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#### Anti-trust is capitalist---competition inevitably replicates market collapse.

Richard Wolff 19 Professor Emeritus of Economics at University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Transcript from YouTube video: “Economic Update: Competition and Monopoly in Capitalism.” Democracy @ Work. December 9th, 2019. https://www.democracyatwork.info/eu\_competition\_monopoly\_in\_capitalism.

Today I'm going to devote the program to something many of you have asked me to present, to talk about, to analyze, and that is the question of monopoly. It has to do with the assertions we hear often these days that somehow our capitalist system, here in the United States and beyond, is being negatively affected because monopolies have replaced or displaced competition. The idea here is if only we can get competition back, recreate a competitive capitalism, why then the problems we face will go away. Today's program is a design to show you how and why that is not the case, to think about these things in a different way from this nice story that capitalism is basically fine; it's just the monopoly form we have to get rid of so we get back to the competition which we're all supposed to believe is wonderful and presents us with no problems to solve. So let's go, and let's do it in a systematic way.

First, it is of course easier, faced with a declining capitalism, a capitalism that's all around us with its extreme inequalities, with its instabilities – here we are, trying to cope with the effects of the Great Crash of 2008, even while we anticipate the next downturn coming down the road soon – an economic system that has shown (that is, capitalism) that it is not respectful of the natural environment; it is not, as the words now go, sustainable in a reasonable way. Yeah, we're surrounded by problems of capitalism. So it's comforting in that situation to get the idea from somewhere that this really isn't a problem of capitalism as a system but rather the problem brought in somehow from the outside – monopoly – a situation in which competition among many companies gives way in some way we're not quite sure about to a domination by one or a small handful of companies. And so the argument goes, we don't have to be critical of capitalism; we don't have to think about an alternative system. No, no, we just have to deal with this little detail, the monopoly problem. And if we can deal with that, well, we'll get back to a competition, to a competitive capitalism that is good.

There are three big mistakes involved in this way of thinking, which is nonetheless very widespread and very popular, more so now than in quite some years. First mistake: Capitalism has been wrestling with the problem of monopoly from day one. We have had repeated periods of monopoly. They have eventually led to movements, often of many people, to destroy or remove monopoly. We used to call that in America trust-busting, or antitrust. We even have a department within the Department of Justice in Washington devoted to antitrust activities. Yeah, we've been waging battles against monopoly over and over again, and you know why? Because we keep having monopolies over and over again. Google is a monopoly. Amazon is a monopoly. They're all around us: companies that have effectively no real competition. This is a problem that capitalism has always displayed. And that ought to lead you to wonder whether thinking about it as something we can do away with isn't maybe the best possible example of wishful thinking.

The second big mistake is to imagine that competition is some unmixed blessing. It never was, and it isn't today. A competitive market is a human institution. Like every other human institution, it has strengths, and flaws, and weaknesses. To think of competition as some magical perfection is a silly abnegation of your own rational capability to evaluate something. It's sort of advertising thinking. By that, I mean the advertiser tells you what's good about the product they've been told to advertise; they don't tell you what's bad about it. If you want to evaluate it, you don't talk to an advertiser because they only give you one side. The people who promote competition use advertising logic. We're not going to do that here. Competition is no unmixed blessing.

And finally, I'm going to show you that competition is itself the major cause of monopoly. So that even if we ever got back to a competitive capitalism, all that would mean is we're back in the process that produces monopoly – as it always has.

All right, so let's begin. I'm going to start with explaining how competition has all kinds of consequences that most of you, like me, don't like, don't want. It's a discussion, if you like, of competition's other side: you know, the part that the advertiser doesn't tell you about. The used-car salesman who wants you to buy that junk doesn't tell you about what happened last week in the car crash that that was part of, etc., etc.

All right, let's begin. One of the major reasons that American corporations shut down their operations in the United States and moved them to China, among other places, is because of – you guessed it – competition. They wanted to make more money than they had been before. They were afraid of other companies beating them in the competitive game, so they said wow, let's go to China, because there you can pay workers a lot less. There you don't have the same rules to obey. There they don't care that much about pollution as they do here. So we can save on all kinds of costs, and that will allow us to undercut our competitors. Yeah, one of the consequences of competition was the exodus of American companies to other parts of the world, and the enormous unemployment that resulted from it. Yeah, that was a result, among other things, of competition.

Here's another one: Capitalists, employers, seeking to compete with one another, often engage in what we call automation. They bring in machines that are cheaper to use than human laborers, and that gets them a step ahead of their competitors. Okay, if we replace people with machines, we throw those people out of work. That has an impact on them, their self-esteem, their relationship to their spouse, their relationship to their children, their relationship to alcohol – should I continue? What are the social costs of automation? They're huge. They've been documented over and over again. Competition provokes and produces automation.

Let me give you another example: Companies are competing, say, in the food business – you know, trying to get a customer like you or me to buy this kind of cereal rather than another. So they get their labs to go to work, and they discover we can replace wheat, which we used to put in our little flakes, with – Lord help us – some chemical that is cheaper than wheat. We're not going to worry about what that chemical does to your chemistry in your body because we can now lower the price of our cereal, because we're saving on wheat, and undercut the competitor. The human beings who eat this stuff will suffer, now and in the future, but competition left our producer of cereal no choice.

And in case you think I'm making some up, let me give you some concrete ones. The Boeing Corporation, the major producer of airplanes in this country, is in a crisis as a corporation. You know why? Because the 737 Max crashed a couple of times, killing hundreds of people. And you know why? It turns out they economized on safety measures, and training measures. And you know why they did that? Because they're in a very tight competition with European and other airplane manufacturers, and that leads them – as it usually does – to look to cut corners: that race for, quote, "efficiency." Yeah, it was competition that contributed to those deaths and to that problem. That's competition too. You can't whitewash this story; they're real. One of the ways Amazon beats its competition is it speeds up the work process. It has figured out ways to make people work much more intensely, using up their brains, their muscles, their nerves, in ways that cause real long-term physical damage to working people. That, too, is a result of the competitive effort.

And you know, it wasn't so long ago that children were part of the labor force. That's right, kids as young as five and six years of age. We were told they have little fingers, you see. They can be more productive than people who are adults with big fat fingers, you know – that doesn't work. And by the way, you should be grateful because poor kids are the ones we hire, and that gives their poor families more income than they would otherwise have. We heard those arguments. Competition, the companies said, required them to use the more productive, and the lower-wage, children rather than adults. So child labor was also a result of competition. It was so ugly and so troubling to so many people that finally there were movements in the United States and many other countries simply to outlaw child labor. So it became a crime for any employer to use a worker who was under 16 or 18 years of age. That was a way in which people said we are not going to allow competition among capitalists to destroy our children. They were recognizing that competition has an awful effect in what it does to children.

Well, it has many awful effects. So let's be clear: In the history of capitalism, the monopoly problem (which we're going to get to in the second half of today's program) is no worse, it's just different, from the competition problems. Capitalism goes through phases of competition and monopoly, going from one to the other, as I will explain. But we shouldn't bemoan the one in favor of the other, any more than vice-versa. These are neither of them solutions; they are both phases of the problem. And the problem is capitalism, which does its number on us both in the period when it's competitive and in the period when it's monopoly. People who want us to engage one more time in an anti-monopoly crusade are doing something that in the end evades the problem, which is the system – capitalism – not this or that form of that system, such as competition and monopoly.

We've come to the end of the first half of today's Economic Update. This gives me an opportunity to remind you, please, to sign up if you haven't already, to subscribe to our YouTube channel. It's a way easily for you to support us, doesn't cost any money, and it is a big help to us in terms of our reputation and what we can accomplish. Likewise, please make use of our websites. They are there for your communication with us. They are there for you to be able to, with a click of a mouse, to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. And finally, a special thanks goes, as always, to our Patreon community for their ongoing enthusiastic support. It means the world to us. My final, very final for this first half, is about a new book that we have just produced and released. It's a follow-up to an earlier volume I have spoken to you about that was called Understanding Marxism. For the same reason, we have now produced a brand-new book, just out, called Understanding Socialism. It is a response, as this program is, to issues, questions, comments you have sent to us in large numbers. It's an attempt to give an overview of the different interpretations of what socialism means, of what happened in countries like Russia and China that tried to create this – the strengths, the weaknesses, the lessons to be learned, what to do, and what not to do. Please, if you're interested and want to follow up, check us out, check the book out: lulu.com is how you find both books. And I will be right back; stay with us.

Welcome back, friends, to the second half of today's Economic Update. This program, as I explained, is devoted to the analysis of competition and monopoly as two interactive, sequential phases of capitalism as a system. The first part of the program was devoted mostly to competition, so let's turn now to monopoly. What is the basic definition and criticism of monopoly? Strictly speaking, monopoly is defined simply as a situation in which the producers of a particular commodity – shoes, software programs, haircuts, it doesn't matter – have been reduced to only one. Literally one seller – a monopolist. But in general language, it includes also situations where many producers who once competed with one another have been reduced to only a handful. The strict term for only a handful is "oligopoly," but we don't have to split hairs about this. "Monopoly" will be the word we use for either one or a very small number.

For example, there were once dozens of automobile companies, but very quickly their competition reduced them to basically three for much of the post-World War II period, and you know their names: Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. And likewise there were once many cigarette producers, there were once many television-set producers, and they became very few, whose names, therefore, we all know.

What's the criticism of a monopoly or oligopoly situation? Again, very simple: The idea is, if there's only one seller of something, that seller can jack up the price way above what he might have otherwise because he doesn't have any competitor. If he had a competitor, if he raised the price, the competitor would get all the business because we'd all go to the competitor who hadn't raised the price rather than buy it at a higher price from the monopolist. So we don't like monopolies, because they can jack up their prices and their profits because they don't have a competitor. And if it's a few, a handful, well then we talk about things like cartels: arrangements when a few get together over dinner, or out on the golf course, and tell us what the price is. If you ever wondered why the prices of different cars, different cigarettes, and so on, are so close to one another – mm-hmm – that's because there are few sellers, and somehow they worked it all out. But the basic criticism is that a monopoly is a situation in which the seller of something jacks the price up way beyond what they could otherwise get because there are no more competitors.

So let's talk about this monopoly problem and where the monopolies come from. Well, the first and most important lesson is this: Competition produces monopoly. It's not something external, imposed on competition. It has nothing to do with human greed or anything else. Are people greedy? You betcha – some more, some less – but that's really a separate matter. It's competition that produces monopoly, and let me show you how that works. In competition, we have, by definition, a whole bunch of producers. They all produce the same thing. They compete with one another, hoping we, the consumer, will buy from one rather than the other. They compete in the quality of what they produce and in the price of what they produce. And we are supposed, as consumers, to go look for the best quality at the lowest price, and to patronize that one who offers that to us better than the others that we could buy from but choose not to.

Okay, that's a fair definition. Now let's follow the logic. Company A produces – however it manages it – a better quality and/or a lower price than Company B. So we all go to Company A. Company B can't find any buyers because it's not competitive. Or to say the same thing in other words, Company A outcompetes Company B. Here's what happens: Company B collapses. Because it can't sell its goods, we're all going to Company A. So Company B sooner or later declares bankruptcy. It can't continue. It lays off its employees, it stops buying inputs, because it can't compete. Good. Now what happens in Company A? Company A says hey, there's a whole bunch of workers that have just lost their job at Company B; they're trained in producing what we produce; let's go hire some of them. And likewise, Company A says, they're not using their computers, or their trucks, or their other inputs. They're going to have to sell them on the secondhand market. We can get some important inputs we need at a lower price than we would have to pay if we bought them new. So what begins to happen is, where before there were two companies, A and B, there's now one larger A, and B has disappeared. Or to say the same thing in simple English, A – the winner in the competitive struggle – eats, absorbs into itself, what's left of Company B.

And this process is repeated over and over, until 30, or 300, companies have become one, or two, or three. That's the result of competition. That's how competition is supposed to work. That's how competition does work. It's important to understand: Monopoly is where competition leads. And as if that weren't enough, let me make sure you understand this from the business point of view: It is the great dream of every entrepreneur to become the last one standing in the competition, to win the competition, not just because it makes you feel good you outmaneuvered your competitors, but because if you're the last one standing, you're the monopolist. The reward for having outcompeted the others is that you're now in a position to jack up the profits, and the prices, way beyond what you could have done before.

So we have a system that produces monopoly, and all the incentives for every entrepreneur in competition to work as hard as possible to become the monopolist. So why is anyone surprised that monopolies keep happening, because they're the whole point and purpose of capitalist competition. If you ever were – and we never have, but if you ever were – able to get rid of all the monopolies and re-establish competition, all you would be doing is setting this same process in motion again for the umpteenth historical time. In other words, fighting against monopoly is pointless as long as you have capitalism, because it is the endless reproducer of this problem – as it always has been.

Now, how do monopolies maintain themselves? If you're the only one standing, you're a monopolist. Or you're an oligopoly, you're a few, and you get together and jack up your prices together. The question becomes look, a monopolist makes very high profits – much higher than a competitor can achieve – and isn't that an enormous incentive for other capitalists to get in on that business? Because look at the profits they're earning, because they're the only one. Apple, Amazon, Google – the profits are staggering. Everybody wants to get in. So the way a monopolist has to think is, I've got to create obstacles that block other people from coming in to get a piece of the enormous profits my monopoly allows me to get. We call that in economics "barriers to entry." Monopolists need to create barriers. Let me give you a couple of examples.

The major soft drink makers in the United States – basically Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola – they produce a drink that has sugar and coloring in it, and lots and lots of water. Let me assure you, there is nothing difficult or complicated about producing a mixture of sugar, color, and water. It doesn't take a genius; it never did. Pepsi and Coca-Cola make a fortune off of their product, as we know, and they have for decades. They have a virtual monopoly. Now, lots of other people could produce water, sugar, and color close to, if not identical with, whatever they produce, but they can't break through. They can't really get to that status. And you know why? Because Coca-Cola and Pepsi erected a barrier to entry. And the way they did that was with advertising. Every billboard, every magazine cover, every doorway of every institution you've ever been to has a picture of smiling, happy people drinking one or the other. You've learned: that's the drink, that's the drink. Another company might make a perfect substitute, but they can't afford the enormous cost of advertising. The advertising costs more than the water, and the sugar, and the color. What you pay for when you buy Pepsi and Coke is the advertising that got you to buy it. You're paying for being hustled. But it works, because it means other companies know that they can't get in there by cheaply producing an alternative, because you have to produce the advertising that goes with it, or else you can't do it. And so their monopoly is maintained.

Here's another way to maintain a monopoly: Get the government to step in. Here the famous example is the milk producers. Some years ago, there was a crisis with milk. There was contamination; people were getting sick. So the clever milk monopolies came in and said, we're going to support the enormously expensive, special equipment to guarantee pasteurization, and so on, of milk. Why did they support it? Because your small farmer, your small dairy producer, can't afford it, so they go out of business. Only the big, rich few that are left can afford the enormous equipment. They used governmental rules to create a barrier to entry.

Here's another way: corrupt public officials. President Trump denounces Huawei corporation because it compromises our national security. It denounces European car producers because somehow their shipping cars here compromises our security. Who cares? As long as the president blocks other companies from getting into the business that might compete with an American, a barrier to entry exists. Monopolists have been very creative in coming up with ways to preserve their monopolies.

I don't want to lose the basic point. The basic point is: Capitalism oscillates, back and forth between competition and monopoly – first this industry, then that one. For a while, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler were the monopolies – or the oligopoly, if you like – in automobiles. But eventually, Toyota, and Nissan, and Peugeot, and Fiat broke the monopoly. In that case, it was foreigners who did it. And then we had some competition, and that, then, is now shrinking. The French – the last two producers in France – have just agreed to merge. You get the picture. Industry by industry, first this one, then that one, go through one phase or another.

The important point is: The phases are not our problem. They merge into, and incentivize, each other. Each provokes movement in the other direction. The point to understand is that the problems of a capitalist system are not about this oscillation of phases. We're not going to solve the problem of monopoly by getting rid of them and re-establishing competition. We've been there; we've done that; it reproduces monopoly; and it doesn't change the basic inequality, unsustainability, instability of capitalism. We need to get beyond that stale, old debate – competition versus monopoly – and face the underlying reality: Capitalism is the problem, and getting beyond it is the solution.

#### Capitalism drives extinction and structural violence.

Jamie Allinson et al 21. Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Introduction. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963 //shree

This is the question that vexed us as we set out to write The Tragedy of the Worker. From the vantage point of the present, the history of capitalist development is, as Marx expected, the history of the development of a global working class, the proletarianisation of the majority of the world’s population. But the very same process of that development has brought us to the precipice of climate disaster. Our position, to recall Trotsky’s rationalisation of War Communism in 1920, is in the highest degree tragic.

It is now clear that we will pass what scientists have long warned will be a tipping point of global warming, accelerating the already catastrophic consequences of capitalist emissions. How do we imagine emancipation on an at best partially habitable planet? Where once communists imagined seizing the means of production, taking the unprecedented capacities of capitalist infrastructures and using them to build a world of plenty, what must we imagine after the apocalypse has befallen us? What does it mean that as capitalism has become truly global, the gravediggers it has created dig not only capitalism’s grave, but also that of much organic life on earth?

Our answers to these questions remain rooted in the politics of revolutionary communism. Our stance is not based on the fantasy of a homeostatic nature that must be defended but on the critique of the capitalist metabolism – the Stoffwechsel- that must be overthrown. Earth scientists are accustomed to speak in terms of ‘cycles’ by which substances circulate in different forms: the water cycle, the rock cycle, the nitrogen cycle, the glacial-interglacial cycle, the carbon cycle, and others. One way of registering the catastrophe of climate change is to see these cycles – most of all, but not solely, the carbon cycle – as disordered, under- or over-accumulating. But this is to ignore the more fundamental circuit of which these now form epicycles, like Ptolemy’s sub-orbits of the heavenly bodies: the circuit of capital accumulation, M-C-M′.

This circuit accumulates profit and produces death. Neither is accidental. It is for this reason that the debates that capitalist ruling classes permit among themselves on ‘adaptation’ versus ‘mitigation’ take place on false premises. What is to be mitigated is the impact of climate change on accumulation, rendered through the ideology of ‘growth’ as something that benefits everyone. What we are to adapt to are the parameters of accumulation, sacrificing just enough islands, eco-systems, indigenous – and non-indigenous – cultures to maintain its imperatives for a period of time until new thresholds must be crossed, and new life sacrificed to the pagan idol of capital. Already, capitalist petro-modernity builds a certain quantum of acceptable death into its predicates: at the very least, the 8.7 million killed by fossil fuels each year according to Harvard University are considered a price worth paying for the stupendous advantages of fossil capital. And the sky can only keep going up, as deforestation, polar melt, ocean acidification, soil de-fertilisation and more intense wildfires and storms tear the web of life into patches. If the necropolitical calculus of the Covid-19 pandemic appears crass, just wait until its premises are applied to climate catastrophe.

#### Vote neg for anti-capitalist commons---collectives should refuse commitments to competitive principle and the straitjacket of what’s “realistic.”

Nick Rose 21. PhD in Political Ecology from RMIT University. Executive Director of Sustain: The Australian Food Network. From the Cancer Stage of Capitalism to the Political Principle of the Common: The Social Immune Response of “Food as Commons.” Int J Health Policy Manag 2021. 3-31-21. DOI: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.20 //shree

Silvia Federici provides a longer historical perspective, noting that ‘commoning is the principle by which human beings have organised their existence for thousands of years;’ and that to ‘speak of the principle of the common’ is to speak ‘not only of small-scale experiments [but] of large-scale social formations that in the past were continent-wide.’87 Hence a commons-based society is neither a utopia or reducible to fringe projects, and the commons have persisted despite the many and continuing enclosures, ‘feeding the radical imagination as well as the bodies of many commoners.’87 Federici acknowledges that commons and practices of commoning are diverse, that many are susceptible to cooptation and many are consistent with the persistence of capitalism; indeed some, such as charities providing social services (including foodbanks) during the years of austerity budgets in the United Kingdom (2010-2015), reinforce and stabilise capitalism.87 What matters to Federici is the character and intentionality of the commons as anti-capitalist, as ‘a means to the creation of an egalitarian and cooperative society…no longer built on a competitive principle, but on the principle of collective solidarity [and commitments] to the creation of collective subjects [and] fostering common interests in every aspect of our lives.’87

Federici’s analysis resonates with the political thought and proposals developed by Dardot and Laval in their 2018 work, ‘On Common: Revolution in the 21st century.’11 For Dardot and Laval, the common is likewise understood as a principle of political struggle, a demand for ‘real democracy’ and a major driving force behind the emerging articulation of a political vision and programme that transcends and overcomes the straitjacket logic of neoliberal ideological hegemony and its ‘policy grammar’ which appears to foreclose all alternatives and lock us forever into a capitalist realism in which ‘it is easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism.’89 Eschewing Bollier’s ‘triarchy’ of a market/state/ commons coexistence, Dardot and Laval argue for a politics of the common based on an engaged citizenry that directly participates and deliberates in all decisions which impact it, and in the process not merely transforms the institutions responsible for the management of services and allocation of resources, but creates new institutions and new ways of being in the world.11

Dardot and Laval describe this form of politics as ‘instituent praxis’: the common, they argue, is ‘not produced but instituted.’11 This acknowledges the conventional understanding of Ostrom, Bollier and others of ‘the commons’ as residing in the rules – the laws – that a community establishes for the collective management and use of shared resources, but extends it much further and in a more radical direction. The essence of the commons, they argue, is not in the goods per se such as land or a forest or a seed bank ‘held in common,’ but rather in the process of their establishment as well as the ongoing negotiation that will surround their use and governance. Hence, Dardot and Laval distinguish the commons from the ‘rights’ tradition of property, arguing that ‘the commons are above all else matters of institution and government…the use of the commons is inseparable from the right of deciding and governing. The practice that institutes the commons is the practice that maintains them and keeps them alive and takes full responsibility for their conflictuality through the coproduction of rules.’90 To ‘institute’ in this context should not be misunderstood as ‘to institutionalise [or] render official;’ rather it is ‘to recreate with, or on the basis of, what already exists.’ 90 This messy, conflictual and evolving process is what Dardot and Laval insist will ultimately bring about a revolution, not in the form of a violent uprising or insurrection, but rather through the ‘reinstitution of society’ via the transformation of politics and economy from its current state of ‘representative oligarchy’ to full participatory and deliberative democracy.11 Such a vision is premised on a mass politicisation of society; in effect a return of mass popular political contestation and a turn away from the postpolitical era of the neoliberal consumer.91-92

### FTC Trade Off---1NC

#### FTC’s increasing enforcement in privacy now---it’s focused on algorithmic bias.

James V. Fazio 21. Special counsel in the Intellectual Property Practice Group at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP, with Liisa M. Thomas, 3/11. “What Is FTC’s Course Under Biden?” https://www.natlawreview.com/article/what-ftc-s-course-under-biden

The new acting FTC chair, Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, recently signaled that the FTC may increase enforcement and penalties in the privacy and data security realm. Slaughter pointed to several areas of focus for the FTC this year, which companies will want to keep in mind: Notifying Consumers About FTC Allegations: Slaughter referred favorably to two recent cases: (1) the Everalbum biometric settlement from earlier this year (which we wrote about at the time); and (2) the Flo Health settlement over alleged deceptive data sharing practices (which we also wrote about at the time). In drawing on these two cases, Slaughter indicated that in future cases the FTC intends to include as part of any settlement a requirement to notify customers of any FTC allegations. This, she said, would allow consumers to “vote with their feet” and help them decide whether to recommend their services to others. FTC Intent to Plead All Relevant Violations: According to Slaughter, another lesson the FTC is taking from the Flo case is to include in the cases it brings all potentially applicable violations of all relevant privacy-related laws. In the Flo case, Slaughter said the FTC should have pleaded a violation of the Health Breach Notification Rule, which requires that vendors of personal health records notify consumers of data breaches. Focus on Ed Tech and COPPA: Given the explosive growth of education technology during COVID-19, the FTC is conducting an industry sweep of the industry. Related to this, the FTC is reviewing its Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act Rule. This goes beyond the refresh the agency did of their FAQs earlier in the pandemic (which we wrote about at the time). For now, Slaughter reminds companies that parental consent is needed before collecting information online from children under the age of 13. Examination of Health Apps: The FTC will take a closer look at health apps, including telehealth and contact tracing apps, as more and more consumers are relying on such apps to manage their health during the pandemic. Overlap Between Competition and Privacy: Slaughter also indicated that it is worth looking at situations where there may be not only privacy concerns, but antitrust as well. Because the FTC has a dual mission (consumer protection and competition) she notes that it has a “structural advantage” over other regulators in that it can look at these issues, especially since -she states- “many of the largest players in digital markets are as powerful as they are because of the breadth of their access to and control over consumer data.” Racial Equality and AI/Biometrics/Geotracking: Slaughter noted that COVID-19 is exacerbating racial inequities. She pointed to the unequal access to technology, as well as algorithmic discrimination (the idea that discrimination offline becomes embedded into algorithmic system logic). The FTC intends to focus on algorithmic discrimination, as well as on the discrimination potentially embedded into facial recognition technologies. (This mirrors concerns that gave rise to the recent Portland facial recognition law, which we recently wrote about). Finally, Slaughter commented on the use of location data to identify characteristics of Black Lives Matter protesters, and said she is concerned about the misuse of location data to track Americans engaged in constitutionally protected speech. Putting it Into Practice: Companies that operate health apps, that are in the education technology space, or that use algorithms or facial recognition tools will want to keep in mind that these are areas of focus for the FTC. And for everyone, keep in mind that the FTC has indicated it will beef up privacy law penalties and will ask for more notification to injured consumers.

