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#### FTC fraud prevention is funded now---unexpected demands trade off

Bilirakis et al. 21 (Gus Michael Bilirakis is an American lawyer and politician serving as the U.S. Representative for Florida's 12th congressional district since 2013; Hon. Noah Joshua Phillips is a Commissioner at the Federal Trade Commission; Hon. Lina Khan is the Chair of the Federal Trade Commission, “Transforming the FTC: Legislation to Modernize Consumer Protection,” *Committee on Energy and Commerce*, 6/28/21, <https://energycommerce.house.gov/committee-activity/hearings/hearing-on-transforming-the-ftc-legislation-to-modernize-consumer>)

Gus Bilirakis (3:12:44): Thank you. Our committee has worked extensively in a bipartisan manner to protect consumers from fraud and scams. Mr. Carter's Combating Pandemic Scams Act was enacted at the beginning of the year thanks to all of our leadership here. Representive Blunt Rochester's Fraud and Scam Reduction Act, as well as Representative Kelly's Protecting Seniors from Emergency Scams Act both cleared our chamber with bipartisan support this year. My bill, HR 2672, the FTC Reports Act, would require the FTC to report on fraud against our seniors. Commissioner Philips, how important is the work the FTC staff does to protect Americans from scams? Noah Josuha Phillips (3:13:33): Congressman, thank you for your question. The work we do to protect American consumers against frauds and scams, is our bread and butter as an agency. There is no work that makes me feel better as a commissioner, when we watch our ability to find bad guys, or taking money from American consumers, dipping into their life savings, and get that money back to them. So the work that you have done on the committee to provide funding, to provide tools for us to go after scam artists, is critical. And I think that needs to continue with the agency. Gus Bilirakis (3:14:05): Thank you, and Chair Khan, again, as you pursue other initiatives, when staff and resources be shifted away from the fraud program, which is so essential in preventing bad actors from harming our constituents? That's the question, please. Lina Khan (3:14:22): Sorry, could you repeat the question - when should services be shifted... Gus Bilirakis (3:14:26): Yes, of course. As you pursue other initiatives, when staff and resources be shifted away from your fraud program, which is so essential in preventing bad actors from harming our constituents? Lina Khan (3:14:40): Well, of course, we're always limited by the appropriations bills when it comes to thinking through how we're delegating resources across the agency. In certain instances, I think there are exigent needs that can arise in certain aspects. Gus Bilirakis (3:14:54): But you don't anticipate moving money from the fraud program, is that correct? Lina Khan (3:15:00): Not especially, but I mean, I think overall, we are trying to look through the prism of managerial efficiency and trying to understand how we can best use our resources, especially given some of the exigent circumstances and so we'll be continuing to make those determinations. Gus Bilirakis (3:15:15): I suggest that you not because this is such a very important program. Commissioner Wilson, can you elaborate on why the FTC Reports Act would also prove beneficial to increasing much needed transparency and the flow of information within the commission?

#### Unplanned expanded enforcement drains finite resources from existing priorities

Dafny 21, Professor of Business Administration at the Harvard Business School and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, and former Deputy Director for Healthcare and Antitrust in the Bureau of Economics at the Federal Trade Commission. Professor Dafny’s research focuses on competition in health care markets, and the intersection of industry and public policy. (Leemore, “The Covid-19 Pandemic Should Not Delay Actions to Prevent Anticompetitive Consolidation in US Health Care Markets,” *Pro Market*, <https://promarket.org/2021/06/10/covid-pandemic-consolidation-pandemic-monopoly/>)

However, as Commissioner Rebecca Slaughter, the current acting FTC chair has noted, these efforts have “faced resistance, with two of these recent victories only coming after district court setbacks.” Blocking a horizontal merger, even when it appears to be an “open and shut” case to a layperson, requires extraordinary resources, including large investigation and litigation teams, as well as economic and other subject matter experts who must analyze the transaction, lay out the case for blocking the merger, and rebut arguments advanced by Defendants’ attorneys and experts. To pick a recent example, consider the proposed merger of two hospital systems in the Memphis area, which the FTC filed to block in November 2020. Based on the FTC’s complaint, the merger would have reduced the number of competing systems from four to three and created a system with over a 50 percent market share. In the face of litigation, the parties abandoned the deal—consistent with this being a straightforward case. Although the FTC prevailed without a trial, it took nearly a year from the merger announcement to the abandonment. Over that period, the FTC likely devoted thousands of staff hours to the investigation and lawsuit and expended substantial taxpayer resources on expert witnesses. The higher the payoff from the merger for the merging parties—and the payoff in the case of an increase in market power can be substantial—the greater the incentive for defendants to invest extraordinary resources to fight a merger challenge. Even if there is only a middling (and in some cases, small) chance of getting a merger through, it may well be in the parties’ interest to see if they can prevail, absorbing the agencies’ (i.e., DOJ and FTC’s) scarce resources in that attempt and preventing them from devoting those resources to investigate other transactions or anticompetitive practices. The substantial resources required to challenge transactions, paired with stagnating enforcement budgets, may explain why authorities have elected not to challenge some horizontal transactions they would likely have challenged in previous eras. Using data on a wide range of industries, antitrust scholar John Kwoka documents that enforcers rarely raise concerns about changes in market structure that used to draw scrutiny—that is, mergers that yield five or more market participants.

#### Fraud funds terror operations

Tierney 18, George & Mary Hylton Professor of International Relations; Director Global Research Institute (GRI) (Michael, “#TerroristFinancing: An Examination of Terrorism Financing via the Internet,” International Journal of Cyber Warfare and Terrorism, vol. 8, no. 1, 01/2018, pp. 1–11)

2. TERRORIST FINANCING AND THE INTERNET

As mentioned, terrorists’ use of the internet has become a major concern for security officials across the world in recent years. Like many other users, terrorists have found that the internet is an invaluable tool to share information quickly, in order to disseminate ideas and link up with likeminded individuals (Jacobson, 2010; Okolie-Osemene & Okoh, 2015). In this manner, terrorists use the internet for a variety of purposes, including recruitment, propaganda, and financing. As scholars have also noted, the internet is an attractive option for extremists due to the security and anonymity it provides (Jacobson, 2010). Yet while there have been a growing number of studies completed on the ways in which terrorist organizations use the internet to recruit and indoctrinate others, there has been relatively little focus on the methods by which terrorists finance themselves through online activities. Some researchers have attempted to fill gaps in this area by broadly studying internet aspects of terrorism financing. However, research on this particular aspect of terrorism financing still appears to be lacking, with little focus on new methods of terrorist financing via the internet or a marrying of strategies to combat online financing trends available to practitioners in the field.

For instance, Sean Paul Ashley (2012) assessed the mobile banking phenomenon, which is prevalent in regions such as the Middle East and Africa, and provides extremists with the ability to easily connect to the internet and remit funds around the world. The decentralization of this kind of banking, due to the fact that brick-and-mortar facilities are not needed to conduct transactions, has allowed terrorist financiersto more efficiently move funds while avoiding detection from authorities. Other researchers,such as MichaelJacobson (2010), have studied the waysin which terrorists engage in cyber-crime to raise and move funds. For example, Jacobson (2010) found that online credit card fraud was a fairly major source of terrorist financing. By stealing a victim’s private credit information, terrorists are able to co-opt needed funds and provide support to themselves or their counterparts. Yet as James Okolie-Osemene and Rosemary Ifeanyi Okoh (2015) note, the internet is mostly used to augment and assist activities which occur in the physical world. In this way, it would appear that the internet is far more useful as a means to move funds globally in support of terrorism, rather than simply as a method to raise funds.

#### Nuclear war---cash is key

Hayes 18, Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability, Ph.D. in Energy and Resources from the University of California-Berkeley, Professor of International Relations at RMIT University (Dr. Peter J., “Non-State Terrorism and Inadvertent Nuclear War”, NAPSNet Special Reports, 1/18/2018, <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-special-reports/non-state-terrorism-and-inadvertent-nuclear-war/>)

The critical issue is how a nuclear terrorist attack may “catalyze” inter-state nuclear war, especially the NC3 systems that inform and partly determine how leaders respond to nuclear threat. Current conditions in Northeast Asia suggest that multiple precursory conditions for nuclear terrorism already exist or exist in nascent form. In Japan, for example, low-level, individual, terroristic violence with nuclear materials, against nuclear facilities, is real. In all countries of the region, the risk of diversion of nuclear material is real, although the risk is likely higher due to volume and laxity of security in some countries of the region than in others. In all countries, the risk of an insider “sleeper” threat is real in security and nuclear agencies, and such insiders already operated in actual terrorist organizations. Insider corruption is also observable in nuclear fuel cycle agencies in all countries of the region. The threat of extortion to induce insider cooperation is also real in all countries. The possibility of a cult attempting to build and buy nuclear weapons is real and has already occurred in the region.[15] Cyber-terrorism against nuclear reactors is real and such attacks have already taken place in South Korea (although it remains difficult to attribute the source of the attacks with certainty). The stand-off ballistic and drone threat to nuclear weapons and fuel cycle facilities is real in the region, including from non-state actors, some of whom have already adopted and used such technology almost instantly from when it becomes accessible (for example, drones).[16]

Two other broad risk factors are also present in the region. The social and political conditions for extreme ethnic and xenophobic nationalism are emerging in China, Korea, Japan, and Russia. Although there has been no risk of attack on or loss of control over nuclear weapons since their removal from Japan in 1972 and from South Korea in 1991, this risk continues to exist in North Korea, China, and Russia, and to the extent that they are deployed on aircraft and ships of these and other nuclear weapons states (including submarines) deployed in the region’s high seas, also outside their territorial borders.

The most conducive circumstance for catalysis to occur due to a nuclear terrorist attack might involve the following nexi of timing and conditions:

1. Low-level, tactical, or random individual terrorist attacks for whatever reasons, even assassination of national leaders, up to and including dirty radiological bomb attacks, that overlap with inter-state crisis dynamics in ways that affect state decisions to threaten with or to use nuclear weapons. This might be undertaken by an opportunist nuclear terrorist entity in search of rapid and high political impact.
2. Attacks on major national or international events in each country to maximize terror and to de-legitimate national leaders and whole governments. In Japan, for example, more than ten heads of state and senior ministerial international meetings are held each year. For the strategic nuclear terrorist, patiently acquiring higher level nuclear threat capabilities for such attacks and then staging them to maximum effect could accrue strategic gains.
3. Attacks or threatened attacks, including deception and disguised attacks, will have maximum leverage when nuclear-armed states are near or on the brink of war or during a national crisis (such as Fukushima), when intelligence agencies, national leaders, facility operators, surveillance and policing agencies, and first responders are already maximally committed and over-extended.

At this point, we note an important caveat to the original concept of catalytic nuclear war as it might pertain to nuclear terrorist threats or attacks. Although an attack might be disguised so that it is attributed to a nuclear-armed state, or a ruse might be undertaken to threaten such attacks by deception, in reality a catalytic strike by a nuclear weapons state in conditions of mutual vulnerability to nuclear retaliation for such a strike from other nuclear armed states would be highly irrational.

Accordingly, the effect of nuclear terrorism involving a nuclear detonation or major radiological release may not of itself be *catalytic* of *nuclear* war—at least not intentionally–because it will not lead directly to the destruction of a targeted nuclear-armed state. Rather, it may be catalytic of non-nuclear war between states, especially if the non-state actor turns out to be aligned with or sponsored by a state (in many Japanese minds, the natural candidate for the perpetrator of such an attack is the pro-North Korean General Association of Korean Residents, often called Chosen Soren, which represents many of the otherwise stateless Koreans who were born and live in Japan) and a further sequence of coincident events is necessary to drive escalation to the point of nuclear first use by a state. Also, the catalyst—the non-state actor–is almost assured of discovery and destruction either during the attack itself (if it takes the form of a nuclear suicide attack then self-immolation is assured) or as a result of a search-and-destroy campaign from the targeted state (unless the targeted government is annihilated by the initial terrorist nuclear attack).

It follows that the effects of a non-state nuclear attack may be characterized better as a *trigger* effect, bringing about a *cascade* of nuclear use decisions within NC3 systems that shift each state increasingly away from nuclear non-use and increasingly towards nuclear use by releasing negative controls and enhancing positive controls in multiple action-reaction escalation spirals (depending on how many nuclear armed states are party to an inter-state conflict that is already underway at the time of the non-state nuclear attack); and/or by inducing concatenating nuclear attacks across geographically proximate nuclear weapons forces of states already caught in the crossfire of nuclear threat or attacks of their own making before a nuclear terrorist attack.[17]

### 1NC

#### “Businesses” in “Business practices” are for profit- Excludes the public sector

Monnin 20 (Paul Monnin- 2020 J.D. Graduate from the University of North Dakota School of Law. “NOTE: A NEW WAVE OF PRIVACY AND CONSUMER LAWS: SHOULD THE CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT BE IMPLEMENTED IN NORTH DAKOTA?”, 95 N.D. L. Rev. 345, 358. 2020. Lexis accessed online via KU libraries, date accessed 2/2/22)

Generally, the CCPA applies to businesses, rather than individuals. 106Under the CCPA, a business is defined as:

Any for-profit entity "that collects consumers' personal information, or on the behalf of which such information is collected and that alone, or jointly with others, determines the purposes and means of the processing of consumers' personal information, that does business in the State of California. 107

#### Violation---“common carriers” are both public and private.

Kenton 19 (Will, expert on the economy and investing laws and regulations. He previously held senior editorial roles at Investopedia and Kapitall Wire and holds a MA in Economics from The New School for Social Research and Doctor of Philosophy in English literature from NYU, “Common Carrier,” <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/common-carrier.asp#:~:text=A%20common%20carrier%20is%20defined,to%20another%20for%20a%20fee.&text=A%20common%20carrier%2C%20such%20as,clients%20on%20a%20contractual%20basis>, DOA: 2-5-2022) //Snowball

What Is a Common Carrier?

A common carrier is defined by U.S. law as a private or public entity that transports goods or people from one place to another for a fee. The term is also used to describe telecommunications services and public utilities.

The word "common" is an important distinction here. A common carrier, such as a bus service, offers its services to the general public, unlike a private carrier that might be available to only specific clients on a contractual basis.

A utility may be considered a common carrier under the law because it makes no distinction in its customers. It is available to anyone in its coverage area who is willing to pay the fee.

#### Limits---justifies affs about public utilities like electricity, water, gas, and telecom kills fairness

### 1NC

#### Text: The United States federal government should

#### develop a data strategy that promotes innovation;

#### increase investment in artificial intelligence and 5g;

#### and, promote artificial intelligence workforce development.

#### Spread broadband to rural communities

#### The CP solves AI – if we kick it, there’s three alt causes that outweigh the aff.

West and Allen ’18 [Darrell; is vice president and director of Governance Studies and holds the Douglas Dillon Chair; John; is a member of the Board of Advisors of Amida Technology and on the Board of Directors of Spark Cognition; April 24th; “How Artificial Intelligence is Transforming the World”; <https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-artificial-intelligence-is-transforming-the-world/>; accessed 11/8/18//MSCOTT//MM]

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to balance innovation with basic human values, we propose a number of recommendations for moving forward with AI. This includes improving data access, increasing government investment in AI, promoting AI workforce development, creating a federal advisory committee, engaging with state and local officials to ensure they enact effective policies, regulating broad objectives as opposed to specific algorithms, taking bias seriously as an AI issue, maintaining mechanisms for human control and oversight, and penalizing malicious behavior and promoting cybersecurity.

Improving data access

The United States should develop a data strategy that promotes innovation and consumer protection. Right now, there are no uniform standards in terms of data access, data sharing, or data protection. Almost all the data are proprietary in nature and not shared very broadly with the research community, and this limits innovation and system design. AI requires data to test and improve its learning capacity.[50] Without structured and unstructured data sets, it will be nearly impossible to gain the full benefits of artificial intelligence.

In general, the research community needs better access to government and business data, although with appropriate safeguards to make sure researchers do not misuse data in the way Cambridge Analytica did with Facebook information. There is a variety of ways researchers could gain data access. One is through voluntary agreements with companies holding proprietary data. Facebook, for example, recently announced a partnership with Stanford economist Raj Chetty to use its social media data to explore inequality.[51] As part of the arrangement, researchers were required to undergo background checks and could only access data from secured sites in order to protect user privacy and security.

Google long has made available search results in aggregated form for researchers and the general public. Through its “Trends” site, scholars can analyze topics such as interest in Trump, views about democracy, and perspectives on the overall economy.[52] That helps people track movements in public interest and identify topics that galvanize the general public.

Twitter makes much of its tweets available to researchers through application programming interfaces, commonly referred to as APIs. These tools help people outside the company build application software and make use of data from its social media platform. They can study patterns of social media communications and see how people are commenting on or reacting to current events.

In some sectors where there is a discernible public benefit, governments can facilitate collaboration by building infrastructure that shares data. For example, the National Cancer Institute has pioneered a data-sharing protocol where certified researchers can query health data it has using de-identified information drawn from clinical data, claims information, and drug therapies. That enables researchers to evaluate efficacy and effectiveness, and make recommendations regarding the best medical approaches, without compromising the privacy of individual patients.

There could be public-private data partnerships that combine government and business data sets to improve system performance. For example, cities could integrate information from ride-sharing services with its own material on social service locations, bus lines, mass transit, and highway congestion to improve transportation. That would help metropolitan areas deal with traffic tie-ups and assist in highway and mass transit planning.

Some combination of these approaches would improve data access for researchers, the government, and the business community, without impinging on personal privacy. As noted by Ian Buck, the vice president of NVIDIA, “Data is the fuel that drives the AI engine. The federal government has access to vast sources of information. Opening access to that data will help us get insights that will transform the U.S. economy.”[53] Through its Data.gov portal, the federal government already has put over 230,000 data sets into the public domain, and this has propelled innovation and aided improvements in AI and data analytic technologies.[54] The private sector also needs to facilitate research data access so that society can achieve the full benefits of artificial intelligence.

Increase government investment in AI

According to Greg Brockman, the co-founder of OpenAI, the U.S. federal government invests only $1.1 billion in non-classified AI technology.[55] That is far lower than the amount being spent by China or other leading nations in this area of research. That shortfall is noteworthy because the economic payoffs of AI are substantial. In order to boost economic development and social innovation, federal officials need to increase investment in artificial intelligence and data analytics. Higher investment is likely to pay for itself many times over in economic and social benefits.[56]

### 1NC

#### Next off is T private sector

#### Private sector means all non-governmental persons or entities,

Senate Report 95 (Senate Report. 104-1, “UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995,” <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-report/104th-congress/senate-report/1> , date accessed 9/10/21)

"Private sector" is defined to cover all persons or entities in the United States except for State, local or tribal governments. It includes individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, and educational and nonprofit institutions.

#### Violation: the aff applies exclusively to conduct in a specific segment of the private sector.

#### Vote neg:

#### FIRST---limits and ground---the number of potential subsets is infinite---any industry, product, single companies, individuals---undermines clash. Only big affs have link uniqueness.

#### SECOND----precision---our interp has intent to define, exclude and is in legislative context.

### 1NC-

#### Text: The 50 United States and relevant subnational entities should enact and enforce substantial legislation prohibiting anticompetitive practices by common carriers.

#### State antitrust is enforceable and solvent.

Lange et al. 21, \*Perry A., JD, antitrust lawyer, vice-chair of the ABA Antitrust Section’s Joint Conduct Committee. \*Brian K. Mahanna, JD, former chief of staff and deputy attorney general in the Office of the New York State Attorney General, \*Nicole Callan, JD, vice chair of the Civil Practice and Procedure Committee of the American Bar Association (ABA)'s Section of Antitrust Law, \*Álvaro Mateo Alonso, LLM, Law Degree, antitrust lawyer. (3-5-2021, "Developments in Antitrust Law: Keep an Eye on New York", *WilmerHale*, Full report accessible at: https://www.wilmerhale.com/en/insights/client-alerts/20210305-developments-in-antitrust-law-keep-an-eye-on-new-york)

Although much attention recently has been focused upon debates in Congress, potential legislative changes to U.S. antitrust law are not limited to proposals at the federal level. Many states are considering changes to their own antitrust laws, which usually can be enforced by state attorneys general and private plaintiffs. Importantly, New York legislators have introduced two bills that propose sweeping changes to the State’s antitrust law, the Donnelly Act, building on measures introduced in New York’s last legislative session.

These proposals, if enacted, would make New York’s single firm conduct statutory provisions the most aggressive in the United States and would give the New York Attorney General a more prominent role in reviewing transactions—including by creating a first-of-its-kind state merger notification requirement. These changes would allow New York’s antitrust law to reach a range of conduct not actionable under any existing federal or state antitrust law, and would introduce European-style antitrust standards to New York. Accordingly, this reform would create considerable new compliance challenges and risk for companies potentially subject to New York antitrust law, whether or not those companies are located in New York.

Other U.S. states and territories are considering antitrust law changes, but the New York proposals are the most significant. Although much of the conversation concerning developments in antitrust law has focused on “Big Tech” companies, these proposals would affect businesses across all sectors of the economy. This alert discusses these legislative proposals and key implications for businesses.

### 1NC

#### Anti-trust reform is based in free market logics of upholding competition which saves capitalism.

Parakkal & Bartz-Marvez 13, Raju Parakkal: Assistant Professor of International Relations, Philadelphia University. Sherry Bartz-Marvez: Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Miami (Capitalism, democratic capitalism, and the pursuit of antitrust laws, *The Antitrust Bulletin*, Vol. 58, No. 4, Winter 2013, DOI: 10.1177/0003603X1305800409)

Antitrust laws have historically been associated with countries that possess a free-market capitalist economy, which is understood as an economic system in which competition and the market forces of demand and supply determine economic outcomes. This historical association between capitalism and antitrust laws is evident from the fact that the countries that first adopted national antitrust laws, such as Canada, the United States, and the countries of Western Europe, are countries that have long embraced a market economy. On the contrary, the statist economies of the erstwhile Soviet bloc and many developing countries, for the most part, did not institute antitrust laws of the type associated with free market economies.

