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**Standards-Setting Organizations** [SSO’s] **are industry members who jointly establish standards for information tech defined by the adoption of standard-essential patents** [SEP’s]**, which are licensed to companies who wish to implement the tech in their product, called implementers, on Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory** [FRAND] **terms. Current standards promote price gouging, FRAND enforcement is critical.**

**Melamed & Shapiro 18**, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

I. Standard Setting and the Competitive Process

The **fundamental economics** in the **information technology** sector, driven by **network effects**, implies that there is **enormous value** associated with establishing compatibility standards. Popular standards include the mobile broadband standards used in cell phones, which are established by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), and the Wi-Fi technology for wireless local area networks, which is enabled by the 802.11 standard established by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).4

There are many SSOs, and their rules and procedures differ considerably. In addition to IEEE, leading SSOs include the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).5 SSOs generally establish standards by holding a series of committee meetings among industry participants. These meetings culminate in a vote on a technical specification that describes what features or attributes a product must have in order to comply with the standard. Most SSOs are open to all industry participants and seek to operate on a consensus basis, applying certain voting rules. SSOs do not normally engage in patent licensing, nor do they specify how patent royalties will be divided up among patent holders. They leave that to their members, which in some cases form patent pools to address these issues.6

SSOs adopt specific policies relating to intellectual property rights (IPRs).7 These IPR policies are generally intended to enable the SEP holders to obtain reasonable royalties for licensing their patents, while prohibiting them from charging excessive royalties after other industry participants have committed to the standard. At that point, firms committed to implementing the standard— which we call “implementers”—would find it **very costly** to avoid using the patented technology. For this purpose, most SSOs require SEP owners to license their SEPs on FRAND terms.8

FRAND policies are especially necessary because negotiations between SEP holders and implementers generally **take place only after** the implementers have used and infringed the technologies claimed by the SEPs. Standards involving information and communications technology can involve hundreds or even **thousands of SEPs**, many with **uncertain boundaries** for infringement. In addition, a time lag exists between patent application and patent issuance. For these and other reasons, it is **impractical** for implementers to enter into negotiations for patent licenses with all SEP owners prior to the establishment of a standard and to their implementation of it.9

The fact that patent negotiations generally do not take place until after implementers have used and infringed the technologies has several critical implications. First, at the time of negotiation, implementers are **locked into the standard** and the technologies claimed by the SEPs—that is, the **cost to switch** to an alternative technology or standard at that point—ex post—is **much greater** than it was ex ante, before the patented technology was first included in the standard. Ex post, the patent holder is no longer competing to have its technology included in the standard, nor is it competing to have implementers of the standard use its technology. Instead, because the patent holder owns an asset that is essential to the standard, implementers have no choice but to use the patented technology.

If the standard is commercially successful, implementers are willing to pay a much larger royalty for use of the patented technology than they would have paid ex ante, when the SEP holder faced competition from other technologies. In these circumstances, the SEP holder can be said to have obtained **monopoly power** in the market in which the patented technology is licensed for use in implementing the standard.10

Second, because of lock-in and the implementer’s ongoing infringement, the **potential for litigation looms large** in licensing negotiations. In effect, the parties are negotiating about how to settle an infringement suit, and that negotiation is **heavily influenced** by their predictions as to what the court will do if they cannot agree. This situation is not unique to SEPs; it arises frequently when firms are faced with patent infringement claims for products they have independently developed or technologies they have inadvertently infringed. Patent law addresses such instances by specifying that patent holders are entitled to “**reasonable royalties**,” defined as the royalties that the parties would have negotiated prior to the infringement and thus prior to lock-in.11 Those hypothetical ex ante royalties reflect the market value of the patent license. Notwithstanding the law’s embrace of this principle, however, as a practical matter, patent holders are **generally able to recover more** than the **ex ante value** of the patent when litigation occurs after the implementers are locked in. Further, negotiations in the shadow of litigation after lock-in tend to **result in royalties in excess** of the ex ante or **market value** of the patented technology.12

Third, the shadow of litigation is **particularly problematic** in the communications and technology sector, in which products typically include hundreds or **thousands** of **patented technologies**. A court-ordered injunction involving such products would deprive the implementer of not only the value of the technology covered by the patent-in-suit, but also the value of the **entire product**.13 Implementers that are forced to bear the risk of an injunction are thus **induced to agree to royalties** greater than those that would be **appropriate** if only the value of the patented technology were at stake. Those royalties **systematically provide** SEP holders with **excessive compensation** in comparison with the benchmark of ex ante royalties.

These implications of lock-in and ex post dealings are well-understood: they represent an example of the **general concept** of **lock-in** and **opportunism** developed by Oliver Williamson.14 The Federal Circuit has also recognized the market distortions caused by the inclusion of patented technologies in public standards and the resulting danger of patent holdup involving SEPs.15

For these and other reasons, the SEP holder has ex post monopoly power that, if left unchecked, would enable it to obtain royalties **far in excess** of the royalties that it could earn in a competitive market.16 To address this common problem and limit ex post opportunism by SEP holders, SSOs typically require participants that own SEPs to make certain FRAND commitments. In particular, by requiring a commitment to license on “fair and reasonable” terms, the FRAND requirement aims to prevent, or at least reduce, the **extent of monopoly pricing** by SEP holders. And by requiring a commitment to license on “nondiscriminatory” terms, the FRAND requirement can prevent SEP holders from **extracting monopoly premiums** by selective licensing or, more important, migrating their monopoly power from the FRAND-regulated market to unregulated standard-implementing product markets by licensing to only one or a few implementers or licensing to selected implementers on discriminatorily favorable terms.

**Patent holdup is accentuated by the Ninth Circuit’s recent decision in *FTC v. Qualcomm* that permits ICT firms to engage in innovation-stifling conduct with antitrust impunity.**

**Moss 20**, \*Alex Moss is a Staff Attorney on EFF’s intellectual property team, before joining EFF, Alex practiced complex commercial litigation at Sullivan & Cromwell LLP in New York and Durie Tangri LLP in San Francisco; (August 26th, 2020, “Throwing Out the FTC's Suit Against Qualcomm Moves Antitrust Law in the Wrong Direction”, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2020/08/throwing-out-ftcs-suit-against-qualcomm-moves-antitrust-law-wrong-direction)

Standards can enhance **competition** and **consumer choice**, but they also **massively inflate** the **value** of **patents** deemed **essential** to the standard, and give their owners the power to **sue companies** that implement the standard for **money damages** or **injunctions** to block them from using their SEPs. When standards cover critical features like wireless connectivity, SEP owners wield a huge amount of **“hold-up” power** because their patents allow them to effectively **block access** to the **standard** altogether. That lets them charge **unduly large tolls** to anyone who wants to implement the standard.

To minimize that risk, standard-setting organizations typically require companies that want their patented technology incorporated into a standard to promise in advance to license their SEPs to others on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. But that promise strikes at a **key tension** between antitrust and patent law: patent owners have **no obligation** to let anyone use technology their patent covers, but to get those technologies incorporated into standards, patent owners usually have to promise that they will give **permission** to anyone who wants to implement the standard as long as they pay a reasonable license fee.

Qualcomm is one of the most **important** and **dominant** companies in the **history** of **wireless** communication standards. It is a multinational conglomerate that has owned patents on every major wireless communication standard since its first CDMA patent in 1985, and it **participates** in the **s**tandard-**s**etting **o**rganization**s** that define those standards. Qualcomm is somewhat unique in that it not only **licenses SEPs**, but also **supplies** the **modem chips** used by a wide range of devices. These include chips that **implement** wireless communication **standards**, which lie at the **heart** of every mobile **computing device**.

Although Qualcomm promised to license its SEPs (including patents essential to CDMA, 3G, 4G, and 5G) on FRAND terms, its conduct has to many looked **unfair**, **unreasonable**, and **highly discriminatory**. In particular, Qualcomm has drawn scrutiny for bundling tens of thousands of patents together—including many that are **not** standard-**essential**—and offering portfolio-only licenses no matter what licensees actually **want** or **need**; refusing to sell modem chips to anyone without a SEP license and threatening to **withhold chips** from companies trying to **negotiate** different license terms; **refusing** to license anyone other than original-equipment manufacturers (OEMs); and insisting on **royalties** calculated as a **percentage** of the **sale price** of a handset sold to end users for hundreds of dollars, despite the minimal contribution of any particular patent to the retail value.

In 2017, the U.S. Federal Trade Commission [sued](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2017/01/ftc-charges-qualcomm-monopolizing-key-semiconductor-device-used) Qualcomm for violating both sections of the Sherman Antitrust Act by engaging in a number of anticompetitive SEP licensing practices. In May 2019, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California agreed with the FTC, identifying numerous instances of Qualcomm’s unlawful, anticompetitive conduct in a comprehensive [233-page opinion](https://www.eff.org/document/ftc-v-qualcomm-district-court-opinion). We were pleased to see the FTC take action and the district court credit the overwhelming evidence that Qualcomm’s conduct is corrosive to market-based competition and threatens to cement Qualcomm’s dominance for years to come.

But this month, a panel of judges from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit unanimously [overturned](https://www.eff.org/document/ninth-circuit-opinion-ftc-v-qualcomm) the district court’s decision, reasoning that Qualcomm’s conduct was “hypercompetitive” but not “anticompetitive,” and therefore not a violation of antitrust law. To reach that result, the Ninth Circuit made the patent grant more powerful and antitrust law weaker than ever.

According to the Ninth Circuit, patent owners don’t have a duty to let anyone use what their patent covers, and therefore Qualcomm had no duty to license its SEPs to anyone. But that framing requires **ignoring** the **promises** Qualcomm made to license its SEPs on **reasonable** and **non-discriminatory** terms—promises that courts in this country and around the world have **consistently** enforced. It also means ignoring antitrust principles like the essential facilities doctrine, which limits the ability of a monopolist with **hold-up power** over an **essential facility** (like a port) to **shut out** rivals. Instead, the Ninth Circuit held rather simplistically that a duty to deal could arise only if the monopolist had provided access, and then reversed its policy.

But even when Qualcomm restricted its licensing policies in critical ways, the Ninth Circuit found reasons to approve those restrictions. For example, Qualcomm stopped licensing its patents to chip manufacturers and started licensing them only to OEMs. This had a major benefit: it let Qualcomm charge a much **higher royalty rate** based on the **high retail price** of the end user devices, like smartphones and tablets, that OEMs make and sell. If Qualcomm had continued to license to chip suppliers, its patents would be “**exhausted**” once the chips were sold to OEMs, extinguishing Qualcomm’s right to assert its patents and control how the chips were used.

Patent exhaustion is a century-old doctrine that protects the rights of consumers to use things they buy without getting the patent owner’s permission again and again. Patent exhaustion is important because it **prevents price-gouging**, but also because it protects **space** for **innovation** by letting people **use things** they buy **freely**, including to build innovations of their own. The doctrine thus helps patent law serve its underlying goal—promoting economic **growth** and **innovation**. In other words, the doctrine of exhaustion is baked into the patent grant; it is not optional. Nevertheless, the Ninth Circuit wholeheartedly approved of Qualcomm’s efforts to avoid **exhaustion**—even when that meant **cutting off** access to **previous licensees** (chip-makers) in ways that let Qualcomm charge **far more** in **licensing fees** than its SEPs **could possibly** have **contributed** to the **retail value** of the **final product**.

It makes **no sense** that Qualcomm could **contract around** a fundamental principle like patent **exhaustion**, but at the same time **did not assume** any **antitrust duty** to deal under these circumstances. Worse, it’s **harmful** for the **economy**, **innovation**, and **consumers**. Unfortunately, the kind of harm that antitrust law recognizes is limited to harm affecting “competition” or the “competitive process.” Antitrust law, at least as the Ninth Circuit interprets it, doesn’t do nearly enough to address the **harm** downstream consumers experience when they pay **inflated** prices for high-tech devices, and miss out on **innovation** that might have developed from fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory licensing practices.

We hope the FTC sticks to its guns and asks the Ninth Circuit to go en banc and reconsider this decision. Otherwise, antitrust law will become an even **weaker weapon** against **innovation-stifling conduct** in **technology markets.**

**Weakened antitrust enforcement emboldens firms to follow Qualcomm’s lead, which collapses FRAND integrity.**

**Hovenkamp 20**, \*Herbert J. Hovenkamp is James G. Dinan University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania; (2020, “FRAND and Antitrust”, <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3095&context=faculty_scholarship>)

While the FRAND process has been highly productive, it is also **fragile**. Firms are tempted to make commitments at the beginning when the incentive to join is large, but **renege** on them **later** when they can profit by doing so. At least in this particular case, private FRAND enforcement **had not worked** very well. Qualcomm had been able to violate FRAND commitments in order to **exclude rivals** and obtain **higher royalties** than FRAND would permit, largely with **impunity**. Other firms will very likely **follow Qualcomm’s lead**. If that happens the **FRAND system** will **fall apart**, doing **irreparable injury** to the modern wireless telecommunications network or, at the very least, **diminishing** the **leadership role** of the United States in preserving effective **network competition**.

While governments can be heavily involved in standard set-ting,9 the implementation of technical standards in information technologies is largely the work of private actors. Government involvement is limited mainly to enforcement of contract, intellectual property, or antitrust law. As private actors, those involved in standard setting or compliance are fully subject to the federal antitrust laws.

This Article addresses one question: when is an SSO participant’s violation of a FRAND commitment an antitrust violation, and if it is, of what kind and what are the implications for remedies? It warns against two extremes. One is thinking that any violation of a FRAND commitment is an antitrust violation as well. In the first instance FRAND obligations are contractual, and most breaches of contract do not violate any antitrust law. The other extreme is thinking that, because a FRAND violation is a breach of contract, it cannot also be an antitrust violation. The question of an antitrust violation does not de-pend on whether the conduct breached a particular agreement but rather on whether it caused competitive harm. This can happen because the conduct restrained trade under section 1 of the Sherman Act, was unreasonably exclusionary under section 2 of the Sherman Act, or amounted to an anticompetitive condition or understanding as defined by section 3 of the Clay-ton Act.10 The end goal is to identify practices that harm com-petition, thereby injuring consumers.

The Ninth Circuit’s Qualcomm decision will make antitrust violations in the context of FRAND licensing much more **difficult to prove**, even in cases where **anticompetitive behavior** and consumer harm **seem clear**.11 Indeed, in this case the court itself acknowledged the harm to consumers but appeared to think that they were not entitled to protection.12 If this decision stands, FRAND obligations will to a **larger extent** have to be settled through private litigation and the federal antitrust enforcement agencies will have a **diminished role**. Anticompetitive behavior by one firm that is **not effectively disciplined** will lead **others** to do the **same thing**.

**A trusted and credible system for ICT innovation is critical to rapid tech diffusion and economic growth---absent FRAND, the system will collapse.**

**Bauer et al. 17**, \*Matthias Bauer is Senior Economist at ECIPE; \*Fredrik Erixon is a Swedish economist and writer. He has been the Director of the European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) ever since its start in 2006; (October 2017, “Standard Essential Patents and the Quest for Faster Diffusion of Technology”, https://ecipe.org/publications/standard-essential-patents/)

It is easy to take a **pessimistic view** about whether the system will **break**. If the current trend continues, the system is **likely** to break at **some point** for the simple reason that companies will **not trust it** anymore. The series of legal disputes witnessed over the past years – sometimes referred to as the “smartphone patent wars” – has been fodder for a pessimistic reading of “the two tales of SEPs”. While it is common in the business world that disputes over patents and licenses are settled in courts, various SEP disputes have revealed **problematic** aspects of the SEP market that are different from those disputes that follow the normal stream of business and contracts. Often, the SEP disputes are less concerned about the rights and boundaries of patents, and more about **antitrust limits** to market **behavior**: they concern market **abusive practices** and **restrictions** to **competition** as much as they are about intellectual property.

If the SEP system actually **does break** at some point, the consequences would be **felt** throughout the **economy**. SEPs have been a **critical part** of the ICT revolution. SEPs have allowed for the **fast rates** of innovation **diffusion** that the world has witnessed over the **past quarter** of a **century**. All the computer and Internet related products and services that people are now dependent upon for their private and professional lives are **intricate webs** of intellectual property. As many as 250,000 patents can be used to claim ownership of some technical specification or design element in a single smartphone (NYT 2012). A laptop, suggests one calculation, implements more than 250 interoperability standards (Biddle et al. 2010), and the number of SEP holders for 3G and 4G standards grew from 2 in 1994 to 130 in 2013 while the number of SEPs rose from fewer than 150 in 1994 to more than 150,000 in 2013 (Galetovic and Gupta 2016). The standardization-body ETSI has registered more than 150,000 declarations of SEPs from companies, and ETSI is just one of many bodies in the world of ICT standardization. For the 3G standard, the same body has about 24,000 patents that have been declared essential. Now, with the economy yet again on the **threshold** of big technological change, a **trusted** and **credible system** for creators and users of technology to standardize proprietary technology would be a boon for **innovation**, **interoperability** and – ultimately – the **consumers**.

And there are reasons for optimism. Although many of the problems in the SEP regimes need to be addressed, the numbers above indicate that the SEP system is in fact attractive to patent holders and SEP implementers. It is easy to see why: neither holders nor implementers are presented with alternative options that on the face of it would be far more profitable for them. In other words, there simply would not be as many patents declared as essential if both creators and users of technology believed the SEP system worked to their disadvantage or was grossly unfair. While the reality for some companies may be that legal disputes and unpredictability prompt them to find other ways than SEPs to get access to key technologies for their products, it remains the case that most stakeholders have strong economic incentives to maintain a balanced SEP system that is trusted.

First, standard essential patents are an asset for creators of technology because, by becoming **essential** to a standard, their volumes of sales for technologies that users value rise **significantly**. As many holders want to raise more revenues for their SEPs and – ideally – have the freedom to contract with buyers on their terms, they can expand their customer base when they agree to sell patented technology in accordance with a set of rules that are designed to prevent SEP holders exploiting the weakness of a customer that has grown dependent on having access to their technology.

Second, SEPs are hugely **beneficial** also to those that buy the licenses – the implementers or users. Through the SEP system, they can access technologies that are **interoperable** and work with different **products** and **functionalities** – and they can do it under conditions that, if history is a guide, in most cases give them stable and predictable terms of contract. As a consequence, both creators and users can focus on their competitive advantages and profit on the economies of scale and specialization. Downstream firms do not need to develop their own upstream technology and upstream firms do not need to package their technologies in end-customer products in order to make their products valuable.

Third, standard-setting organisations (SSOs) also have a big stake in an SEP system that works well – and, like creators and users of technology, they would stand to lose significantly if the SEP system were to collapse.

Lastly, the biggest beneficiaries are individual consumers – those who buy the end products using FRAND-conditioned SEPs. The advent of SEPs and the rules represented by FRAND have enabled a **development** of fast technology creation and contributed to the **rapid diffusion** in ICT goods and ICT-based services. The SEP system has also allowed for new competition, both between existing technologies and brands, and from new ones that have stepped into the market with the ambition to disrupt it, again to the benefit of the consumer. It is **difficult** to imagine that the ICT and digital **development** would have been as **fast** as it has been if SEPs had not been a **central feature** of the **market**.

