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### 1AC --- Advantage --- Primacy

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially increase prohibitions on platform utilities by expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws to include standards against owning and competing on a platform and the acquisition of potential and/or nascent competitors

#### The plan effectively limits big tech

D'Souza, 20 (Deborah D'Souza, Deborah received her bachelor's degree in English from Fergusson College. She earned her master's degree in social anthropology at the University of Oxford and her master's degree in journalism from Columbia University., 9-12-2020, accessed on 9-1-2021, Investopedia, "Elizabeth Warren's Plan to Break Up Big Tech Explained", https://www.investopedia.com/how-will-elizabeth-warren-break-up-big-tech-4772263)//Babcii

The Plan [Among Warren's 48 plans](https://www.investopedia.com/elizabeth-warren-s-economic-plan-explained-4706529), is the "How we can break up Big Tech" plan. According to her, companies acquire smaller rivals and use their proprietary online marketplaces to unfairly limit competition. Her plan to fix this consists of two main parts and some goals for the future: Online Marketplaces = Platform Utilities Warren wants to pass legislation that requires **online marketplaces** run by companies with annual global revenue above $90 million to be designated as "**platform utilities." Companies with annual global revenue above $25 billion will not be allowed to own** platform **utilities and participants** on it at the same time. In other words, companies will not be able to sell services on a public marketplace they own and control. Platform utilities will have to treat all users fairly and equally. If sued and found guilty of violating the neutrality requirement, they would have to pay a fine equal to 5% of their annual revenue. **Reversing mergers** Warren will also appoint federal regulators who will reverse "**illegal**" and "**anti-competitive**" mergers. Goals Her three goals are to give people more control over how their personal data is collected, shared, and sold, help news outlets and artists keep more of the value their content generates, and ensure that no foreign power uses social media to influence U.S. elections. What the Plan Means for the FAANGs **Facebook**: Under Warren's plan, Facebook's 2012 acquisition of Instagram and 2014 acquisition of WhatsApp would be reversed, something Zuckerberg called an "existential" threat. "Facebook would face real pressure from Instagram and WhatsApp to improve the user experience and protect our privacy," says Warren's campaign website. Seventy percent of U.S. adults and 51% of U.S. teens use Facebook, according to [Pew Research](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/05/16/facts-about-americans-and-facebook/). However, 70% of U.S. teens use Instagram, the platform Facebook is using to compete with the likes of Snap Inc. and TikTok. The company will be depending on Instagram to drive ad revenue in the coming years. **Amazon**: Amazon.com Inc. ([AMZN](https://www.investopedia.com/markets/quote?tvwidgetsymbol=amzn)) would **not be allowed to sell its own products** alongside third-party sellers on Amazon.com, if Warren's legislation is passed. Its privately-owned brands, like AmazonBasics, would have to be spun off or shuttered. Its mergers with Whole Foods (2017) and Zappos (2009) would also be unwound. Most of the hundreds of brands Amazon owns haven't had too much success, but Oweise Khazi, senior principal at Gartner L2, told [Retail Dive](https://www.retaildive.com/news/with-private-brands-amazon-plays-the-long-game/550790/) that Amazon is "playing the long game" and will be studying the massive amount of data it has access to. **Apple**: Apple Inc. ([AAPL](https://www.investopedia.com/markets/quote?tvwidgetsymbol=aapl)) is not among the companies mentioned on Warren's official campaign website, but the **AppStore would also qualify as a platform utility**. This means Apple would not be able to sell its own applications, like Apple Music and Apple News, on the platform. “It’s got to be one or the other,” said Warren when asked about it by [The Verge](https://www.theverge.com/2019/3/9/18257965/elizabeth-warren-break-up-apple-monopoly-antitrust). “Either they run the platform or they play in the store. They don’t get to do both at the same time.” This would come in the way Apple's Services business ambitions. Netflix: Netflix Inc. ([NFLX](https://www.investopedia.com/markets/quote?tvwidgetsymbol=nflx)) faces little regulatory risk at this point. In March 2019, BMO Capital Markets made Netflix its top technology stock instead of Amazon for this reason, according to [CNBC](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/15/bmo-favors-netflix-over-amazon-because-of-sen-warren.html). The debate about whether the company is a budding [monopoly](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/monopoly.asp) with its massive original content budget is still ongoing. Alphabet Inc. ([GOOGL](https://www.investopedia.com/markets/quote?tvwidgetsymbol=googl)): **Google’s Ad Exchange and** Google **Search are both platform utilities** under the proposed law and would **need to be spun off**. Alternatively, Google would have to stop including its own comparison shopping service, restaurant ratings etc. in search results, because it would be competing with other companies like Yelp, and separate its business from Ad Exchange. Its acquisitions of Waze, Nest and DoubleClick would also be unwound

#### The advantage is Primacy:

#### Future tech is the only credible threat China will pose to U.S primacy --- The ability of the U.S to leverage private innovation is key

**Stephen, 21** (Capt Stephen, Captain Fuller’s (MS, Tarleton State University; BS, University of Phoenix. He is an ANG Cyber Operations Officer serving as the Director of Operations of the Base Communications Flight at Will Rogers, ANGB., 3-12-2021, accessed on 8-31-2021, Air University (AU), "China in Search of AI Supremacy", https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2532254/china-in-search-of-ai-supremacy/)//Babcii

In order to totally understand the need of the United States to maintain and compete for artificial intelligence (AI) supremacy over our near peer threat, China, we must first look at the Chinese Communist Party’s (CCP) militarily goals and what makes them unique in their pursuit. According to the Department of Defense’s (DOD) 2000’s Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China, the People’s Liberation Army’s (PLA) **ground, air, and naval forces** were sizable but **mostly obsolete**. Their **cyber capabilities were rudimentary**, and its use of information technology was well behind the curve.1 China’s defense industry was **struggling to produce high-quality systems**. Flash forward two decades and the PLA’s objective is to become a “world-class military” by the end of 2049; this per the DOD’s Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China, 2020. How does a country once floundering by the wayside with obsolete weaponry and technology make such dramatic leaps to be able to announce their intentions of becoming a “world-class” military by the end of 2049? In just a short 20 years, the Chinese are already surpassing us, the mightiest military in the world, in shipbuilding, land-based conventional ballistic and cruise missiles, and integrated air defense systems. Alongside conventional warfare, the CCP is investing heavily in technology innovations and has specifically mentioned **AI** as a **paramount part of their National Defense Strategy**. Why is AI so important? What is AI? AI can be thought of as the ability of an artificial agent to achieve goals in a “wide range of environments.”2 What China is interested in is more in line with the deep learning aspect of AI. Deep learning, now popularly associated with artificial intelligence, is a technique that harnesses neural networks to train algorithms to do specified tasks, such as image recognition.3 With this deep learning, there are many military applications such as automating military equipment to perform a task(s) while learning better strategies to simply taking more and more of the human element out while the AI makes decisions based on the algorithms that are input into the system(s). While focusing on how it will benefit China economically and socially, they will also be utilizing technology, specifically AI to improve their military efforts; no real line between them in the Chinese construct. Although China is not yet up to par with the rest of the—primarily Western—world, they are putting significant capital in its progress. A perfect example of how serious China is in investing in AI is the AI startup SenseTime. In a four-year span, it went from an academic project to becoming the world’s most valuable artificial intelligence company with a current valuation of $4.5 billion. SenseTime is now the largest algorithm provider in China, as well as the fifth largest AI platform. Along with other tech titans, SenseTime is working with the Chinese government on Made in China 2025, an initiative to make the country economically autonomous.4 Made in China 2025 states the strategic goals of turning China to a major manufacturing power. By 2020, their goal was to consolidate manufacturing power and increase manufacturing digitalization. By 2035, Chinese manufacturing will reach an intermediate level among manufacturing powers. By 2049, China’s manufacturing sector status will become more consolidated, and China will become the leader among the world’s manufacturing powers.5 In order to accomplish this, the Chinese are relying on technology innovations from AI companies such as SenseTime. This brings us to the why and how China is able to rely on civilian innovation as much as it does for not only the social and economic benefits but also the direct alignment of military goals. ”Military-Civil Fusion, or MCF, is an aggressive, national strategy of the CCP. Its goal is to enable the PRC to develop the most technologically advanced military in the world… Under MCF, the CCP is systematically reorganizing the Chinese science and technology enterprise to ensure that new innovations simultaneously advance economic and military development.”6 As a national strategy, military-civil fusion traces roots to the Maoist idea of “people’s warfare,” which prescribed a “whole-of-society” approach to military mobilization, and builds on industrial policy to drive military modernization.7 While civilian companies, such as SenseTime and Ali-Baba, are working to improve the social and economic functions of China; they are also directly in line with the CCP to improve the innovations and the capabilities of the PLA. Unlike the United States, there is no clear line or delineation between the government and its civilian counterparts. The partnership goes both ways; not only do the civilian entities in China share technology and AI algorithms with the government but the CCP ensures that there is plenty of capital invested in the civilian sector, primarily to the companies and entities that have a direct role in achieving the ambitious plans of the CCP. When searching for MCF, the number one topic that comes up time and time again is that of AI. Chinese firms and research institutes are advancing uses of AI that could undermine US **economic leadership and provide an asymmetrical advantage in warfare**. Chinese military strategists see AI as a breakout technology that could enable China to rapidly modernize its military, surpassing overall US capabilities and developing tactics that specifically target US vulnerabilities.8 The CCP is rapidly growing its arsenal, whether it be conventional warfare items or aggressively investing in technology and innovations. Although the PRC does not have the technology and the assets, the engineers, or the capabilities that we have right now, they are **pumping all the resources they can** to ensure that they reach their end state of being a player that everyone has to recognize on an equal playing field. What can a country such as the United States do when we have moral obligations that the CCP does not have, nor institutes? Having a gray area between the civilian sector and the military gives them a clear advantage as there is no such thing as a separation of government and the civilian sector. Our government has some leeway in pushing tax dollars towards certain functions that will improve our overall social and economic structure but crossing the line of government versus private sector is still a clear boundary that most will not cross. We have a democracy as to where our government can change greatly every two to four years, whereas the Chinese have a government that is setup to exist generationally and even past that. Our greatest asset of Democracy might also be the reason that the CCP and the PLA can gain on us in the future, possibly. **The greatest advantage that the United States has over China is our free market system.** **We enable companies to compete** for monetary advantage and with only little government interference/oversight unlike China, which consistently monitors all businesses and citizens. In 2019, privately held AI companies attracted nearly $40 billion in disclosed equity investment—defined as venture capital, private equity, and mergers and acquisitions—across more than 3,100 discrete transactions. US companies attracted most of this investment: $25.2 billion in disclosed value (64 percent of the global total) across 1,412 transactions.9 What does this tell us? Well, China has not attracted the investment that most think; if $25.2 billion or 64 percent of the global total is still coming from the United States, then maybe the competition is not as close as most think it is. Our military depends greatly on our private companies coming up with usable applications for civilian purposes and then the military legally purchases or contracts the item for military use. We do not stifle civilian innovation; we tend to reuse the items in different manners but depend on that civilian innovation for the next greatest thing in technology. Nothing is owed to the United States government and the civilian companies can negotiate the value of their AI product. Although China is focusing more internally on their own startups, their AI narrative, and it seems to not be at the level that our AI innovation is, we must continue to proceed with caution. As soon as we let down our guard, China may surpass us and could possibly one day become the world’s AI leader.

#### Two Internal links ---

#### First---Integration---Big tech is integrating with China --- That undermines Tech development and makes it a zero-sum game

Sitaraman, 20 (Ganesh Sitaraman , Prof @ Vanderbilt University law school, A.B. in government magna cum laude from Harvard College, a master’s degree in political thought from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and his J.D. magna cum laude from Harvard Law School. longtime advisor to Elizabeth Warren, 1-30-2020, accessed on 7-18-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The National Security Case for Breaking Up Big Tech by Ganesh Sitaraman :: SSRN", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3537870)//Babcii

The claim that big American tech companies are somehow an alternative to Chinese dominance—or, in the more extreme form, that they are competing with China on behalf of the United States—is largely backwards. In fact, many big American tech companies are operating in China, working with Chinese companies, and seeking to expand. Because markets and the state are intertwined in China, interactions with Chinese companies and investments in China are likely to pass along operational and technological developments to the Chinese government and military, including in ways that advance its emerging surveillance state—and accelerate its ability to spread its model of digital authoritarianism around the world. In short, big tech companies that operate in China are likely assisting the rise of China, not acting as a hedge against it. Rather than competing with China, many big tech companies are integrating with China or attempting to deepen their integration with China. Google has announced an AI center in Beijing,8 and it is exploring a partnership with Tencent that involves using the Chinese tech giant’s cloud service as an alternative to Google Cloud.9 In 2018, the company also proposed Project Dragonfly, which would have created a search engine that would be in compliance with Chinese censorship regulations behind the Great Firewall.10 That endeavor created controversy within the firm and criticism from human rights groups.11 Other companies also operate in China or are seeking to do so. Microsoft is expanding data centers in China and has built an operating system, “Windows 10 China Government Edition,” for the Chinese government.12 After Alibaba, Amazon provides the largest cloud service in China, and its Amazon Web Services division works with local companies and is expanding its data centers.13 Apple, of course, famously designs its phones in California but makes them in China.14 In 2017, Apple announced a partnership with a Chinese firm with close ties to the government and a year later moved its Chinese iCloud and iCloud encryption services to China.15 Notably, Facebook isn’t operating in China—but not for lack of trying. The company has repeatedly attempted to gain access but has been blocked by government officials.16 Merely operating in China might not seem like it undermines the claim of U.S.-Chinese competition. After all, it might be that American companies are seeking to steal market share from Chinese companies in China. Global dominance requires, unsurprisingly, dominance around the globe, including in the world’s biggest markets. The problem is that, according to scholars, U.S. government officials, and even American business associations, any U.S. company that is developing AI in China, making significant technological investments in China, or simply operating in China is likely supporting the Chinese government and military. Chinese companies are often state-run, partly owned by the state, or have informal ties to state and Communist Party officials, as scholars have documented.17 Formal and informal ties allow the government to have influence over many companies, and they create an incentive for companies to comply with party preferences preemptively even without formal government pressure.18 Cooperation and partnerships with these companies therefore mean cooperation with state-directed aims. “No major Chinese company,” Senator Mark Warner has noted, “is independent of the Chinese government and Communist Party.”19 An official at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce goes even further, arguing that American firms going to China have “to please the Chinese government and the Communist Party.”20 Moreover, because artificial intelligence is a dual-use technology, ostensibly commercial innovations can also have military implications. China’s stated doctrine of “civil-military fusion” thus virtually guarantees that companies are indirectly assisting the military if they are working with Chinese entities.21 Under that doctrine, “any technologies held by the private or academic sectors—whether imported or developed in-house—must be shared with the Chinese military.”22 When combined with the corporate-state relationship in China, this means the technological innovations in the private sector are likely being shared with the government for military purposes. As former defense secretary Ash Carter has noted, “If you’re working in China, you don’t know whether you’re working on a project for the military or not.”23 The fact that Chinese companies and the state are intertwined means that American companies working in China are potentially helping accelerate the adoption of digital authoritarianism within China and its spread abroad. In general, the development of artificial intelligence “offers a plausible way for big, economically advanced countries to make their citizens rich while maintaining control over them.”24 Big data, combined with AI, enables governments and big tech companies not only to predict but also to shape what individuals will do. Politically, this means that governments will have the power to preempt dissenters to a far greater degree than authoritarian regimes of the past.25 Economically, it means that centralized economic planning might find greater success than in the past, because governments and companies can shape the behavior of individuals.26 And over time, behavioral changes shape beliefs, potentially building support for the regime itself.27 These dynamics suggest that the new “digital authoritarianism” may have greater staying power than its low-tech precursors.28 At home, China has long been concerned about domestic disharmony and has pursued a policy of “social management” to achieve “holistic” security—not just national security but party organization and the management of the social order.29 The Chinese State Council sees AI as “irreplaceable” in ensuring social harmony in the future.30 China has taken steps to develop a “social credit system,” in which individuals are assessed in every interaction to determine their trustworthiness, their compliance with laws and social norms, and the degree to which their social networks are also compliant. Chinese tech companies have reportedly agreed to share data with the government in support of this project.31 Local governments and tech companies are cooperating to develop “credit cities,” the local counterpart to a full-on national system.32 Chinese companies are also already exporting surveillance technologies abroad, including biometric censors and facial recognition software.33 Given that many big American tech companies are operating in China or seeking to do so and that engagement with Chinese entities likely means information is transferred to the government, the idea that big American tech companies are helping the United States vis-à-vis China in some kind of Cold War-style technology arms race makes little sense. It is just as likely, if not much more so, that firms operating in China are directly or indirectly furthering China’s emergent domestic surveillance capabilities, its military use of those technologies, and its spread of digital authoritarianism abroad as well.34 How Big Tech’s Entanglements Threaten American Power and Values In addition to benefiting Chinese power, big tech’s integration with China threatens the United States by creating leverage over the United States, and it could, in the future, undermine the American ecosystem of free speech and expression. This could happen in multiple ways: Integration opens the United States to espionage and surveillance, creates economic leverage over the United States, and preemptively forces companies to adhere to the standards of Chinese censors, thereby restricting speech and expression particularly on issues related to democracy. Most obviously, integration with China raises concerns about espionage and surveillance. For example, Pentagon officials have been concerned that if the Chinese company Huawei operates 5G systems among American allies, the United States will have to restrict intelligence sharing along such systems; if those systems have surveillance capacities or backdoors, information across the system could be captured by the Chinese government.35 Federal regulators have also flagged a Chinese company’s acquisition of the dating app Grindr, which has a great deal of personal information that could be used to pressure or blackmail users.36 More broadly, economic interdependence can be used as leverage for political purposes. Scholars refer to this by a variety of terms, including “geoeconomics,”37 “reverse entanglement,”38 and “weaponized interdependence.”39 But the tactics are similar regardless of the label— and China utilizes them frequently. To retaliate against South Korea’s adoption of a U.S. missile defense system, China blocked tourism to the country.40 And it blocked imports from Norway after dissident Liu Xiaobo was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.41 Interdependence in the economy generally, and in the technology sector specifically, thus bring significant risks to the United States in an era of great power competition. The more integrated the economies of two countries, the more likely it is that a foreign country will have leverage over the United States. The use of boycotts is one example. But raising tariffs to start a trade war could devastate sectors of the economy, and interrupting a supply chain for essential parts and components (whether consumer, commercial, or military) could have significant consequences, particularly in a crisis. Integration also means that corporations are contorting their operations outside of China in order to comply with the preferences of Chinese censors. The most prominent concern is self-censorship—companies and other actors that change their messages, artistic choices, or statements for fear of offending Chinese censors. For example, the general manager of the Houston Rockets basketball team tweeted support for the Hong Kong protestors, only to backtrack in the face of concerns about the Chinese reaction.42 The People’s Daily branded Mercedes-Benz an “enemy of the people” after the car manufacturer posted a quote from the Dalai Lama on Instagram; Mercedes later deleted the post.43 Some university researchers are concerned about self-censorship within academia on topics related to China.44 Hollywood studios are reportedly changing dialogue, scenes, and themes in movies in order to comply with Chinese censors.45 And tech companies too have taken steps toward compliance with Chinese internet regulations: Apple, for example, “removed VPNs [virtual private networks] from the Chinese version of its App Store.”46 Google’s Project Dragonfly was controversial internally with employees for the same reason. Why does it matter if corporations change their behaviors based on Chinese preferences? After all, global companies have done so for many years. McDonald’s and Coca-Cola, for example, offer different menus and beverages in different countries to respond to the tastes and preferences of consumers. The shift in corporate behavior in response to Chinese preferences differs in two ways. First, unlike the McDonald’s and Coca-Cola examples, companies aren’t just changing their products within China. They are doing so globally. That the leaders of Mercedes won’t quote the Dalai Lama and Hollywood writers are changing scripts for blockbuster films because they might offend Chinese censors means that American audiences are subject to the views of Chinese censors, as is the rest of the world. Second, the willingness of these companies to adhere to Chinese preferences calls into question whether global firms can be trusted when they seek to lobby or influence the U.S. government. In the mid-twentieth century, the maxim “what’s good for General Motors is good for America” suggested a link between corporate success and national success. That is unlikely to be the case anymore (if it ever was). Under the dominant ideology of contemporary corporate lawyers—who see shareholder profits as the sole aim of corporate managers—corporate managers are required to pursue profitable operations; American national interests are not part of the calculus.47 A global corporation that gains most of its profits from abroad might therefore have profit-based interests that do not align with American national interests. To put a fine point on it, one could imagine a company that seeks to expand its access into China lobbying the United States government in ways that are detrimental to American interests and, indeed, even serve the interests of the Chinese government. This is not to say that corporate executives or lobbyists are foreign agents deliberately pursuing such an aim—or that they think of themselves that way and would state as much to government officials. This wolf comes in sheep’s clothing: Policies will likely be justified as pursuing neutral economic principles, and many who advocate for them might not even see the broader connections. Defenders of integration often suggest that narrowly drawn regulations can address any problems that might arise from integration, though at least some defenders consider even limited restrictions on economic integration to be disastrous.48 For example, one set of think tank scholars have argued for requiring transparency in Chinese corporation ownership (that is, to identify state-owned or -invested companies) as a way to prevent Chinese influence over American corporations. 49 Another set says that U.S. policy should consider “who owns a company’s stock, how the company is governed, and whether it has sizable contracts with the Chinese military or defense industry. ... Similarly, companies with executives close to the state, through either prior employers or personal connections, warrant further scrutiny.”50 A third argues that “the United States should work with its allies and trading partners to pressure Beijing to open up the Chinese market to foreign companies, curb its preferential treatment of Chinese firms, and better protect foreign companies’ intellectual property.”51 If it is correct that the Chinese state and market are integrated, as a number of senior defense officials and scholars of the Chinese state and market have argued,52 then these policy solutions cannot meet the nature of the challenge. Transparency rules will not solve the problem of informal ties between government and private sector in China, nor do they place mandates on companies if there are formal ties. Careful investigation of the relevant relationships and ownership ties might miss important connections, ignore the fact that Chinese doctrine requires civil-military fusion, and neglect to address the incentive companies have to comply preemptively with Chinese government preferences, even absent any specific connection to the government or pressure from the government. Finally, efforts to reduce preferential treatment and protect American intellectual property run counter to the fact that the integration of state and market in China is not a bug, but a central feature of the system. How Breaking Up Big Tech Builds a More Resilient Economy and Democracy What does bigness have to do with integration? Or to put it differently, is the real problem integration with China rather than a weak antitrust and regulatory regime to govern big tech companies? The question of integration with China as a general matter is beyond the scope of this essay, but the size and dominance of American tech companies is part of the problem, and breaking up big tech should therefore be part of the solution. To see why, compare a concentrated ecosystem with a small number of big companies to a competitive ecosystem with a large number of small companies. In a concentrated ecosystem with few players, China will have far more leverage over the United States. A small number of big tech companies that are integrated with China will be more dependent on Chinese markets for consumers and profits—and, in turn, more vulnerable to pressure from the Chinese government. In contrast, in a fractured market with many players, it is much more likely that some will seek other sources for supply chains, develop domestic American capacities, or simply choose not to engage in the Chinese market—whether because of idiosyncratic preferences, competitive dynamics, product differentiation, higher costs, or other factors. It is theoretically possible that we might instead expect another outcome: A small number of tech firms making monopoly profits might not need Chinese markets and therefore would be more independent from that country’s fusion of politics and economics. Likewise, a multi-player ecosystem of smaller companies, each with razor-thin profit margins, might push all of these players to dependence on Chinese markets for consumers and profits (this is, of course, where debates over integration versus disentanglement are relevant). But theory is not reality, and this alternative hypothesis has not been borne out. In our current highly concentrated tech market, big tech companies are not forsaking Chinese markets out of a combination of morality, patriotism, and monopoly profits. They are operating in China and are desperate to integrate further. Concerns about censorship and distorted practices are also significantly reduced in a competitive ecosystem of smaller players because some companies and creative gatekeepers won’t aim to comply with Chinese government preferences. Consider the Hollywood context. Disney’s share of box office sales domestically, for example, approaches 40 percent, and the six biggest studios have 85 percent of box office sales.53 These companies produce fewer films and, because of their market power, can contractually require that those films be shown in theaters in ways that block other films.54 These companies are also increasingly integrating vertically across production and distribution: Netflix both produces shows and operates a streaming service, as does Amazon and now even Disney. The result is that smaller players are likely to face a tilted playing field because integrated behemoths can prioritize their own content over competitors and might not take chances on content that isn’t likely to maximize their viewership goals.55 If these big integrated companies comply with Chinese censors because of their ambitions in the Chinese market, then American consumers will not see content that doesn’t adhere to Chinese government preferences. In contrast, in a system with a large number of small studios, many would not have the size and scope to play to the Chinese market, let alone be dependent on the Chinese market. They also wouldn’t have the power and scale to preference their own content over competitors through vertical integration. The result would be an ecosystem in which Americans will have a range of content choices—including entertainment that might not accord with the views of foreign censors. Big tech companies are not likely immune from what is happening in Hollywood—as well as what has happened to Mercedes and other entities that seek to operate in China. Many of these companies, like Amazon and Google, seek access to Chinese markets and operate as both content producers and distributors or platforms. To the extent that they have divisions whose work is objectionable to censors in foreign countries (Amazon, of course, creates its own content; as does YouTube, which is a subsidiary of Google), they too will feel pressure to preemptively shape that content in ways that are palatable to censors. And because of their market power within the United States, U.S. consumers are likely to be left with fewer and fewer serious scalable alternatives. Finally, in a competitive ecosystem with many players, concerns about the ill effects of lobbying are mitigated as well. In a system with a few dominant players, efforts to lobby the United States government should be seen as highly questionable because of companies’ dependence on Chinese markets. A multi-player ecosystem addresses this challenge in two ways: First, many companies will not be dependent on Chinese markets. Second, in a multi-player ecosystem, differentiated companies are less likely to have shared interests and are more likely to end up on different sides of policy questions.56 This means that their lobbying efforts are less likely to cut in a single direction and thus less likely to capture government. This insight is not a new one—it is foundational to American political and constitutional thought. In Federalist 10, James Madison argued that in a political ecosystem with many groups with differentiated interests, no particular faction would be able to capture government.57 Instead, they would cancel each other out and enable policymakers to pursue the public good. Competition between interests, not the dominance of a few interests (particularly if foreign-influenced), preserves a free and democratic government.

