FOOD SUPPLY first. We’ve had an amazing run since the end of World War II, with crop yields growing fast enough to keep ahead of a fast-rising population. It’s come at great human cost — displaced peasant farmers fill many of the planet’s vast slums — but in terms of sheer volume, the Green Revolution’s fertilizers, pesticides, and machinery managed to push output sharply upward. That climb, however, now seems to be running into the brute facts of heat and drought. There are studies to demonstrate the dire effects of warming on coffee, cacao, chickpeas, and champagne, but it is cereals that we really need to worry about, given that they supply most of the planet’s calories: corn, wheat, and rice all evolved as crops in the climate of the last ten thousand years, and though plant breeders can change them, there are limits to those changes. You can move a person from Hanoi to Edmonton, and she might decide to open a Vietnamese restaurant. But if you move a rice plant, it will die.

A 2017 study in Australia, home to some of the world’s highest-tech farming, found that “**wheat productivity** has **flatlined** as a **direct result of climate change**.” After tripling between 1900 and 1990, wheat yields had stagnated since, as temperatures increased a degree and rainfall declined by nearly a third. “The chance of that just being variable climate without the underlying factor [of climate change] is less than one in a hundred billion,” the researchers said, and it meant that despite all the expensive new technology farmers kept introducing, “they have succeeded only in standing still, not in moving forward.” Assuming the same trends continued, yields would actually start to decline inside of two decades, they reported. In June 2018, researchers found that a two-degree Celsius rise in temperature — which, recall, is what the Paris accords are now aiming for — could cut U.S. corn yields by 18 percent. A four-degree increase — which is where our current trajectory will take us — would cut the crop almost in half. The United States is the world’s largest producer of corn, which in turn is the planet’s most widely grown crop.

**Corn is vulnerable** because even a week of high temperatures at the key moment can **keep it from fertilizing**. (“You only get one chance to pollinate a quadrillion kernels of corn,” the head of a commodity consulting firm explained.) But even the hardiest crops are susceptible. Sorghum, for instance, which is a staple for half a billion humans, is particularly hardy in dry conditions because it has big, fibrous roots that reach far down into the earth. Even it has limits, though, and they are being reached. Thirty years of data from the American Midwest show that heat waves affect the “vapor pressure deficit,” the difference between the water vapor in the sorghum leaf’s interior and that in the surrounding air. Hotter weather means the sorghum releases more moisture into the atmosphere. Warm the planet’s temperature by two degrees Celsius — which is, again, now the world’s goal — and sorghum yields drop 17 percent. Warm it five degrees Celsius (nine degrees Fahrenheit), and yields drop almost 60 percent.

It’s hard to imagine a topic duller than sorghum yields. It’s the precise opposite of clickbait. But **people have to eat**; in the human game, the single most important question is probably “What’s for dinner?” And when the answer is “Not much,” things **deteriorate fast**. In 2010 a severe heat wave hit Russia, and it wrecked the grain harvest, which led the Kremlin to ban exports. The global **price of wheat spiked**, and that helped **trigger the Arab Spring** — Egypt at the time was the largest wheat importer on the planet. That experience set academics and insurers to work gaming out what the next **food shock** might look like. In 2017 one team imagined a vigorous El Niño, with the attendant floods and droughts — for a season, in their scenario, corn and soy yields declined by 10 percent, and wheat and rice by 7 percent. The result was chaos: “quadrupled commodity prices, civil unrest, significant negative humanitarian consequences . . . **Food riots** break out in urban areas across the Middle East, North Africa, and Latin America. The euro weakens and the main European stock markets lose ten percent.”

At about the same time, a team of British researchers released a study demonstrating that even if you can grow plenty of food, the transportation system that distributes it runs through just fourteen major choke-points, and those are vulnerable to — you guessed it — massive disruption from climate change. For instance, U.S. rivers and canals carry a third of the world’s corn and soy, and they’ve been frequently shut down or crimped by flooding and drought in recent years. Brazil accounts for 17 percent of the world’s grain exports, but heavy rainfall in 2017 stranded three thousand trucks. “It’s the glide path to a perfect storm,” said one of the report’s authors.