#### Antitrust enforcement saps up FTC resources and personnel, which are finite.

Tara L. Reinhart, et al. 21. \*\*Head of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*Steven C. Sunshine, Co-head of Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*David P. Whales, antitrust lawyer with over 25 years of experience in both private and public sectors. \*\*Julia Y. York, partner at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP. \*\*Bre Jordan, associate at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP focusing on antitrust law. “Lina Khan’s Appointment as FTC Chair Reflects Biden Administration’s Aggressive Stance on Antitrust Enforcement.” 6/18/21. https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2021/06/lina-khans-appointment-as-ftc-chair

Second, like all antitrust enforcers, Ms. Khan and the FTC will face resource constraints. Bringing antitrust litigation is an expensive and laborious process, often requiring millions of dollars for expert fees and a large army of FTC staff attorneys and taking many months or even years to accomplish. Typically, the FTC can only litigate a handful of antitrust matters at a time. It seems likely that Congress will provide more funding to the FTC in the current environment, but even with these extra resources, the FTC will still have to pick its cases carefully and cannot challenge every deal or every instance of alleged unlawful conduct.

#### That trades off with the necessary resources for privacy enforcement.

John O. McGinnis\* and Linda Sun\*\* 20. \*George C. Dix Professor, Northwestern University, and Associate-Designate, Wilmer Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP. “Unifying Antitrust Enforcement for the Digital Age.” Northwestern Public Law Research Paper No. 20-20. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3669087

The FTC needs more resources to adequately address the nation’s growing privacy concerns. Currently, the FTC oversees both consumer protection—encompassing privacy—and antitrust,249 making the FTC the chief federal agency on privacy policy and enforcement250 and the nation’s de-facto privacy agency.251 The agency has long-standing experience in enforcing privacy statutes252 and also has special privacy assets, such as an internet lab capable of high-quality tech forensics to track invasions of privacy.253 The FTC, however, has failed to keep pace with the massive growth of privacy concerns—a phenomenon also driven by modern technology. Very few Americans feel conﬁdent in the privacy of their information in the digital age.254 According to a 2019 study, over 80% of Americans feel that they have little to no control over the data collected on them by companies and the government.255 To adequately address privacy concerns, the FTC needs more resources.256 The agency has been explicit that it needs more manpower to police tech companies. In requesting increased funding from Congress, FTC Director Joseph Simons said the money would allow the agency to hire additional staff and bring more privacy cases.257 A former director of the FTC’s Bureau of Consumer Protection, which houses the privacy unit, has called the FTC “woefully understaffed.”258 As of the spring of 2019, the FTC had only forty employees dedicated to privacy and data security, compared to 500 and 110 employees at comparable agencies in the UK. and Ireland, respectively.259 Without more lawyers, investigators, and technologists, the FTC will be forced to conduct privacy investigations less thoroughly, and in some cases, forgo them altogether.260 Currently, the FT C’s resources are spread thin across multiple missions, to the detriment of its privacy efforts. Removing the agency’s antitrust responsibilities would reallocate resources from the antitrust department to its privacy unit and other areas of consumer protection. Further, it would free up the scarce time of the commissioners to oversee this essential effort.261

#### Unchecked algorithmic bias risks massive inequality and extinction.

Mike Thomas 20. Quoting AI experts including MIT Physics Professors, Senior Features Writer for BuiltIn. THE FUTURE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: 7 ways AI can change the world for better ... or worse, Updated: April 20, 2020, <https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/artificial-intelligence-future>

Klabjan also puts little stock in extreme scenarios — the type involving, say, murderous cyborgs that turn the earth into a smoldering hellscape. He’s much more concerned with machines — war robots, for instance — being fed faulty “incentives” by nefarious humans. As MIT physics professors and leading AI researcher Max Tegmark put it in a 2018 TED Talk, “The real threat from AI isn’t malice, like in silly Hollywood movies, but competence — AI accomplishing goals that just aren’t aligned with ours.” That’s Laird’s take, too. “I definitely don’t see the scenario where something wakes up and decides it wants to take over the world,” he says. “I think that’s science fiction and not the way it’s going to play out.” What Laird worries most about isn’t evil AI, per se, but “evil humans using AI as a sort of false force multiplier” for things like bank robbery and credit card fraud, among many other crimes. And so, while he’s often frustrated with the pace of progress, AI’s slow burn may actually be a blessing. “Time to understand what we’re creating and how we’re going to incorporate it into society,” Laird says, “might be exactly what we need.” But no one knows for sure. “There are several major breakthroughs that have to occur, and those could come very quickly,” Russell said during his Westminster talk. Referencing the rapid transformational effect of nuclear fission (atom splitting) by British physicist Ernest Rutherford in 1917, he added, “It’s very, very hard to predict when these conceptual breakthroughs are going to happen.” But whenever they do, if they do, he emphasized the importance of preparation. That means starting or continuing discussions about the ethical use of A.G.I. and whether it should be regulated. That means working to eliminate data bias, which has a corrupting effect on algorithms and is currently a fat fly in the AI ointment. That means working to invent and augment security measures capable of keeping the technology in check. And it means having the humility to realize that just because we can doesn’t mean we should. “Our situation with technology is complicated, but the big picture is rather simple,” Tegmark said during his TED Talk. “Most AGI researchers expect AGI within decades, and if we just bumble into this unprepared, it will probably be the biggest mistake in human history. It could enable brutal global dictatorship with unprecedented inequality, surveillance, suffering and maybe even human extinction. But if we steer carefully, we could end up in a fantastic future where everybody’s better off—the poor are richer, the rich are richer, everybody’s healthy and free to live out their dreams.”

### Japan DA---1NC

#### New antitrust is applied globally---offends allies---regs counterplan avoids it.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

Today few of us are sympathetic with the view that the common law exists apart from and somehow transcends the jurisdiction of the courts that make it. Nevertheless, there is a powerful sense in which the rules of antitrust law are regarded as "natural," while explicitly regulatory rules are considered to be purely local, territorial, or political. This view is given considerable support by a powerful neoclassical economic model that views markets as natural, in the sense that they exist separate and apart from state policy making. 32

Within this model antitrust law is a kind of background umpire that does not make first instance choices about price, quantity, quality, new entry and the like, but that does limit the anticompetitive exercise of market power. Antitrust operates as a kind of "macro" version of contract law. The common law of contracts is designed to facilitate and protect the utility of individual private bargains; antitrust is designed to do much the same thing, but for markets as a whole. Under this conception a well defined set of antitrust principles always operates in the background, so to speak, permitting private bargaining to proceed without interference in the great majority of instances, but intervening when competitive processes go awry. Further, widespread agreement exists both inside and outside the United States on a set of core principles pertaining to such things as naked price fixing, market division agreements, and the like. Within this core, problems of extraterritoriality have largely been limited to the technical ones of devising appropriate jurisdictional rules and remedies.

In contrast, the power to regulate is different. Under the traditional view of regulation the power to set price, quantity, quality, or the right to enter a market emanates in the first instance from the government. Further, although there is widespread economic agreement on fundamental principles, regulatory design is much more specific to the sovereign-more likely to reflect the demographics, industrial or employment base, or politics of the particular state imposing the regulation.

For example, nearly all of the 50 states of the United States have an antitrust law. With relatively few exceptions, however, the substantive coverage of these antitrust laws is the same, and mimics federal law. Many states have court decisions or even legislative enactments stating that federal antitrust law should govern the interpretation of that particular state's antitrust law as well. 33 The result is that the coverage of state antitrust law is remarkably similar from one state to the next. But one can hardly say the same thing about each state's regulation of land use, power generation and distribution, taxicabs, liquor pricing, and the like. Whatever homogeneity regulatory theory might produce, the politics of regulation virtually guarantees jurisdiction-specific outcomes.

But homogeneity in antitrust policy also begins to break down when antitrust law moves beyond its fundamental neoclassical concern with cartels or well-defined exclusionary practices, and into areas where its role is more controversial or marginal. This is often the case when the antitrust laws are applied in recently deregulated markets. For example, a common antitrust problem that arises in deregulated industries falls under the general rubric of unilateral refusals to deal. In order to encourage competition, newly deregulated firms may be forced to share their facilities, information, intellectual property, or other assets with new rivals. Devising reasonable "nonregulatory" rules governing refusals to deal in such markets has always extended the antitrust laws to the margin of their competence.

Increasingly, American courts seem willing to apply antitrust law to markets regulated by foreign nations under circumstances where regulatory laws themselves would never reach. For example, neither Congress nor a state legislature would very likely attempt to regulate the customer service or information provision practices of a foreign national's telephone company. But both federal and state courts have done precisely that under the guise of antitrust enforcement.3 4

Antitrust policy makes this thinkable as a result of the confluence of two sets of doctrines. First is the expansive reach of our antitrust laws to practices that have a substantial effect on United States commerce. Second is the very narrow conception of comity that applies in antitrust cases.

As a general matter, comity concerns in the international conflict of laws requires the court to consider the competing interests of domestic and foreign sovereigns. 35 After a half century of debate over the meaning of comity in international Sherman Act adjudication, the Supreme Court gave the doctrine an extraordinarily narrow meaning in the Hartford Fire case.36 That case involved an alleged insurance boycott in which Lloyd's of London participated as reinsurer. Lloyd's conduct-agreeing with some United States insurers not to write reinsurance policies for other United States insurers who wanted to write policies with broader coverage-was neither forbidden nor compelled by British law. To the defendant's claim of comity the Supreme Court replied that the provisions of the Sherman Act governing jurisdiction over transactions in foreign commerce were mandatory. As a result, a federal court could not simply decline jurisdiction on the basis of some general balancing of interests. 37 Rather, "comity" permits a federal court to decline jurisdiction only when there was a "conflict" between the law of the foreign sovereign and United States law. Further, "conflict" was defined not under choice of law principles, but more absolutely, as occurring only when the foreign law compelled the conduct at issue. 38

Perhaps significantly, the activity of the London reinsurers was very likely reachable under United States antitrust law even under ordinary interest analysis principles. British law was found by the Supreme Court to be indifferent to what the London reinsurers were doing. Further, what they were doing was agreeing not to insure against liability for particular toxic pollution risks in the United States, and risk of liability is of course measured in relation to the physical environment and legal regime in which the injury occurs. 39 As a result, the London reinsurers were selling a product especially targeted for United States markets and allegedly participating in a boycott designed to keep broader coverage insurance policies out of that market.

But Hartford Fire's definition of comity is significantly problematic under deregulation. To the extent a foreign sovereign deregulates a public utility or common carrier, that firm enjoys greater discretion to make its own decisions. As a result, considerations of comity may no longer preclude a Sherman Act suit. What makes this especially problematic is the way that the Sherman Act has been used in the United States as a kind of replacement for the regulatory agency. Under comprehensive agency regulation a filed tariff plus regulatory oversight would have governed numerous acts by regulated firms, including pricing, entry into new markets, interconnection obligations and other duties to deal.40 Government relaxation of regulatory restrictions has given firms some discretion over these things but in the process has substituted the antitrust courts as governmental supervisor. In some situations this causes little difficulty because regulation may have been misapplied to a competitively structured industry to begin with.41 In other situations, such as long-distance telecommunication, a competitive environment has developed because of changes in technology, and topto-bottom price and product regulation is no longer necessary.42

But in a third class of situations the application of the antitrust laws is much more "regulatory" and more difficult to defend. These are the cases where unilateral conduct of the kind that was historically supervised by the regulatory agency now comes under antitrust jurisdiction. For example, under the essential facility doctrine a federal court of general jurisdiction may be asked to apply antitrust law to determine the scope of a formerly regulated firm's duty to interconnect with rivals. The circuit courts have applied the doctrine frequently in the telecommunications industry,43 but also to railroads" and natural gas pipelines.4 5 Problematically, supervising interconnection requirements involves the court in highly technical questions about the scope of the duty to deal and perhaps even about the price at which the deal must be made. In these cases we have not really "deregulated" at all; rather, we have simply substituted regulation by a government agency for regulation by a court, often through the highly inefficient and uncertain process of a jury trial. To do that in a purely domestic situation is ill-advised enough, but to do it abroad by taking advantage of the expansive jurisdictional reach of the Sherman Act is completely unjustified.

IV. Extraterritorial antitrust and foreign deregulation

As expansive as the regulatory power asserted by the United States sometimes becomes, it does not generally interfere directly into foreign governments' regulation of their own highly regulated industries. But to a large extent modem antitrust has inherited the regulatory attitude expressed by the Western Union decision discussed above. For several reasons, the idea that the United States Antitrust laws are jurisdictionally exceptional can produce overreaching that is offensive to foreign prerogatives. First, the United States antitrust laws are extremely general and make no distinction between ordinary competitive firms and public utilities or common carriers; the same rules purport to apply to all business firms. Second, the jurisdictional language of the antitrust laws is both mandatory and general to the same extent-that is, the "affecting foreign commerce" language of the basic Sherman Act and the export commerce language of the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvement Act 6 do not distinguish between regulated and ordinary competitive firms. And third, the limiting doctrines of international law-namely Act of State, foreign sovereign compulsion, foreign sovereign immunity, and comity-do not distinguish among types of firms or types of antitrust complaints. They apply equally to both price fixing, which is at the core of antitrust concern, and to the essential facility doctrine, which lies at or outside its margin.

#### Ends the Japan economic alliance---they respond with diplomatic protest to new extraterritorial antitrust.

Takaaki Kojima 02. Fellow, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 2001-2002. “International Conflicts over the Extraterritorial Application of Competition Law in a Borderless Economy”. https://datascience.iq.harvard.edu/files/fellows/files/kojima.pdf

We are witnessing increasingly widespread and penetrating economic globalization today. As a result of trade liberalization, import restrictions or regulations on trade and investment have decreased substantially, and trans-border business activities face less barrier. At the same time, the role of trans-border business activities, especially those by so-called multinational or global enterprises, have become increasingly important and even dominant in some sectors.

As far as the territorial scope of business activities are concerned, state borders are more or less diminishing to become almost borderless; as for legal regimes, however, sovereign states retain in principle exclusive jurisdiction over their territories and nationals under international law. Business activities are regulated by the domestic laws of sovereign states or by international agreements concluded among sovereign states. The pertinent question is how to coordinate “borderless” business activities within the existing legal regimes governed by sovereign states. In the field of trade law, the measures of each state are restricted by international agreements, in particular under the GATT/WTO regime. In the field of competition law, such an international regime is lacking and the domestic laws of each state regulate private restraints of trade in the relevant markets.

Serious jurisdictional conflicts have transpired in the last several decades between the United States and other states over the so-called extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws on anticompetitive conducts abroad. This problem has also caused diplomatic frictions between the United States and other states, as it concerns state sovereignty. In this essay, the author will review the historical development of international conflicts caused by the extraterritorial application of competition law and attempt to examine the options available to circumvent or solve these conflicts. The main focus will be U.S. antitrust law and its relation with other jurisdictions, mainly the European Union and Japan, considering the grave implications to competition law and policy as well as to the world economy. 2

II. Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Antitrust Laws

Problems concerning the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws have been discussed in many publications. Of the U.S. antitrust laws, the Sherman Act applies to “commerce … with foreign nations ” (Section 1) without qualifying provisions concerning its territorial scope as “within the United States” (Section 2) or “in any section of the country” (Section 3) as specified in the Clayton Act. In the past, U.S. courts interpreting the Sherman Act of 1890 and other antitrust laws commonly followed the traditional territorial principle with regard to its jurisdictional reach. In the American Banana case (213 U.S. 347 (1909)), where all the acts complained of were committed outside the territory of the United States, including the defendant’s alleged inducements of the Costa Rican government to monopolize the banana trade, the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed the complaint on the ground, inter alia, that acts committed outside of the United States are not governed by the Sherman Act. In this case, the territorial principle in the classic sense was applied.

In later decisions such as the American Tobacco case (221 U.S. 106 (1911)) and the Sisal case (274 U.S. 268 (1927)), jurisdiction was exercised over the defendants on the ground that although the agreements in question were concluded by foreigners outside the United States, jurisdiction was limited to what was performed and intended to be performed within the territory of the United States. In these cases, the territorial principle was applied more flexibly, but it has been observed that this application cannot be argued other than as a sensible and reasonable deployment of the objective territorial theory. 3

An entirely different approach was taken in the Alcoa case (148 F.2d. 416 (1944)), in which foreign companies outside the United States had concluded the agreements. The Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit held it settled law that any State may impose liabilities, even upon persons not within its allegiance, for conduct outside its borders that has consequences within its borders. It went on further to state that the agreements, although made abroad, were unlawful if they were intended to affect imports and did affect them.

This theory of the intended effect (the effects doctrine) elaborated in the Alcoa case was criticized by many as an excess of jurisdiction under public international law. For instance, R.Y. Jennings noted that “in this new guise it apparently comprehends the exercise of jurisdiction over agreements made abroad, by foreigners with foreigners provided only that the agreement was intended to have repercussions upon American imports or exports,” 4 while F.A. Mann argued that “the type of effect within the meaning of the Alcoa ruling has nothing in common with the effect which by virtue of established principles of international jurisdiction confers that right of regulation.” 5 Neverthele ss, since the Alcoa case, U.S. courts have continued to follow the new jurisdictional formula of the effects doctrine.

In response to excessive application of U.S. antitrust laws, especially with respect to courts’ orders to produce documents such as subpoena duces tecum located abroad, a considerable number of states have issued diplomatic protests. Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and New Zealand have even enacted blocking legislation. 6 The protesting states maintain that taking evidence abroad, including an order to produce documents, is an exercise of extraterritorial enforcement of jurisdiction that, under international law, requires the consent of the state where the evidence is located. The United Kingdom has been one of the strongest opponents to U.S. claims of extraterritorial jurisdiction. The U.K. government stated for instance that “HM Government considers that in the present state of international law there is no basis for the extension of one country’s antitrust jurisdiction to activities outside of that country of the foreign national.” 7 The Protection of Trading Interest law was enacted in 1980, which provides to extensively thwart the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws. The U.K. government invoked the provisions in the Laker Airways case (1983 W.L.R. 413) in 1983.

Having faced the antagonistic reactions of other states, U.S. courts began to show some restraint in assuming extraterritorial jurisdiction. In the Timberlane case (549 F.2d. 9 th Cir. (1976)), the court concluded that it had jurisdiction over alleged anticompetitive conducts in Honduras but refrained from asserting extraterritorial jurisdiction after having applied three tests: first, whether the challenged conduct had had some effect on the commerce of the United States; second, whether the conduct in question imposed a burden on U.S. commerce; and third, whether the complaint’s interests of and links to the United States were sufficiently strong vis-à-vis those of other nations to justify an assertion of extraterritorial authority. The Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act enacted in 1976 applies to foreign conduct that has a direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable effect on U.S. commerce, The U.S. enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), have adopted this jurisdictional rule of reason formula since the Enforcement Guidelines for International Operations of 1988. However, divergent views exist as to whether the third test of balancing the interests of other states is a rule of international law or just a comity. 8 Furthermore, not all U.S. courts have consistently applied the test of balancing interests. 9

In 1993, the Supreme Court decision in the Hartford Fire Insurance case (113 S. Ct. 2891 (1993)) reaffirmed the effects doctrine, stating that the Sherman Act applies to foreign conduct that was meant to produce and did in fact produce some substantial effect in the United States. The Court then took a restrictive view on the test of balancing interests, stating that the only substantial question is whether there is a true conflict between domestic and foreign law, and held that no such conflict seemed to exist because British law did not require defendants to act in a manner prohibited by U.S. law. 10

Japan maintains the territorial principle and rejects the effects doctrine, stating that the effects doctrine cannot be regarded as an established rule of international law. In the view of the Government of Japan, the extraterritorial application of U.S. domestic laws (including U.S. antitrust laws) based on the effects doctrine is not allowed under general international law. 11 In the Nippon Paper case, where a Japanese company was prosecuted under the Sherman Act, the Japanese government submitted a brief of amicus curiae where it stated, inter alia, that the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a conduct of a Japanese company engaged in business in Japan is unlawful under international law. 12 Nonetheless, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Appeal decision, which assumed the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a criminal case for the first time (118 S. Ct. 685 (1998)).

#### Economic alliance is key to Indo-Pacific cyber security---only coop allows them to leverage technology.

Patrick M. Cronin 4/15/21. Asia-Pacific Security Chair @ Hudson. "U.S.-Japan Alliance in Full Bloom". https://www.hudson.org/research/16835-u-s-japan-alliance-in-full-bloom

Even if seldom mentioned by name, China is the unmistakable fulcrum around which alliance policy on all issues turns. Competition with China is primarily economic and technological, but these issues often spill over into security and human rights.

Economically, a rebounding U.S. economy and Japan will collaborate to strengthen the resilience of vital supply chains. Semiconductor chips are essential for all electronics, and Suga and Biden are determined to ensure their availability. Equally, the U.S. and Japan have an opportunity to leverage their two-year-old digital trade agreement to help negotiate a multilateral accord and establish high international standards for finance and commerce in the cyber age.

As a dominant player in semiconductor manufacturing and a member of APEC and the World Trade Organization, Taiwanshould play a part in both supply chain security and digital trading standards. Indeed, bolstering Taiwan’s place in the global economy of other democracies is a far better means of thwarting Beijing’s intimidation strategy against Taiwan than just sailing near the Taiwan Strait with an aircraft carrier.

The commanding heights of the 21st century economy center on technology. So, while the United States and Japan retain a strong interest in economic cooperation with China, those relations become considerably sharper over leading-edge technologies such as 5G telecommunications, artificial intelligence and quantum computing. Biden and Suga should showcase their commitment, not against China, but in favor of technological innovation and secure connectivity.

An excellent way for the alliance to demonstrate a commitment to practical technology cooperation would be to work together to expand investment in 5G Open Radio Access Networks (ORAN). Given the concerns surrounding allowing China to dominate fifth-generation telecommunications infrastructure, the United States and Japan need to scale up a cloud-based software alternative. The good news is that Japan’s Rakuten is already a leader in demonstrating ORAN’s feasibility, and there is bipartisan support in Congress for increasing U.S. investment in modular 5G.

The alliance also requires deeper cooperation on cybersecurity. Of five issues highlighted at the recent 2 + 2 meeting between U.S. and Japan defense and foreign ministers, cyberspace was the most traditional national security issue. Japan is inching closer toward becoming a de facto sixth member of the Five Eyes intelligence-sharing arrangement, and the Biden administration should encourage that trajectory. A stronger digital alliance can, in turn, advance cyber resilience throughout the Indo-Pacific region.

#### Extinction---Indo-Pak nuclear war.

Ahyousha Khan 20. "Research Associate" at Islamabad Based Think-tank "Strategic Vision Institute". "Artificial Intelligence without Cyber Resilience in South Asia". South Asia Journal. 7-16-2020. http://southasiajournal.net/artificial-intelligence-without-cyber-resilience-in-south-asia/

With increased dependence on information technology and rapid digitization of systems, term cybersecurity gained momentum. However, these systems not only need to be securitized but they should be resilient against the threats. Cyber resilience is the ability of the system to operate during an attack and achieve a minimum level of operationalization while responding to an attack. It also enables the system to develop a back-up system that works in case of attack. Cyber resilience is a step forward from cybersecurity because it not only ensures the security of the system, but also identifies the threats to it and then proposes the system that could work amidst such attacks. Most military systems are resilient against kinetic attacks because resilience and survivability go hand in hand. But, with modernizations in the military, it is necessary that the state’s cyber networks which are working on artificial intelligence must be resilient against kinetic and non-kinetic attack.

Today states are in a race to use the AI in their military systems to achieve maximum military gains and denying their adversary the same. The situation is not so different in South Asia where two nuclear rivals of the region are paving the way towards the use of artificial intelligence for military purposes. India has developed the Center for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (CAIR) in DRDO, with the aim to develop AI within the military systems to improve geographical information system technology, decision support systems, and object detection and mapping. Moreover, companies like Bharat Electronics Limited (BEL) are already in the process of developing and incorporating AI into military equipment. This includes an AI-enabled patrol robot developed by BEL built in the hope to be utilized by the Indian military. Moreover, in 2019 India’s Gen. Bipin Rawat said adversary in the north is spending a huge amount on AI and cyber warfare, so we cannot be left behind in this race. It is mostly projected by the Indian policymakers and many international scholars that India is facing adversaries at two fronts (China-Pakistan), to justify India’s military expenditure and modernization. However, recently, events like Galwan Valley clash evidently exposed that India’s military capabilities are mostly against Pakistan. Moreover, South Asia’s security dynamics are heavily characterized by the action-reaction chain. To avoid the security dilemma vis-à-vis India, Pakistan would also invest in AI. At the moment Pakistan has also started working towards achieving expertise in AI. In 2019 President of Pakistan launched PIAIC with a focus on the development of skills in AI to strengthen economy and defence systems. Moreover, there are centers like the National Center of Artificial Intelligence and the Department of Robotics and Intelligent Machine Learning in NUST, which are working to improve AI-based knowledge in Pakistan. Besides that Pakistan recently launched a program named “Digital Pakistan” to increase access and connectivity, digital infrastructure, e-government, digital killing, and training and introduce innovation and entrepreneurship.