#### Second---Innovation---Big tech destroys the DIB and suppresses innovation --- National champions is historically bunk

Sitaraman, 20 (Ganesh Sitaraman , Prof @ Vanderbilt University law school, A.B. in government magna cum laude from Harvard College, a master’s degree in political thought from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and his J.D. magna cum laude from Harvard Law School. longtime advisor to Elizabeth Warren, 1-30-2020, accessed on 7-18-2021, Papers.ssrn, "The National Security Case for Breaking Up Big Tech by Ganesh Sitaraman :: SSRN", https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3537870)//Babcii

BIG TECH AND THE FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN POWER American power is also critical in a time of great power competition. Here too, the case for protecting big tech and restricting competition in the tech sector is weak. Under conventional market theory—and economic practice—competition sparks innovation. If the United States wants to continue to be at the forefront of technological innovation, then more competition is desirable, not less. Breaking up and regulating big tech will thus improve innovation, not reduce it. America’s position in a great power rivalry also depends on its defense industrial base—the resilience and capacity of its defense sector. But a concentrated defense sector means less innovation in defense, higher prices for taxpayers to procure defense systems, and a functional redistribution of taxpayer funds from R&D or other kinds of spending to profits for defense contractors. As technology becomes more integrated with defense, the same dangers of a concentrated defense industrial base could emerge with respect to the defense technological base. Breaking up and regulating big tech, combined with R&D funding, would likely instead create a more competitive defense sector and a more innovative, more resilient, and cheaper one too. Big Tech, Competitiveness, and Innovation One of the central arguments against breaking up and regulating big tech on national security grounds is that big tech companies are essential for innovation in the tech sector and thus for American competitiveness and ultimately for national security. Historically, however, **innovation has come from** a mix of **competition** and public funding of research and development. Breaking up and regulating tech companies thus doesn’t mean ceding ground to the Chinese on technological innovation—it means creating a competitive marketplace with great innovative capacity. Whether or not they say it explicitly, those who want to protect big tech from antitrust and regulation support a national champions model. The national champions approach suggests that innovation takes place within big companies that are protected from competition and therefore have resources to spend on research and development. Some associate this approach with Joseph Schumpeter, who suggested that firms in competitive markets might be less innovative than monopolists.58 In this vein, commentators celebrate how Bell Labs was able to innovate for generations and see Google X, Facebook, and other tech companies as similarly investing in frontier research that will ultimately lead to innovative breakthroughs.59 While innovation can take place under a national champions model, innovation does not require national champions—and there are strong arguments that the **national champions approach is** limited and even **counterproductive**. First, as Tim Wu has noted, “[B]oth history and basic economics suggest we do much better trusting that fierce competition at home yields stronger industries overall.”60 This response, of course, has been commonplace in basic economics for decades and in debates on competition is linked to the views of Kenneth Arrow.61 Market competition is good for innovation because competitors have to find ways to differentiate themselves in order to survive and expand. In contrast, large protected firms get lethargic, are slow to innovate, and rest on their laurels Wu points out that we also have evidence—not just theory—to show that protecting national champions is inferior to encouraging competition. In the 1980s, Wu argues, **Japan took** the approach of protecting its **national champions** in the electronics industry. Powerhouses like NEC, Panasonic, and Toshiba had direct government support. In contrast, **the United States took the opposite** tack with IBM. The computer firm was brought under antitrust scrutiny, and the legal battle went on for more than a decade, along the way chilling Big Blue from engaging in any conduct that could even potentially run afoul of the antitrust laws. **The result**, Wu notes, **was** to create the space for a variety of hardware and software companies, **Microsoft, Lotus, and Apple** among them. **Competition led to innovation** and the creation of some of the most forward-looking companies of the era.62 Second, national champions can actually limit innovation because they have an incentive to avoid research and innovations that might jeopardize their business model or undermine their dominant position. Bell Labs, for example, has long been celebrated for its role as an “ideas factory.”63 But **Bell and AT&T** also **suppressed innovations** when they threatened its business model. Bell inventors, for example, developed recording devices in the 1930s that could have been used for answering machines. But AT&T’s management blocked their emergence for fear that they would jeopardize use of the telephone.64 An alternative approach to innovation is one that relies less on protectionism for national champions and more on market competition and on public investment in research and innovation. Competition, as noted already, can be a powerful motivator for innovation. When big tech incumbents face little competition, society forgoes the innovation benefits that come from competition. Who knows if Instagram or WhatsApp could have dethroned Facebook’s primacy and developed even more new and innovative products? Facebook’s moves to acquire those firms prevented us from ever finding out. What small businesses might emerge if they didn’t have to compete with Amazon Basics on Amazon’s Marketplace? **Unwinding mergers and separating platforms from companies that do business on the platform would help** spur competition and **lead to** innovation. Some might argue that **robotics, AI, and quantum computing** are so resource-intensive that an ecosystem of smaller companies engaged in fierce competition would mean that no company would have the resources available to invest in those next-generation technologies. There are a few responses to this argument. First, it is not clear that breaking up and regulating big tech would prevent those firms from having the considerable resources to develop the technologies of the future. Facebook would still have billions of users, even without Instagram and WhatsApp, for example. Amazon’s platform would still have enormous market power. Second, and more importantly, part of the answer is that the decision to break up and regulate tech companies should be accompanied by public investment in R&D. One of the primary arguments for the national champions view is that monopolists have the resources to be able to invest in innovation because they do not face competitive pressures.65 But any system of innovation operates against a backdrop of laws and public policy.66 The ability to capture the gains of innovation depends on intellectual property law. The possibility of winning government contracts for frontier projects that require innovation is determined by procurement policies. And, of course, an alternative to monopolist investment in R&D is public investment in R&D. These policy choices all shape the innovation ecosystem, and it is not at all obvious why society has to accept national champions instead of thinking about revising these laws and policies more broadly. Given the emphasis that proponents of national champions place on research and development, it is worth noting that historically, as Mariana Mazzucato has argued, government has been a significant driver of innovation through its research and development efforts.67 Today, one could easily imagine the government spending considerable sums of money on R&D in artificial intelligence, robotics, quantum computing, augmented and virtual reality, and other technological research. Public investment in research has a variety of benefits. First, because it is not tied to the profit motive and business model of a single company, it covers a wider range of subjects, leading potentially to innovations that would otherwise go undiscovered. Public investment extends to basic research that does not have immediate or foreseeable commercial applcations. It could also include research into areas that might challenge the incumbency and business models of existing companies. Second, and relatedly, public investment into research is less likely to be geared toward improving surveillance capacity. As long as the biggest companies have surveillance, personalized targeting, and behavioral response at the heart of their business models, research and innovation within those companies will likely be geared, in no trivial part, toward improving those activities. A digital authoritarian country might see that as a valuable public goal, but it is not at all clear why a free and democratic society should. Public-sponsored research might instead be directed toward a variety of socially beneficial uses other than continual improvement of individual monitoring and behavioral reactions. Notably, as there are more opportunities in research outside of the big tech companies, many talented people might choose to work on a wider range of problems. Third, public investment in R&D has the potential to spread the benefits of technology, innovation, and industry throughout the country. At present, much of the country’s technological and intellectual prowess is concentrated in a few regions, the most prominent being northern California, Seattle, and Boston. Geographic inequality has a variety of negative consequences—economic, social, and political.68 But, as economists Jonathan Gruber and Simon Johnson show in their book Jump-Starting America, there is no reason that public investment couldn’t spur successful economies in dozens of mid-sized cities all over the country, with spillover benefits for their regions.69 Unlike government action, technology companies have no reason to develop the capacities of all regions of the country. Amazon’s so-called competition for its second headquarters is a good example. After much public attention, the company settled on New York City and a suburb of Washington, D.C., two superstar cities. Artificial intelligence, of course, requires considerable data in order to improve precision and accuracy. One of the arguments for big tech is that such companies alone are able to collect this data and use it. But there is no reason why this has to be the case either. Consider two alternate possibilities. First, the United States could create a public data commons that would be highly regulated to protect privacy. The public data commons would include publicly available data from a variety of government sources, and qualifying businesses, local governments, or nonprofits could train their machines using this data. Any new data they collect from users could then be fed back into the data commons (de-identified), so that the data commons improves in quality and quantity of data over time.70 Second, we could imagine requiring big tech companies to make their data available in interoperable formats. If these companies effectively have a monopoly power over data, then they could be regulated as monopolies—and one condition of their continued protection as monopolies could be enabling access to the datasets. Again, there is no legal or regulatory reason why these kinds of policy options are impossible. And in either case, they would enable a larger number of players to innovate than does the status-quo, stand-pat approach to protecting big tech from competition. Big Tech and the Defense Industrial Base Concentration in the tech sector also threatens the defense industrial base due to higher costs, lower quality, less innovation, and even corruption and fraud.71 Each of these dynamics has already been a problem for America’s over-consolidated defense industrial base. As technology becomes more and more central to defense and national security, it is likely that these same dynamics will replicate themselves with big tech companies. This will become a national security threat, both directly, in terms of the quality and speed of procurement, and indirectly, by reducing innovation and functionally redirecting defense budgets from research spending to higher monopoly profits.72Conventional economic theory suggests that monopolists have the ability to increase prices and reduce quality because consumers are captive.73 When it comes to defense spending, the Government Accountability Office commented in 2019 that “competition is the cornerstone of a sound acquisition process and a critical tool for achieving the best return on investment for taxpayers.”74 At the same time, the GAO observed that “portfolio-wide cost growth has occurred in an environment where awards are often made without full and open competition.”75 Indeed, it found that 67 percent of 183 major weapons systems contracts had no competition and almost half of contracts went to a handful of firms. Of course, consolidation also means that the Defense Department is in a symbiotic relationship with these big contractors. Some startup executives wanting to sell to the government thus see the Pentagon as “a bad customer, one that is heavily skewed in favor of larger, traditional players,” and they don’t feel like they can break into the sector.76 Standard stories about political economy and capture also suggest that these firms will have outsized power over government.77 As Frank Kendall, the former head of acquisitions at the Pentagon, has said, “With size comes power, and the department’s experience with large defense contractors is that they are not hesitant to use this power for corporate advantage.”78 In the defense context, that means monopolists retain power (and profits), even if they overcharge taxpayers and risk the safety of military personnel in the field. In an important article in The American Conservative on concentration in the defense sector, researchers Matt Stoller and Lucas Kunce argue that contractors with de facto monopoly at the heart of their business models threaten national security. They write that one such contractor, TransDigm, buys up companies that supply the government with rare but essential airline parts and then hike up the prices, effectively holding the government “hostage.”79 They also point to L3, a defense contractor that had ambitions to be a “Home Depot” for the Pentagon, as its former CEO put it. L3’s de facto monopoly over certain products, according to Stoller and Kunce, means that it continues to receive lucrative government contracts, even after admitting in 2015 that it knowingly supplied defective weapons sights to U.S. forces.80 Consolidation also threatens U.S. defense capacity. The decline of competition, according to a 2019 Pentagon report, leaves the military vulnerable to “sole source suppliers, capacity shortfalls, a lack of competition, a lack of workforce skills, and unstable demand.”81 With a limited number of producers, there is less talent and knowhow available in the country if there is a need to build capacity rapidly.82 In 2018, the Defense Department released a report on vulnerable items in the military supply chain, including numerous items in which only one or two domestic companies (and, in some cases, zero domestic companies) produced the essential goods.83 How did the United States lose so much of its industrial base? The combination of consolidation and global integration is part of the story. As Stoller and Kunce argue, companies consolidated in the 1980s and 1990s while shifting emphasis from production and R&D to Wall Street-demanded profits. Globalization then allowed them to shift production overseas at a lower cost. The result was to gut America’s domestic industrial base—and, in many cases, to shift it to China, which engaged in a decades-long strategic plan to develop its own industrial base. The result, in the words of the 2018 Defense Department report, is that “China is the single or sole supplier for a number of specialty chemicals used in munitions and missiles.” In other areas too, the risks of losing access to critical resources are real. Describing the problem of limited carbon fiber sources, the same Pentagon report notes, “[a] sudden and catastrophic loss of supply would disrupt DoD missile, satellite, space launch, and other defense manufacturing programs. In many cases, there are no substitutes readily available.”84 As technology becomes more integral to the future of national security, it is hard to see how big tech will not simply go the way of the big defense contractors. Corporate mottos not to “be evil” are long gone,85 and big tech companies spend millions on conventional Washington, D.C., lobbying efforts.86 Over time, as contracts move to tech behemoths, there will no longer be competitive alternatives, and the Pentagon will likely be locked into relationships with big tech companies—just as they currently are with big defense contractors.87 Some commentators suggest that robust antitrust policies are a problem because only a small number of tech companies can contract for defense projects.88 But there is another way to look at it: The goal should be to encourage competition in the tech sector so that there are multiple contractors available. As former secretary of homeland security Michael Chertoff has said, defending the antitrust case against Qualcomm, “a single-source national champion creates an unacceptable risk to American security—artificially concentrating vulnerability in a single point. ... We need competition and multiple providers, not a potentially vulnerable technological monoculture.”89 The consequence of consolidation in tech is that taxpayers will likely see higher bills even as innovation slows due to reduced competition. Worse still, every taxpayer dollar that goes to monopoly profits—whether in the form of higher prices or fraud and corruption—is a dollar that is not going toward innovation for the future. A concentrated defense sector means not only less innovation due to the lack of competition in the sector; it means that funding that could have been available for innovation instead gets redirected via monopoly profits to the pockets of big tech executives and shareholders.

#### Chinese tech lead quickly collapses US primacy

Nouwens, 15 (Meia Nouwens, Senior Fellow for Chinese Defence Policy and Military Modernisation, Meia holds a BA Hons in international relations and political science from Macquarie University, a master’s in international relations and diplomacy from Leiden University in conjunction with the Clingendael Institute, and an MPhil in modern Chinese studies from the University of Oxford and Peking University., 10-29-2015, accessed on 8-9-2021, IISS, "China’s pursuit of advanced dual-use technologies", https://www.iiss.org/blogs/research-paper/2018/12/emerging-technology-dominance)//Babcii

In the realm of defence, too, AI plays a current and future role. **Beijing aims to** build high-technology weaponry that would enable China to **leapfrog the United States’ currently superior** military **capabilities**, integrating advanced technologies like AI and big data into the PLA. AI will be incorporated into Chinese military technologies across domains, from unmanned combat aerial vehicles (UCAVs) and drone swarms to fire-and-forget modes for China’s varied missile arsenal and cyber-attacks. Importantly, the PLA aims to use AI to support intelligent operations and system-of-systems warfare.61 According to Shen Shoulin and Zhang Guoning, ‘”brain supremacy” (the ability to interfere with or damage the cognition of the enemy) **will replace earlier warfare concepts seeking military dominance over land, sea, air and more recently space and cyber domains’**.62 Once intelligence supremacy is achieved over enemies in the information space, **supremacy over other domains is rendered meaningless**, according to this approach.63 AI will also be imperative to intelligent monitoring and early-warning systems.64

#### That causes nuclear escalation

Kroenig and Gopalaswamy, 18 (Matthew Kroenig and Bharath Gopalaswamy, Kroenig is an Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. , Gopalaswamy is the Director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council. He holds a PhD in mechanical engineering with a specialization in numerical acoustics from Trinity College, Dublin., 11-12-2018, accessed on 8-11-2021, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war? - Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists", <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/>)//Babcii

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts **in the balance of power as a** primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but **when bargaining** breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But **shifts in the balance of power** muddy understandings **of** which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles,quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, **and** artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power **that** often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be **more willing** than previously **to** initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflictthrough limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear **brinkmanship**, or simple accidentor inadvertent escalation**.** This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And **the** solution **is not** to preserve **second-strike** **capabilities, but** to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek **to maintain an innovation edge**. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but **the consequences of Washington losing the race** for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just **might mean nuclear Armageddon.**

#### Primacy collapse causes nuclear proliferation and escalation --- It also causes Jacksonian policies that result in US interventionism

Fay, 17 (Matthew Fay, Director of Defense and Foreign Policy Studies The Niskanen Center, 11-16-2017, accessed on 12-19-2021, Niskanen Center, "America Unrestrained?: Engagement, Retrenchment, and Libertarian Foreign Policy - Niskanen Center", https://www.niskanencenter.org/america-unrestrained-engagement-retrenchment-libertarian-foreign-policy/)//Babcii

American retrenchment could similarly lead to an anarchic, **multipolar Europe**—thus **increasing** the chances of **war** on the continent. Such a system could engender nationalist sentiments among the populations of Europe, heightening animosities between national groups. These heightened animosities could help **erode norms against military aggression** that have facilitated the decline in interstate war. Nationalist groups within a country can seize on these sentiments to **pursue confrontational and expansionist policies**.89 Encouraging support for increased military capabilities through nationalism might lead populations to see war as once again a means to national glory or maintaining national honor. Matters of national prestige and honor can lead to the initiation of wars when bound up in territorial claims, while at the same time increasing the intensity and duration of a conflict.90 Nationalism and security competition might also erode the pacifying effects of economic openness. Realism suggests states are concerned about relative gains.91 States in security competition might be wary of trading with one another due to concerns about how a potential rival’s economic gains might provide it with an advantage if translated into military power. They may also adopt autarkic policies for fear of undermining their economic and military self-sufficiency.92 Territorial conquest has become increasing anachronistic in international politics. However, the proliferation of protectionist policies might once again make aggression and preventive war seem like strategically sensible ways for states to secure the resources necessary to reduce the ability of potential rivals to cut them off economically. If the risk of territorial aggression increases, the possession of nuclear weapons would become an **attractive** option for some **states whose security was previously guaranteed by the United States**. Nuclear weapons are most useful for deterring major territorial aggression, meaning their potential utility increases as the potential for war does.93 A number of U.S. allies have either previously pursued nuclear weapons or have the capability to do so. They might choose to obtain a nuclear arsenal once responsible for their own security. There are at least two reasons why increasing the number of nuclear weapons states may not have the pacifying effect some realists suggest they do. First, states do not always adopt the second-strike—that is, retaliatory—postures realists assume they will. Recent research shows that even in the paradigmatic case of mutual assured destruction—the Cold War superpower standoff—neither the United States nor the Soviet Union abandoned the search for a first-strike capability.94 Moreover, political scientist Vipin Narang’s research on India-Pakistan nuclear relations has demonstrated that states sometimes adopt risky postures in pursuit of goals other than deterrence.95 Second, an increased number of nuclear weapon states will increase the chances nuclear weapons will be used even if states do adopt second-strike postures. On the one hand, simple organizational pathologies or political instability in a new nuclear state could lead to an accidental or unauthorized nuclear launch.96 On the other hand, even for retaliatory postures, effective deterrence requires that states credibly signal that they are willing to use nuclear weapons in retaliation for an attack. To do so requires that nuclear states in competition with one another must maintain **a willingness to risk nuclear war. The greater the number** of these “competition[s] in risk taking,” as Thomas Schelling called them, **the more likely it is that nuclear weapons will be used** at some point.97 The situation in Northeast Asia helps illustrate how increasing the number of nuclear weapons states increases the probability that nuclear weapons will be used. **Absent U.S. security guarantees**, there is a real possibility that **Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea** would build nuclear arsenals of their own given their concerns about China and North Korea.98 There are currently two nuclear dyads in the region: the United States and China, and the United States and North Korea. If Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea all acquired nuclear weapons, there would be at least **five additional dyads**: China and Taiwan, China and Japan, China and South Korea, North Korea and South Korea, and North Korea and Japan. Given lingering tensions from its pre-1945 occupation of the Korean Peninsula, a South Korea-Japanese nuclear dyad is entirely plausible as well.99 Each new dyad adds a contest in risk-taking, which increases the chances that nuclear weapons will be used in the region.100 Though America’s geographic isolation insulates it from many the threats of an increasingly competitive and unstable world, it does not provide absolute immunity. As noted above, Christopher Layne rightly highlights the major wars in Europe in which the United States did not become involved. However, the question should not be about frequency of American involvement in major power wars in Eurasia. Instead, it should be about the cost when the United States does become involved in such a conflict. The purpose of insurance is to protect against low frequency, high-cost events. There was a relatively low probability that the Soviet Union would have invaded Western Europe during the Cold War, but the United States invested in deterring an invasion because the costs of an actual war would have been higher.101 While the United States avoided involvement in a number of European wars, the major conflicts the United States did become involved in were high-cost events. At the height of World War II, the United States spent 37 percent of its gross domestic product on its military.102 More than 8 percent of the U.S. population was in uniform at the war’s peak.103 The size of the American state expanded massively during this time.104 The United States did not need a formal military alliance with any of the belligerents prior to either of the world wars to become involved in the conflicts. America’s involvement in World War II suggests that one way the United States might become involved in another major war is if some former U.S. allies fail to build their military capabilities in the face of aggressive powers. Neoclassical realist scholars refer to this problem as “underbalancing.”105 According to this theory, states may fail to internally balance against a threat due to domestic political factors.106 If states fail to check an aggressive power, it could pave the way for the type of hegemonic threat realists believe would require American military action. If such a threat materialized, and if frontline states failed to contain it, the offshore balancing logic underpinning retrenchment recommends the United States regenerate its military capabilities to defeat it. Mearsheimer argues that these periodic military buildups are a feature of offshore balancing strategies. He writes: Offshore balancers like the United Kingdom and the United States tend to maintain relatively small military forces when they are not needed to contain a potential hegemon in a strategically important area… [W]hen it is necessary for an offshore balancer to check a potential hegemon, it is likely to sharply expand the size and strength of its fighting forces, as the United States did in 1917, when it entered World War I, and in 1940, the year before it entered World War II.107 Retrenchment assumes that this process would be somewhat mechanical. The United States, aware of a new threat and the inadequacy of frontline states to counter it, would convert its latent material strength into military power to confront, and if necessary, militarily defeat the threatening state.108 However, the process is unlikely to be as automatic or frictionless as realists suggest. Drawing on America’s economic resources to tap its latent military power would not provide the same advantage it did before World War II for two reasons. First, changes in military technology would make it difficult for the U.S. military to return to regions where it previously positioned forces. While modern technology enables the United States to project military power around the globe, it also makes it easier for potential adversaries to increase the cost of doing so. A number of states hostile to American interests have already procured anti-access and area denial (A2/AD) capabilities as a cost-effective means to prevent the U.S. military from operating near their respective territories.109 Second, tapping American economic power to mobilize for war would not be the same as it was before World War II. The economic conditions that obtained before the world wars are no longer with us. There is no great surplus of labor and idle manufacturing capacity as the Great Depression had provided the United States when it converted to a war economy prior to World War II.110 Converting to a war economy today would therefore require far-reaching political and social disruptions. In light of those disruptions, any effort to mobilize the American public for war would require a unifying mechanism. Realists assume **nationalism is that mechanism**. Ordinary Americans are unlikely to get worked up over the abstract threat of a distant regional hegemon in Eurasia. **Confronted with a new military threat** in Eurasia, American leaders are likely to rouse what historian Walter Russell Mead refers to as the **populist “Jacksonian” tendency** in American foreign policy. This tendency, Mead argues, **leads to American wars that are particularly violent and destructive**.11