The changing fortunes of companies operating in the cellular and smartphone market would not have been possible if there had not been an SEP system that supported competition. Now that the **world economy** is on the **doorstep** of new innovations that are dependent on a great number of input technologies – e.g. the Internet-of-Things, transport connectivity and intelligent vehicles – it is **crucially important** for the consumer that a **balanced** and **functioning** SEP system is maintained and that actors in the system **converge** towards it – which would ultimately **meet** their **economic interests**.

**ICT innovation is key to post-COVID economic recovery and long-term growth.**

**van Ark 21**, \*Bart van Ark is a Senior Advisor of the Economy, Strategy and Finance (ESF) Center at The Conference Board; Bart van Ark, \*Klaas de Vries is an economist with The Conference Board; \*Abdul Erumban is an assistant professor at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands and a senior research fellow at The Conference Board; (2021, “HOW TO NOT MISS A PRODUCTIVITY REVIVAL ONCE AGAIN”, https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/nie.2020.49)

Introduction

As the global economy has entered recession in 2020, triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic, the human casualties, and economic **damage** are perceived to be **very large**. Even as the health crisis will gradually become manageable, the impact on economic growth can be **long-lasting** and the recovery path can take several **years**. In particular, growth drivers such as the pace of job creation, income generation and investment may take several years to get back to pre-crisis trends. Initially the productivity of those growth drivers may be of less concern as the mantra of ‘we’ll do what it takes to avoid worse’ is predominant in this phase of the crisis.

However, once the recovery gets underway the **productive** use of **resources** is key to **sustained** growth. While we do not ignore the short-term challenges of the economic recovery, our primary focus in this paper is on the productivity puzzle from a **long-term** perspective. Productivity is driven by technological **change** and **innovation** which, in turn, depends on **investment** in human and physical capital as well as in other ‘missing capitals’ often referred to as intangible assets. Indeed, those investments create a **positive feedback** effect, as the productivity it generates also helps to make more **efficient** usage of **scarce** resources in the future. When properly measured and valued, productivity also provides a critical yardstick to realise a fairer distribution of the gains from economic growth to those who bring the resources to bear. It thereby creates the incentives for people to produce and business to invest helping to drive economic growth and raise living standards.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008/2009, many economies around the world, especially advanced economies, have failed to recharge the economy by powering productivity as the key source of growth in the long term. Indeed the latest update of The Conference Board Total Economy Database (July 2020) points at significant weakening in labor productivity growth in Europe up to 2019 (figure 1a–c). While the United States experienced somewhat faster productivity growth from 2017 to 2019 than the Euro Area and the United Kingdom, it still has **not recovered** to the rates of productivity growth from before the global financial crisis either.

The slowdown in productivity growth over the past 15 years has been well documented. There are multiple causes including an exhaustion of catch-up potential in emerging markets impacting economies along entire global value chains, and the drag from the global financial crisis because of low demand and weak investment, too low interest rates causing misallocations an overreliance on cheap labor, and failing fiscal policies (Bauer et al., 2020; Cette et al., 2016; Crafts, 2018; Dieppe, 2020; Fernald et al., 2017; Syverson, 2016).1 Technical measurement issues regarding inputs and outputs may have played a role as well.

In our earlier work we have stressed the importance of time lags in the adoption of new technologies, and in particular the complexity in generating productivity growth from the latest round of new digital technologies since the early 2010s, including the move toward mobile, ubiquitous access to broadband, the rise of cloud storage and advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics (van Ark, 2016a, 2016b; van Ark and O’Mahony, 2016; van Ark et al., 2016).

While the first priority for economic recovery from the COVID-19 crisis is to restore jobs, it is important that any employment-intensive growth path does go together with a **productivity revival**. In this paper, we argue that it is possible to avoid another productivity **slowdown**. Underneath the aggregate figures, there is evidence pointing toward a possible **tipping point** at which many advanced economies may expect to see more **widespread** impacts from the adoption and absorption of **digital technology** on **productivity** and GDP **growth**.

In Section 2 we review the latest literature on the productivity impacts of general purpose technologies (GPTs), including the notion of time lapses through which digital technologies result in faster productivity growth. We also look at patterns by which innovation and productivity effects GPTs emerge across industries and disperse across the economy. We explain why the New Digital Economy (NDE) is especially characterised by long lag effects.

In Section 3 we provide an empirical analysis of productivity growth by industry data to observe whether we can detect a distinct pattern across groups of industries pointing to a structural improvement in recent years. We use a taxonomy on digital intensity by industry which was recently developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (Calvino et al., 2018), showing that the most digital-intensive industries have experienced a relatively strong performance in terms of labor productivity growth since 2007 and especially since 2013.

In Section 4 of the paper, we discuss the connection between labor and skills in the digital economy, which we believe provides the key to a productivity revival. We developed a new metric on innovation competencies by occupation on the basis of data from the O\*Net database on occupation-specific descriptors in the United States (Hao et al., 2018). When applied to the United Kingdom, we find that innovation competencies point at stronger productivity effects by industry.

In Section 5 we focus on how productivity has been behaving in the short-term during the COVID-19 recession. In particular, we address the potential trade-offs between traditional pro-cyclical recovery effects and scarring effects the recession leaves, especially on the labor market. We argue that increased adoption and usage of digital technologies during the COVID-19 crisis may create a positive productivity effect. In the final section, Section 6, we will review our hypothesis that a productivity revival could be imminent in the light of the recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. In order **not to miss** this **opportunity** again, as happened a decade ago, we argue that a coordinated effort from business and policy is needed, and has to be delivered in such a way that the gains from productivity will be more **widespread** and such that those who provide the resources for growth are incentivised to deliver them in an efficient way.

2. The productivity paradox of the New Digital Economy

It is well known that General Purpose Technologies (GPTs), defined as new methods of producing and inventing new goods and services which are important enough to have a long-term aggregate impact on the economy, can take a significant amount of time to translate to faster **productivity** growth at the **aggregate level** of the economy. This is inherent to the three critical characteristics of a GPT as identified by Bresnahan and Trajtenberg (1995).2

1. Pervasiveness –The GPT should spread to most sectors.

2. Improvement –The GPT should get better over time and, hence, should keep lowering the costs of its users.

3. Innovation spawning –The GPT should make it easier to invent and produce new products or processes.

Historical analysis has focussed on productivity trends in previous technology phases (Bakker et al., 2019; Crafts, 2004). Recent literature has shown that the information and communication technology (ICT) revolution of the past 50 years can be characterised as a GPT and doesn’t pale with previous GPTs such as steam technology, electricity and the combustion engine. For example, Hempell (2005) concludes that ‘investment in information and communication technologies (ICT) are **closely linked** to **complementary** innovations and are most **productive** in firms with experience from earlier innovations’. In a more recent analysis of the evolution of the Internet, Simcoe (2015) argues that the modularity of the internet has prevented a **fall** in **return** to **investments** in **innovation** by ‘facilitating low-cost **adaptation** of a shared general-purpose technology to the demands of heterogeneous applications’. In a review of the data, Liao et al. (2016) conclude that:

‘...ICT investment does **contribute** to **productivity** but not in the usual manner –we find a positive (but lagged) ICT effect on technological progress. We argue that for a positive ICT role on growth to actually take place, a period of negative relationship between productivity and ICT investment together with ICT-using sectors’ capacity to learn from the embodied new technology was crucial. In addition, it took a learning period with appropriate complementary co-inventions for the new ICT-capital to become effective and its gains to be realised. Our findings provide **solid**, further **empirical evidence** to support ICT as a general purpose technology’.

**Growth solves nuclear war.**

**Henricksen 17**, \*Thomas H., emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution; (March 23rd, 2017, “Post-American World Order,” Hoover Institution, <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>)

What Is To Be Done?

The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in  “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union.

What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by staying militarily and **economically strong**, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ **hawkish behavior** that might otherwise trigger a **major conflict**. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic **chess match** with Russia and China will prove **tense** and **demanding**—since all the countries boast **nuclear arms** and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously.

There can be **little room** for **error** in **fraught crises** among **nuclear-weaponized** and hostile powers. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a **waiting game** in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a **collapse**, as happened to the Soviet Union.

Some Chinese and Russian experts predict grave domestic problems for each other. They also entertain **similar** thoughts about the United States, which they view as terminally decadent and catastrophically polarized over politics, ethnicity, and the future direction of the country. So, the brewing three-way struggle also involves a **systemic contest**, which will test the competitors’ **economic** and **political institutions**.

At this juncture, the world is entering a standoff among the three great and several not-so-great powers. Averting war, while defending our interests, will prove a challenge, calling for deft policy, political endurance, and **economic growth**, as well as sufficient military force to **keep at bay** aggressive states or **prevail** over them if ever a war breaks out.

**Emergence of smart cities depends on IoT applications of 5G interoperability standards---absent FRAND, excessive royalties will undermine sustainable development.**

**Schwartz 18**, \*Matt Schwartz, Privacy Fellowship Coordinator at ACT, App Association; (March 2nd, 2018, “It’s Smart to be FRANDly: How the FRAND Commitment Will Determine the Future of Smart Cities”, https://actonline.org/2018/03/02/its-smart-to-be-frandly-how-the-frand-commitment-will-determine-the-future-of-smart-cities/)

In December, we [outlined](https://actonline.org/2017/12/18/smart-cities-connecting-your-community-through-technology/%5d) the emergence of **Smart Cities** – cities that harness technological **innovations** like internet of things (**IoT**) devices and data analytics to improve essential infrastructure in growing urban centers. The technological foundation of Smart Cities aims to improve public safety, better allocate resources, and meet the needs of citizens more quickly.

A central element to Smart Cities is the comprehensive network of sensors and devices implemented within buildings, roads, traffic signs, and parking meters that allows them to interact with public, and potentially private-owned, infrastructure. These sensors will “speak” to one another, communicating information about energy usage, traffic density, or other elements of city management that have traditionally either been analyzed separately or not tracked at all. The potential of Smart Cities allows data to flow from previously disconnected branches of the city and be processed in real-time, unlocking previously unknown insights.

The powerful **interoperability** of Smart Cities will rely heavily on **standardized technologies** developed in organizations like the IEEE, which is responsible for standardizing the wi-fi technology we use every day. Standardized technologies often include standard-essential patents (**SEPs**), which, like their name suggests, are patents declared essential to an industry standard by a standards-setting organization. In simple terms, one cannot implement the standardized technology without using the patent.

Like regular patents, the users of SEPs must pay royalties or **licensing fees** to the patent owner before they may use it. For example, if a manufacturing company wants to make an IoT device interoperable with a 5G network, the manufacturer must pay a licensing fee to the owner of the SEP that is essential to the 5G standard. SEPs play a **vital role** in the new innovations we enjoy and have come to expect, and because of the value of these patents, SEP holders have the ability to demand **high license fees** from those who wish to implement the standard. To offset this **competition issue**, many SEP holders **voluntarily** agree to license their SEPs to any willing licensee under fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (**FRAND**) terms.

While wi-fi and LTE are standards that will be vital to Smart City deployment, countless new standardized technologies are being developed that will be integral to any fully-operational Smart City. With **reasonable access** to SEPs, assured by the FRAND commitment, innovators can enjoy the **legal** and **business certainty** they need to **compete**. While the meaning of the FRAND commitment continues to be refined – as evidenced by the development of SEP best practices recently launched by the App Association in Europe – its foundations are well-established.

But what happens when SEP holders do not abide by the FRAND licensing commitment, or simply refuse to license at all? Sadly, small and medium-sized companies would be **forced** to accept **untenable** licensing terms, but more realistically, they would be **priced out** of using the standard **altogether**. As a result, it would impose a **barrier** to **innovation** that would result in **fewer products** offered to consumers or cities eager to implement **IoT technologies**. For example, many hope the rise of autonomous vehicles will be seamlessly integrated into the Smart City network. But how beneficial would it be if only some autonomous vehicle brands are able to license the technology needed to communicate with traffic lights, simply because of the market power of a chipmaker? The FRAND commitment is an important backstop to that unfortunate possibility.

It is vital for SEP holders to honor FRAND licensing terms, if not for small and medium-sized innovators, then for the sustainability of future Smart Cities. FRAND creates a platform for innovation, providing a floor on which companies can stand, innovate, and compete. If the foundation of the FRAND commitment is reneged, American innovators pay a **steep price** – not only do they lose a **key component** of product **development** and **market entry**, but they are also left with years of expensive negotiations and litigation if they choose to challenge the licensing practice. What’s more, the **confidence** developed in the open standards development system is **shaken**, and Smart Cities have fewer choices in IoT solutions for their future.

To achieve the promise of Smart Cities, a balanced standards ecosystem is essential. We must allow small and medium-sized developers to **leverage industry standards** for innovation and prevent cost-prohibitive royalty structures and negotiating practices that are **detrimental** to **competition**, while also ensuring that SEP owners can protect their intellectual property and be fairly compensated for its use. The FRAND commitment continues to be the **best framework** to achieve this balance, and **adherence** to its **principles** will determine the **future** and **success** of **Smart Cities**.

**Climate change is anthropogenic and causes extinction---5G-enabled smart cities are critical for mitigation and adaptation.**

**Huseien 21**, \*Ghasan Fahim Huseien is a research fellow at Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; Dr. Kwok Wei Shah is presently an assistant professor and deputy program director with the Department of Building, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore; (August 23rd, 2021, “Potential Applications of 5G Network Technology for Climate Change Control: A Scoping Review of Singapore”, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/17/9720)

Currently, the **entire planet** is at risk due to continual **climate change** [1–3]. The recorded increase in average temperature across the world in the past hundred years, and the associated changes attributed to this, are known as global warming. Many scientists are convinced by the published evidence that this change is **anthropogenic** and resulted from the **elevated emission levels** of global greenhouse gases (GHGs) [4,5]. Gases such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone are responsible for the absorption and emission of thermal radiation. These changes in the relative quantities of the GHGs induce a proportional change in the amount of preserved solar energy. Presently, the accepted indicator for global warming is the sustained rise in the mean temperature worldwide. This definition is designed to account for the fact that there may be some localized exceptions to this rise. For example, there may be cooling experienced in a region while the global temperature may increase altogether, hence the need for average temperature. A key concern with the GHGs trapping of more heat in the atmosphere is that it affects both climate and short scale weather patterns. Consequently, it results in **greater numbers** of **adverse weather events** such as storms, heat waves, cold snaps, droughts, and fires [6]. **Climate-related risks** to health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, human safety, and economic growth are projected to **increase** with global warming of 1.5 ◦C [7] and further increase further at 2 ◦C, as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the risks to global aggregated economic growth due to the climate change impacts are projected to be lower at 1.5 ◦C than at 2 ◦C by the end of this century.

Carbon dioxide has the most **substantial effect** on global warming [8]. Although it was once assumed to have an ~100 year lifespan in the atmosphere, careful studies revealed that the situation is far worse, with three-quarters of the gas expected to remain for a time in the region of up to ~1000 years, with the remainder lasting for an indefinite period of time [9]. It was indicated that the present impacts of humanity on the atmosphere can certainly cause a long term problem [10]. Carbon dioxide is released when oil, coal, and other fossil fuels are burnt for the energy we use to power our homes, cars, and smartphones. By **lessening** its **usage**, we can **curb** our own **contribution** to climate change while saving money. The first challenge is eliminating the burning of coal, oil, and, eventually, natural gas. Oil is the lubricant of the global economy as it is hidden inside such ubiquitous items as plastic and corn, fundamental to the transportation of both consumers and goods. Coal is the substrate, supplying roughly half of the electricity worldwide, a percentage that is likely to grow according to the International Energy Agency (IEA). In fact, buildings contribute up to 43% of all the greenhouse gas emissions worldwide [11], even though investing in thicker insulation and other cost-effective as well as temperature-regulating strategies can save money in the long run. Investment in **new infrastructures**, or radical **upgradation** of the existing highways and transmission lines, may help to **reduce** greenhouse gas **emissions**, yielding economic growth in the developing countries.

Nations across the globe have kept very **high targets** to reducing their GHG discharges [12,13]. In order to meet these goals, **considerable reductions** in city energy usage is required. At a global scale, urban communities represent over half (55%) of the population, which is predicted to reach **68%** by the middle of this century [14]. Urban areas claim ownership of the **highest levels** of energy use, gas emission, and also the largest local economy. As such, it is **crucial** for urban areas to **reduce** their **consumption** and utilize **renewable sources** wherever available to reduce their gas discharge levels. Smart cities often utilize **digital sensors** to measure and transmit data about the levels of GHGs in the city at that moment, as a means of tackling them [15]. The **efficacy** of such a system is thus **reliant** on the network used to collate and analyze the data collected as an extant network. The mobile telecommunications networks offer a **convenient solution** to this desire, as their pre-existence has the clear benefit of reducing costs compared to the design and implementation of a novel system. It is recognized that smart cities will certainly act as the key players meeting these ambitious targets [16,17]. In this study, we focused primarily on the potential applications of 5G network technology to control climate change in Singapore. In addition, a **clear overview** of the **sustainability benefits** of introducing **5G** technology **compatible** smart cities, buildings, and farms in all aspects of urbanization is provided. Herein, the main purpose is to tackle the **negative outcomes** associated with **anthropogenic climate change**, with a particular focus on the contributions that are best made by the telecoms network operators.

Climate change is one of the most **challenging problems** that humanity has ever faced. Presently, hundreds of millions of lives, innumerable species, entire ecosystems, health, economy, and the **future habitability of this planet** are at risk. Fortunately, climate change is **solvable**, we just need to **wisely exploit** the **existing technologies** and **sciences**. Climate change mitigation is a pressing international need in which many management actions are required. The development of 5G technology has been largely driven by smart mobile devices and advanced communication technologies. It may thus serve as a **technical enabler** for a whole new range of business opportunities, energy, and facilities management, together with industrial applications. Moreover, it may enable different devices to work together seamlessly. Definitely, the 5G cellular network technology is expected to **revolutionize** the **global industries** with **profound effects** on the savings of energy, waste generation and recycling, and water resources management, thus **reducing** the **climate change impacts**.

**1AC — Cybersecurity**

**Advantage 2 is Cybersecurity —**

**Aggressive patent strategies create structural flaws in 5G standardization that imperils domestic cybersecurity---market competition reduces the incidence of vulnerability and severity of attacks.**

**Duan 20**, \*Charles Duan is a senior fellow and associate director of tech & innovation policy at the R Street Institute, where he focuses his research on intellectual property issues; (2020, “OF MONOPOLIES AND MONOCULTURES: THE INTERSECTION OF PATENTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY”, Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, 36(4), 369-405. Retrieved from <https://www2.lib.ku.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/monopolies-monocultures-intersection-patents/docview/2442966690/se-2?accountid=14556>)

III. COMPETITION AND CYBERSECURITY

In addition to the historical review done so far, another approach to understanding the relationship among patents, competition, and national security is to consider the role of **cybersecurity**. There is little doubt that computer system vulnerabilities that enable **hacking** and **spread** of **computer exploits** are a **threat** to the **nation’s defenses**, so better cybersecurity is a **key part** of national security strategy.155

**Strong competition** can thus **complement** national security by enhancing domestic cybersecurity, and **patent assertion** that **unduly weakens** competition **detracts** from cybersecurity.156 Competition promotes better cybersecurity in at least two ways. First, multiple studies show that competition encourages firms to improve their products on multiple vectors including cybersecurity. Second, competition avoids a situation that security experts call a “monoculture,” which increases vulnerability to severe cyberattacks. As former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff wrote recently, “We need **competition** and **multiple providers**, not a potentially vulnerable technological monoculture,” to **guarantee** national security.157 Thus, cybersecurity provides a **useful lens** for understanding how **unfettered** patent assertion and **licensing** can **detract** from **national security**.