There are many studies done on the implications of AI on nuclear deterrence and strategic stability in South Asia. These studies highlight that due to prevalent asymmetry in the conventional military build-up, the introduction of AI into military technology would worsen the already fragile deterrence stability of the region. This assumption is based on the argument that due to AI in reconnaissance systems, high-level intelligence collection would affect the survivability of nuclear weapons, which is based on diversification and concealment. However, AI would also enable both states to have more response options in a short time with the help of decision-making tools in case of a crisis, especially in aerial battles.

Moreover, both states are moving towards the massive digitalization of their military systems and society without building cyber-resilient systems. Resilience can be built against vulnerabilities like human factors, massive speed of the systems, protection, and storage of data and advanced persistent threats (ATPs). Artificial intelligence-based systems must be incorporated in societies and militaries along with mechanisms to strengthen the cybersecurity systems. A front runner in AI like the US has also expressed concerns over the need for modern equipment to operate on “internet-like networks” and subsequently increased vulnerabilities due to their applicability. Therefore, military modernization can happen effectively through cyber resiliency in military systems, network processes, and cyber architecture. A cyber-resilient system would enable the state to develop a system that would remain functional during a phishing attack. Steps like cyber deception, agility, and clone defense could increase resilience in the existing systems. This is important to understand in already lacking strategic stability, military systems based on artificial intelligence would be an ideal target of AI advanced persistent threats in South Asia.

Therefore, as the process of digitalization is increasing in the Pakistan-India equation, it is also becoming very important that both states should develop resilience in their cyber systems so that the technologies could give them an advantage rather than becoming a security peril for them.

### Politics DA---1NC

#### Infrastructure will pass now but can be derailed.

Laura Tyson & Lenny Mendonca 9-14-2021, Laura Tyson, former chair of the US president's Council of Economic Advisers, is professor of the Graduate School at the Haas School of Business and chair of the Blum Centre Board of Trustees at the University of California, Berkeley. Lenny Mendonca, senior partner emeritus at McKinsey & Company, is a former chief economic and business adviser to Governor Gavin Newsom of California and chair of the California High-Speed Rail Authority "Why America must go big on infrastructure," Jordan Times, https://www.jordantimes.com/opinion/project-syndicate/why-america-must-go-big-infrastructure

Economists across the political spectrum have long advocated an increase in infrastructure investment in the United States. Now, Congress is debating infrastructure spending packages that would secure the current economic recovery and boost potential growth over the next decade. Despite deep partisan divisions on most other issues, the Senate recently passed the $1 trillion Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) by a large majority. The bill now must pass the House of Representatives, where Speaker Nancy Pelosi has secured an agreement for a vote by the end of September. Approval looks likely but is by no means certain, given complete lack of support from House Republicans and ongoing divisions among House Democrats.

#### Antitrust reform requires PC and trades off with other legislative priorities.

Peter C. Carstensen 21, the Fred W. & Vi Miller Chair in Law Emeritus, University of Wisconsin Law School, February 2021, “THE “OUGHT” AND “IS LIKELY” OF BIDEN ANTITRUST,” https://www.concurrences.com/en/review/issues/no-1-2021/on-topic/the-new-us-antitrust-administration-en

14. Similarly, despite bipartisan murmurs about competitive issues, the potential in a closely divided Congress that any major initiatives will survive is limited at best. In part the challenge here is how the Biden administration will rank its commitments. If it were to make reform of competition law a major and primary commitment, it would have to trade off other goals, which might include health care reform or increases in the minimum wage. It is likely in this circumstance the new administration, like the Obama administration’s abandonment of the pro-competitive rules proposed under the PSA, would elect to give up stricter competition rules in order to achieve other legislative priorities.

15. Another key to a robust commitment to workable competition is the choice of cabinet and other key administrative positions. Here as well, the early signs are not entirely encouraging. In selecting Tom Vilsack to return as secretary of agriculture, the president has embraced a friend of the large corporate interests dominating agriculture who has spent the last four years in a highly lucrative position advancing their interests. Given the desperate need for pro-competitive rules to implement the PSA and control exploitation of dairy farmers through milk-market orders, the return of Vilsack is not good news. Who will head the FTC and who will be the attorney general and assistant attorney general for antitrust is still unknown, but if those picks are also centrists with strong links to corporate America the hope for robust enforcement of competition law will further attenuate!

16. In sum, this is a pessimistic prognostication for the likely Biden antitrust enforcement agenda. There is much that ought to be done. But this requires a willingness to take major enforcement risks, to invest significant political capital in the legislative process, and to select leaders who are committed to advancing the public interest in fair, efficient and dynamically competitive markets. The early signs are that the new administration will be no more committed to robust competition policy than the Obama administration. Events may force a more vigorous policy—I will cling to that hope as the Biden administration takes shape.

#### Infrastructure bill is key to revitalize the grid.

Riley ’21 — Tonya, Researcher and reporter at the Washington Post. "The Cybersecurity 202: Democrats' new infrastructure bill highlights cybersecurity concerns." Washington Post. 3-12-2021. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/03/12/cybersecurity-202-democrats-new-infrastructure-bill-highlights-cybersecurity-concerns/. accessed 3-17-2021 //ART

The House's new $312 billion infrastructure bill, as part of that push, aims to secure the country's most critical infrastructure – and increase the cybersecurity of essential services, including hospitals, broadband, and the electric grid. A recent string of high-profile cyberattacks pushed long-neglected cybersecurity issues to the center of national policy discussions. “The infrastructure in the United States is in sore need of updates and the fact that Congress is now recognizing the importance of upgrading not just physical infrastructure, but cybersecurity infrastructure is a sign of a new importance and awareness of cybersecurity,” says John Gilligan, president and CEO of the Center for Internet Security, a cybersecurity nonprofit. Key cyberse'curity-related investments in the bill include $10 billion to help hospitals guard against cyber criminals and roughly $3.5 billion for electric grid security. Mounting high-profile cybersecurity incidents have made the problem hard to ignore. “Over the last year, we’ve seen the devastating results of inaction: major power outages, water shortages, health care facilities stretched to the limit, and communities left behind due to the digital divide,” Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Frank Pallone Jr. (D-N.J.) said in a statement introducing the bill. In February, Florida police revealed that a hacker tried to poison the water supply of the town of Oldsmar. And although not the result of a cyberattack, the fallout of a mass grid failure in Texas raised alarms from researchers and lawmakers about cybersecurity weaknesses in America's power systems that could lead to a much worse outage. During the coronavirus pandemic, hospitals have been hit with a surge of dangerous attacks in which attackers locked up data and systems in exchange for a ransom, leaving hospital services unavailable. Congress is also scrambling to respond to a Russian attack on software company SolarWinds, which resulted in the hacking of at least nine federal agencies, as well as a recent Chinese-tied campaign against a vulnerability in Microsoft software. Both are used heavily by the government and critical industries including the energy sector. Biden last month signed an executive order requiring a review of the security of America's supply chains and is expected to sign another executive order addressing cybersecurity improvements in critical software systems. A bipartisan group of members of the House Committee on Homeland Security yesterday introduced a bill that would cement the role of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency in protecting critical infrastructure. Incidents such as the one in Florida are a wake-up call that the U.S. government needs to do more to defend critical infrastructure, said the committee's ranking Republican, Rep. John Katko (N.Y.), who led the bill. “These systems operate many vital components of our nation’s critical infrastructure and remain under constant attack from cyber criminals and nation state actors,” he said in a statement.

#### Grid resilience solves extinction—it’s a threat buffer and the impact is understated

Greene 19 (Sherrell R. Greene Mr. Greene received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Nuclear Engineering from the University of Tennessee. He is a recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development. Mr. Greene is widely acclaimed for his systems analysis, team building, innovation, knowledge organization, presentation, and technical communication skills. Mr. Greene worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades. During his career at ORNL, he served as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs. . "Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs)." https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true)

Societies and nations are examples of large-scale, complex social-physical systems. Thus, societal resilience can be defined as the ability of a nation, population, or society to anticipate and prepare for major stressors or calamities and then to absorb, adapt to, recover from, and restore normal functions in the wake of such events when they occur. A nation’s dependence on its Critical Infrastructure systems, and the resilience of those systems, are therefore major components of national and societal resilience. There are a variety of events that could deal crippling blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5 As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s. Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack. Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid. These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

## Advantage 1

### Anti-Trust Fails---1NC

#### Antitrust intervention in ag wrecks food security

Philip Watson & Jason Winfree, 21. Watson is an Associate Professor, Agriculture Economics & Rural Sociology at the University of Idaho. Winfree is an Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at the University of Idaho. "Should we use antitrust policies on big agriculture?" Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy (2021): 1-14.

Market control and food security/safety

Others argue that antitrust laws should be used in agricultural markets owing to the amount of control certain firms have in the food supply and the potential effect that this might have on food security and safety (Hendrickson et al., 2017). The market control concern is similar to the arguments being made to break up technology firms such as Google, Twitter, and Facebook, and is again somewhat subject to the scrutiny of contestability. While technology firms often have a large share of the social media market, these markets could be thought of as contestable, and consumers and competitors are free and able to switch platforms. It is difficult to say whether this is comparable in food markets. While many aspects of the food industry might be considered contestable, especially in the long term, large sunk costs may prevent some competition in some markets. Certainly, control of the food supply, or even widespread adoption of technology, can generate risk. For example, in 1970, over 80% of corn in United States was Texas cytoplasmic male sterile corn. This type of corn was susceptible to fungus (Southern corn leaf blight) and caused a drastic reduction in corn yield. If market concentration creates less genetic diversity, it is possible that this is a cost. However, the association between market concentration and food safety is not entirely clear and using antitrust with this intention would be complex. For example, as previously stated, large firms can often implement safety standards more easily. While controlling the food supply is certainly an incredible responsibility with an enormous downside potential, it is not clear how much actual power firms have and why this power would harm consumers. This may be an area of research that might help inform this policy process.

### AT: Their Ev

#### Says other policies are key---Emory reads yellow.

Howard & Hendrickson 21

[Philip & Mary, a faculty member in the Department of Community Sustainability at Michigan State University, Op-ed: Monopolies In the Food System Make Food More Expensive and Less Accessible. Civil Eats, 2-17-2021, <https://civileats.com/2021/02/17/op-ed-monopolies-in-the-food-system-make-food-more-expensive-and-less-accessible/>]

Agribusiness executives and government policymakers often praise the U.S. food system for producing abundant and affordable food. In fact, however, food costs are rising, and shoppers in many parts of the U.S. have limited access to fresh, healthy products. This isn’t just an academic argument. Even before the current pandemic, millions of people in the U.S. went hungry. In 2019, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that over 35 million people were “food insecure,” meaning they did not have reliable access to affordable, nutritious food. Now, food banks are struggling to feed people who have lost jobs and income thanks to COVID-19. As rural sociologists, we study changes in food systems and sustainability. We’ve closely followed corporate consolidation of food production, processing, and distribution in the U.S. over the past 40 years. In our view, this process is making food less available or affordable for many Americans. Fewer, Larger Companies Consolidation has placed key decisions about our nation’s food system in the hands of a few large companies, giving them outsized influence to lobby policymakers, direct food and industry research, and influence media coverage. These corporations also have enormous power to make decisions about what food is produced how, where and by whom, and who gets to eat it. We’ve tracked this trend across the globe. It began in the 1980s with mergers and acquisitions that left a few large firms dominating nearly every step of the food chain. Among the largest are retailer Walmart, food processor Nestlé, and seed/chemical firm Bayer. Some corporate leaders have abused their power–for example, by allying with their few competitors to fix prices. In 2020, Christopher Lischewski, the former president and CEO of Bumblebee Foods, was convicted of conspiracy to fix prices of canned tuna. He was sentenced to 40 months in prison and fined $100,000. In the same year, chicken processor Pilgrim’s Pride pleaded guilty to price-fixing charges and was fined $110.5 million. Meatpacking company JBS settled a $24.5 million pork price-fixing lawsuit, and farmers won a class action settlement against peanut-shelling companies Olam and Birdsong. Industry consolidation is hard to track. Many subsidiary firms often are controlled by one parent corporation and engage in “contract packing,” in which a single processing plant produces identical foods that are then sold under dozens of different brands–including labels that compete directly against each other. Recalls ordered in response to food-borne disease outbreaks have revealed the broad scope of contracting relationships. Shutdowns at meatpacking plants due to COVID-19 infections among workers have shown how much of the U.S. food supply flows through a small number of facilities. With consolidation, large supermarket chains have closed many urban and rural stores. This process has left numerous communities with limited food selections and high prices–especially neighborhoods with many low-income, Black or Latinx households. Widespread Hunger As unemployment has risen during the pandemic, so has the number of hungry Americans. Feeding America, a nationwide network of food banks, estimates that up to 50 million people– including 17 million children–may currently be experiencing food insecurity. Nationwide, demand at food banks grew by over 48 percent during the first half of 2020. Simultaneously, disruptions in food supply chains forced farmers to dump milk down the drain, leave produce rotting in fields, and euthanize livestock that could not be processed at slaughterhouses. We estimate that between March and May of 2020, farmers disposed of somewhere between 300,000 and 800,000 hogs and 2 million chickens–more than 30,000 tons of meat. What role does concentration play in this situation? Research shows that retail concentration correlates with higher prices for consumers. It also shows that when food systems have fewer production and processing sites, disruptions can have major impacts on supply. Consolidation makes it easier for any industry to maintain high prices. With few players, companies simply match each other’s price increases rather than competing with them. Concentration in the U.S. food system has raised the costs of everything from breakfast cereal and coffee to beer. As the pandemic roiled the nation’s food system through 2020, consumer food costs rose by 3.4 percent, compared to 0.4 percent in 2018 and 0.9 percent in 2019. We expect retail prices to remain high because they are “sticky,” with a tendency to increase rapidly but to decline more slowly and only partially. We also believe there could be further supply disruptions. A few months into the pandemic, meat shelves in some U.S. stores sat empty, while some of the nation’s largest processors were exporting record amounts of meat to China. U.S. Senators Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) and Cory Booker (D-NJ) cited this imbalance as evidence of the need to crack down on what they called “monopolistic practices” by Tyson Foods, Cargill, JBS, and Smithfield, which dominate the U.S. meatpacking industry. Tyson Foods responded that a large portion of its exports were “cuts of meat or portions of the animal that are not desired by” Americans. Store shelves are no longer empty for most cuts of meat, but processing plants remain overbooked, with many scheduling well into 2021. Toward a More Equitable Food System In our view, a resilient food system that feeds everyone can be achieved only through a more equitable distribution of power. This in turn will require action in areas ranging from contract law and antitrust policy to workers’ rights and economic development. Farmers, workers, elected officials, and communities will have to work together to fashion alternatives and change policies. The goal should be to produce more locally sourced food with shorter and less-centralized supply chains. Detroit offers an example. Over the past 50 years, food producers there have established more than 1,900 urban farms and gardens. A planned community-owned food co-op will serve the city’s North End, whose residents are predominantly low- and moderate-income and African American. The federal government can help by adapting farm support programs to target farms and businesses that serve local and regional markets. State and federal incentives can build community- or cooperative-owned farms and processing and distribution businesses. Ventures like these could provide economic development opportunities while making the food system more resilient. In our view, the best solutions will come from listening to and working with the people most affected: sustainable farmers, farm and food service workers, entrepreneurs, and cooperators– and ultimately, the people whom they feed.

### AT: Food Prices---1NC

#### 2008 price spike empirically denies the impact.

#### Food prices don’t cause conflict–reject their bad studies.

Demarest 15—PhD Researcher at the Centre for Research on Peace and Development [Leila, “Food price rises and political instability: Problematizing a complex relationship,” *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 27, No. 5, p. 650-671, Emory Libraries]

6. Conclusions and Way Forward

While some progress has been made in improving our understanding of the linkages between rising food prices and conflict, several important gaps remain. Firstly, notions of conflict and political instability are often used interchangeably, while these concepts and the relationships between them remain to some extent vague. The ‘food riot’ concept in particular leads to confusion. Although it is popularly seen as a violent rise of the masses, in reality, many peaceful events are gathered under this term, while violence is often committed by the state rather than by hungry consumers. The term also presupposes that food is the central issue at hand, which does not necessarily have to be the case. Many misunderstanding arise from the second gap identified in this paper: the uncritical data gathering based on international news reports. Not only are these remarkably inconsistent, they also make use of classifications which are not scientifically investigated. Finally, causal mechanisms in the relationship between rising food prices and conflict often remain assumptions in the literature and lack empirical foundation. Three crosscutting avenues for improvement therefore exist: better concept definitions, better data gathering, and more focus on contexts.

Clearly defined concepts and categorizations of conflict and instability are a necessary foundation for research on the linkages between rising food prices and conflict. For (food) protests in particular, purposeful categorizations require an enhanced insight in the events that took place on the ground. Local news sources for data gathering can prove to be more reliable than Western (English) media to accomplish this. Event descriptions are also likely to be more detailed in local sources, which allows for a first-hand qualitative analysis of causes and context.

As international food prices are likely to remain high, improving our understanding of the causal mechanisms which can lead to conflict remains crucial. We can draw important lessons from the literature on poverty and conflict, resource scarcity and conflict, and regime transition in Africa. The causal role of economic factors alone has continuously been questioned, and ‘context’ or prevailing political, economic, and social factors play a crucial role in the conflict outcome. The argument that adverse economic shocks seem more of a trigger to conflict rather than an important cause is not particularly remarkable in itself. Yet while many authors acknowledge this, the focus often remains on the trigger. Resource scarcity, climate change, population growth, or food insecurity often remain the starting point of analyses, with researchers consequently tracing the divergent (theoretical) possibilities for conflict. In the end, most admit that these factors do not automatically lead to conflict everywhere, and stress the importance of context. Because the theoretical possibilities for conflict are so large, however, the context factor remains rather understudied with as most agreed upon notions that elements of ‘grievance’ and ‘collective action’ are required.

It is hence important to focus more on the ‘contexts’ that can lead to conflict and, in doing so, to make the distinction between different forms of conflict. This also implies a data collection exercise. Contextual data are currently collected at the aggregate, national level, and only on a yearly basis, which can lead to spurious relations. While the use of these variables is increasingly questioned in civil war studies, we can also doubt their strength in the study of highly localized, one-time events such as riots. I particularly make the case for ‘bringing politics back in’. The policies taken by the government are crucial in the violent escalation of social conflict (e.g. accommodation versus repression), but the only variable currently in use to explain state behaviour seems to be the country-level regime type variable (Polity IV or Freedom House), which is also used with regards to highly localized conflicts. Other ways in which politics matter, can be the strength of the political opposition. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, for example, was probably better organized than other opposition groups to make use of economic unrest.

### AT: Food Wars---1NC

#### No resource conflict---countries cooperate.

Agha BAYRAMOV 18. PhD candidate and lecturer at the department of International Relations and International Organization of the University of Groningen. “Review: Dubious nexus between natural resources and conflict.” *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 9(1): 72-81. Emory Libraries.

The arguments of scarcity adherents have been challenged by a number of scholars in terms of qualitative and quantitative findings. According to Stern (2016) the assumptions underpinning the scarcity notion are illogical due to the exaggeration of threats arising from oil ownership from misperceptions of market information. Furthermore, Koubi et al. (2013) explain that despite their strong empirical explanations, scarcity scholars have weak quantitative research results ones that fail to prove the link between resource scarcity and intrastate or interstate conflict. The reason for this is that some large-N findings contradict early results, which illustrate that the scarcity-conflict nexus is more complicated than scarcity scholars would have us believe. Dinar (2011), meanwhile, argues that natural resource scarcity may in fact be an important force for cooperation between states. However, scholars of natural resource scarcity have hitherto ignored the ways in which scarcity can spur cooperation (Deudney, 1999).

Considering these findings, three conclusions can be drawn from this section. First, scarcity is a complex term and it should not be equated with only natural resources. As it is explained by Kester (2016) some countries may suffer from scarcity of technical, knowledge and human capacity rather than natural resources. In light of this, without a proper capacity it is also possible to have scarcity within abundancy of resources. While supporting the scarcity argument, Andrews-Speed (2015) offer an alternative explanation that natural resources are not physically scarce but there are indeed economic, political, environmental and equity barriers that can lead to a scarcity of natural resources. Due to the strong rule of law, decent neighbourly relations and existence of strong norms for compromise and of multilateral institutions, the North Atlantic countries are highly unlikely to utilize force against or declare war to each other. However, these dimensions and buffers are currently lacking in the Middle East, Africa and Asia. As such, the U.S and Europe should work closely with these regions to prevent any resource disputes erupting (Andrews-Speed 15). Similarly, Gleditsch (1998) explains that some highly developed countries have population density, clean water, and land degradation problems but they still do not suffer from environmental violence. Thus the main issue might be that poor economic development, rather than environmental scarcity, leads to conflict. Kester (2016) names this situation as “second-order-scarcity” which refers to a lack of technology, economic capacity, and knowledge to stop resource scarcity. In this regard, it may be scarcity, itself, rather than natural resources that leads to conflict.

Second, conflict can be defined differently based on different dimensions. However, the common consensus is that conflict consists of multiple dimensions (political, economic, environmental, historical, cultural, and geographical etc.) rather than single factor. In this regard, scarcity of natural resources is not strong enough, by itself, to induce either interstate or intrastate conflict. It needs in fact to interact with other variables. Finally, related to the previous reasons, scarcity of natural resources might be a contributing or marginal reason for rather than the root cause of a given conflict. In other words, it needs to interact with non-resource factors in order to cause violence.

## Advantage 2

### Anti-Trust Fails---1NC

#### Labor violations are an alt cause.

Nathan Rosenberg & Bryce Wilson Stucki, 21. Nate is a visiting scholar at the Harvard Food Law and Policy Clinic and an adjunct professor at the University of Iowa College of Law. Bryce is an independent journalist based in D.C. who writes about food and agriculture. “Don’t trust the antitrust narrative on farms.” 05.10.21 This post is part of our symposium on the Law and Political Economy of Meat. https://lpeproject.org/blog/dont-trust-the-antitrust-narrative-on-farms/

The mainstream **antitrust** movement is aware of these problems and will readily concede the need for greater labor protections. But their unmistakable focus is on farmers, which has led them to endorse a trickle-down theory of reform in which farmers, post trust-busting, will share the extra profits they capture with their workers. According to antitrust advocates Sandeep Vaheesan and Claire Kelloway, “Reducing the oppressive buyer power of massive retailers like Walmart, and dominant meat processors, like Tyson, would help return a larger share of the food dollar to producers, and, by extension, their workers.”

This sounds logical: if farmers had more money, they’d have more of it to share with their workers. But the data makes clear that **there is little to no relationship between farm profits and farm wages**. When farm profits spiked in the mid-2000s, wages stayed level. When profits hit new highs in the early 2010s, wages rose slightly, then climbed as profits fell again. Philip Martin, the scholar of farm labor, attributes the recent rise to a slowdown in immigration and state-level increases in the minimum wage, not increased generosity among hiring managers.

Research on meat processing and packing workers also cuts against the antitrust trickle-down theory. Scholars who have examined working conditions in meat processing and packing industries have found that the rapid dissolution of union power, not consolidation, is responsible for worsening pay and labor conditions. In fact, workers at large meatpacking plants enjoyed substantially higher wages than those at smaller companies prior to a collapse of unions in the 1980s and 1990s. Agricultural workers don’t need wealthier bosses, they need more rights—to unionize, to live free from harassment and mistreatment, to have decent food and housing, to collectively own the land they work.

#### The plan worsens market concentration and inequality.

Philip Watson & Jason Winfree, 21. Watson is an Associate Professor, Agriculture Economics & Rural Sociology at the University of Idaho. Winfree is an Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at the University of Idaho. "Should we use antitrust policies on big agriculture?" Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy (2021): 1-14.

