# 2nc

### 2nc – fw

#### We meet — our links prove the plan causes bad outcomes.

#### Counter-interp: the 1AC is an object of research. That means the aff must defend their entire 1AC, not just the plan. We’re debaters, not trust-busters — focusing solely on the plan lets neoliberal epistemology continue unchecked.

#### Pandemic pedagogy DA — Neoliberalism exists beyond policy: in the words we say, the framing we use, and the justifications we present. Plan focus lets neoliberal ideology thrive behind the scenes, which ensures serial policy failure and co-option of anti-capitalist movements. Debate can’t shape policy implementation but challenging pedagogical practices in educational spaces is the critical first step to building a powerful anti-capitalist movement. That’s Giroux.

#### Accountability DA — The aff should be held accountable for the representations of their 1AC. Adopting their model of debate means the aff could say something racist and still win the debate if their plan is a good idea, which is unethical and produces bankrupt education since racist and classist arguments inevitably cause policy failure.

#### Fiat DA — Their model forwards a broken approach to political organizing, assuming the government will listen if we just ask them nicely. That reifies neoliberal logics and state control — only the alt proposes a clear road map for breaking down neoliberalism.

Quinn 16, Canadian writer and comedian based in London (R.J., December 10th, “Can I Talk to a Manager?” *Jacobin Magazine*, <https://jacobinmag.com/2018/12/liberalism-brexit-donald-trump>, Accessed 08-24-2021)

If Guy Debord were alive today, he might say that “in societies where the neoliberal conditions of political economy prevail, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of customer service interactions.” That is, to the liberal, all relationships are business transactions.

Nowhere is this tendency more apparent than in the contemporary liberal approach to political organizing, which seems to be reducible to a great cry of “Can I speak to a manager?” And nowhere was it better exemplified than in early October, when several thousand middle-class dog owners marched through central London to protest Brexit. Yet another outgrowth of the “People’s Vote” campaign (which is pushing for a redo of the Brexit referendum), the demonstration was called the “Wooferendum.”

The ur-concept of contemporary liberal politics is faith in the authority of a rule-governed order, and an expectation that the appointed minders of that rule-governed order will operate society, more or less, as a service to those who pay for it. In other words, “Excuse me, I do not mean to cause a fuss, but I’m not entirely satisfied.”

In the two years since its vote to leave the European Union, the UK has seen innumerable marches on parliament advancing the demand that the government cancel Brexit, or at least offer a People’s Vote. These marches, proudly unaffiliated with a political tendency, and frequently tinged with rhetoric suggesting that the Brexit vote was enabled by provincial rubes or spending skulduggery, have been an exhortation to the government of the day to just act, please. They are billed as marches politicians “cannot ignore,” that politicians have gone on to ignore. The political theory of change used by The Wooferendum, and others like it, is that once displeasure is voiced by enough people, the powerful — be they billionaires, political leaders, or whoever else — will then graciously remove the offending policy.

This phenomenon, of course, is hardly confined to the United Kingdom. In the United States, the years since Donald Trump’s election have been marked by a liberal obsession with the prospect of a released tax return or well-placed confession extracted by special counsel Robert Mueller to get rid of him. Just act, please.

“Speaking to the manager” is a sort of tyrannical helplessness; it is the haughty demand for intercession on one’s behalf by an array of greater forces you assume are servile. It is worded like a demand, but it is in fact a plea. It relies on a deeply held belief that society has been ordered for your benefit, because you bought it. And by repeatedly reminding those in charge that society is not entirely to your liking, a number of dutiful institutions or solicitous political Jeeveses will course correct and bring things “back to normal.”

It also assumes a hierarchical society, ordered like a restaurant: some eat, some serve, and there is a manager to keep it all going. This is why these same liberals tend to find the prospect of greater popular control over the media, economy, or society chilling, because they must confront the possibility that they will no longer be served and tended to.

We have been conditioned by the market to believe “the customer is always right.” But the power the customer holds over a business is a thin simulacrum of power. Power is classically understood as the ability to compel others to do what, but for you, they would not have done. Yet “consumer” power relies on businesses doing what customers say when it is in their interest to do so. The human construed as a customer can pull but one lever for change: “no.” The customer can decline to purchase, even voice displeasure, but the role of customer is inherently passive.

#### [ ]No fairness impact — you just need to defend your 1AC and Cap is the most predictable K on antitrust. Critical education outweighs whining about fairness.

#### [ ]No clash impact — Clash is inevitable, and it is better when it is over the political ideology of the aff because ideas we can change while but policies we cannot. Lack of clash is the aff’s fault kritiks are not new.