Five weeks after that, another report raised an even deeper question. What if you can figure out how to grow plenty of food, and you can figure out how to guarantee its distribution, but the food itself has lost much of its value? The paper, in the journal Environmental Research, said that rising carbon dioxide levels, by speeding plant growth, seem to have reduced the amount of protein in basic staple crops, a finding so startling that, for many years, agronomists had overlooked hints that it was happening. But it seems to be true: when researchers grow grain at the carbon dioxide levels we expect for later this century, they find that minerals such as calcium and iron drop by 8 percent, and protein by about the same amount. In the developing world, where people rely on plants for their protein, that means huge reductions in nutrition: India alone could lose 5 percent of the protein in its total diet, putting 53 million people at new risk for protein deficiency. The loss of zinc, essential for maternal and infant health, could endanger 138 million people around the world. In 2018, rice researchers found “significantly less protein” when they grew eighteen varieties of rice in high–carbon dioxide test plots. “The idea that food became less nutritious was a surprise,” said one researcher. “It’s not intuitive. But I think we should continue to expect surprises. We are completely altering the biophysical conditions that underpin our food system.” And not just ours. People don’t depend on goldenrod, for instance, but bees do. When scientists looked at samples of goldenrod in the Smithsonian that dated back to 1842, they found that the protein content of its pollen had “declined by a third since the industrial revolution — and the change closely tracks with the rise in carbon dioxide.”

Bees help crops, obviously, so that’s scary news. But in August 2018, a massive new study found something just as frightening: crop pests were thriving in the new heat. “It gets better and better for them,” said one University of Colorado researcher. Even if we hit the UN target of limiting temperature rise to two degrees Celsius, pests should cut wheat yields by 46 percent, corn by 31 percent, and rice by 19 percent. “Warmer temperatures accelerate the metabolism of insect pests like aphids and corn borers at a predictable rate,” the researchers found. “That makes them hungrier[,] and warmer temperatures also speed up their reproduction.” Even fossilized plants from fifty million years ago make the point: “**Plant damage** from insects **correlated** with rising and falling **temperatures**, reaching a maximum during the warmest periods.”
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#### Big tech key to DOD cloud computing

Ron Miller, 18. “Why the Pentagon’s $10 billion JEDI deal has cloud companies going nuts.” September 15, 2018. https://techcrunch.com/2018/09/15/why-the-pentagons-10-billion-jedi-deal-has-cloud-companies-going-nuts/?guccounter=1

By now you’ve probably heard of the Defense Department’s massive winner-take-all $10 billion cloud contract dubbed the Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure (or JEDI for short). Star Wars references aside, this contract is huge, even by government standards.The Pentagon would like a single cloud vendor to build out its enterprise cloud, believing rightly or wrongly that this is the best approach to maintain focus and control of their cloud strategy. Department of Defense (DOD) spokesperson Heather Babb tells TechCrunch the department sees a lot of upside by going this route. “Single award is advantageous because, among other things, it improves security, improves data accessibility and simplifies the Department’s ability to adopt and use cloud services,” she said. Whatever company they choose to fill this contract, this is about modernizing their computing infrastructure and their combat forces for a world of IoT, artificial intelligence and big data analysis, while consolidating some of their older infrastructure. “The DOD Cloud Initiative is part of a much larger effort to modernize the Department’s information technology enterprise. The foundation of this effort is rationalizing the number of networks, data centers and clouds that currently exist in the Department,” Babb said. Setting the stage It’s possible that whoever wins this DOD contract could have a leg up on other similar projects in the government. After all it’s not easy to pass muster around security and reliability with the military and if one company can prove that they are capable in this regard, they could be set up well beyond this one deal. As Babb explains it though, it’s really about figuring out the cloud long-term. “JEDI Cloud is a pathfinder effort to help DOD learn how to put in place an enterprise cloud solution and a critical first step that enables data-driven decision making and allows DOD to take full advantage of applications and data resources,” she said. The single vendor component, however, could explain why the various cloud vendors who are bidding, have lost their minds a bit over it — everyone except Amazon, that is, which has been mostly silent, happy apparently to let the process play out. The belief amongst the various other players, is that Amazon is in the driver’s seat for this bid, possibly because they delivered a $600 million cloud contract for the government in 2013, standing up a private cloud for the CIA. It was a big deal back in the day on a couple of levels. First of all, it was the first large-scale example of an intelligence agency using a public cloud provider. And of course the amount of money was pretty impressive for the time, not $10 billion impressive, but a nice contract.