Notwithstanding these country examples, which indicate a positive association between a capitalist economic system and antitrust laws, there exist arguments that both support and oppose antitrust laws for a capitalist economy. Arguments in support of antitrust laws for a capitalist economy begin with the fundamental understanding that the most important ingredient of a capitalist system is market competition. The presence of a competitive market is vital to achieving the efficiency levels that a capitalist economy seeks. Therefore, competitive forces need to be protected to discipline the market players, especially the dominant ones. By preventing and punishing anticompetitive practices by market players, an antitrust law protects and promotes market competition. 1

In the United States, which is commonly understood to be the leading bastion of free-market capitalism and one of the first countries to enact an antitrust law, the role of antitrust legislation in preserving the capitalist character of its economic system is underscored by the near-constitutional status accorded to its antitrust statues by the U.S. Supreme Court. 2 The Court described these statutes as “the Magna Carta of free enterprise” and “as important to the preservation of economic freedom and our free enterprise system as the Bill of Rights is to the protection of our fundamental personal freedoms.”3 Such a sentiment is appropriate, given that the American antitrust law, the Sherman Act, was passed in 1890 to protect economic competition from rapidly-growing “trusts.”4

While the social and political zeitgeist has changed considerably since the passing of the Sherman Act, the fact remains that antitrust is perceived as key to “protecting consumers against anticompetitive conduct that raises prices, reduces output, and hinders innovation and economic growth.”5 Moreover, it is understood that “competition is a public good, and society cannot expect the victims of anticompetitive conduct to protect themselves.”6 The implication therefore is that government power, through the enforcement of antitrust statutes, is critical to reining in corporate power in order to protect economic competition and capitalism.

#### Capitalist 5G innovation causes exploitation, mass layoffs, unsustainable accumulation,.

Ray 20, Member of the Leicester Socialist Party and Writer at the Socialist Alternative (Fred, August 4th, “5G: SOCIALIST CHANGE NEEDED TO ENSURE ACCESS AND BENEFIT FOR ALL,” *The Socialist Alternative*, <https://www.socialistalternative.net/2020/08/04/5g-socialist-change-needed-to-ensure-access-and-benefit-for-all/>, Accessed 08-26-2021)

These high band towers offer incredible performance, but at a cost – they have a range of only around 1000 feet. For comparison current 4G towers and low band 5G towers have a range of 10 miles, more than 50 times further than high frequency 5G. This means that high frequency 5G deployments require a huge number of base stations anywhere that needs coverage. As you can imagine the plans are currently to deploy these only to metropolitan areas – where there would be enough customers for the telecom companies to make a profit from the installation. The cost of high frequency deployment guarantees that 5G will be deployed unevenly – with blazingly fast connections for areas that can afford it, and little improvement for those outside these areas.

The short range of a top end 5G tower also presents a number of important logistical challenges. For a city to be properly wired up with full 5G coverage a base station must be placed around every 500 feet. The question of where these towers should be installed is taking place behind closed doors. Masts are already being installed across the country and we have seen a number of incidents where local residents have objected to the imposition of a base station on their streets – but have been left with no recourse. It’s clear that profits and the abstract idea of ‘progress’ are being put ahead of the real needs of our people.

This has also been undertaken with little regard to preserving historically and culturally important sites. The Church of England has reached an agreement with a number of telecom providers to install 5G base stations in places of worship. This is not a new phenomenon. There are already 16,000 churches in the UK that are formally serving as network nodes. Vodaphone’s head of networks Kye Prigg let the mask slip when, referring to previous rollouts, he stated that “it looked like they were trying to help the community but really it has been about monetising the steeple.”

The government is keen that our concerns do not stop them from becoming a telecoms world leader. They have proposed removing the already very limited power of local councils to reject the installation of 5G infrastructure in their areas. They have even proposed doing away with planning permission entirely – instead, giving private telecom companies a blanket “permitted development right.” This would enable telecom giants to install towers of at least 20m in height without any approval from local authorities. In Birmingham a tower of this height has already been proposed and is being opposed by local councillors. Labour’s Councillor Rob Pocock stated that “in effect, the government intends that masts of the kind being proposed at Sutton Oak Road would be installed by the telecoms companies without residents or indeed councils having any say in it whatsoever. These proposals are potentially robbing people of their right to a democratic vote!”

These concerns are often dismissed by the liberal establishment as pure NIMBYism. One article published at ISPReview.com laments the “tedious process of planning permission” when referring to plans to increase the height of a Manchester tower by 7.5m and to deploy new 5G infrastructure on top of it. The writer callously dismisses local opposition, stating: “Suffice to say that adding a bit of height isn’t likely to make too much of a difference to the local area, which is already fairly mixed in appearance.”

There is little doubt that 5G networks will outperform the current generation. But what will this enable? As Marxists we understand that all large-scale technology is implemented to serve the interests of the current ruling class. Trotsky put this well when he stated that: “Technique and science develop not in a vacuum but in human society, which consists of classes. The ruling class, the possessing class, controls technique and through it controls nature. Technique in itself cannot be called either militaristic or pacifistic. In a society in which the ruling class is militaristic, technique is in the service of militarism.”

In capitalist society the driving force of the ruling class is private profit, and the installation of these new networks definitely enable further exploitation and accelerated accumulation of capital. At the most basic level it will allow industry to automate and monitor far more than the current network allows. With industry in private hands this means job losses for the masses and profits for the bosses. If industry was publicly owned under the democratic control of workers then this automation could benefit the whole of society.

5G towers will allow around one million ‘smart’ devices to communicate per square mile. This will enable an explosion in the Internet of Things (IOT) – networked devices across the country that communicate with each other to collect data. At its best, IOT can be used to develop and deliver incredibly optimised processes. There is an orthodoxy in the ruling class that IOT is going to be the next big thing, that it will produce a huge surplus of value any day now. At present this value is largely speculative in nature, huge troves of data are being collected with the promise that one day somebody will find something to do with it. 5G is likely to be the key that unlocks this data. It will enable lightweight smart devices to send their sensor feeds back to data centres for crunching in real time. Demos are already in place showing factories with robots and cameras being controlled remotely from the cloud.

It is clear that AI and the Internet of Things cannot be left in the hands of the bosses. Companies like Amazon are using their innovations as chains to bind the working class. We are monitored constantly at work and algorithms help them decide who to work harder, who to sack and who is at risk of doing something dangerous like unionising. Internal documents from Amazon have proven that they have created an interactive heat map of their 510 Whole Foods locations across the US – and assigned each store a unionization risk score. Their calculations used factors like “employee loyalty, turnover rate and racial diversity.”

The promise of increased speed for urban centres is also appealing to the ruling class – it will enable a new generation of toys for the super-rich – with self-driving cars, seamless virtual reality and an endless stream of ‘smart’ devices providing a colourful set of distractions while our planet collapses under the weight of their greed.

But beyond the immediate uses of 5G technology itself, the project of deploying it is incredibly valuable for a number of reasons. There is a huge opportunity in the rollout of 5G – it is being called the critical infrastructure of our generation. Private companies stand to make huge profits from the installation and ultimately the ownership of this structure. Huge contracts for the development and installation of 5G infrastructure are providing new market opportunities for the private sector. We are also seeing this become a key part of the trade war between China and the US. Over a sustained period the world is increasingly fractured into competing blocs, with smaller countries forced to choose which superpower they will trust with their telecoms. Cisco or Huawei, Trump or Xi Jinping.

The question of whether or not there is a backdoor in Huawei kit is inane. Of course there is, just like there is a backdoor in Cisco kit, and a backdoor in all the legacy kit. The real argument isn’t whether there’s a risk of Chinese kit being used for spying – it’s a flat choice as to whether we want the American or Chinese state to have access to our data. This is not conjecture. There is a long history of Cisco made network infrastructure being used by American institutions like the National Security Agency (NSA) for spying. In 2013, the German newspaper Der Spiegel revealed that the NSA was able to use backdoors in Cisco kit. Cisco denied that they were collaborating with the state but leaks like this kept happening. In 2014 another so called “undocumented test interface” was found in Cisco small business hardware. And in 2018 it was revealed that 8.5 million Cisco routers had a hidden hardcoded account for remote access.

Of course, none of this is to say that we should reject or oppose technological development, but simply that under capitalist rule its development will continue to deepen inequality and serve as a means for collecting and monetising data on working class people. A democratic planned economy, by contrast, could use the resources that have been piled into 5G to meet the real needs of humankind. For starters, 1.9 million households in Britain have no access to the internet – and at least 10 million more have only ‘pay as you go’ sim cards allowing them a trickle of access to our networks. As digital services increasingly become the default, families are left to choose between an internet connection and food. This inequality is most often described as “the digital divide.”

Those who punt 5G would quickly butt in at this point to explain that 5G will go a long way to addressing the digital divide. Tech companies have spent a great deal of effort convincing us that this is the case. The best example of this is Cisco’s 5G Rural First campaign. They managed a deployment of 5G base stations to rural communities – providing connectivity to those who previously had to go without and proving that the Internet of Things could be useful in tracking salmon for fishing.

Crucially though, the organisers admitted that almost everything they did would have been possible on older 4G technology. The issue is not that we don’t have good enough technology to bring the internet to deprived communities – the issue is that our ruling class doesn’t care to. It’s not profitable to run fibre-optic to sparsely populated countryside and there’s not usually money in providing free unrestricted access to what ought to be infrastructure. The issue is one of resources and where they go. A planned economy could easily prioritise full coverage over blazing fast speeds – but a market economy in the hands of the capitalists simply does not.

Every human should have access to the internet. Crucially this access must be unrestricted. Companies like Facebook are deploying what they call “free” network access across the developing world – but to borrow a term from the open source community – this access is “free as in beer, not free as in freedom.” Users find themselves locked in to Facebook and its subsidiaries and partners – unable to access unrestricted information. While this does cost Facebook money in the short term, much like Coca Cola did in the last century, they are laying the groundwork for a future monopoly – and not acting through altruism.

#### All capitalism is racial capitalism---Exploitation and extraction have to outweigh
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\*\*Footnote 14 is inserted below the paragraph it’s cited in, other footnotes excluded for readability.

Burden-Stelly 20, Visiting Scholar in the Race and Capitalism Project at the University of Chicago. She is currently an Assistant Professor of Africana Studies and Political Science at Carleton College (Charisse, July 1st, Modern U.S. Racial Capitalism, *The Monthly Review*, Volume 72, Number 3, Available at: https://monthlyreview.org/2020/07/01/modern-u-s-racial-capitalism/)

Drawing on the intellectual production of twentieth-century Black anticapitalists, I theorize modern U.S. racial capitalism as a racially hierarchical political economy constituting war and militarism, imperialist accumulation, expropriation by domination, and labor superexploitation.14 The racial here specifically refers to Blackness, defined as African descendants’ relationship to the capitalist mode of production—their structural location—and the condition, status, and material realities emanating therefrom.15 It is out of this structural location that the irresolvable contradiction of value minus worth arises. Stated differently, Blackness is a capacious category of surplus value extraction essential to an array of political-economic functions, including accumulation, disaccumulation, debt, planned obsolescence, and absorption of the burdens of economic crises.16 At the same time, Blackness is the quintessential condition of disposability, expendability, and devalorization.

[Footnote 14]: Another feature of modern U.S. racial capitalism is property by dispossession. In Theft Is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory, Robert Nichols draws on the experience of Indigenous peoples in the United States, Canada, and New Zealand to theorize how the “system of landed property” was fundamentally predicated on violent dispossession. While the Anglo-derived legal-political regimes differed in these localities, the “intertwined and co-constitutive” material effects converged in the legalized theft of indigenous territory amounting in “approximately 6 percent of the total land on the surface of Earth.” Such dispossession, Nichols notes, is recursive: “In a standard formulation one would assume that ‘property’ is logically, chronologically, and normatively prior to ‘theft.’ However, in this (colonial) context, theft is the mechanism and means by which property is generated: hence its recursivity. Recursive dispossession is effectively a form of property-generating theft.” As such, theft and dispossession, through property regimes, are an ongoing feature of the Indigenous reality of modern U.S. racial capitalism. Robert Nichols, Theft Is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020), 50–51.

My operationalization of capitalism follows Oliver Cromwell Cox’s explication in Capitalism and American Leadership.17 Modern U.S. racial capitalism arose in the context of the First World War, when, as Cox explains, the United States took advantage of the conflict to capture the markets of South America, Asia, and Africa for its “over-expanded capacity.”18 Cox further expounds upon this auspicious moment of ascendant modern U.S. racial capitalism thus: By 1914, the United States had brought its superb natural resources within reach of intensive exploitation. Under the stimulus of its foreign-trade outlets, the financial assistance of the older capitalist nations, and a flexible system of protective tariffs, the nation developed a magnificent work of transportation and communication so that its mines, factories, and farms became integrated into an effectively producing organism having easy access to its seaports.… [Likewise,] further internal expansion depended upon far greater emphasis on an ever widening foreign commerce.… Major entrepreneurs of the United States proceeded to step up their campaign for expansion abroad. The war accentuated this movement. It accelerated the growth of [modern] American [racial] capitalism and impressed upon its leaders as nothing had before the need for external markets.19 Relatedly, Peter James Hudson argues that the First World War fundamentally changed the terms of order of international finance, allowing New York to compete with London, Paris, and Berlin for the first time in the realm of global banking. This was not least because the Great War “drastically reordered global credit flows,” with the United States transforming from a debtor into a creditor nation.20 In addition to Latin American and Caribbean nations and businesses turning to the United States for financing and credit, domestic saving and investment patterns were altered to the benefit of imperial financial institutions like the City Bank.21 Although the United States is, to use Cox’s terminology, more a “lusty child of an already highly developed capitalism” than an exceptional capitalist power, the nation perfected its techniques of accumulation through its vast natural wealth, large domestic market, imbalance of Northern and Southern economies, and, importantly, through its lack of concern for the political and economic welfare of the overwhelming masses of its population, least of all the descendants of the enslaved.22 Modern U.S. racial capitalism is thus sustained by military expenditure, the maintenance of an extremely low standard of living in “dependent” countries, and the domestic superexploitation of Black toilers and laborers. Cox notes that Black labor has been the “chief human factor” in wealth production; as such, “the dominant economic class has always been at the motivating center of the spreads of racial antagonism. This is to be expected since the economic content of the antagonism, especially at its proliferating source in the South, has been precisely that of labor-capital relations.”23 In a general sense, racial capitalism in the United States constitutes “a peculiar variant of capitalist production” in which Blackness expresses a structural location at the bottom of the labor hierarchy characterized by depressed wages, working conditions, job opportunities, and widespread exclusion from labor unions.24 Furthermore, modern U.S. racial capitalism is rooted in the imbrication of anti-Blackness and antiradicalism. Anti-Blackness describes the reduction of Blackness to a category of abjection and subjection through narrations of absolute biological or cultural difference; ruling-class monopolization of political power; negative and derogatory mass media propaganda; the ascent of discriminatory legislation that maintains and reinscribes inequality, not least various modes of segregation; and social relations in which distrust and antipathy toward those racialized as Black is normalized and in which “interracial mass behavior involving violence assumes a continuously potential danger.”25 Anti-Blackness thus conceals the inherent contradiction of Blackness—value minus worth—obscuring and distorting its structural location by, as Ralph and Singhal remark, contorting it into only a “debilitated condition.”26 Antiradicalism can be understood as the physical and discursive repression and condemnation of anticapitalist and/or left-leaning ideas, politics, practices, and modes of organizing that are construed as subversive, seditious, and otherwise threatening to capitalist society. These include, but are not limited to, internationalism, anti-imperialism, anticolonialism, peace activism, and antisexism. Anti-Blackness and antiradicalism function as the legitimating architecture of modern U.S. racial capitalism, which includes rationalizing discourses, cultural narratives, technologies of repression, legal structures, and social practices that inform and are informed by racial capitalism’s political economy.27 Throughout the twentieth century, anti-Blackness propelled the “Black Scare,” defined as the specter of racial, social, and economic domination of superior whites by inferior Black populations. Antiradicalism, in turn, was enunciated through the “Red Scare,” understood as the threat of communist takeover, infiltration, and disruption of the American way of life.28 For example, in the 1919 Justice Department Report, Radicalism and Sedition Among the Negroes, As Reflected in Their Publications, it was asserted that the radical antigovernment stance of a certain class of Negroes was manifested in their “ill-governed reaction toward race rioting,” “threat of retaliatory measures in connection with lynching,” open demand for social equality, identification with the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), and “outspoken advocacy of the Bolshevik or Soviet doctrine.”29 Here, anti-Blackness, articulated through the fear of the “assertion of race consciousness,” was attached to the IWW and Bolshevism—in other words, to anticapitalism—to make it appear even more subversive and dangerous. Likewise, antiradicalism, expressed through the denigration of the IWW and Soviet Doctrine, was made to seem all the more threatening and antithetical to the social order in its linkage with Black insistence on equality and self-defense against racial terrorism. In this way, “defiance and insolently race-centered condemnation of the white race” and “the Negro seeing red” came to be understood as seditious in the context of modern U.S. racial capitalism. The link between my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism and Robinson’s catholic theory of racial capitalism, beyond his “suggest[ion] that it was there,” is vivified through the prison abolitionist and scholar Ruth Wilson Gilmore, who writes: “Capitalism…[is] never not racial.… Racial capitalism: a mode of production developed in agriculture, improved by enclosure in the Old World, and captive land and labor in the Americas, perfected in slavery’s time-motion, field factory choreography, its imperative forged on the anvils of imperial war-making monarchs.”30 Racial capitalism, she continues, “requires all kinds of scheming, including hard work by elites and their compradors in the overlapping and interlocking space-economies of the planet’s surface. They build and dismantle and reconfigure states, moving capacity into and out of the public realm. And they think very hard about money on the move.”31 Perhaps more than Gilmore, though, my approach aligns with that of Neville Alexander as described by Hudson.32 Like Alexander, who focused on South Africa, I offer a particularistic understanding of racial capitalism, mine being rooted in the political economy of Blackness and the legitimating architectures of anti-Blackness and antiradicalism in the United States. Gilmore qua Robinson offers a more universalist and transhistorical conception. Like Alexander, my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism is primarily rooted in (Black) Marxist-Leninists and fellow travelers. This is an important epistemological distinction: whereas Robinson finds Marxism-Leninism to be, at best, inattentive to race, my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism is rooted in the work of Black freedom fighters who, as Marxist-Leninists, were able to offer potent and enduring analyses and critiques of the conjunctural entanglements of racialism, white supremacy, and anti-Blackness, on the one hand, and capitalist exploitation and class antagonism on the other hand.33 Although Robinson draws on scholars like Fernand Braudel, Henri Pirenne, David Brion Davis, and Eli Heckscher to understand European history, socialist theory, and the European working class, the work of Black Marxists like James Ford, Walter Rodney, Amílcar Cabral, and Paul Robeson offer me those same intellectual, historical, and theoretical resources. Finally, I agree with Alexander that the resolution to racial capitalism is antiracist socialism, not a cultural-metaphysical Black radical tradition. In what remains of this essay, I will draw on the work of Black Marxist-Leninists and anticapitalists to explicate the defining features of modern U.S. racial capitalism—war and militarism, imperialist accumulation, expropriation by domination, labor superexploitation, and property by dispossession. In this, I demonstrate that their critiques and analyses offer a blueprint for theorizing modern U.S. racial capitalism. War and militarism facilitate the endless drive for profit. Military conflicts between imperial powers result in the reapportioning of boundaries, possessions, and spheres of influence that often exacerbate racial and spatial economic subjection. War and militarism also perpetuate the endless construction of “threats,” primarily in racialized and socialist states, against which to defend progress, prosperity, freedom, and security. The manufacturing of conflict legitimates the mobilization of extraordinary violence to expropriate untold resources that produce relations of underdevelopment, dependency, extraversion, and disarticulation in the Global South. Moreover, the ruling elite and labor aristocracy in imperialist countries, not least the United States, wage perpetual war to defend their way of life and standard of living against the racialized majority who, because they would benefit most from the redistribution of the world’s wealth and resources, represent a perpetual threat. Here, Du Bois’s 1915 essay, “The African Roots of War,” is instructive.34 Though he does not directly analyze the United States, he nonetheless demonstrates how racism, white supremacy, and the plunder of Africa underpinned the capitalist imperialist war that engulfed the world from July 1914 to November 1918—a war that catapulted the United States into the center of the capitalist world system. Using Du Bois’s own words, Hubert Harrison, the father of Harlem radicalism, makes the direct link: But since every industrial nation is seeking the same outlet for its products, clashes are inevitable and in these clashes beaks and claws—armies and navies—must come into play. Hence beaks and claws must be provided beforehand against the day of conflict, and hence the exploitation of white men in Europe and America becomes the reason for the exploitation of black and brown and yellow men in African and Asia. And, therefore, it is hypocritical and absurd to pretend that the capitalist nations can ever intend to abolish wars.… For white folk to insist upon the right to manage their own ancestral lands, free from the domination of tyrants, domestic and foreign, is variously described as “democracy” and “self-determination.” For Negroes, Egyptians and Hindus to seek the same thing is impudence.… Truly has it been said that “the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the ‘Color Line.'” And wars are not likely to end; in fact, they are likely to be wider and more terrible—so long as this theory of white domination seeks to hold down the majority of the world’s people under the iron heel of racial oppression.35 For Du Bois, the imperialist rivalry for the booty on offer in Africa drove Berlin’s efforts to consolidate its place in the sun by displacing London in particular. While Vladimir Lenin understood that “the war [was] a product of half a century of development of world capitalism and of billions of threads and connections,” Du Bois expanded this analysis by providing a critique of the racial foundations of capitalist expansion.36 He held that the struggle to the death during the Great War for African resources and labor had begun to “pay dividends” centuries earlier through the enslavement of African peoples, the subsequent conflation of color and inferiority, and the reduction of what was routinely referred to as the “Dark Continent” to a space of backwardness ideally suited for dispossession. He further noted that “with the waning possibility of Big Fortune…at home, arose more magnificently the dream of exploitation abroad,” especially in Africa—a dream shared by white labor and the ruling class.37 In other words, this “democratic despotism” allowed for the white working class to “share the spoil of exploiting ‘chinks and niggers,'” and facilitated the creation of “a new democratic nation composed of united capital and labor” that perpetuated racial capitalism across class lines.38 Moreover, this national unity was strengthened through the disrespect and dehumanization of the racialized toilers and peasants in the plundered colonies that mitigated the exploitation and impoverishment of the white working class in imperial countries. This superexploitation allowed white workers to get a share, however pitiful, of “wealth, power, and luxury…on a scale the world never saw before” and to benefit from the “new wealth” accumulated from the “darker nations of the world” through cross-class consent “for governance by white folk and economic subjection to them”—a consensus solidified through the doctrine of “the natural inferiority of most men to the few.”39 Given the entanglement of racialization and capitalist exploitation, Du Bois averred, “Racial slander must go. Racial prejudice will follow…the domination of one people by another without the other’s consent, be the subject people black or white, must stop. The doctrine of forcible economic expansion over subject people must go.” Insofar as this admonishment applied as much to the United States as to European imperialists, beyond the international proletariat, it was the darker peoples and nations of the world who would challenge racial capitalism, not least “the twenty-five million grandchildren of the European slave trade…and first of all the ten million black folk in the United States.”40