A. Cybersecurity as Competitive Value-Add

Competition enhances national security by **reducing** the **incidence** of technical **vulnerabilities**. That effect is **especially important** for security **sensitive systems** such as **mobile telecommunications**.

Intuitively, a **causal chain** from **competition** to **cybersecurity** makes logical sense. Computer security is a value-added benefit to consumers, so firms in competitive markets are likely to use security to gain an edge over their competitors.158 In monopolized markets, though, there may be less **external impetus** to **test products** for flaws, and the **monopolist** may **choose** to **focus less** on **security** and more on new product features or increased product quality.

Economic research confirms these hypotheses about competition leading to better cybersecurity. A 2009 empirical study of web browsers considered the impact of market concentration on the amount of time that vendors took to fix security vulnerabilities as they were discovered.159 The study found that the **presence** of more **competitors** correlated with **faster cybersecurity** response—a reduction of 8–10 days in response time per additional market rival.160 Similarly, business researchers in 2005 modeled incentives for firms to engage in sharing of cybersecurity information, and concluded that the “**inclination** to **share information** and **invest** in **security technologies** increases as the **degree** of **competitiveness** in an industry increases.”161 Another study found that, where two software firms are in competition, at least one will be willing to take on **some degree** of **risk** and **responsibility** for cybersecurity, whereas a monopoly software firm will **consistently fail** to accept such responsibility.162 To be sure, an unpublished study from 2017 found that some market concentration can make firms more responsive to cybersecurity issues, but only to a point: “being in a dominant position reduces the positive effect of having less competitors on the responsiveness of the vendor,” and indeed the “more dominant the firm is, the less rapid it is in releasing security patches.”163 This research confirms that competition is more conducive to cybersecurity.

It is not hard to see how this applies to emerging communication technologies markets. In the absence of competition, the above research suggests that device manufacturers, chip makers, and software developers will **lack incentives** to **respond** to **vulnerabilities**, to **share information** about cybersecurity practices and issues, and to **take responsibility** for security matters. Mobile phone chips have had their share of cybersecurity failures already.164 **The best way to flush out ongoing and future cybersecurity issues is to maintain competitive pressure at all levels of the supply chain.**

B. Vulnerabilities of “Monocultures”

A second reason why monopoly undermines cybersecurity is that monopoly leads to a “**monoculture**” of single-vendor products, opening the door to **massive** systemic **failure** in the case of a **cyberattack**. Computer researchers developed the theory of software monocultures in the early 2000s, in response to the regular phenomenon of computer viruses and other attacks spreading rapidly by exploiting flaws in the dominant operating system at the time, Microsoft Windows.165 Where a computer system such as Windows has a commanding share of users, a virus that **exploits** a **flaw** in that system can quickly **spread** to **infect** a whole **interconnected ecosystem**. An operating system monopoly thus enables fast and easy spread of cyberattacks, and better cybersecurity would be achieved through greater diversity in online systems.166 As one research group posited, “a network architecture that **supports** a collection of **heterogeneous network** elements for the same **functional capability** offers a **greater possibility** of **surviving** security **attacks** as compared to **homogeneous networks**.”167

There has been considerable study of the theory that computer monocultures are **naturally** more **vulnerable** to attacks.168 In one study, computer science researchers reviewed a catalog of 6,340 software vulnerabilities recorded in 2007, to compare whether comparable software would share the same flaws.169 Of the 2,627 vulnerabilities applicable to application software (as opposed to operating systems, web scripts, and other software components), only 29 (1.1%) applied to substitute products from different vendors but providing the same functionality.170 By contrast, different versions of a single software product were found to share vulnerabilities 84.7% of the time.171 Thus, software monocultures share **exploitable flaws** even when there is some **variation** in **versions** across the **monoculture**; by contrast, diversity in software is almost **guaranteed** to **prevent** a **single flaw** from **affecting** all **users**.

In the case of 5G and wireless mobile communications, a monoculture is an **especially concerning** possibility. To the extent that systems such as smart city sensors or communication networks are **widely deployed** in a monoculture fashion, a **widespread attack** could have **devastating** consequences, potentially blacking out a region and affecting essential services such as 911.172 A monoculture that is vulnerable to so-called “**rootkits**” or “**backdoors**”—maliciously installed software that enable **bad actors** to commandeer systems—could also enable **mass surveillance** or **spying** by private hackers or foreign governments.173 The presence of systems from **multiple vendors** would mitigate these possibilities.

The monoculture theory is not without critics, but a review of those criticisms shows them to be inapplicable to contemporary communication technologies. Some critics suggest that software diversity imposes **unwarranted costs** on firms who must **forego** economies of scale and devise seemingly duplicative yet different setups of computer systems.174 But those concerns **largely focus** on the situation where a **single firm** produces and manages heterogeneous systems, concerns that are **avoided** where **heterogeneity** arises **naturally** through **competition** between two **unrelated** firms. Critics also argue that technological measures can create “artificial diversity” through automated randomization of software code, so software engineers can purportedly solve monoculture issues and device users need not worry about the issue.175 But even these critics acknowledge that artificial diversity techniques are often **insufficient** because they must make **assumptions** about what **aspects** of the **technology** are **most vulnerable** to **attack**, and they **concede** that artificial diversity **cannot stop** attacks involving operation of **legitimate** software functions in **undesirable** ways (sending spam emails or deleting document files, for example).176

It is widely recognized that a monoculture is **unavoidable** in at least one respect: Most connected devices will need to **conform** to technical **standards**.177 5G, for example, is a technical standard developed by a private industry consortium called 3GPP.178 A **flaw** in any such standard would render **all mobile devices** implementing the standard **vulnerable** to an **identical attack**.179 Avoiding these sorts of **systemic flaws** in standards requires rigorous **development**, **analysis**, and **testing** of the standard in the development process, which in turn requires ensuring that **as many firms** as **possible**, especially firms that share basic American values, are **involved** in the **development** of those **standards**.180 Thus, the necessary **standardization** of **information** and **communication technologies** is perhaps the most **important reason** why a **competitive** communication technology **market** is **essential** to **cybersecurity** and national security.

**Insecure technical standards cause inevitable systemic grid collapse---extinction.**

**DeNardis 21**, \*Dr. Laura DeNardis, PhD in Science and Technology Studies from Virginia Tech, Dean of the School of Communication at American University, and Gordon M. Goldstein, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, (March 1st, 2021, “The Real Lesson of the Texas Power Debacle”, Lawfare, 3/1/2021, https://www.lawfareblog.com/real-lesson-texas-power-debacle)

The infrastructure was essential, ubiquitous and providing basic functionality for everything in daily life from water to heat and transportation. And in an instant it was gone, plunging tens of thousands of residents into a life-threatening crisis. This is, of course, the narrative of the recent debacle in Texas, where a winter storm overwhelmed the state’s electrical grid and brought the state to a near-total blackout. But it should also be interpreted as a preemptive **warning** of what Americans will face from the next generation of the **internet** and the new realm of cybersecurity risk it will **dramatically** amplify.

Both forms of infrastructure—a state-run electrical grid and the **5G** and “**internet of things**” future to which we are rapidly hurtling—share three attributes. First, their construction reflects a lack of imagination about the danger that can quickly **coalesce** when seemingly remote threat scenarios become real. Second, compounding a lack of analytic imagination is an absence of preparedness. Third, for both the Texas electrical grid and the emerging internet, public policy protections are either meager or completely absent.

In planning for the resilience of its electrical grid, public officials in Texas **discounted** the potentially devastating disruption that could occur from **unpredictable** events—whether related to climate change or just a once-a-century anomaly. They also eschewed precautions other states take seriously by allowing for the interconnection of electrical grid supply chains across their borders, ostensibly because of their ideological rejection of federal regulatory oversight governing such arrangements.

As the United States builds out a new national **5G** cyber-physical communications network through private service providers, Americans similarly **discount** the **risks**—myriad in their diversity and severity—that are **orders** of **magnitude** more **significant** than what Texas confronted recently. More physical things than people are already connected. The super empowered internet of tomorrow, known among some in the field as the “internet of everything,” will exceed by **tens of billions** of devices the number of connections between individuals simply communicating via social media or digital screens.

This confronts policymakers with an imminent threat: A cyber outage is **no longer** about losing digital communications but about losing basic **societal functioning** and even **human life**. The failure of imagination is to think of the SolarWinds attack on U.S. federal agencies and tech companies as a **worst-case scenario**. The failure of imagination is to think of cybersecurity through a content-centric lens rather than as possible attacks on the material world. The emergence of internet-connected cardiac devices, digitally dependent cars, and internet-connected agriculture systems portend the stakes of a cyberattack to **health care**, economic and **social functioning**, and **food security.**

The United States should be prepared for, and certainly not be caught by surprise by, such cyberattacks. Yet, the internet of everything is notoriously **insecure**. Internet-connected physical objects are not necessarily upgradeable. Nor do they come with adequate default security and encryption. The 5G infrastructure that helps connect digital objects has been at the center of debates over Chinese espionage. Industrial cyber-physical **systems** are based on **technical standards** that have not been collaboratively vetted for **security** and **interoperability**. One of the most infamous cyberattacks—the so-called Mirai botnet that took down major media sites and corporations—hijacked these insecure objects in homes to carry out the assault. The United States is not yet prepared.

Finally, in the race to conceive and deploy effective public policy responses, the U.S. government as a whole is hardly more anticipatory or synthesized in its response to potential calamity than the state of Texas. The focus of U.S. cyber policy remains on information policy issues such as disinformation, manipulation and violent speech rather than securing the digital world that now powers our material day-to-day lives. The Biden administration confronts an enormous challenge in crafting a comprehensive strategy to the cybersecurity risks foreshadowed by the ruinous experience in Texas and its management of vital infrastructure. While the digital world has leapt from two-dimensional to three-dimensional space, cyber policy has not at all jumped from 2D to 3D.

This failure of imagination, preparedness and policy protection must not be America’s cyber future; the stakes are far **too high** and the costs are far **too great.** The Texas disaster is a potent illustration of what has always been true: Our digital society and economy are extremely vulnerable and grow more porous and subject to penetration day by day. As digital sensors and cyber control systems become further embedded in physical infrastructure like energy systems, agriculture and transportation, there is no longer a separation between security of the **“real” world** and security of the **online world**. They are **entangled** and increasingly **enmeshed**—and policy has yet to catch up to either envisioning or mitigating the looming threats the U.S. confronts.

If the energy grid cannot weather a winter storm, how can it be expected to withstand a major cyberattack? What other vital forms of national infrastructure—ranging from water, bridges, highways and roads, and ultimately our day-to-day financial system—are **comparably** at **risk**? As Texas dramatizes, it is neither **hyperbolic** nor **exaggerated** to assert that **our survival** could now depend on **securing** the inevitable **cyber-physical future** that is accelerating with **stunning rapidity**.

#### Cyberwar is increasingly likely---SolarWind emboldens hackers to undermine critical infrastructure and nuclear supply chains.

Bajema 21, \*Dr. Natasha Bajema is the Director of the [Converging Risks Lab at the Council on Strategic Risks](https://councilonstrategicrisks.org/programs/csw/dr-natasha-bajema/) and an IEEE Spectrum contributor. She has held long-term assignments at the National Defense University, in the U.S. Office of the Secretary of Defense, and at the U.S. Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration; (March 24th, 2021, “Today's Cyberattacks Foreshadow Wars to Come”, https://spectrum.ieee.org/riskfactor/aerospace/military/todays-cyberattacks-foreshadow-wars-to-come)

Cyberattacks are no longer just a matter of cybersecurity, they directly threaten a country’s national security. Cyberattacks alter the character of warfare—much like nuclear weapons once did, allowing adversaries to potentially cross enemy lines to harm large numbers of innocent civilians.

Today’s malicious actors can now seek to cause physical damage from remote locations through digital channels, wreaking devastation on a country at levels that previously would have required a kinetic attack.

On February 8, 2021, hackers breached the Bruce T. Haddock Water Treatment Plant in Oldsmar, Fla. using known software vulnerabilities in an attempt to poison the local water supply with sodium hydroxide—also known as lye. They accessed the plant through its industrial control system (ICS)—a system designed to allow for remote control and supervision of the plant. Taking over the plant’s controls, hackers increased parts of the chemical, used to [adjust the acidity and remove metals from drinking water](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/senate-intel-chairman-florida-water-plant-cyberattack), to one hundred times over the normal level. The system used an [old version of Windows, was accessible with a shared password, and had no firewall protection against intrusions](https://techgenix.com/florida-water-treatment-facility-cyberattack/). Thankfully, [a supervisor noticed the dangerous change in time whilst working remotely](https://www.govtech.com/em/safety/Cyberattack-on-Water-Treatment-Facility-Suggests-More-to-Come.html), averting a crisis that may have caused chemical burns and blindness among those exposed to the toxic chemical.

U.S. government officials have recently expressed concerns about similar vulnerabilities across water and energy sectors and other critical infrastructure including [health, emergency services, food and agriculture, and transportation systems](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/senate-intel-chairman-florida-water-plant-cyberattack). The cyberattack on the water plant occurred just a week before a major winter storm led to a widespread blackout and water crisis across Texas. [More than five million](https://time.com/5939633/texas-power-outage-blackouts/) went without power and running water for several days, illustrating the fragility of such interconnected infrastructure and the physical devastation that could be caused in the event of a cyberattack targeting the grid.

Critical infrastructure is not alone in its vulnerabilities to cyberattacks with physical implications—supply chains are also at risk. For at least a span of months (if not years), hackers have [exploited vulnerabilities](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2020_United_States_federal_government_data_breach) in software from Microsoft, VMWare and the Texas-based company [SolarWinds](https://www.solarwinds.com/) to compromise data security in at least 200 organizations in the U.S. government and other agencies around the world.

Although the SolarWinds attack appears to be a [case of classic espionage by Russia](https://www.securityinfowatch.com/cybersecurity/article/21206223/more-questions-than-answers-as-solarwinds-breach-probe-expands) via the U.S. supply chain, there are aspects of the attack that also illustrate the potential for achieving physical effects via digital channels. As early as [March 2020](https://www.securityinfowatch.com/cybersecurity/article/21206223/more-questions-than-answers-as-solarwinds-breach-probe-expands), Russian hackers breached the Orion network management software designed by SolarWinds, a federal contractor, and planted malicious code likely intended to gain access to sensitive information. Evidence of malware was first detected [in December by a cybersecurity company](https://www.newsweek.com/colorado-representative-says-solarwinds-hack-could-cyber-equivalent-pearl-harbor-1555994) that also uses the Orion software. The impact of the SolarWinds cyberattack spanned [thousands of networks](https://www.securityinfowatch.com/cybersecurity/article/21206223/more-questions-than-answers-as-solarwinds-breach-probe-expands) at [nine federal agencies and 100 private sector companies](https://www.cyberscoop.com/solarwinds-cyber-espionage-russia-neuberger/), including the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which is responsible for overseeing the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile.

Although NNSA claims there was no impact to classified systems, officials found [evidence of attempted intrusion](http://www.politico.com/news/2020/12/22/nuclear-weapons-agency-congress-hacking-450184) in unclassified systems—although, according to the NNSA Public Affairs office, the system in question was used for business purposes, not for transport of nuclear weapons and materials. The agency also detected attempts to gain access to servers at the Los Alamos National Laboratory—one of three nuclear weapons labs. [NNSA immediately disconnected the software from relevant networks](https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-update-cyber-incident-related-solar-winds-compromise), removing the possibility for deleterious effects. While hackers were not likely targeting the transport of nuclear weapons, the [vulnerabilities of nuclear weapons](https://www.nap.edu/read/11538/chapter/6#112) [while en-route](https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1409912) [between secure locations](https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/Pub1348_web.pdf) are well known.

The exact objectives for the SolarWinds cyberattack remain unclear, but the vast extent of its reach may demonstrate to U.S. adversaries the significant potential of cyberattacks for achieving physical ends, including the possibility of stealing nuclear weapons. However, the incident is not the first major one from which malicious actors have deduced such capabilities—[consider the lessons from the NotPetya attack in 2017](https://spectrum.ieee.org/tech-talk/computing/it/notpetya-latest-ransomware-is-a-warning-note-from-the-future). Russian hackers spread malicious code through a popular accounting software developed by a Ukrainian business across many countries in Europe, eventually infecting tens of thousands of computers around the world. In addition to rendering infected computers useless, the attack shut down the global operations of the Maersk shipping company and caused major traffic congestion on the roads near ports in the United States. It also slowed operations of Merck & Co, Inc., a major producer of drugs and vaccines in the U.S., [reducing production capacity for a short period of time](https://www.fiercepharma.com/manufacturing/merck-has-hardened-its-defenses-against-cyber-attacks-like-one-last-year-cost-it). Even a classic espionage or sabotage incident may carry significant potential for physical damage.

The [Biden administration has already issued guidance](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/02/24/executive-order-on-americas-supply-chains/) for shoring up vulnerabilities in U.S. supply chains, but much more needs to be done to protect critical infrastructure and dissuade malicious actors from exploiting digital channels to achieve physical ends. In an era of hybrid and gray zone warfare, cyberattacks are attractive to nations seeking to undermine their adversaries due to challenges of attribution and the associated benefit of deniability. In the future, these nations may also come to see cyberattacks with physical effects as a new form of warfare—a Trojan horse in the form of their adversary’s own infrastructure or supply chains. In so doing, they can cross enemy lines and cause damage and destruction without defeating any military forces.

**Actors have the means and motivations to strike critical infrastructure.**

**Wintch 21**, \*Timothy M. Wintch, an active-duty Major in the United States Air Force. He is currently a graduate student at the Oettinger School of Science & Technology Intelligence, National Intelligence University, in Bethesda, Maryland. Mr. Wintch has over 11 years of experience in command-and-control operations as an Air Battle Manager. He holds a Bachelor of Arts in Politics from the University of California, Santa Cruz, and a Master of Arts in Military Studies from American Military University. (April 20th, 2021, “PERSPECTIVE: Cyber and Physical Threats to the U.S. Power Grid and Keeping the Lights on”, https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/)

Among critical infrastructure sectors in the U.S., energy is perhaps the most crucial of the 16 sectors defined by the Department of Homeland Security. This sector is **so vital** because it provides the energy necessary to run **every other** critical infrastructure sector. However, the U.S. power grid, the backbone of the energy sector, is built upon an aging skeleton that is becoming increasingly **vulnerable** every day. Whether from terrorists or nation-states like Russia and China, the power grid is susceptible to not just physical attacks, but also to **cyber** intrusion as well. However, much of this threat can be mitigated if the U.S. takes the appropriate steps to safeguard the power grid and avoid a potential catastrophe in the future.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, terrorism on U.S. soil has been at the forefront of American consciousness. Critical infrastructure provides an **appealing** target because of the disproportionally **large impact** even a **small attack** can have on the sectors. In particular, the power grid represents a particularly lucrative target, both in terms of the ease of access and the large impact it can make. The National Research Council stated that the U.S. power grid is “vulnerable to intelligent multi-site attacks by knowledgeable attackers intent on causing maximum physical damage to key components on a wide geographical scale.”[[1]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn1) Additionally, the physical security of transmission and distribution systems is difficult due to the **dispersed** nature of these key components, which in turn is advantageous to attackers as it reduces the likelihood of their capture.[[2]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn2) From 2002-2012, approximately 2,500 physical attacks occurred against transmission lines and towers worldwide and approximately 500 attacks against transformer substations.[[3]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn3) Terrorists have the **motivation** to attack the U.S. power grid but the very nature of the grid makes it highly vulnerable. The power grid is not only at risk from physical attacks, but also nation-state cyberattacks.