Income inequality has been a primary goal of some advocates of an increase in antitrust enforcement. However, while helping small firms has been an ongoing economic policy goal in the United States, **using antitrust law is likely an inefficient way to achieve income equality** (Shapiro, 2018). In agriculture, this discussion is typically framed as large agricultural firms versus small agricultural firms. While the USDA has implemented numerous programs explicitly deigned to benefit small, beginning, and family farms (Katchova & Ahearn, 2015), there is sharp criticism that large farms are profiting at the expense of small farms (Bruckner, 2016). However, it is not clear whether using antitrust law is the most effectual mechanism to achieve this goal. Even if we are able to shift market shares from large producers to small producers, there are a number of problems in achieving income equality. First, even ignoring consumers, **it is not clear whether protecting small and/or family farms would increase income equality** among agricultural producers. For example, large firms do not necessary [sic] have higher incomes per employee (Brown & Medoff, 1989). Low-income workers may bear some of the burden of breaking up large agricultural firms. In other words, it is quite possible that there is a negative correlation between profit per worker and the size of the farm, in which case **protecting smaller farms may worsen income inequality**. Second, it has been shown that the incomes of small farms are, on average, higher than non-farm incomes (Lusk, 2016). This implies that food consumers are poorer than food producers. Ma et al. (2021) show that for developing countries, consolidation into larger farms can have an overall positive effect while hurting rural households. However, in developed countries, it is not obvious that market concentration exacerbates overall income inequality. It is likely that increasing agricultural output prices to help small farmers will hurt an even more vulnerable population of low income food consumers. If the goal is income equality, certainly the poorest are of the utmost importance. Given Engel's law and the obvious importance of food, changes in the food supply can heavily influence the well-being of the most poor. In this situation, protecting smaller farms will exacerbate rather than alleviate the problem of income inequality. Third, there may be a misconception about what consolidation means. For example, according to the USDA, in the United States in 2019, almost 98% of farms were family farms, and 90% are small family farms with less than $350,000 in gross cash farm income. So, many of the farms that are being consolidated are being consolidated into other family farms. While some of the rhetoric may focus on large corporations in the agricultural industry, policies are likely to have a negative effect on some family farms as well.

#### Small farms fail.

Ted Nordhaus & Dan Blaustein-Rejto, 21. Ted Nordhaus, Executive Director, Breakthrough Institute and Dan Blaustein-Rejto, Director, Food and Agriculture, Breakthrough Institute, “Small Farms, Big Pollution,” Foreign Policy, June 2, 2021. https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/06/02/big-agriculture-pollution-small-farms-inefficient/, accessed 6-8-21]

Consider the negative impacts that nitrogen pollution from the American corn belt has had on the Gulf of Mexico. Most of that runoff comes from industrial farms for the simple reason that large-scale, intensive production is the dominant form of agriculture across the region. Shifting production to organic practices, though, wouldn’t much change the situation. Organic farms are typically associated with higher rates of runoff per calorie of food produced, even as they require more land. So unless total production were very substantially scaled back, a corn belt dominated by organic farms rather than conventional ones would require more land while having similar or even greater impacts on waterways and biodiversity.

### Their Ev

#### Too late. Yellow.

Grimes 17 (Warren, Irving D & Florence Rosenberg Professor of Law, Southwestern Law School, “ENTREPRENEURIAL CHOICE: RESTORING A RELEVANT ANTITRUST POLICY”, Case Western Reserve Law Review, Vol. 68, No. 1) DB

In 1890, and for at least the three decades that followed, agriculture and the Sherman Act were joined at the hip. Rural Americans were a key constituency pressing for antitrust legislation-support that was illustrated by the frequent references to agriculture in congressional debates. 7 Key targets were processors and the rail industry that transported goods to processors." What followed were key enforcement initiatives directed at railroads," meat packing,40 tobacco," and oil.42 The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 further buttressed the enforcement framework intended to protect competition considered vital for farmers and ranchers.43 By the mid-twentieth century, agriculture was no longer the focus of antitrust enforcement. Even private enforcement actions that might have aided small farmers fell on hard times44 as the Supreme Court stiffened procedural and substantive requirements. In Cargill, Inc. v. Monfort of Colorado, Inc.,45 the Court did not address buyer-power issues and followed simplistic Chicago School logic in reversing a lower court decision that would have thwarted further consolidation of the beef packing industry.46 Levels of concentration tolerated in seller-power industries are anathema when the same firms exercise buyer power over vulnerable, atomistic sellers. Plant and animal products that spoil or become less valuable after a prime selling time increase the vulnerability of a small seller to a powerful buyer. 7 Geographic limits on buyer markets are a critical issue for farmers and ranchers. That meat processing plants may be relatively unconcentrated in national terms is irrelevant to a rancher who must find a buyer quickly and, because of substantial transportation costs, in a relatively limited geographic area. The farmer's vulnerability to powerful buyers is borne out by a model that showed prices received by a hog farmer dropped in direct correlation to the degree of concentration among meat packers." Today, meat processing is highly concentrated nationally, and even more so when one considers the limited geographic market available for those selling livestock." Choice of product is also an issue. Many consumers prefer to eat beef from cattle raised on a natural grass-fed diet. 0 The market, however, can be distorted by the power of oligopolistic processors. In the United States, industrial ranching practices call for cattle, around one year of age, to be removed from pastures where they consumed a biologically suited grass diet." They are then stacked into two story trucks and transported for up to twenty hours with no food or drink to crowded feedlots that contain up to 18,000 cattle.52 From this point on, the animals can no longer graze, but are fed diets consisting of corn and soybeans, sometimes supplemented with candy to increase animal weight, the slaughterhouse remains of chickens, pigs, or other cows, plastic pellets to add the fiber that would be in the natural grass diet, and even waste material taken from a chicken coop consisting of chicken feed and manure. The animals can also be dosed with hormones and antibiotics to prevent disease and promote growth. 61 In feed lots, they stand in areas of as little as twenty-three square feet per animal, the equivalent of a four-foot by six-foot enclosure, with no vegetation, a great deal of manure, and often lots of mud. Life in a feeding station can be from three months to a year before they are taken to a slaughterhouse." These industrial practices are, in a narrow sense, efficient, and at least some of these savings may be passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices. Cattle raised in accord with industrial practices can be brought to slaughter weight as much as a year more quickly than an animal that stays on a natural, grass-fed diet. The beef from a grassfed animal, with no antibiotics added to its diet, can cost up to $3 more per pound, a reflection of the longer growth period and greater space requirements for the grass-fed animal." Using industrial methods, more cattle can be raised with a smaller land and labor footprint, so more beef can be supplied. The short-sighted industrial efficiency that prevails in beef production also governs in poultry. In the United States, the raising of chickens still is a hands-on job done by hundreds of small entrepreneurs who contract with a handful of very large chicken processors and distributors. Many find they are indebted to the processors for the costs of their equipment, are forced to upgrade their facilities at substantial cost, and-short of bankruptcy-must continue to struggle under oppresssive conditions for themselves and their livestock. 7 These conditions led one economist to compare the chicken farmer's plight to economic serfdom." At the other end of the chain, factory-commoditized chicken is available in supermarkets at relatively low prices, but consumer choice and quality is limited. The efficiencies of raising animals in crowded industrial conditions are open to question. There is evidence that free range chickens that can eat bugs, grubs, and worms as part of a natural diet produce smaller but more nutritious eggs, and that their eggs have thicker shells less prone to breakage." The workers who work with free-range chickens reportedly have fewer respiratory health issues than those who work in crowded chicken coops. 0 Many of the additional costs to industrial farming are external costs that are passed on to society, among them the degradation of antibiotics that are fed to animals and ingested in small doses each time a consumer eats the meat. 1 Other external costs are the environmental burden on society from the fecal dust and unwelcome odors emanating from feed lots, the burden of disposing of large amounts of concentrated animal waste, and even the social welfare benefits that must be paid to some of the contract farmers or their employees because of poverty level income.62 Some farmers have refused to follow industrial farming practices and raise animals following centuries old animal husbandry practices. They have an opportunity for success as fast food chains and supermarkets begin to offer alternatives to meat produced through industrial farming practices. The story, however, does not end here. The labels "organic," "natural," or "free range" have to some degree been coopted by large meat processors, who still find ways of short cutting traditional animal husbandry practices and selling their products with such labels. Chickens stuffed into crowded hen houses are given a small outside area to escape, then are sold as "free range."6" They are advertised as having no "antibiotics" added to their food, but cannot eat the natural diet of grubs, bugs, and worms that would produce eggs with thicker shells and the dark yellow yolks of a traditional free range chicken. These eggs might more accurately be labeled "industrial organic."6 These practices border on deceptive. Leaving aside any consumer-protection issue, industrial organic farming makes it more difficult for a farmer and processor desiring to use traditional husbandry practices. Retailers that might otherwise be persuaded to carry the farmer's genuinely organic animal products will be pressured to carry instead the mass-produced industrial "organics." These woes are compounded by federal regulation, which is designed to fit the industrial processor's practices. For example, dominant chicken processors slaughter poultry in a large industrial facility that must meet USDA requirements for impermeable, white washed walls and antiseptic conditions.65 It is difficult for a small chicken farmer raising chickens under more natural conditions to satisfy these requirements. The regulations do not require measuring the actual bacterial content of the slaughtered animals, which would seem the most relevant test.66 A small-volume organic processor may choose to slaughter the animals in a natural outdoor facility, which many believe results in the lowest bacteria exposure. That processor, however, may be out of compliance because it has no walls to white wash and treat with antiseptic chemicals. 7 The genuine organic farmer or processor risks closure or operation as a rogue facility." These regulatory obstacles are outside the reach of antitrust authorities. At the same time, timid merger enforcement was complicit in creating the oligopolistic conditions that surround USDA regulation. Regulators of meat products respond to the industry, but presumably do not seek to change its structure or the power distribution within that industry. Consider how food regulation might differ if a large percentage of meat products-say 20 percent or more-were raised, slaughtered, and brought to market in accord with more traditional animal husbandry practices. A less concentrated processing industry would likely respond more flexibly to consumer demand, offering more choices. USDA regulation that is now designed for large plant meat processing would be forced to adjust to consumer demand for organic farming practices. The Justice Department, in its 2012 report on competition in agriculture, acknowledged special monopsony issues in agriculture mergers. 9 That report, however, stopped well short of recognizing the unique vulnerability of the small producer to monopsony power and the need for more stringent controls of mergers that increase buying power. The Cargill case is a classic case of neglect of the buyer-power issue. 70 Seen only from a short-term consumer price perspective, further concentration of beef packers may have seemed benign. From the perspective of cattle ranchers or consumers wishing more choice in how cattle are raised and slaughtered, the picture is starkly altered. The merging firms could, by reducing a rancher's alternatives, place downward pressure on prices paid for cattle. If only a portion of the reduced costs were passed on to consumers, the oligopolistic beef packers could expect higher margins and profits. The Justice Department Report also failed to recognize the difficulties faced by affected producers who might seek antitrust relief. Most contract farmers, for example, are afraid to act publicly to question the actions of the processor on whom they depend. The class action enforcement vehicle is becoming less viable as the Supreme Court has made rulings that limit the availability of class action relief. The Court's decision in American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurantn invites processors to insert no-class-action clauses in their contracts with farmers to prevent both arbitration and litigation on a class action basis. 72 Changes in substantive law add to these difficulties. The Supreme Court's decision in Weyerhaeuser Co. v. Ross Simons Hardwood Lumber Co., Inc.73 created a heavy burden on any atomistic seller alleging predatory buying practices.74 These changes in the law governing private enforcement of the Sherman Act place increased importance on prophylactic merger enforcement that could lessen the occurrence of power abuses in agriculture. The question remains whether invigorated enforcement, assuming it were to occur, would be too late to preserve or restore a competitive market structure.

### AT: ABR---1NC

#### ABR won’t get close to extinction, intervening actors solve it, their internal link can’t

Ed Cara 17, science writer for The Atlantic, Newsweek, and Vocativ, 1/27/17, “The Attack Of The Superbugs,” http://www.vocativ.com/394419/attack-of-the-superbugs/

Antibiotic-resistant infections kill at least 700,000 people worldwide a year right now, according to an exhaustive report commissioned by the UK in 2014, and without any substantial medical breakthroughs or policy changes that slow down resistance, they may claim some 10 million deaths annually by 2050 — eclipsing cancer in general as a leading cause. These deaths largely won’t come from pan-resistant infections, just tougher ones. A preventable death there, a preventable death here. Leaving that aside, antibiotics, along with proper sanitation and nutrition, gird our entire way of living. Most every invasive surgery, pregnancy, organ transplant and chemotherapy session we go through will become riskier. Other diseases like HIV, malaria or influenza will become deadlier, since bacteria often exploit the opening in our immune system they leave behind. And already precarious populations like those living with cystic fibrosis, prisoners, and the poor will lose years off their lives. For all the warranted gloom, though, Farewell does think there are reasons to be hopeful. “I don’t think we are doing enough, but the scientific community along with many governmental and private foundations are very actively involved in finding not only new antibiotics, but new solutions to this problem,” she said. There’s been a noticeable change in attitude and increased urgency surrounding antibiotic resistance, she said, one that she hadn’t seen even five years ago, let alone twenty. Until recently, that attitude change could be seen from places as high up as the U.S. federal government. In 2014, former President Obama issued an executive order aimed at addressing antibiotic resistance, the first real acknowledgement of the problem from an administration, devoting funding and outlining a national action for combatting resistance. Through its federal agencies, the administration pushed to reduce antibiotic use on farms and encouraged doctors to stop using them in excess. “There has been a lot of work done the last couple of years, much of it spurned by [Obama’s] National Action Plan,” said Dr. David Hyun, a senior officer for Pew Charitable Trusts’ Antibiotic Resistance Project. The CDC, in particular, has used its funding to open up regional labs that allow them to better detect and respond to antibiotic-resistant outbreaks like the Nevada case, he said. They ultimately hope to create an expansive surveillance system that can easily keep track of resistance rates on a national, state and regional level. A parallel system also exists for monitoring resistance in the food chain, shepherded by the CDC and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In fact, it was this sort of cooperation between national and local health agencies that enabled Nevada doctors to stop the worst from happening, said Dr. Lei Chen. The swift identification of a possible CRE strain by the hospital, coupled with the woman’s medical history, led to a precautionary quarantine, while also prompting Chen’s public health department and eventually the CDC into action. And it may help prevent future cases from spilling into the public. According to Chen, the CDC has allocated funding this year to all of Nevada’s state public health departments so they can better detect CRE and other dangerous resistant strains. Under the Trump administration, there’s no telling how these small victories will hold up or whether they will advance. All references to antibiotics once found on the Whitehouse.gov site have been removed, including a link to the Obama administration’s national action plan, and the fact that they’re already tried to bar USDA scientists from discussing their work with the public while stripping funding from other public health agencies isn’t encouraging. Even with the best public policy, however, there’s no clear light at the end of the tunnel. Antibiotic resistance has gradually been worsening, even within the last 15 to 20 years, when superbugs like methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) first became widely known, said Hyun. The effort needed to develop new drugs has been in short supply, hamstrung by pharmaceutical companies’ inability to recoup the costs of bringing new antibiotics to market. That’s because, unlike the latest heart medication, any new antibiotics will have to be treated like the last drops of water during a drought, used as little as possible — the exact opposite way to make money off a new product. Yet, much like climate change, the financial toll of not doing anything will total in the trillions years down the road. And it already numbers in the billions now, according to the CDC. Of course, we need bacteria to survive. And most need or pay no mind to us in return. Even pan-resistant bacteria don’t really mean harm. Some have been found in perfectly healthy people, a fact that’ll either comfort you or keep you awake at night, only causing problems when our immune system wavers. There’s no army of sentient E. coli that will rise up and someday overthrow the human race. But barring the calvary showing up, a new fear of ours will learn to settle in, almost unnoticed. It’ll creep in when we pick our heads up from a nasty fall that scrapes our skin open or breaks our bones; when we wave goodbye to our loved ones before they enter an operating room, or when we cradle our newborns into a world teeming with the living infinitesimal, wishing there was still a way to shield them from it as our parents once could for us. A fear of naked vulnerability. The antibiotic apocalypse will be gentle, if it fully arrives, but it won’t be any less devastating to the human spirit.

#### No superbugs.

Drew SMITH 16. Former R&D director, MicroPhage and SomaLogic. “The Myth Of The Post-Antibiotic Era.” Forbes. June 14. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2016/06/14/the-myth-of-the-post-antibiotic-era/#db027696fa83>.

The worst-case scenario would be that it would be like 1940, only without a raging World War. Keep in mind that by 1940, before the introduction of penicillin, deaths from infectious diseases in the US had been reduced by 90% from their 19th century levels [1]. This reduction was entirely due to the provisions of clean food, water, and vaccines. We have (or should have) better systems for delivering these public health goods than we did 75 years ago.

But there is never going to be a post-antibiotic era. Antibiotic therapy will continue to be effective most of the time. If antibiotic therapy is informed by rapid microbiology testing, then it will be effective nearly all of the time. Very few bugs are, or will be, pan-resistant and untreatable by antibiotics. Even the worst superbugs—MRSAs, CREs, ESBLs, and now MCR-1s—are almost always susceptible to at least one clinically useful antibiotic (XDR TB is the most troubling exception to this rule).

What has changed is that resistance to at least one first-line antibiotic is now common, and doctors will have to become smarter about their prescribing practices. They can no longer mindlessly write scripts based on signs and symptoms alone and expect good results every time. Doctors consistently underestimate local levels of resistance, and exhibit high levels of complacency about the impacts of resistance on their practices [2] [3] [4] . This culture of complacency will have to change.

Antibiotics will continue to be effective, but our traditional method of prescribing them, called empiric therapy [5], will become increasingly ineffective. This will require a change in the way that we use antibiotics, but will not be an end to the usefulness of antibiotics. That is an important distinction to keep in mind when reading articles about the coming antibiotic apocalypse: change, yes; the end, no.

# 2NC

### Framework Top---2NC

#### 4. The aff is utopian. Criticism is a prerequisite to formulating new solutions.

Paul Mason 7-17-15. Writer of Live Working or Die Fighting: How the Working Class Went Global and [PostCapitalism: A Guide to our Future](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PostCapitalism:_A_Guide_to_our_Future). Culture and Digital Editor of Channel 4 News. Visiting Professor at the University of Wolverhampton. Bachelors in Music and Politics from the University of Sheffield. "The end of capitalism has begun," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun

The power of imagination will become critical. In an information society, no thought, debate or dream is wasted – whether conceived in a tent camp, prison cell or the table football space of a startup company. As with virtual manufacturing, in the transition to postcapitalism the work done at the design stage can reduce mistakes in the implementation stage. And the design of the postcapitalist world, as with software, can be modular. Different people can work on it in different places, at different speeds, with relative autonomy from each other. If I could summon one thing into existence for free it would be a global institution that modelled capitalism correctly: an open source model of the whole economy; official, grey and black. Every experiment run through it would enrich it; it would be open source and with as many datapoints as the most complex climate models. The main contradiction today is between the possibility of free, abundant goods and information; and a system of monopolies, banks and governments trying to keep things private, scarce and commercial. Everything comes down to the struggle between the network and the hierarchy: between old forms of society moulded around capitalism and new forms of society that prefigure what comes next. ... Is it utopian to believe we’re on the verge of an evolution beyond capitalism? We live in a world in which gay men and women can marry, and in which contraception has, within the space of 50 years, made the average working-class woman freer than the craziest libertine of the Bloomsbury era. Why do we, then, find it so hard to imagine economic freedom? It is the elites, cut off in their dark-limo world, whose project looks forlorn It is the elites – cut off in their dark-limo world – whose project looks as forlorn as that of the millennial sects of the 19th century. The democracy of riot squads, corrupt politicians, magnate-controlled newspapers and the surveillance state looks as phoney and fragile as East Germany did 30 years ago. All readings of human history have to allow for the possibility of a negative outcome. It haunts us in the zombie movie, the disaster movie, in the post-apocalytic wasteland of films such as [*The Road*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/movie/131971/road) or [*Elysium*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/aug/22/elysium-review). But why should we not form a picture of the ideal life, built out of abundant information, non-hierarchical work and the dissociation of work from wages? Millions of people are beginning to realise they have been sold a dream at odds with what reality can deliver. Their response is anger – and retreat towards national forms of capitalism that can only tear the world apart. Watching these emerge, from the pro-Grexit left factions in Syriza to the [Front National](https://www.theguardian.com/world/marine-le-pen) and the isolationism of the American right has been like watching the nightmares we had during the [Lehman Brothers](https://www.theguardian.com/business/lehmanbrothers) crisis come true. We need more than just a bunch of utopian dreams and small-scale horizontal projects. We need a project based on reason, evidence and testable designs, that cuts with the grain of history and is sustainable by the planet. And we need to get on with it.

#### 5. Invert your standard for solvency. That’s enough to vote neg, even if the alt solves nothing.

Eugene McCarraher 19. Associate Professor of Humanities at Villanova University, PhD in US Cultural and Intellectual History from Rutgers University; The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became the Religion of Modernity, 11/12/19, p. 15-18

Words such as “paradise” or “love” or “communion” are certainly absent from our political vernacular, excluded on account of their “utopian” connotations or their lack of steely-eyed “realism.” Although this is a book about the past, I have always kept before me its larger contemporary religious, philosophical, and political implications. The book should make these clear enough; I will only say here that one of my broader intentions is to challenge the canons of “realism,” especially as defined in the “science” of economics. As the master science of desire in advanced capitalist nations, economics and its acolytes define the parameters of our moral and political imaginations, patrolling the boundaries of possibility and censoring any more generous conception of human affairs. Under the regime of neoliberalism, it has been the chief weapon in the arsenal of what David Graeber has characterized as “a war on the imagination,” a relentless assault on our capacity to envision an end to the despotism of money.24 Insistent, in Margaret Thatcher’s ominous ukase, that “there is no alternative” to capitalism, our corporate plutocracy has been busy imposing its own beatific vision on the world: the empire of capital, with an imperial aristocracy enriched by the labor of a fearful, overburdened, and cheerfully servile population of human resources. Every avenue of escape from accumulation and wage servitude must be closed, or better yet, rendered inconceivable; any map of the world that includes utopia must be burned before it can be glanced at. Better to follow Miller’s wisdom: we already inhabit paradise, and we can never make ourselves fit to live in it if we obey the avaricious and punitive sophistry professed in the dismal pseudoscience. The grotesque ontology of scarcity and money, the tawdry humanism of acquisitiveness and conflict, the reduction of rationality to the mercenary principles of pecuniary reason—this ensemble of falsehoods that comprise the foundation of economics must be resisted and supplanted. Economics must be challenged, not only as a sanction for injustice but also as a specious portrayal of human beings and a fictional account of their history. As a legion of anthropologists and historians have repeatedly demonstrated, economics, in Graeber’s forthright dismissal, has “little to do with anything we observe when we examine how economic life is actually conducted.” From its historically illiterate “myth of barter” to its shabby and degrading claims about human nature, economics is not just a dismal but a fundamentally fraudulent science as well, akin, as Ruskin wrote in Unto This Last, to “alchemy, astrology, witchcraft, and other such popular creeds.”25 Ruskin’s courageous and bracing indictment of economics arose from his Romantic imagination, and this book partakes unashamedly of his sacramental Romanticism. “Imagination” was, to the Romantics, primarily a form of vision, a mode of realism, an insight into the nature of reality that was irreducible to, but not contradictory of, the knowledge provided by scientific investigation. Romantic social criticism did not claim the imprimatur of science as did Marxism and other modern social theories, yet the Romantic lineage of opposition to “disenchantment” and capitalism has proved to be more resilient and humane than Marxism, “progressivism,” or social democracy. Indeed, it is more urgently relevant to a world hurtling ever faster to barbarism and ecological calamity. I wrote this book in part out of a belief that many on the “left” continue to share far too much with their antagonists: an ideology of “progress” defined as unlimited economic growth and technological development, as well as an acceptance of the myth of disenchantment that underwrites the pursuit of such expansion. The Romantic antipathy to capitalism, mechanization, and disenchantment stemmed not from a facile and nostalgic desire to return to the past, but from a view that much of what passed for “progress” was in fact inimical to human flourishing: a specious productivity that required the acceptance of venality, injustice, and despoliation; a technological and organizational efficiency that entailed the industrialization of human beings; and the primacy of the production of goods over the cultivation and nurturance of men and women. This train of iniquities followed inevitably from the chauvinism of what William Blake called “single vision,” a blindness to the enormity of reality that led to a “Babylon builded in the waste.”26 Romantics redefined rather than rejected “realism” and “progress,” drawing on the premodern customs and traditions of peasants, artisans, and artists: craftsmanship, mutual aid, and a conception of property that harkened back to the medieval practices of “the commons.” Whether they believed in some traditional form of religion or translated it into secular idioms of enchantment, such as “art” or “beauty” or “organism,” Romantic anticapitalists tended to favor direct workers’ control of production; the restoration of a human scale in technics and social relations; a sensitivity to the natural world that precluded its reduction to mere instrumental value; and an apotheosis of pleasure in making sometimes referred to as poesis, a union of reason, imagination, and creativity, an ideal of labor as a poetry of everyday life, and a form of human divinity. In work free of alienation and toil, we receive “the reward of creation,” as William Morris described it through a character in News from Nowhere (1890), “the wages that God gets, as people might have said time agone.”27 Rendered gaudy and impoverished by the tyranny of economics and the enchantment of neoliberal capitalism, our sensibilities need replenishment from the sacramental imagination. As Americans begin to experience the initial stages of imperial sclerosis and decline, and as the advanced capitalist world in general discovers the reality of ecological limits, we may find in what Marx called the “prehistory” of our species a perennial and redemptive wisdom. We will not be saved by our money, our weapons, or our technological virtuosity; we might be rescued by the joyful and unprofitable pursuits of love, beauty, and contemplation. No doubt this will all seem foolish to the shamans and magicians of pecuniary enchantment. But there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of on Wall Street or in Silicon Valley.

