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#### The aff is a ruse to solidify US domination, which erases imperialism---ensures antitrust only serves American interests

Kwet 22, PhD in Sociology from Rhodes University, visiting professor at Yale Information Society Project (Michael Kwet, 2022, “The Digital Tech Deal: a socialist framework for the twenty-first century,” *Race & Class*, Vol. 63, Issue 3, DOI:10.1177/03063968211064478)

Limitations of liberal and progressive ‘techlash’ reforms

In response to the rise of Big Tech, the intellectual classes in the Global North, led by American scholars, researchers and journalists, have formulated a liberal/progressive critique of Big Tech and a corresponding set of capitalist reforms they call the ‘techlash’. Their framework, informed by progressive-era figures like Louis Brandeis and Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), aims to restore the Golden Age of Capitalism through enlightened state regulation. This circuit of intellectuals are drawn primarily from elite universities (Ivy League, MIT, Stanford, Oxford, etc.) and the corporate media. Money for their research is sourced from elite academia and media outlets, wealthy foundations, philanthropists and Big Tech itself. The techlash critics ignore or downplay the analytical and moral centrality of digital capitalism and colonialism, ecological context and the need for a socialist transformation. A de facto vanguard within the intellectual community tuned into tech, together with Big Tech itself, these elite intellectuals set the bounds of leftist discourse and exercise ‘tech hegemony’ over the broader narrative.37

There are two branches of critique put forth by the American techlashers: a legal branch which focuses on anti-trust as its centrepiece to reform digital capitalism and a human rights branch which focuses on discrimination, privacy, content moderation and workers’ welfare. These intellectuals are typically in agreement with each other and often weave their critiques and solutions together. Let us consider each in turn.

Legal reformers

Within the legal domain, a new wave of anti-trust scholars have occupied centre-stage to address the digital economy.38 At the leftmost end of the spectrum in the United States, ‘neo-Brandeisian’ anti-trust scholars draw inspiration from Louis Brandeis, who viewed a fair and just democracy as one without extreme concentrations of wealth and power into the hands of corporations. Neo-Brandeisians share with socialists the idea that socioeconomic inequality in part springs from the monopoly power of big corporations. However, anti-trust reformers depart from socialists in irreconcilable ways.

For one, they envision a ‘small business capitalism’ of private property owners kept intact by enlightened state regulators. Socialists, by contrast, argue that the capitalist system naturally concentrates wealth and objects to class inequalities and private ownership of the means of production. For another, neo-Brandeisians fetishise competition as a force for social good, rather than a force which pits owners and workers against each other in the battle for revenue, profits and market share.

Critically, the limits of economic growth are not acknowledged anywhere in the literature, nor are digital colonialism and American empire. This is an analytical failure because the fact that Big Tech corporations exercise global dominance should be evaluated in light of their international and environmental impact. It’s as if central features of the global tech economy – American empire and ecological crisis – don’t even exist. It is a moral failure because all parties affected should be involved in formulating and implementing remedies, but, instead, the United States’ scholars, lawmakers, courts and regulators are the ones making critical decisions about reforming American firms with global reach.

European counterparts share in the US anti-trust reformist agenda, with an added caveat: the Europeans are explicitly trying to cut down the American super-giants in order to build their own tech giants and colonise global markets.

In Europe, there are already tens of unicorns (privately held start-ups valued over $1 billion). Rich European countries dominate this race. The UK leads the pack and aims to produce its own trillion-dollar behemoth. President Emanuel Macron will be pumping €5 billion to tech start-ups in hopes that France will have at least twenty-five unicorns by 2025. Germany is attracting billions for its start-ups and spending €3 billion to become a global AI powerhouse and a world leader (i.e., market coloniser) in digital industrialisation. For its part, the Netherlands aims to become a ‘unicorn nation’. In 2021, the European Union’s competition commissioner, Margarethe Vestager, told the press in no uncertain terms that Europe needs to ‘build its own European tech giants’.39

Thus, the notion that European leaders are against Big Tech is demonstrably false. They are trying to shrink the American super-giants (GAFAM) so they can carve out market share for burgeoning European tech giants. It’s pure power politics – an inconvenient truth for America’s neo-Brandeisians, who laud and borrow ideas from their European counterparts.

The new anti-trust scholars erase these realities from within their own self-referential echo chambers, and instead act as if anti-trust is a matter of remedying harms to their own citizens. This is not a small point. Even if anti-trust reforms go through, the space created for new market entrants will almost certainly be dominated by the rich countries, who still have the most advanced engineers and resources to pay them high salaries and poach foreign talent.

#### Competition law fuels capitalist expansion

Irani 19, Assistant Professor in the Department of Historical and Political Studies at Arcadia University (Freya Irani, 2019, “Beyond De Jure and De Facto Boundaries: Tracing the Imperial Geographies of US Law,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 26, Issue 2, DOI: 10.1177/1354066119869801)

Abstract

Since 1945, US judges have extended numerous “domestic” US laws (including securities and antitrust laws) to govern economic transactions taking place “abroad”. However, they have generally failed to extend US labor and employment laws to govern employer– employee relationships outside “US territory”. Through a close reading of federal court decisions and drawing on recent work in the field of critical legal studies, this article makes an argument for centering the study of jurisdiction in International Relations scholarship and for approaching states as instantiated in their jurisdictional assertions. I suggest that such an approach enables us to capture the geographies—including the imperial geographies—of US law in the “normal,” everyday course of affairs. In particular, such an approach allows us to see that, since the mid-20th century, the legal authority and legal relations of the US government have come to be organized around the notion of the national economy (rather than simply around, for example, notions of territory or citizenship). What this means is that it is increasingly a posited relationship to this national economy that determines whether people and corporations, wherever in the world they are located, are subjected to or protected by US law.

Since 1945, US courts have frequently used US laws to adjudicate certain kinds of civil disputes arising anywhere in the world. They have also allowed the Department of Justice to use these laws to criminally prosecute individuals and corporations (including “nonUS” citizens and corporations) for certain kinds of conduct carried out “abroad”.1 US courts have justified these extensions of US laws (which are referred to as instances of “extraterritorial jurisdiction”) in a variety of ways, pointing, for instance, to a need to protect US citizens located abroad from acts of “terrorism” or to otherwise safeguard the vital “national interests” of the United States.