Imperialist accumulation denotes the rapacious conscription of resources and labor for the purpose of superprofits through violent means that are generally reserved for populations deemed racially inferior. On the precipice of the Great Depression, the prominent Black communist James Ford beautifully explicated imperialist accumulation. In his 1929 report on the Second World Congress of the League Against Imperialism, he explained that the extant political economy constituted the consolidation of Africa’s partition and the “complete enslavement of its people”; the arresting of its industrialization, which hindered the development of the “toiling masses”; and the relegation of the continent to a source of raw material, a market for European goods, and a dumping ground for accumulated surplus capital. In the U.S. South, the Black poor were dehumanized by Wall Street, “white big business,” and the “rising Negro bourgeoisie” whose condition of possibility was the subjection of the Black working class. This oppression was exacerbated by rigid racial barriers, disenfranchisement, and lynching. Ford further argued that the West Indies, subjected to U.S. militarism and occupation on behalf of Wall Street, were largely transformed into a marketplace for U.S. goods. Moreover, throughout Africa, the U.S. South, and the Caribbean, Black workers were impressed into forced labor, laying railroads, building roads and bridges, and working in mines; were entrapped on plantations through peonage; and were subjected to convict leasing. In addition, they suffered intolerable working conditions and routinized violence.41

Expropriation by domination designates the seizure and confiscation of land, assets, property, bodies, and other sources of material wealth set to work by relations of economic dependence. This relationship exists both between nations and between groups. A quintessential enunciation of expropriation by domination between groups is We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People, edited by the Black Communist William Patterson (with significant help from his wife and comrade Louise Thompson Patterson) and submitted to the United Nations by the Civil Rights Congress in 1951.42 The petition meticulously documented the past and present expropriation of Black people by the ruling class of modern U.S. racial capitalism through consistent and persistent discrimination in employment, unfair wages, forced ghettoization, inequitable and inferior accommodation and services, and the denial of justice in the courts. It further argued that this process was sustained by genocidal terror, white supremacist law, and the drive of monopoly capitalists for superprofits. Importantly, We Charge Genocide noted that, for primarily economic reasons, the historical and geographical locus of anti-Black genocide was the “Black Belt” of the Southern United States, a region expropriated by the Northern industrial capitalists and by Southern landowners alike. This was due in large part to plantation systems of sharecropping and peonage—legacies of slavery—in which Black political and economic rights were virtually nonexistent, Black laborers were inexorably tied to the land through debt, and the threat of violence and death precluded demands for justice. For Patterson, such expropriation by domination was the basis of “racist contamination that has spread throughout the United States.”43 We Charge Genocide further conveyed that expropriation by domination, a central element of modern U.S. racial capitalism, was more than a domestic concern because such practices “at home must inevitably create racist commodities for export abroad—must inevitably tend toward war.”44

Labor superexploitation can be understood as an economic relationship in which the intensity, form, and racial basis of exploitation differs little from slavery. Its effects are so extreme that it pushes racialized, particularly Black, labor effectively below the level of sheer physical subsistence. As Harrison explained, in the context of modern U.S. racial capitalism, Black workers “form a group that is more essentially proletarian than any other American group” because enslaved Africans were brought to the “new world” to be ruthlessly exploited. This reality fixed their social status as the most despised group, which in turn intensified their subjection.45 Likewise, organizations like the American Negro Labor Congress and the Anti-Imperialist League analyzed that the racial capitalist superexploitation of Black nations like Haiti in the first quarter of the twentieth century for the purposes of consolidating Wall Street control over land, commercial relations, and production was accompanied by the brutalization of Black labor, the export of Jim Crow practices, military occupation, and political repression.46 In effect, superexploitation results from the conjuncture of white supremacy, racialization, and the “badge of slavery,” which exacerbates the conditions of exploitation to which white working classes are subjected. As the Black Marxist Harry Haywood argued in 1948, “the stifling effects of the race factor are most strikingly illustrated by the drastic differences in the economic and cultural status of Negroes and whites.… Beyond all doubt, the oppression of the Negro, which is the basis of the degradation of the ‘poor whites,’ is of separate character demanding a special approach.”47 Superexploitation, he explained further, constitutes a combination of direct exploitation, outright robbery, physical violence, legal coercion, and perpetual indebtedness. It stifles “the free economic and cultural development” of the Black masses “through racist persecution as a basic condition for maintaining” virtual enslavement.48

The entrapment of Black women in domestic labor throughout the twentieth century—a function of their “triple oppression”—is perhaps the most glaring example of labor superexploitation under modern U.S. racial capitalism. In 1936, the lifelong Black radical Louise Thompson explained that Black women’s superexploitation in the capitalist mode of production was based on their race, sex, and subordination in the labor market.49 That same year, Black militants Marvel Cooke and Ella Baker published an article titled “The Bronx Slave Market” in which they studied triple oppression as it related to Black domestic workers. Cooke and Baker explained that the entanglements of racism, sex-based labor subordination, and structural poverty were deeply intensified by the Great Depression and forced Black domestic workers to pauperize their labor for the abysmal wage of less than thirty cents an hour. This form of labor exploitation was unique to the female sex because domestic work was conventional “women’s work,” and it was racialized insofar as the denigration of Black people fitted this group of women for low-wage, unprotected, and contingent labor.50

#### Capitalism causes extinction---the only alternative is socialism

Foster 20, Editor of Monthly Review, and a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon (John Bellamy, The Renewal of the Socialist Ideal, *Monthly Review*, September 2020, Volume 72, Number 4)

Any serious treatment of the renewal of socialism today must begin with capitalism’s creative destruction of the bases of all social existence. Since the late 1980s, the world has been engulfed in an epoch of catastrophe capitalism, defined as the accumulation of imminent catastrophe on every side due to the unintended consequences of “the juggernaut of capital.”1 Catastrophe capitalism in this sense is manifested today in the convergence of (1) the planetary ecological crisis, (2) the global epidemiological crisis, and (3) the unending world economic crisis.2 Added to this are the main features of today’s “empire of chaos,” including the extreme system of imperialist exploitation unleashed by global commodity chains; the demise of the relatively stable liberal-democratic state with the rise of neoliberalism and neofascism; and the emergence of a new age of global hegemonic instability accompanied by increased dangers of unlimited war.3

The climate crisis represents what the world scientific consensus refers to as a “no analogue” situation, such that if net carbon emissions from fossil fuel combustion do not reach zero in the next few decades, it will threaten the very existence of industrial civilization and ultimately human survival.4 Nevertheless, the existential crisis is not limited to climate change, but extends to the crossing of other planetary boundaries that together define the global ecological rift in the Earth System as a safe place for humanity. These include: (1) ocean acidification; (2) species extinction (and loss of genetic diversity); (3) destruction of forest ecosystems; (4) loss of fresh water; (5) disruption of the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles; (6) the rapid spread of toxic agents (including radionuclides); and (7) the uncontrolled proliferation of genetically modified organisms.5

This rupturing of planetary boundaries is intrinsic to the system of capital accumulation that recognizes no insurmountable barriers to its unlimited, exponential quantitative advance. Hence, there is no exit from the current capitalist destruction of the overall social and natural conditions of existence that does not require exiting capitalism itself. What is essential is the creation of what István Mészáros in Beyond Capital called a new system of “social metabolic reproduction.”6 This points to socialism as the heir apparent to capitalism in the twenty-first century, but conceived in ways that critically challenge the theory and practice of socialism as it existed in the twentieth century.

The Polarization of the Class System

In the United States, key sectors of monopoly-finance capital have now succeeded in mobilizing elements of the primarily white lower-middle class in the form of a nationalist, racist, misogynist ideology. The result is a nascent neofascist political-class formation, capitalizing on the long history of structural racism arising out of the legacies of slavery, settler colonialism, and global militarism/imperialism. This burgeoning neofascism’s relation to the already existing neoliberal political formation is that of “enemy brothers” characterized by a fierce jockeying for power coupled with a common repression of the working class.7 It is these conditions that have formed the basis of the rise of the New York real-estate mogul and billionaire Donald Trump as the leader of the so-called radical right, leading to the imposition of right-wing policies and a new authoritarian capitalist regime.8 Even if the neoliberal faction of the ruling class wins out in the coming presidential election, ousting Trump and replacing him with Joe Biden, a neoliberal-neofascist alliance, reflecting the internal necessity of the capitalist class, will likely continue to form the basis of state power under monopoly-finance capital.

Appearing simultaneously with this new reactionary political formation in the United States is a resurgent movement for socialism, based in the working-class majority and dissident intellectuals. The demise of U.S. hegemony within the world economy, accelerated by the globalization of production, has undermined the former, imperial-based labor aristocracy among certain privileged sections of the working class, leading to a resurgence of socialism.9 Confronted with what Michael D. Yates has called “the Great Inequality,” the mass of the population in the United States, particularly youth, are faced with rapidly diminishing prospects, finding themselves in a state of uncertainty and often despair, marked by a dramatic increase in “deaths of despair.”10 They are increasingly alienated from a capitalist system that offers them no hope and are attracted to socialism as the only genuine alternative.11 Although the U.S. situation is unique, similar objective forces propelling a resurgence of socialist movements are occurring elsewhere in the system, primarily in the Global South, in an era of continuing economic stagnation, financialization, and universal ecological decline.

But if socialism is seemingly on the rise again in the context of the structural crisis of capital and increased class polarization, the question is: What kind of socialism? In what ways does socialism for the twenty-first century differ from socialism of the twentieth century? Much of what is being referred to as socialism in the United States and elsewhere is of the social-democratic variety, seeking an alliance with left-liberals and thus the existing order, in a vain attempt to make capitalism work better through the promotion of social regulation and social welfare in direct opposition to neoliberalism, but at a time when neoliberalism is itself giving way to neofascism.12 Such movements are bound to fail at the outset in the present historical context, inevitably betraying the hopes that they unleashed, since focused on mere electoral democracy. Fortunately, we are also seeing the growth today of a genuine socialism, evident in extra-electoral struggle, heightened mass action, and the call to go beyond the parameters of the present system so as to reconstitute society as whole.

The general unrest latent at the base of U.S. society was manifested in the uprisings in late May and June of this year, which took the form, practically unheard of in U.S. history since the U.S. Civil War, of massive solidarity protests with millions of people in the streets, and with the white working class, and white youth in particular, crossing the color line *en masse* in response to the police lynching of George Floyd for no other crime than being a Black man.13 This event, coming in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and the related economic depression, led to the June days of rage in the United States.

But while the movement toward socialism, now taking hold even in the United States at the “barbaric heart” of the system, is gaining ground as a result of objective forces, it lacks an adequate subjective basis.14 A major obstacle in formulating strategic goals of socialism in the world today has to do with twentieth-century socialism’s abandonment of its own ideals as originally articulated in Karl Marx’s vision of communism. To understand this problem, it is necessary to go beyond recent left attempts to address the meaning of communism on a philosophical basis, a question that has led in the last decade to abstract treatments of The Communist Idea, The Communist Hypothesis, and The Communist Horizon by Alain Badiou and others.15 Rather, a more concrete historically based starting point is necessary, focusing directly on the two-phase theory of socialist/communist development that emerged out of Marx’s Critique of the Gotha Programme and V. I. Lenin’s The State and Revolution. Paul M. Sweezy’s article “Communism as an Ideal,” published more than half a century ago in Monthly Review in October 1963, is now a classic text in this regard.16

Marx’s Communism as the Socialist Ideal

In The Critique of the Gotha Programme—written in opposition to the economistic and laborist notions of the branch of German Social Democracy influenced by Ferdinand Lassalle—Marx designated two historical “phases” in the struggle to create a society of associated producers. The first phase was initiated by the “revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat,” reflecting the class-war experience of the Paris Commune and representing a period of workers’ democracy, but one that still carried the “defects” of capitalist class society. In this initial phase, not only would a break with capitalist private property take place, but also a break with the capitalist state as the political command structure of capitalism.17 As a measure of the limited nature of socialist transition in this stage, production and distribution would inevitably take the form of to each according to one’s labor, perpetuating conditions of inequality even while creating the conditions for their transcendence. In contrast, in the later phase, the principle governing society would shift to from each according to one’s ability, to each according to one’s need and the elimination of the wage system.18 Likewise, while the initial phase of socialism/communism would require the formation of a new political command structure in the revolutionary period, the goal in the higher phase was the withering away of the state as a separate apparatus standing above and in antagonistic relation to society, to be replaced with a form of political organization that Frederick Engels referred to as “community,” associated with a communally based form of production.19

In the later, higher phase of the transition of socialism/communism, not only would property be collectively owned and controlled, but the constitutive cells of society would be reconstituted on a communal basis and production would be in the hands of the associated producers. In these conditions, Marx stated, “labor” will have become not a mere “means of life” but “itself…the prime necessity of life.”20 Production would be directed at use values rather than exchange values, in line with a society in which “the free development of each” would be “the condition for the free development of all.” The abolition of capitalist class society and the creation of a society of associated producers would lead to the end of class exploitation, along with the elimination of the divisions between mental and manual labor and between town and country. The monogamous, patriarchal family based on the domestic enslavement of women would also be surmounted.21 Fundamental to Marx’s picture of the higher phase of the society of associated producers was a new social metabolism of humanity and the earth. In his most general statement on the material conditions governing the new society, he wrote: “Freedom, in this sphere [the realm of natural necessity], can consist only in this, that socialized man, the associated producers, govern the human metabolism of nature in a rational way…accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy” in the process of promoting conditions of sustainable human development.22

Writing in The State and Revolution and elsewhere, Lenin deftly captured Marx’s arguments on the lower and higher phases, depicting these as the first and second phases of communism. Lenin went on to emphasize what he called “the scientific distinction between socialism and communism,” whereby “what is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the ‘first,’ or lower phase of communist society,” whereas the term communism, meaning “complete communism,” was most appropriately used for the higher phase.23 Although Lenin closely aligned this distinction with Marx’s analysis, in later official Marxism this came to be rigidified in terms of two entirely separate stages, with the so-called communist stage so removed from the stage of socialism that it became utopianized, no longer seen as part of a continuous or ongoing struggle. Based on a wooden conception of the socialist stage and the intermediary principle of distribution to each according to one’s labor, Joseph Stalin carried out an ideological war against the ideal of real equality, which he characterized as a “reactionary, petty-bourgeois absurdity worthy of a primitive sect of ascetics but not of a socialist society organized on Marxist lines.” This same stance was to persist in the Soviet Union in one way or another all the way to Mikhail Gorbachev.24

Hence, as explained by Michael Lebowitz in The Socialist Imperative, “rather than a continuous struggle to go beyond what Marx called the ‘defects’ inherited from capitalist society, the standard interpretation” of Marxism in the half-century from the late 1930s to the late ’80s “introduced a division of post-capitalist society into two distinct ‘stages,’” determined economistically by the level of development of the productive forces. Fundamental changes in social relations emphasized by Marx as the very essence of the socialist path were abandoned in the process of living with and adapting to the defects carried over from capitalist society. Instead, Marx had insisted on a project aimed at building the community of associated producers “from the outset” as part of an ongoing, if necessarily uneven, process of socialist construction.25

This abandonment of the socialist ideal associated with Marx’s higher phase of communism was wrapped up in a complex way with changing material (and class) conditions and eventually the demise of Soviet-type societies, which tended to stagnate once they ceased to be revolutionary and even resurrected class forms, heralding their eventual collapse as the new class or nomenklatura abandoned the system. As Sweezy argued in 1971, “state ownership and planning are not enough to define a viable socialism, one immune to the threat of retrogression and capable of moving forward on the second leg of the movement to communism.” Something more was needed: the continuous struggle to create a society of equals.26

For Marx, the movement toward a society of associated producers was the very essence of the socialist path embedded in “communist consciousness.”27 Yet, once socialism came to be defined in more restrictive, economistic terms, particularly in the Soviet Union from the late 1930s onward, in which substantial inequality was defended, post-revolutionary society lost the vital connection to the dual struggle for freedom and necessity, and hence became disconnected from the long-term goals of socialism from which it had formerly derived its meaning and coherence.

Based on this experience, it is evident that the only way to build socialism in the twenty-first century is to embrace precisely those aspects of the socialist/communist ideal that allow a theory and practice radical enough to address the urgent needs of the present, while also not losing sight of the needs of the future. If the planetary ecological crisis has taught us anything, it is that what is required is a new social metabolism with the earth, a society of ecological sustainability and substantive equality. This can be seen in the extraordinary achievements of Cuban ecology, as recently shown by Mauricio Betancourt in “The Effect of Cuban Agroecology in Mitigating the Metabolic Rift” in Global Environmental Change.28 This conforms to what Georg Lukács called the necessary “double transformation” of human social relations and the human relations to nature.29 Such an emancipatory project must necessarily pass through various revolutionary phases, which cannot be predicted in advance. Yet, to be successful, a revolution must seek to make itself irreversible through the promotion of an organic system directed at genuine human needs, rooted in substantive equality and the rational regulation of the human social metabolism with nature.30

Freedom as Necessity

Building on G. W. F. Hegel’s philosophy, Engels famously argued in Anti-Dühring that real freedom was grounded in the recognition of necessity. Revolutionary change was the point at which freedom and necessity met in concrete praxis. Although there was such a thing as blind necessity beyond human knowledge, once objective forces were grasped, necessity was no longer blind, but rather offered new paths for human action and freedom. Necessity and freedom fed on each other, requiring new periods of social change and historical transcendence.31 In illustrating this materialist dialectical principle, Lenin acutely observed, “we do not know the necessity of nature in the phenomena of the weather. But while we do not know this necessity, we do know that it exists.”32 We know the human relation to the weather and nature in general inevitably varies with the changing productive relations governing our actions.

Today, the knowledge of anthropogenic climate crisis and of extreme weather events is removing human beings from the realm of blind necessity and demanding that the world’s population engage in the ultimate struggle for freedom and survival against catastrophe capitalism. As Marx stated in the context of the severe metabolic rift imposed on Ireland as a result of British colonialism in the nineteenth century, the ecological crisis presents itself as a case of “ruin or revolution.”33 In the Anthropocene, the ecological rift resulting from the expansion of the capitalist economy now exists on a scale rivaling the biogeochemical cycles of the planet. However, knowledge of these objective developments also allows us to conceive the necessary revolution in the social metabolic reproduction of humanity and the earth. Viewed in this context, Marx’s crucial conception of a “community of associated producers” is not to be viewed as simply a far-off utopian conception or abstract ideal but as the very essence of the necessary human defense in the present and future, representing the insistent demand for a sustainable relation to the earth.34

But where is the agent of revolutionary change? The answer is that we are seeing the emergence of the material preconditions of what can be called a global environmental proletariat. Engels’s Condition of the Working Class in England, published in 1845, was a description and analysis of working-class conditions in Manchester, shortly after the so-called Plug Plot Riots and at the height of radical Chartism. Engels depicted the working-class environment not simply in terms of factory conditions, but much more in terms of urban developments, housing, water supply, sanitation, food and nutrition, and child development. The focus was on the general epidemiological environment enforced by capitalism (what Engels called “social murder” and what Norman Bethune later called “the second sickness”) associated with widespread morbidity and mortality, particularly due to contagious disease.35 Marx, under the direct influence of Engels and as a result of his own social epidemiological studies twenty years later while writing Capital, was to see the metabolic rift as arising not only in relation to the degradation of the soil, but equally, as he put it, in terms of “periodical epidemics” induced by society itself.36

What this tells us—and we could find many other illustrations, from the Russian and Chinese Revolutions to struggles in the Global South today—is that class struggle and revolutionary moments are the product of a coalescence of objective necessity and a demand for freedom emanating from material conditions that are not simply economic but also environmental in the broadest sense. Revolutionary situations are thus most likely to come about when a combination of economic and ecological conditions make social transformations necessary, and where social forces and relations are developed enough to make such changes possible. In this respect, looked at from a global standpoint today, the issue of the environmental proletariat overlaps with and is indistinguishable from the question of the ecological peasantry and the struggles of the Indigenous. Likewise, the struggle for environmental justice that now animates the environmental movement globally is in essence a working-class and peoples’ struggle.37

The environmental proletariat in this sense can be seen as emerging as a force all over the world, as evident in the present period of ecological-epidemiological struggle in relation to COVID-19. Yet, the main locus of revolutionary ecological action in the immediate future remains the Global South, faced with the harsh reality of “imperialism in the Anthropocene.”38 As Samir Amin observed in Modern Imperialism, Monopoly Finance Capital, and Marx’s Law of Value, the triad of the United States, Europe, and Japan is already using the planet’s bio-capacity at four times the world average, pointing toward ecological oblivion. This unsustainable level of consumption of resources in the Global North is only possible because

a good proportion of the bio-capacity of society in the South is taken up by and to the advantage of these centers [in the triad]. In other words, the current expansion of capitalism is destroying the planet and humanity. The expansion’s logical conclusion is either the actual genocide of the peoples of the South—as “overpopulation”—or, at the least, their confinement to ever-increasing poverty. An eco-fascist strand of thought is being developed which gives legitimacy to this kind of “final solution” to the problem.39

A New System of Social Metabolic Reproduction

A revolutionary process of socialist construction aimed at building a new system of social reproduction in conformity with the demands of necessity and freedom cannot occur without an overall “orienting principle” and “measure of achievement” as part of a long-term strategy. It is here, following Mészáros, that the notion of substantive equality or a society of equals, also entailing substantive democracy, comes into play in today’s struggles.40 Such an approach not only stands opposed to capital at its barbaric heart but also opposes any ultimately futile endeavor to stop halfway in the transition to socialism. Immanuel Kant spelled out the dominant liberal view shortly after the French Revolution when he stated that “the general equality of men as subjects in a state coexists quite readily with the greatest inequality in degrees of the possessions men have.… Hence, the general equality of men coexists with great inequality of specific rights of which there may be many.”41 In this way, equality came to be merely formal, existing merely “on paper” as Engels pointed out, not only with respect to the labor contract between capitalist and worker but also in relation to the marriage contract between men and women.42 Such a society establishes, as Marx demonstrated, a “right of inequality, in its content, like every right.”43 The idea of substantive equality, consistent with Marx’s notion of communism, challenges all of this. It demands a change in the constitutive cells of society, which can no longer consist of possessive individualists, or individual capitals, reinforced by a hierarchical state, but must be based on the associated producers and a communal state. Genuine planning and genuine democracy can only start through the constitution of power from the bottom of society. It is only in this way that revolutions become irreversible.