#### Cloud computing key to effective air force and warfighting

Meredith Roaten, 21. Writer for National Defense Magazine. “Death of the JEDI: Pentagon Learning from Terminated Cloud Initiative.” August 27, 2021. https://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/articles/2021/8/27/pentagon-learning-from-terminated-cloud-initiative

Rossino said he views the JWCC as a pathfinder program because the Pentagon is trying to implement emerging standards and integrate new systems with which it has not previously dealt. “There are a lot of new things here, and so coming to terms with that over the next few years is really going to be the key,” he said. Hicks noted that security of the cloud environment is a serious concern that a multi-cloud approach could tackle. The commercial cloud computing industry has its reputation on the line for any cybersecurity threats that it could face, he explained. “If they are seen as being vulnerable people will start to flee from their platform to other platforms, so they’re constantly spending millions and billions of dollars across the industry on cybersecurity,” he said. **The Defense Department’s cloud** environment would be the **No. 1 target for any adversary**, so the commercial industry’s latest innovations are needed for protection, he said. “It will be imperative for our adversaries to bring that network down because it will give us a tactical advantage,” Hicks said. Pursuing the JWCC will boost competition and help companies showcase their strengths in service of the Pentagon, said Air Force Lt. Gen. S. Clinton Hinote, deputy chief of staff for strategy, integration and requirements. “The search for best of breed continues on,” Hinote said at the National Defense Industrial Association’s JADC2 & All Domain Warfare Symposium. Microsoft and Amazon Web Services are considered likely candidates to win JWCC contracts, but the Pentagon will be reaching out to other cloud service providers to assess their capabilities, Sherman told reporters. Hinote noted that the new approach will better serve the military’s needs for joint all-domain command and control. **Cloud computing** architectures will serve **as the “backbone” of the Air Force**’s contribution to JADC2 known as the Advanced Battle Management System. Efforts to connect sensors and shooters are needed as intelligence on adversary behavior has found that competitors are trying to disrupt U.S. systems of war, Hinote said. Empowering warfighters with centralized information will protect critical missions even if communications are disrupted. The military needs a “system of systems, such that they can’t tear it apart,” he said. **Easy access to the cloud is critical for the Pentagon to gain advantage of adversaries in future fights**, said NDIA CEO and President retired Air Force Gen. Hawk Carlisle. The cloud enables leaders to exchange data with warfighters up to the tactical edge and boost situational awareness without information overload. Point-to-point information transfer doesn’t work because decisions will need to be made quickly in the fights of the future, said Carlisle. “In tomorrow’s battlefield, you have to have that ability to get information at a pace that the cloud right now is really the only way to do it,” he said. He added that JEDI’s failure spurred JADC2 stakeholders to realize how fast the architecture needs to come together and how extensive the sprawling effort will be as it includes everything from the cloud network to the algorithms and procedures needed to operate the system. The government, military officials, industry and academia “all understand the importance of having to do this and get it right,” Carlisle said.

### ---1NC – Vaccine Passports

#### Vaccine passports key to prevent covid spread, but government passport systems are inadequate

Andrew Tarantola, 21. Journalist who has covered topics from military hardware and cutting-edge medical devices to HALs (Artificial Intelligences and Machine Learning systems), as well as the weekly Hitting the Books column. “These 'vaccine passports' are why we can have nice things.” August 13, 2021. https://www.engadget.com/these-vaccine-passports-are-why-we-can-have-nice-things-180018254.html