International Relations (IR) scholars have been increasingly attentive to these practices. However, reflecting the traditional realist and liberal, and more-recent constructivist, foci of the discipline, they have generally focused on how these practices have unfolded in two contexts—security and human rights (Liste, 2014, 2016; Lohmann, 2016; Shambaugh, 1999). With some important exceptions (Putnam, 2009, 2016; Slaughter, 1995; Slaughter and Zaring, 1997), IR scholars have been less attentive to extensions of US “economic” laws, such as antitrust and securities laws, to govern conduct taking place abroad. An important aspect of these extensions is their routineness. Unlike extensions of, for example, US “terrorist financing” laws, which are often represented as necessitated by “exceptional” circumstances, extensions of US economic laws are significant precisely because of such laws’ applicability to, and impact on, routine commercial activities. As such, studying such extensions allows us to capture an important modality through which the US government structures and regulates global economic activity. It further enables us to capture the geographies—including the imperial geographies—of US law in the “normal,” everyday course of affairs. Since World War Two, the extraterritorial extension of US economic laws has often taken place pursuant to the “effects doctrine.” As described by US courts, the effects doctrine states that governments may apply their own laws to conduct that takes place outside their territorial boundaries, but that has effects (of a particular magnitude) within such boundaries. Before 1945, courts, including the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ), had used the doctrine to uphold jurisdictional assertions by governments over conduct taking place abroad but having physical effects within their territories (S. S. Lotus [France v. Turkey], PCIJ, 1927). The frequently-cited example was a bullet fired across an international border giving rise to jurisdiction where the bullet landed. However, in 1945, a US federal appellate court held for the first time that economic effects, within the United States, of extraterritorial conduct would be sufficient to trigger the application of US law. Specifically, in United States v. Aluminum Company of America (“Alcoa”), the Second Circuit Court of Appeals (1945) applied the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 to the allegedly-anticompetitive activities of a Canadian company, taking place in Switzerland. The court justified its decision by pointing to the effects of these activities on quantities of aluminum imported into, and on prices of aluminum within, the US In subsequent decades, US courts invoked this “economic” version of the effects doctrine in a variety of contexts, using it, for instance, to apply US securities and trademark laws to conduct taking place abroad (Schoenbaum v. Firstbrook, Second Circuit, 1968; Steele v. Bulova Watch Co., US Supreme Court, 1952). However, they failed or refused to apply the doctrine in other contexts, and in particular, refused to apply US employment and labor laws to govern conduct taking place abroad (Foley Bros. v. Filardo, US Supreme Court, 1949 (“Foley”); Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Arabian American Oil Co., US Supreme Court, 1991 (“Aramco”)). In this article, through an examination of US courts’ effects-based extraterritoriality since 1945, I do two things. First, I provide a descriptive account of the geographies of the jurisdictional boundaries of the United States, understanding “jurisdictional boundaries” as the shifting lines between spaces in which, and subject areas and people to which, US law does and does not apply. There has long been a disjuncture between these jurisdictional boundaries and the territorial boundaries that the US government claims as its own. This article moves beyond a simple demonstration of such a disjuncture, to trace its precise (though ever-changing) shapes. Through a close reading of US court decisions in the antitrust and employment/labor contexts, I show that, in the post-World War Two (“postwar”) period, in addition to the notion of territory, the jurisdictional boundaries of the United States have come to be organized around a (partly-legal) construct called the “national economy.” What this means is that it is increasingly a posited relationship to this national economy that determines whether US law applies in a particular case, and so also determines where US law applies. Through my descriptive account, I also make a broader argument for foregrounding jurisdictional assertions in IR scholarship, and for approaching states as both instantiated in and constituted by these jurisdictional assertions. In particular, I show the potential of such an approach in helping us think about the state “around” (Reid-Henry, 2010: 752) or “beyond” (Glassman, 1999: 669) the territorial trap.2 I show that, by foregrounding and tracing jurisdictional assertions, we are better able to empirically capture the shifting geographical coordinates of states’ legal boundaries. Furthermore, I show that, by foregrounding and tracing jurisdictional assertions, we are able to reconceptualize such legal boundaries, to see them as not static and singular, but shifting and multiple. Some such borders are “clearly visible in the landscape,” others are “hidden from immediate view” (Cowen, 2009: 70)—though no less consequential, and—crucially— no less “formal” or “legal” for that. In one sense, then, my argument is a very specific, empirical one about US extraterritoriality. I am not suggesting a similar rise in extraterritoriality elsewhere in the postWorld War Two period: rather, as I explain in the next section, I view postwar “economic” extraterritoriality as, until recently, a largely US practice, enabled primarily by and enabling of US economic preeminence. Yet my argument is also a broader one in its proposal of a particular approach to states’ boundaries, an approach which finds these shifting boundaries in the routine, seemingly-mundane jurisdictional assertions of states. I show that, by tracing these jurisdictional assertions, we can better capture the multiple ways in which legal authority is organized and authorized in the contemporary world— sometimes around and by the notion of territory, sometimes around and by the notion of the national economy, sometimes in still other ways. In highlighting the multiple ways in which legal authority is organized in the contemporary world, this article does not suggest that the notion of territory is no longer important—quite the contrary. My concern is rather with the political productiveness of the very assumption of the territorial organization of jurisdiction, of the assumption that legal authority is both supreme and even within, and limited by, territorial boundaries. For example, in settler-colonial states, the assumption of supremacy and evenness of the settler government’s jurisdiction within its claimed territory works to obscure rival indigenous forms of authority and law (Pasternak, 2017). So too, this assumption serves to obscure, and so enable, ongoing violent processes through which such jurisdiction needs to continually be imposed on, and is continually resisted by, indigenous peoples (Pasternak, 2017). At the same time, and as this article shows, the assumption of the territorial limitedness of the US government’s jurisdiction works to obscure, and so to enable, the routine reach of US law “abroad.” At its core, then, this article aims to counter these assumptions of the territorial exclusiveness and limitedness of jurisdiction, and so to make possible the consideration and tracing of other contemporary geographies of law, and specifically, of the imperial geographies of law. In the section “Centering jurisdiction”, drawing on work on jurisdiction and territory in IR and law (Dorsett, 2002; Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012; Elden, 2013; Kaushal, 2015; McVeigh, 2007; Pahuja, 2013; Ryngaert, 2016; Valverde, 2009), I detail my approach to jurisdiction, and describe how it diverges from conventional approaches to the same. In the sections “The emergence of effects-based extraterritoriality” and “Delineating the US economy”, I show that, since 1945, the jurisdictional boundaries of the United States have come to be organized around a construct called “national economy.” I do this in two steps. In the section “The emergence of effects-based extraterritoriality”, contrasting two cases decided 36 years apart, I demonstrate the importance of this construct, which was only at play in the latter case, in enabling the extraterritorial extension of US law. In the section “Delineating the US economy”, I detail the ways in which US judges continually construct the national economy through their decisions, by articulating some people and conduct to, and disarticulating other people and conduct from, that national economy. I suggest that, in doing so, these judges draw US jurisdictional boundaries in ways that include US corporations but exclude US workers employed abroad. The final section concludes. Centering jurisdiction IR scholars and international lawyers tend to think and talk about jurisdiction—the authority to speak or enunciate the law—primarily in terms of territorial sovereignty. Territorial sovereignty is generally seen as coming before jurisdiction, in two ways. First, territorial sovereignty is seen as giving rise to jurisdiction, as providing grounds for the authority to speak the law. Second, territory—already-formed territory—is seen as setting the spatial extent of jurisdiction: a state’s jurisdictional boundaries are seen as normally limited by its existing territorial bounds. Such an approach has crucial implications for the study of jurisdiction: as Sundhya Pahuja (2013: 70) writes, it casts jurisdiction as “a technical question concerned with whether a particular sovereign state, or any judicial or quasi-judicial body constituted according to [. . .] law, can exercise legal authority over a territory, dispute, person or issue.” Recent writings on jurisdiction by critical legal scholars (Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012; Kaushal, 2015; Pahuja, 2013) have called into question this view of territorial sovereignty as anterior to jurisdiction. These writings have instead stressed the “inaugural” quality of jurisdiction, the ways in which jurisdictional practices, rather than being carried out by already-constituted political communities, serve as important sites for the constitution and reconstitution of such community (with all the violent Irani 5 inclusions, displacements, and expulsions that such processes often involve) (Kaushal, 2015: 781–782).3 In this article, I draw on this flipped characterization of legal authority, but I add an emphasis on practice. In my account, legal assertions not only form, border, and construct “the state”: they are the state. The state is instantiated in its jurisdictional assertions: it is “the ever-changing snapshot emerging from [multiple] jurisdictional assertions, the very pattern of assertions of jurisdiction, not an entity that ponders whether to assert jurisdiction or not” (Malley et al., 1990: 1296). Changing jurisdictional assertions do not simply change what “the state” does: they further change what the state is, who and what it includes and excludes, and crucially, where it is located. Approaching the state as both constituted by and instantiated in its jurisdictional assertions effects a transformation in our understandings of the geographies of states and their borders. In particular, it enables us to better capture the imperial geographies of some states and their borders. Rather than entities that exert legal authority uniformly within, and only within, fixed lines-on-maps, states come to have multiple boundaries, formed in particular moments, through particular assertions. Territorial borders become only one among many legalized boundaries of state authority; territory becomes only one way of organizing and limiting state law. This opens up space to think about other (nonor less-territorial) legalized boundaries of state authority, other (non- or less-territorial) ways of organizing and limiting state law, ways that—far from being superseded at Westphalia or overcome with decolonization and the supposed universalization of the state form—actually exist in the contemporary world. In IR scholarship, the primary place these other ways of organizing and limiting jurisdiction make an appearance is in the historical scholarship on territory (Elden, 2013; Ruggie, 1993). Such scholarship generally describes a shift in the organization of legal authority, variously identified as taking place sometime between the 14th century and the Peace of Westphalia: while prior to this period, multiple legal authorities had coexisted in given spaces, during this time period, governments for the first time began to claim exclusive authority over bordered spaces and the people they “contained.” I draw from this work a recognition of the historical situatedness and specificity of the territorial organization of jurisdiction, a recognition which opens up space to both consider multiple ways of organizing jurisdiction and investigate their techniques and micro-politics— as I do below. But I diverge from this work in emphasizing that such multiple ways of organizing jurisdiction are contemporaneous and contemporary, rather than successive or primarily of historical interest.4 To capture the existence of multiple contemporaneous and contemporary ways of organizing jurisdiction, I employ the concept of jurisdictional rationalities, or modes of jurisdictional thought and action (Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012: 32). Much like political rationalities, different jurisdictional rationalities can be understood as different “conceptions of the proper ends and means of government” and law (Miller and Rose, 1990: 5). These rationalities can be distinguished by the particular “concept or category” around which jurisdiction is “centered” (for example, “territory” or the “national economy”) (Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012: 48). Different jurisdictional rationalities “engage” law differently: they are associated with different kinds of legal subjects, spaces, and institutions (Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012: 42, 48). For example, while “territory” (as a mode of jurisdictional thought and action) is associated with “sovereign-subject (or citizen) 6 European Journal of International Relations 00(0) relations distributed in territorial terms” (Dorsett and McVeigh, 2012: 41), the “national economy” is associated with—and brings into being—other kinds of subjects and relations (for example, relations between the “United States” and corporations located abroad whose actions are understood as affecting prices within the United States). Conversely, as I show below, thinking about legal authority in terms of a national economy can erase sovereign-citizen relations, when such relations are understood as unimportant to the economy of the United States. In subsequent sections, I examine the jurisdictional rationalities, the modes of jurisdictional thought, underlying US judges’ decisions about whether or not to extend US antitrust and labor laws to govern conduct “abroad.” I show that, while territory remains important as an organizing principle for legal authority, there emerged, in the postwar period, a new mode of thinking and talking about legal authority, which centered on the national economy. I show that, in decisions in this period in which judges considered whether or not to extend US laws abroad, they increasingly represented people, corporations, and activities in terms of their relationships to “US commerce” or “the US economy,” rather than solely in terms of where they were located, incorporated, or born. It is these relationships that served—and continue to serve—to make possible, or to preclude, the extension of US law. These relationships—between various people, corporations, and activities and the “US economy”—are not ones that pre-exist the decisions in which they are invoked, although they are portrayed by judges as such. Such relationships are not found or noticed by judges: judges create them. For instance, as I will show below, judges draw on general economic “laws” to make connections between extraterritorial agreements to restrain production of a particular commodity and prices of that commodity within the United States. In so doing, they characterize the parties to such agreements as affecting the US economy, and so as subject to the legal authority of the US government. Of course, in defining particular people and activities as “part of” or as “affecting” the US economy, judges delineate the US economy itself. It is, in part, in and through particular legal decisions that the national economy is given form and limits, and is modified, over and over again. What this means is that the national economy is constructed in and through the decisions for which it serves as jurisdictional grounds.5 I discuss this process of construction in subsequent sections. In doing so, I focus on judges’ reasoning, on the texts of their decisions. However, it bears mentioning that these decisions have material effects, in part because they are enforced. Enforcement is a complicated legal question in an international context: legal scholars generally agree that, while states may sometimes declare their laws applicable to particular kinds of conduct taking place anywhere in the world (a form of jurisdiction known as “prescriptive jurisdiction”), they may rarely legally “enforce” these laws or judgments in another state’s territory without permission (a form of jurisdiction known as “enforcement jurisdiction”) (Lowe, 2003: 338). Nonetheless, this general rule obscures the US government’s frequent use of “indirect territorial means” of enforcement (for example, the seizure of assets located within the United States, a ban on travel to the United States) to enforce the judgments of US courts (Ryngaert, 2008: 24–25). Crucially, “indirect territorial means” for enforcement are differently available to different states. Enforcement, in particular, depends on the material capabilities and Irani 7 economic positioning of states. In theory, any government can employ the economic effects doctrine to apply its domestic law to conduct taking place abroad. In