It was the explicit recognition of the challenge and burden of twenty-first-century socialism in these terms that represented the extraordinary threat to the prevailing order constituted by the Venezuelan Revolution led by Hugo Chávez. The Bolivarian Republic challenged capitalism from within through the creation of communal power and popular protagonism, generating a notion of revolution as the creation of an organic society, or a new social metabolic order. Chávez, building on the analyses of Marx and Mészáros, mediated by Lebowitz, introduced the notion of “the elementary triangle of socialism,” or (1) social ownership, (2) social production organized by workers, and (3) satisfaction of communal needs.44 Underlying this was a struggle for substantive equality, abolishing the inequalities of the color line and the gender line, the imperial line, and other lines of oppression, as the essential basis for eliminating the society of unequals.

In “Communism as an Ideal,” Sweezy emphasized the new forms of labor that would necessarily come into being in a society that used abundant human productivity more rationally. Many categories of work, he indicated, would “be eliminated altogether (e.g. coalmining and domestic service), and insofar as possible all jobs must become interesting and creative as only a few are today.” The reduction of the enormous waste and destruction inherent in capitalist production and consumption would open up space for the employment of disposable time in more creative ways.

In a society of equals—one in which everyone stands in the same relation to the means of production and has the same obligation to work and serve the common welfare—all “needs” that emphasize the superiority of the few and involve the subservience of the many will simply disappear and will be replaced by the needs of liberated human beings living together in mutual respect and cooperation.… Society and the human beings who compose it constitute a dialectical whole: neither can change without changing the other. And communism as an ideal comprises a new society and a new [human being].45

More than simply an ideal, such an organizing principle in which substantive equality and substantive democracy are foremost in the conception of socialism/communism is essential not only to create a socialist path to a better future but as a necessary defense of the global population confronted with the question of survival. Dystopian books and novels notwithstanding, it is impossible to imagine the level of environmental catastrophe that will face the world’s peoples, especially those at the bottom of the imperialist hierarchy, if capitalism’s creative destruction of the metabolism of humanity and the earth is not stopped mid–century.

According to a 2020 article on “The Future of the Human Climate Niche” in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, based on existing trends, 3.5 billion people are projected to be living in unlivable heat outside the human climate niche by 2070, under conditions comparable to those of the Sahara desert.46 Even such projections fail to capture the enormous level of destruction that will fall on the majority of humanity under capitalist business as usual. The only answer is to leave the burning house and to build another now.47

The International of Workers and Peoples

Although untold numbers of people are engaged in innumerable struggles against the capitalist juggernaut in their specific localities all around the world, struggles for substantive equality, including battles over race, gender, and class, depend on the fight against imperialism at the global level. Hence, there is a need for a new global organization of workers based on the model of Marx’s First International.48 Such an International for the twenty-first century cannot simply consist of a group of elite intellectuals from the North engaged in World Social Forum-like discussion activities or in the promotion of social-democratic regulatory reforms as in the so-called Socialist and Progressive Internationals. Rather, it needs to be constituted as a workers-based and peoples-based organization, rooted from the beginning in a strong South-South alliance so as to place the struggle against imperialism at the center of the socialist revolt against capitalism, as contemplated by figures such as Chávez and Amin.

In 2011, just prior to his final illness, Chávez was preparing, following his next election, to launch what was to be called the New International (pointedly not a Fifth International) focusing on a South-South alliance and giving a global significance to socialism in the twenty-first century. This would have extended the Bolivarian Alliance for Peoples of Our America to a global level.49 This, however, never saw the light of day due to Chávez’s rapid decline and untimely death.

Meanwhile, a separate conception grew out of the efforts of Amin, working with the World Forum for Alternatives. Amin had long contemplated a Fifth International, an idea he was still presenting as late as May 2018. But in July 2018, only a month before his death, this had been transformed into what he called an Internationale of Workers and Peoples, explicitly recognizing that a pure worker-based International that did not take into account the situation of peoples was inadequate in confronting imperialism.50 This, he stated, would be an organization, not just a movement. It would be aimed at the

alliance of all working peoples of the world and not only those qualified as representatives of the proletariat…including all wage earners of the services, peasants, farmers, and the peoples oppressed by modern capitalism. The construction must also be based on the recognition and respect of diversity, whether of parties, trade unions, or other popular organizations of struggle, guaranteeing their real independence.… In the absence of [such revolutionary] progress the world would continue to be ruled by chaos, barbarian practices, and the destruction of the earth.51

The creation of a New International cannot of course occur in a vacuum but needs to be articulated within and as a product of the building of unified mass organizations expanding at the grassroots level in conjunction with revolutionary movements and delinkings from the capitalist system all over the world. It could not occur, in Amin’s view, without new initiatives from the Global South to create broad alliances, as in the initial organized struggles associated with the Third World movement launched at the Bandung Conference in 1955, and the struggle for a New International Economic Order.52 These three elements—grassroots movements, delinking, and cross-country/cross-continent alliances—are all crucial in his conception of the anti-imperialist struggle. Today this needs to be united with the global ecological movement.

Such a universal struggle against capitalism and imperialism, Amin insisted, must be characterized by audacity and more audacity, breaking with the coordinates of the system at every point, and finding its ideal path in the principle of from each according to one’s ability, to each according to one’s need, as the very definition of human community. Today we live in a time of the perfect coincidence of the struggles for freedom and necessity, leading to a renewed struggle for freedom as necessity. The choice before us is unavoidable: ruin or revolution.

## Case

## Adv 1

### 1NC- Alt cause

#### People don’t buy for other reasons- access isn’t key

Kansas= Yellow

Colwell, Director of Telecommunications Strategy, 20

(Mark, at Voqal, 8/18/20, *How Increasing Broadband Competition Can Address the Adoption Gap*, accessed 8/30/21, <https://voqal.org/how-increasing-broadband-competition-can-address-the-adoption-gap/>, RAW)

Never has the need for closing the digital divide received more attention than in recent months, as Americans have relied more than ever on broadband for work, school, entertainment, and commerce. Broadband has moved from a “nice to have” to a “must-have” and has become an [election](https://bangordailynews.com/2020/06/30/opinion/contributors/broadband-investment-will-foster-open-government-and-safe-elections/) [issue](https://news.wttw.com/2020/07/20/chicago-voters-weigh-citywide-plan-broadband-internet-assault-weapons-nov-3) for many Americans. Closing the digital divide requires a nuanced diagnosis. There are two components driving the lack of connectivity: the access gap and the adoption gap. The access gap, which tends to attract the most attention from lawmakers, refers to those who have no provider offering broadband service where they live. According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) [2020 Broadband Deployment Report](https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-20-50A1.pdf), about 5.6% of all Americans have no access to what we call “fixed” broadband at their homes. (Note: There is, of course, the normal caveat that the FCC data is provided by internet service providers and is often inaccurate.) Disclaimer aside, 5.6% works out to about 18.3 million Americans who still lack access. While 98.5% of Americans living in urban areas have access, just 77.7% of those living in rural areas and 72.3% of those living on Tribal lands have access. Much of the focus in policy circles has been on how to expand broadband access to those Americans without it. This is a worthy goal, but we should not lose sight of the magnitude of the other part of the digital divide: the adoption gap. FCC data shows about 35% or approximately 114 million Americans do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Cost is often cited as the leading factor for why Americans do not subscribe to broadband even when it is offered. Clearly, we need a strategy to address this gap, too. One reason broadband prices are too high for millions of Americans is a lack of competition. A [new report](https://baseilsr-15adc.kxcdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2020_08_Profiles-of-Monopoly.pdf) from the Institute for Self-Reliance finds that two of the largest broadband companies – Comcast and Charter – maintain a monopoly over at least 47 million Americans. The report also found that the only alternative for an additional 33 million Americans in “competitive” duopoly markets is inferior DSL service. Americans are becoming increasingly irritated by their lack of options. A new poll from Data for Progress and The Justice Collaborative found that more than [3 out of 5 likely voters support break-ups in the telecom and cable markets](https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2020/08/12/is-kamala-harris-a-win-for-silicon-valley-789855). Among Republicans, 68% supported splitting up telecom and cable giants. Despite this public sentiment, both the Trump and Obama Administrations have supported megamergers. New competition is the most likely solution to drive down prices and provide greater satisfaction to American consumers. This new competition could come in the form of fixed satellite service or fixed wireless. While satellite is likely several years away from providing high-speed, low-latency service, fixed wireless is already a real solution in some parts of the country. Recent announcements by [Verizon](https://www.lightreading.com/4g3gwifi/verizon-fashionably-late-to-lte-fixed-wireless-party/d/d-id/762817) and T-Mobile show that the mobile wireless industry is interested in earning more of the [home broadband market share](https://www.fiercewireless.com/operators/t-mobile-says-it-will-have-thousands-2-5-ghz-sites-live-year). T-Mobile, for its part, has rolled out a home broadband pilot in Grand Rapids, Michigan, which offers customers 50 Mbps service with no data cap, no equipment rental fee, and no contract for just $50 per month. As part of its merger with Sprint, T-Mobile promised regulators it would market in-home broadband service to 28 million eligible households, including 5.6 million rural households, within 6 years.

### 1NC---!D---Food Wars

#### Food insecurity doesn’t cause war.

Vestby et al 18, \*Jonas, Doctoral Researcher at the Peace Research Institute Oslo, \*\*Ida Rudolfsen, doctoral researcher at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University and PRIO, and \*\*\*Halvard Buhaug, Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO); Professor of Political Science at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU); and Associate Editor of the Journal of Peace Research and Political Geography. (5/18/18, “Does hunger cause conflict?”, *Climate & Conflict Blog*, <https://blogs.prio.org/ClimateAndConflict/2018/05/does-hunger-cause-conflict/>)

It is perhaps surprising, then, that there is little scholarly merit in the notion that a short-term reduction in access to food increases the probability that conflict will break out. This is because to start or participate in violent conflict requires people to have both the means and the will. Most people on the brink of starvation are not in the position to resort to violence, whether against the government or other social groups. In fact, the urban middle classes tend to be the most likely to protest against rises in food prices, since they often have the best opportunities, the most energy, and the best skills to coordinate and participate in protests.

Accordingly, there is a widespread misapprehension that social unrest in periods of high food prices relates primarily to food shortages. In reality, the sources of discontent are considerably more complex – linked to political structures, land ownership, corruption, the desire for democratic reforms and general economic problems – where the price of food is seen in the context of general increases in the cost of living. Research has shown that while the international media have a tendency to seek simple resource-related explanations – such as drought or famine – for conflicts in the Global South, debates in the local media are permeated by more complex political relationships.

## Adv 2

### 1NC---5G Advantage

#### US already has 5G leadership.

Woo 21, Wall Street Journal reporter. (Stu, 5-26-2021, "The U.S. Is Back in the 5G Game", *WSJ*, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/us-5g-companies-11621870061)---language> edited, brackets

The U.S. government has upended the $35 billion-a-year cellular-equipment industry, ushering in a new era of competition and giving U.S. companies a shot at re-entering a sector they vacated years ago. In the past five years, only China’s Huawei Technologies Co., Sweden’s Ericsson ERIC +0.24% AB and Finland’s Nokia Corp. NOK +4.30% captured more than a 20% share of revenue in the wireless-equipment market, according to Dell’Oro Group, a research firm. No other competitor consistently cracked even 10%. Now that landscape is changing. Pushed by Washington’s campaign to [undermine] cripple Huawei over cybersecurity concerns, countries representing more than 60% of the world’s cellular-equipment market are considering or have already enacted restrictions against Huawei, says Dell’Oro Group. And to take advantage of that opening, the U.S. government—as well as governments in the U.K. and European Union—are considering financial support and other measures to boost domestic cellular-equipment makers trying to crack the three incumbents’ stranglehold on the market. The result is a newly competitive market that is reminiscent of the 1990s, when bygone industry giants such as Lucent, Motorola, Nortel, Siemens and Alcatel fought for a piece of a growing telecom-equipment pie. “It’s got a Wild West feel to it,” says Bill Plummer, a former Nokia and Huawei executive now working at JMA Wireless, a Syracuse, N.Y., 5G company. “We haven’t seen this since probably the eve of the dot-com bust—this dynamic and thriving competitive environment in wireless.” That new environment could benefit everyone—other than, of course, Huawei, Ericsson and Nokia. It will give a host of competitors a chance to win business that only a couple of years ago seemed out of reach. And the new competitive fervor should increase innovation and lower costs for wireless carriers, which could pass on savings—and the fruits of those innovations—to customers. American officials further say the new competitive landscape is crucial to U.S. efforts to counter China’s influence in developing 5G technology, the next generation of wireless technology that will serve as the building blocks for all sorts of future technologies—whether in robot-run factories, heart-rate monitors, or any number of industries and products. The country that dominates 5G will be well-positioned to lead the technology industry in terms of profits and talent in the years ahead.

### 1NC---!D---Heg

#### No leadership impact---empirics.

Fettweis 20, Associate Professor of Political Science at Tulane University. (Christopher J., 6-3-2020, "Delusions of Danger: Geopolitical Fear and Indispensability in U.S. Foreign Policy", *A Dangerous World? Threat Perception and U.S. National Security*, https://www.cato.org/publications/publications/delusions-danger-geopolitical-fear-indispensability-us-foreign-policy)

Like many believers, proponents of hegemonic stability theory base their view on faith alone.41 There is precious little evidence to suggest that the United States is responsible for the pacific trends that have swept across the system. In fact, the world remained equally peaceful, relatively speaking, while the United States cut its forces throughout the 1990s, as well as while it doubled its military spending in the first decade of the new century.42 Complex statistical methods should not be needed to demonstrate that levels of U.S. military spending have been essentially unrelated to global stability.

Hegemonic stability theory’s flaws go way beyond the absence of simple correlations to support them, however. The theory’s supporters have never been able to explain adequately how precisely 5 percent of the world’s population could force peace on the other 95 percent, unless, of course, the rest of the world was simply not intent on fighting. Most states are quite free to go to war without U.S. involvement but choose not to. The United States can be counted on, especially after Iraq, to steer well clear of most civil wars and ethnic conflicts. It took years, hundreds of thousands of casualties, and the use of chemical weapons to spur even limited interest in the events in Syria, for example; surely internal violence in, say, most of Africa would be unlikely to attract serious attention of the world’s policeman, much less intervention. The continent is, nevertheless, more peaceful today than at any other time in its history, something for which U.S. hegemony cannot take credit.43 Stability exists today in many such places to which U.S. hegemony simply does not extend.

### 1NC- AT: Tech Leadership

#### No risk to tech leadership.

Swaine '21 [Michael; 4/21/21; PhD in Government from Harvard University, director of the East Asia program at the Quincy Institute; "China Doesn’t Pose an Existential Threat for America," https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/04/21/china-existential-threat-america/]

Some observers claim that Beijing could somehow set standards in critical technology areas and install tech hardware around the world, to the extent that China would be able to relegate the United States to a permanently inferior status in both the commercial and military realms, thus threatening the very existence of the country. This is also highly unlikely.

Chinese companies are certainly participating in standard-setting in key areas, including 5G. But this process is highly competitive globally, and U.S., Asian, and European companies all hold major portions of the standards and the standard-essential patents that undergird the global technology ecosystem. There is little if any chance that Chinese companies could come to dominate this process. Many tech experts state that the most likely worst-case outcome of Chinese gains regarding standards and hardware would be a fragmented technology ecosystem that would impoverish all countries, not give China a level of power that would enable it to vanquish the United States.

### 1NC – AT: Smart Cities

They don’t solve smart cities---they’re global, most of the world is on 4G, AND the IOT is in every other country as well.

#### No smart cities AND they fail.

Smith ‘17 [Kendra; November 17; writer @ wired; Scientific American, “The Inconvenient Truth about Smart Cities,” [https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-inconvenient-truth-about-smart-cities]](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-inconvenient-truth-about-smart-cities%5d)

A big reason for the disconnect between smart city potential and reality is the fact that smart cities are where the digital world blends, but can also collide, with the non-digital world. Non-digital issues such as legacy governance, social justice, politics, ideology, privacy and financial elements that are not so smart, efficient or resilient when smart-city planning starts can become large factors. Any one of these elements can pose a challenge in and of itself and grow to monstrous proportions when combined with other longstanding problems in a city. Imagine the entanglements that existing public and private industries must go through to implement a single smart city project, let alone numerous projects such as smart lighting, smart transportation, smart buildings and the like to actually make a more complete smart city. Bill Gates’ effort is notable because Belmont is a blank slate to be built from the ground up.

### 1NC---!D---Cyber

#### No cyber impact.

Lewis 20, PhD, a senior vice president and director of the Technology Policy Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C. (James Andrew, 8-17-2020, "Dismissing Cyber Catastrophe", *CSIS*, https://www.csis.org/analysis/dismissing-cyber-catastrophe)

A catastrophic cyberattack was first predicted in the mid-1990s. Since then, predictions of a catastrophe have appeared regularly and have entered the popular consciousness. As a trope, a cyber catastrophe captures our imagination, but as analysis, it remains entirely imaginary and is of dubious value as a basis for policymaking. There has never been a catastrophic cyberattack.

To qualify as a catastrophe, an event must produce damaging mass effect, including casualties and destruction. The fires that swept across California last summer were a catastrophe. Covid-19 has been a catastrophe, especially in countries with inadequate responses. With ~~man-made~~ actions, however, a catastrophe is harder to produce than it may seem, and for cyberattacks a catastrophe requires organizational and technical skills most actors still do not possess. It requires planning, reconnaissance to find vulnerabilities, and then acquiring or building attack tools—things that require resources and experience. To achieve mass effect, either a few central targets (like an electrical grid) need to be hit or multiple targets would have to be hit simultaneously (as is the case with urban water systems), something that is itself an operational challenge.

It is easier to imagine a catastrophe than to produce it. The 2003 East Coast blackout is the archetype for an attack on the U.S. electrical grid. No one died in this blackout, and services were restored in a few days. As electric production is digitized, vulnerability increases, but many electrical companies have made cybersecurity a priority. Similarly, at water treatment plants, the chemicals used to purify water are controlled in ways that make mass releases difficult. In any case, it would take a massive amount of chemicals to poison large rivers or lakes, more than most companies keep on hand, and any release would quickly be diluted.

More importantly, there are powerful strategic constraints on those who have the ability to launch catastrophe attacks. We have more than two decades of experience with the use of cyber techniques and operations for coercive and criminal purposes and have a clear understanding of motives, capabilities, and intentions. We can be guided by the methods of the Strategic Bombing Survey, which used interviews and observation (rather than hypotheses) to determine effect. These methods apply equally to cyberattacks. The conclusions we can draw from this are:

Nonstate actors and most states lack the capability to launch attacks that cause physical damage at any level, much less a catastrophe. There have been regular predictions every year for over a decade that nonstate actors will acquire these high-end cyber capabilities in two or three years in what has become a cycle of repetition. The monetary return is negligible, which dissuades the skilled cybercriminals (mostly Russian speaking) who might have the necessary skills. One mystery is why these groups have not been used as mercenaries, and this may reflect either a degree of control by the Russian state (if it has forbidden mercenary acts) or a degree of caution by criminals.

There is enough uncertainty among potential attackers about the United States’ ability to attribute that they are unwilling to risk massive retaliation in response to a catastrophic attack. (They are perfectly willing to take the risk of attribution for espionage and coercive cyber actions.)

No one has ever died from a cyberattack, and only a handful of these attacks have produced physical damage. A cyberattack is not a nuclear weapon, and it is intellectually lazy to equate them to nuclear weapons. Using a tactical nuclear weapon against an urban center would produce several hundred thousand casualties, while a strategic nuclear exchange would cause tens of millions of casualties and immense physical destruction. These are catastrophes that some hack cannot duplicate. The shadow of nuclear war distorts discussion of cyber warfare.