#### Even a regional war causes nuclear winter --- guarantees extinction

Nicole S. Lovenduski et al. 20. PhD, Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder; Cheryl S. Harrison, PhD, Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research; Holly Olivarez, Environmental Studies Program, University of Colorado; Charles G. Bardeen, PhD, Atmospheric Chemistry Observations and Modeling Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research; 6 , Owen B. Toon, PhD, Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics; Joshua Coupe, PhD Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers; Alan Robock, PhD, Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers; Tyler Rohr, Water Power Technologies Office, Department of Energy, and Samantha Stevenson; Bren School of Environmental Science and Management. “The Potential Impact of Nuclear Conflict on Ocean Acidification”. Geophysical Research Letters. 47, e2019GL086246. https://doi.org/10. 1029/2019GL086246

Nuclear warfare could have devastating impacts on millions of people, yet it has been suggested that regional or global nuclear conflict may be possible in the future (Toon et al., 2019). In addition to the calamitous impacts of nuclear conflict on a local level, research conducted with a range of climate models finds a global cooling in response to various conflict scenarios (Coupe et al., 2019; Malone et al., 1985; Mills et al., 2014; Pausata et al., 2016; Robock et al., 2007; Turco et al., 1983). This global cooling is driven by fires started by the nuclear weapons. These fires inject smoke into the upper troposphere, where rapid lofting can spread the sunlight-absorbing soot particles into the stratosphere (Turco et al., 1983). Recent research implies that even a small nuclear conflict may have impacts on the global climate system, affecting the state and circulation of the atmosphere (Robock et al., 2007), increasing the sea ice extent in both hemispheres (Mills et al., 2014), and reducing plant productivity and crop yields in regions far from the conflict location (Özdogan et al., ˘ 2013; Toon et al., 2019; Xia & Robock, 2013). While less studied, the potential impacts of nuclear conflict on the ocean are many. Numerous physical, chemical, and biological processes in the ocean are temperature dependent, and sunlight is a critical ingredient for photosynthesizing phytoplankton at the base of the marine food web. Using a climate model with an interactive ocean, Mills et al. (2014) evaluated the ocean physical response to a potential India/Pakistan nuclear war that lofts 5 Tg of black carbon particles into the stratosphere; they find a 0.8◦ C decrease in globally averaged sea surface temperature, with smaller temperature reductions at depth. Recently Toon et al. (2019) used an Earth system model that includes a representation for phytoplankton to evaluate the ocean biological response to nuclear conflict; they report a 5–15% decrease in phytoplankton productivity under a range of conflict scenarios. Such findings prompt further investigation into how nuclear conflict and the resulting global cooling may alter the chemical state of the ocean. Perturbations in the ocean's carbonate chemistry are of particular interest, owing to their importance for ocean acidification. Ocean acidification is an ongoing, large-scale environmental problem driven by fossil fuel emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2). Cumulatively since the preindustrial era, the ocean has absorbed 41% of the carbon emitted by human industrial activities (McKinley et al., 2017). While this ocean absorption of carbon has partially mitigated anthropogenic global warming, it has fundamentally altered the carbonate chemistry of the ocean, increasing the concentration of hydrogen ions ([H+]) while decreasing the concentration of carbonate ions ([CO2− 3 ]). Observations collected at time series sites across the global ocean find statistically significant reductions in the potential hydrogen (pH = −log([H+])) and the saturation state of the calcium carbonate mineral aragonite (Ωarag, which is proportional to [CO2− 3 ]) over the past few decades (Bates et al., 2014). These changes are a direct consequence of the ocean absorption of anthropogenic carbon; carbonate chemistry dictates that the excess carbon will react with water and CO2− 3 to decrease ocean pH and Ω (Feely et al., 2004). Both of these changes may have negative consequences for marine organisms, in particular for those that precipitate calcium carbonate shells (e.g., coccolithophores, pteropods, foraminifera, corals, molluscs, and echinoderms), as the precipitation is hindered by low pH, and because decreases in Ω favor shell dissolution (Doney et al., 2009). To date, there have been no studies of the effects of nuclear conflict on ocean acidification, though past modeling studies on the ocean's response to volcanic forcing and to proposed geoengineering schemes have intimated that ocean carbonate chemistry is highly sensitive to these types of external forcings. Using a fully coupled carbon-climate model, Frölicher et al. (2011) find that volcanic-induced cooling following the 1991 Mt. Pinatubo eruption led to immediate increases in the flux of carbon from atmosphere to ocean and consequently, increases in the total dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) concentration in the surface ocean. Eddebbar et al. (2019) demonstrate that air-to-sea CO2 fluxes are significantly enhanced following the eruptions of Agung, El Chichón, and Pinatubo in a large ensemble of simulations with an Earth system model. Matthews et al. (2009) conduct solar radiation management climate engineering simulations with an intermediate complexity model of the coupled climate-carbon system; they find changes in ocean pH and Ωarag as a result of the anomalous cooling. Similarly, Lauvset et al. (2017) indicate that radiation management geoengineering leads to changes in North Atlantic pH in a fully coupled Earth system model, but they do not explore changes in Ωarag. While these studies are suggestive of the carbonate chemistry response to nuclear conflict, the external forcing perturbations are of a different magnitude and duration than those imposed by nuclear conflict. Further, it is difficult to mechanistically understand the ocean carbonate chemistry response to such external forcing perturbations in fully coupled models, where the terrestrial response to forcing additionally influences the atmospheric CO2 concentration. Here, we use a state-of-the art Earth system model to simulate the ocean carbonate chemistry response to a range of nuclear conflict scenarios. We decouple the ocean carbon cycle from that of the terrestrial carbon cycle via a direct prescription of the atmospheric CO2 boundary condition used for air-sea CO2 flux, that is, changes in the terrestrial biosphere have no influence on the atmospheric CO2 that the ocean sees. As we will demonstrate, we find large perturbations in ocean pH and Ωarag as a result of nuclear conflict. These perturbations have relatively long duration (order of 10 years) and are driven by decreases in temperature and subsequent increases in the ocean carbon inventory. 2. Methods We analyse output generated by the Community Earth System Model (CESM) version 1.3, a state-of-the-art coupled climate model consisting of atmosphere, ocean, land, and sea ice components (Hurrell et al., 2013). The atmosphere component of CESM in our simulations is the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model (WACCM; Marsh et al., 2013) with nominal 2◦ resolution, 66 vertical levels, and a model top at ∼145 km; it uses the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model for GCMs (RRTMG; Iacono et al., 2000) for the radiative transfer. The Community Aerosol and Radiation Model for Atmospheres (Bardeen et al., 2008) is coupled with WACCM to simulate the injection, lofting, advection, and removal of soot aerosols in the troposphere and stratosphere, and their subsequent impact on climate (Coupe et al., 2019; Toon et al., 2019). The ocean component of CESM is the Parallel Ocean Program version 2 (Danabasoglu et al., 2012) with nominal 1◦ resolution and 60 vertical levels. The biogeochemical ocean component of CESM is the Biogeochemical Elemental Cycling model that represents the lower trophic levels of the marine ecosystem, full carbonate system thermodynamics, air-sea CO2 fluxes, and a dynamic iron cycle (Doney et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2004, 2013; Moore & Braucher, 2008; Long et al., 2013; Lindsay et al., 2014). LOVENDUSKI ET AL. 2 of 9 Geophysical Research Letters 10.1029/2019GL086246 The ocean in the coupled CESM simulation is initialized from rest with World Ocean Circulation (WOCE) temperature and salinity (Gouretski & Koltermann, 2004). Biogeochemical tracers are initialized to observationally based climatologies where possible (Lauvset et al., 2016); where these were not available (such as dissolved iron and phytoplankton biomass), the model is initialized with fields interpolated from an existing CESM simulation. The new, fully coupled simulation was spun up for 4 years to an approximate steady state with a constant atmospheric CO2 mixing ratio of 370 ppm, representative of the mixing ratio in the year 2000. Due to the relatively short spin-up period, the globally integrated air-sea CO2 flux is not in steady state (drifting at a rate of 0.14 Pg C year−2) when the perturbation forcing is applied. We therefore present our results as anomalies from the drifting control integrations. Three control simulations of 20-year duration are generated using round-off level differences in atmospheric initial conditions. As each of these control simulations has different phasing of internal variability (e.g., El Niño-Southern Oscillation), we use the standard deviation across this ensemble to identify statistically significant perturbations due to nuclear conflict. We report on the anomalies generated from four simulations of nuclear conflict with varying amounts of soot injection: three India/Pakistan conflict scenarios that inject 5, 27, and 47 Tg of soot, respectively, and one US/Russia conflict scenario that injects 150 Tg of soot. The initial soot injection amounts are generated from plausible scenarios for nuclear conflict following advice from a number of military and policy experts; the reader is referred to Toon et al. (2019) for further details on scenario development. In each case, we prescribe that the conflict begins on 15 May of the 5th year of the first control simulation, and we integrate the model for a 15-year period following the injection. We assume that the smoke generated by mass fires from nuclear conflict is injected into the upper troposphere above the target sites (in the U. S./Russia case, smoke is spread evenly over the two nations), as in Toon et al. (2019). WACCM lofts much of this smoke higher into the stratosphere via solar heating of black carbon aerosols in the smoke, where the black carbon aerosols persist for about a decade. The resulting annual mean, post-conflict (May to the following April) anomalies in aerosol optical depth are shown in Figure 1a. These optical depth changes result in a 10–40% reduction in incoming solar energy (Toon et al., 2019). While we discuss the anomalies generated from all four of these conflict simulations, we describe two in greater detail throughout this manuscript: the U. S./Russia case, as it is the largest climate perturbation overall, and the India/Pakistan 47-Tg case, as it is the largest climate perturbation generated by a regional nuclear conflict. Ocean biogeochemistry in the version of CESM used for our simulations has been extensively validated in the literature (Brady et al., 2019; Freeman et al., 2018; Harrison et al., 2018; Krumhardt et al., 2017; Lindsay et al., 2014; Lovenduski et al., 2015, 2016; Long et al., 2013, 2016; Moore et al., 2013; McKinley et al., 2016; Negrete-García et al., 2019). Of particular note for our study, the simulated surface ocean carbonate ion concentration from a long, preindustrial control simulation of CESM compares favorably with reconstructed observations, albeit with lower interannual variance than has been measured at subtropical time series sites (Lovenduski et al., 2015). In Figure S1 in the supporting information, we illustrate the comparison between observationally based estimates of surface ocean pH and Ωarag (from GLODAPv2; Lauvset et al., 2016) and the CESM control ensemble mean. In this comparison, we note that the observational estimates have been extensively interpolated and are intended to represent year 2002 carbonate chemistry parameters, whereas CESM has been integrated under an atmospheric CO2 mixing ratio that corresponds to year 2000 forcing. We find high correspondence between the spatial patterns of modeled and observed pH and Ωarag, giving us confidence that CESM is capable of representing the mean state of these two variables. 3. Results Globally averaged surface ocean pH increases in response to each of the nuclear conflicts, where the magnitude of the pH anomaly scales with the amount of soot injected (Figure 1b). In each case, the pH anomaly exceeds the interannual standard deviation of pH in the control ensemble mean (gray shading in Figure 1b). We observe the largest increases in surface ocean pH in response to the U. S./Russia 150-Tg case; here the globally averaged surface ocean pH anomaly exceeds 0.05, corresponding to a ∼10% decrease in the global mean hydrogen ion concentration. Under each scenario, the pH anomaly peaks 2–4 years after the conflict and persists for ∼10 years. With the exception of the high-latitude oceans, the pH increase following the nuclear conflict is pervasive across the surface ocean (Figures 2a– 2c). In the 47-Tg India/Pakistan scenario, we observe local pH anomalies exceeding 0.06 units on average in years 2–5 post conflict (Figure 2c); the anomalies are largest in the North Atlantic, North Pacific, and Equatorial Pacific. These large, abrupt changes in surface ocean pH may have important consequences for calcifying organisms, as shell precipitation can be affected by the ambient hydrogen ion concentration in seawater (Kroeker et al., 2013). Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, global ocean pH has dropped by an estimated 0.1 units (Ciais & Sabine, 2013). The anomalies in pH generated by our simulations exceed 50% of this historical change and occur over a much shorter time period. Whether and how organisms respond to the initial and rapid alleviation of low pH, followed by an immediate return to the current pH state in the global ocean, is as yet unknown (see, e.g., Haigh et al., 2015). In contrast to our results for pH, we observe decreases in surface ocean Ωarag following nuclear conflict (Figure 1c), which should tend to inhibit the maintenance of shells and skeletons in calcified organisms. While minimal changes in Ωarag are simulated for the 5-Tg India/Pakistan case, the other three cases produce large decreases in saturation state, on the order of 0.1 to 0.3 units (Figure 1c). In each of these three cases, the anomalies exceed the interannual standard deviation of Ωarag in the control ensemble mean (gray shading in Figure 1c). The peak response in these three cases occurs 3–5 years post conflict, a year or so later than the pH response. While for pH the globally averaged anomaly is negligibly small, 10-years post conflict; anomalies in globally averaged Ωarag persist beyond our 15-year simulation time frame for all conflict scenarios. The decreases in aragonite saturation state span the tropics and subtropics, with the exception of the central and eastern Equatorial Pacific region (Figures 2d– 2f). Local decreases in saturation state exceed 0.5 units in the western North Atlantic and western North Pacific under the 47-Tg India/Pakistan scenario (Figure 2f). Importantly, the simulated decreases in saturation state are highly pronounced in regions that host diverse coral reef ecosystems (for instance, the western and southwestern Pacific and the Caribbean), and like pH, the changes in saturation state occur fairly rapidly. Projections from climate models suggest that coral reef ecosystems across the world will experience aragonite saturation state declines from their preindustrial value of 3.5 to 3.0 by the end of the century (Ricke et al., 2013); alarmingly, our simulations project similar Ωarag declines over a 3- to 5-year period, which then persist for years after the initial forcing dissipates. The opposite-signed anomalies in pH and Ωarag induced by nuclear conflict seem puzzling at first, as for "typical" anthropogenic ocean acidification scenarios, both of these variables simultaneously decrease. Why would nuclear conflict cause opposing responses in pH and saturation state? To understand these opposing responses, we need to consider the carbonate chemistry system in seawater and its sensitivity to changing temperature. Gaseous CO2 reacts with seawater to form carbonic acid (H2CO3), which then dissociates to form H+ and bicarbonate (HCO− 3 ). The hydrogen ion then reacts with CO2− 3 to form additional HCO− 3 , CO2 + H2O− ↽−−−−−−⇀−H2CO3. (1) H2CO3− ↽−−−−−−⇀−H+ + HCO− 3 . (2) H+ + CO2− 3 − ↽−−−−−−⇀−HCO− 3 . (3) The equilibrium constants for these reactions (typically expressed as K0, K1, and K2, respectively; Sarmiento & Gruber, 2006) are sensitive to changes in temperature, for example, the cooling induced by nuclear conflict. We need to also consider the dissolution reaction for mineral calcium carbonate (CaCO3) in seawater, CaCO3(s)− ↽−−−−−−⇀−Ca2+ sat + CO2− 3,sat, (4) where [Ca2+]sat and [CO2− 3 ]sat are the concentrations of dissolved calcium and carbonate in equilibrium with mineral CaCO3, and the solubility product (Ksp) for this reaction is also sensitive to temperature (Sarmiento & Gruber, 2006). Further, the saturation state for a calcium carbonate mineral in seawater (here: aragonite), can be expressed as Ωarag = [Ca2+][CO2− 3 ] Ksp , (5) where both [CO2− 3 ] and Ksp are affected by changes in temperature (Ca2+ is highly abundant in seawater, and thus changes in temperature do not affect its concentration enough to matter for CaCO3 dissolution; Emerson & Hedges, 2008; Sarmiento & Gruber, 2006). Thus, we can decompose the anomalies in pH and Ωarag into the component driven by temperature-induced changes in the carbonate chemistry equilibrium constants (K0, K1, K2, and Ksp) and the component driven by all other changes to the carbonate chemistry system, such as changes in the DIC concentration, the alkalinity, or the salinity. We approximate the temperature sensitivity of the equilibrium constants using a program developed for CO2 system calculations (CO2SYS; van Heuven et al., 2011) via finite difference approximation. The component driven by all other changes to the carbonate system is computed as the residual of the other two terms. The pH response to nuclear conflict is the sum of two opposing drivers: an increase in pH driven by a decrease in sea surface temperature that alters the carbonate chemistry equilibrium constants and a decrease in pH driven by an increase in the DIC concentration of the upper ocean. Figure 1b illustrates the temporal evolution of the components of the global pH anomalies from the India/Pakistan 47-Tg simulation driven by changes in the equilibrium constants versus all other changes in the carbonate chemistry system. The equilibrium constant-driven pH anomaly is positive, peaking 2–3 years after the conflict, whereas the “other” component of the pH anomaly is negative, peaking 3–5 years after the conflict. The resulting total pH anomaly is positive, indicating that it is more strongly influenced by changes in the equilibrium constants than other changes. In the India/Pakistan 47-Tg case, globally averaged temperature reaches a minimum 2 to 3-years post conflict; the model initially produces 3.5◦C–4◦C anomalies at the surface that rewarm toward pre-conflict values for the duration of the simulation (Figure 3a). In contrast, surface ocean salinity-normalized DIC anomalies peak 3 to 5-years post conflict (Figure 3b), mainly as a result of the enhanced solubility of CO2 in colder seawater. While decreasing biological export production also contributes to increased DIC in the surface ocean, this signal is small relative to the change driven by enhanced air-to-sea CO2 flux (e.g., Figure S2). The delay in DIC relative to temperature anomalies is a result of the long (order months to years) timescale for CO2 to fully equilibrate with the surface mixed layer (Emerson & Hedges, 2008). The cold, high DIC surface anomalies slowly propagate into the global ocean thermocline; we observe 1◦ C and 10 mmol m−3 anomalies in temperature and DIC, respectively, at a depth of 300 m that persist beyond the length of our simulation (Figure 3). As there are no significant anomalies in global mean alkalinity or salinity post conflict (not shown), we conclude that the DIC perturbation drives the “other” component of the pH anomalies. We find similar behavior for these components in the other conflict scenarios (not shown). The negative Ωarag anomalies post conflict are driven by a combination of lower temperatures and higher DIC concentrations. Colder surface temperatures tend to increase Ksp, while higher surface DIC concentrations tend to decrease [CO2− 3 ], resulting in lower Ωarag values post conflict. Figure 1c illustrates that the DIC (other) component dominates the total Ωarag anomaly for the India/Pakistan 47-Tg simulation. As for pH, the equilibrium constant component peaks earlier than the other component; this is due to the timing of the temperature and DIC perturbations (Figure 3). The spatial patterns of the post-conflict surface pH and Ωarag anomalies in the India/Pakistan 47-Tg scenario (Figures 2c and 2f) result from perturbations in local surface ocean temperature and DIC (Figure S3). Negative temperature anomalies and positive DIC anomalies are pervasive in the tropics and extratropics, with the exception of the eastern Equatorial Pacific, where a large and long-lasting El Niño-like event develops following the conflict (Coupe, et al., manuscript in review). This strong reduction in the equatorial trade winds greatly weakens upwelling in the cold tongue region, producing near-zero surface temperature anomalies and a reduction in vertical DIC supply here (Figure S3). In the Southern Ocean, temperature and DIC are not much affected by the nuclear conflict, likely a result of enhanced upwelling of warm water from the subsurface (Harrison, et al., manuscript in preparation). Taken together, the aforementioned changes in temperature and DIC lead to increases in pH and decreases in Ωarag over most of the ocean surface (Figure S4). The changes in surface ocean pH that we simulate for nuclear conflict resemble the simulated response of pH to volcanic eruptions, but are an order of magnitude larger. Figure S5 illustrates the anomaly in surface ocean pH in the first year following the eruptions of Agung, El Chichón, and Mt. Pinatubo, as estimated by the CESM Large Ensemble (Kay et al., 2015), which uses the same physical and biogeochemical ocean components as in our nuclear conflict simulations. The ensemble mean isolates the evolution of the Earth system under historical external forcing, including the aerosol loading following volcanic eruptions (Eddebbar et al., 2019), and averages across the various representations of internal variability (Deser et al., 2012; we note that ensembles are not necessary for the nuclear conflict scenarios since the much larger magnitude of forcing provides a higher signal-to-noise ratio). The anomaly in the ensemble mean shown here thus cleanly captures the response of surface ocean pH to volcanic eruptions. Here we show the anomaly in preindustrial pH (pH anomalies in equilibrium with preindustrial atmospheric CO2, which is computed simultaneously with contemporary pH at model run time), as the contemporary pH anomalies include also the response to increasing atmospheric CO2 from one year to the next. The similarity in the spatial patterns of volcanically induced pH anomalies and those produced under nuclear conflict is striking (cf. Figures S5 and 2c), suggesting that volcanic forcing produces similar temperature, DIC, and thus pH anomalies (including the El Niño-like response to volcanic forcing in the eastern Equatorial Pacific, described in Eddebbar et al., 2019). However, the eruption-driven pH anomaly is both smaller (an order of magnitude) and of shorter duration (∼2 years) than in the India/Pakistan 47-Tg simulation. Unfortunately, a similar analysis of volcanic Ωarag anomalies in the CESM Large Ensemble was not possible as preindustrial [CO2− 3 ] was not saved to disk. 4. Conclusions and Discussion We report on the surface ocean pH and Ωarag anomalies generated from four simulations of nuclear conflict using the CESM with full ocean carbonate system thermodynamics. Globally averaged surface ocean pH increases in response to each conflict, with the largest increases in the North Atlantic, North Pacific, and Equatorial Pacific Ocean. The pH anomalies persist for 10 years post conflict and are primarily driven by changes in the carbonate chemistry equilibrium constants as a result of decreases in sea surface temperature. In contrast, CESM simulates globally averaged decreases in surface ocean Ωarag in response to nuclear conflict, with the largest decreases in the tropics and subtropics. The Ωarag anomalies persist beyond the length of our 15-year simulations and are driven by a combination of changes in the carbonate chemistry equilibrium constants and the solubility-driven increases in DIC. We further demonstrate that the surface pH anomalies induced by nuclear conflict resemble those induced by volcanic eruptions in the same modeling system. The simulated changes in global and regional pH and Ωarag as a result of nuclear conflict are large and abrupt. In the most extreme forcing scenario (U. S./Russia 150 Tg), over a period of ∼5 years, global surface ocean pH increases by 0.06 units, and Ωarag decreases by 0.3 units. To put these numbers into perspective, this simulated rate of change of pH is 10 times larger than the rate of change we have observed over the past two decades as a result of ocean acidification (−0.0018 year−1; Lauvset et al., 2015). Worryingly, surface ocean Ωarag decreases more than six times faster than has been observed in the open ocean over the past three decades (−0.0095 year−1 at the Bermuda Atlantic time series; Bates et al., 2014). While the cooling associated with nuclear conflict rapidly and briefly alleviates the decline in pH associated with ocean acidification, the increase in solubility causes the ocean to absorb ∼11 Pg of excess carbon in a 10-year period, leading to a rapid drop in Ωarag. Whether and how calcifying organisms might respond to such rapid and opposing changes in pH and Ωarag is as yet unknown. In order to measure organism response to ocean acidification, a majority of laboratory studies perform CO2 bubbling perturbation experiments, which simultaneously decrease the pH and Ωarag in the surrounding seawater solution (Pörtner et al., 2014). This simultaneous change in two carbonate chemistry parameters challenges our ability to isolate the organism response to changes in pH or changes in Ωarag alone. A recent laboratory sensitivity study of marine bivalve larvae used chemical manipulation experiments to decouple these two parameters; they found that larval shell development and growth were negatively impacted by decreasing Ω and unaffected by changes in pH (Waldbusser et al., 2014). If these sensitivities are sustained in other organisms, we might conclude that calcifying organisms would be severely affected by nuclear conflict. Our findings shed light on the ocean biogeochemical response to other forms of extreme external forcing, such as volcanic eruptions (Eddebbar et al., 2019; Frölicher et al., 2011) and solar radiation management climate engineering (Lauvset et al., 2017; Matthews et al., 2009). They may further inform the study and understanding of the role of ocean acidification in marine extinction following the Chicxulub impact event (Henehan et al., 2019). Importantly, our results suggest that even a regional nuclear conflict can have an impact on global ocean acidification, adding to the list of the many, far-reaching consequences of nuclear conflict for global society.