#### If we win framework, you must prioritize the ideologies of the 1AC over the hypothetical benefits of the plan. If we lose it, you still vote neg on links to the plan and our impacts outweighing.

### 2nc – ! – o/v

#### It’s try or die for rejecting the capitalist logics of the 1AC, that’s Burden-Stelly and Foster:

#### Racial Capitalism – modern capitalism relies on extraction from and dehumanization of black workers, exploitation of the Global South via resource mining and wage labor, endless proxy wars, and theft of indigenous land. These impacts must be rejected on ethical grounds and come before any aff impacts.

#### Climate Change – growth caused rifts in planetary boundaries, ocean acidification, disruption of nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, and disappearance of forests – all independently posessing the ability to pop the carbon bubble and lock in climate change

#### War – profit incentives continue to drive war in strategic oil regions and the battle between the fear of losing US and capitalist dominance causing nuclear arms race with Russia and continued conflict with a rising china - that globalizes colonial violence and threatens to go nuclear.

#### Disease – Factory farming is creating a perfect storm of existential ABR superbugs while healthcare is only available for the rich.

### 2nc – ! – turns solvency

#### Capitalism makes monopolization inevitable.

Klitgaard 13 (Kent, Professor of Economics and Sustainability at Wells College, “Heterodox Political Economy and the Degrowth Perspective,” Sustainability 2013, 5, 276-297; doi:10.3390/su5010276, DOA: 8-30-2021) //Snowball

Marx also makes an important distinction between wealth and value that many contemporary economists do not consider. Wealth consisted of use values, and the source of much wealth was found in nature. Without the use values of inputs, such as resources and energy, no production could occur. But, value or price was derived from human labor capable of producing surplus value. The products of nature only transferred their value when capitalized. Most economists and social theorists (e.g., David Ricardo) treated nature’s contribution as “a free gift.” Value or price depended upon the amount of human labor embodied in the commodity [9]. The debate about how seriously Marx took issues of nature remains controversial to this day and forms one of the differences between the CNS approach and the Monthly Review School. For Marx, the primary contradiction was between social production (many interdependent workers, merchants and capitalists were responsible for production) and private appropriation. Surplus value was capitalized as private profit and reinvested in the expansion of the business. Growth or more properly, capital accumulation, was built into the dynamic of capitalism from the level of the individual enterprise. However, this reinvestment process was not smooth. Capitalists needed to expand the scope of their factories and markets. This entailed increasing the organic composition of capital (or the capital labor ratio) in order to increase labor productivity, as well as to create new products and processes. Recall that only living labor creates new value in the theoretical framework of classical political economy. When the rate of surplus value (a measure of labor productivity) rises faster than does the capital-labor ratio, profits will rise. However, eventually under conditions of price competition, the value of the capital-labor ratio rises faster than does the rate of surplus value. Profits then fall and an economic crisis commences. In the crisis, the conditions that created it, the rise of the organic composition and the fall in the rate of surplus value, are rectified. Excess capacity and bad debts are written off, and unemployed workers are willing to work harder for less. The organic composition falls and the rate of surplus value rises, issuing in a new era of capital accumulation and growth. In the process, however, capitals become concentrated or larger in scale and more centralized or owned by fewer capitalists. In short, the inevitable outcome of capitalist competition is a tendency towards monopoly.