State use of cyber operations is consistent with their broad national strategies and interests. Their primary emphasis is on espionage and political coercion. The United States has opponents and is in conflict with them, but they have no interest in launching a catastrophic cyberattack since it would certainly produce an equally catastrophic retaliation. Their goal is to stay below the “use-of-force” threshold and undertake damaging cyber actions against the United States, not start a war.

This has implications for the discussion of inadvertent escalation, something that has also never occurred. The concern over escalation deserves a longer discussion, as there are both technological and strategic constraints that shape and limit risk in cyber operations, and the absence of inadvertent escalation suggests a high degree of control for cyber capabilities by advanced states. Attackers, particularly among the United States’ major opponents for whom cyber is just one of the tools for confrontation, seek to avoid actions that could trigger escalation.

The United States has two opponents (China and Russia) who are capable of damaging cyberattacks. Russia has demonstrated its attack skills on the Ukrainian power grid, but neither Russia nor China would be well served by a similar attack on the United States. Iran is improving and may reach the point where it could use cyberattacks to cause major damage, but it would only do so when it has decided to engage in a major armed conflict with the United States. Iran might attack targets outside the United States and its allies with less risk and continues to experiment with cyberattacks against Israeli critical infrastructure. North Korea has not yet developed this kind of capability.

One major failing of catastrophe scenarios is that they discount the robustness and resilience of modern economies. These economies present multiple targets and configurations; they are harder to damage through cyberattack than they look, given the growing (albeit incomplete) attention to cybersecurity; and experience shows that people compensate for damage and quickly repair or rebuild. This was one of the counterintuitive lessons of the Strategic Bombing Survey. Pre-war planning assumed that civilian morale and production would crumple under aerial bombardment. In fact, the opposite occurred. Resistance hardened and production was restored.1

This is a short overview of why catastrophe is unlikely. Several longer CSIS reports go into the reasons in some detail. Past performance may not necessarily predict the future, but after 25 years without a single catastrophic cyberattack, we should invoke the concept cautiously, if at all. Why then, it is raised so often?

### ---Grid Resilient

#### Grid resilient.

Niiler 19, citing a study by the Electric Power Research Institute. (Eric, 4-30-2019, "The Grid Might Survive an Electromagnetic Pulse Just Fine", *Wired*, https://www.wired.com/story/the-grid-might-survive-an-electromagnetic-pulse-just-fine/)

The study, by the Electric Power Research Institute, a utility-funded research organization, finds that existing technology can protect various components of the electric grid to buffer it from the effects of solar flares, lightning strikes, and an EMP from a nuclear blast all at the same time: a three-for-one surge protector. “We have a strong technical basis for what the impacts [of an EMP] might be,” says Randy Horton, EPRI project manager and author of the report being released today. “That is one thing that didn’t exist before.”

Horton says that EPRI technicians worked with experts at the Department of Energy labs at Los Alamos and Sandia to simulate some effects of an EMP on substations and distribution systems. They also did real-world testing of electrical equipment at an EPRI laboratory in Charlotte, North Carolina. The study, which took three years to complete, looks at the effects of three kinds of energy spawned by a nuclear detonation.

The first high-energy wave occurs in just a few nanoseconds and is called an E1. The second wave, called an E2, lasts up to a second and can fry electric systems the way a lightning strike does, unless they are properly grounded. Effects of an E2 wave on the grid are expected to be minimal. The third kind of wave can last for tens of seconds and is similar to what utility operators might expect from a low-frequency, long-duration solar flare or geomagnetic storm. The report says that the combination of an E1 and E3 would cause the most damage over the widest area.

Horton says simulations and testing by EPRI contradicts earlier findings that an EMP would wipe out the US grid. “You could have a regional voltage collapse, but you wouldn’t damage a large number of bulk power transformers immediately,” Horton says. “That was the difference in our finding. There were some studies that said you could damage hundreds of transformers. We just didn’t find it.”

# 2NC

## Cap

### Overview — 2NC

#### You should actively flip the script against UTIL

Jackson 12, Professor of Peace Studies and the Director of the National Peace and Conflict Studies Centre at the University of Otago, New Zealand (Richard, August 5th, “The Great Con of National Security,” <https://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-great-con-of-national-security/>, Accessed 09-22-2021)

It may have once been the case that being attacked by another country was a major threat to the lives of ordinary people. It may also be true that there are still some pretty serious dangers out there associated with the spread of nuclear weapons. For the most part, however, most of what you’ve been told about national security and all the big threats which can supposedly kill you is one big con designed to distract you from the things that can really hurt you, such as the poverty, inequality and structural violence of capitalism, global warming, and the manufacture and proliferation of weapons – among others.

The facts are simple and irrefutable: you’re far more likely to die from lack of health care provision than you are from terrorism; from stress and overwork than Iranian or North Korean nuclear missiles; from lack of road safety than from illegal immigrants; from mental illness and suicide than from computer hackers; from domestic violence than from asylum seekers; from the misuse of legal medicines and alcohol abuse than from international drug lords. And yet, politicians and the servile media spend most of their time talking about the threats posed by terrorism, immigration, asylum seekers, the international drug trade, the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea, computer hackers, animal rights activism, the threat of China, and a host of other issues which are all about as equally unlikely to affect the health and well-being of you and your family. Along with this obsessive and perennial discussion of so-called ‘national security issues’, the state spends truly vast sums on security measures which have virtually no impact on the actual risk of dying from these threats, and then engages in massive displays of ‘security theatre’ designed to show just how seriously the state takes these threats – such as the x-ray machines and security measures in every public building, surveillance cameras everywhere, missile launchers in urban areas, drones in Afghanistan, armed police in airports, and a thousand other things. This display is meant to convince you that these threats are really, really serious.

And while all this is going on, the rulers of society are hoping that you won’t notice that increasing social and economic inequality in society leads to increased ill health for a growing underclass; that suicide and crime always rise when unemployment rises; that workplaces remain highly dangerous and kill and maim hundreds of people per year; that there are preventable diseases which plague the poorer sections of society; that domestic violence kills and injures thousands of women and children annually; and that globally, poverty and preventable disease kills tens of millions of people needlessly every year. In other words, they are hoping that you won’t notice how much structural violence there is in the world.

More than this, they are hoping that you won’t notice that while literally trillions of dollars are spent on military weapons, foreign wars and security theatre (which also arguably do nothing to make any us any safer, and may even make us marginally less safe), that domestic violence programmes struggle to provide even minimal support for women and children at risk of serious harm from their partners; that underfunded mental health programmes mean long waiting lists to receive basic care for at-risk individuals; that drug and alcohol rehabilitation programmes lack the funding to match the demand for help; that welfare measures aimed at reducing inequality have been inadequate for decades; that health and safety measures at many workplaces remain insufficiently resourced; and that measures to tackle global warming and developing alternative energy remain hopelessly inadequate.

Of course, none of this is surprising. Politicians are a part of the system; they don’t want to change it. For them, all the insecurity, death and ill-health caused by capitalist inequality are a price worth paying to keep the basic social structures as they are. A more egalitarian society based on equality, solidarity, and other non-materialist values would not suit their interests, or the special interests of the lobby groups they are indebted to. It is also true that dealing with economic and social inequality, improving public health, changing international structures of inequality, restructuring the military-industrial complex, and making the necessary economic and political changes to deal with global warming will be extremely difficult and will require long-term commitment and determination. For politicians looking towards the next election, it is clearly much easier to paint immigrants as a threat to social order or pontificate about the ongoing danger of terrorists. It is also more exciting for the media than stories about how poor people and people of colour are discriminated against and suffer worse health as a consequence.

Viewed from this vantage point, national security is one massive confidence trick – misdirection on an epic scale. Its primary function is to distract you from the structures and inequalities in society which are the real threat to the health and wellbeing of you and your family, and to convince you to be permanently afraid so that you will acquiesce to all the security measures which keep you under state control and keep the military-industrial complex ticking along.

#### It’s a better frame

Kaczmarek 17 – Patrick Kaczmarek, PhD at the University of Glasgow, a Senior Researcher at Effective Giving, Visiting Researcher at the Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford and a Visiting Scholar at the Department of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh. [How Much is Rule-Consequentialism Really Willing to Give Up to Save the Future of Humanity? Utilitas, 29(2), https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/utilitas/article/how-much-is-ruleconsequentialism-really-willing-to-give-up-to-save-the-future-of-humanity/F867301151A79F7DA566A14DF71749B3]//BPS

Notice, the problem can be cast two different ways. First, the loss associated with humanity's premature extinction is so great that even if the probability of a catastrophic event is very low, an expected value calculation suggests that we should strive to prevent its possible occurrence. And yet, there is something deeply puzzling about ruining the lives of all actual persons for the sake of humanity eking out a longer stay in the universe.

Second, you may have realized that the above implication bears close resemblance to the dreaded Repugnant Conclusion. The Repugnant Conclusion states that for any population, all with a very high quality of life, there must be some larger imaginable population whose existence, all else being equal, would be better despite their lives being barely worth living.19The mistake, as countless critics have noted, is that quantity (that is, size of population) should not be able to compensate for a stark reduction to their average quality of life.

I'm inclined to agree that this looks worrisome. For some, if this were the end of the story, it would surely act as a reductio ad absurdum of the view. But this is not the full story.

AN INDIRECT APPROACH TO LOWERING THE THREAT OF EXTINCTION

In setting out our earlier comparison of the two populations it was assumed that only costs go up, never benefits. That is to say, A was fixed and the total sum of goods went up merely because the size of the population grew, despite internalization costs reducing average quality of life. Colouring in the picture, this corresponds to the scenario where, all else being equal, existential threats are directly targeted. To illustrate, this could amount to putting a lot of resources towards asteroid deflection programmes.20

I now wish to argue that we could instead reduce existential risk by indirect means, and in so doing make the world in two ways go better. As noted earlier, we would prolong humanity's place in the cosmos. Furthermore, an indirect approach improves the average welfare of persons, particularly the worse-off in our population.

Certainly, it would be a mistake to concentrate exclusively on indirectly lowering the probability of doomsday. Returning to our earlier example, reducing global poverty cannot prevent an Earth-bound asteroid the size of Texas from making impact. Nevertheless, if we were also to adopt an indirect approach, then this would contribute to existential risk reduction by curbing the negative ripple effects of readily preventable illnesses, global hunger, and so forth.

Ripple effects are a class of phenomena that affect the far future in significant ways, shaping how our history unfolds over time.21A ripple effect is initiated by a particular event that has some causal influence on the course of events that follow it. These events, in turn, may have their own impact on how further events play out. And so on it goes, reaching wider and wider as time passes.

#### Accumulation outweighs extinction under UTIL

Povinelli 19 (Elizabeth A. prof of anthrology at Columbia. The Urban Intensions of Geontopower)

Thegreat cities of Europe are technological condensations and displacements of countless despoiled and depopulated spaces—what have become the rural and wasteland areas along and beyond their peripheries. The minerals dug out of Congo, South Africa, Australia, and Canada went somewhere. In other words, they are not merely accumulation of an abstraction (surplus value) or a double abstraction (surplus value of surplus value), but a material redistribution and transformation: the shapes of European cities that were taken from colonized landscapes and the tailings of toxins, the rivers of poison, and the mountains of mudslides engulfing entire communities that came with them. As Europeans crossed and recrossed the globe pulling out what they needed and leaving what was superfluous to them behind, it created a new hegemonic order of things: an emergent andexploitative **western classification of existence**, or in other words, what was what and how each related to each other. The hegemonic force of this order of things was secreted in the emerging routes such that things could be used and moved only if they appeared as one kind of thing. **These different logics of use and abuse certainly included what was grievable, what was killable, and what could be destroyed in order to enhance someone else somewhere else.** If you are the subject of capitalist extraction (which everyone is but not qualitatively or quantitatively equally) and you wish to eke out an existence, then the everyday ethical, social, and political hierarchies and differences of things have to be treated as if their materialities do not matter. At this point in time, the dynamic of colonial and postcolonial accumulation seems much messier than promised by the crisp dialectics of Hegel and Marx and out of which Césaire and Fanon originally built their critique. **Accumulation has less the look of a precisely rendered logic and more of a harvesting machine worthy of science fiction: a massive earth-destroying Death Star ripping and gutting a million worlds and then returning to re-ravage them as many times as it can find new forms of extracting profit from existence** (or in the language of capitalist disavowal, “creative destruction”). The wheels of the machine do not go forward, they go backward, side-to-side, and around-and-around. Capitalism as such emerged from a mad circle of primitive accumulation: scraping value out of the bodies of enslaved west Africans, pulling nutrients from Caribbean soil, and casting gunpowder recipes from Chinese knowledge.7 But this primitive accumulation, Glen Coulthard has argued, depended on an originary accumulation of Native American lands—a Caribbean rid of Caribs, an American South without the Caddo, Seminole, Catawba, Cherokee, Shawnee and hundreds of others. Coulthard insist that David Harvey’s understanding of capitalism as accumulation by dispossession depended on an initial dispossession.8 Forward into visions of semiotechno-capitalist solutions and industrial climate toxicity: as TJ Demos, Bron Szerszinsky, and others have discussed, numerous such liberal, neoliberal, and libertarian geo-engineering projects figure the anthropos “as ultimate self-creator, for whom no challenge—climate change, agricultural failure, artificial intelligence, planetary hunger, even death and extinction—will be beyond technological overcoming, especially when matched to Silicon Valley capital.”9 Lifted up, lifted out, anthropos was claimed to be different from and superior to all other forms of existence. But this anthropos is not Man. It is a toxic imaginary brewed out of specific colonial and capitalist sociality. **Great cities rose from the smolder; and within these cities new topologies of glistening paving stones and stinking alleyways. As human and nonhuman worlds were ripped from one place to produce wealth in another, the great harvester would return, digging deeper into previously ravaged spaces,** this time with imperial and corporate armies to reorganize “free” African labor for mines, plantations, and the construction of new megalopolises in the global south. The interior contours of these new cities have been understood and documented ever since Engels’s The Condition of the Working Class in England, continuing on through Mike Davis’s The Planet of Slums. Likewise, countless studies have detailed the dynamics that drain human and nonhuman materials and values from outside the city, accelerating the process by which urban centers grow and rural areas become vast reservoirs of toxicity. **This is what Du Bois saw: material and social space being bent to distortedly sculpt routes and worlds, including the means of connecting by differentiating between the urban and rural and the city and its slum. Human and nonhuman existence was forced into specific forms as the condition for movement** (what roads demanded; ocean-ways allowed; undersea cables provided; low-earth, mid-earth, and geostationary space satellite networks oversaw). **The conditions of existence in one place stretched way beyond its location**, but in ways that seemed disfigured only to some. (Rising rents in renewed American cities condemn the precariat to lives lived on buses commuting to low wage work from new suburban ghettos.) But this idea that toxicity could be kept at a distance was always a fantasy. This fantasy has now been punctured. The toxic waterways they sealed far away from their view or right below their own feet are now overflowing. Critical indigenous theory has long argued that **colonialism did not merely destroy people and their lands, but attempted to destroy myriad non-Western understandings of the irreducible entanglement of human and nonhuman existences** that challenge the toxic imaginary of colonial and capitalist extraction. In colonial conditions, the bargain between colonial invaders and indigenous peoples was never for either your goods or your life, but was always both your modes of life and your goods. Thus, at the heart of Coulthard’s analysis of originary dispossession is this aspect of the harvesting machine: If we base our understanding of originary dispossession from an indigenous standpoint, it’s the theft not only of the material of land itself, but also a destruction of the social relationships that existed prior to capitalism violently sedimenting itself on indigenous territories. And those social relations are often not only based on principles of egalitarianism but also deep reciprocity between people and with the other-than-human world.10 Countless deeply reflexive practices of how one belongs across and in existence were disrupted, dug up, and run over as Europeans went southward and westward to make their cities, neighborhoods, and livelihoods. Coulthard is not arguing that settler colonialism burnt these worlds down to their root, nor that the effect of this destruction flowed in only one direction. Rather, the harm had different forms and temporalities. The gangrene took root in colonizers as soon as they began treating the Americas as something to be conquered, but the gangrene was slow-acting. They could postpone the effects of the poisons they were creating by moving away from or exporting the poisons they wrought. At some point there would be no further, no behind, no over there. Today may be that day. Peer down into the gutters, follow the flows of water, of metals, and the pollutants they carry and disperse.

### AT: Cap Solves Food

#### Food scarcity is inevitable under capitalism — the problem is distribution which the alternative solves

**Holt-Gimenez 19** , served as executive director of Food First in Oakland, California, from 2006 until mid-2019. He is the editor of Food First’s Food Movements Unite! Strategies to Transform Our Food Systems; co-author of Food Rebellions! Crisis and the Hunger for Justice; author of Campesino a Campesino; author of A Foodie’s Guide to Capitalism; and most recently, Can We Feed the World Without Destroying It? Eric has a master’s in international agricultural development from the University of California, Davis, and a Ph.D. in Environmental Studies from UC, Santa Cruz. He has taught at UC, Berkeley, UC, Santa Cruz, Boston University, University of the Pacific, and Italy’s National Gastronomic University. He previously served as the Latin America program manager for the Bank Information Center in Washington, D.C. (Eric, 8/9/19, “Capitalism, food, and social movements: The political economy of food system transformation,” *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, <https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.091.043> Date Accessed: 7/19/21)

The Scarcity Narrative The “golden fact” is the idea that, because of pop-ulation growth, we’re going to have to double our food production within a generation in order to feed the population. Well, you’d be surprised who says this—people who know better. The FAO says this even though quietly they admit it’s not true. USDA says this. Monsanto loves this. Respected scientists, whom I admire very much, such as Thomas Foley, a global ecologist, says this in National Geographic when he also knows it’s not true. The scarcity narrative is such a powerful narrative because scarcity is an integral part of capitalism. Why? Because it brings up prices and generates more profit. Scarcity must be created even if it isn’t there. And if you create it in people’s minds, that’s even better. (And by the way, who is going to produce all this new food? Modern industry, industrial agriculture, new capitalist technologies. . .) We know the scarcity narrative is false because if you look back over the last 10, 20, 30 years—if you go even farther back than this graph (Slide 2), what you see is that we have been increasing production by 12 percent per capita every year consistently for decades. Per capita. This accounts for population growth; every single person in this room, and everywhere around the world every year should be getting 12 percent more food. And yet we have at least one fifth or a third of the world population going hungry or malnourished. Despite this, absolute poverty has not changed. So no matter how much food you produce, these people can’t buy it in a capitalist food system. Similarly, undernourish-ment—the little yellow dots—that hasn’t changed. Why is it that we keep producing more and more food without solving hunger or malnutrition, yet the solution is always—always—to produce more food? Food Crises in a Capitalist Food System The food price index (Slide 3) illustrates the decline in food prices since the turn of the century. Why would that be? Again, overproduction. We’re producing so much food that we have been driving down food prices for the past hun-dred years. We have never had a problem of underpro-duction. On the contrary, since the beginning of capi-talism, we’ve had a problem of overproduction. The downward trend in food prices changed suddenly in 2008, when prices shot up beyond anything we had ever recorded in the past. Why? Did food suddenly become scarce? No. Actually, 2008 was a time of record harvests. This was also the case in 2010, when there was another food price spike. In these years, we saw record harvests, record hunger, and record profits by the oligopolies that control our food system. This means that the Monsantos, the Cargills, and the large retail chains were all making record profits at a time when millions of people were being driven into the ranks of the hungry because they couldn’t afford to buy food. Slide 4 shows the two food price spikes in 2008 and in 2011. The vertical red lines represent the frequency of food riots around the world. The figure illustrates the threshold at which increasing food prices cause people so much pain that they start rioting. When food price decrease below that threshold, people stop rioting. You can see this threshold being crossed in both 2008 and 2011, where high food prices are accompanied by spikes in food riots. It’s important to note that these riots did not just occur in locations that have ongoing struggles with hunger, such as Sub-Saharan Africa and Haiti, where people were subsisting off of mud biscuits at the time. Riots also occurred in Italy and Milwau-kee, rich, productive places. So what does this mean? What’s happening with our food? Slide 5a illustrates the global (red) and local (blue) food prices between 2007 and 2011. Again, we see the spikes in global prices in 2008 and 2011.The local price—the retail price—increases with the glo-bal price in 2008. This makes sense; as food gets more expensive globally, its price in the store increases as well. But then the global price of food drops precipitously while the retail price stays the same. This is called gouging. There’s no other word for it. Consumers are getting gouged; poor people are getting gouged while food companies make incredible profits. For example, Wal-Mart, one of the biggest grocers in the world (soon to be outseated by Amazon) made so much money that they had a crisis of over-accu-mulation. They had made huge profits that needed to be reinvested as capital, but there was nowhere to go because we were in a recession. The share prices of Monsanto’s stock (Slide 5b) reflects the profits seen by large food oligopo-lies during these food crises. Monsanto’s share prices increase as people go hungry. As people’s hunger is alleviated, Monsanto’s share price goes down. So what does Monsanto need? They need food crises. There’s a lot of talk about the causes of global food price spikes, including increased droughts globally, changing climates, rising meat consump-tion in India, Brazil, and China, low grain reserves, etc. I call these proximate causes. But really, while we have all of those contributing factors, what raised food prices beyond anything we’d ever seen was speculation with our food, as reflected in the explosion of trading in commodity index funds. Financial houses were speculating with our food and pushing prices up.