We’ve reached a disquieting point in the COVID-19 pandemic wherein a significant portion of the American public refuses to accept the free and wildly effective vaccines while simultaneously demanding a “return to normalcy” — and all the benefits that reopening the economy would entail. But with the Delta variant’s rapid spread threatening to send the country back into another round of social isolation, state and local governments (and numerous businesses) are seeking to strike a balance between the public’s health and the nation’s economic needs through the use of digital vaccine cards, aka “vaccine passports.” But, unlike the mRNA vaccine itself, these passports are not quite the magic bullets against COVID we had hoped. Vaccine passports, either physical or digital records certifying that a person has been fully vaccinated against a disease, have been around since the 19th century. As early as the 1880s, students and educators in the US were required to show proof of immunization against smallpox before attending classes. In 1897 Russian scientist Waldemar Haffkine developed a vaccine against the bubonic plague. His breakthrough treatment was immediately put to use by the British colonizers of India. To help ensure that densely populated Hindu and Muslim pilgrimage sites in the country did not mutate into outbreak clusters of the disease, the local government began requiring proof of vaccination by every pilgrim before entering these sites. With the rise of air travel in the second half of the 20th century, the United Nations adopted similar rules in 1951 and then again in 1969, dubbed the International Health Regulations. These regulations, along with widespread outbreaks of yellow fever, led to the advent of “yellow cards,” which international travellers have carried for decades to certify their immunization against a wide variety of infectious diseases. Yellow fever is currently the only disease currently on the IHR for which countries can demand vaccination proof as a condition of entering the country, though the UN’s regulations on any disease are advisory and non-binding in nature so the responsibility for adhering to and implementing those rules falls to individual nations. In response to the COVID pandemic, many nations already have embraced a new generation of vaccine passports. Israel has the Green Pass, Denmark has the Coronapas, the European Union (but not the UK) offers the EU Digital Covid Certificate, China rolled out its vaccine passport as a WeChat mini app in March, and Estonia uses VaccineGuard. Even private businesses are considering implementing their own systems. United, JetBlue and Lufthansa, for example, are rolling out CommonPass, a system designed to verify an international passenger’s COVID testing and vaccination status. “This is likely to be a new normal need that we’re going to have to deal with to control and contain this pandemic,” Dr. Brad Perkins, chief medical officer at the Commons Project Foundation, the nonprofit that developed CommonPass, told The New York Times in December. The Biden administration has made clear that it does not support the creation of a vaccine passport program at the Federal level. The President did, however, issue an executive order in January directing the State Department to work with the WHO and international aviation and travel agencies to develop standards for post-pandemic travel. “The federal government is working on this issue of vaccine credentialing or vaccine verification or what some people call vaccine passports. So we’re going to be following carefully what the federal government comes out with,” Tomás Aragón, director of the California Department of Public Health, told the SF Chronicle in April. “If they don’t move fast enough, we will come out with technical standards of what we expect and also really focusing on making sure that that privacy is protected and that equity is protected.” Instead, Americans are offers a hodgepodge of local and state regulations, at least those states that haven't banned certification systems — looking at you, Arkansas, Texas, Florida, and Indiana — despite clear legal precedent affirming the government’s authority to temporarily abridge certain individual rights during a public health crisis (see: Jacobson v. Massachusetts). Take California, for example. The Golden State recently rolled out the Digital COVID-19 Vaccine Record, a system that securely pulls the data stored in the California immunization registry. It’s the same state-collected vaccination data that is seen on the paper cards issued when you got your shots — specifically your name, date of birth, vaccination dates, and vaccine manufacturer. “It’s not a passport. It’s not a requirement. It’s just the ability now to have an electronic version of that paper version,” California Governor Gavin Newsom explained during a press conference announcing the system’s rollout in June. The system can also store a scannable QR code on your mobile device so that businesses and venues that do require certification of full vaccination prior to entry can do so easily. The QR code is built on the non-profit SMART Health Card technology, which means that only SMART-compatible scanners can actually read the codes. And in San Francisco, that’s literally all of them. This is a built-in security feature ensuring that some random clown at the bar can’t surreptitiously scan your code using the generic QR reader on their phone and get access to your information. However, the system’s rollout has not been without its hiccups. This reporter specifically has spent the past six weeks attempting to resolve an issue with incomplete vaccination data being reported to the registry. (Basically, it reads that my second dose is the only dose I received.) The CDPH declined to comment on how many Californians have registered for the service and how many of those registrants have run into similar problems, though the agency has set up a virtual agent to help guide users through the process of alerting the state to any mistakes or omissions. New York, on the other hand, has not one but two competing vaccine verification systems, neither of which has proven particularly reliable, trustworthy or useful. At the state level, you’ve got the Excelsior Pass, which operates in a similar fashion to California’s DCVR system — pulling immunization data directly from the state’s registry — and leverages IBM’s proprietary blockchain technology to maintain data security and user privacy. At the local level, New York City has rolled out a passport app of its own, dubbed the NYC COVID Safe App, which for all intents and purposes is a half-assed image storage app that is ridiculously easy to spoof.