### AT: Perm Do Both---2NC

#### 3. Any combination poisons the alt.

William Curran 16. Editor for the Antitrust Bulletin. Commitment and betrayal: Contradictions in American democracy, capitalism, and antitrust laws. Antitrust Bulletin. 2016. 61(2): 246

Scholars now link antitrust with distributional values. 11 Professor Anthony B. Atkinson wants antitrust to value the individual,1 12 recognizing as Hand did in Alcoa1 13 that "among the purposes of Congress in 1890 was a desire to put an end to great aggregations of capital because of the helplessness of the individual before them." 1 14 And it is the individual-rich and poor, but especially the poor-whom Atkinson wants to protect from the inequities of the marketplace.115 Atkinson sees as Senator John Sherman did in 1890 that the "problems that may disturb [the] social order ... none is more threatening than the inequality of condition of wealth, and opportunity that has grown within a single generation out of the concentration of capital into vast combinations to control production and trade to break down competition." 11 6 Sherman's and Hand's worries were certainly not Bork's. Hand said it best in Alcoa, "[W]e have been speaking only of the economic reasons which forbid monopoly ... [but] there are others, based upon the belief that great industrial consolidations are inherently undesirable, regardless of their economic results.",1 1 7 Bork-regardless of destructive results to democracy-would never find efficient economic results inherently undesirable. Bork would likely find democracy a "cornucopia of social values, all rather vague and undefined but infinitely attractive."iiS A definition that was surely meant to disparage, fails. What makes democracy attractive is its socially related values. 11 9 What makes it infinitely attractive are its regenerative capacities and potential for self-definition. 120 Bork blocked democracy's values so as not to tempt liberal judges. He worried needlessly. An antitrust solution to wealth's severe inequality is simply not plausible. 121 Antitrust has always been the heart of capitalism's ideology. 122 In truth, antitrust's distribution of wealth for the wealthy is more than ideology-it is heartless reality. So was Bork right? Are the fates of capitalism and antitrust intertwined? 123 And if antitrust were repealed? Professor Atkinson wants antitrust saved and used for citizens.124 But like Professors Stiglitz, Krugman, and Reich, he has fallen headfirst into antitrust's heartless ideological trap. And like the other three he would resurrect TR's trust-busting for the twenty-first century. Piketty avoids ideological traps. He learns the facts of history-unencumbered by ideologies like Bork's-and has an unobstructed vision 125 of the unequal and democratically destructive wealth of capitalism. Bork's antitrust is the wrong policy tool for a nation presumed to be dedicated to serving citizens equitably. 126

### AT: Cap is Sustainable

#### 1. Energy--- Mineral cycles make it impossible---that’s Allinson---copper, lithium, manganese hit bottlenecks.

Nafeez Ahmed 20 M.A. in contemporary war & peace studies and a DPhil (April 2009) in international relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University. Capitalism Will Ruin the Earth By 2050, Scientists Say. Vice. 10-21-2020. https://www.vice.com/en/article/v7m48d/capitalism-will-ruin-the-earth-by-2050-scientists-say

Endless growth will generate minerals scarcity within decades

The EV transition is, in short, a massive industrial project. Electrification of roads and rail will require upgraded smart grids, complex routes connected to high power lines, and regular battery-swap stations. The paper explores several scenarios to explore how such a transition would take place.

In a continuing GDP growth scenario, the authors note that the economy begins to stagnate “due to peak oil limits at around 2025-2040,” but GDP is able to continue growing thanks to the EV transition. This shows that the reduction in liquid fuels in transportation can play a powerful role in avoiding “energy shortages in the economy as a whole.”

But then the economy hits the limits of mineral and material production to sustain this electric transition—in just three decades. And this is even with high levels of minerals recycling.

By 2050, in this scenario, the EV transition will “require higher amounts of copper, lithium and manganese than current reserves. For the cases of copper and manganese the depletion is mainly due to the demand from the rest of the economy,” but most lithium demand “is for EV batteries,” and this alone “depletes its estimated global reserves.”

Mineral depletion takes place even with “a very high increase in recycling rates” in a continuing GDP growth scenario.

In one such scenario, the authors apply what they consider to be realistic upper level recycling rates of 57 percent, 30 percent and 74 percent to copper, lithium and manganese respectively. These are based on extremely optimistic projections of recycling capabilities relative to their costs.

But still they find that even these high recycling rates wouldn’t prevent depletion of all current estimated reserves by 2050. The conclusion corroborates findings of other studies, estimating an expected bottleneck for lithium by 2042-2045 and for manganese by 2038-2050.

Actual bottlenecks could come even earlier because existing studies—including the MEDEAS model—don’t account for material requirements needed for internal wiring, the EV motor, EV chargers, building and maintaining the grid to connect and charge EV batteries, the catenaries to electrify the railways, as well as inherent difficulties in recycling metals.

#### 2. Renewables--- can’t reverse capital’s heavy metal use or nuclear waste – extinction

Jamie Allinson et al 21. Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Chapter 1: M-C-M’ and the Death Cult. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963

Fossil capital is but one modality of the death cult, albeit a paragon. The ‘externalities’ of capital – climate chaos, biosphere destruction, resource depletion, topsoil erosion, ocean acidification, mass extinction, the accumulation of chemical, heavy metal, biological and nuclear wastes – extend far beyond the specific catastrophe of a carbonised atmosphere. Capitalism is a comprehensive system of work-energetics. The food industry, which powers waged labour, and is key to the shifting value of labour-power itself, is as central to the deterioration of the biosphere as is fossil-fuelled transit. Nonetheless, the continuing decision for fossil fuels as a solution to the energy demands of capitalist production, for all the growing denial of climate-change denial among the antivulgarian ruling class, for all their concerned mouth music, is an exemplary case of the capitalist imperative of competitive accumulation at work.

#### 3. Innovation. Profit stifles innovation Propriety rights, no incentive for R&D.

Vanessa A .Bee 18 Senior Litigation Counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a JD from Harvard Law. Innovation Under Socialism. 10-24-2018. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2018/10/innovation-under-socialism>

But prioritizing profit is a double-edged sword that can hamper innovation. Owning the proprietary rights allows private firms to block workers—through anti-competitive tools like non-compete agreements, patents, and licenses—who put labor into the innovation process from applying the extensive technical expertise and intimate understanding of the product to improve the innovation substantially. This becomes especially relevant once the workers leave the firm division in which they worked, or leave the firm altogether. Understandably, this lack of control and ownership will cause some workers, however passionate they may be about a project, to be less willing to maximize their contribution to the innovation.

Of course, the so-called nimbleness that allows firms to make drastic changes like mass layoffs is extremely harmful to the workers. This is no fluke. The capitalist economy thrives on a reserve army of labor. Inching closer to full employment makes workers scarcer, which empowers the labor force as a whole to bargain for higher wages and better work conditions. These threaten the firm’s bottom line. So, the capitalist economy is structured to maintain the balance of power towards the owners of capital. Positions that pay well (and less than well) come with the precariousness of at-will employment and disappearing union power. A constant pool of unemployed labor is maintained through layoffs and other tactics like higher interest rates, which the government will compel to help slow growth and thereby hiring. This system harms the potential for innovation, too.

The fear of losing work can dissuade workers from taking risks, experimenting, or speaking up as they identify items that could improve a taken approach—all actions that foster innovation. Meanwhile, thousands of individuals who could be contributing to the innovative process are instead involuntarily un-employed. This model also encourages monopolization, as concentrating market power gives private firms the most control over how much profit they can extract. But squashing competition that could contribute fresh ideas hurts every phase of the innovation process, while giving workers in fewer workplaces space to innovate.

Deferring to profit causes many areas of R&D to go unexplored. Private firms have less reason to invest in innovations likely to be made universally available for free if managers or investors do not see much upside for the firm’s bottom line. In theory, the slack in private research can be picked up by the public sector. In reality, however, decades of austerity measures  threaten the public’s ability to underwrite risky and inefficient research. Both the Democratic and Republican parties increasingly adhere to a neoliberal ideology that vilifies “big government,” promotes running government like a business, pretends that government budgets should mirror household budgets or the private firm’s balance sheet, and rams privatization under the guises of so-called public-private partnerships and private subcontractors.

In the United States, public investment in R&D has been trending downward. As documented in a 2014 report from the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, “[f]rom 2010 to 2013, federal R&D spending fell from $158.8 to $133.2 billion … Between 2003 and 2008, state funding for university research, as a share of GDP, dropped on average by 2 percent. States such as Arizona and Utah saw decreases of 49 percent and 24 percent respectively.” Even if public investment in the least profitable aspect of research suddenly surged, in our current model, the private sector continues to be the primary driver of development, production, and distribution. Where there remains little potential for profit, private firms will be reluctant to advance to the next phases of the innovation process. Public-private projects raise similar concerns. Coordinated efforts can increase private investment by spreading some costs and risk to the public. But to attract private partners in the first place, the public sector has a greater incentive to prioritize R&D projects with more financial upsides.

This is how the quest for profits and tight grip over proprietary rights, both important features of the capitalist model, discourage risk. Innovations are bound for plateauing after a few years, as firms increasingly favor minor aesthetic tweaks and updates over bold ideas while preventing other avenues of innovation from blossoming. At the same time, massive amounts of capital continue to float into the hands of a few. The price of innovating under capitalism is then both decreased innovation and decreased equality. The idea that this approach to innovation must be our best and only option is a delusion.

#### 4. It doesn’t solve the Carbon bubble, peak oil.

Jeremy Rifkin 19. Honorary Doctorate in Economics at Hasselt University. Recipient of the 13th annual German Sustainability Award in December 2020. BS in Economics at UPenn – Wharton School. Founder of People’s Bicentennial Commission. The Green New Deal: Why the Fossil Fuel Civilization Will Collapse By 2028, and the Bold Economic Plan to Save Life on Earth. St Martin’s Press. P7-8. Google Book. //shree]

The Carbon Tracker Initiative, a London-based think tank serving the energy industry, reports that the steep decline in the price of generating solar and wind energy “will inevitably lead to trillions of dollars of stranded assets across the corporate sector and hit petro-states that fail to reinvent themselves,” while “putting trillions at risk for unsavvy investors oblivious to the speed of the unfolding energy transition.”19 “Stranded assets” are all the fossil fuels that will remain in the ground because of falling demand as well as the abandonment of pipelines, ocean platforms, storage facilities, energy generation plants, backup power plants, petrochemical processing facilities, and industries tightly coupled to the fossil fuel culture. Behind the scenes, a seismic struggle is taking place as four of the principal sectors responsible for global warming—the Information and Communications Technology (ICT)/telecommunications sector, the power and electric utility sector, the mobility and logistics sector, and the buildings sector—are beginning to decouple from the fossil fuel industry in favor of adopting the cheaper new green energies. The result is that within the fossil fuel industry, “around $100 trillion of assets could be ‘carbon stranded.’”20 The carbon bubble is the largest economic bubble in history. And studies and reports over the past twenty-four months—from within the global financial community, the insurance sector, global trade organizations, national governments, and many of the leading consulting agencies in the energy industry, the transportation sector, and the real estate sector—suggest that the imminent collapse of the fossil fuel industrial civilization could occur sometime between 2023 and 2030, as key sectors decouple from fossil fuels and rely on ever-cheaper solar, wind, and other renewable energies and accompanying zero-carbon technologies.21 The United States, currently the leading oil-producing nation, will be caught in the crosshairs between the plummeting price of solar and wind and the fallout from peak oil demand and accumulating stranded assets in the oil industry.22

#### 5. COVID---“recovery” is sugar rush that drives crisis.

Roberts & Smith ‘21 [Michael Roberts worked as an economist for over 40 years, Activist in British Labor Movement in Britain. Interviewed by Ashley Smith, Author at Specter Journal. “Out of Lockdown and Back into the Long Depression.” 7-6-21. <https://spectrejournal.com/out-of-lockdown-and-back-into-the-long-depression/> //shree]

The Covid slump of 2020-21 was basically a supply-side shock due to the global spread of the Covid-19 virus and the failure of governments in the major economies (with a few exceptions) to prevent its spread. There were delayed and bungled measures along with weakened health systems, so economies had to close down as lockdowns and isolation measures were the only answer to avoiding catastrophe. Economically, that meant supply stopped, and then that led to a collapse in demand as people were laid off and businesses crashed. But recovery is now under way (more or less) in most major economies. Demand was propped up in the major advanced economies through massive government fiscal spending and central bank injections of credit for businesses (particularly large ones). And now through a combination of lockdowns and the incredibly fast development and rollout of effective vaccinations (thanks to publicly funded science), the major economies are now able to recover. But in the G7 economies this initial recovery has the aspect of a “sugar rush.” The “sugar” of fiscal stimulus and historic levels of easy credit is infusing capitalist businesses and household spending with an energy boost. Indeed, during the pandemic slump sections of capitalism did not suffer at all; on the contrary, they gained hugely, e.g., the social media and tech sector, the mega-distribution companies, and Big Pharma. Better-off households also suffered less (at least materially) as they continued to be paid, could work at home, and saved income significantly. This led to a house purchase boom as these sectors of labour looked to change their lifestyles post-Covid. At the same time, zero interest rates and cheap credit allowed financial institutions to make hay in financial markets and billionaire wealth rocketed as stock and bond markets hit historic highs. But, for most manual workers in the cities and in low-paid service industries, the pandemic slump was a disaster and with little prospect of returning to “normal” for them in the recovery. And it’s the advanced capitalist economies and the East Asian states that are recovering best in 2021-22. The so-called global South suffered hugely in the pandemic, with record levels of excess deaths and a massive rise in unemployment and poverty levels. Fiscal support from governments was limited and the rollout of vaccines to get economies going again is way short. Estimates are that the target vaccination levels in these countries will not be achieved until 2023-4! So, what we are going to see is the major capitalist economies of the West and China returning to pre-pandemic levels of national output by the end of this year or in early 2022, but Latin America, Africa, South Asia failing to do so. What are the weaknesses and contradictions of the recovery in those economies? Before the pandemic, the world economy was slowing down. Real GDP growth rates in the G7 were dropping to just 1 percent or lower; the so-called emerging economies had growth rates down to 3 percent (hardly enough to cover increases in population). World trade was declining. Even the giant economies of China and India had slowed. The main reason was that growth in investment in productive assets that can boost the productivity of labor and expand technology and employment had also slowed. In my view, investment and productivity growth are key to developing the productive forces of modern capitalist economies, and they were failing because under capitalism, profitability is the driving force behind investment. And according to the best estimates, US and global profitability levels are at historic lows. This is the long-term result of the basic contradiction of capitalism: between raising the productivity of labour and sustaining profitability. Over the long term, this cannot be done, and this is the economic Achilles heel of capital. At first sight, this result seems strange when we read of the huge profits being made by the likes of the so-called FAANGS (the tech and social media monopolies) and Amazon. But these are the exceptions that prove the rule. On average, the profitability of firms in the productive sectors of capitalist economies are low. That’s partly why profits have been reinvested into financial and other unproductive sectors like property where profitability is higher. Indeed, it is estimated that before the pandemic, about 15-20 percent of companies in the major economies were what are called “zombies,” i.e., not making enough profit to invest or expand, but just enough to pay wages and service their debts. They are the “living dead” in capitalist terms. At the same time, however, corporate debt is at record highs in most countries, raising the risk of bankruptcies if interest rates were to rise. All this makes it unlikely that we shall see any significant change post-pandemic from what we saw in the post-great recession decade, i.e., slow growth in investment, low wage growth, poor productivity growth, rising inequality, and unchanged or worsened global poverty. In the US, a lot has been made about Biden’s turn away from the neoliberal consensus toward Keynesianism. What has he done, why has he done it, and what has been its impact so far? The pandemic fiscal packages introduced by various G7 governments and, of course, by the Biden administration were emergency measures by states to avoid complete meltdown and catastrophe from the pandemic. In my view, they do not signify a change of ideology or policy by pro-capitalist governments. The usual talk is “let’s get out of this slump and preserve capitalist businesses using state funds and credit and then worry about paying it all down later.” The “later” is still to come. Biden’s fiscal packages have been heralded as a sea change in government policy and a return to Keynesian macro-management and stimulation of capitalist economies. But first, let’s leave aside the fact that Keynesian stimulus and macro-management was mainly a myth anyway and really the product of a war economy after 1945 which was ditched in the mid-1970s. Instead let us consider the actual impact of the Biden packages. The latest estimates by Goldman Sachs, hardly a voice of the left, is that after all the machinations of Congress by the end of this year, the Biden package will be equivalent to about 1 percent of US GDP each year for the rest of Biden term. But Biden is going to pay for these partly by increasing taxation by 0.75 percent of GDP a year. Given that the best estimates of so-called multiplier effects on GDP from fiscal stimulus are about one, that means the net effect of the Biden packages, if fully implemented, might boost US real GDP growth by 0.25 percent a year. The current forecast for long-term us real GDP growth is just 1.8 percent a year. So, the “great” return to Keynes by Biden will be minimal. If Biden manages to get his larger proposals for increased spending on infrastructure and social welfare spending through Congress, what impact will that have on the US and world economies? If the Biden package will have a limited effect on the US economy, any spillover effect into other economies will be even less substantial. The EU is also planning an economic recovery package that will boost government funds in EU countries with already large debt burdens like Italy and Spain. But again, the impact on the capitalist sectors of these economies will be minimal. Japan is about to announce a fiscal package that aims to “balance the books” over the next decade – hardly stimulus then! Indeed, the latest growth forecast for japan is a further slowing from its pre-pandemic pace of less than 1 percent a year. And apart from China, Vietnam, and the small East Asian states, the rest of the global South has little prospect of any fiscal stimulus or economic recovery. Most estimates from international agencies are that these economies will not recover to pre-pandemic GDP levels before 2023 and will never recover to pre-pandemic trajectories of economic growth. There is a permanent “scarring” of these weak peripheral capitalist economies. There has been a whole range of bourgeois commentators like Lawrence Summers warning about the threat of inflation. What’s your assessment about the arguments about inflation? What are the dangers of a return to what in the 1970s was called stagflation, a combination of slow growth and increased inflation? In the short term, inflation has returned to many economies. This is because of the sugar rush of consumer demand as economies open up again and people start spending down savings built up during the pandemic slump, while companies search for raw materials and components to restart businesses. Coupled with a significant disruption of global value chains, supply cannot meet demand and bottlenecks have created an inflation of prices in raw materials and consumer goods and services. But is this as transitory as the federal reserve and other central banks claim (though to be fair, there are divergent views within these banks)? Some, like Summers, argue that credit and fiscal stimulation boost demand without engendering enough supply because there is a secular stagnation in investment and productivity in modern economies. Others argue that credit injections and monetary easing after the great recession did not lead to inflation. On the contrary, easing only boosted financial and property prices. The Keynesian view is that inflation only happens when wage costs rise, i.e., inflation is caused by labor rather than capital. And that is not happening so far. My view is that price inflation in goods and services in capitalist economies comes about through a combination of demand generated by new value (as expressed in wages and profits) and the pace of money supply growth. But it is the change in value production that matters most. Capitalist economies have experienced a slowdown in new value growth for decades, so inflation rates have slowed to a trickle. Central banks have tried very hard with monetary easing to get some inflation (2 percent targets, etc.) and failed. Tinkering with interest rates and money quantities cannot deliver even moderate inflation in these conditions. So, after this initial burst, inflation will rise above pre-pandemic rates (i.e., 2 percent or so) only if the world capitalist economies generate faster growth in new value (unlikely) and/or there are sustained levels of double-digit growth money supply (possible). The latter is what central banks control, and they are divided on how long to maintain that. This raises larger theoretical questions on the left. Many believe that Keynesianism or Modern Monetary Theory can stimulate growth and bring about a more egalitarian capitalist order. You have challenged these ideas in your blog, The Next Recession. Why do Marxists argue that Keynesianism can’t overcome capitalist crisis in general and in this slump? The key to answering this is to recognize that capitalists decide whether economies grow or go into slump. By that I mean capitalists will only invest in means of production and employment if there is a profit to be made. Profit calls the tune under capitalism. And as mentioned above, average profitability in the major capitalist economies is low; corporate debt is high, and many firms are just surviving through cheap credit and not investing productively. But Keynesian theory does not consider capitalist economies from the perspective of profitability. It’s effective demand that decides. If government spending can increase demand, then it can get capitalist economies going. If Marxist theory is a better explanation of capitalist accumulation, then if profitability of capital stays low and does not recover to new higher levels post-pandemic, then government spending will be ineffective.

### AT: Cap Solves War

#### 2. Alt solves war---changes calculi that enable conflict.

Wills et al 20. Professor of History, Brooklyn College, CUNY. Joseph Entin, Professor of American Studies, Brooklyn College, CUNY. Richard Ohmann, Professor Emeritus of English, Wesleyan University. “’Resist, Rethink, and Restructure’: Teaching About Capitalism, War, and Empire in a Time of COVID-19.” Radical Teacher (117): 5-6. DOI: 10.5195/rt.2020.792

Moreover, endless spending on war has had dire consequences for those living within the United States and its territories. With monopoly capitalists, systems integrators, and military-intelligence contractors exercising undue influence over both federal and state spending, the United States has created international chaos and a “Homeland Security Bubble” on the verge of collapse. With the Bush administration gutting the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and increasing its military-surveillance-prison budget year-after-year, the world has watched in horror as the United States fails to protect people within its own borders, beginning with Hurricane Katrina and thereafter showing its inability to meet the challenges of the next in a series of climate disasters. As the ongoing deregulation of the financial services sector continued during the first decade of the 21st century, George W. Bush also called upon Americans to mortgage their futures on consumption as a patriotic duty. When combined with risky financial instruments, and billion-dollar markets opened up for small- and medium-sized “Homeland Security” providers in North America, Internet and other forms of consumption also created the context for a real-estate bubble that collapsed in 2006 and ushered in the Great Recession of 2008. To make U.S. war-making less visible as the Obama administration focused on restoring an economy teetering on the brink of another depression, drone strikes became more common even if spending on the military declined from a then-high of $824 billion in 2008 to $621 in 2016.9

Over the past twenty years, the response to every crisis, at both the federal as well as state and local levels, has consistently centered on funding for war, policing, and surveillance, tax cuts for the ultra-wealthy, and austerity programs that have eviscerated budgets for public health, transportation, education, and other social-essential services. The Trump administration has merely made things much, much worse: “re-branding” the United States from a mythological nation of immigrants who welcome all-comers to a walled society intolerant of anyone other than those who are white, fomenting what Americans have described under right-wing dictatorships as “death squads” (white nationalists, the police, the military, second amendment revisionists, and others) to engage in an all-out war against black and brown people, and advancing a more rabid doctrine of private property rights at the expense of Americans, the undocumented, the global population, and other “barriers” to expansion as the country plunges more deeply into the authoritarian state Trump and his enablers fetish, no matter the cost. The 25 May 2020 public lynching of George Floyd by members of the Minneapolis Police Department is symptomatic of a much longer history, one we desperately need to unpack, not only for those who already understand that this nation needs structural change, but also for those who still refuse to come to terms with the United States’ catastrophic trajectory.

Drawing on his 20-year experience in studying, writing, and teaching about war, Vine provides a thoughtful and comprehensive list of suggestions about how we might more effectively engage people from a variety of backgrounds, respecting those we meet in the classroom where we find them, then gently guiding them through the mythology, misinformation, and mystification of the post-9/11 rationale for militarization, and on to alternative visions of the future. In addition to the many proposals and resources he offers, Vine suggests that we need to show how much wars have cost, and the trade-offs of war spending, including comparisons of military spending versus spending on universal free education and the eradication of student debt. He additionally cautions that we need to focus on the system rather than the soldier, making capitalism, settler-colonialism, Native Americans and indigenous communities, people of color, U.S. territories and overseas colonies and military bases, and the human toll of war and empire visible in ways that expose militarization as neither natural nor inevitable no matter the time period. Employing intersectionality more broadly also allows us to make displacement, racism, sexism, and hypermasculinity more visible, along with the militarization of policing in communities of color and poor neighborhoods, along the U.S.-Mexican border, and within white supremacist militia movements. At the same time, it offers the opportunity to connect these phenomena to dissent and anti-war, civil rights, and other social movements focused on “climate justice, universal health care, labor, racial justice, gender equality, and LGBTQI+ rights.” Doing so will have the added benefit of countering the historical amnesia and clouds of forgetfulness that have infused education in the United States.

Much of this work can be done, Vine suggests, by assigning research projects focused on investigating the long arm of institutions involved in the military-industrial-academic-prison-surveillance complex, and by turning classrooms into “war clinics,” ones that take people out of the classroom to work with various groups, including but not limited to Code Pink, the Costs of War Project, the Institute for Policy Studies, veterans groups, and anti-recruitment/war/military base movements. We would also suggest that readers of Radical Teacher delve into Vine’s latest book—The United States of War: A Global History of America’s Conflicts, from Columbus to the Islamic State (University of California Press, 2020)—along with Daniel Immerwahr’s How to Hide an Empire: A Short History of the United States (Vintage, 2020), both excellent primers about how the United States—along with the global capital markets, multinational corporations, and international organizations it has long dominated—has deepened the integration of an increasingly globalized military-industrial-intelligence complex.