#### Extinction first --- Living is a pre-req for any other issue, magnitude is nearly infinite, and future gains in quality of life ensure it’s a prior question

Todd 17 [Ben has a 1st from Oxford in Physics and Philosophy, has published in Climate Physics, once kick-boxed for Oxford, and speaks Chinese, badly. "The case for reducing extinction risk." https://80000hours.org/articles/extinction-risk/]

In this new age, what should be our biggest priority as a civilisation? Improving technology? Helping the poor? Changing the political system? Here’s a suggestion that’s not so often discussed: our first priority should be to survive. So long as civilisation continues to exist, we’ll have the chance to solve all our other problems, and have a far better future. But if we go extinct, that’s it. Why isn’t this priority more discussed? Here’s one reason: many people don’t yet appreciate the change in situation, and so don’t think our future is at risk. Social science researcher Spencer Greenberg surveyed Americans on their estimate of the chances of human extinction within 50 years. The results found that many think the chances are extremely low, with over 30% guessing they’re under one in ten million.2 We used to think the risks were extremely low as well, but when we looked into it, we changed our minds. As we’ll see, researchers who study these issues think the risks are over one thousand times higher, and are probably increasing. These concerns have started a new movement working to safeguard civilisation, which has been joined by Stephen Hawking, Elon Musk, and new institutes founded by researchers at Cambridge, MIT, Oxford, and elsewhere. In the rest of this article, we cover the greatest risks to civilisation, including some that might be bigger than nuclear war and climate change. We then make the case that reducing these risks could be the most important thing you do with your life, and explain exactly what you can do to help. If you would like to use your career to work on these issues, we can also give one-on-one support. How likely are you to be killed by an asteroid? An overview of naturally occurring extinction risks An overview of naturally occurring extinction risks A one in ten million chance of extinction in the next 50 years — what many people think the risk is — must be an underestimate. Naturally occurring extinction risks can be estimated pretty accurately from history, and are much higher. If Earth was hit by a 1km-wide asteroid, there’s a chance that civilisation would be destroyed. By looking at the historical record, and tracking the objects in the sky, astronomers can estimate the risk of an asteroid this size hitting Earth as about 1 in 5000 per century.3 That’s higher than most people’s chances of being in a plane crash (about one in five million per flight), and already about 1000-times higher than the one in ten million risk that some people estimated.4 Some argue that although a 1km-sized object would be a disaster, it wouldn’t be enough to cause extinction, so this is a high estimate of the risk. But on the other hand, there are other naturally occurring risks, such as supervolcanoes.5 All this said, natural risks are still quite small in absolute terms. An upcoming paper by Dr. Toby Ord estimated that if we sum all the natural risks together, they’re very unlikely to add up to more than a 1 in 300 chance of extinction per century.6 Unfortunately, as we’ll now show, the natural risks are dwarfed by the human-caused ones. And this is why the risk of extinction has become an especially urgent issue. A history of progress, leading to the start of the most dangerous epoch in human history If you look at history over millennia, the basic message is that for a long-time almost everyone was poor, and then in the 18th century, that changed.7
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This was caused by the industrial revolution — perhaps the most important event in history. It wasn’t just wealth that grew. The following chart shows that over the long-term, life expectancy, energy use and democracy have all grown rapidly, while the percentage living in poverty has dramatically decreased.8
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Literacy and education levels have also dramatically increased:
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**People** also seem to become happier as they get wealthier. In The Better Angels of Our Nature, Steven Pinker argues that violence is going down.9 Individual freedom has increased, while racism, sexism and homophobia have decreased. Many people think the world is getting worse,10 and it’s true that modern civilisation does some terrible things, such as factory farming. But as you can see in the data, many important measures of progress have improved dramatically. More to the point, no matter what you think has happened in the past, if we look forward, improving technology, political organisation and freedom gives **our descendant**s the **potential to solve our current problems**, and have vastly better lives.11 It is possible to end poverty, prevent climate change, alleviate suffering, and more. But also notice the purple line on the second chart: war-making capacity. It’s based on estimates of global military power by the historian Ian Morris, and it has also increased dramatically. Here’s the issue: improving technology holds the possibility of enormous gains, but also enormous risks. Each time we discover a new technology, most of the time it yields huge benefits. But there’s also a chance we discover a technology with more destructive power than we have the ability to wisely use. And so, although the present generation lives in the most prosperous period in human history, it’s plausibly also the most dangerous. The first destructive technology of this kind was nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons: a history of near-misses Today we all have North Korea’s nuclear programme on our minds, but current events are just one chapter in a long saga of near misses. We came near to nuclear war several times during the Cuban Missile crisis alone.12 In one incident, the Americans resolved that if one of their spy planes were shot down, they would immediately invade Cuba without a further War Council meeting. The next day, a spy plane was shot down. JFK called the council anyway, and decided against invading. An invasion of Cuba might well have triggered nuclear war; it later emerged that Castro was in favour of nuclear retaliation even if “it would’ve led to the complete annihilation of Cuba”. Some of the launch commanders in Cuba also had independent authority to target American forces with tactical nuclear weapons in the event of an invasion. In another incident, a Russian nuclear submarine was trying to smuggle materials into Cuba when they were discovered by the American fleet. The fleet began to drop dummy depth charges to force the submarine to surface. The Russian captain thought they were real depth charges and that, while out of radio communication, the third world war had started. He ordered a nuclear strike on the American fleet with one of their nuclear torpedoes. Fortunately, he needed the approval of other senior officers. One, Vasili Arkhipov, disagreed, preventing war. Putting all these events together, JFK later estimated that the chances of nuclear war were “between one in three and even”.13 There have been plenty of other close calls with Russia, even after the Cold War, as listed on this nice Wikipedia page. And those are just the ones we know about. Nuclear experts today are just as concerned about tensions between India and Pakistan, which both possess nuclear weapons, as North Korea.14 The key problem is that several countries maintain large nuclear arsenals that are ready to be deployed in minutes. This means that a false alarm or accident can rapidly escalate into a full-blown nuclear war, especially in times of tense foreign relations. Would a nuclear war end civilisation? It was initially thought that a nuclear blast might be so hot that it would ignite the atmosphere and make the Earth uninhabitable. Scientists estimated this was sufficiently unlikely that the weapons could be “safely” tested, and we now know this won’t happen. In the 1980s, the concern was that ash from burning buildings would plunge the Earth into a long-term winter that would make it impossible to grow crops for decades.15 Modern climate models suggest that a nuclear winter severe enough to kill everyone is very unlikely, though it’s hard to be confident due to model uncertainty.16 Even a “mild” nuclear winter, however, could still cause mass starvation.17 For this and other reasons, a nuclear war would be extremely destabilising, and it’s unclear whether civilisation could recover. How likely is a nuclear war to permanently end civilisation? It’s very hard to estimate, but it seems hard to conclude that the chance of a civilisation-ending nuclear war in the next century isn’t over 0.3%. That would mean the risks from nuclear weapons are greater than all the natural risks put together. (Read more about nuclear risks.) This is why the 1950s marked the start of a new age for humanity. For the first time in history, it became possible for a small number of decision-makers to wreak havoc on the whole world. We now pose the greatest threat to our own survival — that makes today the most dangerous point in human history. And nuclear weapons aren’t the only way we could end civilisation. How big is the risk of run-away climate change? In 2015, President Obama said in his State of the Union address that:18 “No challenge  poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change” Climate change is certainly a major risk to civilisation. The graph below shows estimates of climate sensitivity. Climate sensitivity is how much warming to expect in the long-term if CO2 concentrations double, which is roughly what’s expected within the century. The most likely outcome is 2-4 degrees of warming, which would be bad, but survivable. However, these estimates give a 10% chance of warming over 6 degrees, and perhaps a 1% chance of warming of 9 degrees. That would render large fractions of the Earth functionally uninhabitable, requiring at least a massive reorganisation of society. It would also probably increase conflict, and make us more vulnerable to other risks. (If you’re sceptical of climate models, then you should increase your uncertainty, which makes the situation more worrying.) So, it seems like the chance of a massive climate disaster created by CO2 is perhaps similar to the chance of a nuclear war. Researchers who study these issues think nuclear war seems more likely to result in outright extinction, due to the possibility of nuclear winter, which is why we think nuclear weapons pose an even greater risk than climate change. That said, climate change is certainly a major problem, which should raise our estimate of the risks even higher. (Read more about run-away climate change.) What new technologies might be as dangerous as nuclear weapons? The invention of nuclear weapons led to the anti-nuclear movement just a decade later in the 1960s, and the environmentalist movement soon adopted the cause of fighting climate change. What’s less appreciated is that new technologies will present further catastrophic risks. This is why we need a movement that is concerned with safeguarding civilisation in general. Predicting the future of technology is difficult, but because we only have one civilisation, we need to try our best. Here are some candidates for the next technology that’s as dangerous as nuclear weapons. In 1918-1919, over 3% of the world’s population died of the Spanish Flu.19 If such a pandemic arose today, it might be even harder to contain due to rapid global transport. What’s more concerning, though, is that it may soon be possible to genetically engineer a virus that’s as contagious as the Spanish Flu, but also deadlier, and which could spread for years undetected. That would be a weapon with the destructive power of nuclear weapons, but far harder to prevent from being used. Nuclear weapons require huge factories and rare materials to make, which makes them relatively easy to control. Designer viruses might be possible to create in a lab with a couple of biology PhDs. In fact, in 2006, The Guardian was able to order segments of the extinct smallpox virus by mail order.20 Some terrorist groups have expressed interest in using indiscriminate weapons like these. (Read more about pandemic risks.) Another new technology with huge potential power is artificial intelligence. The reason that humans are in charge and not chimps is purely a matter of intelligence. Our large and powerful brains give us incredible control of the world, despite the fact that we are so much physically weaker than chimpanzees. So then what would happen if one day we created something much more intelligent than ourselves? In 2017, 350 researchers who have published peer-reviewed research into artificial intelligence at top conferences were polled about when they believe that we will develop computers with human-level intelligence: that is, a machine that is capable of carrying out all work tasks better than humans. The median estimate was that there is a 50% chance we will develop high-level machine intelligence in 45 years, and 75% by the end of the century.21 These probabilities are hard to estimate, and the researchers gave very different figures depending on precisely how you ask the question.22 Nevertheless, it seems there is at least a reasonable chance that some kind of transformative machine intelligence is invented in the next century. Moreover, greater uncertainty means means that it might come sooner than people think rather than later. What risks might this development pose? The original pioneers in computing, like Alan Turing and Marvin Minsky, raised concerns about the risks of powerful computer systems,23 and these risks are still around today. We’re not talking about computers “turning evil”. Rather, one concern is that a powerful AI system could be used by one group to gain control of the world, or otherwise be mis-used. If the USSR had developed nuclear weapons 10 years before the USA, the USSR might have become the dominant global power. Powerful computer technology might pose similar risks. Another concern is that deploying the system could have unintended consequences, since it would be difficult to predict what something smarter than us would do. A sufficiently powerful system might also be difficult to control, and so be hard to reverse once implemented. These concerns have been documented by Oxford Professor Nick Bostrom in Superintelligence and by AI pioneer Stuart Russell. Most experts think that better AI will be a hugely positive development, but they also agree there are risks. In the survey we just mentioned, AI experts estimated that the development of high-level machine intelligence has a 10% chance of a “bad outcome” and a 5% chance of an “extremely bad” outcome, such as human extinction.21 And we should probably expect this group to be positively biased, since, after all, they make their living from the technology. Putting the estimates together, if there’s a 75% chance that high-level machine intelligence is developed in the next century, then this means that the chance of a major AI disaster is 5% of 75%, which is about 4%. (Read more about risks from artificial intelligence.) People have raised concern about other new technologies, such as other forms of geo-engineering and atomic manufacturing, but they seem significantly less imminent, so are widely seen as less dangerous than the other technologies we’ve covered. You can see a longer list of extinction risks here. What’s probably more concerning is the risks we haven’t thought of yet. If you had asked people in 1900 what the greatest risks to civilisation were, they probably wouldn’t have suggested nuclear weapons, genetic engineering or artificial intelligence, since none of these were yet invented. It’s possible we’re in the same situation looking forward to the next century. Future “unknown unknowns” might pose a greater risk than the risks we know today. Each time we discover a new technology, it’s a little like betting against a single number on a roulette wheel. Most of the time we win, and the technology is overall good. But each time there’s also a small chance the technology gives us more destructive power than we can handle, and we lose everything. If we add everything together, what’s the total risk? Many experts who study these issues estimate that the total chance of human extinction in the next century is between 1 and 20%. For instance, an informal poll in 2008 at a conference on catastrophic risks found they believe it’s pretty likely we’ll face a catastrophe that kills over a billion people, and estimate a 19% chance of extinction before 2100.24

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | At least 1 billion T dead | Human  extinction T |
| Number killed by molecular nanotech weapons. | 10% | 5% |
| Total killed by superintelligent Al. | 5% | 5% |
| Total killed in all wars (including civil wars). | 30% | 4% |
| Number killed in the single biggest engineered pandemic. | 10% | 2% |
| Total killed in all nuclear wars. | 10% | 1% |
| Number killed in the single biggest nanotech accident. | 1% | 0.5% |
| Number killed in the single biggest natural pandemic. | 5% | 0.05% |
| Total killed in all acts of nuclear terrorism. | 1% | 0.03% |
| Overall risk of extinction prior to 2100 | n/a | 19% |