In 1966, Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy published their “Essay on the American Economic and Social Order,” entitled Monopoly Capital [11]. They argued that the level of monopoly concentration that Marx had merely predicted had become the dominant business structure by the 20th century. Rather than competing on the basis of price, monopolists competed by expanding market share and reducing costs. Baran and Sweezy use the term monopoly broadly and to mean concentrated industry, rather than as the narrow “single seller” of neoclassical economic theory. Sweezy, after all, was responsible for the “kinked” oligopoly demand curve, a concept rarely transmitted to today’s students. Since, in their analysis, the mechanism that drove the tendency for the rate of profit to fall was price competition among capitalists, the very nature of value changed with the emergence of monopoly capital. Rather than a “decennial cycle” of prosperity and depression, the normal state of monopoly capital was longterm stagnation or slow economic growth. The source of the stagnation was a rising economic surplus that could not be fully absorbed by the spending outlets available: investment, consumption and waste. Baran and Sweezy chronicled why investment was insufficient, further developing an idea made famous by Evesy Domar. Investment creates additional capacity even as it serves as a spending outlet (or absorbs the economic surplus). Spending is short lived, while the investment is long lived, and the problem becomes both perpetual and unsolvable by further incremental investment. Moreover, the system is burdened by excess capacity, which is a chronic condition of monopolistic industrial organization [12], and one cannot rely on vibrant investment in a time when much capital remains unutilized. Consequently, the growth trajectory of a capitalist economy is unstable. Mainstream economic growth theory results from a critique of the work of Domar, along with that of Roy Harrod. In 1956, Robert Solow published “A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth.” In this article, he contended that Harrod and Domar postulated fixed technical conditions of production (although this assumption appears explicitly in neither the original books nor papers of Harrod or Domar.) Solow, claiming that resource substitutability is a “crucial” assumption, substituted a Cobb-Douglas production function for Harrod and Domar’s supposed fixed-production isoquants. Presto! The instability of the system disappears, and a fundamental social problem of economic instability is transformed into an easily-solvable technical problem. Yet, despite Solow’s prominence and the virtual disappearance of the original work of Harrod and Domar from the teaching of economic growth theory, the vast social problems of stagnation and unemployment persist even in today’s economy [13]. Even with the advent of a sales effort to expand conspicuous consumption, the level of spending by capitalists and workers is inadequate to the task of surplus absorption, and government spending was discouraged when it competed effectively with the private sector. This leaves waste, in the form of planned obsolescence and military spending, not to mention fuel inefficiency, as a primary mechanism of surplus absorption. This is a crucial point. If waste is built into the very structures of systemic maintenance in the era of monopoly capital, then sustainability cannot be achieved by increases in efficiency alone. Furthermore, conspicuous consumption is not simply bad behavior on the part of privileged consumers. Rather, it is a fundamental part of the system. In order to achieve sustainability, one must change the institutions that perpetuate waste as a condition of macroeconomic stability and growth.

#### Globalization makes monopolization inevitable and circumvents anti-trust.

Kopf et al. 13, Jerry Kopf, Charles Vehorn, and Joel Carnevale: Radford University (Emerging Oligopolies in Global Markets: Was Marx Ahead of His Time? *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, vol. 14(3), 2013)

REGULATION IN A GLOBAL WORLD

With firms branching out into global competition and countries lowering their trade barriers to promote such competition, the absence of effective global regulation once again raises Marx concerns. Because of strong federal governments, national governments were able to pass and enforce, through the uses of military or police force where necessary, laws that regulated externalities, such as pollution, and antitrust. At the moment there is no strong federal government at the global level and, therefore, no one to pass and enforce laws that effectively regulate externalities or antitrust. Epstein and Greve raise a Marx like concern, “when firms have international market power, one would expect them to behave as monopolists just like domestic firms with market power” (2004). Therefore, without any dominant form of regulatory governance, industry concentration could very well replicate what was seen in the late 19th century, though, globally instead of nationally. Carstensen & Farmer discusses this tendency towards M&A’s: The transformation of formerly regulated or noncompetitive industries to competition is closely linked with merger movements. The historical record demonstrates that once faced with competition, leading firms in these industries began to merge. This has been the pattern in airlines, banks, railroads, electric and gas utilities, health care and, with great prominence, telecommunications (2008).

While some may argue that reaching that level of concentration is unlikely, one should consider current industries that hold a considerable global market share. “Although it may be more difficult to establish and maintain market power internationally, there is no reason to believe that it is impossible or, for that matter, rare. Industries such as pharmaceuticals, passenger aircraft, and software illustrate the phenomenon” (Epstein & Greve, 2004).

There are actually quite a few firms who have emerged into the global market that hold what can be considered a significant share within global industries, ranging from manufacturing, financial intermediation, and transport service along with other service industries. For example, The European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company and The Boeing Company combined hold more than 50% market share within the global civil aerospace products manufacturing industry. Goldman and Sachs hav[e] 20.20% market share within the global investment banking and brokerage industry and Vivendi holds 20.10% within the global music production and distribution industry. United Parcel Service holds 23.80%, within the global logistics – couriers industry (IBISW, 2011).

We do not intend to imply that the monopolization that had plagued the United States in the late 19th century has emulated itself at the global level, creating one dominant firm controlling an entire global industry. However, it does appear that a number of industries are starting to exhibit Marx, “inevitable move toward a monopoly.”

The increase in oligopoly power at the global level presents unprecedented challenges. Reaching a cross-country consensus on competition policy is a difficult. Epstein & Greve discuss some of the issues that arise when attempting to unite foreign and domestic competition policy. Competition policy embodies imprecise normative judgments that invite controversy and defection rather than consensus and commitment. Because its scope extends to such a wide range of economic activity, it has the potential to inflict significant costs on many transactors. In particular, competition policy tempts states both to impose nominally neutral policies that favor local producers and consumers at the expense of global welfare, and to administer their policies in a discriminatory fashion to similar ends” (2004).