practice, however, it is the “presence of assets” within the territorial boundaries of a state that “giv[es] these expansive jurisdictional claims bite,” because it is against such assets that a legal judgment can most easily be enforced (Raustiala, 2009: 113). As such, the centrality of the United States to global economic activity is absolutely crucial in enabling the effective exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction by US courts. This point is obscured by US governmental officials who have defended the extraterritorial extension of US laws by suggesting that other states could similarly extend their laws to govern conduct taking place abroad (Bell, 1978). But it is crucial in understanding the practices described in this article, and specifically, in understanding the uniquely-broad scope of US extraterritoriality, the relative ease with which the United States is able to extend its laws to govern conduct taking place anywhere in the world.6 The emergence of effects-based extraterritoriality In the next two sections, I show that, in the postwar period, the legal authority of the US government has come to be organized around the notion of the national economy. In this section, I demonstrate the importance of this notion in enabling the emergence of (economic) effects-based extraterritoriality in the 1945 Alcoa case. In the next section, I show the ways in which US judges have constructed the national economy in the decades following Alcoa—specifically, in ways that include US consumers and importers, but exclude US workers located abroad. Prior to 1945, the United States and numerous European states routinely applied their laws to certain conduct taking place in much of the “non-European” world, for example, in China and Japan. However, with some exceptions, in relations between the former states, principles of international law and comity were understood to limit states’ legal authority to acts seen as taking place within their territorial boundaries. Within US law, the quintessential statement of this understanding could be found in American Banana Company v. United Fruit Company (“American Banana”), a 1909 US Supreme Court decision which—ignoring and obscuring the routine nature of US extraterritoriality outside of Europe—is sometimes described as marking the high point of strict territoriality in US law (Slaughter and Zaring, 1997: 3). American Banana was an action to recover damages, brought by the American Banana Company against the United Fruit Company for the latter’s alleged violations of the Sherman Act of 1890 (15 U.S.C.A. §§ 1–2), which, among other things, bans certain contracts or combinations in restraint of trade, as well as the monopolization or attempted monopolization of trade and commerce. The plaintiff, American Banana, alleged that the defendant, United Fruit, had violated the Act primarily through its anticompetitive conduct in what was considered, at various historical moments and by different parties, to be Colombian, Panamanian, and Costa Rican territory. American Banana accused United Fruit of entering into quantity- and price-fixing agreements, and of instigating the Costa Rican government to seize goods and materials destined for American Banana’s plantation (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 354). 8 European Journal of International Relations 00(0) Justice Holmes, writing for the Supreme Court, dismissed American Banana’s complaint, holding that since the Sherman Act did not apply in Colombian/Panamanian/ Costa Rican territory, the plaintiff had no legal basis on which to sue. The Court characterized its decision as dictated by “[t]he general and almost universal rule” “that the character of an act as lawful or unlawful must be determined wholly by the law of the country where the act is done” (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 356). Given this rule, the Court stated that “[f]or another jurisdiction, if it should happen to lay hold of the actor, to treat him according to its own notions rather than those of the place where he did the acts, not only would be unjust, but would be an interference with the authority of another sovereign, contrary to the comity of nations, which the other state concerned justly might resent” (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 356). For three decades after American Banana, Justice Holmes’ declaration—that “the character of an act as lawful or unlawful must be determined wholly by the law of the country where the act is done”—remained dominant in US relations with European states. In the 1945 Alcoa case, however, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, acting as a court of final appeal because of the Supreme Court’s inability to muster a quorum, reversed course. Specifically, Judge Learned Hand held that the US Justice Department could use the Sherman Act as a basis for the prosecution of a Canadian corporation, Aluminum Limited, for its acts in Switzerland (and specifically, for its entry into a cartel agreement that aimed at limiting production of aluminum). Justifying his decision, Judge Hand pointed to the effects that this agreement could be presumed to have on quantities of aluminum imported into, and on prices of aluminum within, the United States. Judge Hand contended that these effects brought into play the general rule that “any state may impose liabilities, even upon persons not within its allegiance, for conduct outside its borders that has consequences within its borders which the state reprehends” (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 443, citations removed).7 How are we to understand the Alcoa decision in light of the earlier American Banana one? When one engages in a close reading of the two judgments, what quickly becomes apparent is the very different rationalities, the very different conceptualizations of the proper means and ends of federal government and federal law underlying each decision: these rationalities render different courses of action legitimate and desirable in each case. For Justice Holmes, the author of the earlier American Banana decision, federal government is about controlling and managing a bordered physical space. This understanding of the proper end of federal government is manifest in Justice Holmes’ concern with the locations of acts, his categorization of such acts as inside or outside particular lineson-maps, and the fact that such categorization is determinative of whether or not he thinks US law is to apply (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 355). Justice Holmes writes: “In the first place the acts causing the damage were done, so far as appears, outside the jurisdiction of the United States and within that of other states. It is surprising to hear it argued that they were governed by the act of Congress” (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 355, italics added). And, as mentioned above, after listing certain limited exceptions, Holmes continues: “[t]he general and almost universal rule is that the character of an act as lawful or unlawful must be determined wholly by the law of the country where the act is done” (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 356, italics added). Irani 9 Justice Holmes’ understanding of the proper end of federal government (that is, the control and management of a bordered physical space) is particularly visible in what he does not discuss, and in particular, in his lack of attention to factors other than location. For instance, in American Banana, there is no discussion of the economic implications of the dispute at hand “in” or “for” the United States. There is no discussion of the possible effects of the defendant’s foreign anticompetitive activities on US banana prices or on the overseas opportunities of other US-incorporated companies. Even the injuries to American Banana, itself a US-incorporated corporation, are only mentioned when Justice Holmes summarizes the plaintiff’s claims (that is, not when he discusses the jurisdictional question) (American Banana, US Supreme Court, 1909: 355). Such effects are not yet seen as relevant to the question of legal authority, or, at least, are not the terms in which legal authority can yet be explicitly discussed. In contrast, 35 years later, economic effects are central to Judge Hand’s decision in Alcoa: Judge Hand grounds the application of federal law in the presence of such effects within US borders. Yet, he does not identify any particular individuals or groups located within the United States who might be affected by Aluminum Limited’s agreement to limit production of aluminum. Instead, Judge Hand speaks in general terms about the effects of the aluminum cartel on imports and prices of aluminum, characterizing these effects as “consequences within [the United States’] borders which the state reprehends” (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 443–444). Implicit in the suggestion that the United States, as an entity, “reprehends” particular economic consequences is the notion of a single national economic unit with a single national economic interest: reduced imports and raised prices are bad for the United States itself, rather than for particular people or classes or even component US states. Although he never actually uses the term, we can see the centrality of what we might today call a “national economy” to Judge Hand’s decision. This economy is made up of components like imports, exports and prices, which need not be identified with any particular individuals, classes, or component states, but can simply be identified with the United States These components are linked: Judge Hand feels comfortable setting up a presumption that reduced imports into the United States will lead to uniformly higher prices throughout US territory (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 444–445). These components are all cast as located within the United States, since effects on these components are described as consequences “within [the United States’] borders” that the United States reprehends (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 443–444). Yet they are also cast as vulnerable to economic activities, such as agreements to limit production, taking place abroad: for example, Judge Hand declares that “a depressant upon production which applies generally may be assumed, ceteris paribus, to distribute its effect evenly upon all markets” (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 444–445). From Judge Hand’s discussion of effects in Alcoa, we can both extract, and see the implications of, a jurisdictional rationality that differs from the one at play in American Banana. In the American Banana decision, federal government is about governing a bordered physical space: as such, US law can be extended to govern, and only to govern, acts taking place within that bordered physical space. In contrast, in the Alcoa decision, federal government is not only about managing a bordered physical space (although it certainly is that). Rather, because that bordered physical space is cast as coterminous 10 European Journal of International Relations 00(0) with a national economy, protecting that space involves protecting that national economy (including its components like imports, exports, and prices) as well. And given the ease with which economic effects are seen to travel across borders, a necessary means to the end of economic protection is the extraterritorial extension of US law. The centrality of the national economy to Judge Hand’s 1945 decision, and its absence in Justice Holmes’ 1909 decision, is not surprising: at the time of Justice Holmes’ decision, no such construct was imagined to exist. As Timothy Mitchell (2005a; 2005b) and Hugo Radice (1984) have shown, in the United States, it was not until in the 1920s and 1930s that new practices of accounting, measuring, and calculating “formed. . .the economy as a new object of professional knowledge and political practice” (Mitchell, 2005b: 126).8 The discipline of Economics was a particularly important site in this process: in this field, innovations (like the practice of national income accounting) and publications (like Keynes’ General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money) enabled the economy to, for the first time, be imagined as the “self-contained structure or totality of relations of production, distribution and consumption of goods in a given geographic space” (Mitchell, 2008, p. 1116; see also Radice, 1984: 121).9 Developments outside the discipline, including in the legal field, also played a role in enabling this imagining of the national economy. For example, in domestic “Commerce Clause” decisions in the first half of the 20th century, federal judges began to link and draw together transactions and processes (like production, distribution, and sales) that they had previously represented as separate.10 In addition, they began to consider the effects of previously “local” transactions on “national” economic indicators. These decisions paved the way for the Supreme Court, by 1942, to explicitly speak in terms of a national economy, which, in a series of later New Deal cases, it assigned to the federal government (rather than the United States’ component states) for protection and promotion (Wickard v. Filburn, US Supreme Court, 1942a: 125–126; A.B. Kirschbaum Co. v. Walling, US Supreme Court, 1942b: 520–521). Judge Holmes was unlikely to suggest that the federal government had the authority to extend US law abroad to manage the US economy because he was unlikely to think in terms of such an economy at all. And, as Miller and Rose (1990: 6) write: “Before one can seek to manage a domain such as the economy it is first necessary to conceptualize a set of processes and relations as an economy which is amendable to management.” By the time of Alcoa, however, “[t]he birth of a language of national economy as a domain with its own characteristics, laws and processes that could be spoken about and about which knowledge could be gained” had enabled that national economy to “become an element in programmes which could seek to evaluate and increase the power of nations by governing and managing ‘the economy’.” (Miller and Rose, 1990: 6)11 As such, in Alcoa, Judge Hand was able to allude to a national economy as grounds for his extraterritorial extension of US law. Delineating the US economy In the previous section, I identified a jurisdictional rationality centered on a national economy and demonstrated its importance in enabling the extraterritorial extension of US law in a particular, and particularly-important, case. In this section, I move from Irani 11 identifying a jurisdictional rationality centered on a national economy, to demonstrating that the legal authority of the federal government of the United States has come to be organized partly in terms of that national economy. By this, I mean that people, entities, and conduct are often represented in extraterritoriality decisions in terms of their relationships to a national economy (rather than in terms of their citizenships or locations): it is these posited relationships that justify their subjections to particular US laws. These relationships are not self-evident or pre-existing, although they are often represented as such by judges, lawyers, and rationalist scholars of extraterritoriality (Putnam, 2009).12 Rather, judges construct these relationships in their decisions, articulating some to and disarticulating others from, the US economy: these articulations enable their extensions of, or refusals to extend, US law. In this way, in deciding against and for whom to bring into play the very material force of US law, judges draw the jurisdictional boundaries of the United States. To clarify my argument, it is useful to return to Asha Kaushal’s (2015) discussion of the “inaugural” function of jurisdiction. To recap, Kaushal (2015: 782) describes the “second order manifestation of inaugural jurisdiction” as the “attachment of an individual, place, or event to a legal and political order”. This is not simply the attachment of an individual, place, or event to an unchanging order: rather, the very act of attachment transforms the order itself, modifying what it contains, where it begins and ends. Below, I show how judges, through their decisions, engage in the work of attaching some, and not others, to the United States: I further identify the shifting coordinates of the political and legal orders that emerge from these attachments and detachments. I do this through a comparison of two legal contexts: antitrust and employment/labor law. Several authors have pointed to a disparity in these contexts: US judges have frequently extended US antitrust laws to govern extraterritorial conduct, but have generally refused to do the same for US employment or labor laws (Putnam, 2009: 460; Turley, 1990: 601–602). I show how this disparity has been enabled by judges’ different articulations, in these two contexts, of particular people and conduct to the United States.13 In decisions in which they invoke the effects doctrine, judges have articulated people and conduct to the US economy in two ways. First, judges have represented certain kinds of actors, activities, indicators, and goods as themselves part of the US economy. They have usually done so implicitly, without defending their decisions about membership but simply casting such membership as fact. Second, judges have represented people and conduct “outside” the US economy as affecting those actors, activities, indicators, and goods that they have already decided are “part of” the US economy. Again, they have usually done so without much explanation, often simply characterizing certain kinds of activities as the causes or consequences of others. Occasionally, however, judges have supported their causal assertions by citing basic and commonplace notions about economic tendencies and rules, making repeated references to, for example, the “laws” of supply and demand (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 44–45). Although they “may or may not be empirically valid on their own terms” (Weldes, 1999: 13), these causal relationships are important: they work to relate the allegedly causal actors or activities abroad to components of the US economy, and so to trigger Congress’ authority to protect that economy from externally-originating harm. As such, these relationships serve as “warranting conditions” (Weldes, 1999: 13), enabling extensions of US laws abroad.