One nation that has shown both the **capability** and **intent** to use attacks against critical energy infrastructure is Russia, as demonstrated in their 2015 annexation of Crimea from Ukraine. A Russian cyber threat group known as Sandworm, which used its BlackEnergy malware, attacked Ukrainian computer systems that provide remote control of the Ukraine power grid.[[4]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn4) This attack, and another in 2016, each left the capital Kiev without power, prompting cyber experts to raise concern about the same malware already existing in NATO and the U.S. power grids.[[5]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn5) In any conflict between Russia and NATO, not only would similar cyberattacks pose a threat, but so would potential physical attacks severing fuel oil and natural gas lines to Western Europe. Russia has both the capability and intent to attack critical infrastructure, particularly power grids, during future conflicts in their “hybrid warfare” approach.

Another nation that has the capability to attack critical energy infrastructure is China, representing a threat to not just the U.S. energy infrastructure but also that of our allies whose support would be vital in a major conflict. A recent NATO report highlighted this threat from China’s Belt and Road Initiative, stating that “[China’s] foreign direct investment in strategic sectors [such as energy generation and distribution] …raises questions about whether access and control over such infrastructure can be maintained, particularly in crisis when it would be required to support the military.”[[6]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn6) Like Russia, China has been **active** with cyber **intrusions** in U.S. energy **infrastructure**. The Mission Support Center at Idaho National Laboratory characterized these as attacks as “multiple intrusions into US ICS/SCADA [Industrial Control Systems/Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition] and smart grid tools [that] may be aimed more at intellectual property theft and gathering intelligence to bolster their own infrastructure, but it is likely that they are also using these intrusions to develop capabilities to attack the [**bulk** electric system], as well.”[[7]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn7) China, therefore, has both the **capability** and **intent** to conduct cyber intrusions and attacks for myriad reasons.

Another arm of this threat is the reliance the U.S. energy industry has on imports from China, especially transformers. In early 2020, federal officials seized a transformer in the port of Houston that had been imported by the Jiangsu Huapeng Transformer Company before sending it to Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque. Sandia is contracted by the U.S. Department of Energy for mitigating national security threats.[[8]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn8) The Wall Street Journal reported that “Mike Howard, chief executive of the Electric Power Research Institute, a utility-funded technical organization, said that the diversion of a huge, expensive transformer is so unusual – in his experience, unprecedented – that it suggests officials had significant security concerns.”[[9]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/" \l "_ftn9) Previously destined for the Washington Area Power Administration’s Ault, Colo., substation, the transformer is believed to have been seized due to “backdoor” exploitable hardware emplaced by the Chinese prior to shipment.[[10]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn10) Shortly after these events, President Trump issued Executive Order 13920, “[Securing the United States Bulk-Power System](https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-securing-united-states-bulk-power-system/),” essentially limiting the import of Chinese-built critical energy infrastructure components due to concerns about cybersecurity.[[11]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn11) Interestingly, Jiangsu Huapeng “boasted that it supported 10 percent of New York City’s electricity load.”[[12]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn12)

Franklin Kramer, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, testified before a U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Commerce subcommittee during an energy and power hearing in 2011 and said that a “highly-coordinated and structured cyber, physical, or blended attack on the **bulk power** system, however, could result in long-term (**irreparable**) damage to key system components in multiple simultaneous or near-**simultaneous strikes**.” He added that “an outage could result with the potential to affect a wide geographic area and cause large population centers to lose power for **extended** periods.”[[13]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn13) Even the inclusion of features such as smart grids to the overall grid structure poses new **vulnerabilities** through their connectivity. Kramer stated that “such connectivity means that the **distribution** system could be a **key vector** for a national security attack on the grid.”[[14]](https://www.hstoday.us/subject-matter-areas/infrastructure-security/perspective-cyber-and-physical-threats-to-the-u-s-power-grid-and-keeping-the-lights-on/#_ftn14)

**Those attacks cause accidental nuclear escalation.**

**Klare 19**, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation)

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of **cyberstrikes** and **counterstrikes** against **vital national infrastructure** rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key **economic systems**, such as **power grids**, **financial systems**, and **transportation networks**. As noted, Russia has **infiltrated** the U.S. **electrical grid**, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.[12](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12) The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.[13](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote12)

The danger here is that **economic attacks** of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an **escalating series** of **tit-for-tat attacks** against ever more **vital elements** of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing **widespread chaos** and **harm** and eventually leading one side to initiate **kinetic attacks** on **critical** military **targets**, risking the **slippery slope** to **nuclear conflict**. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”[14](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote14)

These are by no means the only pathways to escalation resulting from the offensive use of cyberweapons. Others include efforts by **third parties**, such as **proxy states** or **terrorist organizations**, to provoke a global nuclear crisis by causing **early-warning systems** to generate **false readings** (“spoofing”) of missile launches. Yet, they do provide a **clear indication** of the **severity** of the **threat**. As states’ reliance on cyberspace grows and cyberweapons become more powerful, the **dangers** of **unintended** or **accidental escalation** can only grow more **severe**.

**Cyber-compromised NC3 causes nuclear war.**

**Klare 19**, \*Michael T. Klare is a professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association; (November 19th, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation”, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>)

The Nuclear-Cyber Connection

These links exist because the NC3 systems of the United States and other nuclear-armed states are **heavily dependent** on **computers** and other **digital processors** for virtually **every aspect** of their **operation** and because those systems are **highly vulnerable** to cyberattack. Every nuclear force is composed, most basically, of weapons, early-warning radars, launch facilities, and the top officials, usually presidents or prime ministers, empowered to initiate a nuclear exchange. Connecting them all, however, is an extended network of **communications** and **data-processing** systems, all reliant on **cyberspace**. Warning systems, ground- and space-based, must constantly watch for and analyze possible enemy missile launches. Data on actual threats must rapidly be **communicated** to decision-makers, who must then weigh possible responses and **communicate** chosen outcomes to launch facilities, which in turn must provide attack vectors to delivery systems. All of this involves **operations** in **cyberspace**, and it is in this domain that great power rivals seek **vulnerabilities** to exploit in a constant struggle for advantage.

The use of cyberspace to gain an advantage over adversaries takes many forms and is not always aimed at nuclear systems. China has been accused of engaging in widespread **cyberespionage** to steal technical secrets from U.S. firms for economic and military advantages. Russia has been accused, most extensively in the Robert Mueller report, of exploiting cyberspace to **interfere** in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Nonstate actors, including terrorist groups such as al Qaeda and the Islamic State group, have used the internet for **recruiting** combatants and spreading fear. Criminal groups, including some thought to be allied with state actors, such as North Korea, have used cyberspace to **extort money** from banks, municipalities, and individuals.[4](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote04) Attacks such as these occupy most of the time and attention of civilian and military cybersecurity organizations that attempt to thwart such attacks. Yet for those who worry about strategic stability and the risks of nuclear escalation, it is the threat of cyberattacks on NC3 systems that provokes the greatest concern.

This concern stems from the fact that, despite the immense effort devoted to protecting NC3 systems from cyberattack, no enterprise that relies so extensively on computers and cyberspace can be made 100 percent invulnerable to attack. This is so because such systems employ many devices and operating systems of various origins and vintages, most incorporating numerous software updates and “patches” over time, offering multiple vectors for attack. Electronic components can also be modified by hostile actors during production, transit, or insertion; and the **whole system** itself is **dependent** to a **considerable degree** on the **electrical grid**, which itself is **vulnerable** to cyberattack and is far **less protected**. Experienced “**cyberwarriors**” of every major power have been working for years to probe for **weaknesses** in these systems and in many cases have devised cyberweapons, typically, malicious software (**malware**) and computer viruses, to exploit those weaknesses for military advantage.[5](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote05)

Although activity in cyberspace is much more difficult to detect and track than conventional military operations, enough information has become public to indicate that the major **nuclear powers**, notably China, Russia, and the United States, along with such secondary powers as Iran and North Korea, have established **extensive** cyberwarfare capabilities and engage in **offensive cyberoperations** on a **regular basis**, often aimed at **critical** military **infrastructure**. “Cyberspace is a contested environment where we are in constant contact with adversaries,” General Paul M. Nakasone, commander of the U.S. Cyber Command (Cybercom), told the Senate Armed Services Committee in February 2019. “We see near-peer competitors [China and Russia] conducting sustained campaigns below the level of armed conflict to erode American strength and gain strategic advantage.”

Although eager to speak of adversary threats to U.S. interests, Nakasone was noticeably but not surprisingly reluctant to say much about U.S. offensive operations in cyberspace. He acknowledged, however, that Cybercom took such action to disrupt possible Russian interference in the 2018 midterm elections. “We created a persistent presence in cyberspace to monitor adversary actions and crafted tools and tactics to frustrate their efforts,” he testified in February. According to press accounts, this included a cyberattack aimed at paralyzing the Internet Research Agency, a “troll farm” in St. Petersburg said to have been deeply involved in generating disruptive propaganda during the 2016 presidential elections.[6](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote06)

Other press investigations have disclosed two other offensive operations undertaken by the United States. One called “Olympic Games” was intended to disrupt Iran’s drive to increase its uranium-enrichment capacity by sabotaging the centrifuges used in the process by infecting them with the so-called Stuxnet virus. Another left of launch effort was intended to cause malfunctions in North Korean missile tests.[7](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote07) Although not aimed at either of the U.S. principal nuclear adversaries, those two attacks demonstrated a willingness and capacity to conduct cyberattacks on the nuclear infrastructure of other states.

Efforts by **strategic rivals of** the United States to **infiltrate** and eventually **degrade** U.S. **nuclear infrastructure** are far **less documented** but thought to be **no less prevalent**. Russia, for example, is believed to have planted **malware** in the U.S. electrical utility grid, possibly with the intent of **cutting off** the **flow** of **electricity** to critical **NC3 facilities** in the event of a major crisis.[8](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote08) Indeed, every major power, including the United States, is believed to have **crafted cyberweapons** aimed at critical **NC3 components** and to have implanted malware in enemy systems for potential use in some future confrontation.

Pathways to Escalation

Knowing that the NC3 systems of the major powers are constantly being probed for weaknesses and probably infested with malware designed to be activated in a crisis, what does this say about the risks of escalation from a nonkinetic battle, that is, one fought without traditional weaponry, to a kinetic one, at first using conventional weapons and then, potentially, nuclear ones? None of this can be predicted in advance, but those analysts who have studied the subject worry about the emergence of dangerous new pathways for escalation. Indeed, several such scenarios have been identified.[9](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote09)

The first and possibly most **dangerous path** to **escalation** would arise from the **early use** of **cyberweapons** in a great power **crisis** to ~~paralyze~~ **undermine** the vital command, control, and communications capabilities of an adversary, many of which serve nuclear and conventional forces. In the “**fog of war**” that would naturally ensue from such an encounter, the recipient of such an attack might fear more punishing follow-up kinetic attacks, possibly including the use of nuclear weapons, and, **fearing** the **loss** of its own **arsenal**, **launch** its weapons **immediately**. This might occur, for example, in a confrontation between NATO and Russian forces in east and central Europe or between U.S. and Chinese forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

Speaking of a possible confrontation in Europe, for example, James N. Miller Jr. and Richard Fontaine wrote that “both sides would have **overwhelming incentives** to go **early** with **offensive** cyber and counter-space **capabilities** to **negate** the other side’s military capabilities or **advantages**.” If these early attacks succeeded, “it could result in huge **military** and **coercive advantage** for the attacker.” This might induce the recipient of such attacks to back down, affording its rival a major victory at very low cost. Alternatively, however, the recipient might view the attacks on its critical command, control, and communications infrastructure as the **prelude** to a **full-scale attack** aimed at **neutralizing** its **nuclear capabilities** and choose to strike first. “It is worth considering,” Miller and Fontaine concluded, “how even a very limited attack or incident could set both sides on a slippery slope to rapid escalation.”[10](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote10)

What makes the insertion of **latent malware** in an adversary’s NC3 systems so **dangerous** is that it may not even **need** to be **activated** to **increase** the **risk** of **nuclear escalation**. If a nuclear-armed state comes to believe that its critical systems are infested with enemy malware, its leaders might **not trust** the information provided by its early-warning systems in a crisis and might **misconstrue** the **nature** of an **enemy attack**, leading them to **overreact** and possibly **launch** their **nuclear weapons** out of **fear** they are at **risk** of a **preemptive strike**.

“The **uncertainty** caused by the unique character of a cyber threat could **jeopardize** the **credibility** of the **nuclear deterrent** and **undermine strategic stability** in ways that advances in nuclear and conventional weapons do not,” Page O. Stoutland and Samantha Pitts-Kiefer wrote in 2018 paper for the Nuclear Threat Initiative. “[T]he introduction of a **flaw** or **malicious code** into nuclear weapons through the **supply chain** that **compromises** the **effectiveness** of those **weapons** could lead to a **lack** of **confidence** in the **nuclear deterrent**,” undermining strategic stability.[11](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation#endnote11) Without confidence in the reliability of its nuclear weapons infrastructure, a nuclear-armed state may misinterpret confusing signals from its early-warning systems and, fearing the worst, launch its own nuclear weapons rather than lose them to an enemy’s first strike. This makes the scenario proffered in the 2018 NPR report, of a nuclear response to an enemy cyberattack, that much more alarming.

**1AC — Plan**

**Plan: The United States federal judiciary should substantially increase prohibitions on private sector conduct that is more restrictive of competition than reasonably necessary to enable creation of information technology standards.**

**1AC — Solvency**

**Solvency —**

**The plan requires SSO’s to administer reasonable action to prohibit ex post opportunism---that strengthens FRAND effectiveness while enabling SEP holders to capture appropriate royalties---which is the best competition-innovation balance.**

**Melamed & Shapiro 18**, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf)

3. Application of the Basic Legal Principles

The antitrust principle is **straightforward**: industry-wide collaboration through SSOs to establish procompetitive standards is **permitted** only if it is **no more restrictive** of competition than **reasonably necessary** to enable creation of the standards. When standard setting predictably creates technology **monopolies** that, if unrestrained, will enable **anticompetitive** ex post **opportunism** that would otherwise not occur, an SSO that **does not** take **effective** measures to prevent or minimize such ex post opportunism engages in conduct that is **more restrictive** of competition than necessary. In that case, the SSO and, in appropriate cases, its members, may well **violate Section 1** of the **Sherman Act**.

Under this principle, SSO procedures and FRAND rules should be **evaluated** based on whether they lead to **reasonable** SEP **royalties**, using the competitive ex ante licensing standard discussed above, which has been **adopted** by the courts in patent law. Put differently, FRAND rules should be evaluated based on their ability to prevent SEP holders from obtaining **more** than the **ex ante value** of their **technology** from implementers.

This limitation **would not** prevent a SEP holder from **proﬁting**, perhaps **greatly**, from participating in the SSO and having its patented technology included in the standard. The SEP holder **continues** to be **rewarded** for its technology because the inclusion of its technology in the standard can still **greatly increase** the volume of licensing opportunities available to the SEP holder.

Whether a particular set of FRAND rules are sufficiently effective in preventing ex post opportunism will depend on the particular circumstances. The procedural unfolding of the case will also depend upon the circumstances. As a general matter, the case would probably be structured as an ordinary **Rule of Reason** case.82

First, the plaintiff would have to demonstrate **harm** to **competition** as a result of the collaboration of the SSO’s members, many of which compete with one another. In this case, the harm to competition would stem from the ability of the SEP holder to exercise **monopoly** power by obtaining royalties in **excess** of the **competitive**, ex ante level. The decision to include patented technologies in the standard would be the allegedly **unlawful** agreement. Notably, the court **need not** determine what a FRAND royalty is; it would **suffice** to **determine** that **market power** has been **created** or **exercised**, and that existing SSO rules and policies were **not adequate** to prevent the competitive harm. The defendant, which could be the SSO or perhaps one or more SSO members, would win at this point if the plaintiff failed to show harm to competition. If might fail if the standard faces substantial competition and the court concludes that the SEP holder therefore does not have market power or if the SSO’s rules and policies are found to be effective in preventing ex post opportunism, even if the plaintiff or even the court thinks that other rules and policies would be preferable.

Second, if the plaintiff makes the requisite showing of harm to competition, the **defendant(s)** would then have to show some **procompetitive justiﬁcation**— in this case, the **beneﬁts** of the standard. These two initial steps should be straightforward.

Third, if as is likely the defendant is able to show a procompetitive justiﬁcation, the plaintiff would have to show that the SSO could have used available, reasonable **alternatives** to realize the **efficiency beneﬁts** with less or **none** of the competitive **harms**. The plaintiff might identify reasonable **alternatives** that would have led to a **different** standard, based on including **unpatented** technology in the standard or perhaps involving **fewer SEPs** or **fewer owners** of SEPs, which would be **less subject** to patent holdup. More likely, the plaintiff could suggest alternative SSO rules that would not change the standard, but would **reduce** the **likelihood** or extent of ex post **opportunism**. For example, the plaintiff might suggest more rigorous FRAND-type rules, such as rules that set forth more precise principles on which FRAND royalties are to be determined and the circumstances under which SEP holders might seek injunctions.

Fourth, the burden would then shift to the defendant(s) to show that the beneﬁts of the standard **could not** have been **realized** if the SSO had adopted any of the proffered **alternatives** or that those alternatives were unrealistic.83 The plaintiff would be entitled to judgment if the court concludes that those beneﬁts could have been realized with less competitive harm if the SSO had adopted the standard with different IPR rules or policies.

Our overall sense, based on experience and the empirical literature, is that the extant FRAND rules are generally useful, but tend to be **inadequate** because they are **imprecise** and leave **unresolved** such critical issues as (a) the meaning of a **reasonable** royalty, even conceptually; (b) the meaning of “**non-discriminatory**;” (c) to whom licenses must be offered; and (d) under what circumstances may a SEP holder obtain an injunction.84 These **imprecise** FRAND commitments are therefore **not sufficient** to adequately prevent ex post opportunism. The recent revisions to IEEE’s FRAND policy represent a signiﬁcant step in the right direction, but even this advance leaves important questions **unanswered**.85 If FRAND rules are inadequate in these ways, litigation involving extant FRAND rules would likely be resolved only at the ﬁnal, fourth step. The defendant would be able to **demonstrate** the **beneﬁts** created by the standard; the plaintiff would be able to demonstrate the **creation** of **market power** and that other reasonable and practical rules or policies would **ameliorate** the problem. The case would thus turn on whether the defendant is able to demonstrate that signiﬁcant beneﬁts associated with standardization could not have been realized if the SSO had adopted those other rules or policies.