While more and more countries are adopting competition policies, this seemingly positive step towards unification of trust law has its negative effects. “Nearly one hundred jurisdictions now have antitrust laws” according to Epstein & Greve, this raises increasing issues of “jurisdictional overlaps” since many countries will assert their “jurisdiction over extraterritorial conduct that has a domestic impact” (2004).

Antitrust enforcement agencies around the world have tried to cope with the increased power of global corporations by staying in regular and increasing contact with one another on individual merger cases as well as on general issues of mutual enforcement interest. Through instruments such as the 1995 Recommendation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that its 29 members cooperate with one another in antitrust enforcement and bilateral agreements like that which exists between the United States and the European Community, the antitrust agencies notify one another when a case under investigation affects another's important interests and they share what information they can and otherwise cooperate in the investigation and resolution of those cases (1999).

Richard Parker, Senior Deputy Director of the Bureau of Competition FTC, presenting on global merger enforcement, discussed the implementation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and concluded with examples of global merger enforcement. While attempts at unified standards of competition policy are underway, the efforts of the OECD are considered to have substantial limitations on enforcing global merger laws. Epstein and Greve state: Information sharing or “soft” cooperation has also been pursued at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which has generated several aspirational texts. None of these impose obligations on states, and they are not intended to do so. Their goals are modestly limited to improving communication on competition issues.

History shows us that even with a strong federal government with the ability to enforce laws through the use of force where necessary, such as the United States federal government has on its states, firms are very good at ignoring or getting around antitrust laws. If the U.S. government did not have strong federal power over states, and it was up to the states to reach agreements on antitrust laws, one can easily imagine that there would likely be problems resulting in less strenuous competition policy. Take for example state control over age discrimination laws. When these laws originated, states chose whether to enact policies aimed at protecting workers rights. By 1960 only 8 states had age discrimination laws until the federal government enacted such regulations as the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). This, along with the Department of Labor in 1979 giving administrative authority to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), established unified laws protecting individual employment rights (Lahey, 2007). Without this dominant authority of the federal government, fair employment practices may still continue to be a regionally dependent right. In the current era of globalization, where industry’s actions domestically can be felt by all corners of the globe and vice versa, without a global entity with strong “federal” powers capable of monitoring and enforcing competition policy, it seems reasonable to conclude that Marx may in fact be proven correct: the inevitable result of the efficient market is increasing concentration of power resulting in global oligopolies or, eventually, monopolies.

CONCLUSIONS

Over 100 years before globalization, largely led by capitalism, reached a point at which the world would be interconnected in virtually every way Marx felt the need to write on the short comings and flaws of capitalism. Around the time of his death, with the consolidation of industry (among other things) there was increased evidence of the validity of some of his beliefs and concerns regarding capitalism. However, the ability of the U.S. federal government to establish and enforce domestic antitrust laws and other regulations and the increased competition that resulted from the transition from national to global markets made it appear Marx concerns might not be as critical as he believed. Today, however, no one can deny the fact that the world is indeed smaller than it once was, allowing industries, firms and even people to create a significant impact on the world.

Although intervention has been largely successful at the domestic level, since there is no global entity capable of establishing unified standards, laws or guidelines for global firms to follow, and, as far as we know, there are no inter galactic competitors ready to enter world markets, the possibility of history repeating itself in emerging global industries should be of grave concern. If global monopolies and externalities develop globally, as they did in the US during the 1800s, and there is no strong federal government to control externalities or regulate antitrust, Marx nightmares could come back to haunt us all with significant negative impact not only on world economies but on the world’s environment and standards of living.

### 2nc – at: util

#### Utilitarianism is just another form of pandemic pedagogy — neutral impact calculus is impossible under capitalism since lives are valued based on productivity and peripheral violence is erased.

Giroux 20, McMaster University Professor for Scholarship in the Public Interest and The Paulo Freire Distinguished Scholar in Critical Pedagogy (Henry, June 9th, “Racist Violence Can’t Be Separated from the Violence of Neoliberal Capitalism,” *Truthout*, <https://truthout.org/articles/racist-violence-cant-be-separated-from-the-violence-of-neoliberal-capitalism/>, Accessed 08-24-2021)