Taking each of these moments of articulation in turn. First, judges have cast very different kinds of actors as themselves part of the US economy in the antitrust and labor contexts, that is, they have represented the composition of the US economy very differently in these two contexts. In antitrust cases, judges have represented US consumers as part of the US economy, so that their losses can be seen as national losses, their gains national gains. So, for example, as previously discussed, in Alcoa, Judge Hand described the higher prices of aluminum to be paid by US consumers as “consequences within [US] borders which the state reprehends” (Alcoa, Second Circuit, 1945: 443, citations removed). In addition, judges have represented US importers, searching for commodities abroad, as part of the US economy, so that interference with their business would amount to interference with the US economy itself. So, for example, in Occidental Petroleum v. Buttes Gas Company (Central District of California, 1971: 102–103), a US District Court stated that one US corporation’s interference with another US corporation’s “business of extracting and importing oil into the United States” through acts in the Persian Gulf would affect US commerce in ways that would, in theory, justify the extension of US law.14

In contrast, judges have defined the composition of the US economy much more narrowly in employment/labor cases. In particular, they have failed or refused to characterize US workers located abroad as part of the US economy. For example, only 4 years after Alcoa, the Supreme Court in Foley (1949: 284) refused to apply a federal overtime pay law to the activities of Foley Bros, a US corporation, undertaking construction projects for the US government in Iran and Iraq: it refused to do so despite the fact that the employee in question, Filardo, was a US citizen. This refusal to cast US workers abroad as part of the US economy continued half a century later. So, for example, in 1991, in Aramco (US Supreme Court, 1991: 247–248), the Supreme Court refused to extend Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (banning employment discrimination on the basis of, among other things, race, religion and national origin) to govern the conduct of a US incorporated corporation in Saudi Arabia, even though the employee in question, Ali Bourselan, was a US citizen and the employment relationship had begun in the US In both these cases, there was no suggestion that the lost wages of US citizens, like the lost profits of US importers, might amount to losses for the US economy (despite the fact that US citizens are often taxed on their global earnings). Instead, in failing to mention or use the economic effects doctrine to extend US law in Foley and Aramco, the Supreme Court characterized the lost wages of US citizens as both localized and private, as theirs alone.

Judges have not simply represented the composition of the US economy very differently in the antitrust and employment/labor contexts. They have also represented the relationships between economic activities, markets, or indicators across national borders very differently in the two contexts. In the antitrust context, judges have emphasized the cross-border consequences of anticompetitive activities, linking activities in one state to economic indicators in others. In Alcoa, for instance, the Second Circuit (1945: 444– 445) connected the contract to limit production, signed in Switzerland, to prices in the United States: it did so by invoking an economic “law” that “a depressant upon production which applies generally may be assumed, ceteris paribus, to distribute its effect evenly upon all markets.” In contrast, in the labor and employment contexts, US judges have routinely cast employment practices and labor markets in different states as unconnected and distinct. For instance, in the Foley and Aramco decisions described above, the Supreme Court never explicitly entertained the possibility that wages, hours or discriminatory employment practices outside US borders could have any effects on workers within what it considered US territory, despite the fact that the practices in question were those of US corporations employing US citizens abroad.