#### Big Tech key to vaccine passport adoption

Samantha Murphy Kelly, 21. Senior writer at CNN Business. “Big Tech failed with contact tracing. Can it do better with vaccine passport apps? August 30, 2021. https://www.cnn.com/2021/08/30/tech/vaccine-passport-apps-apple-samsung/index.html

As some US cities start requiring proof of vaccination to enter restaurants, events and workplaces, smartphone makers such as Apple (AAPL), Samsung (SSNLF) and Google (GOOG) are rolling out ways to make it easy for users to show their Covid-19 vaccine status with just a tap. It could be Big Tech's shot at making a dent with pandemic solution tools following its failed attempt last year at contact tracing apps, which used Bluetooth technology to alert people if they've been in close proximity with someone who tested positive for the virus. Those products were plagued by issues around measuring proximity while keeping data anonymous, notifications that failed to trigger and slow adoption rates among states. On paper, this latest effort should be much simpler, but the companies face a crowded app market and the potential for privacy concerns among some Americans. &#39;Vaccine passports&#39; are taking off. How to prove your Covid-19 vaccination status on your phone 'Vaccine passports' are taking off. How to prove your Covid-19 vaccination status on your phone Samsung recently announced Galaxy device users can load their vaccination record from the CommonHealth app -- created by Commons Project Foundation, the same healthcare nonprofit working with some airlines for proof of vaccination -- and store it in the Samsung Pay digital wallet. Unlike some apps that don't check if uploaded vaccine cards are legit, users verify their identity and gain access to their status from the pharmacy or healthcare provider that provided their shot. The effort could eliminate the need for users to choose from a plethora of available vaccine verification apps -- some of which are more trustworthy than others. "If Big Tech has specific apps they will work with, then this would go a long way to cut down on the volume of app solutions that are currently flooding the market," said Sam Gazeley, digital research analyst at ABI Research. "It would help to a degree by removing the risk of fraudulent certification from forged documents entering circulation." Some vaccine verification apps, such as New York City's NYC Safe app, have faced criticism from some privacy experts for being a "dressed-up camera app," allowing users to upload photos of their vaccine card -- or of anything -- and leaving the onus on business owners to determine if it's real. (To date, countless counterfeit vaccine cards have been sold on the dark web and US border patrol has seized thousands of fakes.) In addition to verifying vaccine status, apps such as the CommonHealth app and the New York Excelsior Pass app developed by IBM provide a scannable QR code for entry at different businesses. They display no personal information beyond whether that person received a shot. Some experts say companies such as Samsung, Google and Apple may play a significant role in the private and public sectors coming together to create verifiable credentials. "Technology companies are helping lead the way in leapfrogging US efforts in verifiable digital Covid-19 credentials, but perhaps more importantly having portable digital consumer health data stored in digital wallets," said Donna Medeiros, senior research director at market research firm Gartner. "This means using mobile phones to share our data in a standardized manner when, where and with whom we want." In June, Google announced Android users will be able to store various test results and vaccine status from healthcare organizations, government agencies and organizations directly on devices. Meanwhile, Apple's iOS 15 software coming this fall can store verifiable vaccine records and test results in its Health app. Other vaccine verification apps available in the Apple App Store undergo a strict approval process and that it only approves those from known entities such as government organizations, health-focused NGOs, medical and educational institutions, and companies credentialed in health issues. Earlier this year, it published an update around health pass apps to outline privacy requirements. Developers can use Apple's PassKit framework to make those apps available on Apple Wallet. Vaccine status apps have seen early adoption in California, New York and Louisiana as more people download their data and store it on their device, due largely to local governments requiring proof of vaccination to enter certain areas. It's also an appealing effort for smartphone makers that don't have to manage the process themselves. Gazeley said serving as a storage solution is less risky than creating location-monitoring softtware rife with privacy concerns. Making a mark Last year, longtime rivals Google and Apple announced to great fanfare that they would work together to help governments track the spread of the Covid-19 using Bluetooth technology. It was also poised to be a potential tipping point in their longtime effort to gain a bigger foothold in the health care industry. (Samsung did not have a contact tracing initiative). Google and Apple's apps intended to anonymously monitor where people were traveling, who they'd been in close proximity with and alert them if they've possibly been exposed to the virus. Ultimately, they were buggy, presented privacy concerns and not widely adopted. Amy Loomis, research director at IDC who closely follows future of work trends, said Big Tech's efforts to support vaccine health pass apps are innately better set up for success. "Language matters," she said. "No one wants to be 'traced' or tracked but we show 'proof of' all the time -- proof of employment with a badge, proof of legal age with license. "Even if [Apple and Google's] involvement is limited to just providing the storage solution for the certificate itself, many will associate it with being issued by [the company] even if this is not the case," Gazeley said. "So in this manner, it achieves more for them than the contact tracing app attempts."
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#### US military AI key to check China – they want to use their AI tech on us