Dr. Toby Ord, who is writing a book on this topic, puts the risk in the next century at 1 in 6 — the roll of a dice. These figures are about one million times higher than what people normally think. What should we make of these estimates? Presumably, the researchers only work on these issues because they think they’re so important, so we should expect their estimates to be high (“selection bias”). But does that mean we can dismiss their concerns entirely? Given this, what’s our personal best guess? It’s very hard to say, but we find it hard to confidently ignore the risks. Overall, we think the risk is likely over 3%. Why helping to safeguard the future could be the most important thing you can do with your life How much should we prioritise working to reduce these risks compared to other issues, like global poverty, ending cancer or political change? At 80,000 Hours, we do research to help people find careers with positive social impact. As part of this, we try to find the most urgent problems in the world to work on. We evaluate different global problems using our problem framework, which compares problems in terms of: Scale – how many are affected by the problem Neglectedness -how many people are working on it already Solvability – how easy it is to make progress If you apply this framework, we think that safeguarding the future comes out as the world’s biggest priority. And so, if you want to have a big positive impact with your career, this is the top area to focus on. In the next few sections, we’ll evaluate this issue on scale, neglectedness and solvability, drawing heavily on Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority by Nick Bostrom and unpublished work by Toby Ord, as well as our own research. First, let’s start with the scale of the issue. We’ve argued there’s likely over a 3% chance of extinction in the next century. How big an issue is this? One figure we can look at is how many people might die in such a catastrophe. The population of the Earth in the middle of the century will be about 10 billion, so a 3% chance of everyone dying means the expected number of deaths is about 300 million. This is probably more deaths than we can expect over the next century due to the diseases of poverty, like malaria.25 Many of the risks we’ve covered could also cause a “medium” catastrophe rather than one that ends civilisation, and this is presumably significantly more likely. The survey we covered earlier suggested over a 10% chance of a catastrophe that kills over 1 billion people in the next century, which would be at least another 100 million deaths in expectation, along with far more suffering among those who survive. So, even if we only focus on the impact on the present generation, these catastrophic risks are one of the most serious issues facing humanity. But this is a huge underestimate of the scale of the problem, because if civilisation ends, then we give up our entire future too. Most people want to leave a better world for their grandchildren, and most also think we should have some concern for future generations more broadly. There could be many more people having great lives in the future than there are people alive today, and we should have some concern for their interests. There’s a possibility the human civilization could last for millions of years, so when we consider the impact of the risks on future generations, the stakes are millions of times higher – for good or evil. As Carl Sagan wrote on the costs of nuclear war in Foreign Affairs: A nuclear war imperils all of our descendants, for as long as there will be humans. Even if the population remains static, with an average lifetime of the order of 100 years, over a typical time period for the biological evolution of a successful species (roughly ten million years), we are talking about some 500 trillion people yet to come. By this criterion, the stakes are one million times greater for extinction **than for** the more modest nuclear wars that kill “only” hundreds of **millions of people**. There are many other possible measures of the potential loss–including culture and science, the evolutionary history of the planet, and the significance of the lives of all of our ancestors who contributed to the future of their descendants. Extinction is the undoing of the human enterprise. We’re glad the Romans didn’t let humanity go extinct, since it means that all of modern civilisation has been able to exist. We think we owe a similar responsibility to the people who will come after us, assuming (as we believe) that they are likely to lead fulfilling lives. It would be reckless and unjust to endanger their existence just to make ourselves better off in the short-term. It’s not just that there might be more people in the future. As Sagan also pointed out, no matter what you think is of value, there is potentially a lot more of it in the future. Future civilisation could create a world without need or want, and make mindblowing intellectual and artistic achievements. We could build a far more just and virtuous society. And there’s no in-principle reason why civilisation couldn’t reach other planets, of which there are some 100 billion in our galaxy.26 If we let civilisation end, then none of this can ever happen. We’re unsure whether this great future will really happen, but that’s all the more reason to keep civilisation going so we have a chance to find out. Failing to pass on the torch to the next generation might be the worst thing we could ever do. So, a couple of percent risk that civilisation ends seems likely to be the biggest issue facing the world today. What’s also striking is just how neglected these risks are. Why these risks are some of the most neglected global issues Here is how much money per year goes into some important causes:27 As you can see, we spend a vast amount of resources on R&D to develop even more powerful technology. We also expend a lot in a (possibly misguided) attempt to improve our lives by buying luxury goods. Far less is spent mitigating catastrophic risks from climate change. Welfare spending in the US alone dwarfs global spending on climate change. But climate change still receives enormous amounts of money compared to some of these other risks we’ve covered. We roughly estimate that the prevention of extreme global pandemics receives under 300 times less, even though the size of the risk seems about the same. Research to avoid accidents from AI systems is the most neglected of all, perhaps receiving 100-times fewer resources again, at around only $10m per year. You’d find a similar picture if you looked at the number of people working on these risks rather than money spent, but it’s easier to get figures for money. If we look at scientific attention instead, we see a similar picture of neglect (though, some of the individual risks receive significant attention, such as climate change): Our impression is that if you look at political attention, you’d find a similar picture to the funding figures. An overwhelming amount of political attention goes on concrete issues that help the present generation in the short-term, since that’s what gets votes. Catastrophic risks are far more neglected. Then, among the catastrophic risks, climate change gets the most attention, while issues like pandemics and AI are the most neglected. This neglect in resources, scientific study and political attention is exactly what you’d expect to happen from the underlying economics, and are why the area presents an opportunity for people who want to make the world a better place. First, these risks aren’t the responsibility of any single nation. Suppose the US invested heavily to prevent climate change. This benefits everyone in the world, but only about 5% of the world’s population lives in the US, so US citizens would only receive 5% of the benefits of this spending. This means the US will dramatically underinvest in these efforts compared to how much they’re worth to the world. And the same is true of every other country. This could be solved if we could all coordinate — if every nation agreed to contribute its fair share to reducing climate change, then all nations would benefit by avoiding its worst effects. Unfortunately, from the perspective of each individual nation, it’s better if every other country reduces their emissions, while leaving their own economy unhampered. So, there’s an incentive for each nation to defect from climate agreements, and this is why so little progress gets made (it’s a prisoner’s dilemma). And in fact, this dramatically understates the problem. The greatest beneficiaries of efforts to reduce catastrophic risks are future generations. They have no way to stand up for their interests, whether economically or politically. If future generations could vote in our elections, then they’d vote overwhelmingly in favour of safer policies. Likewise, if future generations could send money back in time, they’d be willing to pay us huge amounts of money to reduce these risks. (Technically, reducing these risks creates a trans-generational, global public good, which should make them among the most neglected ways to do good.) Our current system does a poor job of protecting future generations. We know people who have spoken to top government officials in the UK, and many want to do something about these risks, but they say the pressures of the news and election cycle make it hard to focus on them. In most countries, there is no government agency that naturally has mitigation of these risks in its remit. This is a depressing situation, but it’s also an opportunity. For people who do want to make the world a better place, this lack of attention means there are lots high-impact ways to help. What can be done about these risks? We’ve covered the scale and neglectedness of these issues, but what about the third element of our framework, solvability? It’s less certain that we can make progress on these issues than more conventional areas like global health. It’s much easier to measure our impact on health (at least in the short-run) and we have decades of evidence on what works. This means working to reduce catastrophic risks looks worse on solvability. However, there is still much we can do, and given the huge scale and neglectedness of these risks, they still seem like the most urgent issues. We’ll sketch out some ways to reduce these risks, divided into three broad categories: 1. Targeted efforts to reduce specific risks One approach is to address each risk directly. There are many concrete proposals for dealing with each, such as the following: Many experts agree that better disease surveillance would reduce the risk of pandemics. This could involve improved technology or better collection and aggregation of existing data, to help us spot new pandemics faster. And the faster you can spot a new pandemic, the easier it is to manage. There are many ways to reduce climate change, such as helping to develop better solar panels, or introducing a carbon tax. With AI, we can do research into the “control problem” within computer science, to reduce the chance of unintended damage from powerful AI systems. A recent paper, Concrete problems in AI safety, outlines some specific topics, but only about 20 people work full-time on similar research today. In nuclear security, many experts think that the deterrence benefits of nuclear weapons could be maintained with far smaller stockpiles. But, lower stockpiles would also reduce the risks of accidents, as well as the chance that a nuclear war, if it occurred, would end civilisation. We go into more depth on what you can do to tackle each risk within our problem profiles: AI safety Pandemic prevention Nuclear security Run-away climate change We don’t focus on naturally caused risks in this section, because they’re much less likely and we’re already doing a lot to deal with some of them. Improved wealth and technology makes us more resilient to natural risks, and a huge amount of effort already goes into getting more of these. 2. Broad efforts to reduce risks Rather than try to reduce each risk individually, we can try to make civilisation generally better at managing them. The “broad” efforts help to reduce all the threats at once, even those we haven’t thought of yet. For instance, there are key decision-makers, often in government, who will need to manage these risks as they arise. If we could improve the decision-making ability of these people and institutions, then it would help to make society in general more resilient, and solve many other problems. Recent research has uncovered lots of ways to improve decision-making, but most of it hasn’t yet been implemented. At the same time, few people are working on the issue. We go into more depth in our write-up of improving institutional decision-making. Another example is that we could try to make it easier for civilisation to rebound from a catastrophe. The Global Seed Vault is a frozen vault in the Arctic, which contains the seeds of many important crop varieties, reducing the chance we lose an important species. Melting water recently entered the tunnel leading to the vault due, ironically, to climate change, so could probably use more funding. There are lots of other projects like this we could do to preserve knowledge. Similarly, we could create better disaster shelters, which would reduce the chance of extinction from pandemics, nuclear winter and asteroids (though not AI), while also increasing the chance of a recovery after a disaster. Right now, these measures don’t seem as effective as reducing the risks in the first place, but they still help. A more neglected, and perhaps much cheaper option is to create alternative food sources, such as those that be produced without light, and could be quickly scaled up in a prolonged winter. Since broad efforts help even if we’re not sure about the details of the risks, they’re more attractive the more uncertain you are. As you get closer to the risks, you should gradually reallocate resources from broad to targeted efforts (read more). We expect there are many more promising broad interventions, but it’s an area where little research has been done. For instance, another approach could involve improving international coordination. Since these risks are caused by humanity, they can be prevented by humanity, but what stops us is the difficulty of coordination. For instance, Russia doesn’t want to disarm because it would put it at a disadvantage compared to the US, and vice versa, even though both countries would be better off if there were no possibility of nuclear war. However, it might be possible to improve our ability to coordinate as a civilisation, such as by improving foreign relations or developing better international institutions. We’re keen to see more research into these kinds of proposals. Mainstream efforts to do good like improving education and international development can also help to make society more resilient and wise, and so also contribute to reducing catastrophic risks. For instance, a better educated population would probably elect more enlightened leaders (cough). Richer countries are better able to prevent pandemics — it’s no accident that Ebola took hold in some of the poorest parts of West Africa. But, we don’t see education and health as the best areas to focus on for two reasons. First, these areas are far less neglected than the more unconventional approaches we’ve covered. In fact, improving education is perhaps the most popular cause for people who want to do good, and in the US alone, receives 800 billion dollars of government funding, and another trillion dollars of private funding. Second, these approaches have much more diffuse effects on reducing these risks — you’d have to improve education on a very large scale to have any noticeable effect. We prefer to focus on more targeted and neglected solutions. 3. Learning more and building capacity We’re highly uncertain about which risks are biggest, what is best to do about them, and whether our whole picture of global priorities might be totally wrong. This means that another key goal is to learn more about all of these issues. We can learn more by simply trying to reduce these risks and seeing what progress can be made. However, we think the most neglected and important way to learn more right now is to do “global priorities research”. This is a combination of economics and moral philosophy, which aims to answer high-level questions about the most important issues for humanity. There are only a handful of researchers working full-time on these issues. Another way to handle uncertainty is to build up resources that can be deployed in the future when you have more information. One way of doing this is to earn and save money. You can also invest in your career capital, especially your transferable skills and influential connections, so that you can achieve more in the future. However, we think that a potentially better approach than either of these is to build a high-quality community that’s focused on reducing these risks, whatever they turn out to be. The reason this can be better is that it’s possible to grow the capacity of a community faster than you can grow your individual wealth or career capital. For instance, if you spent a year doing targeted one-on-one outreach, it’s not out of the question to find one other person with relevant expertise to join you. This would be an annual return to the cause of about 100%. Right now, we are focused on building the effective altruism community, which contains many people who want to reduce these risks. Moreover, the recent rate of growth, and studies of specific efforts to grow the community, suggest that high rates of return are possible. However, we expect that other community building efforts will also be valuable. It would be great to see a community of scientists trying to promote a culture of safety in academia. It would be great to see a community of policymakers who want to try to reduce these risks, and make government have more concern for future generations. Given how few people actively work on reducing these risks, we expect that there’s a lot that could be done to build a movement around them. In total, how effective is it to reduce these risks? Considering all the approaches to reducing these risks, and how few resources are devoted to some of them, it seems like substantial progress is possible. In fact, even if we only consider the impact of these risks on the present generation (ignoring any benefits to future generations), they’re plausibly the top priority. Here are some very rough and simplified figures to show how this could be possible. It seems plausible to us that $100 billion spent on reducing extinction risk could reduce it by over 1% over the next century. A one percentage point reduction in the risk would be expected to save about 100 million lives among the present generation (1% of about 10 billion people alive today). This would mean the investment would save lives for only $1000 per person. Greg Lewis has made a more detailed estimate, arriving at a mean of $9200 per life saved in the present generation.28 There are also more estimates in the thread. We think Greg is likely too conservative, because he assumes the risk of extinction is only 1% over the next century, when our estimate is that it’s several times higher. We also think the next billion dollars spent on reducing extinction risk could cause a larger reduction in the risk than Greg assumes (note that this is only true if the billion were spent on the most neglected issues like AI safety and biorisk, rather than climate change which already receives hundreds of billions of dollars of investment). We wouldn’t be surprised if the cost per present lives saved for the next one billion dollars invested in reducing extinction risk were under $100. GiveWell’s top recommended charity, Against Malaria Foundation (AMF), is often presented as one of the best ways to help the present generation and saves lives for around $7500 (2017 figures).29 So these estimates would put extinction risk reduction as better or in the same ballpark cost-effectiveness as AMF for saving lives in the present generation — a charity that was specifically selected for being outstanding on that dimension. Likewise, we think that if 10,000 talented young people focused their careers on these risks, they could achieve something like a 1% reduction in the risks. That would mean that each person would save 1000 lives over their careers in the present generation, which is probably better than what they could save by earning to give and donating to The Against Malaria Foundation.30 In one sense, these are unfair comparisons, because GiveWell’s estimate is far more solid and well-researched, whereas our estimate is more of an informed guess. There may also be better ways to help the present generation than AMF (e.g. policy advocacy). However, we’ve also dramatically understated the benefits of reducing extinction risks. The main reason to safeguard civilisation is not to benefit the present generation, but to benefit future generations. We ignored them in this estimate. If we also consider future generations, then the effectiveness of reducing extinction risks is orders of magnitude higher, and it’s hard to imagine a more urgent priority right now. Now you can either read some responses to these arguments, or skip ahead to practical ways to contribute. Who shouldn’t prioritise safeguarding the future? The arguments presented rest on some assumptions that not everyone will accept. Here we present some of the better responses to these arguments. You need to focus more on your friends and family We’re only talking about what the priority should be if you are trying to help people in general, treating everyone’s interests as equal (what philosophers sometimes call “impartial altruism”). Most people care about helping others to some degree: if you can help a stranger with little cost, that’s a good thing to do. People also care about making their own lives go well, and looking after their friends and family, and we’re the same. How to balance these priorities is a difficult question. If you’re in the fortunate position to be able to contribute to helping the world, then we think safeguarding the future should be where to focus. We list concrete ways to get involved in the next section. Otherwise, you might need to focus on your personal life right now, contributing on the side, or in the future. You think the risks are much lower than we’ve argued We don’t have robust estimates of many of the human-caused risks, so you could try to make your own estimates and conclude that they’re much lower than we’ve made out. If they were sufficiently low, then reducing them would cease to be the top priority. We don’t find this plausible for the reasons covered. If you consider all the potential risks, it seems hard to be confident they’re under 1% over the century, and even a 1% risk probably warrants much more action than we currently see. You think there’s almost nothing more we can do about the risks We rate these risks as less “solvable” than issues like global health, so expect progress to be harder per dollar. That said, we think their scale and neglectedness more than makes up for this, and so they end up more effective in expectation. Many people think effective altruism is about only supporting “proven” interventions, but that’s a myth. It’s worth taking interventions that only have a small chance of paying off, if the upside is high enough. The leading funder in the community now advocates an approach of “hits-based giving”. However, if you were much more pessimistic about the chances of progress than us, then it might be better to work on more conventional issues, such as global health. Personally, we might switch to a different issue if there were two orders of magnitude more resources invested in reducing these risks. But that’s a long way off from today. A related response is that we’re already taking the best interventions to reduce these risks. This would mean that the risks don’t warrant a change in practical priorities. For instance, we mentioned earlier that education probably helps to reduce the risks. If you thought education was the best response (perhaps because you’re very uncertain which risks will be most urgent), then because we already invest a huge amount in education, you might think the situation is already handled. We don’t find this plausible because, as listed, there are lots of untaken opportunities to reduce these risks that seem more targeted and neglected. Another example like this is that economists sometimes claim that we should just focus on economic growth, since that will put us in the best possible position to handle the risks in the future. We don’t find this plausible because some types of economic growth increase the risks (e.g. the discovery of new weapons), so it’s unclear that economic growth is a top way to reduce the risks. Instead, we’d at least focus on differential technological development, or the other more targeted efforts listed above. You think there’s a better way of helping the future Although reducing these risks is worth it for the present generation, much of their importance comes from their long-term effects — once civilisation ends, we give up the entire future. You might think there are other actions the present generation could take that would have very long-term effects, and these could be similarly important to reducing the risk of extinction. In particular, we might be able to improve the quality of the future by preventing our civilization from getting locked into bad outcomes permanently. This is going to get a bit sci-fi, but bear with us. One possibility that has been floated is that new technology, like extreme surveillance or psychological conditioning, could make it possible to create a totalitarian government that could never be ended. This would be the 1984 and Brave New World scenario respectively. If this government were bad, then civilisation might have a fate worse than extinction by causing us to suffer for millennia. Others have raised the concern that the development of advanced AI systems could cause terrible harm if it is done irresponsibly, perhaps because there is a conflict between several groups raising to develop the technology. In particular, if at some point in the future, developing these systems involves the creation of sentient digital minds, their wellbeing could become incredibly important. Risks of a future that contains an astronomical amount of suffering have been called “s-risks”.31 If there is something we can do today to prevent an s-risk from happening (for instance, through targeted research in technical AI safety and AI governance), it could be even more important. Another area to look is major technological transitions. We’ve mentioned the dangers of genetic engineering and artificial intelligence in this piece, but these technologies could also create a second industrial revolution and do a huge amount of good once deployed. There might be things we can do to increase the likelihood of a good transition, rather than decrease the risk of a bad transition. This has been called trying to increase “existential hope” rather than decrease “existential risk”.32 We agree that there might be other ways that we can have very long-term effects, and these might be more pressing than reducing the risk of extinction. However, most of these proposals are not yet as well worked out, and we’re not sure about what to do about them. The main practical upshot of considering these other ways to impact the future, is that we think it’s even more important to positively manage the transition to new transformative technologies, like AI. It also makes us keener to see more global priorities research looking into these issues. Overall, we still think it makes sense to first focus on reducing extinction risks, and then after that, we can turn our attention to other ways to help the future. One way to help the future we don’t think is a contender is speeding it up. Some people who want to help the future focus on bringing about technological progress, like developing new vaccines, and it’s true that these create long-term benefits. However, we think what most matters from a long-term perspective is where we end up, rather than how fast we get there. Discovering a new vaccine probably means we get it earlier, rather than making it happen at all. Moreover, since technology is also the cause of many of these risks, it’s not clear how much speeding it up helps in the short-term. Speeding up progress is also far less neglected, since it benefits the present generation too. As we covered, over 1 trillion dollars is spent each year on R&D to develop new technology. So, speed-ups are both less important and less neglected. To read more about other ways of helping future generations, see Chapter 3 of On the Overwhelming Importance of Shaping the Far Future by Dr. Nick Beckstead You’re confident the future will be short or bad If you think it’s virtually guaranteed that civilisation won’t last a long time, then the value of reducing these risks is significantly reduced (though perhaps still worth taking to help the present generation). We agree there’s a significant chance civilisation ends soon (which is why this issue is so important), but we also think there’s a large enough chance that it could last a very long time, which makes the future worth fighting for. Similarly, if you think it’s likely the future will be more bad than good, then the value of reducing these risks goes down (or if we have much more obligation to reduce suffering than increase wellbeing). We don’t think this is likely, however, because people want the future to be good, so we’ll try to make it more good than bad. We also think that there has been significant moral progress over the last few centuries (due to the trends noted earlier), and we’re optimistic this will continue. See more discussion in footnote 11.11 What’s more, even if you’re not sure how good the future will be, or suspect it will be bad in ways we may be able to prevent in the future, you may want civilisation to survive and keep its options open. People in the future will have much more time to study whether it’s desirable for civilisation to expand, stay the same size, or shrink. If you think there’s a good chance we will be able to act on those moral concerns, that’s a good reason to leave any final decisions to the wisdom of future generations. Overall, we’re highly uncertain about these big-picture questions, but that generally makes us more concerned to avoid making any irreversible commitments.33 Beyond that, you should likely put your attention into ways to decrease the chance that the future will be bad, such as avoiding s-risks. You’re confident we have much stronger moral obligations to help the present generation If you think we have much stronger obligations to the present generation than future generations (such as person-affecting views of ethics), then the importance of reducing these risks would go down. Personally, we don’t think these views are particularly compelling. That said, we’ve argued that even if you ignore future generations, these risks seem worth addressing. The efforts suggested could still save the lives of the present generation relatively cheaply, and they could avoid lots of suffering from medium-sized disasters. What’s more, if you’re uncertain about whether we have moral obligations to future generations, then you should again try to keep your options open, and that means safeguarding civilisation. Nevertheless, if you combined the view that we don’t have large obligations to future generations with the position that the risks are also relatively unsolvable, or that there is no useful research to be done, then another way to help present generations could come out on top. This might mean working on global health, mental health or speeding up technology. Alternatively, you might think there’s another moral issue that’s more important, such as factory farming. What can you do to help? Some areas to focus on Our best evidence suggests that we’re the only intelligent life in the observable universe.34 Might we be the generation that extinguishes this life, and leaves the universe barren for the rest of eternity? Let’s see how you can help avoid that.

#### Only unipolarity can explain post WWII peace --- The US led world order is the most peaceful in history

Michael Beckley 18. Professor of political science at Tufts. *Unrivaled: Why America Will Remain the World’s Sole Superpower*. Cornell University Press.

The story of world politics is often told as a game of thrones in which a rotating cast of great powers battles for top-dog status. According to researchers led by Graham Allison at Harvard, there have been sixteen cases in the past ﬁve hundred years when a rising power challenged a ruling power. 3 Twelve of these cases ended in carnage. One can quibble with Allison’s case selection, but the basic pattern is clear: hegemonic rivalry has sparked a catastrophic war every forty years on average for the past half millennium.

The emergence of unipolarity in 1991 has put this cycle of hegemonic competition on hold. Obviously wars and security competition still occur in today’s unipolar world—in fact, as I explain later, unipolarity has made certain types of asymmetric conﬂict more likely—but none of these conﬂicts have the global scope or generational length of a hegemonic rivalry.

To appreciate this point, just consider the Cold War—one of the four “peaceful” cases of hegemonic rivalry identiﬁed by Allison’s study. Although the two superpowers never went to war, they divided the world into rival camps, waged proxy wars that killed millions of people, and pushed each other to the brink of nuclear Armageddon. For forty-ﬁve years, World War III and human extinction were nontrivial possibilities.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, by contrast, the United States has not faced a hegemonic rival, and the world, though far from perfect, has been more peaceful and prosperous than ever before.

Just look at the numbers. From 1400 to 1991, the rate of war deaths worldwide hovered between 5 and 10 deaths per 100,000 people and spiked to 200 deaths per 100,000 during major wars. 4 After 1991, however, war death rates dropped to 0.5 deaths per 100,000 people and have stayed there ever since. Interstate wars have disappeared almost entirely, and the number of civil wars has declined by more than 30 percent. 5 Meanwhile, the global economy has quadrupled in size, creating more wealth between 1991 and 2018 than in all prior human history combined. 6

What explains this unprecedented outbreak of peace and prosperity? Some scholars attribute it to advances in communications technology, from the printing press to the telegraph to the Internet, which supposedly spread empathy around the globe and caused entire nations to place a higher value on human life. 7

Such explanations are appealing, because they play on our natural desire to believe in human progress, but are they convincing? Did humans suddenly become 10 to 20 times less violent and cruel in 1991? Are we orders of magnitude more noble and kind than our grandparents? Has social media made us more empathetic? Of course not, which is why the dramatic decline in warfare after 1991 is better explained by geopolitics than sociology. 8

The collapse of the Soviet Union not only ended the Cold War and related proxy ﬁghting, it also opened up large swathes of the world to democracy, international commerce, and peacekeeping forces—all of which surged after 1991 and further dampened conﬂict. 9 Faced with overwhelming U.S. economic and military might, most countries have decided to work within the American-led liberal order rather than ﬁght to overturn it. 10 As of 2018, nearly seventy countries have joined the U.S. alliance network—a Kantian community in which war is unthinkable—and even the two main challengers to this community, China and Russia, begrudgingly participate in the institutions of the liberal order (e.g., the UN, the WTO, the IMF, World Bank, and the G-20), engage in commerce with the United States and its allies, and contribute to international peacekeeping missions. 11 History may not have ended in 1991, but it clearly changed in profound ways—and mostly for the better.

#### Unipolarity solves interventions by providing the US with the freedom of action to avoid ill-advised fights. BUT retrenchment causes prolif of proxy conflicts and adventurism.

Noel Thomas Anderson 19. Assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto. “Competitive Intervention, Protracted Conflict, and the Global Prevalence of Civil War.” International Studies Quarterly 63(3): 692-706.

Systemic Dimensions: The Varying Prevalence of Competitive Intervention The framework articulated above not only provides a comprehensive account of the duration effects of competitive intervention on civil wars—it also highlights a candidate explanation for the recent decline in the prevalence of intrastate conflict. Insofar as state decisions to aid combatants are consistent with competitive state policy-making, temporal variation in geopolitical competition between states should affect trends in the prevalence of competitive intervention. Variation in the prevalence of competitive intervention should in turn affect temporal trends in the prevalence of internal conflict through the duration effects described above. Consider the pervasiveness of US-Soviet competition during the Cold War. Bipolarity extended the geographic scope of concern and broadened the range of factors included in the competition between the superpowers. American and Soviet leaders worried that challenges to the existing distribution of power might raise doubts about the credibility of their alliance commitments, thereby encouraging their allies to drift toward neutrality or, worse still, switch sides (Hironaka 2005, 107–11). Because challenges to the status quo were perceived to threaten the relative balance of power and credibility, they were resisted. Yet, because any action by one superpower was perceived as an attempt to gain a geostrategic advantage, it demanded a response. The end result was a proliferation of US-Soviet competitive intervention, wherein the superpowers committed resources to opposing government and rebel forces fighting on the periphery of their spheres of influence. That many civil wars during the Cold War were superpower proxy wars is a well-rehearsed perspective, but what is missing from existing accounts is an explanation for why superpower sponsorship should be associated with longer conflicts. If foreign civil wars played such a key role in the larger Cold War struggle, why did the superpowers not do what was necessary to help their respective sides win? The theory outlined above provides an answer: challenges to the relative balance of power and credibility necessitated reflexive responses, but the impossible stakes of direct confrontation advised caution. While the superpowers were compelled to intervene, they were simultaneously—and paradoxically—compelled to do so with restraint. Superpower rivalry also had secondary duration effects. Constrained by the need to both deter and avoid direct confrontation, Washington and Moscow employed indirect strategies for projecting power. Military aid was an integral element of their competition for influence, and accordingly, money and weapons diffused not only to civil wars, but across the international system. This assistance empowered client states, providing a set of Cold War framings and superpower arms that could be used to justify and implement independent foreign policy objectives. Notably, the superpowers struggled to control their clients’ adventurism; by exploiting fears of defection to the opposing bloc, clients found ways to commandeer superpower aid for their own self-interested ends (Krause 1991). The net result was a proliferation of interventions by otherwise weak states in civil wars across the globe. In the post–Cold War period, by contrast, state clients have a harder time garnering American aid. Regional powers continue to intervene in civil wars, but they can no longer rely on the reflexive support of the USSR when conflicts of interest arise vis-à-vis US policy, nor can they threaten defection to the Soviet-bloc in the face of American sanction. In the unipolar period, the United States has greater choice in which state clients it chooses to support, enjoys greater flexibility to discipline adventurism by weaker powers, and maintains “command of the commons” to restrict flows of economic and military aid around the globe (Posen 2003). Together, these features of the unipolar system constrain foreign adventurism by lesser powers relative to the Cold War period, thereby reducing—though not eliminating—the prevalence of competitive interventions among neighboring states and regional rivals. In this way, the transition from a bipolar to unipolar system not only terminated superpower proxy warfare, but also decreased the rate of competitive intervention by lesser powers.

#### Reject outdated primacy bad evidence --- The era of liberal hegemony is over in favor of pragmatic restraint

\* Their evidence will be based on interventions undertaken during the era of liberal hegemony --- That era has been ended in favor of a focus on national security instead of humanitarian interventions  
\* Afghanistan withdrawal went against core tenants of liberal internationalism  
\* The United States has removed democracy and human rights from their “core interests” that need to protected with military power  
\* There will be force reductions in Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi, Syria, and NATO

Shifrinson and Wertheim, 21 (Joshua Shifrinson and Stephen Wertheim, Associate Professor of International Relations at Boston University , Senior Fellow in the American Statecraft Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace , 9-9-2021, accessed on 12-18-2021, Outline, "**Biden the Realist**", <https://outline.com/JSjh3z)//Babcii>

But Biden’s decision to terminate the U.S. war in **Afghanistan** has revealed another side of the United States’ 46th president. In ending the two-decades-long war, Biden **rejected every “liberal internationalist” premise** of the enterprise, including the notion that building a democratic Afghanistan and transforming the region served U.S. interests or advanced universal values. He repeatedly argued that the United States had only one valid reason to use force there: to “get the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11” and might attack again. Once that objective had been achieved, the United States had no business waging war. It was for “the Afghan people alone to decide their future,” he said, including whether they would live in a Western-style democracy or under Taliban rule. The Taliban’s swift takeover, far from changing Biden’s mind, seems to have only affirmed his views about the limits of U.S. military power—in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Ending the war was “about ending an era of major military operations to remake other countries,” he said after the last U.S. soldier left Afghanistan. All this might surprise those who detect a “Biden doctrine” aiming to assert American power and defend democracy across the globe. Yet the Biden who terminated the United States’ longest war has been hiding in plain sight. Throughout his career, Biden has put the pragmatic pursuit of national security over foreign policy **orthodoxy**. For more than a decade, that calculus has made him a critic of regime-change wars and other efforts to promote American values by military force. Although his predecessor, Donald Trump, [gave voice](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-03-05/world-after-trump) to similar impulses, it is Biden who offers **a** more **coherent version of pragmatic realism**—a mode of thought that prizes the advancement of tangible U.S. interests, expects other states to follow their own interests, and changes course to get what the United States needs in a competitive world. If Biden continues to apply this vision, he will deliver a welcome change from decades of **overassertive** U.S. **foreign policy** [that has squandered](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2019-10-14/demolition-us-diplomacy) lives and resources in pursuit of unachievable goals. LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE Since entering the Senate in 1973, Biden has stood out for adapting his foreign policy views to changing domestic and international circumstances. He struck a moderate line early in his national political career when confronted with Americans’ weariness with the war in Vietnam in the 1970s and mounting tensions with the Soviet Union in the 1980s. He opposed sending additional military aid to South Vietnam in 1975 as North Vietnam launched its final offensive. And when President Ronald Reagan launched a massive military buildup to increase pressure on the Soviet Union, he voted against many of the administration’s top priorities. Notably, Biden voted against the 1991 Gulf War against Iraq. “What vital interests of the United States justify sending Americans to their deaths in the sands of Saudi Arabia?” he asked. He also worried that U.S. troops would unfairly shoulder most of the casualties and that “the enmity of the Arab world” would be directed toward the United States. Biden’s views shifted, however, after the Soviet Union collapsed and the United States attained unipolar dominance. As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Biden emerged as a leading proponent of enlarging NATO—a policy that created new, open-ended security commitments for the United States at the time when the “vital interests” involved were highly debatable. He contended that enlargement would guarantee “another 50 years of peace” in Europe as well as redress the “historical injustice” of Stalinist domination in Eastern Europe. Recanting his opposition to the earlier Gulf War, Biden championed U.S.-led military intervention against Serbia in the Bosnian war and the Kosovo crisis. After the 9/11 attacks, Biden voted to authorize the war in Afghanistan and, with some reservations, the war in Iraq. One week into the United States’ “shock and awe” campaign, he expressed hope that the invasion would “put Iraq on the path to a pluralistic and democratic society.” Yet once the wars faltered, Biden adapted again. In the face of insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq, he grew skeptical of both U.S. state-building missions. In 2006, Biden put forward his most distinctive foreign policy proposal to that point: he advocated dividing Iraq into a federal system along sectarian lines, paving the way for the U.S. military’s withdrawal from the country. Without acquiring an antiwar reputation, Biden was looking for an exit from Iraq. Accordingly, he bluntly opposed the U.S. “surge” of troops into Iraq when it was first floated in 2006, describing it as “the absolute wrong strategy.” Biden has consistently put the pragmatic pursuit of U.S. national security over foreign policy orthodoxy. Biden’s opposition to large wars with inflated goals only deepened as vice president. He was nearly alone among President Barack Obama’s senior advisers in dissenting from the administration’s decision to surge U.S. forces into Afghanistan from 2009 to 2011. Biden reasoned that the U.S.-backed Afghan government had insuperable flaws that made a complete victory over the Taliban insurgency impossible. He instead counseled a narrow counterterrorism mission targeting al Qaeda and related groups. It is possible Biden wanted to go even further. In his diary, U.S. envoy Richard Holbrooke recounted that Biden wanted to withdraw from Afghanistan entirely. During one particularly contentious debate, Holbrooke recounted Biden yelling, “I am not sending my boy back there to risk his life on behalf of women’s rights!” Advancing liberal values at gunpoint, he explained, “just won’t work, that’s not what [U.S. troops are] there for.” Biden also appears to have been a voice of caution within the Obama administration on other foreign policy debates. He expressed concern about launching the 2011 Navy SEAL raid that ultimately killed Osama bin Laden, suggesting that the United States gather additional intelligence before taking a step that could imperil relations with Pakistan. Biden also claims to have opposed the bombing of Libya that same year. At the time, he publicly urged U.S. NATO allies to take over the mission from the United States. “We can’t do it all,” Biden said, underscoring that Libya was peripheral to “our strategic interest” in the region. To Biden’s critics, his shifts on foreign policy no doubt seem opportunistic. His supporters, meanwhile, can herald his **willingness to learn from experience**. But Biden’s trajectory from **Cold War** moderate **to liberal-hegemony** enthusiast **to nation-building skeptic** contains a through line: he has always **regarded U.S. security as the paramount basis of foreign policy**, and has been willing to reassess how to advance American interests in light of new conditions and stubborn realities. And this pragmatic realism may augur even more **sweeping changes to American** foreign **policy** now that he resides in the White House. AFTER AFGHANISTAN Afghanistan represents the starkest example of Biden’s pragmatic realist streak. He ended the war swiftly after concluding that doing so would benefit the United States, heeding the strong preference of the U.S. public and resisting pressure from the Pentagon and many foreign policy elites to renew the U.S. state-building project. In justifying his decision, Biden insisted that U.S. service members should be sent into combat only to defend the United States. As an animated Biden told an interviewer during his presidential campaign, “The responsibility I have is to protect America’s national self-interest and not put our women and men in harm’s way to try to solve every single problem in the world by use of force.” Afghanistan may be just the beginning. Biden has **ordered the Defense Department to conduct a “global posture review”** of the United States’ forward deployments. If the review acts on the insight of General Mark Milley, the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, that many existing deployments were “developed during the Cold War,” it could recommend a significant restructuring of the U.S. military footprint. The administration has already signaled its intention to “right-size” the U.S. military presence in the Middle East and has recently begun that process by pulling antimissile systems **out of Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait,** and Saudi **Arabia**. Biden may also become the first president in three decades to **avoid the enlargement of NATO:** he has soft-pedaled talk of extending NATO membership to Ukraine, although he has continued to send military aid to the country. To be sure, Biden has often framed U.S. relations with [China](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-03-17/how-craft-durable-china-strategy) and [Russia](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russian-federation/2020-06-09/pinning-down-putin) in ideological terms. He has vowed to disprove the notion that “autocracy is the wave of the future” by demonstrating the continued vitality of American democratic institutions. Yet Biden’s actual policies toward the two powers betray his pragmatic bent. Rather than merge the countries into a single specter of an authoritarian menace, Biden has **prioritized competition with a rising China** well above that with a weaker Russia. He has aimed to establish a “stable and predictable relationship” with the latter, an approach that seeks to limit bilateral tensions and potentially enable the United States to focus on counterbalancing China. If Biden continues to apply this vision, he will deliver a welcome change from decades of overassertive U.S. foreign policy. As he did during the Cold War, Biden has taken steps designed to open the door to negotiated resolutions to disputes with the United States’ geopolitical rivals. He chose to hold his first major bilateral summit with Russian President Vladimir Putin and has also signaled his interest in meeting with Chinese President Xi Jinping. Diplomacy, he said after his summit with Putin, does not depend on trusting the other party. It requires merely that both sides have mutual interests and establish understandings based on those interests. “This is about self-interest and verification of self-interest,” Biden emphasized. “It’s just pure business.” At times, Biden’s own rhetoric can obscure his most distinctive foreign policy instincts. He has expressed revulsion at Trump for embracing “all the thugs in the world” and vowed that “human rights will be the center of our foreign policy”—a claim that is hard to square with his unapologetic defense of vital national interests as the sole grounds for war. And in December, he plans to hold the first of two “Summits for Democracy” intended to help the world’s democracies defend against authoritarianism and show they can deliver for their citizens. Contrasted with Trump and his affinity for autocrats, Biden may sound like he is returning to the United States’ muscular promotion of liberalism and democracy abroad. Still, most of Biden’s statements and actions are consistent with an outlook that puts national security above all other considerations. Likewise, the Summits for Democracy so far do not reflect a substantial effort either to expand U.S. alliances with democracies or to restrict U.S. alliances to liberal states. After all, pro-democracy rhetoric has not precluded the Biden administration from deepening ties with authoritarian states such as Thailand and Vietnam and increasingly illiberal democracies such as India and the Philippines. The summits may simply reflect the fact that Biden supports democracy, liberal values, and human rights—**without** thinking they should be promoted at **the point of a gun** or dictate U.S. defense obligations. **RESHAPING AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY** If the Biden administration continues to prize pragmatic realism above liberal primacy, [far-reaching changes](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-02-16/present-re-creation) may be in store for U.S. foreign policy. The security-focused analysis that Biden applied to Afghanistan would also lead to **force reductions** elsewhere in the world. The thousands of ground troops currently **in Iraq and Syria** to prevent a future resurgence of the Islamic State (also known as ISIS) are an obvious place to start. Their deployment violates Biden’s stated requirement to “set missions with clear, achievable goals” because success can never be verifiably achieved.