### 2NC- AT:Philosophical Competition

#### Ideology matters.

Lao, 14—Professor of Law and the Maury Cartine Endowed Faculty Research Fellow, Seton Hall University School of Law (Marina, “Ideology Matters in the Antitrust Debate,” 79 Antitrust Law Journal 649 (2014), dml) [language modifications denoted by brackets]

Discussions of modern antitrust often emphasize its evolution, over the last several decades, into a rigorous economic discipline that is largely technocratic and apolitical.1 The suggestion is that current disagreements within the antitrust community, both on a theoretical level and with respect to practical application, are primarily technical differences regarding methodology and data. On the surface, these observations certainly seem to be true. Economics plays a central role in shaping contemporary antitrust thinking and doctrine;2 further, there is broad agreement that it should,3 although some antitrust scholars would preserve a limited role for other values4 and others challenge the central role of economics more frontally.5 There is also a general consensus that, as the Supreme Court declared in Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-OMat, Inc., the purpose of federal antitrust law is to protect competition, and not to protect competitors against the rigors of competition.6 While the overarching goal of antitrust continues to be debated, arguments are usually framed in economic terms, for example, as a choice between a total welfare and a consumer welfare standard.7

Moreover, the Supreme Court and other federal courts, beginning with Continental T.V., Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc., 8 have tended to adopt the language of economics and to ground their decisions in economic reasoning.9 Enforcement agencies also routinely rely on sophisticated economic tools for analysis. In merger review, for example, econometrics and merger simulations are increasingly applied,10 and economic concepts such as “diversion ratios,” “value of diverted sales,” “critical loss analysis,” and “upward pricing pressure” pervade the revised horizontal merger guidelines.11

Even in the most contentious areas of antitrust policy—exclusionary conduct (e.g., tying, exclusive dealing, unilateral refusals to deal) and its treatment under Section 2 of the Sherman Act—the intellectual discourse seems to revolve around economic concepts, such as the strengths and weaknesses of the “raising rivals’ costs” theory, the single monopoly profit theory, free riding, the competing Schumpeter-Arrow theories on market structure and dynamic efficiency, and the appropriate formulation of standards under decision theory. The debate is usually couched in terms of choices of one analytical theory or method over another, with virtually no discussion of social or political values or any hint that these values play a role in antitrust. Nevertheless, I believe that ideology does matter in the antitrust debate, as some antitrust scholars have long asserted or argued.12 Arguments in contemporary antitrust are not merely technical but stem from ideological differences between antitrust conservatives and antitrust liberals concerning the economy and markets and the appropriate role of government within them, the virtues of dominant firms, the value of competition, and related social and political issues.

Though I recognize the risks of over-generalizing,13 for convenience, I apply the labels “conservative” and “liberal” to describe two different antitrust philosophies. As used in this article, a conservative antitrust policy is permissive (or non-interventionist), particularly toward dominant firm conduct and vertical restraints,14 and is generally associated with the Chicago School;15 a liberal antitrust approach is more restrictive (or interventionist), and is often associated with the Post-Chicago School.16 It should be noted that I use the term “ideology,” not in a partisan or pejorative sense, but in the sense of one’s philosophy about economic, social, and political issues,17 such as the robustness of free markets, the capability of government institutions, the virtues of monopolies, the value of competition, and the meaning and importance of property rights, economic liberty, merit, opportunity, and fairness.

Ideological differences between antitrust conservatives and liberals probably have the greatest impact with respect to Section 2 because the competitive effects of various forms of dominant firm conduct are often unclear, and the theories offered to support either permissive or restrictive standards are inconclusive. In this context, it is almost inevitable that a policymaker’s values will influence which theoretical models she [they] will choose, whether her [their] default is to intervene or not intervene if the theories and the evidence are indeterminate, what types of evidence she [they] would consider relevant, and so forth.18 Her [their] core economic and political beliefs will also likely affect her [their] perspective on the aggregate social costs of false negatives relative to false positives, which will impact her [their] judgment on whether liability should be found in a particular case or, indeed, whether a particular case should be brought in the first place. For this reason, I will focus primarily on whether and how the debate on exclusionary claims might be affected by ideological differences.

In Part I, I discuss three issues, each critical to Section 2 enforcement, where economic theory and empirical evidence are indeterminate. They include the choice of theory among a multitude of theories of exclusionary conduct; the resolution of whether concentrated or competitive markets better spur dynamic efficiency; and the application of a decision-theoretic approach to the shaping of Section 2 policy.

In Part II, I discuss how and why a few ideological differences between antitrust conservatives and antitrust liberals may come into play. One set of differences concerns beliefs about the robustness of markets, the competence of antitrust institutions, and the wisdom of relying on government intervention to control dominant firm conduct. Another set involves differing worldviews on dominant firms and on the value of competition. And, a third set relates to differences in conceptions of property rights and economic liberty and on broader social issues such as merit, fairness, and greater opportunity for nondominant firms. I conclude in Part III by suggesting that it would be preferable to bring into the open a discussion regarding the different normative visions about antitrust and to discuss what values matter and why they should matter on their own terms, rather than use economics as a proxy for that normative conversation.19

### 5G Link — 2NC

#### Turns cyber: 1NC Ray says capitalist 5G explodes the IOT — that exponentially increases vulnerabilities.

Albert 20, M.D. @ John Hopkins. BA in Evolutionary Biology (Michael, April, The Dangers of Decoupling: Earth System Crisis and the ‘Fourth Industrial Revolution’, *Global Policy*, Volume 11, Issue 2, DOI: 10.1111/1758-5899.12791)

Cybersecurity in an age of ‘smart everything’

The second key problem with the FIR is that ‘exponential technologies’ deployed to decouple growth from environmental impact will also intensify ongoing cybersecurity threats. Cybercrime has increased to the point of costing the global economy an estimated $500–600 billion per year, while new vulnerabilities in civilian infrastructures continue to be discovered and exploited more quickly than they can be secured (Goodman, 2016). We are thus dealing with an already significant problem, though it remains important to consider how it will deepen in a world reliant on FIR-dependent solutions to the earth system crisis, especially once we take into account the cyber vulnerabilities posed by next generation information systems (Goodman, 2016).

In particular, we must consider the risks associated with the incipient IOT, which is a key component of the solution-set offered by techno-optimists for decoupling economic growth by dramatically improving efficiencies in energy, transportation, and agriculture (Falk et al., 2018; World Economic Forum, 2018). One of the prerequisites of a future renewable energy system capable of providing at least 80 per cent of growing electricity demand would be the creation of national or regional ‘smart grids’ in which energy surpluses in areas with lots of wind and sun at a given time can be transmitted to areas with energy deficits. While this system would itself increase cyber vulnerabilities relative to more modular systems, the efforts of Cisco and others to enhance the efficiency of smart grids via the IOT would intensify these vulnerabilities even more. In this vision, the smart grid would form ‘an intelligent network of power lines, switches, and sensors able to monitor and control energy down to the level of a single lightbulb’, which would be enabled by IOT connected sensors that ‘monitor energy use and manage demand, time shifting noncritical applications like delaying the start of your dishwasher to the middle of the night, when energy is cheaper’ (Diamandis and Kotler, 2014, pp. 169– 171). In this way, every connected device – from iPhones and laptops to dishwashers and microwaves – would become a possible point of entry for hackers to the overall network (Goodman, 2016). The IOT is also envisioned as a possible solution to traffic congestion and fuel efficiency for the future fleet of self-driving electric vehicles that are set to (potentially) transform the market over the next decade. While advocates of ‘smart’ cars and ‘smart’ cities are enthusiastic regarding the possibilities for improved energetic and economic efficiency, it would also leave vehicles vulnerable to remote hijacking, as researchers Chris Valasek and Charlie Miller demonstrated in 2014 by taking control of a 2014 Jeep Cherokee (Markey, 2015). Adding further to the IOT-hype, a recent World Economic Forum report proposes deploying it to create ‘precision agriculture’ systems, which could link farms with global positioning systems and weather data collection to monitor water and soil conditions while enabling farms to automatically optimize inputs (World Economic Forum, 2018).

If these IOT powered energy, urban, and agricultural systems come into being, this would constitute an exponential expansion of attack vectors for would-be hackers, whether they come from states, criminal organizations, or non-state terrorist networks. Cybersecurity analyst Mark Goodman effectively captures the scale the problem:

The IoT will be a global network of unintended consequences and black swan events ... we cannot even adequately protect the standard desktops and laptops we presently have online, let alone the hundreds of millions of mobile phones and tablets we are adding annually. In what vision of the future, then, is it conceivable that we will have any clue how to protect the next fifty billion things to go online? (Goodman, 2016, pp. 301–302).

In short, while the expansion of cyber vulnerabilities is already stressing if not overwhelming the defense capacities of governments, corporations, and public utilities, it is also practically assured that these vulnerabilities will expand significantly if the global economy relies on smart energy grids and the IOT to maximize energy efficiency and decouple growth from growing resource use.

### AT: Cap Solves Environment

#### No decoupling — data that accounts for offshoring and rebound effects prove energy efficiency is getting worse. Staying below 1.5° is biophysically impossible under capitalism.

Albert 20, M.D. @ John Hopkins. BA in Evolutionary Biology (Michael, April, The Dangers of Decoupling: Earth System Crisis and the ‘Fourth Industrial Revolution’, *Global Policy*, Volume 11, Issue 2, DOI: 10.1111/1758-5899.12791)

Unfortunately for the ecomodernists, degrowth scholars and ecological economists have begun to poke holes in their optimistic assessments. Their response can be summarized according to three key counter-arguments: (1) the evidence that ecomodernists provide for relative decoupling is flawed and limited at best; (2) their evidence for the possibility of absolute decoupling is even weaker; and (3) even if absolute decoupling was possible in principle, there is even weaker evidence that this could occur with the necessary speed to stabilize the earth system before reaching irreversible tipping points. First, claims that rich countries have seen relative or even absolute decoupling of economic growth from domestic material consumption have been shown to focus solely on correlations between national GDP and material throughput while ignoring the material-energetic costs embodied in imported consumer goods. For example, Thomas Wiedmann and colleagues show that while the EU, the US, and Japan have grown economically while stabilizing or even reducing domestic material consumption, a broader analysis of their material footprint embedded in their imports shows that it has kept pace with GDP growth. They conclude that ‘no decoupling has taken place over the past two decades for this group of developed countries’ (Wiedmann et al., 2015, p. 6273). Focusing on the global economy as a whole, Krausmann et al. show that its resource intensity improved over the course of the 20th century, though the early 21st century has seen a faster rate of growing resource consumption than global economic growth (cited in Hickel and Kallis, 2019). Thus, as Kallis and Hickel (Kallis and Hickel, 2019, p. 4; italics added) explain: ‘Global historical trends show relative decoupling but no evidence of absolute decoupling, and twenty-first century trends show not greater efficiency but rather worse efficiency, with re-coupling occurring’. Second, given the limited evidence for even relative decoupling, it is little surprise that the evidential basis on which claims for the possibility of absolute decoupling rest is even flimsier. In the most comprehensive summary of the modeling evidence to date, Hickel and Kallis (2019) show that even the most optimistic scenarios fail to prove the possibility of absolute decoupling. For example, a modeling study by Schandl et al. (2016) shows that in a ‘high efficiency’ scenario, one that combines a high and rising carbon price plus a doubling in the rate of material efficiency improvement, global resource use grows more slowly (about a quarter the rate of GDP growth) but steadily to reach 95 billion tons in 2050, while global energy use grows from 14,253 million tons of oil equivalent in 2010 to 26, 932 million in 2050. The authors therefore conclude: ‘While some relative decoupling can be achieved in some scenarios, none would lead to an absolute reduction in ... materials footprint’ (Schandl et al., 2016, p. 8). A high efficiency scenario modeled by the UNEP comes to even less optimistic conclusions (with global resource use rising to 132 billion tons in 2050), since it incorporates the ‘rebound effect’ in which efficiency improvements lead to increased consumption due to resulting price reductions (Hickel and Kallis, 2019). In short, as they conclude, these ‘models suggest that absolute decoupling is not feasible on a global scale in the context of continued economic growth’ (Hickel and Kallis, 2019, p. 6). Third, the critics show that even if absolute decoupling (from both emissions and total environmental impact) were possible in principle, this would need to occur fast enough to prevent transgression of ecological tipping points. Just focusing on the climate problem, the 2018 IPCC report claims that emissions must be reduced 7 per cent annually to reach net zero by 2050 in order to achieve the 1.5 C target, whereas they must reduce 4 per cent annually to reach net zero by 2075 for a shot at the 2 degree target (IPCC, 2018, p. 15). However, even under optimistic assumptions (e.g. a near-term implementation of a high and rising carbon price, alongside heroic carbon intensity improvements), studies suggest that annual declines of 3–4 per cent might be the fastest rate possible assuming continued economic growth (Hickel, 2019). Thus, it would most likely be impossible to meet the 1.5 C target in a context of continuous compound growth. While the 2 degree target might be feasible in this context (assuming implementation of a globally coordinated program starting in 2020), many argue that the IPCC’s estimates downplay the existence of positive feedbacks in the earth system (e.g. Steffen et al., 2018), and thus more rapid emissions cuts might be needed even for 2 degrees. On top of this, economic growth must also be decoupled from impacts on other ‘planetary boundaries’ that may have already been overshot, especially land-use change and biodiversity loss (Raworth, 2017). A number of ecologists believe that to bring humanity back into a ‘safe operating space’, total resource consumption should be reduced from roughly 70 to 50 gigatons per year (Hoekstra and Wiedmann, 2014), while a ‘half earth strategy’ should be implemented that protects 50 per cent of the planet’s surface from direct human interference (up from roughly 18 per cent today) (Wilson, 2017), possibly by 2050 to prevent tipping points in biodiversity loss and land-use change (Hickel and Kallis, 2019). Even if these claims are exaggerated, the magnitude of the overall decoupling challenge remains clear. It would mean that total resource consumption and land use needs to shrink, remain stable, or only increase moderately (depending on our assumptions regarding the further stress (if any) that planetary boundaries can handle) even as the total output of the global economy triples by 2060. It is thus not hyperbole to say, as Boris Frankel puts it, that this goal of absolute decoupling is ‘overwhelmingly staggering in its ambition and historical novelty’ (Frankel, 2018, p. 127).

#### Tech fails — doesn’t displace fossil fuels and increased consumption offsets efficiency gains.

Parrique et al. 19, Centre for Studies and Research in International Development (CERDI), University of Clermont Auvergne, France; Stockholm Resilience Centre (SRC), Stockholm University, Sweden, Barth J., Briens F., C. Kerschner, Kraus-Polk A., Kuokkanen A., Spangenberg J.H. (Timothee, July, Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and arguments against green growth as a sole strategy for sustainability, *European Environmental Bureau*, https://mk0eeborgicuypctuf7e.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Decoupling-Debunked.pdf)

Not leading to relevant innovations

Innovation is not in and of itself a good thing for ecological sustainability. The desirable type of innovation is eco-innovation or one that results “in a reduction of environmental risk, pollution and other negative impacts of resources use compared to relevant alternatives” (Kemp and Pearson, 2008, p.5). But this is only one type among several. In general, firms have an incentive to innovate to economise on the most expensive factors of production to maximise profits. Because labour and capital are usually relatively more expensive than natural resources, more technological progress will likely continue to be directed towards labour- and capital-saving innovations, with limited benefits, if any, for resource productivity and a potential rise in absolute impacts due to more production. But decoupling will not occur if technological innovations contribute to saving labour and capital while leaving resource use and environmental degradation unchanged. Another issue is that technologies do not only solve environmental problems but also tend to create new ones. Assuming that resource productivity becomes a priority over labour and capital productivity, there is still nothing preventing technological innovations from creating more damage. For example, research into processes of extractions can lead to better ways to locate resources (imaging technologies and data analytics), to extract them (horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and automated drilling operations), and to transport them (Arctic shipping routes). These innovations may target resource use but with a result opposite to the objective of decoupling, that is more extraction. And this is not even considering unintended side-effects, which often accompany the development of new technologies (Grunwald, 2018). Not disruptive enough Another problem has to do with the replacement of harmful technologies. Indeed, it is not enough for new technologies to emerge (innovation), they must also come to replace the old ones in a process of “exnovation” (Kimberly, 1981). What is required is a “push and pull strategy” (Rockström et al., 2017): pushing environmentally-friendly technologies into society and pulling harmful ones, like fossil-based infrastructure, out of it. First, in reality, such a process is slow and difficult to trigger. Most polluting infrastructures (power plants, buildings and city structures, transport systems) require large investments, which then creates inertia and lock-in (Antal and van den Bergh, 2014, p. 3). Let us, for instance, consider the energy, buildings, and transport sectors, which account for the large majority of world energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Initial lifetime for a nuclear or a coal power plant is about 40 years. Buildings can last at least as much. The average lifetime for a car is 12-15 years, and this is about what it takes for an innovation to spread in the vehicle fleet. The wide availability of petrol refuelling stations gives an infrastructural advantage to petrol-based cars, whereas this is the opposite situation for electric, gas, or hydrogen vehicles that would require different and new supporting infrastructures. Building a highway or a nuclear plant is a commitment to emit for at least as long as these infrastructures will last – Davis and Socolow (2014) speak of “committed emissions.” Energy is a good case in point: using more renewable energy is not the same as using less fossil fuels. The history of energy use is not one of substitutions but rather of successive additions of new sources of energy. As new energy sources are discovered, developed, and deployed, the old sources do not decline, instead, total energy use grows with additional layers on the energy mix cake. York (2012) finds that each unit of energy use from non-fossil fuel sources displaced less than one-quarter of a unit of its fossil-fuel counterpart, showing empirical support for the claim that expanding renewable energies is far from enough to curb fossil fuel consumption. The relative part of coal in the global energy mix has been reduced since the advent of petroleum but this occurred in spite of absolute growth in the use of coal (Krausmann et al., 2009).

#### ‘Green growth’ relies on unsustainable colonial exploitation of the Global South — maintaining colonial mindsets makes solving warming impossible.

Kolinjivadi & Kothari 20, Vijay Kolinjivadi: Post-doctoral researcher at the Institute of Development Policy, University of Antwerp in Belgium. Ashish Kothari: Global Tapestry of Alternatives in India (May 20th, “No Harm Here is Still Harm There: The Green New Deal and the Global South (I),” *Jamhoor*, https://www.jamhoor.org/read/2020/5/20/no-harm-here-is-still-harm-there-looking-at-the-green-new-deal-from-the-global-south, Accessed 07-13-2021)

Additional crucial flaws would also severely hamper the GND’s potential for real change. Foremost, current variants of the GND retain a significant dependence on technological solutions to problems that are not necessarily technological in nature. They also say nothing about the need to reduce material consumption or energy demand overall (except ‘weatherization’ to reduce domestic consumption). Thus for example, they fail to acknowledge that even if the US transitioned completely to renewable energy and technologies like electric cars, it would still be engaging in unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources.

Moreover, by focusing heavily on carbon reductions, the GND ignores other major ecological crises, including those of biodiversity and ecosystem loss, driven by uncontrolled consumption in the Global North. Finally, while it commits to holding corporations accountable to domestic climate goals and labour standards, it does not ensure that they will also be held accountable globally (beyond carbon emissions). Similarly, while Bernie’s proposals were committed to ending rising inequality within the US, through taxes on fossil fuel billionaires and “green jobs” for low-income sectors, it is not clear how this inequality would be addressed in a way that does not just shift it outside the US.

As such, the GND cannot adequately challenge the structures of capitalism and patriarchy, and from a global perspective remains rooted in “green” colonialism. It effectively perpetuates the quest for cheap raw materials and black and brown labouring bodies to achieve “green” growth.

In the context of the Global South, then, the GND has failed to illustrate what is “new” about it. Put differently, it is simply inadequate, and indeed unjust, in our current hyper-connected world (laid bare by COVID-19) to limit a GND to the national policy of Global North countries. For instance, if a GND for Europe promises to be “climate neutral,” whose resources and labour will be deployed to power Europe’s unrestrained energy and consumption demands?

This is an especially salient question given how renewable technologies for “cleaner,” “greener” economies depend on the same socially and ecologically degrading land and labour practices as traditional energy sources. They are also conveniently located in countries of the Global South, such as Bolivia and DR Congo, where regulatory safeguards are more lax. The uneven playing field of resources and regulatory frameworks works in the favour of those who have not only historically usurped resources and labouring bodies around the world but also currently dictate the modus operandi of development, including its “greener and eco-friendly” varieties. What is easily forgotten in “eco-friendly” talk is just how development models of the Global North are structurally founded on dehumanization, in which hundreds of millions across the globe are seduced and stripped of their diverse ways of knowing the world, and dumbed down into passive consumerist onlookers and screen junkies, unable or unwilling to acknowledge (much less act upon) the consequences of their consumption patterns.