Eric Schmidt, 21. Former CEO and chair of Google/Alphabet, is Chair of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence. “The AI Revolution and Strategic Competition with China.” August 30, 2021. https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/ai-revolution-competition-with-china-democracy-vs-authoritarianism-by-eric-schmidt-2021-08

This AI opportunity coincides with a moment of strategic vulnerability. US President Joe Biden has [said](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/biden-says-he-expects-long-term-stiff-competition-with-china-11613755414) that America is in a “long-term strategic competition with China.” He is right. But it is not only the United States that is vulnerable; the entire democratic world is, too, because the AI revolution underpins the current contest of values between democracy and authoritarianism. We must prove that democracies can succeed in an era of technological revolution. China is now a peer technological competitor. It is organized, resourced, and determined to win this technology competition and to reshape the global order to serve its own narrow interests. AI and other emerging technologies are central to China’s efforts to expand its global influence, surpass the economic and military power of the US, and lock down domestic stability. China is executing a centrally-directed systematic plan to extract AI knowledge from abroad through espionage, talent recruitment, technology transfer, and investments.1 China’s domestic use of AI is deeply concerning to societies that value individual liberty and human rights. Its employment of AI as a tool of repression, surveillance, and social control at home is also being exported abroad. China funds massive digital infrastructure projects around the world, while seeking to set global standards that reflect authoritarian values. Its technology is being used to enable social control and suppress dissent. To be clear, strategic competition with China does not mean we should not work with China where it makes sense. The US and the democratic world must continue to engage with China in areas such as health care and climate change. To stop trading and working with China would not be a viable path forward. China’s rapid growth and focus on social control have made its techno-authoritarian model attractive for autocratic governments and tempting for fragile democracies and developing countries. Much work needs to be done to ensure that the US and the democratic world can package economically viable technology with diplomacy, foreign aid, and security cooperation to compete with China’s exported digital authoritarianism. The US and other democratic countries are playing catch-up in preparing for this global tech competition. On July 13, 2021, the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence (NSCAI) hosted a Global Emerging Technology Summit that showcased an important comparative advantage that the US and our partners around the world retain: the broad network of alliances among democratic countries, rooted in common values, respect for the rule of law, and the recognition of fundamental human rights. The global technology competition is ultimately a competition of values. Together with allies and partners, we can strengthen existing frameworks and explore new ones to shape the platforms, standards, and norms of tomorrow and ensure that they reflect our principles. Extending our global leadership in technological research, development, governance, and platforms will put the world’s democracies in the best position to harness new opportunities and defend against vulnerabilities. Only by continuing to lead in AI developments can we set standards for the responsible development and use of this critical technology. The NSCAI’s final report provides a roadmap for the democratic international community to win this competition. First, the democratic world must use existing international structures – including NATO, the OECD, the G7, and the European Union – to deepen efforts to address all the challenges associated with AI and emerging technologies. Here, the United Kingdom’s current presidency of the G7, with its robust tech agenda and efforts to further cooperation on a range of digital initiatives, is encouraging. The G7’s decision to involve Australia, India, South Korea, and South Africa reflects an important recognition that we must convene democratic countries from around the world in these efforts. Likewise, the newly launched US-EU Trade and Technology Council (which in many ways mirrors NSCAI’s call for a US-EU Strategic Dialogue for Emerging Technologies) is a promising mechanism to align the world’s largest trading partners and economies. Second, we need new structures, such as the Quad – the US, India, Japan, and Australia – to expand dialogue on AI and emerging technologies and their implications, and to enhance cooperation in standards development, telecommunications infrastructure, biotechnology, and supply chains. The Quad can serve as the foundation for broader cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region across government and industry. And, third, we need to build additional alliances around AI and future technology platforms with our allies and partners. The NSCAI has called for the creation of a coalition of developed democracies to synchronize policies and actions around AI and emerging technologies across seven critical areas: Developing and operationalizing standards and norms in support of democratic values and the development of secure, reliable, and trusted technologies; Promoting and facilitating coordinated and joint research and development on AI and digital infrastructure that advances shared interests and benefits humanity; Promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of law through joint efforts to counter censorship, malign information operations, human trafficking, and illiberal uses of surveillance technologies; Exploring ways to facilitate data-sharing among allies and partners through enabling agreements, common data archival procedures, cooperative investments in privacy-enhancing technologies, and by addressing legal and regulatory barriers; Promoting and protecting innovation, particularly through export controls, investment screening, supply-chain assurance, emerging-technology investment, trade policy, research and cyber protections, and intellectual-property alignment; Developing AI-related talent by analyzing labor-market challenges, harmonizing skills and certification requirements, and increasing talent exchanges, joint training, and workforce-development initiatives; and Launching an International Digital Democracy Initiative to align international assistance efforts to develop, promote, and fund the adoption of AI and associated technologies that comports with democratic values and ethical norms concerning openness, privacy, security, and reliability. This momentum can be maintained only by working together. Partnerships – between governments, with the private sector, and with academia – are a key asymmetric advantage that the US and the democratic world have over our competitors. As recent events in Afghanistan have shown, US capabilities remain indispensable in allied operations, but the US must do more to rally allies around a common cause. This era of strategic competition promises to transform our world, and we can either shape the change or be swept along by it. We now know that the uses of AI in all aspects of life will grow as the pace of innovation continues to accelerate. We also know that our adversaries are determined to turn AI capabilities against us. Now we must act.