#### Offensive realism is statistically verifiable regarding China’s rise

\* Accounts for “US Aggression trigger retal” argument by accounting for China’s aggression against US allies and non-US allies and finds they are at the same level

Kihyun Lee 17 and Sung Chul Jung, Myongji University and Korea Institute for National Unification, 4/10/17, “The Offensive Realists Are Not Wrong: China's Growth and Aggression, 1976–2001”, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/pafo.12088

We conduct logit analyses of China's initiation of military conflict from 1976 to 2001 (Table 2: Models 1 & 3) but also rare event logit analyses because the binary dependent variable is heavily skewed to zero (Table 2: Models 2 & 4). Generally speaking, the results of the statistical analyses provide strong support for the hypotheses about economic power itself and territorial disputes (H1a, H2b) and weak support for those regarding economic power growth and US alliance (H1b, H2a) (see Table 2). 41 **As China's** economic **power** **grows**, whether it is assessed relative to all states or only Asian states, **its likelihood of initiating conflict increases** in a statistically significant way (H1a). **As offensive realists argue**, China's economic power had a positive effect on its foreign aggression during the period from 1976 to 2001 (Models 1, 2, 3, 4). China's economic power growth rate also shows a positive but insignificant effect on conflict initiation when measured relative to all states (Models 1 & 2). But the effect of rapid growth on conflict initiation becomes negative, not positive, and negative in the model when China's power is measured relative to Asian states (Models 3 & 4). This means that when China was rising rapidly compared to its regional neighbors, it was less aggressive toward Asian neighbors and major powers.

In support of H2b, the effect of territorial disputes on conflict initiation is positive and significant in Models 1, 2, 3, and 4. Not surprisingly, China was more prone to using military options against its opponents in territorial disputes than against other nations. Many international relations scholars argue that territory is a major reason why states fight each other, because it cannot be easily divided and often possesses symbolic and religious meanings. 37 China and its opponents are not an exception to this rule.

However, in contrast to H2a, China was not more aggressive toward US allies than toward other countries. Whether its opponent had a defense pact with the United States did not affect China's decision to initiate military conflict. This implies that China did not seek a direct military confrontation with the United States during the period from 1976 to 2001. Because this finding is about China's behaviors during the second half of the 20th century, however, it does not directly contradict the offensive realists’ expectation that China will challenge the United States in the future when the two nations are equal in power, at least in East Asia.
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Among the four control variables, Distance has a significant effect on conflict initiation in Models 1 and 3. However, the other three variables – **Relative Power, Economic Dependence, and Contiguity** – do not affect China's military aggression in a statistically significant way.

Next, we illustrate the prediction of China's initiation of military conflict against a non‐US ally. 38 As China's share of global economic power changes from 0.05 to 0.35, its probability of conflict initiation against a territorial dispute opponent increases from 0.01 to 0.81, and its probability of conflict initiation against a non‐territorial dispute opponent increases from 0.002 to 0.45 (see Fig. 3). Although this prediction derives from China's past military behaviors, we can draw two implications: (i) China's economic power has some positive effects on its military aggression; and (ii) China's territorial dispute opponents are likely targets of the rising power.

Summary and Implications

**Offensive realists are right**: China's growth has destabilized regional stability in the post‐Mao period. Our statistical analysis of China's initiation of military conflict shows that its economic power has had significant and positive effects. In addition, China was more aggressive toward its territorial dispute opponents, although the **U**nited **S**tates’ Asian allies were no more likely to be military targets than other Asian states. In short, China's greater power made the country more assertive, rather than cooperative, toward Asian states and major powers. This leads us to expect that China will maintain its current uncompromising and firm position in the South and East China Seas if its economic rise continues. Also, China's growth will accelerate its resolute protection of **core interests** in strategic and economic matters.

#### Even if offensive realism may be theoretically flawed it’s useful in this context because Xi and Chinese leaders believe it to be true and act accordingly

\* Xi’s “China Dream” is based on the understandings of Mingfu, who is an offensive realist  
\* Chinese elites use offensive realism to guide their decisions  
\* Xi rejected Deng, and previous leaders views and adopted a greater role for the military and protection of core interests, which are fundamental offensive realist notions  
\* This isn’t a China evil or more offensive than the west argument, our theory is that every state behaves under an offensive realist paradigm. Thus, China’s actions are logical, but this is proof that China also engages in this paradigm of foreign policy

Zhang, 12 (Baohui Zhang, Baohui Zhang is Associate Professor of Political science at Lingnan University, Hong Kong, with research interests in US-China relations, democratization and Hong Kong Politics., 11-29-2012, accessed on 2-25-2022, Global Asia, "Xi Jinping, ‘Pragmatic’ Offensive Realism and China’s Rise", <https://www.globalasia.org/v9no2/feature/xi-jinping-pragmatic-offensive-realism-and-chinas-rise_baohui-zhang)//Babcii>

CHINESE President Xi Jinping, via a series of new slogans, has generated speculation on the future direction of China’s foreign policy. It is therefore important to understand his concept of China’s role in world affairs and the implications of his policies and strategies for international relations. While Xi’s personal vision and style may account for some differences from his predecessors, the observed and predicted changes may also reflect China’s rising power. In this regard, Xi’s foreign policy may be consistent with the expected behavior of a rising power, but his worldview could generate independent impacts on China’s future posture in world affairs. In general, **Xi** has revealed a strong inclination toward an **offensive realist approach** through his goal to return China to the top of the **global power** hierarchy and his emphasis on the role of **military power** in China’s rise. But this realist inclination is shared by the leaders of many **great powers**, past and present, who aspire to achieve a favorable spot for their countries in the international system. Moreover, while Xi has professed a stronger resolve to defend China’s “core interests,” he has also demonstrated the ability to pursue cautious and flexible diplomacy in a complex world. As a tough but pragmatic realist, Xi is strategically using diplomacy to redefine China’s relations with the US and rebuild its image among its neighbors. XI’S CHINA DREAM: NATIONALIST OR REALIST? On Nov. 29, 2012, less than two weeks after taking over the top position of the ruling Chinese Communist Party, Xi Jinping and six other members of the Standing Committee of the Politburo visited “The Road Toward Renewal” exhibition at the National Museum of China. There, Xi outlined his idea of the “China Dream,” which involves “the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.”1 As the first and most significant political slogan of the new administration, the idea of the China Dream symbolizes Xi’s vision for China’s future and its place in the world. During his speech, Xi emphasized the humiliations suffered by China since the 19th century due to its weakness and backwardness. He suggested that China is nearing the end of a period of continuous striving for rejuvenation that began with the Opium Wars. “We are now closer than ever to the goal of China’s national revival,” he said. “We are more confident and better equipped than ever to realize this goal.”2 This seemingly nationalistic vision led to speculation among observers of China that the new administration’s foreign policies might demonstrate distinctive characteristics that reflect Xi’s own vision and worldview. In particular, there was conjecture that Xi might have a more nationalistic mind-set than his predecessors.3 His later comments on China’s uncompromising defense of its core interests and his championing of a strong military seemed to support this perspective. However, there may be alternative interpretations of Xi’s China Dream and his goal of returning the country to the center of the world stage. Realism argues that a **state’s relative power defines its foreign policy**. As Fareed Zakaria puts it in his study of the rise of the United States as a world power, “capabilities shape intentions.”4 From this perspective, a state’s goals tend to expand with its material capabilities. A rising power inevitably aspires for more. Thus, Xi’s ambition to restore China to its former glory reflects its rapid ascendance in the international system, particularly off the back of its strong economic growth over more than three decades. Recent international assessments all indicate that China’s economy is rising faster than expected.5 Until recently, the general opinion was that US dominance could continue until 2050.6 However, following the 2008 global financial crisis, China’s high-speed growth and the appreciation of the renminbi have led to a re-evaluation of predictions for the convergence of the economic power of China and the United States. Now, it is expected that China’s gross domestic product (GDP) could surpass that of the US sometime between 2017 and 2025, depending on whether the predictions are based on purchasing power parity (PPP) or the US dollar’s market exchange rate. Therefore, Xi’s stated goal of a great revival is not based on nationalistic fervor. Instead, it reflects the realistic ambition of a rising state that is about to claim its place at the top tier of the international power hierarchy. This realist interpretation of Xi’s intentions is significant, because it could lead to different predictions regarding his preferences, worldview and policies. In contrast to a classical realist interpretation of Xi’s China Dream slogan, which links his bold vision for China to its rising power, the concept of offensive realism, which emphasizes the effects of the anarchic international structure, offers an alternative understanding of his goals and motives. According to John Mearsheimer, the anarchic nature of international relations forces states to try to maximize their power.7In particular, states attempt to increase their power in relation to other states to achieve a position of greater security. Therefore, all great powers are revisionist, because they all attempt to change the balance of power in their favor, the ultimate goal being to become the most powerful country in the international system. From this perspective, Xi’s goal of returning China to the top of the global power hierarchy could reflect an offensive realist motive in that **one must have power to have security** and that more power leads to more security. For example, in his China Dream speech, Xi specifically mentioned the Chinese adage that “backwardness invites aggression,” which has defined China’s understanding of its abuse by imperialist powers since the 19th century. This essentially offensive realist understanding of power and security still **underlies thinking on international relations among China’s elites.** Looking from this angle, Xi’s China Dream slogan may show affinity with a book of the same title written by Liu **Mingfu**, a People’s Liberation Army (PLA) strategist. Liu’s **book**, published in 2010, promotes an unambiguously offensive realist agenda for China in world affairs by specifically calling for it to become the world’s most powerful country with the most powerful military, all for the purpose of protecting China’s national security. When Xi proposed his China Dream slogan, the BBC interviewed Liu, who claimed that China’s new leader shared his dream of making China the world’s dominant power.8 Such an offensive realist understanding of Xi’s vision for China implies that he is no different from the leaders of many other **great powers**, present and past, who have all aspired to attain a favorable spot for their countries in the international power hierarchy. Indeed, as American scholars have argued, the US itself pursued a grand strategy of hegemony during the unipolar era after the Cold War.9 They point out that the administrations of US presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush both articulated a national security strategy aimed at preventing the rise of a peer challenger. Both also pursued policies, such as missile defense and expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to maximize US power advantages over other great powers. These origins of Xi’s China Dream slogan are critical to understanding his vision of **China’s role** in world affairs. Alternative interpretations lead to different expectations of China’s future goals and behavior. For instance, a nationalist interpretation could lead to less sanguine expectations. In this context, a nationalistic leader consumed by China’s past humiliations and aided by its rapidly expanding power could favor more aggressive scenarios that threaten the security of other countries. In contrast, a realist understanding could lead to more benign expectations of China. While it seems logical to conclude that China’s rising power indicates expanding goals and ambitions, good realists are also capable of implementing cautious and pragmatic policies. In fact, as discussed later, recent Chinese foreign policies in various contexts indicate that Xi is a pragmatic realist. A HARDER REALIST **Xi** Jinping has also demonstrated two important **realist characteristics**: his emphasis on **military power**, and his tough position on external conflicts that involve China’s **core interests.** Soon after outlining his China Dream vision, Xi made a grand tour of southern China and used the occasion to highlight his other ideas for a rising China. On Dec. 8 and 10, 2012, Xi visited military units of the Guangzhou Military District and delivered an important message to the PLA.10 He said that while the basis of the China Dream is a great revival of the Chinese nation, for the PLA “it is the dream for a powerful military.” As he emphasized, “To achieve the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, we must steadfastly champion a unified goal of a rich country and powerful military.” Further, Xi stressed that a powerful military “must be able to fight and be able to win.”11 Xi’s recognition of the equal importance of a rich country and a powerful military **is a**n important modification of the Chinese grand strategy. Two decades ago, **Deng** Xiaoping advised China to **focus on economic modernization** as the pathway to national revival. His successors, **Jiang** Zemin **and Hu** Jintao, **maintained the same** strategic **focus**. Although neither neglected the modernization of the Chinese military, both Jiang and Hu adhered to Deng’s tenets that prioritized economic power over military power. As a result, China’s rise followed a primarily liberal international strategy that emphasized economic modernization, technological changes and integration with the world market. In fact, Hu Jintao’s greatest theoretical legacy was his idea of “scientific development,” which emphasized sustainable economic progress. Deng’s emphasis on economic power reflected not only his appreciation of the importance of China’s economy to its rise, but also his understanding of the potential international backlash if military power was assigned equal importance in Beijing’s grand strategy. Deng was acutely aware of the diplomatic challenges facing a rising China, particularly if the international system was characterized by a unipolar order.12 **Xi** has now modified Deng’s strategic tenets by emphasizing the parity of the twin goals of a rich country and **a powerful military**. The China Dream and China’s return to the top of the international power hierarchy depends on both economic and military power. This reflects a true **realist understanding** of international relations, and it differs from the hitherto rather liberal international strategy that focused on economic modernization as the pathway for China’s rise. Xi’s view represents a classic realist approach. Indeed, realists past and present have emphasized the importance of military power. In their conception, as long as the international system is anarchic, security remains the No. 1 priority for states.13 Only a powerful military can protect states from external threats to their security. Therefore, realists tend to see military power as a higher priority than economic power in the complex array of comprehensive national capabilities. According to offensive realists like Mearsheimer, military power defines power itself, while economic capabilities merely represent a state’s latent power.14Although Xi does not prioritize the military over the economy, he has nonetheless modified Deng’s strategic tenets by assigning them equal importance. However, it would be wrong to conclude that Xi has abandoned China’s strategy of a peaceful rise. In many occasions Xi has re-stated China’s adherence to it. The truth is that Xi is a realist who has a more complex understanding of China’s rise than his predecessors did. Compared to Chinese leaders before him, Xi is more astutely aware of the uncertainties and instabilities of a realist world. After all, Xi assumed leadership amid heightened tensions between China and Japan that almost brought them to the brink of war. Neither Jiang Zemin nor Hu Jintao faced the same scenario. Therefore, Xi’s emphasis on military power should not be detached from the context of his political succession. Moreover, Xi’s vision of China as a world-class economic and military power is no different from the standard viewpoint of American leaders, who, without exception, emphasize the importance of maintaining US military dominance. Indeed, according to the US National Intelligence Council’s future power assessment, although the US must learn to live in an increasingly multipolar world, it must strive to maintain its military superiority.15 Democrats and Republicans alike share that goal. This obsession with military supremacy explains why the US spends nearly 5 percent of its GDP on the military. This far exceeds the military expenditures of other great powers, including China, which is estimated to spend around 2 percent of its GDP on defense. Therefore, Xi’s view on the role of the military in safeguarding China’s security is no different from that of American leaders. They all exhibit a realist’s concern for security in an anarchic international system. Nonetheless, a militarily powerful China could try to resolve disputes with other countries in its own favor. So while Xi’s emphasis on military power reflects **normal state behavior** in an anarchic international system, it could trigger concerns among other countries — and already has in the case of **maritime disputes** with Japan and several Southeast Asian nations. In addition to his appreciation of the role of military power in China’s “great rejuvenation,” **Xi** has professed a stronger resolve to defend China’s **core national interests**. At a Politburo meeting on Jan. 28, 2013, Xi emphasized that while China will adhere to the path of a peaceful rise, it “will not sacrifice its rightful and legitimate interests. No other countries should expect us to trade away our core interests. Nor should they expect us to swallow the bitter results of injuries to our sovereignty, security, and development.”16 This statement by Xi has been interpreted as the toughest to date regarding China’s core interests. According to some analyses, Xi’s comments indicate that **China is willing to go to war** to safeguard its legitimate **interests**, even though doing so would inevitably have negative consequences for its economic prosperity.17

#### The aff’s use of legal research and scenario planning are essential to solvency --- In depth studies and scenario analysis are critical to effective antitrust enforcement

O’Keeffe, 17 (Siún O’Keeffe, Strategy advisor, Netherlands Authority for Consumers and Markets., Nov 2017, accessed on 9-14-2021, Journal of European Competition Law & Practice, "Use and Importance of Market Studies in Modern Competition Enforcement", https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1093/jeclap/lpx081)//babcii

Market studies too, can ultimately lead to swifter problem-solving. They allow us to examine a complicated market and establish how it works. This can prove **invaluable to assessments of whether or not particular activities are harmful**. Take the Online Hotel Booking Monitor that was published by EU competition authorities in February 2017. The Monitor examined empirical evidence that showed that many hotels were unaware of the legality or otherwise of the clauses controlling their prices. Also, it revealed no evidence of increased competition in markets where both wide and narrow across platform parity clauses were prohibited, in comparison to markets where only the wide APPA was stopped (through commitments). It is an example of crossborder number-crunching cooperation between 11 member states, including ACM, and the European Commission (in a sector in which authorities are often criticised for a lack of cooperation). ACM recently conducted an online video streaming study, with a focus on online video advertising. The study showed the intricate working of a swiftly moving multi-sided market. Online video platforms compete heavily for consumer attention. This battle primarily takes places in the fields of video-content and new service provision. The study suggested that none of the online video platforms currently has a dominant position in online advertising (it did not further explore content issues). The **large, international platforms** such as YouTube and Facebook face competition on these markets, at present, from each other and from smaller competitors. Online advertisements can be placed in a number of ways. In addition, there are many different companies that sell advertising space and place advertisements. Advertisers are able to choose the type of advertisement, and choose with whom they wish to do business, and they take advantage of these opportunities. There is also sufficient competition between the companies that facilitate the trade of advertising space. Personal data-sets are becoming more and more important in online advertising. However, the study suggested that the large data-sets of established platforms are not an insurmountable barrier for being able to enter this particular market. This study reveals a dynamic market where one player has a certain degree of market power, and **explores scenarios showing potential problems** that could arise. In-depth knowledge of how a market works allows the authority to intervene more quickly in the future, if necessary with interim measures, when a problem does arise. It allows us to combine ‘thinking fast’, with ‘thinking slow’, and it helps to waylay knee-jerk legislative reactions. Interim measures and quick interventions can be invaluable to prevent situations of harm arising. However, they do not replace empirical studies and thorough investigation based on the examination of facts and data. In the digital age, despite all the pressures, there is also a need to heed William Henry Davies’ advice to take the ‘time to stand and stare’ not in the pursuit of leisure, but rather in the pursuit of fact-based decision-making.