Pandemic pedagogy thrives on inequality and becomes a militarized and heartless normalizing tool to convince the broader public that the lives of the elderly, sick, and vulnerable should be valued according to how much they contribute to the economy. And if they are willing to die in order not to be a drain on the economy, all well and good. Nothing escapes the cruel logic of neoliberalism with its arrogance and hubris on full display as it bathes in the glow of right-wing populism, ultra-nationalism, and neofascism. Its accoutrements of dictatorship are everywhere and can be seen in the swagger of militia that storm state capitals, in police who punch and pepper spray protesters and push elderly men to the ground, and in military forces on the streets without badges reinforcing a climate of fear, repression, and unaccountability. There is more at work here than a lack of humanity on the part of the Trump administration. As the Irish journalist Fintan O’Toole observes, there is also the deepening grip of a culture of cruelty and dehumanization. He writes:

“As a society the American people are being habituated into accepting cruelty on a wide scale. Americans are being taught by Trump and his administration not to see other people as human beings whose lives are as important as their own. Once that line has been crossed – and it is not just Trump and the people around him, but many of Trump’s supporters as well – then we know where that all leads, what the ultimate destination is. There is no mystery about it. We know what happens when a government and its leaders dehumanize large numbers of people.”

### 2nc – at: permutation

#### reject the perm – prioritizing short term solutions over the alt’s pedagogical shift away from cap wrecks the alternative – any affirmation of a capitalist epistemology must be rejected for action to come – all links are disads and are an independent reason to reject the affirmative

#### timeframe da – we need to reject capitalism now – COVID has provided a unique opportunity to restructure our epistemology – the perm will only delay the epistemological restructuring and continue to invest in the belief that change is impossible – Giroux

#### Ambiguity da – inclusion of the aff only creates ambiguity and wrecks our attempts in building public support for socialism by fracturing movements – Giroux

#### Competition da – Antitrust laws are intertwined with the capitalist system – their purpose it to uphold and protect market competition and efficiency – the aff feeds into the logic of painting competition as a public good – like being good for the workers at tesla factories which the conditions are horrible - which is incompatible with the alt and pushes minorities and the lower class to the that’s parakkal.

### 2nc – links

#### Conceded three links

#### 1 – antirtrust – politics over antitrust are handled through billionaires who write the rules to profit themselves – the 1nc Daniels evidence is a perfect example – the scenario basically relies on massive tech companies to ask the government to pay them and them only – promoting competition is the epitome of capitalism and encourages wage slavery

#### 2 – innovation – they frame innovation as a net good and turns research into a business – this is bad because it means that people only research what elites pay for – like think tanks paying only for certain articles and distorts our reality

### 2nc – at: mcafee

#### Fintech reinforces gross exploitation and white supremacy

Friedline 21 Friedline, Terri. Banking on a Revolution: Why Financial Technology Won't Save a Broken System. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2021. ND.