The court would have **available** a **variety** of **possible remedies** if the plaintiff prevails. Implementers that paid supracompetitive royalties or were unlawfully excluded in whole or in part from product markets as a result of the inadequate FRAND policies would be **entitled** to **damages** and, in some cases, to **treble damages**.86 If the unlawful SSO conduct is regarded as the **collective action** of the SSO and its members, which is likely to be the case in most instances, SSO members would be **jointly** and **severally liable** for the damages. Forward-looking injunctive relief aimed at restoring competition would need to be fashioned to the requirements of the individual case. For example, a court could order the SSO to adopt a new rule or policy proposed by the plaintiff. If the court is reluctant to take on that governance role, it might give the SSO a period of time—maybe ninety days—to develop a rule, subject to the court’s ultimate approval, which would adequately ameliorate the competitive problem created by the SSO. Alternatively or in addition, the court might order the parties to attempt to **negotiate** a **rule** or policy on which they can agree. And, depending on the circumstances, the court might order SEP holders, including at least those that were defendants in the case, to comply with the new SSO rules and policies.

**Threatening antitrust liability lures SSO’s into adopting best practices.**

**Lemley & Shapiro 13**, \*Mark Lemley is the William H. Neukom Professor at Stanford Law School and a partner at Durie Tangri LLP; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business, University of California at Berkeley and a Senior Consultant at Charles River Associates; (2013, “A SIMPLE APPROACH TO SETTING REASONABLE ROYALTIES FOR STANDARD-ESSENTIAL PATENTS”, (https://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/shapiro/frand.pdf)

Under our approach, many of these issues should become moot, since the patentee cannot obtain an injunction (or transfer the patent to someone who can) against a willing licensee, and since competitors are not involved in jointly setting the reasonable royalty rate. If SSOs set clear, reasonable rules following the best practices we recommend, and parties follow those rules, there should be **little** or **no need** for **antitrust** to **intervene**. Indeed, even the risk of non-disclosure of a patent is lessened, since the patentee has committed to license its essential patents whether or not it discloses them. For the most part, the rules we have described are **self-executing**, meaning that even if a party tries to break the rules set by the SSO there still may be no need for antitrust to intervene. Thus, we suggest that **parties** who **abide** by these **procedures**—patentees, implementers, and the SSOs themselves—should be **immune** from **antitrust liability** for activities that merely follow those rules.107 They have entered into an arrangement that is **on balance good** for **competition**, one that allows patentees to receive **reasonable royalties** but **prevents holdup** and **reduces** the risk of **monopolization** by **trickery**.

The fact that antitrust remains a last resort available when SSOs don’t follow best practices may have two practical benefits, however. First, under our approach the **promise** of **avoiding** the risk of **antitrust liability** will be a **powerful incentive** for both SSOs and patent owners to **adopt** the **best practices** we propose. Second, the risk of antitrust liability may be relevant when an individual patentee wants to adopt best practices but the SSO governing the standard has not yet done so. We propose that a patentee that unilaterally commits to the FRAND procedures we describe here should be immune from antitrust liability for following these procedures.108 A patentee’s unilateral binding commitment to arbitration could be enforced whether or not it was elicited by an SSO. Thus, just as the prospect of antitrust immunity might **lure SSOs** to **adopt best practices**, it might also lure **patentees** to **implement** those **practices** even if the SSO has not done so. Given the large number of standard-essential patents based on preexisting standards,109 and given that SSOs tend to update their IP rules rather slowly,110 this is **not** a **small matter**.

**Only antitrust enforcement creates a consumer-action feature that counterbalances SSO’s conspiratorial incentives---private action fails.**

**Melamed & Shapiro 18**, \*A. Douglas Melamed is Professor of the Practice of Law at Stanford Law School; \*Carl Shapiro is the Transamerica Professor of Business Strategy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California at Berkeley; (May 2018, “How Antitrust Law Can Make FRAND Commitments More Effective”, <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/How-Antitrust-Law-Can-Make-FRAND-Commitments-More-Effective.pdf>)

2. Why Antitrust Enforcement Is Necessary

Some SSO members have an interest in ensuring that the SSO takes steps to minimize the potential harms from the SEP holders’ monopoly power, and this undoubtedly explains in part why most SSOs have adopted FRAND policies or similar requirements. But, as shown in the economic model in the Appendix,73 SSOs **cannot** in general **be counted on** to adopt effective FRAND policies. The bases for this conclusion, which is central to our argument for the applicability of Section 1 to SSO FRAND rules, can be summarized as follows.74

First, the SSO members **collectively have an interest** in permitting SEP holders to charge supracompetitive royalties that elevate the downstream price of compliant devices to the monopoly level. Doing so will enable the members **in aggregate** to collect **increased revenues** from consumers, and thus to generate **increased profits** that in theory could be **shared by all** the members. In other words, supracompetitive royalties can enrich industry participants as a group at the expense of final consumers. This fact alone should serve as a **clear and strong signal** regarding the **dangers** of counting on SSOs to implement effective FRAND policies: if the SSO members negotiate **efficiently**, the outcome will be **just as bad** for consumers as if the members agreed to **fix downstream prices**.75 The **fundamental problem** is that **final consumers** are **not at the table** when the SSO rules are negotiated.

Second, SSO members that own SEPs but earn little or no profits as implementers have a **powerful self-interest** in being able to exercise the ex post monopoly power associated with their SEPs. Because SSO policies are usually determined by a **consensus** process, these members will likely be able to **block the adoption** of **fully effective FRAND policies**. Moreover, these SSO members often have the greatest interest in SSO patent policies. Since much of their income may be attributable to patent licensing, they can be expected to devote substantial resources to block the adoption of FRAND policies that effectively prevent patent holdup.

Third, even SSO members that earn **significant profits** as implementers may have **mixed incentives** if they also own SEPs, which can also lead to **weak or in-effective FRAND rules**. In the Appendix, we show that, if the **requisite share** of votes in the SSO are cast by firms whose **share of SEP royalties** is at least as large as their share of **downstream profits**, and if these firms can coordinate their voting over the FRAND rules, then an SSO **unconstrained** by antitrust laws will establish FRAND rules leading to an outcome **no better for consumers** than would result from an **integrated monopolist** controlling all SEPs and all downstream sales.76

Fourth, even SSO members that are **downstream implementers** and own few, if any, SEPs may have only a **modest interest** in promoting effective policies to restrict ex post opportunism. Because all implementers will be subject to the opportunism, all of them will face **increased licensing costs**, and therefore will likely be able to **pass on** most or all of the **increased costs** to their customers.77 Furthermore, these implementers might not be **especially active** or **effective** in the standard-setting process for **free-riding** or **public-good** reasons, especially if SEP royalties constitute only a **relatively small portion** of the costs of their standard-implementing products. Public choice theory predicts that the highly motivated SEP holders are likely to have the **greatest influence** over **patent policies**.

Empirical evidence bears out these concerns. As a starting point, we find it striking that SSO FRAND rules are almost **always quite vague**.78 Notably, SSOs in which SEP holders are more prevalent tend to have weaker FRAND rules.79 Further, to our knowledge, SSOs have made almost **no effort** to enforce their FRAND rules and have, instead, **left enforcement** efforts to **others**.80 This evidence raises serious doubts about the effectiveness of the existing FRAND rules in preventing ex post opportunism.

#### Antitrust is critical---the broad standing and available remedies afforded are vastly superior to any other types of law.

Cary et al. 11, \*Messrs. George Cary and Alex Sistla are members of the California and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Mark Nelson is a member of the New York and District of Columbia Bars. Mr. Steven Kaiser is a member of the New Jersey and District of Columbia Bars; (2011, “THE CASE FOR ANTITRUST LAW TO POLICE THE PATENT HOLDUP PROBLEM INSTANDARD SETTING”, <https://www.clearygottlieb.com/~/media/organize-archive/cgsh/files/publication-pdfs/the-case-for-antitrust-law-to-police-the-patent-holdup-problem-in-the-standard-setting.pdf>)

III. CONCLUSION

Patent holdup where a patentee has deceived an SSO in order to secure a position in the standard is, at its core, an antitrust problem. In this context, patent holders harm consumers by exploiting the competition-reducing aspects of standard setting to their own private advantage. In addition to being the body of law directed toward anticompetitive conduct, antitrust provides numerous practical advantages, including the possibility of governmental enforcement, and appropriately broad standing.

Remedying the patent holdup problem exclusively through non-antitrust legal remedies would be perverse. Indeed, it would be a bit like remedying patent infringement through the doctrine of common law conversion. In some instances, it might work, but there certainly would be under-enforcement.

To be sure, there are instances where deceptive conduct by the patentee does not harm competition and, in those instances, there is no antitrust claim. Often there will be patent remedies in that situation, or contract or even tort remedies. The legal regimes can and do coexist peacefully.

Those who argue that the marginal benefit of antitrust remedies do not out-weigh the cost of antitrust litigation both understate the benefits (broad standing and ready remedies where appropriate) and overstate the costs (the potential, however unknown, of “false positives,” i.e., condemning behavior that is not anticompetitive). In addition to being overstated, the false positives concern is also misplaced in this context. Unlike an antitrust attack on price cutting or a securities offering, the risk of a false positive here is not the over-deterrence of desired behavior, but rather that over-deterrence of deceptive and opportunistic behavior. Fretting about that form of over-deterrence seems itself to be a misallocation of resources. And preventing that form of over-deterrence by reliance on the competitive outcomes under legal regimes not designed to protect competition strikes us as unwise.

#### \*Ex ante disclosure solves lock-in, improves transparency and openness.

Contreras 13, \*Jorge L. Contreras is a Presidential Scholar and Professor of Law at the University of Utah with an adjunct appointment in the Department of Human Genetics. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School (JD) and Rice University (BSEE, BA); (Contreras, J. L. (2013). TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND EX ANTE DISCLOSURE: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF AN EMPIRICAL STUDY. Jurimetrics, 53(2), 163-211. Retrieved from https://www2.lib.ku.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/technical-standards-ex-ante-disclosure-results/docview/1428261870/se-2?accountid=14556)

Ex ante disclosure of licensing terms could potentially alleviate the causes of such disputes by making a patent holder's royalty rate known before lock-in of a standard. Thus, if maximum royalty rates were known in advance, it would be more difficult for an implementer to argue that such rates were unreasonable (as the SDO could have chosen an alternative technology if this were the case).148 Lacking this potential defense against an infringement claim by the patent holder, implementers might be more inclined to negotiate with patent holders before the adoption of a standard. By the same token, if a patent holder knew that its maximum royalty rate would be scrutinized before the approval of a standard, and that SDO participants would be free to consider alternative, less costly technologies, it would have an incentive to disclose a royalty rate that was as reasonable (or low) as possible.149

Ex ante disclosure of licensing terms has an intuitive appeal. Like the prices of menu items at a restaurant, it has been argued that the royalty rates for standards-essential patents should be disclosed before product vendors (diners) are locked into costly technology choices. But critics of ex ante disclosure have argued that requiring early disclosure of licensing terms will impede standards-development processes and create additional legal risks for participants. To assess the validity of these complaints, we studied ex ante licensing

disclosures at VITA, IEEE and IETF and found no evidence that such policies resulted in measurable negative effects on the number of standards started or adopted, personal time commitments or quality of standards, nor was there compelling evidence that ex ante policies caused the lengthening of time required for standardization or the depression of royalty rates. There was evidence to suggest that the adoption of ex ante policies may have contributed to positive effects observed on some of these variables. In addition, a significant majority of participants in VITA, the only SDO adopting a mandatory ex ante policy, felt that the information elicited by the organization's ex ante policy improved the overall openness and transparency of the standards-development process. Thus, while there are numerous areas in which further study and analysis may be warranted, and other organizations in which the implementation of ex ante policies may have different effects, we concluded that the process-based criticisms of ex ante policies and the predicted negative effects flowing from the adoption of such policies are not supported by the available evidence.
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**Their description of a decolonial future which will emerge from the demand binds them to a logic of linear time which turns the alt**

**Strakosch & Macoun 12** [Elizabeth, Faculty Member of the School of Political Science & International Studies at the University of Queensland in Australia, and Alissa, Indigenous Studies Research Network at Queensland University of Technology in Australia, “The Vanishing Endpoint of Settler Colonialism,” *Arena Journal* 37/38 (2012): 40-62] // myost

Firstly, Australian **settler colonialism holds on to the post-colonial image of a** single, **transformative moment of a radical political break marking decolonization**. While its exact nature is not specified, this change will somehow draw a line under the problematic colonial relationships of the past and mark the nation’s movement into a newly certain future. **Settler colonialism circles around this moment,** variously **locating it in the past, the present and the future**. And yet, **in settler-colonial formations, no such radical break ever seems to come — ‘invasion is a structure not an event’**. The vanishing endpoint that is continually pursued is, in effect, the moment of colonial completion. That is when the settler society will have fully replaced Indigenous societies on their land, and naturalized this replacement. Secondly, the more widely known temporal narrative of post-colonialism is deployed within settler colonialism in ways that assist this project of full colonization. The settler-colonial project identifies its own endpoint with the moment of decolonization. However, decolonization and settler-colonial completion have very different political effects. **The linear narrative of colonization–decolonization–post-colonialism reflects the** very **specific histories of sub-continental Asia and Africa. Applying this post-colonial story** of linear progress **to the settler-colonial project** is not only inaccurate, it actually **assists the** settler-**colonial project by obscuring the very different transformative moment to which it aspires.** Merging the moment of **decolonization and the moment of colonial completion, these narratives can mobilize conservative and progressive settler voices towards colonial goals.** Overall, we seek to open up discussion of temporal and teleological narratives within settler-colonial policy-making, and suggest that we need to contest our currently unacknowledged stories of the colonial future. By seeking resolution through extinguishment, **these narratives tend to foreclose more productive debates about how settler and Indigenous people might live together differently across time**.

#### Use consequentialism---evaluating causal outcomes is most ethical. “You link, you lose” diverts political responsibility for atrocity---which turns the alternative.

Zanotti 17, \*Laura Zanotti, Associate Professor Department of Political Science, Virginia Tech, (January 13th, 2017, “Reorienting IR: Ontological Entanglement, Agency, and Ethics,” International Studies Review)

Furthermore, if we accept Barad’s position that we are “of the world” and not above the world, theorizing looks more like a practice endowed with performative political effects than a quest for the discovery of the “true nature” of what exists. Therefore, intellectual undertakings are a form of political agency and come with great responsibility. Such responsibility requires the need for exercising prudence in making truth statements about what is universally good or naturally inevitable. Assumptions about linearity of causal relations, universal laws of history, or ontological properties of entities yield two problematic effects. On the one hand, they may stifle political imagination; on the other hand, they could encourage actions based upon abstract prescriptions rather than upon careful diagnosis of the forces that obtain in the situation at hand. In an entangled world, there are no externalities. Arguments that divert responsibility by basing political choices upon abstract principles or aspirations and, as a result, that treat what happens on the ground as “unintended consequences” or “collateral damage,” are ethically thin and politically dangerous.

In fact, unintended consequences may well be the result of irresponsible political decision-making that does not include a competent assessment of the practical configurations that constitute the context of action and the means necessary to achieve stated goals. Such attitudes, Amoureux and Steele (2014) have suggested, have led to disastrous initiatives, such as the Bush administration’s invasion of Iraq. Likewise, Kennedy (2006) has shown that the bland rhetoric of jus in bello that provides standardized criteria regarding the number of acceptable civilian casualties (conveniently called collateral damage) produces the effect of diverting responsibility from those who conduct war while assuaging their consciences concerning the injuries and deaths their choices are inflicting. Kennedy (2004) has also shown that as a result of the preference for universal normativity, the human rights profession (which he calls “the invisible college”) is more concerned with protecting abstract norms than with acting politically so as to devise viable solutions to specific problems.

Universal norms and bureaucratic routines play a major role in prescribing and justifying UN peacekeeping interventions. As Jean Marie Guehe ́nno argued more than a decade ago, strategies of international intervention based upon assumptions of causal linearity and invariance may amount to hubris. Norms and rules can also offer grounds for appeasement. The massacres that occurred in Rwanda and Srebrenica in the 1990s provide examples of how, by uncritically following institutionalized rules, United Nations peacekeepers permitted atrocities. UN employees are not cold-blooded monsters or extremely callous individuals. They follow norms and rules, key examples of which include the principle of “impartiality,” Security Council mandates, and “rules of engagement.” By doing so, however, they have often fallen short of considering the possible consequences of decisions in specific situations. The United Nations’ failure to take action to prevent the Rwanda and Srebrenica genocide testifies to the fact that following universal norms (i.e., the imperative to preserve impartiality) and bureaucratic reasoning (i.e., the rules of engagement prescribing not to intervene to disarm any party of the conflict) set the stage for avoiding a careful assessment of what was at stake on the eve of the massacres. These ways of reasoning also appeased consciences for not making decisions accountable to the people in danger (Zanotti 2014).

#### Working through statist structures does not coopt indigenous groups—they can and do work through structures

Soguk 11 Nevzat Soguk is a professor of political science at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Indigenous Transversality in Global Politics, Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action, Vol 5, No 1 (2011), https://unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/2011/09/06/indigenous-transversality-in-global-politics/

This article examines historical transversal politics in indigenous movements in the Americas and beyond. It argues that contemporary indigenous activism, enacted in multiple political forms, ranging from international governmental organizations to extra-statist indigenous networks, are energized in and through resurgent transversality as a historical spatial condition and a mode of being. In the new global exhilarations a transversal political universe is emerging. This universe works syncretically within the ambit the traditional statist diplomatic regime but is neither subsumed within nor eclipsed by it. Following Michel Foucault on heterotopias, the article argues that indigenous universe exists and works side by side, under and above, in and through the prevailing statist regime yet it preserves a certain transformative, even transgressive, autonomy. In the process, this universe introduces indigeneity as an agent of the political, productive of novel communicative horizons. The article looks into indigenous experiences in modernity as experiences of not simply massive political and economic devastation and cultural displacement, but also centuries-long refusal to be “absorbed” by modernity’s nationalizing and territorializing relations and intuitions anchored in the modern state. Among these institutions are traditional ontologies as political regimes that communicate statist form while excommunicating indigeneity, among others, from the field of political praxis. With this dynamic in mind, a la Armand Mattelart, the article begins to examine indigenous practices that are mobilized (a) to circumvent their excommunication from the political and (b) to communicate indigeneity into global politics as a different ontology of political being and becoming. The article argues that indigenous activisms can be read as critical constructive “engagements” with modernity’s promises and results, in which it is possible to learn limits of the politics, present and future, and offer new insights into how local and global politics, including state-centricity, can be critically and constructively re-envisioned in policy and conduct.