The economic worlds described by US courts in the antitrust and labor contexts are very different. In the antitrust context, courts have painted a picture of a world in which economic activities are not contained by national borders. In Alcoa, the Supreme Court went so far as to entirely ignore such borders, never mentioning how US tariffs might affect the “laws” of supply and demand. In contrast, in the employment/labor context, as in Aramco and Foley, courts have failed or refused to draw connections between working conditions across borders. There are many such connections that could be drawn. For example, courts could presume that discriminatory employment practices of US employers, of the kind at issue in Aramco, could result in greater unemployment within US borders, as discharged employees return home. Or courts could presume, using an often-invoked “race to the bottom” narrative, that weak employment laws abroad would lead to unemployment or to the lowering of labor standards within the United States, as American companies relocate to states that offered the most to employers, or threaten to do the same. In cases like Aramco and Foley, either presumption would have suggested the existence of sufficient effects within the United States to justify the extraterritorial extension of US law. However, rather than make any such connections, which are surely no more speculative than the connections invoked in antitrust cases like Alcoa, US courts tend to represent labor markets in different countries as unconnected, as distinct.

Contrasting extraterritoriality decisions in the contexts of antitrust and employment/ labor law, we can see how US judges draw some into the reach of US law, and eject others from that same reach. Approaching the state as constituted by and instantiated in its jurisdictional assertions, these moves, when coupled with enforcement, can be understood as moments at which the state is brought into being in particular locations and at particular times (quite possibly, to move on again). These decisions can be understood as instances of boundary-making, as judges draw lines, in particular cases, between the inside and the outside. The above discussion shows that the resultant boundaries are not perfectly, or even roughly, coincident with the lines-on-maps that are often understood to mark the boundaries of US territory. Rather, it shows that the resultant boundaries are organized around the notion of the national economy, as the US state expands to incorporate those deemed to be significant, and contracts to eject those deemed unimportant, to that economy.15

#### The US “national economy” can only sustain itself by externalizing negatives of capitalism onto the periphery, which is violent, unsustainable, and causes war

Hickel 21, Economic anthropologist, author, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Professor at the Institute for Environmental Science and Technology at the Autonomous University of Barcelona and Visiting Senior Fellow at the International Inequalities Institute at the London School of Economics, Associate Editor of the journal World Development, and serves on the Statistical Advisory Panel for the UN Human Development Report, the advisory board of the Green New Deal for Europe, and the Harvard-Lancet Commission on Reparations and Redistributive Justice (Jason Hickel, 12-5-2021, “The Age of Imperialism is Not Over—But We Can End It,” *Current Affairs*, <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2021/12/the-age-of-imperialism-is-not-over-but-we-can-end-it>, accessed: 2-15-2022)

To answer these questions, we must come to grips with a key feature of the world economy—one that pundits in the global North tend either to ignore or wish away—namely, the fact that capitalist growth is fundamentally dependent on imperialism. This arrangement, which has persisted now for 500 years in various forms, is beginning to come under significant strain, and climate breakdown is likely to widen the cracks. This opens up opportunities for change, but also poses significant dangers. Everything depends on how governments and social movements choose to respond.

The key thing to grasp is that, under capitalism, “growth” is not about increasing production in order to meet human needs. It is about increasing production in order to extract and accumulate profit. That is the overriding objective. To keep such a system going requires several interventions. First, you have to cheapen the prices of inputs (labor, land, materials, energy, suppliers, etc.) as much as possible, and maintain those prices at a low level. Second, you have to ensure a constantly increasing supply of those cheap inputs. And third, you need to establish control over captive markets that will absorb your output.

Growth along these lines cannot occur within an isolated system. If you place too much pressure on your domestic resource base or your domestic working class, sooner or later you are likely to face a revolution. To avoid such an outcome, capitalism always requires an “outside,” external to itself, where it can cheapen labor and nature with impunity and appropriate them on a vast scale; an outside where it can “externalize” social and ecological damages, where rebellions can be contained, and where it does not have to negotiate with local grievances or demands.

This is where the colonies come in. From the origins of capitalism in the late 15th century, growth in the “core” of the world economy (Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan) has always depended on the sabotage of labor and resources in the “periphery”. Consider the silver plundered from the Andes, the sugar and cotton extracted from land appropriated from Indigenous Americans, the grain, rubber, gold and countless other resources appropriated from Asia and Africa, and the mass enslavement and indenture of African and Indigenous people—all of which exacted a staggering human and ecological toll. On top of this, colonizers destroyed local industries and self-sufficient economies wherever they went, in order to establish captive markets. There was no lag between the rise of capitalism and the imperial project. Imperialism was the *mechanism* of capitalist expansion.

As the Indian economists Utsa Patnaik and Prabhat Patnaik put it, capitalist growth requires an imperial arrangement—not as a side gig but as a *structurally necessary feature*. Imperialism ensures that inputs remain cheap, and thus maintains the conditions for capital accumulation. But it also underpins the fragile inter-class truce that prevails in the core states. If you’re going to raise the real wages of the working classes in the core, or take steps to protect the local ecology, then in order to maintain capital accumulation you have to compensate for this by depressing the costs of labor and nature elsewhere, namely, among workers and producers in the global South. Ever since the rise of the labor movement in the late 19th century, capital’s concessions to the working classes in Europe and the United States have been possible in large part because of imperialism.

This arrangement came under strain in the middle of the 20th century, however, as radical anti-imperialist movements gained traction across the global South. After winning political independence, many Southern governments set about dismantling colonial systems of extraction. They protected their economies and supported their domestic producers using tariffs, subsidies and capital controls; they instituted land reforms; they nationalized key resources and industries; they rolled out public services and improved workers’ wages. This movement was successful in advancing economic sovereignty and improving human development across much of the South. But it also constrained the core’s access to cheap labor and nature, and reduced their control over Southern markets.

The collapse of the imperial arrangement posed a significant threat to Northern capital accumulation. This problem was mitigated for a time by Keynesian policy: massive government expenditure boosted aggregate demand in the global North and generated an extraordinary economic expansion, providing a temporary “fix” for capital. Further concessions to the working classes of the core were sustained under these conditions, permitting the rise of social democracy in some states. But this fix could only hold for so long. As wages rose in the core and the supply price rose in the periphery, growth ground to a halt, capital accumulation became increasingly untenable, and by the mid-1970s the economies of the global North were overcome by a full-blown crisis of stagflation. As it turns out, capitalism cannot function for long under conditions of global justice. Fair wages and decolonization are compatible with a functioning economy, but they are not compatible with a functioning capitalist economy, because they limit the possibility of capital accumulation.

To deal with the crisis of the 1970s, capital needed a way to restore the imperial arrangement, to once again depress Southern prices and regain access to Southern markets. To achieve this, the core states intervened to depose progressive leaders in the global South—including, most prominently, Mossadegh in Iran, Arbenz in Guatemala, Sukarno in Indonesia, Nkrumah in Ghana, and Allende in Chile—replacing them with regimes more amenable to Northern economic interests. But the final blow was delivered by the World Bank and the IMF, which during the 1980s and 1990s imposed neoliberal structural adjustment programs (SAPs) across the region. This move shifted control over economic policy from the national parliaments of the South to technocrats in Washington and bankers in New York and London, ending the brief era of economic sovereignty. SAPs dismantled protections on labor and the environment, privatized public goods and cut public spending, reversing the reforms of the anti-colonial movement in one fell swoop.

It worked: wages and prices in the South collapsed under structural adjustment, and the new “free trade” regime allowed Northern capital to shift production abroad in order to take direct advantage of cheap labor and inputs. This enabled a massive increase in the scale and intensity of appropriation from the global South during the 1980s and 1990s, restoring the imperial arrangement and resolving the crisis of capitalism. Those who see neoliberalism as the main problem, and who fantasize about reverting to a less destructive version of capitalist growth, fail to grasp this point. The neoliberal turn was not some kind of mistake; it was necessary to restore the conditions for growth in the core. It was the obligatory next step in capitalist development.

But now, as the 21st century wears on, the engines of imperial appropriation are slowing down again. This reality is evident in the declining rate of economic growth in the core states, which economists have come to refer to as “secular stagnation.” This is happening for several reasons.

First, in the wake of structural adjustment, the collapse of the USSR, and the semi-integration of China, there are few nation-states and territories left that have not been brought into the remit of the capitalist world system. Imperialist expansion has effectively reached the limits of the planet. Now, instead of shifting production to new pools of cheap labor, capital has to deal with the existing workforce and their demands for higher wages. Second, certain regions of the South—specifically China and the leftist states of South America—are managing to push back against imperialism and improve their terms of trade, even while operating within the basic structure of the capitalist economy. All of this is leading to a rising supply price, which spells trouble for capital accumulation — and growth — in the core.