#### Specifically true of big tech and antitrust --- Civic monopolization means an informed public is key --- Legal engagement is essential to provide cover for political action

**Moore, 16** (Martin Moore, Moore is director of the Centre for the Study of Media Communication and Power in the Policy Institute at King’s College London. He has twenty years experience working across the UK media, in the commercial sector, the third sector and in academia. Prior to King’s he was founding director of the Media Standards Trust., Apr 2016, accessed on 9-14-2021, Kcl.ac, "Tech Giants and Civic Power", https://www.kcl.ac.uk/policy-institute/assets/cmcp/tech-giants-and-civic-power.pdf)//Babcii

The digital world is currently out of joint. A small number of tech companies are very large, dominant and growing. They have not just commercial influence, but an impact on our privacy, our freedom of expression, our security, and – as this study has shown – on our civic society. Even if they mean to have a positive and constructive societal impact – as they make clear they do – they are too big and have too great an influence to escape the attention of governments, democratic and non-democratic. Governments have already responded, and more will. Most of these government responses are destined to fail. They are destined to fail for three reasons: they have not yet adequately defined the problem they are trying to solve; they are using tools that are not suited to dealing with these organisations and the services they provide; and they do not have a vision of where they would like digital society to end up. On the first, the problem, this is generally defined narrowly in terms of privacy, security, and economics. Debates on privacy centre on the **collection and use of personal data** by the tech giants. Those on security focus on the extent to which governments should or should not have access to that personal data. Economic questions relate chiefly to tax and the degree to which the tech giants may be **unfairly promoting their own services over those of their competitors**. The antitrust case launched by the European Commission against Google in April 2015, for example, centres on the extent to which Google was, or was not, using its position as an intermediary to promote its own shopping service over those of its competitors. The Commission claimed that Google had ‘abused its dominant position in the markets for general internet search services in the European Economic Area (EEA) by systematically favouring its own comparison shopping product in its general search results pages.’330 The Commission may, or may not, be able to show the tech giant biased its results to its own service, but it will much harder to demonstrate how this this hurt the end user, particularly given that the service is provided free at the point of use. This is why, as this study has shown**, the problem also needs to be framed in civic terms**. It needs to be recognized that these organisations and their services are starting to play significant civic roles in democratic society, and that, in playing these roles, **they are gaining political and social power**. Democratic societies may decide, in some cases, that this is a fair trade given the benefits - though there has been precious little discussion to date as to the terms of trade and the advantages and disadvantages of reliance. In other cases, societies may decide the risks outweigh the benefits. They then need to figure out how to respond. Working out how to respond will not be straightforward. The tools currently available to democratic governments – including legislation, regulation and taxation – are not well suited to dealing with the issues raised by the tech giants. These organisations are very large and transnational, often work to a different economic model to other corporations, and work in a communications environment that is fundamentally different from their predecessors. Until we better understand and communicate the dilemmas they raise, and until the public become concerned about the potential – or actual – threats they represent, it will be difficult to respond effectively. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, antitrust law was applied more successfully once the problem of ‘bigness’ – that the law was introduced to address – **was more carefully investigated and exposed**. In January 1903, for example, the first of Ida **Tarbell’s** ‘muckraking’ investigations of John D. Rockefeller’s Standard Oil was published in McClure’s magazine. In this, and her following articles, Tarbell detailed how the rise to dominance of Standard Oil ‘was aided at every stage by discriminatory railroad rates and illegal tactics – bribery, fraud, criminal underselling and intimidation.’331 Such was the popular response to Tarbell’s investigations that she was lauded as the ‘Joan of Arc among moderns’ and ‘one of the most commanding figures in American letters.’332 Her **exposure of Standard Oil’s history and practices** **helped** Theodore Roosevelt **steer** his **bills against trusts through Congress** – on rail rebates, on the expedition of antitrust action, and on the establishment of a Department of Commerce with a Bureau of Corporations that had powers to investigate trusts. Eight years later, the US Supreme Court ruled that Standard Oil had abused its dominant position and should be broken up. It was **the combination of the investigation, the exposure, and the public response that enabled political action to be taken.** There has, as yet, been no twenty first century equivalent of Ida Tarbell’s investigations into the tech giants. Democratic societies also need a much clearer vision of where they would like to end up. What would a progressive digital future look like? How should plurality and diversity be defined in an age of information abundance? Should the digital civic landscape be devolved or centralized? These democratic objectives will need to include the needs of the citizen as well as the consumer, and of civic society as well as the security state. Such a vision ought to be led by the public, and has to take account of the state of the digital environment over twenty-five years after the advent of the web. The vision is unlikely to include over reliance on a small cadre of transnational tech companies, but may well include the convenience and efficiency that comes from using one provider for certain services like general search. Without greater clarity on the potential consequences of digital dominance, and a clearer vision of where democratic societies would like to end up, **there is a risk that they jeopardize the** tremendous civic benefits of **digital technology, and fail to build a digital ecosystem** that enables civic participation while protecting citizen’s rights. Without devising progressive responses democratic societies will be left with two alternatives, neither of which is attractive. They can take a laissez-faire approach, accepting that the digital environment will be dominated by a handful of tech giants, and that the most effective way of affecting their behaviour is through persuasion and collaboration. Or, they can react regressively to digital developments, banning services, imposing punishments and even prosecuting organisations and employees who run the tech companies’ tools. Democratic societies do not yet understand the phenomenon of the tech giants, what the phenomenon means in civic terms, what benefits it brings to governance, and the dangers inherent in it. Only once they understand the phenomenon better, and understand where it can help **and where it can damage civic society, will they be in a position to work out how best to respond.**

#### History proves the correlation between legal engagement and effective regulation --- Past tech monopolies prove the process of the 1AC effectively garners concessions from monopolies that solve even absent antitrust

Carlsson and Swartz, 21 (Philipp Carlsson-Szlezak and Paul Swartz, Carlsson-Szlezak is a managing director and partner in BCG’s New York office and global chief economist of BCG. Paul Swartz is a director and senior economist at the BCG Henderson Institute, based in BCG’s New York office., 8-18-2021, accessed on 9-14-2021, Fortune, "Popular outrage, not economics, will determine the fate of Big Tech", <https://fortune.com/2021/08/18/big-tech-breakup-antitrust-popular-outrage-facebook-google-standard-oil-microsoft/>)//Babcii

The power of the biggest tech companies has grown too ubiquitous to ignore—their dominance can be felt in the stock indexes, in segments of the labor market, and in the oversight (or lack thereof) of public discourse, to name just a few areas of influence. Little surprise, then, that [the political script](https://fortune.com/2021/06/24/house-panel-big-tech-facebook-google/) appears to be at a turning point: Regulatory agencies, now [staffed with vocal critics of the industry](https://fortune.com/2021/06/30/ftc-chair-lina-khan-populist-antitrust-movement-what-can-she-do-federal-trade-commission/), are accelerating the pursuit, with [Facebook](https://fortune.com/company/facebook) and [Google](https://fortune.com/company/alphabet) squarely [in the crosshairs](https://fortune.com/2021/01/04/facebook-antitrust-lawsuit-ftc-entrepreneurs-innovation/) of antitrust litigation. Yet predicting Big Tech’s comeuppance could be a losing bet. The path from corporate power to regulatory backlash is neither linear nor predominantly about economics. What’s overlooked in today’s debate is the catalyzing power of popular outrage. The presence of such anger has reliably aligned political will and driven regulatory pushback in the past—and its absence has slowed or prevented such pushback. To see why the political economy of outrage will likely shape [Big Tech’s regulatory fate](https://fortune.com/tag/big-tech/), a brief tour of U.S. history is a good starting point. The legacy of Ida Tarbell The Sherman Act and the dismemberment of Standard Oil in 1911 are often invoked today to highlight regulatory risk and power. However, a more interesting question is why the Sherman Act, passed in 1890, sat idle for nearly 20 years, even as politicians watched Standard Oil’s growing abuse of its market power. What changed? What forced Teddy Roosevelt’s hand wasn’t economic benchmarks such as peaking market share or high prices. It was Ida Tarbell, a star of the emerging field of muckraker journalism, who was on a mission of personal revenge to expose the Rockefeller empire. Her [History of the Standard Oil Company](https://energyhistory.yale.edu/library-item/ida-m-tarbell-history-standard-oil-company-1904) (1904) was a bestseller, serialized in McClure’s Magazine to great effect, and successfully galvanized public opinion against the Rockefellers and their monopoly. Growing up, Tarbell had witnessed Standard Oil bullying her father to sell his oil business—when he refused, the family had to mortgage their home. As such, the birth of U.S. antitrust action captures enduring political-economy dynamics: Standard Oil had enormous political **clout** and averted regulatory action for years. Yet, a groundswell of popular anger was sufficient to align political incentives to apply the law to Standard Oil. It would be a **mistake to see Tarbell’s victory as a case of idiosyncratic history**. On the contrary, the force of public outrage—surprisingly often channeled via the vehicle of literature—plays out again and again in the 20th century. Consider the emergence of the Food and Drug Administration, for example. Upton Sinclair, a contemporary of Tarbell’s, published The Jungle a little after Tarbell’s History. Despite being a work of fiction, The Jungle spawned massive popular backlash against the disgusting conditions in the meat processing plants of Chicago—the reading remains revolting to this day. The public reaction to Sinclair’s story, initially published in 1905, pushed President Roosevelt to sign the Pure **F**ood and **D**rug **A**ct, which passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 63 to 4 in the Senate in 1906 and founded what is now the FDA. There are many other examples of popular resentment driving regulatory action: The financial Panic of 1907 helped create the Federal Reserve; Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring contributed to the swaying of another Republican President, Richard Nixon, to create the **E**nvironmental **P**rotection **A**gency; the Great Financial Crisis of 2008 led to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—and so on. Without outrage, regulators meander While the historical examples above draw straight lines from anger to regulatory shock, it is true that some of the biggest antitrust cases in U.S. regulatory history meandered for decades—antitrust cases against **AT&T,** [**IBM**](https://fortune.com/company/ibm)**, and** later [**Microsoft**](https://fortune.com/company/microsoft) come to mind. Here, too, popular backlash—or the lack of it—played a critical role in shaping their regulatory fates. Yes, AT&T was broken up—in 1982. But its conflict with antitrust regulators had begun all the way back in 1913. Over the years, the company bounced around from being viewed as a good monopoly to being a state-sanctioned monopoly (recall you had to rent your phone from Ma Bell—but couldn’t own it). After a meandering 70-year regulatory pursuit, AT&T lost its case and agreed to break up on Jan. 8, 1982. By contrast, on that same day in 1982, a 30-year–long regulatory pursuit of IBM was dropped. Yet **despite avoiding a breakup**, the cumulative **impact on IBM was** arguably more **significant** than that on AT&T. IBM had been pushed into unbundling hardware and software, which successfully **opened space for new software** behemoths—leaving IBM strategically on the back foot. Popular anger did not underpin the regulatory pursuits of Ma Bell and Big Blue. They did not inspire indignation, perhaps because expensive long-distance calls and clunky computers did not spark emotion—or perhaps because their stories lacked their Tarbell or Sinclair. That did not prevent regulatory action, but that action played out on the battlefield of technocratic concern, which translated into a long-winded **regulatory dance and yielded outcomes** far preferable to Standard Oil’s fate. Microsoft, which moved into the space that IBM’s curtailment had opened, remains an interesting case in the context of outrage and regulation. For there was—some—outrage. It’s easy to forget how loathed in some quarters the firm and Bill Gates were in the late 1990s, just around the time when regulatory scrutiny peaked: the bullying of Netscape, the bundling of software, Gates’ widely panned deposition performance in testimony before Congress, all drove popular dislike if not quite mass resentment. What remains mostly forgotten today is that the judge ruled, in 2000, that Microsoft should break up—delivering a fast judgment aligned with popular sentiment of recent years. Yet the outrage didn’t sustain itself through political transition and appeal. In 2001 the Justice Department said it was no longer seeking a breakup and agreed to a settlement. Is Big Tech more like Standard Oil, or IBM? While history should always be used with care, the correlation between popular backlash (or lack thereof) and sharp regulatory backlash (or lack thereof) remains compelling. In some ways, this is more surprising if we think of antitrust regulation as a field of technocratic economic analysis, and less surprising if we think of it as politicians responding to incentives—such as when the influence of corporate power is outweighed by the electoral threat of outrage.

# 2AC --- NDT R7

## 2AC --- Case

### 2AC --- O/V --- China

#### Chinese AI lead causes extinction --- AI lead flips massive US economic and military advantages overnight --- That’s Nouwens and Stephen --- The transition causes nuclear conflict --- domain efficiency creates assertive pressures that trigger Bargain breakdown --- limited nuclear strats, brinksmanship, and accidental launch ensures it goes nuclear --- That’s Kroenig --- Escalation is empirically verifiable --- Of the 16 cases of a rising power 12 ended in great power war --- That’s Beckley --- Perception of Chinese lead is enough to undermine nuclear stability which causes nuclear war with Japan, SoKo, Taiwan, China, and Noko --- That’s Fay

### 2AC --- AT --- Interventionism

#### 1. Primacy is peaceful ---

#### a. Unipolarity solves interventions --- Allows the United States to contain both adversaries and allies from adventurism --- It also resolves US interventions by providing the United States flexibility of response to opt out of dangerous interventions --- That’s Anderson

#### b. Interstate wars have all but disappeared, civil wars decreased 30% and violence decreased 20% --- That’s Beckley

#### 2. Their evidence doesn’t account for the fall of liberal hegemony --- US interventionist policy has been dismantled by Trump and Biden for pragmatic realism --- The US is now practicing restraint --- That’s Shifrinson

#### 3. Even if wars are occurring, they aren’t major power wars which are longer more violent and are the only ones that can cause nuclear war --- That’s Beckley

#### 4. Forget their shallow indicts --- Primacy quantitatively outweighs

Baron, 13 (Joshua Baron, BS, University of Pennsylvaia, MS, University of Cambridge, PhD, Columbia University, 78-1-2013, accessed on 12-18-2021, Link.springer, "Great Power Peace and American Primacy | SpringerLink", https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9781137299482)//Babcii

D. The meaning of great power peace From the beginning of the modern era until approximately 1962, war was the dominant factor in the relations of great powers. Periods of extended peace were relatively rare and tended to follow devastating wars, serving as respites for exhausted belligerents. Even interludes between conflicts had moments when the brink of war was approached. In the second half of the 20th century, major war receded into the background for the great powers. We have experienced **over 50 years without approaching the precipice of great power war**, which is a modern record by a considerable distance. A group of countries have taken this time of tranquility a step farther. They still disagree, but no longer use military means – or even the threat of them – to resolve their disputes. In sum, great power peace has broken out. The last half-century certainly has not felt like a time of peace. A multitude of **wars have taken place**, some involving great powers on one side of the conflict, and the Cold War cast a lengthy shadow over international relations for much of this period. Consequently, it is not too surprising that this unprecedented period of peace among the great powers has received relatively little attention, despite its uniqueness and importance. Though the tragedy of conflicts in the Middle East or Africa should not be **diminished** in any way, it is important not to forget that from a global perspective **we are living through the best of times**. The absence of great power war is worthy of celebration not because the people who live within the borders of these countries are more important or worthy than others, but rather because such wars have profound consequences for the entire planet. The data makes this point crystal clear. Between the end of the Korean War in 1953 and 2007, 35 interstate wars were fought, including the **Iran–Iraq** War, the **Vietnam** War, **and both Gulf Wars**. In total, these conflicts resulted in the death of approximately **2.6 million** soldiers. By comparison, in **World War II alone 16.6 million** soldiers lost their lives.14 Every death due to war, genocide, oppression, terrorism, or any other violent source **is tragic**. At the same time, it is critical to underscore what happened when the great powers last turned the full extent of their military capabilities on each other. As bad as the **World Wars** were, they would pale in comparison to the devastation that would result from a major war among the great powers **today**. Back in 1984, a group of highly respected scientists examined the destructive potential of such a conflict. They estimated that a major nuclear war would be expected to immediately **kill** somewhere between 750 million and **1.1 billion people**. In addition, the “very fabric of industrial society would be destroyed.” Almost **all cities would, “simply cease to exist”** and much of our “know-how would disappear along with them.” 15 The exact effects of a nuclear war among the great powers are hard to predict, but the possibility of a “nuclear winter” means that the survival of the human **species** would be **at risk.**16

### 2AC --- Transition

#### Retrenchment is worse ---

#### a. spurs Jacksonian policies and spurs US interventionism domestically --- That’s Fay ---

#### b. No chance U.S hands it over willingly --- Overwhelming incentives, Inertia, and war hawks would shut it down

#### c. AI is unique --- Rapid shifts caused by AI muddy understandings which make war inevitable

#### d. Allies would prolif and rogue nations would escalate --- Both cause nuclear war

### 2AC --- Sustainable

#### Primacy is sustainable

Hal Brands & Charles N. Edel 19. \*\*Hal Brands, Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies; Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. \*\*Charles Edel, Assistant Professor of strategy and policy at the U.S. Naval War College; CFR International Affairs Fellow. *The Lessons of Tragedy: Statecraft and World Order*. 2019.

It is easy to lose sight of this fact amid all the upheaval both in America and overseas. Yet the basic picture remains unambiguous. **The United States is no fallen hegemon.** America still accounted for **22 percent of global GDP** in 2016—not far off the historical average since the 1970s—and it **spent as much on defense as the next eight nations combined.** When U.S. treaty allies are factored in, America’s geopolitical coalition possessed nearly **60 percent of global GDP and military spending**, an amount that still vastly exceeds the economic and military power of all U.S. rivals put together, and that seems unimpressive only in comparison to the utterly peerless primacy of the 1990s. Washington remains at the **center of a global network made up of over thirty treaty allie**s, another thirty or so quasi-allies, and still more security and diplomatic partners, **giving it geopolitical leverage and relationships** that no competitor can approach. And **even in the age of Trump, no rival boasts anything close to America’s experience and expertise in coordinating complex military and diplomatic endeavors.** This is not to say that all is well. America’s competitors have closed the gap in some key areas; that narrowing margin is **encouraging the geopolitical tests Washington confronts today.** There are questions regarding whether the United States still has enough military might to uphold key regional balances around the world, which are inseparable from questions about how wisely the country will address its long-term fiscal dilemmas. There are even graver questions as to whether Americans and their leaders still want to use the nation’s power in the service of the postwar order. But the primary limiting factors here are political and psychological rather than material. They relate to historical amnesia, and to a reluctance to make hard choices and face hard facts, rather than any catastrophic collapse of American power. The United States still **possesses advantages that most previous leading powers can only envy; its capabilities are surely sufficient**—particularly when combined with the strengths of its allies—to mount a credible defense of the international system it has constructed. To say the U.S.-led order is endangered is a counsel of realism, but to say the situation is irretrievable is a counsel of unwarranted despair.

#### Being first to AI solves any reason its unsustainable --- Secures military strength in every domain AND remakes the U.S economy --- That’s Stephen and Nouwens --- Winning the race saves and creates alliances --- That’s Zhang --- Overtaking in certain areas doesn’t upset broad primacy --- Only AI can overturn all US advantages

## 2AC --- K

### 2AC --- F/W

#### Framework---weigh the implementation and impacts of the plan vs a competitive alternative

#### 1. Fairness --- Their interp moots 9 minutes of 1AC offense ---Makes it impossible to be aff

#### 2. Clash --- Debates about the plan forces continual iteration which solves epistemic humility and critical reflexivity

#### 3. Plan’s a DA --- The iterative process of Legal proposals, research, and scenario analysis empirically generate strategies for antitrust enforcement to effectively intervene against big tech --- That’s O’keeffee --- The plan’s process of legalistic engagement is empirically verifiable to have a direct correlation with political action against big tech --- That’s Moore --- Rockefeller, The FDA, The federal reserve, The EPA, The CFPB, and IBM all prove --- That’s Carlsson

#### 4. We win under their framework --- If we win the realism debate it justifies our reps and our research project

### 2AC --- Extinction O/W

#### Aff Outweighs ---

#### 1. Irreversibility --- Future life is a pre-req to solving the impact to their internal links which means preventing extinction comes first --- it’s a moral priority over alleviation of suffering – future generations are infinite and have greater access of value to life --- Quality of life is improving --- Wealth, life expectancy, energy use, literacy, education and happiness are at an all time high and are growing rapidly, while poverty is catering --- That’s Todd

#### 2. Cognitive bias --- rejection of existential risks justifies temporal free riding – cognitive biases tip the scales – availability heuristic and scope neglect short circuit logical decision-making incentivizing you to doubt yourself or vote empathetically – err on the side of caution

#### 3. Ethical ambiguity --- If you’re at all unsure leave the decision up to future generations --- Even if their impact does outweigh its not verifiable --- Only way to know is to continue living and studying which requires life as a pre-requisite

### 2AC --- Perms

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do the aff then the alt --- if it can’t overcome the aff it can’t solve the squo

#### If they win primacy or tech development bad then perm solves by ending those things --- Breaking up big tech is still desirable to stop ongoing monopolization of the political sphere and their privacy and economic violence --- That’s O’Keeffe and Moore --- It’s a pre-req cause it shuts down movements

#### Severing reps is good --- makes debate about the plan, most real world, forces better K links, key to aff ground, and proves the alt isn’t a germane opportunity cost

### 2AC --- Link

#### Offensive realism --- If we win this argument we win the debate --- States were both out of anarchic foundations and are thus are on a constant quest to seek power to enable security --- Only using offensive realist frames prevents great power nuclear transition --- Anything cause nuclear transition wars

#### Our theory is true ---

#### 1. Research --- A Consensus of research from numerous fields corroborates our theory

Wolforth 9 (William C. Wohlforth – Dartmouth University International Relations Professor, January 2009, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War”, <https://cpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/sites.dartmouth.edu/dist/b/174/files/2013/04/War.pdf>, accessed 8/5/18,)

The historical record surrounding major wars is rich with evidence suggesting that positional concerns over status frustrate bargaining: expensive, protracted conflict over what appear to be minor issues; a propensity on the part of decision makers to frame issues in terms of relative rank even when doing so makes bargaining harder; decision-makers’ inability to accept feasible divisions of the matter in dispute even when failing to do so imposes high costs; demands on the part of states for observable evidence to confirm their estimate of an improved position in the hierarchy; the inability of private bargains to resolve issues; a frequently observed compulsion for the public attainment of concessions from a higher ranked state; and stubborn resistance on the part of states to which such demands are addressed even when acquiescence entails limited material cost. The literature on bargaining failure in the context of power shifts remains inconclusive, and it is premature to take any empirical pattern as necessarily probative. Indeed, Robert Powell has recently proposed that indivisibility is not a rationalistic explanation for war after all: fully rational leaders with perfect information should prefer to settle a dispute over an indivisible issue by resorting to a lottery rather than a war certain to destroy some of the goods in dispute. What might prevent such bargaining solutions is not indivisibility itself, he argues, but rather the parties’ inability to commit to abide by any agreement in the future if they expect their relative capabilities to continue to shift.[22](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#f22) This is the credible commitment problem to which many theorists are now turning their attention. But how it relates to the information problem that until recently dominated the formal literature remains to be seen.[23](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#f23) The larger point is that positional concerns for status may help account for the puzzle of bargaining failure. In the rational choice bargaining literature, war is puzzling because it destroys some of the benefits or flows of benefits in dispute between the bargainers, who would be better off dividing the spoils without war. Yet what happens to these models if what matters for states is less the flows of material benefits themselves than their implications for relative status? The salience of this question depends on the relative importance of positional concern for status among states. Do Great Powers Care about Status? Mainstream theories generally posit that states come to blows over an international status quo only when it has implications for their security or material well-being. The guiding assumption is that a state’s satisfaction with its place in the existing order is a function of the material costs and benefits implied by that status.[24](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#f24) By that assumption, once a state’s status in an international order ceases to affect its material wellbeing, its relative standing will have no bearing on decisions for war or peace. But the assumption is undermined by cumulative research in disciplines ranging from neuroscience and evolutionary biology to economics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology that human beings are powerfully motivated by the desire for favorable social status comparisons. This research suggests that the preference for status is a basic disposition rather than merely a strategy for attaining other goals.[25](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#f25) People often seek tangibles not so much because of the welfare or security they bring but because of the social status they confer. Under certain conditions, the search for status will cause people to behave in ways that directly contradict their material interest in security and/or prosperity.

#### 2. Especially true regarding international relations and China --- Empirical and logit analysis of Chinese behavior proves a linear regression between conflict initiation and strength, regardless of economic integration and contiguity --- That’s Lee

#### 3. Even if you think our theory is flawed it is still how we should operate --- Offensive realism has been adopted by all great power leaders including China --- Xi has adopted a vision for China rise greatly influenced by offensive realist scholars such as Liu Mingfu, China’s security advisors prefer offensive realist frames for foreign relations, and Xi overturned 25 years of Deng military policy --- That’s Zhang

#### IR scholarship is not intrinsically racist and imperial

Gideon Rose 16, editor of Foreign Affairs, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, March/April 2016, “Review of, ‘White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations,’” https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/capsule-review/2016-02-16/white-world-order-black-power-politics-birth-american

In this interesting and important yet flawed book, Vitalis seeks to bridge the “vast gulf divid[ing] international relations from Africana studies,” bringing the “racism [of the discipline of international relations] to light.” Conventional narratives of the field’s history, he argues, trace it to the rise of realism and national security concerns in the years around World War II, adding a few historical thinkers, such as Thucydides, to claim a timeless intellectual pedigree. But this ignores both the extensive mainstream scholarship of the first decades of the twentieth century that dealt with colonialism and racial issues and the pioneering work of African American writers in what he calls “the Howard School.” Consigning both to the memory hole, he says, paints a distorted picture of the discipline’s origins and nature, obscuring the role that international relations scholarship has played in the construction and perpetuation of white Western dominance.

These are major claims, and some of them hold up better than others. Vitalis is correct to shine a spotlight on the forgotten academic work of the first third of the twentieth century and offers a timely reminder of just how prevalent racialized thinking was and how central a role imperialism—as opposed to straightforward great-power relations—played in global affairs. Back then, for example, “policy relevance” in political science often meant figuring out how to train good colonial administrators. Vitalis also provides a service by telling the story of scholars such as Alain Locke, Ralph Bunche, and Rayford Logan, enriching readers’ understanding of midcentury intellectual debates over U.S. foreign policy and tracing how racism operated inside various professional institutions.

Vitalis is less convincing, however, in casting his analysis as an indictment of the postwar discipline of international relations, let alone its contemporary incarnation. To get there, one has to share his politics. Vitalis sees a project of U.S. imperial domination playing out over the course of the past century, with the “subjection” continuing today, “through new-old policies of intervention, tutelage, and targeted killings in new-old zones of anarchy and civilization deficit.” Given such a reading of U.S. foreign policy, it is not surprising that he believes “the history of ideas, institutions, and practices [in the field] has a constitutive role in their present forms and functions”—or that he sees today’s mainstream international relations scholars as handmaidens of an evil national security state and as the direct descendants of their racist predecessors of a century ago.