#### 2. The state is inevitable—denouncing restrictions as “liberal reformism” ignores that even if we don’t engage the state, it will engage us—they devolve politics into a dogmatic void that the right is all too willing to fill

Choat, 16—PhD in Political Science at Queen Mary University of London, member of the Political Studies Association, Senior Lecturer in the School of Economics, Politics, and History (Simon, “Marxism and anarchism in an age of neoliberal crisis,” <http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/32233/1/Choat-S-3223-AAM.pdf>, dml)

The anarchist critique of Marxist organisational forms is unconvincing, then, because it does not acknowledge the diversity of Marxist approaches and it tends towards a theoreticism that sees a linear, causal, and continuous line from theory to practice. Nonetheless, there are significant differences of strategy between anarchism and Marxism: it is just that these are less to do with organisation as such, and are much more broadly to do with differing attitudes toward politics and the state. Although some (though by no means all) anarchists have supported formal political organisations, with rules, membership criteria, and even internal discipline (Schmidt and van der Walt 2009: 247-263), they have traditionally rejected any engagement with the state – whether it be voting, demanding legal rights or protections, forming political parties, or attempting the revolutionary seizure of government – on the basis that such engagement can only end up replicating the oppressive hierarchies that they are fighting: either it will lead to new forms of dictatorship and bureaucracy (such as developed in the Soviet Union); or it will lead to parliamentary reformism and hence merely reinforce existing structures and relations of power.

If Marxists support (qualified) engagement with the state and even the formation of political parties, however, it is not because they think that centralised hierarchies are desirable or inevitable, but because they begin from a different understanding of politics. They argue that the anarchist abstention from state politics denies us the most effective means of political action: we disempower ourselves rather than the state when we refuse to engage with it. Making demands on the state does not necessarily entail an endorsement of the state, any more than the demands that are made by employees during a strike are an endorsement of the employer or of the system of wage-labour (Marx 1988). Anarchists themselves have at least implicitly recognised the efficacy of political engagement by occasionally supporting the policies of certain governments and even participating in elections (Engels 1988; Franks 2012: 216).

More than this, abstention from state politics is not a genuine option: whether we like it or not, we are all already involved in state politics, because we are all always already submitted to state power, control, and oppression. Anarchists are concerned that participation in conventional politics will lead to parliamentary reformism. But this concern is itself ultimately premised on a tacit acceptance of the liberal-parliamentary understanding of politics: to claim that we can safely repudiate state politics simply by refusing ever to enter a polling booth is to assume that ‘the state’ stops at the door of Parliament. Marxists, in contrast, have argued that the state apparatus includes educational institutions, the media, churches, the family, and so on (e.g. Althusser 1971): simply in going about our daily lives we are all therefore implicated in state politics. Given our necessary involvement within politics, the question is not whether we engage with it, but how we do so; even libertarian Marxists like Holloway argue that engagement with the state is inevitable (Holloway 2005: 40). In contrast, the anarchist recommendation of disengagement from the state risks a politics of withdrawal and isolation.

There are two related reasons why under our current conditions in particular the Marxist willingness to engage in state politics is preferable to an anarchist position. The first is the dominance of neoliberalism today. Given the strength of neoliberalism since the crisis that it created, there is a strong case for a certain pragmatism in our response. A danger of the prefigurative politics favoured by anarchists is that it dogmatically dictates an a priori exclusion of certain forms of political action. For Marxists, on the other hand, political strategies must be decided according to particular conditions and within a certain context. In a context in which private companies are increasingly undertaking tasks previously performed by the state, the active defence of state services and institutions can be viewed as a radical position to adopt: defending welfare provision, public pensions, universal healthcare, and free higher education should be seen not as a reformist compromise with the existing order but as safeguarding the gains of class struggle against capitalist processes of accumulation by dispossession.

This leads to the second reason for doubting the refusal of state politics as a viable tactic under current conditions, which concerns the specific role of the state under neoliberalism. The anti-state politics of anarchism may have made sense during eras in which the state could plausibly be presented as the main threat to freedom and equality: during the period of nation-building and imperialistic expansion in the mid- to late-19th century, of the rise of fascism in the early-20th century, or even of the development of welfare capitalism after WWII. But it has far less purchase in an era in which neoliberalism, as both the official ideology and a form of everyday common sense, is anti-statist. Put simply, the attack on state power too easily echoes the rhetoric of neoliberalism itself (Taylor 2013: 735). When government actors themselves are explicitly endorsing the retreat of the state, then anarchist attacks on state power have limited efficacy either as a tactical call to arms or as a convincing analysis of our present conjuncture. In practice, of course, it is true that neoliberalism has not dissolved state power. But nor has the relation between state and capital remained the same under neoliberalism, such that our analyses, strategies, or rhetoric need not alter. The nature of this relationship between state and capital will be examined in the next section.

#### 3. Absent political transformation their theory pushes negativity onto indigenous people and turns the K

Busbridge, 18—Research Fellow at the Centre for Dialogue, La Trobe University (Rachel, “Israel-Palestine and the Settler Colonial ‘Turn’: From Interpretation to Decolonization,” Theory, Culture & Society Vol 35, Issue 1, 2018, dml)

The prescription for decolonisation—that is, a normative project committed to the liberation of the colonised and the overturning of colonial relationships of power (Kohn & McBride, 2011: 3)—is indeed one of the most counterhegemonic implications of the settler colonial paradigm as applied to IsraelPalestine, potentially shifting it from a diagnostic frame to a prognostic one which offers a ‘proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack’ (Benford & Snow, 2000: 616). What, however, does the settler colonial paradigm offer by way of envisioning decolonisation? As Veracini (2007) notes, while settler colonial studies scholars have sought to address the lack of attention paid to the experiences of Indigenous peoples in conventional historiographical accounts of decolonisation (which have mostly focused on settler independence and the loosening of ties to the ‘motherland’), there is nevertheless a ‘narrative deficit’ when it comes to imagining settler decolonisation. While Veracini (2007) relates this deficit to a matter of conceptualisation, it is apparent that the structural perspective of the paradigm in many ways closes down possibilities of imagining the type of social and political transformation to which the notion of decolonisation aspires. In this regard, there is a worrying tendency (if not tautological discrepancy) in settler colonial studies, where the only solution to settler colonialism is decolonisation—which a faithful adherence to the paradigm renders largely unachievable, if not impossible. To understand why this is the case, it is necessary to return to Wolfe’s (2013a: 257) account of settler colonialism as guided by a ‘zero-sum logic whereby settler societies, for all their internal complexities, uniformly require the elimination of Native alternatives’. The structuralism of this account has immense power as a means of mapping forms of injustice and indignity as well as strategies of resistance and refusal, and Wolfe is careful to show how transmutations of the logic of elimination are complex, variable, discontinuous and uneven. Yet, in seeking to elucidate the logic of elimination as the overarching historical force guiding settler-native relations there is an operational weakness in the theory, whereby such a logic is simply there, omnipresent and manifest even when (and perhaps especially when) it appears not to be; the settler colonial studies scholar need only read it into a situation or context. It thus hurtles from the past to the present into the future, never to be fully extinguished until the native is, or until history itself ends. There is thus a powerful ontological (if not metaphysical) dimension to Wolfe’s account, where there is such thing as a ‘settler will’ that inherently desires the elimination of the native and the distinction between the settler and native can only ever be categorical, founded as it is on the ‘primal binarism of the frontier’ (2013a: 258). It is here that the differences between earlier settler colonial scholarship on Israel-Palestine and the recent settler colonial turn come into clearest view. While Jamal Hilal’s (1976) Marxist account of the conflict, for instance, engaged Palestinians and Jewish Israelis in terms of their relations to the means of production, Wolfe’s account brings its own ontology: the bourgeoisie/proletariat distinction becomes that of settler/native, and the class struggle the struggle between settler, who seeks to destroy and replace the native, and native, who can only ever push back. Indeed, if the settler colonial paradigm views history in similar teleological terms to the Marxist framework, it does not offer the same hopeful vision of a liberated future. After all, settler colonialism has only one story to tell—‘either total victory or total failure’ (Veracini, 2007). Veracini’s attempt to disaggregate different forms of settler decolonisation is revealing of the difficulties that come along with this zero-sum perspective. It is significant to note that beyond settler evacuation (which may decolonise territory, he cautions, but not necessarily relationships) the picture he paints is a relatively bleak one. For Veracini (2011: 5), claims for decolonisation from Indigenous peoples in settler societies can take two broad forms: an ‘anticolonial rhetoric expressing a demand for indigenous sovereign independence and self-determination… and an “ultra”-colonial one that seeks a reconstituted partnership with the [settler state] and advocates a return to a relatively more respectful middle ground and “treaty” conditions’. While both, he suggests, are tempting strategies in the struggle for change, though ‘ultimately ineffective against settler colonial structures of domination’ (2011: 5), it is the latter strategy that invites Veracini’s most scathing assessment. As he writes, under settler colonial conditions the independent polity is the settler polity and sanctioning the equal rights of indigenous peoples has historically been used as a powerful weapon in the denial of indigenous entitlement and in the enactment of various forms of coercive assimilation. This decolonisation actually enhances the subjection of indigenous peoples… it is at best irrelevant and at worst detrimental to indigenous peoples in settler societies (2011: 6-7). The ‘primal binarism of the frontier’ plays a particularly ambivalent role in Veracini’s (2011: 6) formulation, where the categorical distinction between settler and native obstructs the ‘possibility of a genuinely decolonised relationship’ (by virtue of its lopsidedness) yet is a necessary political strategy to guard against the absorption of Indigenous people into the settler fold, which would represent settler colonialism’s final victory. The battle here is between a ‘settler colonialism [that] is designed to produce a fundamental discontinuity as its “logic of elimination” runs its course until it actually extinguishes the settler colonial relation’ and an anti-colonial struggle that ‘must aim to keep the settler-indigenous relationship going’ (2011: 7). In other words, the categorical distinction produced by the frontier must be maintained in order to struggle against its effects. Given the lack of options presented to Indigenous peoples by Veracini (2014: 315), his conclusion that settler decolonisation demands a ‘radical, post-settler colonial passage’ is perhaps not surprising – although he has ‘no suggestion as to how this may be achieved and [is] pessimistic about its feasibility’. Scholars have long reckoned with the ambivalence of the settler colonial situation, which is simultaneously colonial and postcolonial, colonising and decolonising (Curthoys, 1999: 288). Given the generally dreadful Fourth World circumstances facing many Indigenous peoples in settler societies, it could be argued that there is good reason for such pessimism. The settler colonial paradigm, in this sense, offers an important caution against celebratory narratives of progress. Wolfe (1994), it must be recalled, wrote the original articulation of his thesis precisely against the idea of ‘historical rupture’ that dominated in Australia post-Mabo, and was thus as much a scholarly intervention as it was a political challenge to the idea of Australia having broken with its colonial past. Nonetheless, the fatalism of the settler colonial paradigm—whereby decolonisation is by and large put beyond the realms of possibility—has seen it come under considerable critique for reifying settler colonialism as a transhistorical meta-structure where colonial relations of domination are inevitable (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013: 435; Snelgrove et al., 2014: 9). Not only does Wolfe’s ontology erase contingency, heterogeneity and (crucially) agency (Merlan, 1997; Rowse, 2014), but its polarised framework effectively ‘puts politics to death’ (Svirsky, 2014: 327). In response to such critiques, Wolfe (2013a: 213) suggests that ‘the repudiation of binarism’ may just represent a ‘settler perspective’. However, as Elizabeth Povinelli (1997: 22) has astutely shown, it is in this regard that the totalising logic of Wolfe’s structure of invasion rests on a disciplinary gesture where ‘any discussion which does not insist on the polarity of the [settler] colonial project’ is assimilationist, worse still, genocidal in effect if not intent. Any attempt to ‘explore the dialogical or hybrid nature of colonial subjectivity’—which would entail working beyond the bounds of absolute polarity—is disciplined as complicit in the settler colonial project itself, leaving ‘the only nonassimilationist position one that adheres strictly and solely to a critique of [settler] state discourse’. This gesture not only disallows the possibility of counter-publics and strategic alliances (even limited ones), but also comes dangerously close to ‘resistance as acquiescence’ insofar as the settler colonial studies scholar may malign the structures set in play by settler colonialism, but only from a safe distance unsullied by the messiness of ambivalences and contradictions of settler and Native subjectivities and relations. Opposition is thus left as our only option, but, as we know from critical anti-colonial and postcolonial scholarship, opposition in itself is not decolonisation.

#### 4. It erases agency and recreates the impacts

Svirsky 16 — Marcelo Svirsky (senior lecturer, International Studies in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry, and Faculty of Law, Humanities and the Arts, University of Wollongong, Ph.D., M.A. Political Science, University of Haifa, B.A. Physics), Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, “Resistance is a structure not an event,” Settler Colonial Studies, 7(1), 2016, DOI 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1141462, p.4-7) KMM

Wolfe’s position on the issue of resistance, I suspect, encompasses more preoccupations than how to respond to the white appropriation of indigenous discourses. According to Wolfe, ‘Indigenous resistance has been a constant feature of the entire settler-colonial era’, and therefore, ‘in generating its own resistance, settler-colonial power also contains it’.23 Wolfe conceives resistance, it seems, in a Newtonian fashion, as a necessarily reactive force that is always responding to the constraints of power and is thus quickly re-appropriated. In adopting this conception, we risk conceiving no outside to settler colonial power. Thus, oppression and domination in all their forms and shapes are given explanatory monopoly replicating their omnipresence in the shaping and managing of life. Yet, importantly, since Wolfe does not place an emphasis on the study of resistance, this position prompted a lively debate on the ways the strategies of resistance and survival of those subjected to settler colonial domination should be investigated. The implications this scholarly debate has for our understanding of reality in settler societies, and for potentially transformative political work, can hardly be overstated. As Macoun and Strakosch note, the critique of Wolfe’s paradigm centres on its ‘failure to take resistance seriously or to see subjects as sites of freedom and innovation’.24 And as they add: ‘By emphasizing continuities in colonial relationships between the past and the present, SCT [settler colonial theory] can depict colonization as structurally inevitable, and can be deployed in ways that re-inscribe settler colonialism’.25 This line of critique is not new and in fact joins the scholarship that preceded Wolfe’s publications. In this regard, Wolfe construed works such as Henry Reynolds’s The Other Side of the Frontier (1981) as his theoretical-other, since, as Altenbernd and Young explain, Reynolds ‘decisively recast the Australian frontier as a site of settler conquest and indigenous resistance’, and in so doing ‘transformed the content and conclusions of Australian frontier historiography by recuperating the suppressed history of the violence that subtended settlement, and the indigenous agency expressed through various forms of resistance’.26 This critique is not unprecedented. Replying to Wolfe’s 1994 article, Francesca Merlan stated that his position ‘seems to [it] offer[s] no prospect of a place and a future for indigenous peoples ‘within the modern order’, except perhaps a completely oppositional one, defined in terms of a binary logic of radical difference, Aborigine versus Other’, adding that in ‘centering the notion of a continuous “logic” of settler-colonialism, and regarding this as a “structure not an event”, Wolfe succumbs to the appealing closure of all structuralisms, and constitutes this logic as impervious to agency and event’.27 Looking into the dimension of settler subjecthood, Elizabeth Povinelli claimed that identifying ‘one’s procedure if not oneself as thoroughly other to an invasion logic, in no way comparable to or implicated in that invasion’, troubles the identity binary Wolfe flagged as essential to his project.28 In a recent edited book Lisa Ford and Tim Rowse bring together a collection of essays committed to analyses centred on contingency and complexity rather than on ‘notions that settler states were ever total institutions and that settler colonialism is a structure bent inexorably on dispossession, subordination, erasure or extinction’.29 The list does not end here. In the last two years, Settler Colonial Studies has published two special issues dedicated to transformative political work. In 2013 Tate A. LeFevre edited a special issue titled Difference, Representation, Resistance, highlighting – in LeFevre words – ‘a peculiar paradox: the eliminatory logics of settler colonialism are also generative. As the state settles, it produces the materials and possibilities of its own unsettlement’.30 A second special issue, edited by myself, tackles Wolfe’s paradigm from another perspective, that of ‘collaborative struggles’ – those arrangements whereby indigenous agency lead settlers and cooperatively find ways to transcend settler formations.31 These concerns in regards the role of resistance and of the anticolonial struggle in settler colonial theory have a particular relevance for the study of Palestine, perhaps epitomised in Veracini’s poignant question, ‘what can settler colonial studies offer to an interpretation of the conflict in Israel–Palestine?’32 Until recent years, analyses of Palestine have placed the focus majorly on the Zionist structures of domination, a trend that is still been adopted by the younger generations of scholars.33 Yet, as Ilan Pappé recently explained, as useful as the settler-colonial paradigm is, it is nonetheless insufficient to take account of settler constructions such as Israel-Palestine in a comprehensive fashion. For him, while the paradigm ‘challenge effectively the official Israeli, and mainstream scholarly approach […] it is unsatisfactory [because it] applies historical case studies with a known closure to an ongoing reality’.34 On the one hand, a rigid analysis of the history of the Zionist incursion since the late nineteenth century that excludes the study of Palestinian and other forms of struggle and survival would severely distort our empirical understanding of indigenous and settler subjectivities. On the other hand, it would be no less empirically erroneous, and also ethically obscene, to maintain that in Palestine the destructive logics of Zionist settlerism have surrendered to more toned-down axioms. That neither of these understandings should subdue the other is a strategy in the present study. But the reason for bringing these two perceptions together is motivated by a concern to recuperate not just a sense of urgency about the still oppositional and thus oppressive character of settler realties, nor indigenous agency per se, but a sensibility towards political work that reorients settler colonial studies to better communicate with the specificities of historical and ongoing anticolonial struggles. Structure, power, forces In what seems to be an attempt to soften Wolfe’s methodological position, Veracini explains that if ‘there is a plot in the “historiography of elimination” and more generally in settler-colonial studies it is that while the structure attempts to eliminate Indigenous peoples it fails to do so’. The ‘structure cannot be reduced to its intention’.35 That is to say, Wolfe’s logic of elimination should not be equated with elimination itself. As Veracini explains: Far from equating settler colonialism with elimination, Wolfe’s ‘structure’ refers to a continuing relationship of inequality between Indigenous and settler collectives. Beside ‘structure’ and ‘event’, it seems important to note that Wolfe refers to a logic of elimination, not to elimination itself. After all, were Indigenous elimination to become an accomplished and irretrievable fact, settler colonialism would lose its logic.36 Though the key for Wolfe is to shed light on the mechanisms of elimination, Veracini takes Wolfe’s position that ‘we should not view the logic of elimination as solely a drive to exterminate Native human beings’, and suggests that we should focus on what the structure actualising the logic fails to accomplish.37 The difference between the two highlights the incompleteness of the settler project. If settler colonialism is not a fait accompli but an incomplete project invested in a continuing structuration of life actualising the logic of elimination, then we may expect the settler colonial paradigm to take seriously phenomena of struggle, resistance and confrontation, and hence to align itself with the idea of power not just as coercion or repression but as a complex multiplicity. This is simply because the incompleteness of elimination must be explained, and it cannot be explained just in terms of the oppressor’s self-error or strategic deferment. The methodological imperative that derives then, is to trace the forces that cause the settler structure to fail and remain incomplete – forces that work either by compelling retreat in specific policy areas, or because of the ineffectiveness of the settler structure in territorialising its logic and imposing its discourse, codifications, and meanings in all areas of life. As Macoun and Strakosch note, ‘[e]xposing the settler colonial project as fundamentally incomplete – and unable to be completed in the face of Indigenous resistance – has the potential to be a profoundly liberating and destabilizing move’.38 This is because this move leads research to deal with liberatory forces. Some Palestinian scholars have taken the analysis of the Israeli settler state in this direction. Recently, Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian draws on Wolfe’s logic of elimination but not without combining her analysis of surveillance and fear with an account of practices of resistance.39 Similarly, Mazin Qumsiyeh notes that the brutal removal of villagers during Ottoman and later the British and, finally, Israeli rule over the past thirteen decades would have proceeded much faster and certainly would have resulted in a far more homogeneous Jewish state had it not been for Palestinian resistance.40 Explaining strategic and tactical changes in the continuing implementation of elimination only by means of the subject’s determination to eliminate appears as an act of theoretical cannibalism. The vicissitudes of elimination are the vicissitudes of the struggle, of resistance; or, as Veracini recently put it: the ‘settler colonial present is also an indigenous one’.41 Settler stability, in other words, needs to be explained not just by way of the discourse of settler inscription but by taking seriously Veracini’s insistence that the settler colonial situation is best described in terms of a ‘permanent movement’.42 Movement here needs to be conceived as a constantly changing composition of forces – those which seek to eliminate indigenous life together with those that either cause some of these attempts to fail, or that institute forms of life contiguous to settlerism – in both cases compelling settler colonialism to rework itself. The benefit of adopting the perspective of a field of forces lies, in the words of James Williams, in its questioning of ‘the evolution of things in order to sense how they have become what they are and how they may become something other’. This analytical sensibility, as he rightly adds, ‘sets things in movement above the secure foundation of an unchanging given’, enabling a view of political life which emphasises the variations occurring within a social order – though [is] always in the making – claiming to be established.43 This logical development and contribution to the settler colonial paradigm is inspired mainly by the works of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. However, the objections to their works among some scholars of settler colonialism, warrant a more extended response.