But perhaps most importantly — and this is the clincher — climate change and ecological breakdown are beginning to undermine the conditions of production on the tropical landmass. This is beginning to manifest already, with climate chaos ravaging parts of Central America, the Middle East and North Africa, driving social dislocation and human displacement. Without some kind of dramatic change in direction it will get much worse. With existing policies, we are headed for 2.7 degrees of heating this century, which is likely to trigger multi-breadbasket failure and sustained food supply disruptions across large parts of the global South, displace more than 1.5 billion people, wipe out 30–50% of species, and render much of the tropics uninhabitable for humans.

This is a problem for capital, because growth in the global North depends utterly on production in the global South and depends utterly on Southern land and resources—today just as much as during the colonial period. Recent research finds that rich countries rely on a net appropriation of land equal to twice the size of India, a net appropriation of 10 billion tons of material resources per year, and a net appropriation of embodied labor equivalent to a standing army of 180 million workers. This means that as labor is displaced and disrupted, and as the productive capacity of land is constrained by heatwaves, wildfires, storms and desertification, this will lead to a rising supply price in the core that will trigger a severe crisis for capital—more serious than anything it has yet encountered.

The question is, how will the core states respond? To maintain the rate of growth and capital accumulation in the face of this crisis, they will have to find a way to cut the supply price once again.

There are two obvious possibilities. One option is to cut wages in the core states, shred the welfare system and privatize public services, all of which would help cheapen inputs and open up new frontiers for accumulation, giving some reprieve to capital. This option — domestic neoliberal austerity — was deployed in the US and Britain during the 1980s as part of the response to the initial collapse of the imperial arrangement. Now it is being increasingly taken up by the European social democracies themselves, including the Nordics.

Of course, the risk of this approach is that it could trigger a backlash from the domestic working class, which could coalesce into a socialist revolution. Aware of this danger, politicians will seek to promote anti-immigrant and white nationalist narratives. By directing working-class grievance toward an “other,” this approach gets people to accept their own immiseration, so long as they can feel an affinity with the ruling class on the basis of race, and feel superior to people of colour who are kept in conditions more miserable than their own. This strategy has long been used to support the neoliberal project in the United States, and the ruling classes of the UK and Europe are now also turning to this playbook. Boris Johnson is a master of this in British politics.

The second option is that the core states could double down on imperialism. It is not difficult to imagine new rounds of invasion and occupation intended to force Southern prices back down. The recent coup in Bolivia, backed by the U.S. with its rising appetite for cheap lithium, offers hints of what might come. And it is clear that the Biden administration, just as under Trump before him , is already preparing the grounds for aggression against China, among other things to constrain China’s domestic demand for resources. Imperialist interventions that cheapen the supply price would allow capitalists in the global North to maintain accumulation and sustain their truce with the working classes of the core for a little while longer, even as the world crumbles around them.

If left to itself, this is how the capitalist story will play out in the 21st century: neoliberal austerity, white supremacist ideology, and violent imperialist interventions—all for the sake of maintaining growth and capital accumulation in the core. Indeed, this barbarism is already well underway. Liberal politicians denounce the barbarism at every opportunity, and yet they cannot bring themselves to address its underlying causes because they remain fundamentally committed to capitalist growth. The solution that the liberals offer—capital accumulation without barbarism— is a chimera.

There is an alternative ending to this story, however. If the core states shift to a post-growth, post-capitalist economic model—in other words, if they abandon the growth imperative and curtail capital accumulation—this would obviate the need for austerity and imperialist interventions. This is the power of post-growth transition: it would liberate all of us, in North and South alike, from the predatory interventions that are required to sustain capital accumulation.

#### It naturalizes racism and antiblackness; all capitalism is racial capitalism ⁠— the system of competition the aff perpetuates cannot sustain itself without theft of indigenous land, super-exploitation of black labor, imperial extraction, and racist devaluation of ‘disposable populations’

Burden-Stelly 20, Visiting Scholar in the Race and Capitalism Project at the University of Chicago, currently an Assistant Professor of Africana Studies and Political Science at Carleton College (Charisse Burden-Stelly, 7-1-2020, Modern U.S. Racial Capitalism, *The Monthly Review*, Volume 72, Number 3, <https://monthlyreview.org/2020/07/01/modern-u-s-racial-capitalism/>)
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Drawing on the intellectual production of twentieth-century Black anticapitalists, I theorize modern U.S. racial capitalism as a racially hierarchical political economy constituting war and militarism, imperialist accumulation, expropriation by domination, and labor superexploitation.14 The racial here specifically refers to Blackness, defined as African descendants’ relationship to the capitalist mode of production—their structural location—and the condition, status, and material realities emanating therefrom.15 It is out of this structural location that the irresolvable contradiction of value minus worth arises. Stated differently, Blackness is a capacious category of surplus value extraction essential to an array of political-economic functions, including accumulation, disaccumulation, debt, planned obsolescence, and absorption of the burdens of economic crises.16 At the same time, Blackness is the quintessential condition of disposability, expendability, and devalorization.

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

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

Imperialist accumulation denotes the rapacious conscription of resources and labor for the purpose of superprofits through violent means that are generally reserved for populations deemed racially inferior. On the precipice of the Great Depression, the prominent Black communist James Ford beautifully explicated imperialist accumulation. In his 1929 report on the Second World Congress of the League Against Imperialism, he explained that the extant political economy constituted the consolidation of Africa’s partition and the “complete enslavement of its people”; the arresting of its industrialization, which hindered the development of the “toiling masses”; and the relegation of the continent to a source of raw material, a market for European goods, and a dumping ground for accumulated surplus capital. In the U.S. South, the Black poor were dehumanized by Wall Street, “white big business,” and the “rising Negro bourgeoisie” whose condition of possibility was the subjection of the Black working class. This oppression was exacerbated by rigid racial barriers, disenfranchisement, and lynching. Ford further argued that the West Indies, subjected to U.S. militarism and occupation on behalf of Wall Street, were largely transformed into a marketplace for U.S. goods. Moreover, throughout Africa, the U.S. South, and the Caribbean, Black workers were impressed into forced labor, laying railroads, building roads and bridges, and working in mines; were entrapped on plantations through peonage; and were subjected to convict leasing. In addition, they suffered intolerable working conditions and routinized violence.41 Expropriation by domination designates the seizure and confiscation of land, assets, property, bodies, and other sources of material wealth set to work by relations of economic dependence. This relationship exists both between nations and between groups. A quintessential enunciation of expropriation by domination between groups is We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People, edited by the Black Communist William Patterson (with significant help from his wife and comrade Louise Thompson Patterson) and submitted to the United Nations by the Civil Rights Congress in 1951.42 The petition meticulously documented the past and present expropriation of Black people by the ruling class of modern U.S. racial capitalism through consistent and persistent discrimination in employment, unfair wages, forced ghettoization, inequitable and inferior accommodation and services, and the denial of justice in the courts. It further argued that this process was sustained by genocidal terror, white supremacist law, and the drive of monopoly capitalists for superprofits. Importantly, We Charge Genocide noted that, for primarily economic reasons, the historical and geographical locus of anti-Black genocide was the “Black Belt” of the Southern United States, a region expropriated by the Northern industrial capitalists and by Southern landowners alike. This was due in large part to plantation systems of sharecropping and peonage—legacies of slavery—in which Black political and economic rights were virtually nonexistent, Black laborers were inexorably tied to the land through debt, and the threat of violence and death precluded demands for justice. For Patterson, such expropriation by domination was the basis of “racist contamination that has spread throughout the United States.”43 We Charge Genocide further conveyed that expropriation by domination, a central element of modern U.S. racial capitalism, was more than a domestic concern because such practices “at home must inevitably create racist commodities for export abroad—must inevitably tend toward war.”44 Labor superexploitation can be understood as an economic relationship in which the intensity, form, and racial basis of exploitation differs little from slavery. Its effects are so extreme that it pushes racialized, particularly Black, labor effectively below the level of sheer physical subsistence. As Harrison explained, in the context of modern U.S. racial capitalism, Black workers “form a group that is more essentially proletarian than any other American group” because enslaved Africans were brought to the “new world” to be ruthlessly exploited. This reality fixed their social status as the most despised group, which in turn intensified their subjection.45 Likewise, organizations like the American Negro Labor Congress and the Anti-Imperialist League analyzed that the racial capitalist superexploitation of Black nations like Haiti in the first quarter of the twentieth century for the purposes of consolidating Wall Street control over land, commercial relations, and production was accompanied by the brutalization of Black labor, the export of Jim Crow practices, military occupation, and political repression.46 In effect, superexploitation results from the conjuncture of white supremacy, racialization, and the “badge of slavery,” which exacerbates the conditions of exploitation to which white working classes are subjected. As the Black Marxist Harry Haywood argued in 1948, “the stifling effects of the race factor are most strikingly illustrated by the drastic differences in the economic and cultural status of Negroes and whites.… Beyond all doubt, the oppression of the Negro, which is the basis of the degradation of the ‘poor whites,’ is of separate character demanding a special approach.”47 Superexploitation, he explained further, constitutes a combination of direct exploitation, outright robbery, physical violence, legal coercion, and perpetual indebtedness. It stifles “the free economic and cultural development” of the Black masses “through racist persecution as a basic condition for maintaining” virtual enslavement.48 The entrapment of Black women in domestic labor throughout the twentieth century—a function of their “triple oppression”—is perhaps the most glaring example of labor superexploitation under modern U.S. racial capitalism. In 1936, the lifelong Black radical Louise Thompson explained that Black women’s superexploitation in the capitalist mode of production was based on their race, sex, and subordination in the labor market.49 That same year, Black militants Marvel Cooke and Ella Baker published an article titled “The Bronx Slave Market” in which they studied triple oppression as it related to Black domestic workers. Cooke and Baker explained that the entanglements of racism, sex-based labor subordination, and structural poverty were deeply intensified by the Great Depression and forced Black domestic workers to pauperize their labor for the abysmal wage of less than thirty cents an hour. This form of labor exploitation was unique to the female sex because domestic work was conventional “women’s work,” and it was racialized insofar as the denigration of Black people fitted this group of women for low-wage, unprotected, and contingent labor.50