Beyond unequal landscapes and cost burdens, marginalization also may be amplified based on the ways that fintech embeds society’s destructive systems. Fintech and its supporters often operate under the assumption that digital and financial technologies can be developed devoid of white supremacy and financialized racial neoliberal capitalism. For example, as the Co-Director of MIT’s Initiative on the Digital Economy, Andrew McAfee, said in 2018, “If you want the bias out, get the algorithms in.” 66 This sentiment is shared by IBM Fellows Aleksandra Mojsilovic and John Smith, who believe that algorithms can be trained to reduce or eliminate any racial biases built in by their designers. 67 Even Stephen Schwarzman, Chief Executive-Officer (CEO) of Blackstone (yes, the same monopoly-esque investment corporation that is a central figure in Chapter 4), has chimed in on this possibility. Penning an opinion–editorial for The Washington Post in 2019 in a somewhat satirical caricature given his perch atop global capitalism, Schwarzman espoused the importance of an “ethics driven approach” to fintech. 68 Schwarzman described a multidisciplinary approach as sufficient for preventing broadly conceptualized “biases” and ensuring that fintech’s “powerful capabilities are a net positive for people and workers.” In other words, fintech’s disadvantages can be overlooked so long as advantages accrue on average. This viewpoint actually means that any disadvantages can be overlooked because “on average” (or “net positive, ” in Schwarzman’s terms) is code for white. 69 Fintech is acceptable—even ethical—so long as advantages accrue to whites (preferably wealthy elites) while averages disguise vast underlying racial disparities. For example, reporting the median net worth of $78,000 for all households in 2016 would conceal the fact that the median value of white households’ net worth is 41 times greater than that of Black households. 70 In fact, coders, computer scientists, engineers, and other designers—many of whom are white 71—stitch fintech and other technological advancements onto the fabric of society’s systems, 72 developing it as a tool for hoarding capitalism’s wealth. Insidiously, fintech is also developing as tool for surveilling and preying on Black and Brown communities by requiring individuals to sacrifice their privacy in order to participate. 73 This requirement disproportionately subjects people of color to ubiquitous, targeted surveillance that they are already experiencing in other contexts such as law enforcement, 74 education, 75 public welfare, 76 and housing. 77 White fintech users who experience technologies’ benefits without racist exploitation or wealth extraction may actually be contributing to mass surveillance that disproportionately impacts Black and Brown people. Like a white property owner ignoring how their predatory contract agreement contributed to the pattern of mass wealth extraction from Black and Brown communities, white fintech designers and users may similarly discount how their willingness—even eagerness—to sacrifice their privacy in exchange for fintech’s benefits may come with the costs of mass surveillance in the context of the financial system. And, if there was ever a case for history repeating itself, Black and Brown communities will disproportionally accrue the disadvantages if fintech marches full steam ahead without the voices of marginalized communities at the helm. 78 Fintech’s ability to accelerate the concentration of wealth can be overlooked when overemphasizing fintech for individuals. However, the problems with fintech for individuals are a microcosm of what is being acted out on a larger scale. For instance, Pagaya Investments, a U.S.–Israeli fintech start-up that describes its technology as the next generation of asset management investing, 79 announced in 2019 its complete reliance on machine learning and big data analytics to manage its $100 million portfolio. 80 Without human intervention, Pagaya’s fintech automatically manages the company’s asset-backed securities (ABS)—including all trading, buying, and selling transactions—and quickly spots potentially lucrative investment opportunities. Pagaya eventually plans to apply its fintech to collateralized loan obligations (CLO) and mortgage-backed securities (MBS). Minimal oversight from Pagaya’s data scientists is led by a former managing director of BlackRock, another monopoly-esque investment corporation. Buzzwords such as “disrupt, ” “reshape, ” and “innovate” are commonly applied to descriptions of Pagaya’s fintech, similar to the ways these buzzwords are enthusiastically applied to solving inequalities in individuals’ financial access. Pagaya Investments’ CEO, Gal Krubiner, promotes the advantages of a fintech approach that “can access very unique datasets” for making “really important insights and understanding on the valuation of assets” by identifying “what is really the risk behind each individual borrower or loan.” 81 At a 2017 fintech conference held in Tel Aviv, Krubiner described how fintech could modernize the field of corporate asset management, saying, “Many institutional investors are interested in investing in online lending markets. There’s a need for new, technology-based investment tools.” 82 Pagaya’s investors include venture capitalists, hedge funds, and financial institutions such as Oak HC/FT, GF Investments, and Citi Group. 83 In an announcement that Pagaya had raised $75 million in debt finance from the financial institution Citi Group, Citi Group’s Vice President of Consumer Finance, Ari Rosenberg, stated, “This transaction is a great example of the continuing evolution of consumer credit as an asset class and growth opportunity.” 84 Any evolution introduced by Pagaya’s fintech stands to benefit monopoly-esque investment corporations and their shareholders. “Consumer credit as an asset class and growth opportunity” is the language of a financialized racial neoliberal capitalism that equates growth with progress and deploys fintech to scavenge for new, profitable income streams. Individual consumers—the people whose collateralized credit card and mortgage debts are commodified and securitized to form these asset classes—do not see the profits that fintech generates from these new income streams. People are exploited by these processes, where algorithms scrape as much information on an individual as possible to be employed in risk models for generating profits that the individual will never receive. 85 Quickly and quietly, fintech efficiently ensconces the profits into the accounts of already-wealthy corporations and their disproportionately white shareholders. Not only can fintech concentrate wealth, the computer algorithms on which fintech is built replicate and reinforce white supremacy. 86 Evidence from online advertisements provides several examples. A study of Google advertisements reveals that searching for a person with a Black-identifying name is more likely to produce advertisements that falsely suggest the person has a criminal record. 87 Algorithms that determine whether a person is exposed to certain housing advertisements discriminate against people of color and those from lower-income backgrounds. 88 The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) filed a lawsuit against Facebook claiming that their algorithms targeting online job ads to demographic groups excluded women. 89 Netflix has come under scrutiny for its algorithms’ tailoring of promotional advertisements based on customers’ viewing histories, effectively misrepresenting movies’ mostly white casts by showing scenes with movies’ few Black actors to Black customers. 90 Just as these algorithms work to discriminate on social media platforms and streaming services, fintech algorithms calibrate the financial system to whiteness. “Our whole defining mission is to redefine this discussion of both race, gender, and the intersectionality of that as it outlays and plays with closing the digital divide and providing access to girls of color . . . having the divine skills and innate ability to create change in both their own lives and their communities.” —Kimberly Bryant, 2017 91 As it stands—and especially when controlled by white data scientists and the wealthy corporations of financialized racial neoliberal capitalism—fintech offers new and sophisticated means of exploitation and surveillance. In the era of big data and predictive algorithms, benefits do not extend to Black and Brown communities or to lower-income whites. 92 Even Google Fiber’s purportedly well-intentioned city-wide efforts reinforce rather than remedy inequalities. While reflecting on the scientific contributions of her famed father, Stephen Hawking, Lucy Hawking mused, “How good is the track record of the human race in using advances in technology for the good of ordinary people?” 93 We can’t just hope that fintech will offer a slightly better track record. Hope steeped in willful, ahistorical ignorance is insulting and dangerous. We all need and deserve dignified access to digital and financial services without having our information exploited, wealth extracted, and movements surveilled—marginalized communities especially deserve this. Let us make it so.