### 2NC- Socialism solves

#### Socialist innovation is Solves.

Nieto ’20 [Maxi and Juan Mateo; January; PhD sociology from the University of Elche; visiting scholar in the department of Economics at The New School, New York and economics professor at the University of Valladolid (Spain); Science & Society, “Dynamic Efficiency in a Planned Economy: Innovation and Entrepreneurship Without Markets,” Science & Society]

4.1. Innovation and social property. Innovation occurs as a result of a long and complex accumulation process of knowledge and creativity, where very rarely is a single individual solely responsible. This is an essentially social process in which a plurality of actors and institutions contribute in very different spheres and circumstances. The Austrian School presents an idealized image of innovation in capitalist economies, attributing it exclusively to the figure of the enterprising entrepreneur — whether in a disruptive sense (Schumpeter), or in a strictly coordinating sense (Kirzner). In fact, the entrepreneurial function develops within specific institutional frameworks and organized structures, both at the micro and macro levels. In this sense, a socialist economy has significant advantages for developing technological and business innovation, as opposed to a capitalist economy: i) socialism allows for greater and more efficient allocation of resources to R&D&I activities, thanks to centralized control of the surplus and the absence of sumptuous consumption and a rentier population; ii) there are no obstacles (property rights) to the free dissemination of new products and techniques; iii) the equal distribution of resources (which guarantees that no basic needs go unmet) allows for discovery and fuller development of talent, which likewise occurs when work is undertaken through tasks that are more balanced for the majority and less routine; iv) in allocating investment, more information is available and the criteria are more varied than mere expectation of profit; v) social ownership is more inclusive and participatory than capitalist enterprise in terms of generating and mobilizing knowledge (tacit or not) and encouraging innovation; vi) socialism does not impose short-term innovation cycles looking to generate products that can be commercialized in, say, four to six months, as is typical in capitalist economies. Under these favorable general conditions, the development of innovation in a socialist economy would unfold in three fundamental areas: i) Strategic planning: this traces the main lines of scientific, technological, and innovation research. Here would enter programs for the development of new technologies and infrastructures, as well as visionary projects that explore eventualities and future scenarios. This sort of research is carried out in universities, scientific academies, technological institutes, and other specialized centers in coordination with the business world. The process would consist in testing different alternative productive projects or techniques in order to verify results, in connection with the companies and sectors being served. ii) Companies: research, design, and innovation departments. iii) Business entrepreneurship: individuals and teams put forward proposals in hopes of securing financing. For any of these three areas, material incentives would exist that reward the degree to which the freely programmed objectives are achieved, in addition to purely social or moral incentives such as social recognition or professional and personal fulfilment. In the next section, we focus on how socialist entrepreneurship — something that the Austrian School considers impossible — would ostensibly work. 4.2. Ecosystems for innovation and entrepreneurship. In today’s most dynamic capitalist economies, entrepreneurship and business innovation are developed mainly in the so-called innovation ecosystems, which are institutional environments dedicated to promoting symbiotic interaction among the different actors involved in the process of creating and transforming companies and industries. This sort of institutional framework represents the antithesis of the liberal mythology where the individual capitalist–entrepreneur operates in a purely commercial environment, since these ecosystems are based on public institutions and resources as well as procedures that are not strictly mercantile.9 An efficient and dynamic socialist economy needs institutional environments capable of fostering and channeling the initiative of individuals with special talents to translate innovative ideas into business projects. It must be clear that an ecosystem of socialist innovation does not substitute for, but instead complements, the innovations developed by particular state institutions and programs (such as the transition to a new source of energy, new materials, etc.) as well 9 In the case of Spain, think tanks and capitalist consultants openly admit that “there is not enough private capital to invest in new companies, either through individual investment or through venture capital funds” (Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2015, 32). as innovations taking place in the industrial design departments of businesses. The actors involved in such an ecosystem are essentially the same as those participating in the equivalent ecosystems of the current capitalist economies. Principal differences would lie in the form of interaction among them (in the absence of mercantile links), their decision-making capacity (since no private property rights adhere), and the types of rules in force (including the incentive system). Among the main actors would be the following:

### AT: Space

#### Space col creates a corporate fantasy that maximizes resource use instead of minimizing it which locks in climate change.

Crawford, 21 [Kate Crawford is a writer, composer, producer and academic. Crawford is a principal researcher at Microsoft Research (Social Media Collective), the co-founder and director of research at the AI Now Institute at NYU, a visiting professor at the MIT Center for Civic Media, a senior fellow at the Information Law Institute at NYU, and an associate professor in the Journalism and Media Research Centre at the University of New South Wales, “Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence,” 2021, Yale University Press]//Townes

That space colonization and frontier mining have become the common corporate fantasies of tech billionaires underscores a fundamentally troubling relationship to Earth. Their vision of the future does not include minimizing oil and gas exploration or containing resource consumption or even reducing the exploitative labor practices that have enriched them. Instead, the language of the tech elite often echoes settler colonialism, seeking to displace Earth’s population and capture territory for mineral extraction. Silicon Valley’s billionaire space race similarly assumes that the last commons—outer space—can be taken by whichever empire gets there first. This is despite the main convention governing space mining, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which recognizes that space is the “common interest of all mankind” and that any exploration or use “should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples.”21

In 2015, Bezos’s Blue Origin and Musk’s SpaceX lobbied Congress and the Obama administration to enact the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act.22 It extends an exemption for commercial space companies from federal regulation until 2023, allowing them to own any mining resources extracted from asteroids and keep the profits.23 This legislation directly undercuts the idea of space as a commons, and creates a commercial incentive to “go forth and conquer.”24

#### Outweighs on scope and magnitude – space weapons wipe out all life in the universe.

Torres ’18 [Phil; April 20; Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, and founder of the X-Risks Institute; Futures, “Space Colonization and Suffering Risks: Reassessing the ‘Maxipok Rule’,” vol. 100 p. 74-85; kp]

Another possibility involves weaponizing “minor planets” like asteroids. This hints at the deflection dilemma discussed by Sagan (1994), among others, whereby the very same technology that could deflect an asteroid away from Earth could also be used to redirect one toward it. The resultant “planetoid bombs” could be launched in the direction of target civilizations at extremely high velocities and inflict far greater destruction than all the nuclear arsenals on Earth combined (see Cole and Cox 1965; Deudney forthcoming). Even more, asteroids are extremely numerous in the solar system and have a wide range of sizes, with estimates of 1.1 to 1.9 million that have greater-than-1-kilometer diameters in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter. (A 1- kilometer impactor striking Earth would likely annihilate humanity by causing an impact winter.)

Thus, asteroids constitute an abundant source of easily obtainable, civilization-ending weaponry—a particularly worrisome fact given that the technological capabilities to redirect aster- oids will likely emerge at an early stage in our diaspora “out of Earth,” as it were (see Deudney forthcoming).

Other futuristic space weapons include military drones that either initiate attacks or engage in clandestine surveillance of other civilizations. Such drones could hide themselves from counter-surveillance detectors by employing metamaterial invisibility cloaks and propagate themselves through the von Neumann process of self-replication, that is, by converting raw ma- terials into clones of themselves. There is also the possibility of using “heliobeams,” or “sun guns,” to destroy targets by concentrating large amounts of solar radiation via a concave mirror on a satellite. Even more catastrophic are direct-energy weapons (DEWs) like lasers and particle-beams that use highly focused energy to superheat their targets. In fact, the US government has already developed weapons of this sort—they are science fact rather than fiction—although fu- ture breakthroughs could enable them to become immensely more destructive. If this is the case, they will offer yet another mechanism for wreaking unprecedented harm (see Deudney forthcom- ing). Along these lines, Anders Sandberg (forthcoming) suggests that technologically advanced civilizations could potentially use gravitational waves to create black holes. Generating waves of sufficient intensity would be energetically inefficient, according to current physics, but they have the advantage that they can interact with dark matter objects, unlike electromagnetic-energy weapons.

Even more, the universe appears to be in a “metastable” energy state. This suggests that one could tip it into a more stable, lower-energy state, perhaps by concentrating huge quantities of energy in tiny regions of spacetime, as occurs in some high-powered physics experiments. In other words, a particle collider could be weaponized to intentionally nucleate a “vacuum bubble,” or sphere of “true vacuum” spreading in all directions at the speed of light and destroying everything with which it comes into contact. Who might weaponize a particle collider? First, there could be actors who use the threat of a vacuum bubble for blackmail purposes. Second, there could be madmen (like Hitler) who create a vacuum bubble to avoid defeat. That is to say, a predatory actor could hold the following preference ordering: (i) triumphant victory over, say, its Local Group, (ii) total annihilation of the universe, and (iii) defeat. Third, particle colliders would also be the ideal WTD for RNUs, since it would enable them to obliterate not only all extant life in the universe but the very potential for life to arise—and it would do this without inflicting any suffering whatsoever.xviii Another possibility is that Tuckerian actors create a vac- uum bubble for the purely defensive reason of eliminating all potential attackers in the universe. As Sandberg (2017) speculates, it might be possible for “certain configurations of matter, energy, black holes, etc. [to] induce a post-transition structure that can act as an assembler.” This “as- sembler” would enable “some information [to] be transmitted into the new state,” thus making it possible for a civilization to “survive,” in some sense, the universe settling into a lower-energy configuration. On the other side of this transition, the “structure” can recrudesce into a daughter new civilization with the certitude that it is completely alone and, therefore, safe.

Finally, it is crucial to note that future beings—some of whom may have hugely augmented cognitive capacities—will almost certainly invent new weapons that are more powerful and effective than anything we could imagine. Such weapons could enable civilizations—or per- haps lone wolves, of which there could be, once again, trillions and trillions and trillions—to cause unprecedented injury to other civilizations. Consider the following passage from Bostrom (2013):

One can readily imagine a class of existential-catastrophe scenarios in which some tech- nology is discovered that puts immense destructive power into the hands of a large num- ber of individuals. If there is no effective defense against this destructive power, and no way to prevent individuals from having access to it, then civilization cannot last, since in a sufficiently large population there are bound to be some individuals who will use any destructive power available to them.

Scale this up from the individual level to the cosmopolitical level and the same conclusion fol- lows: Life in the universe cannot last.

### Cap Solves War

#### COVID proves.

Walt 20, Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. (Stephen, May 13th, “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?” *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/>, Accessed 04-20-2021)

But war could still be much less likely. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Barry Posen has already considered the likely impact of the current pandemic on the probability of war, and he believes COVID-19 is more likely to promote peace instead. He argues that the current pandemic is affecting all the major powers adversely, which means it isn’t creating tempting windows of opportunity for unaffected states while leaving others weaker and therefore vulnerable. Instead, it is making all governments more pessimistic about their short- to medium-term prospects. Because states often go to war out of sense of overconfidence (however misplaced it sometimes turns out to be), pandemic-induced pessimism should be conducive to peace.

Moreover, by its very nature war requires states to assemble lots of people in close proximity—at training camps, military bases, mobilization areas, ships at sea, etc.—and that’s not something you want to do in the middle of a pandemic. For the moment at least, beleaguered governments of all types are focusing on convincing their citizens they are doing everything in their power to protect the public from the disease. Taken together, these considerations might explain why even an impulsive and headstrong warmaker like Saudi Arabia’s Mohammed bin Salman has gotten more interested in winding down his brutal and unsuccessful military campaign in Yemen.

Posen adds that COVID-19 is also likely to reduce international trade in the short to medium term. Those who believe economic interdependence is a powerful barrier to war might be alarmed by this development, but he points out that trade issues have been a source of considerable friction in recent years—especially between the United States and China—and a degree of decoupling might reduce tensions somewhat and cause the odds of war to recede.

#### Interdependence causes war---empirics and asymmetry---can’t overcome fundamental disagreements.

van de Haar 20 (Edwin, independent scholar specializing in the liberal tradition in international political thought. He has lectured in international relations and political theory at Brown University, PhD from Maastricht University (2008), a MSc in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science (1997) and a MA in Political Science from Leiden University (1996), “Free trade does not foster peace,” 2020, DOI: 10.1111/ecaf.12405, DOA: 1-5-2020) //Snowball //strikethrough of rhetoric

The most obvious rebuttal of these arguments is empirical. It just did not happen. Countries trading with each other, all around the globe, have fought wars with one another, over and over again. Some recent examples are Russia and Georgia, Russia and Ukraine, and Saudi Arabia and Yemen. As Smith predicted, human nature is an important factor in the explanation. People will quarrel and fight: ultimately emotions rule reason. In the domestic situation, there is hardly anyone who thinks that people can do without police and judiciary, because some people simply will not obey the rules. The international system is without a court with enforcement powers. There are some structural constraints, but it remains a human affair. The fundamental insights of Smith and his contemporaries into human behaviour do not amount to some oldfashioned idea, long refuted by modern science. They are confirmed not only by modern economists such as Kahneman (2011) and international relations specialists such as Waltz (1954, pp. 16–79) and Donelan (2007), but also by theorists working on the border between evolutionary psychology and international affairs (Rosen, 2005; Rubin, 2002; Thayer, 2004). The relationship between trade and economic interdependence is also far more complex. Economic interdependence matters sometimes, but it cannot trump power politics. As Copeland (2015, pp. 1–50, 428–46) makes clear, economic interdependence is sometimes a constraint on violent action by a state. Yet it could just as well be a cause of violent action, especially of a pre-emptive nature in the event that actors expect to be cut off from trade and other economic resources in the near future. In this way, the benefits of continued trade lose out against the expected economic vulnerability. Sobek (2009, pp. 107–27) adds that trade relations might lead to uneven power relationships, which may be a cause of war as well. Also relevant here is the fact that free trade does not normally result in bilateral interdependence

, except for trade in the rarest goods. Free trade leads to multilateral trade relations, and consequently there may be more than one country where particular goods can be bought. Therefore, in times of war, it is relatively easy to switch to suppliers from country A to country B or C. In this way warfare may be a less costly option than is assumed by the idea of economic interdependence. Public opinion is not automatically opposed to war, as Cobden painfully found out during the Crimean War (1853–56). This has been evident many times since, not least in the two world wars. So the idea of public opinion as a pacifying factor influencing decision-makers must be discarded. It must also be noted that the public in any case hardly ever influences foreign policy decisions on war and peace (Hill, 2003, pp. 250–82). Trade is unable to foster peace, because it is unable to overcome many causes of war. Think about cultural and religious differences, geopolitical causes such as the fight for natural resources, including increasingly rare raw materials, or more traditional wars between great powers or their proxies over a border dispute. States may also act against their economic interest for some perceived higher goal (Coker, 2014). The causes of war are often multifaceted and complex. Wars happen because people have reasons to fight, in the form of goals and grievances, and possess enough resources and resolve (Ohlson, 2009). Trade relations are just one factor in the mix of causes of war, which include such coincidental factors as chance, luck, or reckless behaviour by individuals who happen to influence public policy. International commerce is simply not a “perfectly effective antiwar device” (Suganami, 1996, pp. 153–210). The best one can say is that the protection of trade relations is sometimes one of the factors in the decision not to wage war. Nothing less, nothing more. To sum up, many of Adam Smith's arguments still stand, and are confirmed or complemented by modern research. There is no solid ground for the expectation that trade promotes, fosters, or leads to peace. Generally, international economic interests are not the crucial factors in decisions over war and peace. Too many other factors come into play. To believe that trade fosters peace was folly even hundreds of years ago. To still think so is to believe in fairy tales, to be ~~blinded~~ [confused] by the correlates computed by limited yet available datasets, or both.

# 1NR---Round 3

## Agriculture

### 1NR---!D---Food

#### No causal evidence, only maybe true for the poorest countries, and government responses check

Rosegrant 13, Director of the Environment and Production Technology Division at the International Food Policy Research Institute, et al. (Mark W., 2013, “The Future of the Global Food Economy: Scenarios for Supply, Demand, and Prices”, in *Food Security and Sociopolitical Stability*, pg. 39-40

The food price spikes in the late 2000s caught the world’s attention, particularly when sharp increases in food and fuel prices in 2008 coincided with street demonstrations and riots in many countries. For 2008 and the two preceding years, researchers identified a significant number of countries (totaling 54) with protests during what was called the global food crisis (Benson et al. 2008). Violent protests occurred in 21 countries, and nonviolent protests occurred in 44 countries. Both types of protest took place in 11 countries. In a separate analysis, developing countries with low government effectiveness experienced more food price protests between 2007 and 2008 than countries with high government effectiveness (World Bank 201la). Although the incidence of violent protests was much higher in countries with less capable governance, many factors could be causing or contributing to these protests, such as government response tactics, rather than the initial food price spike.

Data on food riots and food prices have tracked together in recent years. Agricultural commodity prices started strengthening in international markets in 2006. In the latter half of 2007, as prices continued to rise, two or fewer food price riots per month were recorded (based on World Food Programme data, as reported in Brinkman and Hendrix 2011). As prices peaked and remained high during mid-2008, the number of riots increased dramatically, with a cumulative total of 84 by August 2008. Subsequently, both prices and the monthly number of protests declined.

Several researchers have studied the connection between food price shocks and conflict, finding at least some relationship between food prices and conflict. According to Dell et al. (2008), higher food prices lead to income declines and an increase in political instability, but only for poor countries. Researchers also found a positive and significant relationship between weather shocks (affecting food availability, prices, and real income) and the probability of suffering government repression or a civil war (Besley and Persson 2009). Arezki and Bruckner (2011) evaluated a constructed food price index and political variables, including data on riots and anti-government demonstrations and measures of civil unrest. Using data from 61 countries over the period 1970 to 2007, they found a direct connection between food price shocks and an increased likelihood of civil conflict, including riots and demonstrations.

Other researchers have broadened the analysis by considering government responses or underlying policies that affect local prices, and consequently influence outcomes and the linkage between food price shocks and conflict. Carter and Bates (2012) evaluated data from 30 developing countries for the time period 1961 to 2001, concluding that when governments mitigate the impact of food price shocks on urban consumers, the apparent relationship between food price shocks and civil war disappears. Moreover, when the urban consumers can expect a favorable response, the protests only serve as a motivation for a policy response rather than as a prelude to something more serious, such as violent demonstrations or even civil war.

Many in the international development community see war and conflict as a development issue, with a war or conflict severely damaging the local economy, which in turn leads to forced migration and dislocation, and ultimately acute food insecurity. Brinkman and Hendrix (2011) ask if it could be the other way around, with food insecurity causing conflict. Their answer, based on a review of the literature, is “a highly qualified yes,” especially for intrastate conflict. The primary reason is that insecurity itself heightens the risk of democratic breakdown and civil conflict. The linkage connecting food insecurity to conflict is contingent on levels of economic development (a stronger linkage for poorer countries), existing political institutions, and other factors. The researchers say establishing causation directly is elusive, considering a lack of evidence for explaining individual behavior. The debate over cause and effect is ongoing.

Policies can nevertheless be implemented to reduce price variability. Less costly forms of stabilization, at least in terms of government outlays, include reducing import tariffs (and quotas) to lower prices and restricting exports to increase food availability. However, these types of policy responses, while perhaps helping an individual country’s consumers in the short run, can lead to increased international price volatility, with potential for disproportionate adverse impacts on other countries that also may be experiencing food insecurity.

#### Protests are nonviolent, and intervening actors.

Barrett 13, Deputy Dean and Dean of Academic Affairs of the College of Business, Stephen B. and Janice G. Ashley Professor of Applied Economics and Management, and an International Professor of Agriculture, all at the Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, as well as a Professor in the Department of Economics and a Fellow of the David R. Atkinson Center for a Sustainable Future, all at Cornell University. (Christopher B., “Food Security and Sociopolitical Stability,” 26 September 2013, Google Books)

The simplest definition of sociopolitical stability is the absence of coordinated human activities that cause widespread disruption of daily life for local populations. Note that this excludes violent personal crimes, such as murder, and natural disasters. But this definition encompasses a continuum of activities that we can array according to the magnitude of their human consequences, from nonviolent riots or large-scale political protests and work stoppages at one end, through violent versions of such organized actions, to guerilla movements and terrorism by state and non-state actors, to outright civil war, and finally to interstate war at the other. Boulding (1978) defined peace as the absence of war and emphasized that peace does not require the resolution of all conflicts within or among nations, merely that such conflict remain nonviolent. As used here and in the rest of this volume, stability is an even more Utopian state than mere peace. For example, many of the food riots of the past several years proved extremely disruptive to the populations affected—and threatening to governments—but did not turn violent, at least in the sense of causing deaths. We consider such events moments of instability, even though peace prevailed.

This sort of hierarchical ordering is instructive, as it underscores two fundamental points made directly or indirectly by multiple contributors to this volume. First, not all instability is bad. When peaceful, structured, political, legal, and economic conflict occurs where the probability of large-scale conflict is negligible, mobilization against state policy is not automatically negative. Indeed, nonviolent social protest movements can be important forces for productive change. Social movements often push states to adopt policies that ultimately enhance both food security and sociopolitical stability by offering some redress for longstanding structural grievances that might otherwise lead to violence, even war.

This leads directly to the second fundamental point: the greatest dangers come not from lower-level instability associated with protests, riots, and work stoppages, but rather from violence at scale, especially in the form of organized civil or interstate war. Preserving peace is far more important, in human, economic, and geostrategic terms, than is maintaining stability. Indeed, a certain level of nonviolent instability can help to secure a stable peace if it compels the state to take actions that preempt the intensification and spread of deeper structural grievances—actions it would not choose without pressure. Riots are dangerous to local populations primarily insofar as they enable an opposition to build larger, more durable coalitions for violent political struggle against a regime. State and private actions can defuse more threatening and dangerous guerilla movements, terrorism, and civil or interstate war. Underappreciation of the central place of preventive and responsive action in mediating the relationship between food security and sociopolitical stability is perhaps the greatest deficiency of recent debates, which tend to treat the sociopolitical risks of food insecurity as driven largely by exogenous forcing variables such as climate or global market prices.

#### Adaptation makes agriculture resilient

* plants are being modified to be successful in droughts
* ocean and island crops are resilient to rising sea levels and salinity
* livestock resistant to diseases
* livestock prepared for droughts

FAOUN 19 [FAO COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE @ UN, “THE STATE OF THE WORLD’s BIODIVERSITY FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE”, https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/fao-report.pdf]

Maintaining, using and developing adapted genetic resources A number of countries note the significance of well-adapted species, varieties or breeds in terms of enhancing resilience to climate change. Several specific examples of how such components of BFA have been utilized in adaptation efforts are provided. For example, Papua New Guinea mentions the distribution to farmers of crop accessions identified in ex situ collections as being tolerant to salinity (taro and cassava varieties), drought (cassava, banana and aibika13 varieties) and flooding (taro and banana varieties). It notes that this activity proved very useful in sustaining food security during the drought that struck the country in 2015 and 2016,14 when 40 percent of the population was seriously affected. Panama reports that its criollo livestock breeds have a combination of characteristics that are not found in any introduced breeds, including high fertility rates, longevity, resistance to parasites and diseases and good grazing abilities, including the ability to make use of poor-quality pastures. It notes, in particular, the potential of two locally adapted cattle breeds, the Guaymi and the Guabal^, in climate change adaptation. It also mentions, among its climate change adaptation measures, the development of maize varieties and hybrids that are tolerant of drought and diplodia rot (a fungal disease) and that grow well in soils with low nitrogen levels. With regard to choices at species level, Sudan reports that some of its livestock keepers have replaced cattle and sheep with dromedaries and goats, as the latter species are better suited to a climate change-affected environment that is more prone to droughts.