#### Vote neg for international workers’ movements

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

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

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

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

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

Marx’s Communism as the Socialist Ideal In The Critique of the Gotha Programme—written in opposition to the economistic and laborist notions of the branch of German Social Democracy influenced by Ferdinand Lassalle—Marx designated two historical “phases” in the struggle to create a society of associated producers. The first phase was initiated by the “revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat,” reflecting the class-war experience of the Paris Commune and representing a period of workers’ democracy, but one that still carried the “defects” of capitalist class society. In this initial phase, not only would a break with capitalist private property take place, but also a break with the capitalist state as the political command structure of capitalism.17 As a measure of the limited nature of socialist transition in this stage, production and distribution would inevitably take the form of to each according to one’s labor, perpetuating conditions of inequality even while creating the conditions for their transcendence. In contrast, in the later phase, the principle governing society would shift to from each according to one’s ability, to each according to one’s need and the elimination of the wage system.18 Likewise, while the initial phase of socialism/communism would require the formation of a new political command structure in the revolutionary period, the goal in the higher phase was the withering away of the state as a separate apparatus standing above and in antagonistic relation to society, to be replaced with a form of political organization that Frederick Engels referred to as “community,” associated with a communally based form of production.19 In the later, higher phase of the transition of socialism/communism, not only would property be collectively owned and controlled, but the constitutive cells of society would be reconstituted on a communal basis and production would be in the hands of the associated producers. In these conditions, Marx stated, “labor” will have become not a mere “means of life” but “itself…the prime necessity of life.”20 Production would be directed at use values rather than exchange values, in line with a society in which “the free development of each” would be “the condition for the free development of all.” The abolition of capitalist class society and the creation of a society of associated producers would lead to the end of class exploitation, along with the elimination of the divisions between mental and manual labor and between town and country. The monogamous, patriarchal family based on the domestic enslavement of women would also be surmounted.21 Fundamental to Marx’s picture of the higher phase of the society of associated producers was a new social metabolism of humanity and the earth. In his most general statement on the material conditions governing the new society, he wrote: “Freedom, in this sphere [the realm of natural necessity], can consist only in this, that socialized man, the associated producers, govern the human metabolism of nature in a rational way…accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy” in the process of promoting conditions of sustainable human development.22 Writing in The State and Revolution and elsewhere, Lenin deftly captured Marx’s arguments on the lower and higher phases, depicting these as the first and second phases of communism. Lenin went on to emphasize what he called “the scientific distinction between socialism and communism,” whereby “what is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the ‘first,’ or lower phase of communist society,” whereas the term communism, meaning “complete communism,” was most appropriately used for the higher phase.23 Although Lenin closely aligned this distinction with Marx’s analysis, in later official Marxism this came to be rigidified in terms of two entirely separate stages, with the so-called communist stage so removed from the stage of socialism that it became utopianized, no longer seen as part of a continuous or ongoing struggle. Based on a wooden conception of the socialist stage and the intermediary principle of distribution to each according to one’s labor, Joseph Stalin carried out an ideological war against the ideal of real equality, which he characterized as a “reactionary, petty-bourgeois absurdity worthy of a primitive sect of ascetics but not of a socialist society organized on Marxist lines.” This same stance was to persist in the Soviet Union in one way or another all the way to Mikhail Gorbachev.24 Hence, as explained by Michael Lebowitz in The Socialist Imperative, “rather than a continuous struggle to go beyond what Marx called the ‘defects’ inherited from capitalist society, the standard interpretation” of Marxism in the half-century from the late 1930s to the late ’80s “introduced a division of post-capitalist society into two distinct ‘stages,’” determined economistically by the level of development of the productive forces. Fundamental changes in social relations emphasized by Marx as the very essence of the socialist path were abandoned in the process of living with and adapting to the defects carried over from capitalist society. Instead, Marx had insisted on a project aimed at building the community of associated producers “from the outset” as part of an ongoing, if necessarily uneven, process of socialist construction.25 This abandonment of the socialist ideal associated with Marx’s higher phase of communism was wrapped up in a complex way with changing material (and class) conditions and eventually the demise of Soviet-type societies, which tended to stagnate once they ceased to be revolutionary and even resurrected class forms, heralding their eventual collapse as the new class or nomenklatura abandoned the system. As Sweezy argued in 1971, “state ownership and planning are not enough to define a viable socialism, one immune to the threat of retrogression and capable of moving forward on the second leg of the movement to communism.” Something more was needed: the continuous struggle to create a society of equals.26 For Marx, the movement toward a society of associated producers was the very essence of the socialist path embedded in “communist consciousness.”27 Yet, once socialism came to be defined in more restrictive, economistic terms, particularly in the Soviet Union from the late 1930s onward, in which substantial inequality was defended, post-revolutionary society lost the vital connection to the dual struggle for freedom and necessity, and hence became disconnected from the long-term goals of socialism from which it had formerly derived its meaning and coherence. Based on this experience, it is evident that the only way to build socialism in the twenty-first century is to embrace precisely those aspects of the socialist/communist ideal that allow a theory and practice radical enough to address the urgent needs of the present, while also not losing sight of the needs of the future. If the planetary ecological crisis has taught us anything, it is that what is required is a new social metabolism with the earth, a society of ecological sustainability and substantive equality. This can be seen in the extraordinary achievements of Cuban ecology, as recently shown by Mauricio Betancourt in “The Effect of Cuban Agroecology in Mitigating the Metabolic Rift” in Global Environmental Change.28 This conforms to what Georg Lukács called the necessary “double transformation” of human social relations and the human relations to nature.29 Such an emancipatory project must necessarily pass through various revolutionary phases, which cannot be predicted in advance. Yet, to be successful, a revolution must seek to make itself irreversible through the promotion of an organic system directed at genuine human needs, rooted in substantive equality and the rational regulation of the human social metabolism with nature.30 Freedom as Necessity Building on G. W. F. Hegel’s philosophy, Engels famously argued in Anti-Dühring that real freedom was grounded in the recognition of necessity. Revolutionary change was the point at which freedom and necessity met in concrete praxis. Although there was such a thing as blind necessity beyond human knowledge, once objective forces were grasped, necessity was no longer blind, but rather offered new paths for human action and freedom. Necessity and freedom fed on each other, requiring new periods of social change and historical transcendence.31 In illustrating this materialist dialectical principle, Lenin acutely observed, “we do not know the necessity of nature in the phenomena of the weather. But while we do not know this necessity, we do know that it exists.”32 We know the human relation to the weather and nature in general inevitably varies with the changing productive relations governing our actions. Today, the knowledge of anthropogenic climate crisis and of extreme weather events is removing human beings from the realm of blind necessity and demanding that the world’s population engage in the ultimate struggle for freedom and survival against catastrophe capitalism. As Marx stated in the context of the severe metabolic rift imposed on Ireland as a result of British colonialism in the nineteenth century, the ecological crisis presents itself as a case of “ruin or revolution.”33 In the Anthropocene, the ecological rift resulting from the expansion of the capitalist economy now exists on a scale rivaling the biogeochemical cycles of the planet. However, knowledge of these objective developments also allows us to conceive the necessary revolution in the social metabolic reproduction of humanity and the earth. Viewed in this context, Marx’s crucial conception of a “community of associated producers” is not to be viewed as simply a far-off utopian conception or abstract ideal but as the very essence of the necessary human defense in the present and future, representing the insistent demand for a sustainable relation to the earth.34 But where is the agent of revolutionary change? The answer is that we are seeing the emergence of the material preconditions of what can be called a global environmental proletariat. Engels’s Condition of the Working Class in England, published in 1845, was a description and analysis of working-class conditions in Manchester, shortly after the so-called Plug Plot Riots and at the height of radical Chartism. Engels depicted the working-class environment not simply in terms of factory conditions, but much more in terms of urban developments, housing, water supply, sanitation, food and nutrition, and child development. The focus was on the general epidemiological environment enforced by capitalism (what Engels called “social murder” and what Norman Bethune later called “the second sickness”) associated with widespread morbidity and mortality, particularly due to contagious disease.35 Marx, under the direct influence of Engels and as a result of his own social epidemiological studies twenty years later while writing Capital, was to see the metabolic rift as arising not only in relation to the degradation of the soil, but equally, as he put it, in terms of “periodical epidemics” induced by society itself.36 What this tells us—and we could find many other illustrations, from the Russian and Chinese Revolutions to struggles in the Global South today—is that class struggle and revolutionary moments are the product of a coalescence of objective necessity and a demand for freedom emanating from material conditions that are not simply economic but also environmental in the broadest sense. Revolutionary situations are thus most likely to come about when a combination of economic and ecological conditions make social transformations necessary, and where social forces and relations are developed enough to make such changes possible. In this respect, looked at from a global standpoint today, the issue of the environmental proletariat overlaps with and is indistinguishable from the question of the ecological peasantry and the struggles of the Indigenous. Likewise, the struggle for environmental justice that now animates the environmental movement globally is in essence a working-class and peoples’ struggle.37 The environmental proletariat in this sense can be seen as emerging as a force all over the world, as evident in the present period of ecological-epidemiological struggle in relation to COVID-19. Yet, the main locus of revolutionary ecological action in the immediate future remains the Global South, faced with the harsh reality of “imperialism in the Anthropocene.”38 As Samir Amin observed in Modern Imperialism, Monopoly Finance Capital, and Marx’s Law of Value, the triad of the United States, Europe, and Japan is already using the planet’s bio-capacity at four times the world average, pointing toward ecological oblivion. This unsustainable level of consumption of resources in the Global North is only possible because a good proportion of the bio-capacity of society in the South is taken up by and to the advantage of these centers [in the triad]. In other words, the current expansion of capitalism is destroying the planet and humanity. The expansion’s logical conclusion is either the actual genocide of the peoples of the South—as “overpopulation”—or, at the least, their confinement to ever-increasing poverty. An eco-fascist strand of thought is being developed which gives legitimacy to this kind of “final solution” to the problem.39 A New System of Social Metabolic Reproduction A revolutionary process of socialist construction aimed at building a new system of social reproduction in conformity with the demands of necessity and freedom cannot occur without an overall “orienting principle” and “measure of achievement” as part of a long-term strategy. It is here, following Mészáros, that the notion of substantive equality or a society of equals, also entailing substantive democracy, comes into play in today’s struggles.40 Such an approach not only stands opposed to capital at its barbaric heart but also opposes any ultimately futile endeavor to stop halfway in the transition to socialism. Immanuel Kant spelled out the dominant liberal view shortly after the French Revolution when he stated that “the general equality of men as subjects in a state coexists quite readily with the greatest inequality in degrees of the possessions men have.… Hence, the general equality of men coexists with great inequality of specific rights of which there may be many.”41 In this way, equality came to be merely formal, existing merely “on paper” as Engels pointed out, not only with respect to the labor contract between capitalist and worker but also in relation to the marriage contract between men and women.42 Such a society establishes, as Marx demonstrated, a “right of inequality, in its content, like every right.”43 The idea of substantive equality, consistent with Marx’s notion of communism, challenges all of this. It demands a change in the constitutive cells of society, which can no longer consist of possessive individualists, or individual capitals, reinforced by a hierarchical state, but must be based on the associated producers and a communal state. Genuine planning and genuine democracy can only start through the constitution of power from the bottom of society. It is only in this way that revolutions become irreversible. It was the explicit recognition of the challenge and burden of twenty-first-century socialism in these terms that represented the extraordinary threat to the prevailing order constituted by the Venezuelan Revolution led by Hugo Chávez. The Bolivarian Republic challenged capitalism from within through the creation of communal power and popular protagonism, generating a notion of revolution as the creation of an organic society, or a new social metabolic order. Chávez, building on the analyses of Marx and Mészáros, mediated by Lebowitz, introduced the notion of “the elementary triangle of socialism,” or (1) social ownership, (2) social production organized by workers, and (3) satisfaction of communal needs.44 Underlying this was a struggle for substantive equality, abolishing the inequalities of the color line and the gender line, the imperial line, and other lines of oppression, as the essential basis for eliminating the society of unequals. In “Communism as an Ideal,” Sweezy emphasized the new forms of labor that would necessarily come into being in a society that used abundant human productivity more rationally. Many categories of work, he indicated, would “be eliminated altogether (e.g. coalmining and domestic service), and insofar as possible all jobs must become interesting and creative as only a few are today.” The reduction of the enormous waste and destruction inherent in capitalist production and consumption would open up space for the employment of disposable time in more creative ways. In a society of equals—one in which everyone stands in the same relation to the means of production and has the same obligation to work and serve the common welfare—all “needs” that emphasize the superiority of the few and involve the subservience of the many will simply disappear and will be replaced by the needs of liberated human beings living together in mutual respect and cooperation.… Society and the human beings who compose it constitute a dialectical whole: neither can change without changing the other. And communism as an ideal comprises a new society and a new [human being].45 More than simply an ideal, such an organizing principle in which substantive equality and substantive democracy are foremost in the conception of socialism/communism is essential not only to create a socialist path to a better future but as a necessary defense of the global population confronted with the question of survival. Dystopian books and novels notwithstanding, it is impossible to imagine the level of environmental catastrophe that will face the world’s peoples, especially those at the bottom of the imperialist hierarchy, if capitalism’s creative destruction of the metabolism of humanity and the earth is not stopped mid–century. According to a 2020 article on “The Future of the Human Climate Niche” in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, based on existing trends, 3.5 billion people are projected to be living in unlivable heat outside the human climate niche by 2070, under conditions comparable to those of the Sahara desert.46 Even such projections fail to capture the enormous level of destruction that will fall on the majority of humanity under capitalist business as usual. The only answer is to leave the burning house and to build another now.47