#### Extinction is informed by a shared concern for both settlers and indigenous to continue liberation — allows material conditions to get better even if nothing else.

**Weiss ’15** — Joseph J. Z. Weiss. Ph.D. candidate, Anthropology, University of Chicago. December 2015. “Unsettling Futures: Haida Future-Making, Politics and Mobility in the Settler Colonial Present.” p.216-232, https://knowledge.uchicago.edu/bitstream/handle/11417/1121/Weiss\_uchicago\_0330D\_13139.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

And yet, something has changed in this landscape from the initial erasures of Native futurity we drew out in the first chapter. In the narratives of colonial actors like Duncan Campbell Scott, it was absolutely clear that “Indians” were disappearing because their social worlds were being superseded by more “civilized” ways of living and being, ones that these Native subjects would also, inevitably, in the end, adopt (or failing that, perish outright). There was a future. It was simply a settler one. But the nightmare futures of that my Haida interlocutors ward against in their own future-making reach beyond Haida life alone. Environmental collapse, most dramatically, threatens the sustainability of all life; toxins in the land and the waters threaten human lives regardless of their relative indigeneity, race, or gender (e.g. Choy 2011; Crate 2011). Put another way, the impetus for non-Haida (and non-First Nations subjects more generally) to be “united against Enbridge” with their indigenous neighbours comes in no small part because an oil spill also profoundly threatens the lives and livelihoods of non-Aboriginal coastal residents, a fact which Masa Takei, among others, made clear in Chapter 3. Nor is the anxiety that young people might abandon their small town to pursue economic and educational advantage in an urban context limited to reserve communities. Instead, the compulsions of capitalist economic life compel such migrations throughout the globe. The nightmare futures that Haida people constitute alternative futures to ward against are not just future of indigenous erasure under settler colonialism. They are erasures of settler society itself.

There is thus an extraordinary political claim embedded in Haida future-making, a claim which gains its power precisely *because* Haida future-making as we have seen it does not (perhaps cannot) escape from the larger field of settler-colonial determination. Instead, in Haida future-making we find the implicit assertion that Haida people can make futures that address the dilemmas of Haida *and* settler life alike, ones that can at least “navigate,” to borrow Appadurai’s phrasing, towards possible futures that do not end in absolute erasure. If Povinelli and Byrd are correct and settler liberal governance makes itself possible and legitimate through a perpetual deferral of the problems of the present, then part of the power of Haida future-making is to expose the threatening non-futures that might emerge out of this bracketed present, to expose as lie the liberal promise of a good life always yet to come and to attempt to constitute alternatives.

It is no coincidence that we find this in the midst of a struggle over sovereignty. And this not just in the sense of the Council of the Haida Nation’s ongoing assertion of its sovereign right to govern the lands and waters of Haida Gwaii on behalf of all Haida people, as we saw in Chapter 5. Rather, as Joanne Barker has argued, over the course of the latter half of the twentieth century sovereignty has emerged as a: particularly valued term within indigenous scholarship and social movements and through the media of cultural production. It [is] a term around which analyses of indigenous histories and cultures were organized and whereby indigenous activists articulate their agendas for social change (Barker 2005:18). Through the assertion of sovereignty, indigenous political leaders, activists and scholars refute “the dominant notion that indigenous people [are] merely one among many ‘minority groups’ under the administration of state social service and welfare programs.” Instead, “sovereignty defines indigenous people with concrete rights to self-government, territorial integrity, and cultural autonomy under international law” (18). The trouble is, of course, that indigenous claims to sovereignty are always made within the context of colonial nation-states, ones whose own legitimacy is put at considerably risk both by the prospect of self-determining indigenous Nations (re)-emerging within their boundaries and the troubling of their own historical narratives of sovereign rights (cf: Comaroff and Comaroff 2003b). (One of these narratives, which reinterpreted indigenous lands as terra nullius and thus open to occupation, we’ve encountered already in Chapter 3). Thus, while sovereignty might indeed “define” indigenous peoples with concrete rights to territorial Title and self-determination, in theory equal under international law to the states who also lay claim to their territories, that definition does not in and of itself make possible the practice of this sovereignty. In this regard settler states such as Canada have shifted in their response to First Peoples’ sovereignty claims from outright rejection to a set of policies of selective recognition,5 but even the latter still positions Native nations as being subject to the authority and oversight (if not the structural forms) of the state. This means, as we have seen in Chapter 5, that indigenous governments such as the Council of the Haida Nation are in a precarious position, attempting to constitute their own sovereign authority without access to many of the conventional means of sovereignty in Western political thought – e.g., the monopoly on legitimate violence (Weber 1946), decisive authority to make and enact law (Schmitt 2005), or exclusive territorial control (Brown 2010; cf: Hobbes 1994). Alongside this precarity is the equally anxious question of whether or not sovereignty is even an appropriate analytical to center indigenous rights around precisely because it is historically a Western concept, one that had been drawn on to dispossess indigenous peoples over the course of settler colonial history (Barker 2005:18–19). (Indeed, the very next essay in Barker’s edited volume, by Mohawk scholar Taiake Alfred, categorically rejects sovereignty as an inappropriate tool for indigenous political assertions for these reasons and, also, because it draws attention away from developing and furthering “genuinely” Aboriginal political modes of thought (Alfred 2005; cf: Alfred 2009). The fact that sovereignty remains such a preeminent concept in the struggle for indigenous rights even though it is both epistemologically problematic and politically constrained has meant that there has been a recent push in both anthropology and indigenous studies to “widen” the definition of sovereignty, so that it might encompass multiple forms of indigenous social, political and legal practice outside of the conventional purview of “sovereign power” (e.g. Cattelino 2008; Richland 2011; Simpson 2000; Simpson 2014). Or, as Joanne Barker puts it: There is no fixed meaning for what sovereignty is – what it means by definition, what it implies in public debate, or how it has been conceptualized in international, nation, or indigenous law. Sovereignty – and its related histories, perspectives, and identities – is embedded within the specific social relations in which it is invoked and given meaning. How and when it emerges and functions are determined by the “located” political agendas and cultural perspectives of those who rearticulate it into public debate or political document to do a specific work of opposition, invitation, or accommodation. It is no more possible to stabilize what sovereignty means and how it matters to those who invoke it than it is to forget the historical and cultural embeddedness of indigenous peoples’ multiple and contradictory political perspectives and agendas for empowerment, decolonization, and social justice (Barker 2005:21, emphasis original). The opening up of sovereignty as flexible, multiple, and subject to all manner of diverse rearticulations carries particular weight (and, perhaps, ambiguity) since, as a historical concept in Western political theory, sovereignty was overwhelmingly concerned with closure. As Wendy Brown argues in her Walled States, Waning Sovereignty, the classic vision of sovereign power rests in the capacity to divide the inside from the outside, to make borders around a people – a “nation” – and separate that people from those outside it. Thus Schmitt’s “friend-enemy” distinction, for instance, or even John Locke’s consistent preoccupation with fences as a way of marking the existence of territory (Brown 2010; cf: Schmitt 1996; Locke 1988). The historical conditions of indigenous sovereignty claims in the context of settler colonialism make such absolute closures impossible for indigenous peoples. We might add, though, that their persistent presence also challenges the closure of the settler nation-state. Indeed, this is part of Brown’s point. The very fact that we see ever more spectacular performances of sovereign power on the part of contemporary nation-states – e.g., the titular “walls” that are being constructed along the borders of an increasing number of states - is a sign of the very insecurity of their political authority (Brown 2010).6 The conditions of settler colonial sovereignty, in other words, may be rather more “open,” and thus closer to those of indigenous “nation-within-nations,” then they may at first appear. If this means, in turn, that the future of settler political life is becoming as uncertain as the future for indigenous life has always been since the advent of settlement, then this means only what we have already begun to see: the dilemmas that Haida people confront in their future-making practices are also the dilemmas facing settler society. Take Chapter 4, in which the absence of any “one” definitive governing entity compels the constitution of an aspirational framework of accountability which could, were it realized, render navigable Haida relations to the many governments that claim their loyalties. As I hinted at there, such dilemmas are not restricted to the Haida sociopolitical world; rather, they may in fact be endemic to contemporary democratic societies and the multiple forms of governance (licit and otherwise) that emerge therein. In suggesting that there are Haida ways of refiguring a shared Haida-settler set of contemporary problematics, we might think of Haida future-making as simultaneously an instantiation of the multiple, flexible and always contingently located practices of sovereignty to which Barker points and a different way of thinking about indigenous political potentiality. In the former sense, Haida future-making is without doubt concerned with carving out spaces in which Haida existence can continue, expand, and change without losing the capacity to reproduce itself as, precisely, Haida existence. Thus the processes of homecoming we explored in Chapter 2, or Chapter 5’s explicitly political attempts to establish control over the islands for future generations. If the absence of indigenous sovereignty is the absence of the capacity of an indigenous people to (self)-determine their own futures, then the constitution of Haida futures can be seen exactly as sovereign work, whether in the overt sense of the Council of the Haida Nation’s assertions or the somewhat more implicit mode of Alice Stevens’ proposed mass adoptions. Significant here, though, is the fact that these acts of future-making carry meanings beyond their status as “responses” to the social and political dilemmas of contemporary Haida life. Thus Alice Stevens’ adoptions bring “hippie” children into the framework of Haida kinship relations, in one sense neutralizing their potential threat, but also constituting a complex new network of social relations between Haida and non-Haida whose potential significances go well beyond the protection of Haida territory and resources; thus the Council of the Haida Nation emerges as a “state-like” governing entity through its authorizing promise to “take care” of the islands, but in so doing takes on a series of new roles in Haida political life whose full consequences remain to be seen. If it is a sovereign action to envision an opening of possible futures for Haida people, then this very openness might also exceed the boundaries of sovereignty as a problematic for indigenous people even as it responds to them. Which is also, perhaps, why Haida futures seem so consistently to sketch out social, ecological, and political fields that encompass non-Haida; more, that are futures for Canada as well as for the Haida people living within the nation-state’s borders. Or, at least, futures that have the capacity to be so. What would it mean to figure an indigenous sovereignty that speaks beyond itself, one that promises to invert the order of settler domination through reconfiguring the shared futures of indigenous and settler peoples? This would not be a sovereignty premised on territorial closure, or even absolute political autonomy. It would, however, decisively overturn any settler colonial anticipations of the inevitable erasure of Native peoples. Quite the opposite, it would position indigenous practices of anticipation, aspiration, certainty, and anxiety at the forefront of contemporary modes of political imagination. Unsettling Futures

A question remains, however. Could such a refiguring of the temporal and political horizon of settler and indigenous relationships remain possible even if the futures that indigenous people work to constitute remain unrealized in the settler colonial present? Or, put another way, we must always be careful not to conflate a capacity *to* form new futures for settler nation-states with the actual materializations of these futures. The Haida futures that I have discussed, even as they promise possible ways of navigating – of restructuring, even – the settler-Haida present, remain firmly bound by the colonial constraints of this present. But perhaps the stakes here have never been about overthrowing the Canadian colonial order outright. Rather, what I hope this dissertation has shown is that Haida future-making has the capacity to *unsettle* the settler colonial present, to challenge its received categories and demonstrate how, slowly, gradually, Haida people are reconfiguring its terms through the work of producing the future. Certainly, the sheer fact of Haida futurity should put to the lie any further notion that Haida people exist only to replicate their past or live only in the deferral of their eventual disappearance. The future is alive and well in Old Massett, although this does not meant that it is not also a site of profound anxieties. In working to ward off those anxieties through the juxtaposition of nightmare futures against their more desirable alternatives, then, Haida people unsettle the epistemological foundations of the forms of settler colonialism and liberalism against which Byrd and Povinelli write. At the same time (if you’ll pardon the pun), I think we can see the social work that futuremaking does iteratively, as a gradual reshaping of the actual conditions of Canadian society. Here I borrow Judith Butler’s suggestion, following Foucault, that the regulatory norms of society function only through their consistent and unstable reiteration (and materialization) in everyday social life.7 From this perspective, the ways in which Haida people work within and even reiterate the constraints and demands of Canadian settler mainstream society can also slowly and strategically *shift* those very constraints and demands, materializing a HaidaCanadian future that might in fact be quite different from the present even as it does not ever fully “escape” from its dilemmas. Perhaps the most unsettling potential of all here lies simply in the ways in which Haida people incorporate the conditions of the settler colonial present as being paths towards Haida futures. Not vanished, or vanquished. Ongoing.

#### 1 — Its social & contingent

Juliana Hu Pegues et al 16, Assistant Professor of American Indian Studies and Asian American Studies at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Manu Vimalassery, Assistant Professor of American Studies at Barnard College, Alyosha Goldstein, Associate Professor of American Studies at the University of New Mexico, “On Colonial Unknowing,” https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633283

Wolfe’s description of settler colonialism as a structure, and not an event, has by now achieved the status of a truism in analyses of settler colonialism.24 Wolfe’s work has been crucial in bringing further attention to the fact that colonialism is an ongoing fact of life for indigenous peoples more than fifty years after the advent of the so-called era of decolonization. His scholarship insightfully underscored historical continuities in the shifting regimes and policies of settler states in relation to indigenous peoples, and challenged a certain produced ignorance about the “post” colonial character of societies like the U.S., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.25 Yet drawing an absolute distinction between structure and event, and as a result, discarding a focus on the historicity of settler colonialism, neglects some of the ways Wolfe distinguishes between the binary terms structure/event in the service of further analysis. For example, Wolfe emphasizes how settler colonialism is a “complex social formation” with “structural complexity” that emerges through process.26 When taken up as a modular analytic that travels without regard to the specificities of location or social and material relations, a categorical event/structure binary banishes deeply engaged historical knowledge from the landscape, turning away from historical materialism, devolving into a scholastic debate over identities and standpoints that are reduced to structural essences and divorced from politics or contingency. Emphasizing structure over event also limits the analysis of settler colonialism itself into a descriptive typology, orienting our vision narrowly within the technical perspective of colonial power (in the white Commonwealth countries), away from geographies from below, such as a hemispheric perspective of the Americas, with their multiple and distinct modes of colonialism, thus replicating the conditions of unknowing.27 Foregrounding structure against event might also divert attention away from imperialism. This binary perpetuates taking what Lisa Lowe calls the “colonial divisions of humanity” as given. Situating this compartmentalization as a consequence of imperial formations calls attention to how, as Lowe writes, “The operations that pronounce colonial divisions of humanity—settler seizure and native removal, slavery and racial dispossession, and racialized expropriations of many kinds—are imbricated processes, not sequential events; they are ongoing and continuous in our contemporary moment, not temporally distinct now as yet concluded.”28 If the analytic project is reduced to naming and delimiting settler colonialism as a distinct structure of power that exists in specific places, primarily the settler peripheries of Anglo imperium, we lose focus on the Caribbean and the Americas as the grounds of modern imperialism, abdicating the hard-won horizon of anti-imperialism. An emphasis on structure over event is symptomatic of the stabilization of colonial unknowing through binaries and schematic modes of thought. As Wolfe writes, “Territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element.”29 However, Wolfe’s cartographic model is that of the frontier, in which “the primary social division was encompassed in the relation between natives and invaders.”30 The frontier is a linear model, a binary opposition between civilization and savagery, reflecting both a colonizing subjectivity and its state form. What socio-spatial imaginaries, and concomitant critical models, might become visible if we thought from other spatial forms, such as circles or spirals, spatial forms that are often more relevant to indigenous epistemologies than straight lines? If we remapped the colonial condition through circular or spiraling forms, what new insights might we gain on the decolonial imperative? For one, we might be able to better grasp colonial, racial, and imperial simultaneities, as well as positions that do not easily fit into a settler/native binary. As Wolfe writes, “Settler-colonists came to stay. In the main, they did not send their children back to British schools or retire ‘home’ before old age could spoil the illusion of their superhumanity. National independence did not entail their departure.”31 Moreover, to inflect these insights through the lens of negritude produces a considerably more complex set of possibilities, where the verbs come and stay do not carry any simple or easily recoverable trace of agency or consent.32 As Iyko Day writes, “the logic of antiblackness complicates a settler colonial binary framed around a central Indigenous/settler opposition.”33 It may be useful to dissolve the implied divide between structure and event. How would our critical perspective open up if we began to understand (settler) colonialism as a structuring event, an ongoing elaboration of a structure, a suspension of time, tense, and timeliness? In order to interrogate settler colonialism as a unique structuring event or events in a structure of power, close attention to process and relationship, to structures of power as they transform in specific places and times, seems to be a useful approach for clarifying the stakes of decolonial possibility. Marx’s insights on the need for capital (and for individual capitalists) to perpetually reproduce the social relations of capitalism (on an expanding scale) and the vulnerable never given-in-advance character of that reproduction, could be relevant for contemplating settler colonialism as it constantly thwarts and undoes its own internal governing logics. To consider settler colonialism as a structure of failure seems a useful starting point for an intellectual project that proceeds from the impulse of decolonization.34 To bring the critique of imperialism back to the foreground in indigenous-centered critiques of colonialism is to bring back basic questions about the definitions of these terms, and their relation to each other. This is not about discarding analysis of settler colonialism for analysis of imperialism, but instead about entangling them in order to specify historically particular processes and structures.35 To the extent that a settler colonial analytic disavows relationships between settler and congruent modes of colonization, imperialism, and race, the field formation of settler colonial studies runs a risk of capture, breathing further life into shifting and mutable colonial sovereignty claims.