#### McAfee is wrong about decoupling –

Parrique 21 Timothée Parrique, March 25th, 2021 A response to Bryan Walsh: The card castle of degrowth, <https://timotheeparrique.com/a-response-to-bryan-walsh-the-card-castle-of-degrowth/> He holds a PhD in economics from the Centre d’Études et de Recherches sur le Développement (University of Clermont Auvergne, France) and the Stockholm Resilience Centre (Stockholm University, Sweden). Titled “The political economy of degrowth” (2019), his dissertation explores the economic implications of the ideas of degrowth. He is currently writing a French book adaptation of his PhD dissertation for Flammarion. Tim is also the lead author of “Decoupling debunked – Evidence and arguments against green growth” (2019), a report published by the European Environmental Bureau (EEB). He frequently writes about green growth and decoupling.

Last blow. Degrowth is not only misguided and delusional, it is also unnecessary. For Bryan Walsh, this is because “both rich and poor countries have been able to continue to grow while reducing many pollutants through more efficiency and cleaner energy.” Proof? Andrew McAfee said so. Like many others, I disagree with McAfee’s analysis. Long story short: decoupling is fake news. This is how I summarise the findings of the first exhaustive review of the decoupling literature. Most of the time, if you read that “decoupling is happening,” then it means relative decoupling. This is a good start, and I would like to read this line more often, but it is nothing worth sabering champagne. Relative decoupling is not enough because it means environmental pressures are still on the rise. And even when decoupling is absolute, this is not necessarily problem solved. Take one of the most optimist decoupling study from 2019. The study analyses 18 developed economies between 2005 and 2015 showing that emissions decreased by a yearly 2.4% while GDP grew by 1.1%. The gains are tiny and fall a long way short of what is needed to meet the Paris Agreement targets. Plus, these historically fast rates of decoupling are partly explained by the low growth rates during the period. It is green growth without much growth – nothing too surprising. Saying that rich countries have “decoupled” because their emissions have decreased by a few per cent would be like me saying I have “climbed” Mount Everest just because I hiked the first few meters. Factually, not untrue, but disingenuous still. (This is especially true if this decoupling is in fact a displacement of emissions in poorer countries who manufacture the products we consume.) Most decoupling discussions only focus on greenhouse gas emissions, ignoring other kinds of environmental pressures. For example, 80% of all decoupling studies focus on primary energy and greenhouse gases. Among the rest, only a few consider material use, water use, land change, water pollution, waste, or biodiversity loss. A “sustainable” economy in any meaningful understanding of the term must consider all the complex interactions it has with ecosystems, and not only carbon. Here is my point: the proof of absolute and significant decoupling between GDP and all the environmental pressures that matter is nowhere to be found and it is unwise to invest all our hopes in this decoupling magically materialising in the decade to come. The question is complex and the future always uncertain, but consider this. On the one hand, an article from Andrew McAfee in Wired and a blog post commenting on raw data without any analysis. On the other hand, the first exhaustive review of all decoupling studies ever made – 835 scientific articles. On one side, one author promoting a book written about modern decoupling efforts in the United States and a one-pager blog post about trade-related emissions. On the other side, an international cohort of sixteen scientists from seven different universities who systematically reviewed all knowledge ever produced on the topic. Who shall we trust? Let’s say you wake up with issues breathing and you go get checked at the hospital. Several hundred doctors tell you that, considering the bad state of your lungs, you better ease on the smoking. But there is one guy in the waiting room who tells you it’s all fine, and that, even though it has never happened before, we might in the future be able to decouple smoking from lung damage. What would you do? Personally, I would follow the precautionary principle, and I think we should do the same when it comes to climate change. The precautionary principle means degrowth: reducing emissions where they currently are without expecting them to magically vanish in the future.