Scorning the notion that the postwar liberal international order represents anything particularly new or admirable, Vitalis scores a few points in noting how long it took for some earlier social and racial hierarchies, both international and domestic, to erode. But he refuses to accept the fact that they have indeed eroded. One is left wanting more analysis of how and why the attitudes and patterns of domination Vitalis describes gave way over time, and how the midcentury theorists and practitioners of the liberal international order understood and handled the paradoxes of its halting and inconsistent implementation.

**IR’s not intrinsically Eurocentric — our findings aren’t implicated by colonialism, AND 30 years of dissident IR proves the alt fails**

**Alejandro 19** — Audrey Alejandro (PhD Assistant Professor at the Department of Methodology, London School of Economics and Political Science), “Western Dominance in International Relations?,” Routledge Publishing, forthcoming) xx-xx-2019 //pyrex ultra

**Since the 1970s, a ‘critical’ movement has been developing in the humanities and social sciences denouncing the existence of** ‘**Western dominance’** **over the worldwide production and circulation of knowledge. However, thirty years after the emergence of this** promising **agenda** in International Relations (IR), **this discipline has not experienced a** major **shift**. **This** volume **offers a counter-intuitive and original contribution to the understanding of the global circulation of knowledge**. **In contrast to the literature**, it argues that **the internationalisation of social sciences** in the designated ‘Global South’ **is not conditioned** **by the existence of** a presumably **‘Western dominance’**. Indeed, **although discriminative practices such as Eurocentrism and gatekeeping exist,** **their existence does not lead to a unipolar structuration of IR internationalisation** **around ‘the West’. Based on these empirical results, this** book reflexively **questions the role of critique** in the (re)production of the social and political order. Paradoxically, **the anti-Eurocentric critical discourses reproduce the very Eurocentrism they criticise**. This book offers methodological support to address this paradox by demonstrating how **one can use** discourse analysis and **reflexivity to produce innovative results and decentre oneself from the vision of the world** one has been socialised into.

#### Attempting IR predictions about China is both possible and desirable---even if inaccurate---because giving up on bounding assessment of threats results in security dilemmas

Joseph K. **Clifton 11**, Claremont McKenna College, “Disputed Theory and Security Policy: Responding to the "Rise of China”,” 4-25-2011, http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1164&context=cmc\_theses

First, motives can be known. Mearsheimer is correct in observing that assessing motives can be difficult, but this does not mean that the task is impossible. There clearly are ways of finding out information about the goals of states and the means with which they plan to achieve them. One of the most important roles of intelligence analysts, for example, is to determine state interests and expected behavior based on obtained information. The possibility that information may be flawed should not lead to a rejection of all information. People make decisions based on less than perfect knowledge all of the time. This ability to know motives extends to future motives, because an analyst can use information such as historical trends to observe consistencies or constant evolutions of motives. Prediction of the future is necessarily less certain in its accuracy, but the prediction can still be made.104 Second, even if there is still some uncertainty of motives, the rational response is not to assume absolute aggression. Assuming aggressive motive in a situation of uncertainty ignites the security dilemma, which could actually decrease a state’s security. Mearsheimer calls this tragic, but it is not necessary. An illustrative example is Mearsheimer’s analysis of the German security situation were the United States to withdraw its military protection. Mearsheimer argues that it would be rational for Germany to develop nuclear weapons, since these weapons would provide a deterrent, and it would also be rational for nuclear European powers to wage a preemptive war against Germany to prevent it from developing a nuclear deterrent. 105 This scenario is not rational for either side because it ignores motives. If Germany knows that other states will attack if it were to develop nuclear weapons, then it would not be rational for it to develop nuclear weapons. And if other states know that Germany’s development of nuclear weapons is only as a deterrent, then it would not be rational to prevent German nuclear development. The point is that the security dilemma exists because of a lack of motivational knowledge, so the proper response is to try to enhance understanding of motives, not discard motivational knowledge altogether. Misperception is certainly a problem in international politics, but reducing misperception would allow states to better conform to defensive realist logic, which results in preferable outcomes relative to offensive realism. 106 Assessing motives is vital in the case of the rise of China, because mutually preferable outcomes can be achieved if China is not an aggressive power, as offensive realism would have to assume, but is actually a status quo power with aims that have limited effect on the security of the U.S. and other potentially affected countries. I do not mean here to claim with certainty that China is and will always be a status quo power, and policymakers likely have access to more intentional information than what is publicly known. At the very least, valuing motivational assessments empowers policymakers to act on this knowledge, which is preferable because of the possibility of reducing competition and conflict.

#### Failure to stop China allows them to establish a global dystopian surveillance state. Only Western democracies have self-correcting protections to safeguard citizens from over-stretch

Charlie Campbell 19. East Asia Correspondent for TIME. "The Entire System Is Designed to Suppress Us': What the Chinese Surveillance State Means for the Rest of the World." Time. 11-21-2019. https://time.com/5735411/china-surveillance-privacy-issues/

Still, the risks are considerable. As Western democracies enact safeguards to protect citizens from the rampant harvesting of data by government and corporations, China is exporting its AI-powered surveillance technology to authoritarian governments around the world. Chinese firms are providing high-tech surveillance tools to at least 18 nations from Venezuela to Zimbabwe, according to a 2018 report by Freedom House. China is a battleground where the modern surveillance state has reached a nadir, prompting censure from governments and institutions around the globe, but it is also where rebellion against its overreach is being most ferociously fought.

“Today’s economic business models all encourage people to share data,” says Lokman Tsui, a privacy expert at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In China, he adds, we are seeing “what happens when the state goes after that data to exploit and weaponize it.”

Some 1,500 miles northwest of where Mrs. Chen recovered her purse, surveillance in China’s restive region of Xinjiang has helped put an estimated 1 million people into “re-education centers” akin to concentration camps, according to the U.N. Many were arrested, tried and convicted by computer algorithm based on data harvested by the cameras that stud every 20 steps in some parts.

In the name of fighting terrorism, members of predominantly Muslim ethnic groups—mostly Uighurs but also Kazakhs, Uzbeks and Kyrgyz—are forced to surrender biometric data like photos, fingerprints, DNA, blood and voice samples. Police are armed with a smartphone app that then automatically flags certain behaviors, according to reverse engineering by the advocacy group Human Rights Watch. Those who grow a beard, leave their house via a back door or visit the mosque often are red-flagged by the system and interrogated.

Sarsenbek Akaruli, 45, a veterinarian and trader from the Xinjiang city of Ili, was arrested on Nov. 2, 2017, and remains in a detention camp after police found the banned messaging app WhatsApp on his cell phone, according to his wife Gulnur Kosdaulet. A citizen of neighboring Kazakhstan, she has traveled to Xinjiang four times to search for him but found even friends in the ruling Chinese Communist Party (CCP) reluctant to help. “Nobody wanted to risk being recorded on security cameras talking to me in case they ended up in the camps themselves,” she tells TIME.

Surveillance governs all aspects of camp life. Bakitali Nur, 47, a fruit and vegetable exporter in the Xinjiang town of Khorgos, was arrested after authorities became suspicious of his frequent business trips abroad. The father of three says he spent a year in a single room with seven other inmates, all clad in blue jumpsuits, forced to sit still on plastic stools for 17 hours straight as four HikVision cameras recorded every move. “Anyone caught talking or moving was forced into stress positions for hours at a time,” he says.

Bakitali was released only after he developed a chronic illness. But his surveillance hell continued over five months of virtual house arrest, which is common for former detainees. He was forbidden from traveling outside his village without permission, and a CCTV camera was installed opposite his home. Every time he approached the front door, a policeman would call to ask where he was going. He had to report to the local government office every day to undergo “political education” and write a self-criticism detailing his previous day’s activities. Unable to travel for work, former detainees like Bakitali are often obliged to toil at government factories for wages as miserly as 35¢ per day, according to former workers interviewed by TIME. “The entire system is designed to suppress us,” Bakitali says in Almaty, Kazakhstan, where he escaped in May.

The result is dystopian. When every aspect of life is under constant scrutiny, it’s not just “bad” behavior that must be avoided. Muslims in Xinjiang are under constant pressure to act in a manner that the CCP would approve. While posting controversial material online is clearly reckless, not using social media at all could also be considered suspicious, so Muslims share glowing news about the country and party as a means of defense. Homes and businesses now feel obliged to display a photograph of China’s President Xi Jinping in a manner redolent of North Koreans’ public displays for founder Kim Il Sung. Asked why he had a picture of Xi in his taxi, one Uighur driver replied nervously, “It’s the law.”

Besides the surveillance cameras, people are required to register their ID numbers for activities as mundane as renting a karaoke booth. Muslims are forced from buses to have their IDs checked while ethnic Han Chinese passengers wait in their seats. At intersections, drivers are ushered from their vehicles by armed police and through Tera-Snap “revolving body detector” equipment. In the southern Xinjiang oasis town of Hotan, a facial–recognition booth is even installed at the local produce market. When a system struggled to compute the face of this Western TIME reporter, the impatient Han women queuing behind berated the operator, “Hurry up, he’s not a Uighur, let him through.”

China strenuously denies human-rights abuses in Xinjiang, justifying its surveillance leviathan as battling the “three evils” of “separatism, terrorism and extremism.” But the situation has been described as a “horrific campaign of repression” by the U.S. and condemned by the U.N. Washington has also started sanctioning companies like HikVision whose facial–recognition technology is ubiquitous across the Alaska-size region. But Western aversion to surveillance is much broader and stems in no small part from abuses like the Facebook/Cambridge Analytica scandal, in which the “scraped” personal information of up to 87 million people was acquired by the political consultancy to swing elections around the world.

China is also rolling out Big Data and surveillance to inculcate “positive” behavior in its citizens via a Social Credit system. In China’s eastern coastal city of Rongcheng, home to 670,000 people, every person is automatically given 1,000 points. Fighting with neighbors will cost you 5 points; fail to clean up after your dog and you lose 10. Donating blood gains 5. Fall below a certain threshold and it’s impossible to get a loan or book high-speed train tickets. Some Chinese see the benefit. High school teacher Zhu Junfang, 42, enjoys perks such as discounted heating bills and improved health care after a series of good works. “Because of the Social Credit system, vehicles politely let pedestrians cross the street, and during a recent blizzard people volunteered to clear the snow to earn extra points,” she says.

Such intrusive government is anathema to most in the West, where aversion to surveillance is much broader and more visceral. Whether it’s our Internet browser history, selfies uploaded to social media, data scavenged from fitness trackers or smart-home devices possibly recording the most intimate bedroom conversations, we are all living in what’s been dubbed a “surveillance economy.” In her book The Age of Surveillance Capitalism, Shoshana Zuboff describes this as “human experience [broken down into data] as free raw material for commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales.”

When it comes to facial recognition, resistance is intense given the huge potential for indiscriminate data harvesting. The E.U. is reviewing regulations to give its citizens explicit rights over use of their facial-recognition data. While tech giants Microsoft and Amazon have already deployed the technology, they are also calling for clear legal parameters to govern its use. Other than privacy, there are equality issues too. According to a study by MIT Media Lab, facial-recognition software correctly identified white men 99% to 100% of the time, but that dipped as low as 65% for women of color. Civil-liberties groups are especially uneasy since facial recognition, despite its widespread use by American police, is rarely cited as evidence in subsequent court filings. In May, San Francisco became the first major U.S. city to block police from using facial–recognition software.

Even in China, where civil liberties have long been sacrificed for what the CCP deems the greater good, privacy concerns are bubbling up. On Oct. 28, a professor in eastern China sued Hangzhou Safari Park for “violating consumer privacy law by compulsorily collecting visitors’ individual characteristics,” after the park announced its intention to adopt facial–recognition entry gates. In Chongqing, a move to install surveillance cameras in 15,000 licensed taxicabs has met a backlash from drivers. “Now I can’t cuddle my girlfriend off duty or curse my bosses,” one driver grumbles to TIME.

Russia’s election meddling around the world highlights the risks of commercially harvested data being repurposed for nefarious goals. It’s a message taken to heart in Hong Kong, where millions have protested over the past five months to push for more democracy. These demonstrators have found themselves in the crosshairs after being identified via CCTV cameras or social media. Employees for state airline Cathay Pacific have been fired and others investigated based on evidence reportedly gleaned via online posts and private messaging apps.

This has led demonstrators to adopt intricate tactics to evade Big Brother’s all-seeing eye. Clad in helmets, face masks and reflective goggles, they prepare for confrontations with the police with military precision. A vanguard clutch umbrellas aloft to shield their activities from prying eyes, before a second wave advances to attack overhead cameras with tape, spray paint and buzz saws. From behind, a covering fire of laser pointers attempts to disrupt the recordings of security officers’ body-mounted cameras.

Fending off the cameras is just one response. When Matthew, 22, who used only his first name for his own safety, heads to the front lines, he always leaves his regular cell phone at home and takes a burner. Aside from swapping SIM cards, he rarely reuses handsets multiple times since each has a unique International Mobile Equipment Identity digital serial number that he says police can trace. He also switches among different VPNs—software to mask a user’s location—and pays for protest–related purchases with cash or untraceable top-up credit cards. Voice calls are made only as a last resort, he says. “Once I had no choice but to make a call, but I threw away my SIM immediately afterward.”

The Hong Kong government denies its smart cameras and lampposts use facial-recognition technology. But “it really comes down to whether you trust institutions,” says privacy expert Tsui. For Matthew, the risks are real and stark: “We are fighting to stop Hong Kong becoming another Xinjiang.”

Ultimately, even protesters’ forensic safeguards may not be enough as technology advances. In his Beijing headquarters, Huang Yongzhen, CEO of AI firm Watrix, shows off his latest gait-recognition software, which can identify people from 50 meters away by analyzing thousands of metrics about their walk—even with faces covered or backs to the camera. It’s already been rolled out by security services across China, he says, though he’s ambivalent about privacy concerns. “From our perspective, we just provide the technology,” he says. “As for how it’s used, like all high tech, it may be a double-edged sword.”

Little wonder a backlash against AI-powered surveillance is gathering pace. In the U.S., legislation was introduced in Congress in July that would prohibit the use of facial recognition in public housing. Japanese scientists have produced special glasses designed to fool the technology. Public campaigns have railed against commercial uses—from Ticket-master using facial recognition for concert tickets to JetBlue for boarding passes. In May, Democratic Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio–Cortez linked the technology to “a global rise in authoritarianism and fascism.”

### 2AC --- Alt

#### Alt fails ---

#### 1. Theory comes secondary to the plan’s harm reduction -- the alt causes endless debates at the cost of material improvements in the day to day.

**Jarvis ’0** [Darryl; 2000; Former Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sydney; *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism*, *University of South Carolina Press*, “Continental Drift,” p. 128-129; GR]

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly, it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations?

On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, “So what?” To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate.

#### 2. Changing epistemology is impossible --- Offensive realism is fixed nature, because it is the result of the anarchy of the international system

#### 3. Aff is a DA --- Changing research strategies rejects the 1AC’s use of legalistic research as a resistance to big tech and causes a nuclear transition war

#### Our authors have self-interest against data inflation.

Ravenal 9 – Distinguished Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies at the Cato Institute

(Earl C., also professor emeritus of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, “What's Empire Got to Do with It? The Derivation of America's Foreign Policy.” Critical Review: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Politics and Society 21.1 (2009) 21-75)

The underlying notion of “the security bureaucracies . . . looking for new enemies” is a threadbare concept that has somehow taken hold across the political spectrum, from the radical left (viz. Michael Klare [1981], who refers to a “threat bank”), to the liberal center (viz. Robert H. Johnson [1997], who dismisses most alleged “threats” as “improbable dangers”), to libertarians (viz. Ted Galen Carpenter [1992], Vice President for Foreign and Defense Policy of the Cato Institute, who wrote a book entitled A Search for Enemies). What is missing from most analysts’ claims of “threat inflation,” however, is a convincing theory of why, say, the American government significantly (not merely in excusable rhetoric) might magnify and even invent threats (and, more seriously, act on such inflated threat estimates). In a few places, Eland (2004, 185) suggests that such behavior might stem from military or national security bureaucrats’ attempts to enhance their personal status and organizational budgets, or even from the influence and dominance of “the military-industrial complex”; viz.: “Maintaining the empire and retaliating for the blowback from that empire keeps what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex fat and happy.” Or, in the same section: In the nation’s capital, vested interests, such as the law enforcement bureaucracies . . . routinely take advantage of “crises”to satisfy parochial desires. Similarly, many corporations use crises to get pet projects— a.k.a. pork—funded by the government. And national security crises, because of people’s fears, are especially ripe opportunities to grab largesse. (Ibid., 182) Thus, “bureaucratic-politics” theory, which once made several reputa- tions (such as those of Richard Neustadt, Morton Halperin, and Graham Allison) in defense-intellectual circles, and spawned an entire sub-industry within the field of international relations,5 is put into the service of dismissing putative security threats as imaginary. So, too, can a surprisingly cognate theory, “public choice,”6 which can be considered the right-wing analog of the “bureaucratic-politics” model, and is a preferred interpretation of governmental decision- making among libertarian observers. As Eland (2004, 203) summarizes: Public-choice theory argues [that] the government itself can develop sepa- rate interests from its citizens. The government reflects the interests of powerful pressure groups and the interests of the bureaucracies and the bureaucrats in them. Although this problem occurs in both foreign and domestic policy, it may be more severe in foreign policy because citizens pay less attention to policies that affect them less directly. There is, in this statement of public-choice theory, a certain ambiguity, and a certain degree of contradiction: Bureaucrats are supposedly, at the same time, subservient to societal interest groups and autonomous from society in general. This journal has pioneered the argument that state autonomy is a likely consequence of the public’s ignorance of most areas of state activity (e.g., Somin 1998; DeCanio 2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2007; Ravenal 2000a). But state autonomy does not necessarily mean that bureaucrats substitute their own interests for those of what could be called the “national society” that they ostensibly serve. I have argued (Ravenal 2000a) that, precisely because of the public-ignorance and elite-expertise factors, and especially because the opportunities—at least for bureaucrats (a few notable post-government lobbyist cases nonwithstanding)—for lucrative self-dealing are stringently fewer in the defense and diplomatic areas of government than they are in some of the contract-dispensing and more under-the-radar-screen agencies of government, the “public-choice” imputation of self-dealing, rather than working toward the national interest (which, however may not be synonymous with the interests, perceived or expressed, of citizens!) is less likely to hold. In short, state autonomy is likely to mean, in the derivation of foreign policy, that “state elites” are using rational judgment, in insulation from self-promoting interest groups—about what strategies, forces, and weapons are required for national defense. Ironically, “public choice”—not even a species of economics, but rather a kind of political interpretation—is not even about “public” choice, since, like the bureaucratic-politics model, it repudiates the very notion that bureaucrats make truly “public” choices; rather, they are held, axiomatically, to exhibit “rent-seeking” behavior, wherein they abuse their public positions in order to amass private gains, or at least to build personal empires within their ostensibly official niches. Such sub- rational models actually explain very little of what they purport to observe. Of course, there is some truth in them, regarding the “behavior” of some people, at some times, in some circumstances, under some conditions of incentive and motivation. But the factors that they posit operate mostly as constraints on the otherwise rational optimization of objectives that, if for no other reason than the playing out of official roles, transcends merely personal or parochial imperatives. My treatment of “role” differs from that of the bureaucratic-politics theorists, whose model of the derivation of foreign policy depends heavily, and acknowledgedly, on a narrow and specific identification of the role- playing of organizationally situated individuals in a partly conflictual “pulling and hauling” process that “results in” some policy outcome. Even here, bureaucratic-politics theorists Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow (1999, 311) allow that “some players are not able to articulate [sic] the governmental politics game because their conception of their job does not legitimate such activity.” This is a crucial admission, and one that points— empirically—to the need for a broader and generic treatment of role. Roles (all theorists state) give rise to “expectations” of performance. My point is that virtually every governmental role, and especiallynational-security roles, and particularly the roles of the uniformed military, embody expectations of devotion to the “national interest”; rational- ity in the derivation of policy at every functional level; and objectivity in the treatment of parameters, especially external parameters such as “threats” and the power and capabilities of other nations. Sub-rational models (such as “public choice”) fail to take into account even a partial dedication to the “national” interest (or even the possibility that the national interest may be honestly misconceived in more paro- chial terms). In contrast, an official’s role connects the individual to the (state-level) process, and moderates the (perhaps otherwise) self-seeking impulses of the individual. Role-derived behavior tends to be formalized and codified; relatively transparent and at least peer-reviewed, so as to be consistent with expectations; surviving the particular individual and trans- mitted to successors and ancillaries; measured against a standard and thus corrigible; defined in terms of the performed function and therefore derived from the state function; and uncorrrupt, because personal cheating and even egregious aggrandizement are conspicuously discouraged. My own direct observation suggests that **defense decision-makers** attempt to **“frame”** the structure of the **problems** that they try to solve **on the basis of the** most accurate intelligence. **They** make it their business to know **where** the **threats come from**. Thus, **threats** are not “socially constructed” (even though, of course, some values are). A major reason for the rationality, and the objectivity, of the process is that much security planning is done, not in vaguely undefined circum- stances that offer scope for idiosyncratic, subjective behavior, but rather in structured and reviewed organizational frameworks. Non-rationalities (which are bad for understanding and prediction) tend to get filtered out. People are fired for presenting skewed analysis and for making bad predictions. This is **because something important is riding on the** causal analysis and the contingent **prediction.** For these reasons, “public choice” does not have the “feel” of reality to many critics who have participated in the structure of defense decision-making. In that structure, obvious, and even not-so-obvious,“**rent-seeking” would** not only be shameful; it would **present a** severe risk of career termination**.** And, as mentioned, the defense bureaucracy is hardly a productive place for truly talented rent-seekers to operatecompared to opportunities for personal profit in the commercial world. A bureaucrat’s very self-placement in these reaches of government testi- fies either to a sincere commitment to the national interest or to a lack of sufficient imagination to exploit opportunities for personal profit.

# 1AR

#### Their politics are totalizing – war shouldn’t be blurred with violence of peacetime – war’s reciprocal organized violence must be viewed as distinct from an ongoing culture of violence

Barkawi 12 – Reader in the Department of International Relations, London School of Economics (Tarak, “Of Camps and Critiques: A Reply to ‘Security, War, Violence’,” Millennium - Journal of International Studies September 2012 vol. 41 no. 1 124-130)

A final totalising move in ‘Security, War, Violence’ is the idea that the study of war should be subsumed under the category of ‘violence’. The reasons offered for this are: violence does not entail a hierarchy in which war is privileged; a focus on violence encourages us to see war in relational terms and makes visible other kinds of violence besides that of war; and that the analysis of violence somehow enables the disentangling of politics from war and a proper critique of liberal violence.22 I have no particular objection to the study of violence, and I certainly think there should be more of it in the social sciences. However, why and how this obviates or subsumes the study of war is obscure to me. Is war not historically significant enough to justify inquiry into it? War is a more specific category relative to violence in general, referring to reciprocal organised violence between political entities. I make no claims that the study of war should be privileged over that of other forms of violence. Both the violence of war, and that of, say, patriarchy, demand scholarly attention, but they are also distinct if related topics requiring different forms of theorisation and inquiry. As for relationality, the category of war is already inherently relational; one does not need the concept of violence in general to see this. What precisely distinguishes war from many other kinds of violence, such as genocide or massacre, is that war is a relational form of violence in which the other side shoots back. This is ultimately the source of war’s generative social powers, for it is amidst the clash of arms that the truths which define social and political orders are brought into question. A broader focus on violence in general risks losing this central, distinctive character of the violence of war. Is it really more theoretically or politically adequate to start referring to the Second World War as an instance of ‘violence’? Equally, while I am all for the analysis of liberal violence, another broad category which would include issues of ‘structural violence’, I also think we have far from exhausted the subject of liberalism and war, an important area of inquiry now dominated by the mostly self-serving nostrums of the liberal peace debates.

#### Distinguishing types of violence is necessary to better understand its causes

Charles Tilly 03. Professor of Political Science at Columbia. The Politics of Collective Violence. Cambridge University Press. 4-5.

What about nonviolent violence? Questions of injustice, exploitation, and oppression unquestionably arise across a wide variety of collective violence. What is more, physical seizure or damage often occurs as a contingent outcome of conflicts that greatly resemble each other, many of which proceed without direct short-term damage. Nevertheless, **to spread the term “violence” across all interpersonal relations and solitary actions of which we disapprove actually undermines the effort to explain violence** (for a contrary view, see Weigert 1999). **It blocks us from asking about effective causal relationships between exploitation or injustice, on one side, and physical damage, on the other.** It also obscures the fact that specialists in inflicting physical damage (such as police, soldiers, guards, thugs, and gangs) play significant parts in collective violence. Their presence or absence often makes all the difference between violent and nonviolent outcomes. (edited)