#### 2 — Its ongoing, but not a structure

Beenash Jafri 17, Visiting Assistant Professor of American Studies & Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies at UC Davis, “Ongoing Colonial Violence in Settler States,” http://csalateral.org/issue/6-1/forum-alt-humanities-settler-colonialism-ongoing-violence-jafri/

Retrospectively, however, I believe there is a qualitative difference between arguing that colonization is ongoing, and arguing that colonization is a structure, even as the two may be intertwined. The former gestures to repetition of an originary violence, emphasizing the continual reenactment of colonization, whereas the latter emphasizes the totalizing effects of originary violence, emphasizing colonization’s erasures. To be sure, remembrance and erasure have a dialectical relationship with one another. Yet, there are political-ethical implications to highlighting one over the other. For example, engaging colonization as ongoing generates possibilities for focusing on colonial violence and its intersectional entanglements with racialized, gendered, and sexualized exclusion and exploitation, as exemplified by scholars working on settler colonialism through the lenses of women of color feminism, black feminism, queer of color critique, and critical race and ethnic studies.9 In particular, underscoring the repetition of colonial violence enables (even if it does not guarantee) the centering of Indigenous peoples—who are still here, and still resisting colonialism—while drawing attention to experiences of violence and their embodiment through categories of difference such as race, gender, and sexuality, as well as their connections to land. To return to Razack—her analysis of the Pamela George case elucidates that colonial violence in settler societies happens again and again, with the support of social institutions and discourses. Framing that violence as an intrinsic or established feature of settler societies implies that it has been embedded in a structure that simply replicates itself. Razack’s framing suggests that the violence is active and dynamic—allowing for the possibility of intervention and transformation—whereas framing colonial violence as an intrinsic component of settler societies suggests that the violence is always already there, thus limiting, even if not foreclosing, transformative possibilities. I think here too of Tiffany King’s essay “New World Grammars” (2016), which emphasizes colonialism as conquest rather than as settled structure in order to foreground the encounters with violence that subsequently form the basis for Black and Native relationality.10 King’s essay is included in the Fall 2016 Theory and Event special issue “On Colonial Unknowing,” edited by Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, which insists on the indispensability of “postcolonial feminist theory, critical disability studies, queer theory, and women of color feminism” for undoing the disavowal of colonial relations that characterizes white settler societies.11 In their introduction to the special issue, Vimalassery, Pegues, and Goldstein posit that the over-emphasis on settler colonialism as structure unwittingly obscures settler colonialism’s historicity, or the ways in which it operates and has operated as event, and in conjunction with other modes of power.12

**Bryd reads colonialism as a universal, monolithic and already settled state, making resistance to it impossible.**

Ramzi **Fawaz 2012**, PhD student in English at The George Washington University, “Settling Scores: Claiming Ground for Native and Indigenous Critique in the Americas,” Anthropological Quarterly, Volume 85, Number 1, Winter 2012, Project Muse, KEL

Like many contemporary texts that seek to question the assumed social good of liberal multicultural ideologies, The Transit of Empire often projects the hegemony of the liberal multicultural state as a **monolithic edifice** whose power extends everywhere and is always **already consolidated in advance**. One wonders whether or not the liberal multicultural state is actually a clearly identifiable structure or set of institutions, and whether its ideological reach is as universal and assumed as Byrd and her contemporaries, including scholars like Jasbir Puar, David Harvey, Chandan Reddy, and Elizabeth Povinelli, often claim. Though Byrd rarely invokes the megalith of “neo-liberalism” the liberal multicultural state often comes to stand in for this presumed system that operates within the logic of late capital, as though the desire to include minorities previously denied full citizenship rights and legal recognition is the primary project of contemporary state power or even of the left more broadly. The dual movement of **critiquing the hegemonic function** of liberal multiculturalism **while assuming its status as a universally recognizable hegemony poses** a second question that I returned to throughout my reading: if [End Page 270] liberal multiculturalism and American conceptions of democracy do in fact function as colonial projects in the context of native rights and sovereignty, is the complete autonomy and political isolation of native peoples and their nations necessarily the solution to this on-going problem? There is a tendency in Byrd’s work to present encounters between native and non-native peoples as always defined by a destruction of native sovereignty **or** else **the injection of colonial ideals and values** into native political and social practice, **rather than a generative engagement defined by mutual or reciprocal exchange**. Certainly, under current political and economic conditions, the likelihood of non-coercive social and political reciprocity between the US state and native nations is highly unlikely, but I was left wondering if democracy is always necessarily tainted by colonial aspirations and if it is as easily relegated to the realm of ideological corruption as critics of liberal multiculturalism sometimes imply. The seeming impossibility of such interactions and the development of a collective good that might serve the interests of both native and non-native peoples leaves much to question: including whether or not shared forms of difference between native people’s and other minoritized groups can ever be generative—rather than simply another form of colonial practice that uses Indianness to forward its goals—and whether or not political sovereignty and autonomy is incommensurate with cross-cultural engagement and reciprocity.

**Their good intentions aren’t enough to overcome the flaws of settler colonialism theory – Rifkin’s “everything’s settler colonialism” and their other arguments mask and displace indigenous resistance**

Corey **Snelgrove** (MA Candidate, Indigenous Governance & Grad Student Fellow, Univ of British Columbia), Rita Kaur **Dhamoon** (Assist Prof of Pol Sci, Univ of Victoria), Jeff **Corntassel** (Cherokee Professor in Indigenous Governance Masters Program @ Univ of Victoria) May 26, **2014**, “Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations,” Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, Vol 3, No 2, pp. 1-32, decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/download/21166/17970, KEL

The institutionalization of settler colonial studies (rather than Indigenous studies) is on the one hand a significant shift in the academy. On the other hand, as de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay (2013) rightly argue, even when (and perhaps because) there are good intentions to decolonize and to “cultivate a culture of ‘doing the right thing,’” there are no “fundamental shifts in power imbalances between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples or the systems within which we operate” (p. 386). **Settler colonialism and the study of settler colonialism, in other words, cannot be decolonized because of good intentions**. Following this, **paradoxically** and **in deeply troubling ways, settler colonial studies can displace, overshadow, or even mask over Indigenous studies** (for example, see Veracini, 2013) and variations within Indigenous studies, especially feminist and queer Indigenous work that is centred on Indigenous resurgence. Indeed the link between Indigenous studies and settler colonial studies is still in process. The synergies between the literature by/on two-spirited Indigenous identities, queer theory, Indigenous studies more broadly, and settler colonial studies are notable in their interwoven conversations across fields of study. But at times, **Indigenous peoples and issues are de-centred in settler colonial studies** (**for example, Rifkin**, 2013, p. 323). Furthermore, **while Rifkin is right to argue that settler colonial practices and processes operate in everyday ways, are these practices really in the “background”** (2013, p. 331), **and for whom? Is settler colonialism “largely invisible**”, as Barker (2012) claims? Yes, settler colonialism is naturalized, pervasive, and not just state-centred, but for whom is settler colonialism in the background and invisible? These kinds of claims seem to presume white settler subjectivity as the monolithic lens through which to examine settler colonialism and dispossession, both in the context of whites and people of colour, in ways that obscures differentials of power. For Indigenous peoples, settler colonialism may not be the primary lens of living or theorizing, but it is also neither in the background or invisible.

#### 1 — More marginalization

Sandy Grande 18, “REFUSING THE UNIVERSITY”, Toward What Justice? : Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education, edited by Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang, Routledge, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tamucs/detail.action?docID=5257621>

While within the university the consequences of academic refusal are much less dire, they still carry a risk. To refuse inclusion offends institutional authorities offering “the gift” of belonging, creating conditions of precarity for the refuser. For example, refusal to participate in the politics of respectability that characterizes institutional governance can result in social isolation, administrative retribution, and struggles with self-worth. Similarly, the refusal to comply with the normative structures of tenure and promotion (e.g., emphasizing quantity over quality; pub- lishing in “mainstream” journals) can and does lead to increased marginalization, exploitation, and job loss.16 And, in a system where Indigenous scholars com- prise less than 1% of the professorate, such consequences not only bear hardships for individuals but also whole communities. That said, academic “rewards” and inducements accessed through recognition-based politics can have even deeper consequences. As Jodi Byrd (2011) reminds us, the colonization of Indigenous lands, bodies, and minds will not be ended by “further inclusion or more partici- pation” (Byrd, 2011, p. xxvi).

#### 2 — Re-inscribes power hierarchies

Samantha Balaton-Chrimes & Victoria Stead 17, “Recognition, power and coloniality,” https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13688790.2017.1355875

Hinkson moves us back again to a settler context, this time Australia, to interrogate the ever-present and often frustrating and contradictory recognition relationships between settlers and the Warlpiri people of Central Australia. Working with the praxis of one par- ticular indigenous man, Hinkson shows how the quotidian negotiations of this space can take the form of an attitude of seeking to be ‘free to the world’ by coming to terms with the Other, and seeking forms of pleasure and empowerment through that experience that cannot be reduced to assimilation or refusal of recognition. Kowal and Paradies, also writing in the Australian context, similarly explore spaces of contradiction and grappling, this time with respect to race. They theorise ‘race refusal’ as the practice through which an Aboriginal person who could pass as white refuses to do so, thereby refusing recognition of a certain sort. While emancipatory in some respects, Kowal and Paradies also show how these refusals can also be reappropriated by the state in order to redraw the hierarchical boundary between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Finally, in light of these insights into the freedom-diminishing effects of recognition, or at least the deep contradictions and risks of the politics of recognition, Ivison re-engages political theory directly to interrogate the ongoing relevance of recognition as a moral horizon for conceiving of and practicing intercultural justice. In its place, Ivison offers justification as an alternative, possibly more politically efficacious and morally progressive game for the struggles our contributors explore.

#### 3 — Doesn’t solve

Anna Frances Laing 15. Ph.D. candidate, School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, College of Science and Engineering, University of Glasgow, “Territory, resistance and struggles for the plurinational state: the spatial politics of the TIPNIS Conflict,” Ph.D. thesis, January 2015, p.215-216, http://theses.gla.ac.uk/5974/7/2015laingphd.pdf

The use of indigeneity as a common signifier has fostered mobilisation across different ethnic groups. This process has been aided by NGOs and técnicos (technical experts) that accompanied the Eighth and Ninth Marches. NGO representatives facilitated meetings, provided training, funded activities and constructed written announcements and texts. These mediatory actors therefore helped to re-articulate the grievances of the marchers under the banner of indigenous rights. This could be seen in the writing of open letters to the government during both the Eighth and Ninth Marches, made possible through the aid of technical experts from one of the principle legal organisations defending indigenous rights in Bolivia CEJIS (Centro de Estudios Jurídicos e Investigación Social; Centre of Legal Studies and Social Investigation). Therefore, in order to ‘speak’ and be heard, the indigenous peoples have to undergo a process of representation through the language of legal rights. They therefore remain ‘subaltern’ because their attempts at self-representation fall outside the ‘the lines laid down by the official institutional structures of representation’ (Spivak 1996: 306). Thus, Glenn (2011) contends that the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is ironic since it seeks the recognition of alternative epistemologies through civic institutions that have homogenising and universalising tendencies. However, as Fabricant notes in her work with the Landless Peasants Movement in Bolivia, movements ‘take NGO ideas and meld them with their own creative strategies to come up with solutions that will work for their communities’ (2012: 120). Moreover, Gustafson (2009b) offers a balanced interpretation of the ways that NGOs offer a language and model for politicising alternative worldviews. The indigenous movement consciously reifies certain strategic essentialisms whilst at other times actively resisting them. Indeed, indigenous knowledges do not exist outside of other knowledge forms (Walsh 2002). As Walsh argues ‘[t]he efficacy of the movement in fact derives from its ability to construct and use the correspondences among various contemporary knowledge positions […] in order to exercise political tactics and strategies’ (2002: 71). A politics of refusal is unlikely to advance indigenous demands. As such, Hale suggests an analytical framework based on the Gramscian notion of articulation to ask: will the subjugated knowledge and practices be articulated within the dominant, and neutralised? Or will they occupy the space opened from above while resisting its built in logic, connect with others, toward ‘transformative’ cultural-political alternatives that still cannot be fully imagined? (2002: 499). Indeed, there is the danger that identifying under a single indigenous label risks losing the complexities and processes that permeate the heterogeneous inter-ethnic collectivity of the lowland indigenous movement. This acts to disembody the identity claims from some of the more radical tangents of the movement. Mexican anthropologist Miguel Alberto Bartolomé argues that indigenous autonomy should contemplate ‘new modes of [interethnic, inter-cultural] social articulation that are more egalitarian than existing [ones]’ and that a multi-ethnic state ‘should explore all possible paths in the search for novel forms of conviviality between culturally distinct groups’ (2005: 146 cited in Gustafson 2009a: 998). Escobar similarly calls for a decolonisation that ‘can be started in earnest from a deessentialized perspective’ (2008: 305). Indeed, the movement seeks the recognition of plurality without the homogenisation of indigenous cultures or ideologies or the ranking of difference that necessarily works to subordinate some cultures and let others dominate. This project of emancipatory societal transformation is an on-going challenge for the lowland indigenous movement.

# 1AR

## K

#### Debate over politics is effective at preventing existential catastrophe — the aff recognizes politics is imperfect but contingent — that’s key to learning from the past and solving

Kelz 19 (Rosine, 5/6/19, PHD Philosophy; research associate for the Institute of Advanced Sustainability Studies. “Thinking about future/democracy: towards a political theory of futurity” Sustainability Science, July 2019, Volume 14, Issue 4, pp 905–913| Cite as<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11625-019-00697-6>

Today, representative politics are often perceived as being primarily concerned with short-term goals. Moreover, the future appears to be pre-determined by economic or technological necessities. This ‘closing’ of the future, however, becomes increasingly problematic in the face of global existential crises, such as environmental depletion and climate change. These catastrophic developments could only be mitigated by immediate, decisive political interventions, which would amount to systemic changes that redirect technological research and economic activities. This article seeks to outline how political theory and philosophy can contribute to “(re-)Politicizing the Future”. I argue that political thought should take temporality, and in particular futurity, as a central conceptual and methodological concern. Drawing on the works of prominent twentieth century thinkers such as Hannah Arendt, Stanley Cavell, and Jacques Derrida, I want to develop a deepened analytical understanding of the possibility for a ‘future directed’ political thought which highlights intrinsic connections between sustainability and democracy. Introduction Politics is concerned with the future—this seems to be too obvious to need stating. Whether in debates about the building of a new road, the overhaul of national pension systems, or the forging of transnational agreements on climate change mitigation, all these disparate forms of political decision-making carry implicit or explicit visions of preferable futures. For many, however, this truism sounds increasingly hollow. It appears as if representative politics in contemporary liberal-capitalist countries is concerned primarily with short-term goals. Even social movements are often criticized for lacking positive visions of a future that would radically difer from the current status-quo. Western societies seem to have lost their abilities to imagine utopian futures (Habermas 1985: 7). The disappearance of possible futures that would be profoundly diferent from the present has been propagated as both a political reality and a normative standpoint since at least the early 1980s, and is often linked to the rise of neoliberal forms of government (see, e.g., Fukuyama 1992; Séville 2017). From Margaret Thatcher’s famous proclamation that ‘There is no Alternative’ to current austerity reforms, the political future is presented as pre-determined by economic or technological necessities. This ‘closing’ of the future at frst sight would seem to be at odds with the obvious acceleration of late modern societies, where things appear to be in constant fux. However, while acceleration and rapid change are often regarded as hallmarks of modernity, these are highly uneven and aporetic processes. Some theorists argue that the acceleration of other parts of society leads to a ‘hyper-accelerated standstill’ or to ‘polar inertia’ in the political sphere (see, e.g., Rosa 2003: 17, 21). In the face of rapid movements and shifts in areas such as fnancial markets or scientifc research, representative democratic politics appears to have lost the ability to actively steer social developments. The need for future directed political action and thinking, however, becomes ever more pressing. From the extraction of fossil fuels and the use of nuclear power to genome editing—the use of contemporary technologies has consequences which stretch far into the future. At the same time, capacities for modeling and thus anticipating the possible efects of actions on a global scale have increased rapidly in the past decades. We are currently confronted with dystopian scenarios of environmental depletion and a rapidly changing climate, but current liberal democratic governments often seem to lack the political will to implement systemic changes that would make it possible to avoid the most disastrous pathways. Even though there is thus an obvious need to theorize how politics relates to the creation of future(s), current political theory often appears strangely uninterested in the temporal character of the political sphere. What is called for, then, is political thought that contributes to a project of actively (re-)politicizing societal and political notions of the future. As the ‘Politicizing the Future’ project members argue, this would involve a number of diverse practices which enable the proliferation of multiple alternative possible futures in the present. These practices are intrinsically linked to the pluralization and deepening of democratic processes. However, even though one explicit normative goal of this project is to ‘open up’ the realm of thinkable futures, not all visions of future are equally valued. The normative dimension also entails a notion of strong sustainability, allowing for future generations to exist in a world with a livable natural and just social environment. Thus, Politicizing the Future involves a ‘de-colonization’ of the future, where present people have to refrain from using up resources
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and creating ecological and socio-political issues that would disadvantage those who come after them (Knappe et al. 2018, this issue). The aim of this article is, therefore, twofold. First, I want to show that there are resources in political and moral thought to highlight the importance of temporality and futurity, which can be useful for current debates in sustainability studies. Second, this paper seeks to further explore the normative connections between futurity, democracy, and sustainability, which are proposed by the members of the ‘Politicizing the Future’ project. The notion of (political) contingency is an excellent starting point to explore the connections between a commitment to an open future and the concept of democracy. By political contingency, I mean the simple fact that even though the way a society is organized is not random, it could always be otherwise (Marchart 2010: 80). As political systems are created by overlapping processes, whose beginnings cannot be clearly determined and whose developments do not follow necessary pathways, contingency is a feature of any form of societal organization. However, many forms of rule disavow their own contingency. Often, they seek to afrm their own necessity and immutability by appealing to something outside of the realm of politics, as, for example, a doctrine of divine right, or the unyielding laws of the market. By contrast, the idea of democracy presupposes its own contingent political foundation. Making contingency explicit, in turn, allows for a continuous renegotiation of possible futures. Moreover, as I will discuss in Section I, affirming contingency entails a specifc relationship to the past—and to the role of history in understanding the present and the future—that enables us to learn from past events without understanding history as determining the future. Section II concentrates on the notion that the concept of democracy is closely linked to a particular understanding of futurity. A democratic commitment to an open future, in turn, also implies a commitment to at least a “thin” notion of sustainability. In Section III, the relationship between democracy and sustainability is explored further. I argue that while a societal turn to more sustainable social and economic practices would involve the willingness of individuals to make substantive changes in their daily lives, these commitments are political in nature. Instead of sliding into a neoliberal logic of individualized ‘sustainable consumption’, what is called for is an understanding of moral autonomy that involves a deepening of shared, democratic practices.