Some countries note the significance of participatory breeding programmes in the context of climate change. For example, Oman mentions that local wheat and barley landraces have been improved through such programmes to obtain varieties that have shorter growing seasons and can be managed more flexibly, especially during years with prolonged periods of extreme heat and limited water availability. Ensuring farmers have access to the adapted germplasm they need is another issue highlighted. Nepal, for example, mentions the role of community-based seed banks in providing farmers with immediate access to locally adapted germplasm that can be used in efforts to cope with climate change.

#### US supply isn’t key to global ag.

Charles 13, NPR’s food and agriculture correspondent. Citing Margaret Mellon, a scientist with the environmental advocacy group Union of Concerned Scientists. (Dan, 9/17/13, “American Farmers Say They Feed The World, But Do They?”, *NPR*, https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2013/09/17/221376803/american-farmers-say-they-feed-the-world-but-do-they)

And this is why the words “feed the world” grate on the nerves of people who believe that large-scale, technology-driven agriculture is bad for the environment and often bad for people. Margaret Mellon, a scientist with the environmental advocacy group Union of Concerned Scientists, recently wrote an essay in which she confessed to developing an allergy to that phrase. “If there’s a controversy, the show-stopper is supposed to be, ‘We have to use pesticides, or we won’t be able to feed the world!’ “ she says. Mellon says it’s time to set that idea aside. It doesn’t answer the concerns that people have about modern agriculture — and it’s not even true. American-style farming doesn’t really grow food for hungry people, she says. Forty percent of the biggest crop — corn — goes into fuel for cars. Most of the second-biggest crop — soybeans — is fed to animals. Growing more grain isn’t the solution to hunger anyway, she says. If you’re really trying to solve that problem, there’s a long list of other steps that are much more important. “We need to empower women; we need to raise incomes; we need infrastructure in the developing world; we need the ability to get food to market without spoiling.”

#### COVID thumps food security.

Rudolfsen 20, doctoral researcher at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University and PRIO. (Ida, 7/27/20, "COVID-19, Food Access, and Social Upheaval", *Climate & Conflict*, https://blogs.prio.org/ClimateAndConflict/2020/07/covid-19-food-access-and-social-upheaval/)

According to the World Food Program’s (WFP) latest report, the COVID-19 pandemic will lead to an 82 percent increase in global food insecurity, affecting around 270 million people by the end of the year. On June 29, the organization announced it is undertaking its largest humanitarian effort to assist an increasing number of food-insecure low- and middle-income countries. In a statement about the plan, WFP Executive Director David Beasley said that “until the day we have a medical vaccine, food is the best vaccine against chaos. Without it, we could see increased social unrest and protests, a rise in migration, deepening conflict, and widespread under-nutrition among populations that were previously immune from hunger.”

Why is the pandemic leading to more food insecurity? And why is David Beasley talking about social unrest and protest in connection with food?

As COVID-19 spreads around the world, fears are mounting of how the pandemic might impact and disrupt food distribution channels (e.g., transport disruptions) and disruption in the production of staple foods (e.g., labor shortages due to quarantine measures).

So far, food supply chains have been defined as essential by governments, exempting them from most lockdown measures. Thus, the impact on supply chains has been indirect, mainly caused by reduced income and remittances. A loss of income makes it harder for poor people to access affordable food but also impacts food systems by making it more difficult for producers to sell foodstuffs, since consumer’s ability to buy food declines. Governments, especially in low- and middle-income countries, will therefore have to implement policies that avoid supply chain disruptions and higher food prices.

But what do food insecurity and food prices have to do with protest and violence? The answer: it’s complicated.

The pandemic is spreading at a time when the number of severely food insecure people in the world had already increased—by more than 820 million people before the pandemic started—adding stress to areas already hardly hit by extreme weather events, armed conflict, and low economic development. However, most of these areas have not seen widespread unrest.

## 5G

### 1NR---U---5G

#### America wins the 5G race now. China gooses the stats.

Brake ’20 [Doug and Alexa Bruer; November 30; J.D. from the University of Colorado, a recognized broadband policy expert, Hatfield Scholar at the FCC; Policy Analyst at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, Public Policy Master’s from Harvard; Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, “The Great 5G Race: Is China Really Beating the United States?” https://itif.org/publications/2020/11/30/great-5g-race-china-really-beating-united-states]

5G USERS VERSUS SUBSCRIBERS

Many reports likely overstate the extent of Chinese 5G deployment for several reasons. Part of this is likely due to intentional inflation of statistics reported by operators under pressure from Chinese authorities. This is a long-standing practice in China, going back at least as far as Mao and agricultural communes reporting fake crop yields so as not to displease leadership.4 And today they are not unique to the telecom sector, as organizations of all kinds inflate numbers in order to meet Beijing’s expectations. The Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) put out a statement encouraging telecommunications providers to “accelerate user migration to 5G through measures such as package upgrade offer, and credit purchases, etc.”5 Providers then started encouraging or even forcing customers to upgrade to 5G subscriptions regardless of their actual need, use, or device.6 Some companies reduced 5G subscription prices so much they are even cheaper than staying on a 4G plan.7 As one reporter put it, “[W]ith all of China’s big telcos slashing 5G package prices in the past few months, it could well be that customers are being drawn in more by attractive tariffs than by a desire to get their hands on the latest hardware and its related capabilities.”8 The push for 5G subscribers was evident before 5G was even activated: Although 5G service was not turned on in China until November of 2019, Chinese telecom providers listed 9 million 5G users in October 2019, a month prior to its actual activation.9

By counting anyone on a 5G plan—even if they only have a 4G device connecting to 4G infrastructure—as a 5G subscriber, and measuring individual base stations instead of cell sites, China’s 5G stats paint a misleading picture.

Apparently, the numbers game went too far, as the MIIT later called upon providers to “clean up” reporting and end aggressive sales practices after news of subscriber inflation spread.10 But current numbers are still plagued with confusion. Consider that China Telecom and China Mobile (the two largest operators in China) reported 150 million “5G package customers” as of September 2020. But according to China’s Academy for Information and Communications Technology, only 94 million 5G devices had been shipped for all of China during the same time frame, indicating a sizable gap between the number of “subscribers” and actual 5G users.11

The discrepancy may be due largely to terminology: “5G package customers” is a blanket term often used by Chinese carriers to refer to anyone on a 5G subscription, regardless of whether they actually have a 5G device or access to a 5G network.12 China Mobile acknowledges that they count anyone “who has subscribed to 5G tariff plans” as a 5G customer.13 The number of 5G-capable devices alone is impressive, and the competitive threat from China justifies a thoughtful policy response, but no one should be worked into a panic by goosed stats.

NETWORK DEPLOYMENT: BASE STATIONS VERSUS CELL SITES

Subscriptions are not the only potentially misunderstood stat. Chinese operators tend to count mobile infrastructure differently from how Western operators generally do. The key difference is between cell sites (how U.S. telecommunications operators typically measure deployment) and base stations (how Chinese telecommunications operators typically measure deployment). A cell site usually refers to the entire area of a given tower, which includes potentially multiple base stations and antennas using different spectrum. The term “base station” generally refers to the equipment each carrier uses to send signals over multiple antennas at the cell site. Often one cell site will have multiple base stations, sometimes it will host only one. But generally, it is not a one-to-one conversion between base stations and cell sites or towers; It is important that these numbers are not conflated to mean the same thing.

Deployment figures are often further mischaracterized because of the way Chinese operators sometimes count each spectrum band as a separate “logical” base station instead of actual pieces of equipment.14 Just like how a Wi-Fi router can work on different spectrum (generally 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz), a mobile base station can operate on multiple spectrum bands. American carriers would generally count a multi-spectrum base station as at most one piece of equipment. But some Chinese reporting apparently treats each individual spectrum band a base station supports as a different “logical site.”15 A representative from Huawei explained that “a China Unicom base station supports GSM 900, GSM 1800, WCDMA 2100 and LTE. Most of the equipment is deployed in the same room at one physical site, but there are four bands, so there are four logical sites.”16

As a result, Chinese numbers could easily be misrepresented as three to four times higher compared with how Western operators tend to count equipment.17 Policymakers and the media should take care not to conflate estimates of base stations for logical sites with actual, physical cell sites—these are two totally different measurements. For a rough comparison, it seems fair to assume two or three base stations per cell site, but the number of logical sites—meaning each spectrum band used—could be many more.

ACTUAL PERFORMANCESS

The raw number of base stations is not always a good measure of a network’s performance. What we really care about is a network’s performance for the population it covers. Measuring performance becomes increasingly complicated with 5G’s diverse spectrum assets, some of which do not use the traditional cellular architecture.

The utilization of different spectrum resources or amounts of bandwidth results in varying levels of performance even with equal levels of infrastructure. This is relevant when comparing China, which so far uses exclusively mid-band spectrum for 5G, with the United States, which has made a large push to focus on high-band coverage. High-band 5G offers the highest performance leap over existing networks, at least where it is available.

But that being said, let’s try a rough comparison, assuming the similar spectrum assets and using China’s announcement that it anticipates 600,000 5G base stations by the end of 2020.18 Assume three base stations per Chinese cell site—one for each of the major operators—and we get about 200,000 sites. This could be several times lower if we’re talking logical sites, but it is hard to say—let’s keep the estimate conservative and set that issue aside.

The population served also plays a big role in the performance of a given network. China’s population is about 1.39 billion. This is about 4.5 times larger than that of the United States, indicating Chinese operators will need roughly 4.5 times as many base stations as their U.S. counterparts to get a similar level of performance for each user (all else being equal). So, those 200,000 sites work out to about 1 site per 7,000 people. In 2019 alone, U.S. operators invested in 5G-ready cell sites and added 46,000 new cell sites—roughly 1 site per 7,134 people.19 To the uninformed, 600,000 base stations might sound alarming, but understanding what those numbers mean, we’re about neck-and-neck. If we assume that the Chinese sites include logical sites, and the spectral efficiency of their base stations is less, then it appears the United States is clearly in the lead.

Slow and steady may win the race. Whereas the United States is pursuing a gradual, economical deployment of 5G, the problems with China’s rushed 5G deployments are already starting to show. One of Huawei’s own executives went so far as to call China’s 5G “fake, dumb and poor,” mostly due to poor integration with the 4G network.21 Another former official warned in a recent speech that China’s 5G push could become a failed investment.22 While China is no doubt investing substantially in the expansion of its 5G network, including by pressuring its state-owned carriers to invest faster than the market demands, Chinese figures must be properly scrutinized when using them to make U.S. policy decisions.

#### Wrong. China has more subscribers BUT won’t innovate the best applications.

Soon ’19 [Stella; November 26; reporter, citing Adam Segal, director of the digital and cyberspace policy program at CFR, and Paul Triolo, geo-technology practice head at Eurasia Group; CNBC, “Here’s how the US can beat China in the race for dominance in next generation networks,” https://www.cnbc.com/2019/11/26/5g-race-how-the-us-can-beat-china-in-the-competition-for-dominance.html]

While China has embraced next generation networks at a faster pace, experts say the U.S. still has some advantages in the competition for dominance.

China rolled out its 5G networks nationwide on Nov. 1, with three of its state-owned carriers offering plans for the service. One week later, Beijing said it launched research and development efforts into 6G networks.

5G refers to mobile networks with super-fast data speeds that can support technologies like driverless cars. While 6G refers to the next generation of networks, 5G is still in its early stages as much of the world still operates on 4G networks.

“There will be a tendency to cast these developments as another sign that the United States is losing the race for the next generation of communication technologies,” Adam Segal, director of the digital and cyberspace policy program at CFR, wrote in a separate note earlier this month.

“But the United States still has strengths to play,” Segal said. “U.S. companies can dominate the applications and services that run over 5G.”

Just because China switched on its networks first does not mean that the competition is over.

That’s where the United States’ innovative capacity could give it an advantage, said Paul Triolo, geo-technology practice head at Eurasia Group. U.S. technology companies have already been working on autonomous vehicles, augmented reality, and virtual reality, which he explained could be the first few killer applications of 5G.

“Even as China rolls out 5G a little faster, the U.S. will eventually roll out 5G in enough breadth and scope that U.S. will be able to innovate on top of it,” said Triolo.

### 1NR---!D---Cyber

#### Uncertainty alone checks.

Lewis 18, PhD, a senior vice president at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (James Andrew, 1-1-2018, “Rethinking Cybersecurity: Strategy, Mass Effect, and States”, pg. 29, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep22408.8?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents>)

This upper bound on cyber attack is affected by the likelihood of attribution. If an attacker was confident that it could avoid having the attack attributed to it, the risk of retaliation would be reduced, making some attacks more attractive. Uncertainty about attribution capabilities, particularly American capabilities, combined with uncertainty about the effectiveness of cyber attack, creates caution. Public expressions of uncertainty about attribution are not shared by opponents, who know when they have been caught. Over the last decade, the United States has made a major effort to improve its attribution capabilities and has succeeded to the point where no opponent can be confident about anonymity and this, if linked to truly credible threats to impose consequences, may finally produce the cyber deterrence so long sought by the United States.

The implicit threshold governing cyber attack is the line between force and coercion. With very few exceptions, states have avoided cyber actions that could be judged as the use of force, based on international understandings on what actions qualify as the use of force or armed attack. Opponents have engaged in cyber actions below this implicit threshold with impunity, but they are reluctant to cross it for fear of creating a situation that they cannot control. In this, cyber incidents are more like border incursions or bandit raids than attacks.

Public sources suggest that at least seven countries have used cyber tools for coercive purposes. However, they have been careful to avoid anything that could be interpreted as the use of force, and they have avoided physical destruction or casualties. This suggests that countries prefer actions that advance their strategic goals without creating unmanageable risk of escalation into armed conflict. Opponents calculate the advantage they would gain from an attack against the potential cost. Miscalculation is possible, but if anything, opponents appear more likely to overestimate the risk of retaliation.

#### 3---no motivation.

Lewis 18, PhD, a senior vice president at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (James Andrew, 1-1-2018, “Rethinking Cybersecurity: Strategy, Mass Effect, and States”, pg. 7-9, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep22408.5?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents>) \*language edited---brackets

The most dangerous and damaging attacks required resources and engineering knowledge that are beyond the capabilities of nonstate actors, and those who possess such capabilities consider their use in the context of some larger strategy to achieve national goals. Precision and predictability—always desirable in offensive operations in order to provide assured effect and economy of force—suggest that the risk of collateral damage is smaller than we assume, and with this, so is the risk of indiscriminate or mass effect.

State Use of Cyber Attack Is Consistent with Larger Strategic Aims

Based on a review of state actions to date, cyber operations give countries a new way to implement existing policies rather than leading them to adopt new policy or strategies. State opponents use cyber techniques in ways consistent with their national strategies and objectives. But for now, cyber may be best explained as an addition to the existing portfolio of tools available to nations.

Cyber operations are ideal for achieving the strategic effect our opponents seek in this new environment. How nations use cyber techniques will be determined by their larger needs and interests, by their strategies, experience, and institutions, and by their tolerance for risk. Cyber operations provide unparalleled access to targets, and the only constraint on attackers is the risk of retaliation—a risk they manage by avoiding actions that would provoke a damaging response. This is done by staying below an implicit threshold on what can be considered the use of force in cyberspace.

The reality of cyber attack differs greatly from our fears. Analysts place a range of hypothetical threats, often accompanied by extreme consequences, before the public without considering the probability of occurrence or the likelihood that opponents will choose a course of action that does not advance their strategic aims and creates grave risk of damaging escalation. Our opponents’ goals are not to carry out a cyber 9/11. While there have been many opponent probes of critical infrastructure facilities in numerous countries, the number of malicious cyber actions that caused physical damage can be counted on one hand. While opponents have probed critical infrastructure networks, there is no indication that they are for the purposes of the kind of [devastating] crippling strategic attacks against critical infrastructure that dominated planning in the Second World War or the Cold War.

Similarly, the popular idea that opponents use cyber techniques to inflict cumulative economic harm is not supported by evidence. Economic warfare has always been part of conflict, but there are no examples of a country seeking to imperceptibly harm the economy of an opponent. The United States engaged in economic warfare during the Cold War, and still uses sanctions as a tool of foreign power, but few if any other nations do the same. The intent of cyber espionage is to gain market or technological advantage. Coercive actions against government agencies or companies are intended to intimidate. Terrorists do not seek to inflict economic damage. The difficulty of wreaking real harm on large, interconnected economies is usually ignored.

Economic warfare in cyberspace is ascribed to China, but China’s cyber doctrine has three elements: control of cyberspace to preserve party rule and political stability, espionage (both commercial and military), and preparation for disruptive acts to damage an opponent’s weapons, military information systems, and command and control. “Strategic” uses, such as striking civilian infrastructure in the opponent’s homeland, appear to be a lower priority and are an adjunct to nuclear strikes as part of China’s strategic deterrence. Chinese officials seem more concerned about accelerating China’s growth rather than some long-term effort to undermine the American economy.6 The 2015 agreement with the United States served Chinese interests by centralizing tasking authority in Beijing and ending People’s Liberation Army (PLA) “freelancing” against commercial targets.

The Russians specialize in coercion, financial crime, and creating harmful cognitive effect—the ability to manipulate emotions and decisionmaking. Under their 2010 military doctrine on disruptive information operations (part of what they call “New Generation Warfare”). Russians want confusion, not physical damage. Iran and North Korea use cyber actions against American banks or entertainment companies like Sony or the Sands Casino, but their goal is political coercion, not destruction.

None of these countries talk about death by 1000 cuts or attacking critical infrastructure to produce a cyber Pearl Harbor or any of the other scenarios that dominate the media. The few disruptive attacks on critical infrastructure have focused almost exclusively on the energy sector. Major financial institutions face a high degree of risk but in most cases, the attackers’ intent is to extract money. There have been cases of service disruption and data erasure, but these have been limited in scope. Denial-of-service attacks against banks impede services and may be costly to the targeted bank, but do not have a major effect on the national economy. In all of these actions, there is a line that countries have been unwilling to cross.

When our opponents decided to challenge American “hegemony,” they developed strategies to circumvent the risks of retaliation or escalation by ensuring that their actions stayed below the use-of-force threshold—an imprecise threshold, roughly defined by international law, but usually considered to involve actions that produce destruction or casualties. Almost all cyber attacks fall below this threshold, including, crime, espionage, and politically coercive acts. This explains why the decades-long quest to rebuild Cold War deterrence in cyberspace has been fruitless.

It also explains why we have not seen the dreaded cyber Pearl Harbor or other predicted catastrophes. Opponents are keenly aware that launching catastrophe brings with it immense risk of receiving catastrophe in return. States are the only actors who can carry out catastrophic cyber attacks and they are very unlikely to do so in a strategic environment that seeks to gain advantage without engaging in armed conflict. Decisions on targets and attack make sense only when embedded in their larger strategic calculations regarding how best to fight with the United States.

There have been thousands of incidents of cybercrime and cyber espionage, but only a handful of true attacks, where the intent was not to extract information or money, but to disrupt and, in a few cases, destroy. From these incidents, we can extract a more accurate picture of risk. The salient incidents are the cyber operations against Iran’s nuclear weapons facility (Stuxnet), Iran’s actions against Aramco and leading American banks, North Korean interference with Sony and with South Korean banks and television stations, and Russian actions against Estonia, Ukrainian power facilities, Canal 5 (television network in France), and the 2016 U.S. presidential elections. Cyber attacks are not random. All of these incidents have been part of larger geopolitical conflicts involving Iran, Korea, and the Ukraine, or Russia’s contest with the United States and NATO.

There are commonalities in each attack. All were undertaken by state actors or proxy forces to achieve the attacking state’s policy objectives. Only two caused tangible damage; the rest created coercive effect, intended to create confusion and psychological pressure through fear, uncertainty, and embarrassment. In no instance were there deaths or casualties. In two decades of cyber attacks, there has never been a single casualty. This alone should give pause to the doomsayers. Nor has there been widespread collateral damage.

### 1NR---!D---Heg

#### 2---alternative explanations for stability outweigh.

Fettweis 20, Associate Professor of Political Science at Tulane University.. (Christopher J., 6-3-2020, "Delusions of Danger: Geopolitical Fear and Indispensability in U.S. Foreign Policy", *A Dangerous World? Threat Perception and U.S. National Security*, https://www.cato.org/publications/publications/delusions-danger-geopolitical-fear-indispensability-us-foreign-policy)

Many of the factors that contribute to geopolitical fear — Manichaeism, religiosity, various vested interests, and neoconservatism — also help explain American exceptionalism and the indispensability fallacy. And unipolarity makes hegemonic delusions possible. With the great power of the United States comes a sense of great responsibility: to serve and protect humanity, to drive history in positive directions. More than any other single factor, the people of the United States tend to believe that they are indispensable because they are powerful, and power tends to blind states to their limitations. “Wealth shapes our international behavior and our image,” observed Derek Leebaert. “It brings with it the freedom to make wide‐​ranging choices well beyond common sense.“49 It is quite likely that the world does not need the United States to enforce peace. In fact, if virtually any of the overlapping and mutually reinforcing explanations for the current stability are correct, the trends in international security may well prove difficult to reverse. None of the contributing factors that are commonly suggested (economic development, complex interdependence, nuclear weapons, international institutions, democracy, shifting global norms on war) seem poised to disappear any time soon.50 The world will probably continue its peaceful ways for the near future, at the very least, no matter what the United States chooses to do or not do. As Robert Jervis concluded while pondering the likely effects of U.S. restraint on decisions made in foreign capitals, “It is very unlikely that pulling off the American security blanket would lead to thoughts of war.“51 The United States will remain fundamentally safe no matter what it does — in other words, despite widespread beliefs in its inherent indispensability to the contrary.