All of this might seem like a heavy lift, but as we know from our own experiences on campus and beyond it, those who embrace capitalism as an article of faith do not necessarily know what it means or implies. Once defined and unpacked, however, capitalism’s profit motive, insatiable appetite for expansion, and internal contradictions make clearer the ways in which inhabitants of the United States, particularly since World War II, have slowly but surely acquiesced to the “privatization and militarization of everything,” to the belief that the nation’s imperial ambitions are for the greater good of humanity, that the benefits and conveniences of surveillance technologies developed for the military (the computer, the Internet, GPS tracking, drones, and so on) outweigh the costs; that is, until they learn about the provenance of the U.S. command economy, examine the numbers, and realize that they can never again unsee the bedeviling trade-offs they have unwittingly sanctioned: warmaking for profit versus healthcare and education; resource extraction versus environmental protections; surveillance versus convenience; and the snare and delusion that technologies can solve our larger political, social, and economic problems versus actually tackling them through structural change. As sociologist Vincent Mosco observed after the dot.com bubble burst at the turn of the 21st century, “Myth is not a gloss on reality; it embodies its own reality. These views are especially difficult for people to swallow as the chorus grows for the view that we are entering a new age, a time so significant that it merits the conclusion that we have entered ‘the end of history.’” But he also asserted that such myths fail “to consider the potential for a profound contradiction between the idea of a liberal democracy and the growing control of the world’s political economy by the concentrated power of its largest businesses.”10 As the rest of the essays in this volume make clear, we may live in the present, but we carry our histories with us; and therefore need to confront those histories, make them more visible, if we hope to change course.

As a complement to Vine’s piece, William J. Astore shares his decades-long experiences as a retired lieutenant colonel, professor of history, academic administrator, author of books on Vietnam and the aerospace industry, and regular contributor to various publications, including TomDispatch.com, CounterPunch, and Truthout. His “Militarism and Education in America” makes another vital pedagogical intervention. Astore emphasizes the need for critical thinking about and resistance to what he describes as the “soft militarism” of American society, including but hardly limited to the commodification of an education “infused with militarism,” and a popular culture of films, literature, and performative acts that celebrate war and spectacular feats of violence. He also unveils many of the other ways in which the military influences education, including the hiring of retired generals and admirals to run universities “even though they have no experience in education,” military fly-overs at football games and other militaristic displays and celebrations, ROTC recruiting at high schools and on college campuses, funding to universities that push them to become “feeders to the military-industrial complex and the wider intelligence community,” pension plans heavily invested in military expansion, and every other act that sells education as a commodity “for private gain rather than a process of learning for the public good.” Among the antidotes he recommends, Astore suggests antiwar comic/graphic books that can reach wider audiences, “impact maps” that show the military suppliers who have entered states in which campus communities live, research into the “revolving door” between senior military officers and major defense contractors, and collaborative projects with organizations such as Veterans for Peace and About Face: Veterans Against the War.

As the rest of the essays in this volume make clear, we may live in the present, but we carry our histories with us; and therefore need to confront those histories, make them more visible, if we hope to change course.

#### 3. Transition stops short term war.

Rose ‘21 [Nick. PhD in Political Ecology from RMIT University. Executive Director of Sustain: The Australian Food Network. From the Cancer Stage of Capitalism to the Political Principle of the Common: The Social Immune Response of “Food as Commons.” Int J Health Policy Manag 2021. 3-31-21. DOI: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.20 //shree]

Until recently, it has for most ‘been easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism.’89 The COVID-19 pandemic has been a disruptive event, for the food system, for the wider economy, for national and global political elites, and for populations everywhere. Glimpses of a different, quieter, more peaceful and less destructive world have emerged, albeit fleetingly and falteringly. At the same time, the suffering wrought by the pandemic, both directly in the form of disease and death, and indirectly via the cascading economic shocks brought about through societywide shutdowns, has fallen, and will continue to fall, on the most vulnerable and marginalised members of societies. In many ways it has accelerated and intensified a growing systemic crisis that has been building for decades, politically, economically, ecologically and culturally.

We have reached a fork in the road. The last time the global capitalist system confronted a systemic crisis was in the 1970s, and that crisis created the conditions for the emergence of neoliberalism, ushering us into the cancer stage of capitalism. The time before that, in the 1930s, the profound economic crisis heralded the rise of genocidal fascism and world war, with tens of millions dead in the worst slaughter humanity has ever unleashed. The embers and echoes of both these earlier decades of systemic crisis are with us now, at the beginning of the 2020s. Capitalism is once more in profound, systemic crisis. The political far right is, once more, in the ascendancy. The drums of war are being beaten, with China the clearly identified ‘enemy.’

At the same time, the yearning for profound change in the direction of greater equality and ecological integrity is both powerful and substantial, with major political protests in 2019 and 2020 in many parts of the world. Hence the significance, relevance and importance of proposals for transformative change in both food system governance and in the social relations that underpin the food system. Currently we have global and national food systems that are oligopolistic in nature, supported by political structures that resemble plutocracies and oligarchies more closely than they do democracies, insofar as that characterisation is based on their policy development and policy outcomes. Dardot and Laval’s theorisation of the political principle of the common, informed by Holt-Gimenez and van Lammeren’s historically and materially grounded modification of the food as commons proposal, with Federici’s insistence on an explicit anti-capitalist orientation, offers progressive scholars, activists and practitioners a principled and hopeful pathway beyond the contemporary crisis.

### AT: Inequality and Poverty

#### 2. Cap turns inequality---profit motive, populism, protectionism

Edward Webster 21. Distinguished Research Professor, Southern Centre for Inequality Studies, University of the Witwatersrand. The coronavirus pandemic has revealed capitalism’s greatest weakness. Quartz. 6-2-2021. https://qz.com/africa/2016030/the-coronavirus-pandemic-has-revealed-where-capitalism-fails/

Under certain circumstances, far-reaching peaceful reform has been possible. Why then has the coronavirus pandemic deepened inequality rather than reduced it? Goldin attributes this paradoxical outcome to four decades of neoliberal thinking. I agree with his critique of neoliberalism. But he doesn’t give sufficient attention to power, particularly the concentration of economic power. This book, nevertheless, offers important opportunities for the elites of the world and ordinary citizens to explore ways of reducing inequality. The case for a rethink of capitalism Inequality, Goldin suggests had been rising in both Europe and the US since the 1980s. He argues that this is: …mainly due to the tide of liberalization that was ushered in when Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Ronald Reagan in the US initiated a race to the bottom in taxation, attacks on trade unions, and a weakening of competition policy, which all allowed for the growing concentration and strength of employers. What is needed, Goldin believes, is a fundamental rethinking of capitalism. Big government and the activist state is back, he says. The pandemic has led to a counter-revolution. Conservative governments now go beyond even arguments put forward by the economist Maynard Keynes in the 1930s that governments needed to spend their way out of the Great Depression. Unless inequality is reduced, he warns, populism and protectionism will become dominant. The tragedy is that the policies implemented by these populist leaders benefit the few not the many, thereby deepening and entrenching inequality. For Goldin this global trajectory of populism is not inevitable. He believes that it is human actions and leaders that shape societies, not simply events. The chapter Reducing inequality is full of sensible proposals designed to reduce inequality. Among these are: the closure of tax havens and loopholes, the introduction of wealth taxes on the assets of the top 1% earners, higher inheritance taxes on the transfer of wealth of the top 1 per cent, and progressive income taxes that exempt the lowest earners and then rise steeply for the highest earners. Goldin discusses how five biggest American tech companies—Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix, and Google—dominate the stock markets. He cites the fact that the $28 trillion attributed to these companies is five times greater than all the physical assets owned by all the other 500 companies in the Standard and Poor’s stock index. Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon, saw his wealth almost double. This makes him the first person in history to be worth more than $200 billion. Meanwhile, the wealth of Elon Musk, the founder of Tesla, increased by more than $160 billion during the pandemic, to $184 billion. What needs to be done Goldin draws on Nobel prize winner, Amartya Sen, who sees inequality as the function of the distribution of capabilities. From this perspective, inequality is above all about inequality of opportunities available to people to lead fulfilling lives. Central to this is education, gender, and human rights. Sen is far removed from orthodox neoliberalism. He adopts human well being, rather than mere growth, as the goal of development. But his approach to development is grounded in pragmatic neoliberalism. His message is clear: people in developing countries should adopt free markets, strictly delimit the role of the state, promote liberal democratic institutions , ensure the provision of basic education and healthcare and welcome open discussion of issues. I disagree with Goldin when it comes to drawing on Sen. This is because I am skeptical of Sen’s faith in free markets, free speech and reasoned social progress. He abstracts freedom from power relations and focuses on individual actors. But inequality is primarily a power relation. Sen gives a false promise to the poor and excluded. He does not challenge the concentration of economic power, centered on global and national markets. Instead he takes them for granted. A “rethinking of capitalism” requires that our primary focus should be on the distribution of economic power (rather than the unequal distribution of capabilities) as the potential leading causal factor driving inequality.

## Alt Fails

#### 2. The alternative can be implemented.

Spencer Bokat-Lindell 9-16. Bachelor of Arts in French at Yale University. Member of the Yale Journalism Initiative. Staff editor in the Opinion section for the New York Times. Past Senior Writer and Co-Editor at [Katie Couric Media](https://www.linkedin.com/company/katie-couric-media?trk=public_profile_experience-item_profile-section-card_subtitle-click) Previous editor at The Paris Review and Axios."Do We Need to Shrink the Economy to Stop Climate Change?" New York Times. 9-16-2021. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/16/opinion/degrowth-cllimate-change.html>

Forgetting about growth

At the moment, degrowth has no mass constituency. But some of its animating ideas are nonetheless exerting an influence on political economic thought — particularly the critique of G.D.P. growth as the lodestar of human progress.

“Even within mainstream economics, the growth orthodoxy is being challenged, and not merely because of a heightened awareness of environmental perils,” John Cassidy wrote in The New Yorker last year. “After a century in which G.D.P. per person has gone up more than sixfold in the United States, a vigorous debate has arisen about the feasibility and wisdom of creating and consuming ever more stuff, year after year.”

What’s the alternative? Kate Raworth, an English economist, has identified one option: “doughnut economics.” In Raworth’s view, 21st-century economies should abandon growth for growth’s sake and make it their goal to reach the sweet spot — or the doughnut — between the “social foundation,” where everyone has what they need to live a good life, and the “environmental ceiling.”

“The doughnut model doesn’t proscribe all economic growth or development,” Ciara Nugent explains in Time. “But that economic growth needs to be viewed as a means to reach social goals within ecological limits, she says, and not as an indicator of success in itself, or a goal for rich countries.”

Raworth’s ideas have had real-world impact: Last year, during the first wave of the pandemic, Amsterdam’s city government announced it would aim to recover from the crisis by adopting the precepts of “doughnut economics.” A year before that, Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern of New Zealand announced her country would prioritize its residents’ welfare and happiness over G.D.P. growth.

Delighted to hear that Jacinda Ardern is reading Doughnut Economics and that it reinforces her existing views. There is another economy waiting and it's starting to be made...

Even in the United States, which has embraced no such policy, G.D.P. growth has slowed in the past two decades, largely because of falling birthrates and a switch in spending patterns from goods to services.

That hasn’t solved the problem of America’s addiction to fossil fuels, of course. “Yet the sorts of policies on offer from degrowth advocates — like universal basic services and shorter working hours — could help address some of the long-standing ills now afflicting a wide range of economies,” Kate Aronoff writes in The New Republic. “Rather than chasing an increasingly far-off goal by trying to coax forth elusive corporate investment with giveaways, governments could start planning for what a fairer lower growth, lower carbon future might look like.”

#### 1. Cap stifles innovation---Inequality, work times, fear of shareholder suits.

Vanessa A. Bee 20 Senior Litigation Counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a JD from Harvard Law. Would We Have Already Had a COVID-19 Vaccine Under Socialism? No Publication. 4-20-2020. https://inthesetimes.com/features/covid-19-coronavirus-vaccine-capitalism-socialism-innovation.html

STIFLING WORKERS, STIFLING CREATIVITY

Many of the most sophisticated innovations of our time, from groundbreaking drugs to smart car technology, have depended on a deep pool of creative labor. But the idea that capitalism allows the bestsuited workers to join that pool is wishful thinking. As journalist Chris Hayes writes in Twilight of the Elites: America After Meritocracy, meritocracy “can only truly come to flower in a society that starts out with a relatively high degree of equality.” From 1979 to 2015, the annual average household income of the top 1% grew five times faster than that of the bottom 90th percentile. The reality is that deep inequalities in how this country’s wealth is distributed make meritocracy all but a myth. Some people can afford to attend college and access spaces where discovery is encouraged, moving into a “creative pipeline,” while their poorer peers go right into the workforce or juggle demanding classes with work schedules. While some with great innate talent for innovation end up in these coveted creative jobs, many more—poor and workingclass—are pushed by financial necessity into positions mismatched to their potential.

In theory, one doesn’t need a creative-focused job to innovate. But creativity requires a certain freedom— an ability to “waste” time, to work nonlinearly, to experiment and repeatedly fail. Capitalism’s constant dictate to maximize productivity leaves people with little time to spare, at work or at home—especially in poor and working-class households: The bottom fifth of earners have seen their work hours increase by 24.3% since 1979, compared to 3.6% for the top fifth.

Being in a more precarious financial position, or in a job with little security, also discourages workers from taking risks, even when the risks might lead to innovation. The precarity makes it difficult to approach one’s supervisors and ask for sick days, let alone personal time to go down rabbit holes. It makes it frightening to change fields or spend money on any project that might result in even more precarity.

Notably, the corporate structure itself has been known to stifle creation. Many corporate firms are under the effective control of shareholders, to whom managers owe a fiduciary duty to maximize profits. Shareholders who believe this duty has been breached typically have the right to sue the corporation. While this power can be used for the greater good—note how Tesla was sued by shareholders in response to its poor safety record—it also opens the door to shortsighted shareholders. One DuPont shareholder, for example, demanded the chemical company “not invest a single dollar in research that will not generate a positive return within f ive years.” What’s more, according to a 2017 working paper by the Institute for New Economic Thinking, “Many of America’s largest corporations, Pfizer and Merck among them, routinely distribute more than 100% of profits to shareholders, generating the extra cash by reducing reserves, selling off assets, taking on debt or laying off employees.”

Even the most creative of workers who make it into innovative roles in the private sector may find themselves starved of resources. As professors Chen Lin and Sibo Liu of the University of Hong Kong, and Gustavo Manso of the University of California, Berkeley, explain in a 2018 study, the threat of shareholder litigation generally discourages managers from “experimenting [with] new ideas,” which acts as an “uncontrolled tax on innovation.”

#### 2. Paradigm shift now towards the alt.

CJ Atkins 21. Managing Editor at People’s World with a Ph.D. in political science from York University in Toronto. Neoliberalism’s in trouble: A Marxist look at the American Rescue Act. People's World. 3-11-2021. https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/neoliberalisms-in-trouble-a-marxist-look-at-the-american-rescue-act/

Change from below Many analysts are taking notice of this paradigm change. Paul McCulley, a business professor at Georgetown, told the New York Times earlier this week, “Having the tools of economic stabilization work a whole lot more through the fiscal channel and a whole lot less through the monetary channel is a profound, pro-democracy policy mix.” In plainer language: It’s better to have elected representatives rather than unelected bankers making the call on how public money is spent. Some media commentators are seeing the shift, but they’re missing the real reasons for why it’s happening. Times opinion writer Neil Irwin, for instance, characterizes it as a battle between “pointy-headed technocrats” and lawmakers, or as the headline of his article earlier this week put it, “Move over, nerds. It’s the politicians’ economy now.” Without the insights that come from a class analysis of the situation, Irwin and other commentators in the bourgeois press continue to look only at the differences among those at the top of society to explain social change. The truth, however, is that the pressure now being applied to neoliberal ideology is the result of class struggle from below. Since the last recession, working-class action has been steadily building and gaining strength. The first sparks came in the Occupy Wall Street movement that emerged in the wake of the financial crisis. There were the two Bernie Sanders campaigns for president as well as that of Elizabeth Warren, which inserted explicitly social democratic demands like Medicare for All into public conversation. The trade union movement has begun to reverse its decades-long decline, with new organizing efforts like the campaign by Alabama Amazon workers showing that more and more workers are looking to collective action as the way to improve their lives. The Black Lives Matter national uprising, with its demand to defund policing and militarization and redirect funds toward human needs, has melded together the fights to end racism and economic inequality. Opinion polls have shown interest in the ideas of socialism gaining steam for several years already, showing up also in the fact that left-wing organizations like Democratic Socialists of America and the Communist Party USA have seen explosive growth. The 2018 and 2020 elections were further proof, as the caucus of progressive legislators swelled. Bold women of color leaders like Reps. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ayanna Pressley, Ilhan Omar, and Pramila Jayapal now lead the charge in Washington on everything from the Green New Deal to the Fight for $15 and more. The mass death and destruction experienced in the past year because of coronavirus have only accelerated the trend of people questioning the status quo and looking for alternatives. The pandemic has accelerated class struggle trends that were already becoming apparent. Increasingly, millions are questioning capitalism, as shown by this message spray-painted onto a wall in Toronto. | C.J. Atkins / People’s World All this simmering of organized working-class activity and political growth—driven by the material conditions workers and oppressed people find themselves living in—is having an impact at the national level of policy and debate. In Marxist terms, changes in the economic foundation of society are affecting mass consciousness and therefore prodding change in the superstructure—the legal, political, and philosophical ideas of our times. Old ideologies like neoliberal capitalism are under pressure from new ones arising out of class struggle. Those new ideas are not yet fully formed, though, and the forces pushing them are not yet strong enough to assert their power at all times. The new is still in conflict with the old, and the outcomes are uneven. Allies (like politicians) will at times waver. Victories will be real, but incomplete (like the dropping of the $15 minimum wage from the ARA). Defeats are not unavoidable. As Frederick Engels wrote, “History makes itself in such a way that the final result always arises from conflicts…there are innumerable intersecting forces.” So the American Rescue Plan, despite whatever we didn’t get out of it, is a big win for the working class. The people have been demanding a change in how our economy operates and whom it benefits. Organization and unity are making it happen—the 2020 election was proof of that as well.

## Advantages

### Off Shoring---1NC

#### 1. Off-shoring takes out both --the 2AC says quote “Latin America, Central and South Asia, and China all have perilous food systems”---- they have no reason the US alone solves.

Jerry Kopf et al 13 . Professor of Economics, Radford University. Charles Vehorn, Professor of Economics, Radford University. Joel Carnevale, Professor of Economics, Syracuse University. “Emerging Oligopolies in Global Markets: Was Marx Ahead of His Time?” Journal of Management Policy and Practice 14(3): 96-98. <http://www.m.www.na-businesspress.com/JMPP/KopfJ_Web14_3_.pdf>

With firms branching out into global competition and countries lowering their trade barriers to promote such competition, the absence of effective global regulation once again raises Marx concerns. Because of strong federal governments, national governments were able to pass and enforce, through the uses of military or police force where necessary, laws that regulated externalities, such as pollution, and antitrust. At the moment there is no strong federal government at the global level and, therefore, no one to pass and enforce laws that effectively regulate externalities or antitrust. Epstein and Greve raise a Marx like concern, “when firms have international market power, one would expect them to behave as monopolists just like domestic firms with market power” (2004). Therefore, without any dominant form of regulatory governance, industry concentration could very well replicate what was seen in the late 19th century, though, globally instead of nationally. Carstensen & Farmer discusses this tendency towards M&A’s: The transformation of formerly regulated or noncompetitive industries to competition is closely linked with merger movements. The historical record demonstrates that once faced with competition, leading firms in these industries began to merge. This has been the pattern in airlines, banks, railroads, electric and gas utilities, health care and, with great prominence, telecommunications (2008). While some may argue that reaching that level of concentration is unlikely, one should consider current industries that hold a considerable global market share. “Although it may be more difficult to establish and maintain market power internationally, there is no reason to believe that it is impossible or, for that matter, rare. Industries such as pharmaceuticals, passenger aircraft, and software illustrate the phenomenon” (Epstein & Greve, 2004). There are actually quite a few firms who have emerged into the global market that hold what can be considered a significant share within global industries, ranging from manufacturing, financial intermediation, and transport service along with other service industries. For example, The European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company and The Boeing Company combined hold more than 50% market share within the global civil aerospace products manufacturing industry. Goldman and Sachs hav2 20.20% market share within the global investment banking and brokerage industry and Vivendi holds 20.10% within the global music production and distribution industry. United Parcel Service holds 23.80%, within the global logistics – couriers industry (IBISW, 2011). We do not intend to imply that the monopolization that had plagued the United States in the late 19th century has emulated itself at the global level, creating one dominant firm controlling an entire global industry. However, it does appear that a number of industries are starting to exhibit Marx, “inevitable move toward a monopoly.” The increase in oligopoly power at the global level presents unprecedented challenges. Reaching a cross-country consensus on competition policy is a difficult. Epstein & Greve discuss some of the issues that arise when attempting to unite foreign and domestic competition policy. Competition policy embodies imprecise normative judgments that invite controversy and defection rather than consensus and commitment. Because its scope extends to such a wide range of economic activity, it has the potential to inflict significant costs on many transactors. In particular, competition policy tempts states both to impose nominally neutral policies that favor local producers and consumers at the expense of global welfare, and to administer their policies in a discriminatory fashion to similar ends” (2004). While more and more countries are adopting competition policies, this seemingly positive step towards unification of trust law has its negative effects. “Nearly one hundred jurisdictions now have antitrust laws” according to Epstein & Greve, this raises increasing issues of “jurisdictional overlaps” since many countries will assert their “jurisdiction over extraterritorial conduct that has a domestic impact” (2004). Antitrust enforcement agencies around the world have tried to cope with the increased power of global corporations by staying in regular and increasing contact with one another on individual merger cases as well as on general issues of mutual enforcement interest. Through instruments such as the 1995 Recommendation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that its 29 members cooperate with one another in antitrust enforcement and bilateral agreements like that which exists between the United States and the European Community, the antitrust agencies notify one another when a case under investigation affects another's important interests and they share what information they can and otherwise cooperate in the investigation and resolution of those cases (1999). Richard Parker, Senior Deputy Director of the Bureau of Competition FTC, presenting on global merger enforcement, discussed the implementation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and concluded with examples of global merger enforcement. While attempts at unified standards of competition policy are underway, the efforts of the OECD are considered to have substantial limitations on enforcing global merger laws. Epstein and Greve state: Information sharing or “soft” cooperation has also been pursued at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which has generated several aspirational texts. None of these impose obligations on states, and they are not intended to do so. Their goals are modestly limited to improving communication on competition issues. History shows us that even with a strong federal government with the ability to enforce laws through the use of force where necessary, such as the United States federal government has on its states, firms are very good at ignoring or getting around antitrust laws. If the U.S. government did not have strong federal power over states, and it was up to the states to reach agreements on antitrust laws, one can easily imagine that there would likely be problems resulting in less strenuous competition policy. Take for example state control over age discrimination laws. When these laws originated, states chose whether to enact policies aimed at protecting workers rights. By 1960 only 8 states had age discrimination laws until the federal government enacted such regulations as the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). This, along with the Department of Labor in 1979 giving administrative authority to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), established unified laws protecting individual employment rights (Lahey, 2007). Without this dominant authority of the federal government, fair employment practices may still continue to be a regionally dependent right. In the current era of globalization, where industry’s actions domestically can be felt by all corners of the globe and vice versa, without a global entity with strong “federal” powers capable of monitoring and enforcing competition policy, it seems reasonable to conclude that Marx may in fact be proven correct: the inevitable result of the efficient market is increasing concentration of power resulting in global oligopolies or, eventually, monopolies.

#### 2. Their evidence agrees they don’t solve Spain, Kenya, Mexico, or Eastern Europe. EMORY GK = BLUE

1AC Hendrickson, et al, 20

[Mary, Phillip Howard, Emily Miller, Douglas Constance, Associate Professor in Rural Sociology at the University of Missouri, Columbia, CONCENTRATION AND ITS IMPACTS

A Special Report to the Family Farm Action Alliance, 11-19-2020, <https://farmactionalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Hendrickson-et-al.-2020.-Concentration-and-Its-Impacts-FINAL.pdf>, sh]

In the last 150 years of relatively temperate and stable climate, we have come to rely on a high-yielding, mechanized, capital-intensive system of agriculture and food that operates at a global scale, impacting local places around the globe unevenly. Lyson (2004) succinctly illustrated how technological revolutions including mechanization, the use of chemicals, and biotechnology made agriculture more specialized, disconnecting food production and consumption from particular places and their communities. Big data/digitalization of agriculture continues this trend (Mooney 2018; Rotz et al 2019). These revolutions tend to deskill agrifood labor, rewarding the most powerful firms and exploiting vulnerable labor forces. Our fossil-fuel dependent transportation systems have enabled regional specialization across the globe – for example, fruit and vegetable specialization in places such as Spain, Kenya or Mexico, or highly industrialized grain production in the American Midwest or Eastern Europe. These processes have altered producers’ relationship with their land and communities, often marginalizing the labor process across the food chain, and changing the relationship of consumers with food acquisition and preparation – transforming ecological and community relationships in the process. These changes have paved the way for the current social and economic structure of our agrifood system. A capital-intensive system rewards those with access to capital (that is money), and marginalizes those without it. This has become particularly important in an increasingly unequal society, where money and power have accrued to a few, predominantly white households, with agriculture following the same trends. More importantly, money and wealth that is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few risks the notions of dispersed power at the center of Western democracies (Wu 2018). This concentration of ownership, wealth and power is particularly apparent in the agrifood system where just a few companies dominate almost all aspects of food production. The social and ecological risks associated with our current agrifood system – rising levels of food insecurity and hunger, ecological degradation – are directly related to who has the power to make decisions in food and agriculture.