On warming

#### Allowing warming to continue perpetuates racist inequalities
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Everywhere we turn, the issues and impacts of climate change confront us. One of the most serious environmental threats facing the world today, climate change has moved from the minds of scientists and offices of environmentalists to the mainstream. Though the media is dominated by images of polar bears, melting glaciers, flooded lands, and arid desserts, there is a human face to this story as well. Climate change is not only an issue of the environment; it is also an issue of justice and human rights, one that dangerously intersects **race and class**. All over the world people of color, Indigenous Peoples and low-income communities bear **disproportionate burdens** from climate change itself, from ill-designed policies to prevent it, and from side effects of the energy systems that cause it. A Climate of Change explores the impacts of climate change on African Americans, from health to economics to community, and considers what policies would most harm or benefit African Americans—and the nation as a whole. African Americans are thirteen percent of the U.S. population and on average emit nearly twenty percent less greenhouse gases than non-Hispanic whites per capita. Though far less responsible for climate change, African Americans are significantly more vulnerable to its effects than non- Hispanic whites. Health, housing, economic well-being, culture, and social stability are harmed from such manifestations of climate change as storms, floods, and climate variability. African Americans are also more vulnerable to higher energy bills, unemployment, recessions caused by global energy price shocks, and a greater economic burden from military operations designed to protect the flow of oil to the U.S. Climate Justice: The Time Is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances are forged and traditional movements are transformed. An effective policy to address the challenges of global warming cannot be crafted until race and equity are part of the discussion from the outset and an integral part of the solution. This report finds that: Global **warming amplifies nearly all existing inequalities**. Under global warming, injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the fight to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice. Climate policies that best serve African Americans also best serve a just and strong United States. This paper shows that policies well-designed to benefit African Americans also provide the most benefit to all people in the U.S. Climate policies that best serve African Americans and other disproportionately affected communities also best serve global economic and environmental justice. Domestic reductions in global warming pollution and support for such reductions in developing nations financed by polluter-pays principles provide the greatest benefit to African Americans, the peoples of Africa, and people across the Global South. A distinctive African American voice is critical for climate justice. Currently, legislation is being drafted, proposed, and considered without any significant input from the communities most affected. Special interests are represented by powerful lobbies, while traditional environmentalists often fail to engage people of color, Indigenous Peoples, and low-income communities until after the political playing field has been defined and limited to conventional environmental goals. A strong focus on equity is essential to the success of the environmental cause, but equity issues cannot be adequately addressed by isolating the voices of communities that are disproportionately impacted. Engagement in climate change policy must be moved from the White House and the halls of Congress to social circles, classrooms, kitchens, and congregations. The time is now for those disproportionately affected to assume leadership in the climate change debate, to speak truth to power, and to assert rights to social, environmental and economic justice. Taken together, these actions affirm a vital truth that will bring communities together: Climate Justice is Common Justice. African Americans and Vulnerability In this report, it is shown that African Americans are disproportionately affected by climate change. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Climate Change and Global Warming Co-Pollutants ¶ • The six states with the highest African American population are all in the Atlantic hurricane zone, and are expected to experience more intense storms resembling Katrina and Rita in the future. ¶ • Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of heat waves or extreme heat events. African Americans suffer heat death at one hundred fifty to two hundred percent of the rate for non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Seventy-one percent of African Americans live in counties in violation of federal air pollution standards, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the white population. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within thirty miles of a coal-fired power plant, as compared to fifty-six percent of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Asthma has strong associations with air pollution, and African Americans have a thirty-six percent higher rate of incidents of asthma than whites. Asthma is three times as likely to lead to emergency room visits or deaths for African Americans. ¶ • This study finds that a twenty-five percent reduction in greenhouse gases—similar to what passed in California and is proposed in major federal legislation—would reduce infant mortality by at least two percent, asthma by at least sixteen percent, and mortality from particulates by at least 6,000 to 12,000 deaths per year. Other estimates have run as high as 33,000 fewer deaths per year. **A disproportionate number of the lives saved by these proposed reductions would be African American**. African Americans Are Economically More Vulnerable to Disasters and Illnesses ¶ • In 2006, twenty percent of African Americans had no health insurance, including fourteen percent of African American children—nearly twice the rate of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • In the absence of insurance, disasters and illness (which will increase with global warming) could be cushioned by income and accumulated wealth. However, the average income of African American households is fifty-seven percent that of non-Hispanic whites, and median wealth is only one-tenth that of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Racist stereotypes have been shown to reduce aid donations and impede service delivery to African Americans in the wake of hurricanes, floods, fires and other climate-related disasters as compared to non-Hispanic whites in similar circumstances. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Energy Price Shocks ¶ • African Americans spend thirty percent more of their income on energy than non-Hispanic whites. • Energy price increases have contributed to seventy to eighty percent of recent recessions. The increase in unemployment of African Americans during energy caused recessions is twice that of non-Hispanic whites, costing the community an average of one percent of income every year. • Reducing economic dependence on energy will alleviate the frequency and severity of recessions and the economic disparities they generate. African Americans Pay a Heavy Price and a Disproportionate Share of the Cost of Wars for Oil • Oil company profits in excess of the normal rate of profit for U.S. industries cost the average household $611 in 2006 alone and are still rising. • The total cost of the war in Iraq borne by African Americans will be $29,000 per household if the resulting deficit is financed by tax increases, and $32,000 if the debt is repaid by spending cuts. This is more than three times the median assets of African American households. A Clean Energy Future Creates Far More Jobs for African Americans • Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to five times as many people as comparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. ¶ • Switching just one percent of total electricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renewable sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. ¶ • A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by 3 to 4 percent.