### 2nc – alt – o/v

#### The alternative is to reject the aff and critically interrogate the neoliberal discourse of the 1AC — that is the most critical action we can take in educational spaces to further radical movements against capitalism. Debate can’t actualize a plan or a movement, but critical interrogation of discourse can resist the pandemic pedagogy and create radical subjects that can lead future movements. Those movements will push for a social state that prioritizes the wellbeing of its population and the environment, rather than a corporate state that prioritizes profit above all. That’s Giroux.

## Case

#### No internal link

### 2NC---!D---Hypersonics Impossible

#### Drag and extreme heating undermine performance.

Tracy & Wright 2-5-2021, \*Cameron L., Kendall Fellow in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists. He has a PhD in materials science. \*\*David, research associate in the Laboratory for Nuclear Security and Policy in the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has a PhD in physics. ("Don't Believe the Hype About Hypersonic Missiles", *IEEE Spectrum*, https://spectrum.ieee.org/tech-talk/aerospace/military/hypersonic-missiles-are-being-hyped)

Technical reassessment

First, consider the claim that hypersonic weapons can reach their targets faster than existing ballistic missiles. The fastest hypersonic vehicles are launched on rocket boosters, like those that launch intercontinental-range ballistic missiles. Thus, both types of missile reach the same initial speeds. But hypersonic weapons fly through the atmosphere where they are subjected to substantial drag forces. Ballistic missiles, on the other hand, fly high into outer space where they are free from these drag effects. Thus, while hypersonic weapons fly a more direct path to their targets, they lose much of their speed throughout flight, ultimately taking longer to reach their targets than comparable ballistic missiles.

Gliding through the dense atmosphere at hypersonic speeds subjects these gliders to more than just drag forces. As they slow down, hypersonic vehicles deposit large quantities of energy to the surrounding air, a portion of which is transferred back to the vehicle as thermal energy. Their surfaces commonly reach temperatures of thousands of degrees Celsius.

This extreme heating limits performance in two ways. First, it constrains glider geometry, as features like sharp noses and wings may be unable to withstand aerothermal heating. Because sharp leading edges decrease drag, these constraints degrade glider aerodynamics.

Second, this heating renders hypersonic missiles vulnerable to detection by the satellite-mounted sensors that the United States and Russia currently possess, and that China is reportedly developing. Hot objects emit light in proportion to their temperature. These satellites watch for light in the infrared band to warn of missile strikes. Ballistic missiles are visible to them during launch, when fiery rocket plumes emit a great deal of infrared light, but become harder to see after rocket burn-out, when the warhead arcs through outer space. Hypersonic missiles, on the other hand, stay hot throughout most of their glide. Our calculations indicate that incoming gliders would remain visible to existing space-based sensors not only during launch, but for nearly their entire flight.

Finally, it is often claimed that hypersonic weapons will upend the strategic balance between adversaries because they can bypass missile defenses. The reality is more complex. As discussed, the effects of atmospheric drag and heating mean that hypersonic weapons will have few, if any, advantages over existing missiles when it comes to outpacing interceptors or evading detection. Still, their low-altitude flight would allow them to fly under the reach of defenses designed to intercept ballistic missiles in outer space. Their maneuverability could also allow them to dodge interceptors in the atmosphere.

Yet the performance of hypersonic weapons against missile defenses is strategically meaningful only if it offers a new capability (i.e., if these weapons do something existing missiles cannot). This is not the case. Existing long-range missiles could easily overcome defensive systems by fairly simple means, such as firing more missiles than the adversary has interceptors, or by using countermeasures, like decoys.

#### Their authors have incentive to exaggerate the threat.

Tracy & Wright 2-5-2021, \*Cameron L., Kendall Fellow in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists. He has a PhD in materials science. \*\*David, research associate in the Laboratory for Nuclear Security and Policy in the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has a PhD in physics. ("Don't Believe the Hype About Hypersonic Missiles", *IEEE Spectrum*, https://spectrum.ieee.org/tech-talk/aerospace/military/hypersonic-missiles-are-being-hyped)

Hypersonic hype

In short, technical analysis of the performance of hypersonic weapons shows that many claims as to their supposedly “revolutionary” performance are misinformed. So why has an arms race coalesced around a weapon that does not work as advertised?

Development and acquisition of strategic missiles are complex, bureaucratic processes involving a broad range of actors, from the military organizations that use these weapons to the legislators who fund them. In this context, decisions commonly serve the diverse interests (financial, professional, etc.) of broad coalitions, rather than narrow technical criteria. Even if a missile does not perform to the specifications by which it is marketed, proponents are often keen to convince others of its “revolutionary” nature—thus securing funding, prestige, and other benefits that accompany the successful development of a new weapon.