### Turns Agri-Food Consolidation---2NC

#### Exploitation will occur on small farms on a larger scale.

Nathan Rosenberg & Bryce Wilson Stucki, 21. Nate is a visiting scholar at the Harvard Food Law and Policy Clinic and an adjunct professor at the University of Iowa College of Law. Bryce is an independent journalist based in D.C. who writes about food and agriculture. “Don’t trust the antitrust narrative on farms.” 05.10.21 This post is part of our symposium on the Law and Political Economy of Meat. https://lpeproject.org/blog/dont-trust-the-antitrust-narrative-on-farms/

The mainstream antitrust approach also does little to solve more fundamental problems. In 1524, the German peasant leader and preacher, Thomas Müntzer, lambasted the nobility for taking living creatures as their private property. He wrote, outraged, “that all creatures have been turned into property, the fish in the water, the birds in the air, the plants on the earth—all living things must also become free.” Karl Marx approvingly cited Müntzer 320 years later, when he argued that capitalism not only degrades how we relate to each other, but also how we relate to nature. As long as we treat living things as commodities, neither they, nor we, will be free.

A programmatic path to the liberation of all things is beyond the scope of this post— instead, we offer a critique of the antitrust narrative focused on farmers.

**Antitrust** enforcement can be a useful tool at times, but when its proponents use concentration to explain all the ills of agriculture, they distort reality. **The break ’em up approach may distribute property rights in human and animal misery more evenly, but it does not address the exploitation at the heart of the system.**

The antitrust movement has a profoundly flawed analysis of the farm economy. Its proponents argue that, in effect, tending to the needs of a small, highly conservative, and well-off constituency will redound to the benefit of their workers and society. But it is farmworkers, not farmers, who are already at the forefront of movements against environmental abuses and labor violations by their employers, that is to say, farmers. They also have the ability, through withholding and redirecting their labor, to shut down and reshape food production in the United States. Antitrust writers argue that breaking up agribusiness will help farmers and farmworkers alike. They dream of a cross-class alliance, but deny the intense conflict already with us, playing out every day in fields and farmhouses across the country.

#### 2. Their second internal link is about the lack of seed diversity---

#### Capitalism trends toward monoculture and consolidation of seed production because of the drive for profit---makes unsustainability inevitable.

Matt Huber 20. Assistant professor of geography at Syracuse University. “COVID-19 Shows Why We Must Socialize the Food System”. https://jacobinmag.com/2020/04/covid-food-system-coronavirus-agriculture-farming

The COVID-19 crisis is revealing a basic contradiction at the heart of capitalism. On the one hand, we have learned that this virus is itself a product of our capitalist agricultural system. As Rob Wallace and coauthors argue, the conditions for virus transmission are rooted in our propensity to clear-cut dense, wild forests — often the reservoirs of viruses themselves — and replace them with homogenous plantation ecologies like palm oil or livestock operations with one species of animal crowded together.

As they put it:

the entirety of the production line is organized around practices that accelerate the evolution of pathogen virulence and subsequent transmission. Growing genetic monocultures — food animals and plants with nearly identical genomes — removes immune firebreaks that in more diverse populations slow down transmission.

For example, the avian and swine influenza outbreaks of years past often have their origins in confined livestock feeding operations. COVID-19 apparently emerged in a “wet market” that combined all kinds of natural commodities, from exotic wild animals like snakes to domesticated livestock like hogs. Congregating multiple kinds of species in a small space with loads of human buyers and sellers is an excellent platform for virus transmission.

As one scholar put it, “We cut the trees; we kill the animals or cage them and send them to markets. We disrupt ecosystems, and we shake viruses loose from their natural hosts. When that happens, they need a new host. Often, we are it.”

On the other hand, for millions of workers across the world, a brutal ecological reality of capitalism asserts itself: we depend on money to access those same very agricultural supply chains to live. Millions of workers living paycheck to paycheck see their jobs or wages cut, forcing families to decide how much they can spend on rent versus food.

For those working-class people still with income, the experience of the epidemic has been one of nervously pacing through crowded grocery aisles, fighting with others over toilet paper, and discovering shelf after emptied shelf. Grocery supply chain experts declare that “there is plenty of food in the country,” but it is clear that “just-in-time” supply-chain capitalism is ill equipped to service all of society’s needs in a global pandemic.

The supply chains use statistical algorithms to predict consumer demand so it can be fine-tuned with production and logistics networks. These systems are geared toward saving retail corporations money on inventory (warehousing) costs, but they easily fail when demand unexpectedly spikes or “disruptions” occur in the supply chain.

And now the violence of the market is asserting itself through price spikes for basic food staples. Communities are going hungry as local food banks run short of the basics, while farmers are leaving fresh vegetables to rot in the fields and dairy producers are dumping milk down the drain because of plummeting prices and lack of demand. So much for the nimble and resilient market, supposedly the most efficient system in allocating resources.

The capitalist agri-food system is clearly irrational. The socialist demand that can move us toward a food system based on social and ecological needs should ring a familiar bell: food for all.

If the “Medicare for All” struggle has shown the popularity of the slogan “health care is a human right,” then why is food not seen the same way? The only thing preventing “food as a human right” is an industry that relies on creating artificial scarcity of food to maintain prices and profits.

A socialist approach to these problems can’t address them piecemeal, reforming agriculture on the one hand and delivering food as a human right on the other. The goal should be to revolutionize the entire food system and orient it toward social and ecological needs.

COVID-19 and the Capitalist Food System

As we discover our agricultural system is responsible for spreading the virus, we also realize how perilously dependent we all are on those very systems of food provision for survival. Both of these problems are caused by one problem: our food system as a whole is controlled by private, for-profit capitalists.

As Wallace et al. explain, the agricultural system is structured in a narrow way: “the private command of production remains entirely focused on profit.” It is the profit motive and competition that compels agricultural producers to brutally rationalize and homogenize nature in the form of the monoculture plantation or mono-species livestock operation. These not only provide perfect ecological systems for virus transmission, they also replace formerly biodiverse ecologies that tend to keep wild viruses at bay.

Yet we can’t think of these agro-industrial farms in isolation from the larger system. All these capitalist agro-industrial profits would be impossible if it were not for its main source of consumer demand: working classes all around the world dispossessed of any means of livelihood, who can only eat so long as they work for money.

As Raj Patel argued over a decade ago, we live in an “hourglass” food system where, on both ends, millions of farmers and worker-consumers are exploited by a tiny group of agro-industrial corporations in the middle, the food processors and retail giants. Working-class demand is essential to the entire system. Even the best kind of government-welfare provisions, like food stamps or the current interest in a Universal Basic Income (UBI), only ensure further cash flowing into the hands of the massive retail chains, food processors, and agribusiness companies.

#### Capitalism is the root cause of the crisis

Paul Robbins 20. Director of the Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, January. “Is less more … or is more less? Scaling the political ecologies of the future.” Political Geography, Volume 76, January 2020. ScienceDirect. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.04.010>

I am standing amidst hundreds of milk cows in a vast dairy barn in central Wisconsin. In many ways, what I see reminds me of the dozens of other Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) I have encountered over the years. The number of animals is mind-boggling; rows upon rows of cows are munching away on feed and silage. The size of the animals, bred for explosive productivity, is incredible; each animal produces 23 thousand pounds of milk every year. The excrement from these animals is removed by machinery and funneled through sluices towards a perilously large nearby lagoon. All of this is pretty familiar to anyone who has spent time in rural Wisconsin, where the number of farms has fallen from 167,000 to 9100 in the period since 1930, while production of milk has skyrocketed from eleven billion pounds annually to more than thirty billion (Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service 2019). The shed I am in, with perhaps eight hundred milking head and run by a small single family, is actually tiny by regional standards.

It is not difficult to mount a straightforward political ecological critique. The central cause of this race towards productivity comes from a crisis of overproduction. With more and more milk in constant circulation, prices have fallen, creating a treadmill of intensification. In the process, the human workforce is minimized. Given the high cost of labor (and the difficulty of finding anyone willing to do the backbreaking work), a mostly immigrant workforce has emerged in the sector: underpaid variable capital. This process, in turn, also undervalues the natural capital on which it stands, creating animal suffering and reckless nutrient overloading in the watershed in the form of cow feces loaded with nitrogen and phosphorus. The second contradiction of capitalism is made manifest in oceans of manure (O'Connor 1996).

#### 3. Their first impact is food prices---if the link turns the case and they cause more consolidation they recreate their impacts AND the a solves decommodification of food.

Matt Huber 20. Assistant professor of geography at Syracuse University. “COVID-19 Shows Why We Must Socialize the Food System”. https://jacobinmag.com/2020/04/covid-food-system-coronavirus-agriculture-farming

“Food for All”

As people lose their jobs and incomes, they are starving themselves to make sure their children eat. Like health care, food should have always been considered a fundamental human right. This means we need an ecosocialist strategy focused on a core platform of the decommodification of food. It is commodification — and the forces of competition and profit — that compel capital to design food production landscapes as if they were factories — rows of the same crop harvested assembly-line style.

The first premise of decommodification is provisioning food as a human right to everyone. Consider another vital need of humans: water. Despite efforts at privatization, many societies provision water as a public utility, either for free or below cost. When bankrupt cities like Detroit attempt to shut off water to poor households, they are rightly accused of human rights abuses.

Why can’t we also see the food system as a similar kind of public utility? Food is, of course, much different than water (although our need for it is not). Food is highly diverse: it comes in different forms and is the product of divergent cultural practices. This is not a call for centrally planned gruel rations. It is about making food — in all its cultural diversity — a public question rather than a private one.

Currently, consumers vote with their dollars to express food preferences — more money, more votes — and private food sellers make decisions based on shareholder returns.

Thus, making the food system a public utility also entails the second aspect of decommodification: democratic control. While decommodification is often seen as simply the provision of “free stuff,” basic human dignity should also include people controlling decisions that affect their lives.

What would food-system democracy look like? Sam Gindin argues for a socialist middle ground between local worker control and higher-level and democratic state planning. He proposes we could create “sectoral councils” for specific and socially important sectors like food and agriculture. These councils would ideally represent both communities in need of food provision and the workers involved in agricultural production.

These councils could inform larger-scale efforts at “ecological planning.” Wallace and others’ research shows that our food production system is highly irrational from an ecological perspective. We have no shortage of ecological scientific knowledge that could be used to inform all kinds of production. Capital simply ignores it. Ecosocialists need to argue that ecological planning must be integrated into all our production systems — and our food system is an obvious place to start.

The coronavirus crisis has revealed capitalism as a system at war with life. Deadly viruses emerge on capitalist plantations and travel through networks of money and commodity circulation. Humans not killed by the virus itself are left unable to access the food they need to live a healthy life. This crisis represents a dramatic opportunity to reimagine what our society and economy could be if organized on different terms.

#### 4. Cap turns food insecurity – waste, supply chain disruptions, pandemics

Rose 21 [Nick. PhD in Political Ecology from RMIT University. Executive Director of Sustain: The Australian Food Network. From the Cancer Stage of Capitalism to the Political Principle of the Common: The Social Immune Response of “Food as Commons.” Int J Health Policy Manag 2021. 3-31-21. DOI: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.20 //shree]

If the accelerating biophysical and social contradictions of the capitalist food system were substantively manifesting a decade ago, the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic has brought them into sharp relief.64 Where-ever one turns, the pandemic and the responses to it reveal a fragile food system enmeshed in crisis. From extraordinary levels of food waste caused by supply chain disruptions, to sharply rising levels of food insecurity, to widespread injury and death resulting from exposure to the pandemic amongst highly exploited food system workers, to the origins of the virus itself linked in part to the global grain-livestock and factory farming complex, COVID-19 is a ‘wake-up call for the food system.’65-75 More broadly, the negligence with which governments in Europe, Britain and the United States handled the pandemic, leading to high rates of infection and death that would have been preventable had public health, rather than economic activity, been prioritised, led the British Medical Journal to accuse those in charge of ‘social murder.’76 It is important to note that while the burden of suffering in 2020 fell disproportionately on low-income sectors and people of colour, with as many as 500 million more people falling into poverty, the world’s billionaires experienced a bonanza year, with their collective wealth increasing by nearly $4 trillion.77 Having laid bare the cause of our social and ecological malady – capitalism in its cancer stage - the question becomes: what is to be done?

#### 5. Consumption.

John Gibbons 21. Environmental journalist and co-author of the Routledge International Handbook of Environmental Journalism. Resolving the paradox of satisfying the needs of all while using far less energy. Irish Times. 5-6-2021. https://www.irishtimes.com/news/science/resolving-the-paradox-of-satisfying-the-needs-of-all-while-using-far-less-energy-1.4542693

‘Drastic changes’

“Our intention is to imagine a world that is fundamentally transformed, where state-of-the-art technologies merge with drastic changes in demand to bring energy (and material) consumption as low as possible, while providing decent material conditions and basic services for all”, the authors state. Only through such a radical transformation, they add, can human needs be met within critical planetary boundaries.

At present, those daring to suggest alternatives to our current model of constant economic growth or promoting steady state economics are likely to be dismissed as new age cultists or “degrowth fetishists” trying to make everyone poor.

The new study, according to lead author, Joel Millward-Hopkins of the University of Leeds, “offers a response to the cliched populist objection that environmentalists are proposing that we return to living in caves”.

The paper points out that “inequality and especially affluence, are now widely recognised as core drivers of environmental damage”. Consider that in the year since the Covid-19 pandemic began, the collective wealth of the world’s billionaires has ballooned by some $3.9 trillion (€3.2 trillion) while hundreds of millions of the world’s poorest people were plunged deeper into poverty and financial insecurity as a result of the pandemic.

Trickle-down economics

This further debunks the concept known as trickle-down economics, the notion that tax breaks for the wealthy would somehow flow towards wider society. Resources are instead being rapidly siphoned upwards towards the already wealthy and economically powerful.

The paper points out that current levels of energy usage “underpin numerous existential crises, resource scarcity and the geopolitical instabilities these issues can catalyse, especially in a growth-dependent global economy”. While there have been significant improvements in energy efficiency, these have “largely served to boost productivity and enable further growth”.

Crucially, beyond a certain point, increases in energy use in a given society deliver little or no additional benefits to that society. The study envisages, with the aid of technologies, radical demand-side transformations that largely eliminate excessive consumption and focuses available resources instead on providing the conditions required for flourishing. These include basic physical health and safety, access to clean air and safe water, good quality (largely plant-based) nutrition, and the opportunity for social and political participation.

Resolving the paradox of how to satisfy the needs of all while using far less energy and fewer resources depends on sharp global reductions in meat-eating, down by some 85 per cent in rich countries. A massive expansion of public transport globally would greatly reduce energy and emissions while allowing people to meet their transport needs without the expense of owning and running resource-intensive private cars.

Globally, much of the existing housing stock needs to be replaced over time with modern buildings with very low heating and cooling energy requirements. This would be another vital step in achieving decent living conditions with far less energy than at present.

#### 6. Don’t solve the profit motive behind Ag collapse.

Jamie Allinson et al 21. Allinson is Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Chapter 1: M-C-M’ and the Death Cult. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963 //shree]

The Triassic-Permian ‘great dying’ was a megaphase change taking place through pulses lasting for tens of thousands of years, separated by interludes of hundreds of thousands of years, if not millions. The current mass extinction event is a megaphase change taking place in microphase time. Mass extinction is punctuated by the production of what the environmentalist Jonathan Lymbery calls ‘dead zones’: the conversion of wild ecosystems into dead monocultures. In Sumatra, these dead zones are made by burning rainforest and, amid the stench of death, planting palm crop. The palm oil is used in foods and household items, while the nut is used in animal feed. It is secured with barbed wire, and treated with poison, to prevent the crop from being eaten. Surviving animal life, and surrounding human communities, are pushed to the edges, to the brink of extinction. Agricultural workers are abused, underpaid, even enslaved. This is an example of what Moore would call ‘cheap food’, where the ‘value composition’ of the goods, the amount of waged labour necessary to produce each item is ‘below the systemwide average for all commodities’. In this case, a ‘cheap nature’ is produced by a distinctly capitalist form of territorialisation, wherein forestry is converted through deforestation into palm monoculture, while ‘cheap labour’ is secured partly through the dispossession of neighbouring human communities. More calories with less socially-necessary labour-time is cheap food. Cheap is not, of course, the same thing as efficient. Food production is, alongside fuel, a fulcrum of the capitalist organisation of work-energetics. It is one that, as with fossil fuels, wastes an incredible amount of the energy it extracts. According to the FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 30 per cent of cereals grown for human and animal consumption are wasted, along with almost half of all root crops, fruits and vegetables. To conclude from this grotesque squander that a ‘more efficient’ capitalism would ‘solve the problem’ of ‘the environment’ would be to fail to understand waste, capitalism and ecology: that the first is intrinsic to the second; that the second, whatever the degree to which it is inflected by the first, is inimical to the third. Capitalism also directly undermines its own productivity, precisely through its industrially-produced biospheric destruction. According to the UN, for example, there are at most sixty harvests remaining before the world’s soils are too exhausted to feed the planet. This edaphic impoverishment is a product, not a byproduct. It is the predictable, and long-predicted, consequence of intensive agriculture, over-grazing and the destruction of natural features (such as trees) that prevent erosion. Likewise, the death-drop of insect biomass, the decline of pollinating bees, are hastened by the extensive use of pesticides and fertilisers. Capitalist food production can only evade the problem – a problem, in its terms, of accumulation – either by establishing new ‘cheap natures’ through such means as deforestation, or by extracting rent from competitor producers through such means as intellectual property rights. For instance, since 1994’s notorious TRIPS agreement (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights), through the rules of UPOV (Union for the Protection of New Plant Varieties), particularly the notorious UPOV 1991, and in the face of local fightbacks from Guatemala to Ghana, the World Trade Organisation has enforced property agreements outlawing the saving of seeds from one season to the next, thus sharply raising costs for farmers producing 70 per cent of the global food supply.

# 1NR

### Links---1NR

#### 1---Antitrust---it’s applied extraterritorially---regs are territorial.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

Sovereign states have historically enjoyed the prerogative of regulating their own markets when their economic and political policies dictate market intervention. Within the United States, for example, states in the first instance regulate their own land uses, local provision of electricity, or local telephone service. By the same token, the United States generally oversees regulated industries within its own borders, while leaving other sovereign nations to govern theirs. To be sure, federal law often regulates transactions between the United States and foreign countries. Further, international treaties provide for regulation of international trade and transportation, the commercialization of some natural resources, the environmental impact of business activities, and other things with significant extraterritorial spillovers. But by and large we leave other sovereigns to regulate their own markets, particularly those falling within the traditional category of regulated industries, such as public utilities and common carriers.

The conventional literature on regulation recognized the optimal regulatory sovereign as the one whose geographic territory encompassed the regulated firm's service area. Of course, state regulation often yields to federal power under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution. However, in these cases extraterritoriality is not at issue because the federal government's territory encompasses everything contained in the individual states. So, for example, interstate components of electric power generation and transport were traditionally regulated by the federal government, while intrastate components, particularly retail delivery, were regulated by the individual states where the retail customers were located.

Over the last two decades regulated industries in both the United States and elsewhere have been deregulated to one degree or another. What "deregulation" generally means is that certain questions about pricing, new firm entry, or the range of services that a firm can offer, or the construction of additional production or transmission facilities, are no longer supervised by a government agency, at least not as closely. The most extreme examples of deregulation are in transportation markets. For example, under comprehensive Civil Aeronautics Board regulation in the 1970s and earlier the price that an airline set, the schedule it flew, whether it could add or remove a route, and even whether it could bundle air travel with such amenities as hotel rooms or rental cars were subject to comprehensive government supervision. Today the Civil Aeronautics Board no longer exists,' and to one degree or another all these decisions are now up to the firm and the market.

One natural consequence of deregulation has been expanded application of the antitrust laws. As agency command and control becomes less pervasive and an increasing number of market decisions are placed within the firm's discretion, antitrust's general market principles become the regulator of last resort. However, this expansion of antitrust has proceeded in fits and starts, and gone much more smoothly in some markets than in others. Interstate air travel, for example, went rather completely from a regime recognizing widespread antitrust immunity under CAB regulation,2 to one in which carriers are treated as ordinary business enterprises subject to fairly complete antitrust control. 3 By contrast, the road in telecommunications has been much bumpier, with the federal courts currently in complete disarray about the proper role that antitrust should play in bringing competition to local telephone service.4

This change from government agency control to antitrust control is beginning to have one consequence that was not foreseen. While regulatory regimes in the United States could be state, federal, or local, they were for the most part quite strictly territorial. For example, residents of Minneapolis might have their retail electricity regulated intraterritorially by the federal government, the State of Minnesota, or perhaps even the city. But it is unlikely that retail electricity in Minneapolis would be regulated by the State of Illinois or the government of Canada.

The antitrust laws do not exercise the same territorial circumspection. Under traditional ideas about regulatory control it would be almost unthinkable that the United States would attempt to apply its law to a Mexican telephone company's rate structure or customer selection policies; under modern conceptions of antitrust law it is not. The global reach of antitrust extends very far. Actions that occur abroad can be condemned under the Sherman Act if they have an intended, substantial and foreseeable effect on United States commerce. 5 Appellate courts have even approved criminal indictments under United States antitrust law for activity that took place entirely abroad.6

#### 2---Anticompetitive---courts interpret it to mean global---regs are particular.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

III. Extraterritoriality and the core concerns of competition policy

The principle that regulation of public utilities or common carriers is strictly territorial is well established in American law. The United States Supreme Court enforced it with a vengeance in the second half of the 19th century. However, the Court also recognized some room for extraterritorial regulation when courts were applying market principles regarded as "universal" in some sense, as opposed to the specific, highly political and often idiosyncratic provisions of a regulatory statute. Within this framework basic competition rules were thought of as natural, global, and more or less self-defining. In pre-Realist parlance, they were said to be recognized rather than created by the courts. By contrast, specific regulatory provisions were strictly local, or "municipal," and their enforcement was limited to the territory of the sovereign that created them. The result of this dichotomy was more expansive jurisdictional assertions when the policy being enforced was thought to protect general market competition rather than merely enforcing the regulatory mandate of a particular sovereign.

### Ag Evidence---1NR

#### Here’s Japan specific evidence. There’s an agriculture monopoly.

Yamashita Kazuhito 13. “Understanding the Japan Agricultural Cooperatives” Nippon. July 30, 2013. https://www.nippon.com/en/currents/d00082/

There is a great mystery surrounding the Japan Agricultural Cooperatives group, known as the JA. It is commonly phrased in questions like: “If Japanese agriculture is in decline, why is the JA developing, and even flourishing?” and “If the number of farmers is decreasing, why does the JA **have such a large political influence**?” A Japanese Financial Giant It appears that nothing can check the steady fall of Japanese agriculture. Gross agricultural production peaked at ¥11.7 trillion in 1984 and declined to ¥8.2 trillion in 2011. In 1960 there were over 6 million farming households, representing 14.5 million people; the number of households fell by more than half, to 2.5 million, in 2010, and the agricultural workforce dropped to 2.5 million people by 2012—one-sixth of the former level. Despite all this, **the JA continues to grow.** In 1960 it had 6.5 million members; by 2010, that number had grown by 50% to 9.7 million. The organization’s banking businesses commanded ¥88 trillion in funds in 2012—making JA a megabank competing for the number-two spot in the country. The total assets of its insurance arm amount to ¥47 trillion, the same level as Japan’s biggest life insurance company, Nissay, which has ¥51 trillion in assets.

### AT: Thumpers

#### Here’s recent evidence---Japan hates US extraterritorial application---assumes Japanese extraterritorial issues of the AMA

Thanh Cong Phan 18. PhD Diss. Master of Laws, Nagoya University, 2013. Bachelor of Laws, Hanoi Law University, 2004. “Competition Law and the Possibility of Private Transnational Governance”. https://dspace.library.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/1828/10033/Thanh\_Phan\_PhD\_2018.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

In contrast to its willingness to apply the AMA to anticompetitive conduct abroad, the Japanese government does not recognize the exercise of foreign competition law in Japan. On 18 November 1996 in United States of America v. Nippon Paper Industries Co., the government of Japan filed a brief in the U.S. Court of Appeal for the First Circuit in which it asserted that, following principles of international law, “anticompetitive activities occurring within Japanese territory by Japanese corporations fall primarily under the scope of Japanese jurisdiction and are regulated by Japanese legislation.”280 The Japanese government continued that the application American antitrust laws to such activities would be invalid “in the absence of a substantial link between the activities and the source of jurisdiction.”281 The Japanese government also argued that “[o]ne nation’s unilateral adjudication or extraterritorial application of its national laws is not, however, an appropriate means of resolving international differences.”282 The government of Japan urged the court to hold that U.S. courts should not exercise American jurisdiction over business activities conducted in Japan by Japanese companies.283

The government of Japan made the same argument in 2004 in F. Hoffman-La Roche v. Empagran S.A.284 In that case, the Japanese government submitted an amicus curiae brief in support of petitioners to the Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit.285 The Japanese government argued that the FTAIA sought to clarify the limits of U.S. antitrust jurisdiction in U.S. foreign commerce, not expand that jurisdiction.286 The brief cited the statement of the U.S. Congress that “[t]he clarified reach of our own laws could encourage our trading partners to take more effective steps to protect competition in their markets under their competition laws.”287 The government of Japan asserted that nothing in the FTAIA’s legislative history suggests that it was intended to expand American antitrust jurisdiction to foreign firms in foreign markets and if the legislature had intended such an expansion, “there would have been a storm of criticism by foreign governments.”288

In sum, Japan’s approach to the extraterritorial application of competition law is inconsistent. On the one hand, the JFTC has applied the AMA extraterritorially, apparently based on an effects doctrine, but it fails to provide a clear limit on the AMA’s extraterritorial jurisdiction. On the other hand, the Japanese government strongly opposes the extraterritorial application of foreign competition law to transactions conducted by Japanese corporations in Japan. These conflicting views suggest that Japan has a double standard when it comes to the extraterritorial application of competition law.

#### Narrowly defined core antitrust is uncontroversial---only the plan’s expansion offends allies.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

V. Conclusion

Within competition policy worldwide, a great deal of consensus exists about such practices as price fixing and other naked agreements in markets that we generally consider to be competitive, or unregulated. In the presence of that consensus, using national court systems to reach activities outside national boundaries is increasingly uncontroversial, unlikely to cause a great deal of harm, and often does much good. Indeed, importing nations typically have a greater incentive than exporting nations to apply their law to cartel agreements causing monopoly prices. The same thing can be said of a very small number of unilateral practices, such as improper intellectual property (IP) infringement actions or other abuses of IP rights, particularly when there is international consensus about the scope of these rights.

But when one moves away from these core concerns of competition policy, consensus breaks down to a very significant extent. A unique combination of antitrust jurisdictional doctrines then operate so as to impose the highly general United States antitrust statutes on foreign regulators-a task clearly beyond anyone's vision of antitrust's appropriate mandate. The broad view of extraterritorial jurisdiction and the narrow conception of comity developed in the Hartford Fire decision72 become affirmatively offensive to foreign regulatory prerogatives when the antitrust laws are applied beyond their traditional "core" concerns, and in ways that make the United States court little more than a substitute for the regulatory agency and for a foreign regulatory agency at that.

#### Current law is inoffensive---labeling new businesses practices anticompetitive is seen as adventurist.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

Such assertions of extraterritorial power may be relatively inoffensive when the complaint challenges naked price fixing or some other practice widely acknowledged by every competition law authority in the world as anticompetitive. But antitrust in newly deregulated industries has given rise to many more adventuresome antitrust claims about which there is significantly less consensus, even within the United States. A principal one of these is antitrust's essential facility doctrine, which requires a dominant firm to share a facility that is "essential" in the sense that rivals cannot prosper in the market without access to it.50 For example, under the essential facility doctrine a telephone company might be required to share its wire loop or other essential network elements with smaller long-distance or local carriers that want to deliver services in the market as well, but can do so only if they can interconnect. 51

### Courts Apply---1NR

#### Courts will apply extraterritorially---case law is settled.

Stephen D. Piraino 12. J.D. Candidate, 2013; Hofstra University School of Law; B.A, 2010; Boston College. "A Prescription for Excess: Using Prescriptive Comity to Limit the Extraterritorial Reach of the Sherman Act," Hofstra Law Review: Vol. 40: Iss. 4, Article 10. Available at: http://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/hlr/vol40/iss4/10

C. The Current State of the Extraterritorial Application of the Sherman Act

The Sherman Act has evolved from American Banana, where it was a strictly territorial statute.'0 9 It is well-settled law that courts may apply the Sherman Act extraterritorially to foreign conduct causing effects within the United States." 0 Recent case law demonstrates the expansive jurisdiction that courts have to adjudicate Sherman Act violations resulting from purely foreign conduct."' However, the expansive use of the effects doctrine has serious consequences, including possible criminal penalties for foreign corporations engaged in foreign conduct." 2

After Hartford Fire, U.S. courts now only need to look to two factors to determine if they can apply the Sherman Act extraterritorially.' ' 3 First, they examine the effects on the U.S. economy. 14 Second, they determine if there is a true conflict between U.S. antitrust law and foreign law." 5 They do not need to apply a comity analysis.' 6 A jurisdiction-based comity test has been replaced by a simple question of whether a party can obey two-albeit different-laws at the same time. 17

Hartford Fire solidified the importance of the Alcoa effects test to determine the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act and deemphasized Judge Choy's comity-based concerns in Timberlane."8 Comity in the wake of Hartford Fire is now an incredibly difficult defense for a foreign defendant to raise when challenging the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act.' 9 Foreign entities are now even less certain if their conduct will give rise to a Sherman Act violation. 1 20

### Application Bad---1NR

#### Extraterritorial antitrust fractures diplomacy---kills relations with allies.

S. Nathan Park 17. Career in Law Teaching Fellow, Columbia Law School; Adjunct Professor of Law, Georgetown Law Center; Of Counsel, Kobre & Kim LLP. “Equity Extraterritoriality”. https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1515&context=djcil

2. Strife in Diplomatic Relations

Because Equity Extraterritoriality infringes upon a foreign sovereign’s interest, it frequently causes diplomatic strife. The Argentina bond case, litigated before a New York federal court, provided anti-American fodder to Argentina’s politicians.232 Reporters for the Restatement have noted the level of friction and acrimony caused by extraterritorial discovery orders.233 Extraterritorial orders issued pursuant to U.S. antitrust laws have “provoked the loudest and most consistent foreign protests.”234 Discussing American antitrust laws, a Canadian government official did not mince words: “For one government to seek to resolve the conflict in its favor by invoking its national law before its domestic tribunals is not the rule of law but an application, in judicial guise, of the principle that economic might is right.”235 Foreign governments would file amicus curie briefs objecting to U.S. extraterritoriality, but the U.S. court’s deference to such views is not consistent. The In re Uranium Antitrust Litigation opinion is an example of hostility, in which the Seventh Circuit called the governments of Australia, Canada, South Africa, and the United Kingdom “surrogates” of the foreign corporation defendants who “subversively presented for them their case.”236 The Uranium court’s hostility toward the foreign states prompted the State Department to inform the court that the opinion “has caused serious embarrassment to the United States in its relations with some of our closest allies.”237

It is a significant problem that the unelected judiciary, which is often a state court or a federal court applying state law, is effecting foreign policy consequences. When a court issues an extraterritorial order, it is conducting an indirect type of diplomacy against its constitutional mandate.238 The problem is worse when a state law is involved. Territoriality principles prohibit a state law from being applied beyond state borders, much less beyond U.S. borders.239 Yet under Equity Extraterritoriality, a state law may be applied anywhere in the world, causing diplomatic strife with foreign sovereigns.

#### Extraterritorial antitrust shreds commerce and relations.

J. Franck Hogue 16. Recalling First Principles: The Importance of Comity in Avoiding Antitrust Imperialism, 73 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 533 (2016), https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol73/iss1/12

I would add a somewhat less apocalyptic source of conflict that may hamper the operation of global commerce: the overzealous extraterritorial application of antitrust laws. Each of the countries that supplied a part of Mr. Friedman’s computer have their own laws and regulations that govern the conduct of companies doing business within their borders, among them competition laws that delineate what is and what is not permissible.11 These regulations reflect the legal and commercial traditions unique to particular jurisdictions, and embody the differing choices made by these states. And, of course, the United States has its own innumerable laws that govern the conduct of commerce within its own borders.12 These are the product of the U.S. and Western commercial heritage. As to all of the countries, it has long been established in international law that principles of sovereignty permit these nations to apply their laws to conduct occurring within their territory.13 But conflict and friction in the international commercial system can occur when one nation seeks to apply its own laws to conduct that takes place within the borders of another nation.14

---FOOTNOTE 14 STARTS, MID PARAGRAPH---

14. See Brief for Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry of Japan as Amici Curiae Supporting Appellees 3, Motorola Mobility LLC v. AU Optronics Corp., 775 F.3d 816 (7th Cir. 2015) (No. 14-8003) (“‘[E]xcessive’ extraterritorial application of competition law tends to bring about serious tension between the countries involved.”); Brief for Belgian Competition Authority as Amicus Curiae Supporting Appellee 6, Motorola Mobility, 775 F.3d 816 (No. 14-8003) (“The proliferation of competition law systems can contribute significantly to a better functioning of markets. But without the necessary convergence and comity, conflicting policies may well become a significant obstacle to trade and investment, as recognized by nations across the globe.”).

---FOOTNOTE 14 ENDS, PARAGRAPH RESUMES---

The extraterritorial application of antitrust regulations is a potent example. Conflict is particularly possible when it is American antitrust law that is urged to reach foreign commerce and conduct.15 While such an application can be permissible in certain circumstances, there are constraints on the extraterritorial application of American antitrust laws to alleviate such friction.16 One such constraint, but certainly not the only one, is the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act (FTAIA).17

While the FTAIA initially enjoyed little celebrity, it has taken on an increased importance in debates over how far and to what conduct American courts should extend the reach of American antitrust law.18 Increasingly, American courts have taken up the proper application of FTAIA to cases involving foreign conduct, foreign commerce, and domestic claims.19 So too has academia, producing a remarkable volume of scholarly research and shining much-needed light on a once-obscure statute.20

It is into this already-crowded field that Ms. Leonard bravely enters with her timely Note, In Need of Direction: An Evaluation of the “Direct Effect” Requirement Under the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act.21 In her Note, Ms. Leonard seeks to identify the appropriate test to allow the FTAIA to play its proper role in the modern global economy.22 Ms. Leonard focuses her analysis on a single aspect of the analysis with which courts engage when applying the FTAIA, namely the direct effect prong.23 She skillfully dissects and analyzes two differing tests that courts have used in evaluating whether there is a sufficient link between foreign conduct and an alleged harm to domestic American commerce.24 And while Ms. Leonard’s analysis is sound and her ultimate conclusion well-supported, fundamental principles of comity—a first principle when discussing foreign application of a nation’s law—plays only a supporting role in her Note.25

But notions of international comity must not be relegated to such a secondary position. Courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court, have recognized that comity concerns play a prime role as a first principle in determining whether to extend the antitrust laws to foreign conduct.26 Because, as the Court observed, “Why should American law supplant, for example, Canada’s or Great Britain’s or Japan’s own determination about how best to protect Canadian or British or Japanese customers from anticompetitive conduct engaged in significant part by Canadian or British or Japanese or other foreign companies?”27

As other countries have urged, “Greater comity is required in our modern era when international transactions involve a constant flow of products, wealth and people across the globe.”28 Greater comity leaves other countries free to organize their economies and develop their own domestic industries in accordance with the wishes of their own people.29 As the government of Japan has put it, Japan “has significant economic, political, and legal interests in ensuring that companies based in Japan shall comply with the Japanese legal system, and that Japanese companies running businesses elsewhere shall comply with ‘reasonable’ jurisdictional requirements of other nations.”30 The United Kingdom, Ireland, and the Netherlands cited the U.S. Supreme Court to renowned scholar Vaughan Lowe in making the point that a faithful adherence to notions of international comity preserve to each country the ability to conduct its domestic affairs in accordance with that nation’s own norms and priorities.31 An overzealous extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws, and failure to heed comity concerns, risks “fail[ing] to give proper consideration to the legitimate choices those nations have made concerning the regulation of their own commerce and competition in their own industries.”32

### Econ Alliance High---1NR

#### Economic alliance high.

Akira Igata and Brad Glosserman 7/15/21. Akira Igata is Executive Director and Visiting Professor at the Center for Rule-Making Strategies at Tama University and an adviser to the Japanese government, bureaucracy, and private sector and to international organizations on economic security issues. Brad Glosserman is Deputy Director and Visiting Professor at the Center for Rule-Making Strategies at Tama University, a Nonresident Senior Adviser at the Pacific Forum, and the author of Peak Japan: The End of Great Ambitions. "Japan Is Indispensable Again". Foreign Affairs. 7-15-2021. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-07-15/japan-indispensable-again

Japan has been delighted with the first months of Joe Biden’s presidency. Unlike his predecessor, whose transactional view of diplomacy rankled many in Tokyo, Biden has been at pains to rekindle the U.S.-Japanese alliance and to emphasize that Japan remains the linchpin of U.S. security policy in Asia. In February, the two nations renewed the agreement under which Japan hosts U.S. troops, and in March, Secretary of State Antony Blinken and Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin both visited Japan on their first overseas trips. Biden hosted Japanese Prime Minister Suga Yoshihide as his first foreign guest as president.

It will surprise no one that a major focus of these early meetings has been China, whose economic and military rise has unnerved Washington and Tokyo and united them in competition with Beijing. Biden administration officials have repeatedly affirmed their readiness to defend Japan, including its claim to the disputed Senkaku Islands (known in China as the Diaoyu Islands). But in addition to military and diplomatic competition with China, which has long been central to the U.S.-Japanese relationship, both countries have placed a new and important emphasis on economic security. In their first meeting, Biden and Suga discussed ways to protect critical supply chains, intellectual property rights, and sensitive technology that should not pass into Beijing’s hands. At the March meeting of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue, an informal strategic forum that includes Australia, India, Japan, and the United States, both leaders took a similarly expansive view of the China challenge, leading to the creation of working groups on controlling critical and emerging technologies, among other economic security issues.

That heightened economic competition with China has helped Japan reinvigorate its alliance with the United States is not an accident. Over the last several years, the Japanese government—first under Prime Minister Abe Shinzo and then under Suga—has honed a new brand of economic statecraft designed to protect the country’s economic interests, limit China’s creeping influence in Asia, and bolster Japanese soft power. Through a combination of enhanced economic intelligence, tighter trade restrictions, and better stewardship of data and emerging technologies, Japan has become a force for economic security in Asia and reinforced its position as an indispensable U.S. ally.

ABE’S ECONOMIC STATECRAFT

Japan has long thought of security in more than military terms. In part because of the military constraints imposed by its pacifist constitution, Tokyo has historically tried to win the trust of other Asian powers through aid, trade, and diplomacy. And it has largely succeeded: public opinion surveys in Southeast Asia consistently show that Japan is the most trusted major power in the region and that it has considerable soft power.

### Indo-Pak War---1NR

#### 2. There’s a risk of Indo-Pak war---it goes nuclear---kills billions.

Zachary Keck 17. Wohlstetter Public Affairs Fellow at Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, George Mason University. “Billions Could Die If India and Pakistan Start a Nuclear War.” The National Interest. July 21. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/billions-could-die-if-india-pakistan-start-nuclear-war-21623?page=2>

Billions Could Die If India and Pakistan Start a Nuclear War

With the world’s attention firmly fixated on North Korea, the greatest possibility of nuclear war is in fact on the other side of Asia.

That place is what could be called the nuclear triangle of Pakistan, India and China. Although Chinese and Indian forces are currently engaged in a standoff, traditionally the most dangerous flashpoint along the triangle has been the Indo-Pakistani border. The two countries fought three major wars before acquiring nuclear weapons, and one minor one afterwards. And this doesn’t even include the countless other armed skirmishes and other incidents that are a regular occurrence.

At the heart of this conflict, of course, is the territorial dispute over the northern Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, the latter part of which Pakistan lays claim to. Also key to the nuclear dimension of the conflict is the fact that India’s conventional capabilities are vastly superior to Pakistan’s. Consequently, Islamabad has adopted a nuclear doctrine of using tactical nuclear weapons against Indian forces to offset the latter’s conventional superiority.

If this situation sounds similar, that is because this is the same strategy the U.S.-led NATO forces adopted against the Soviet Union during the Cold War. In the face of a numerically superior Soviet military, the United States, starting with the Eisenhower administration, turned to nuclear weapons to defend Western Europe from a Soviet attack. Although nearly every U.S. president, as well as countless European leaders, were uncomfortable with this escalatory strategy, they were unable to escape the military realities undergirding it until at least the Reagan administration.

At an event at the Stimson Center in Washington this week, Feroz Khan, a former brigadier in the Pakistan Army and author of one of the best books on the country’s nuclear program, said that Pakistani military leaders explicitly based their nuclear doctrine on NATO’s Cold War strategy. But as Vipin Narang, a newly tenured MIT professor who was on the same panel, pointed out, an important difference between NATO and Pakistan’s strategies is that the latter has used its nuclear shield as a cover to support countless terrorist attacks inside India. Among the most audacious were the 2001 attacks on India’s parliament and the 2008 siege of Mumbai, which killed over 150 people. Had such an attack occurred in the United States, Narang said, America would have ended a nation-state.

The reason why India didn’t respond to force, according to Narang, is that—despite its alleged Cold Start doctrine—Indian leaders were unsure exactly where Pakistan’s nuclear threshold stood. That is, even if Indian leaders believed they were launching a limited attack, they couldn’t be sure that Pakistani leaders wouldn’t view it as expansive enough to justify using nuclear weapons. This is no accident: as Khan said, Pakistani leaders intentionally leave their nuclear threshold ambiguous. Nonetheless, there is no guarantee that India’s restraint will continue in the future. Indeed, as Michael Krepon quipped, “Miscalculation is South Asia’s middle name.”

Much of the panel’s discussion was focused on technological changes that might exacerbate this already-combustible situation. Narang took the lead in describing how India was acquiring the capabilities to pursue counterforce strikes (i.e., take out Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal in a preventive or more likely preemptive strike). These included advances in information, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities to be able to track and target Islamabad’s strategic forces, as well as a missile-defense system that could take care of any missiles the first strike didn’t destroy. He also noted that India is pursuing a number of missile capabilities highly suited for counterforce missions, such as Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs), Maneuverable Reentry Vehicles (MARVs) and the highly accurate BrahMos missiles that Dehli developed jointly with Russia. “BrahMos is one hell of a counterforce weapon,” even without nuclear warheads, Narang contended.

As Narang himself admitted, there’s little reason to believe that India is abandoning its no-first-use nuclear doctrine in favor of a first-strike one. Still, keeping in mind Krepon’s point about miscalculation, that doesn’t mean that these technological changes don’t increase the potential for a nuclear war. It is not hard to imagine a scenario where the two sides stumble into a nuclear war that neither side wants. Perhaps the most plausible scenario would start with a Mumbai-style attack that Indian leaders decide they must respond to. In hopes of keeping the conflict limited to conventional weapons, Delhi might authorize limited punitive raids inside Pakistan, perhaps targeting some of the terrorist camps near the border. These attacks might be misinterpreted by Pakistani leaders, or else unintentionally cross Islamabad’s nuclear thresholds. In an attempt to deescalate by escalating, or else to halt what they believe is an Indian invasion, Pakistani leaders could use tactical nuclear weapons against the Indian troops inside Pakistan.

With nuclear weapons introduced, Delhi’s no-first-use doctrine no longer applies. Indian leaders, knowing they’d face incredible domestic pressure to respond, would also have no guarantee that Pakistani leaders didn’t intend to follow the tactical use of nuclear weapons with strategic strikes against Indian cities. Armed with what they believe is reasonable intelligence about the locations of Pakistan’s strategic forces, highly accurate missiles and MIRVs to target them, and a missile defense that has a shot at cleaning up any Pakistani missiles that survived the first strike, Indian leaders might be tempted to launch a counterforce first strike. As former Indian National Security Advisor Shivshankar Menon wrote in his memoirs (which Narang first drew people’s attention to at the Carnegie Nuclear Policy Conference in March): “India would hardly risk giving Pakistan the chance to carry out a massive nuclear strike after the Indian response to Pakistan using tactical nuclear weapons. In other words, Pakistani tactical nuclear weapon use would effectively free India to undertake a comprehensive first strike against Pakistan.”

#### 3. Indo-Pak nuclear war causes extinction.

Joseph Trevithick & Tyler Rogoway 19. \*Fellow at GlobalSecurity.org, MA in Conflict Resolution from Georgetown University. \*\*Defense journalist and photographer who maintains the website Foxtrot Alpha for Jalopnik.com. “Yes, India And Pakistan Could End The World As We Know It Through A Nuclear Exchange.” https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/26674/yes-india-and-pakistan-could-end-the-world-as-we-know-it-through-a-nuclear-exchange

India and Pakistan's nuclear arsenals are tiny compared to those of the United States and Russia, and these weapons are focused primarily on deterring each other, but that does not mean they're purely regional threats. Unlike conventional weapons, nuclear weapons create lasting and far-reaching effects that scientists have posited could upend life on Earth if warring parties were to use them in sufficient numbers.

In 2012, Alan Robock, a distinguished professor in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Associate Director of the Center for Environmental Prediction at Rutgers University, and Owen Brian Toon, a professor in the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a research associate at the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics at the University of Colorado, Boulder, argued that it might not take a large amount of nuclear weapons to create a scenario commonly known as "Nuclear Winter."

In general, this hypothesized event occurs when smoke and soot from nuclear explosions block significant amounts of sunlight from reaching the earth's surface, leading to a precipitous drop in temperatures that results in mass crop failure and widespread famine.

Robcock and Toon summarized their findings, which were based in part on their previous work, in an article in the Bulletin of The Atomic Scientists, writing:

"Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs – only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power – as airbursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about 20 percent for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.

The bomb the United States dropped on Hiroshima Japan, known as Little Boy, was an inefficient and essentially experimental design with a yield of around 15 kilotons. The reported results from Indian and Pakistani nuclear testing indicate that both countries can meet this threshold and both countries' weapons programs have almost certainly matured in the decades since.

In previous studies, Robcock, working with others, postulated that temperature changes could begin within 10 days of a limited nuclear exchange and the effects from the detonations of 100 nuclear weapons in the 15-kiloton class would directly result in the deaths of at least 20 million people. The second order impacts would be even worse in the years that followed.

In 2014, Michael Mills and Julia Lee-Taylor, both then working at the federally-funded National Center for Atmospheric Research's (NCAR) Earth System Laboratory, authored another paper with Robcock and Toon. This study concluded again that detonation of 100 15-kiloton yield bombs in a purely regional conflict would result in "multi-decadal global cooling" and "would put significant pressures on global food supplies and could trigger a global nuclear famine."

It is important to note that critics have questioned whether the Nuclear Winter concept relies on too many assumptions and would ever actually occur. At the center of many of these rebuttals are debates about whether the nuclear explosions would truly create the amount of smoke and soot necessary for major climate change, as well as the specific conditions for those particles to remain in the atmosphere for a prolonged period of time.

The studies here do indicate significant impacts based on a relatively limited number of nuclear detonations of smaller yield devices, though. But even if the impacts are less pronounced than projected in this particular scenario, they could be far more severe if India and Pakistan were to use a larger number weapons and/or ones of higher yields, which both belligerents readily have.

In addition, Nuclear Winter is just one of the potential things that might happen following a nuclear exchange between the longtime foes. A detonation of dozens of nuclear weapons, even small ones, would throw hazardous nuclear fallout into the air that, depending on the weather pattern, could carry that material far and wide, causing both near- and short-term health impacts. The various ground zeroes themselves would be irritated and potentially hazardous for many years to come.

Depending on where the detonations occur, a nuclear exchange could potentially cut people off from critical water and food supplies, putting increased and potentially unsustainable strains on uncontaminated areas. After the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, situated in Ukraine, melted down and exploded in 1986, authorities established a 1,000 square mile restricted access "exclusion zone" that remains in place today.

There would also be a major danger of second-order "spillover" effects, as individuals fled affected areas, putting economic and political strains on neighboring regions. This could inflame existing tensions not directly related to the inter-state conflict between India or Pakistan or lead to all new and potentially violent competition for what might already be limited resources. India has already threatened to weaponize water access in its latest spat with the Pakistanis.

Any serious impacts on food and water supplies, or other economic upheavals as a direct or indirect result of the conflict, would have cascading impact across South Asia and beyond, as well. The very threat of a potential India-Pakistan war of any kind already caused some negative reactions in regional financial markets. Those markets would certainly collapse after an unprecedented nuclear exchange actually occurred, and that is before the long-term physical impacts of such an event would even manifest themselves.

Overall, we are talking about a sudden and dramatic geopolitical, financial, and environmental shift that would change our reality in a matter of hours. Even then, the darkness, both figuratively and literally, that could propagate over the weeks, months, and years would be far more damaging.