The International of Workers and Peoples

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

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

Meanwhile, a separate conception grew out of the efforts of Amin, working with the World Forum for Alternatives. Amin had long contemplated a Fifth International, an idea he was still presenting as late as May 2018. But in July 2018, only a month before his death, this had been transformed into what he called an Internationale of Workers and Peoples, explicitly recognizing that a pure worker-based International that did not take into account the situation of peoples was inadequate in confronting imperialism.50 This, he stated, would be an organization, not just a movement. It would be aimed at the alliance of all working peoples of the world and not only those qualified as representatives of the proletariat…including all wage earners of the services, peasants, farmers, and the peoples oppressed by modern capitalism. The construction must also be based on the recognition and respect of diversity, whether of parties, trade unions, or other popular organizations of struggle, guaranteeing their real independence.… In the absence of [such revolutionary] progress the world would continue to be ruled by chaos, barbarian practices, and the destruction of the earth.51

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

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

#### That requires critical epistemologies
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Looking forward: academic and practitioner pushback against colonialism, and cautionary tales

Given the historical and ongoing mutual complicity between knowledge producers and policy-makers in upholding imperial and racial orders, we now consider the responsibilities, possibilities and challenges faced in altering the nature of that nexus. Doing so requires turning to what Danso and Aning call an ‘episteme of alternativity’;41 and the primary way for academics to enact this would be to draw on anti-colonial practice and legacies, rather than imperial competition, as the foundation of their theorizing.

Thus, in his article, Sizwe Mpofu-Walsh forefronts global South policy-makers and focuses on the nuclear order (a topic that is typically associated with realist IR) to demonstrate how it can be approached through an alternative, critical epistemology.42 Disrupting the ‘Great Power gaze’, Mpofu-Walsh asks what the politics of non-proliferation looks like from the perspective of the global South, especially the African continent as the sole nuclear weapon-free zone (NWFZ). There, denuclearization is fundamentally linked to decolonization. Thus anti-colonial goals, rather than hegemonic/imperialist competition, are at the root of both policy and theorizing. How different would IR knowledge and theories on nuclear weapons be if African praxis and the importance of NWFZs were taken seriously? Turning to the Middle East, Gani similarly argues in her article that the inclusion of non-western history and voices—from policy-makers to activists and scholars—in think-tank discussions can mitigate the latent colonialism that shapes western policy.43

Nevertheless, even with an incorporation of non-western practice and knowledge in policy making and scholarly theorizing, multiple perspectives that are marginalized even in the local context, owing to class or gender, may continue to go unheard.44 One crucial way in which both academics and practitioners can challenge such patterns is by adopting a more expansive reading of what constitutes ‘knowledge’ and indeed ‘practice’. In doing so, we can dismantle some of the constructed and false hierarchies between elite ‘knowledge’ and ‘research’ on one hand, and local ‘tradition’ on the other.45 The former is assumed to be objective, reliable and associated with western (and western-validated) universities; while the latter is viewed as subjective, unscientific and commonly associated with Indigenous, racialized, grassroots communities. Assumptions about who counts as a true knowledge producer or ‘expert’ is not only elitist but heavily racialized and gendered. Definitions of who counts as a ‘practitioner’ are equally narrow, so that scholars or policy-makers may place much weight on the views and actions of state, global governance and corporate practitioners, but do not view as equal practitioners those involved in everyday practice in their communities—those who in fact sustain their ecology, livelihoods, security and identities, all while having to navigate the impact of top-down policies.46

Both the articles by Jan Wilkens and Alvine Datchoua-Tirvaudey on climate justice, and by Althea Rivas and Mariam Safi on the organizing and practices of Afghan women, share knowledge from non-elite local communities and challenge the above binaries and hierarchies. In their article on climate justice in the Arctic and the Mediterranean, Wilkens and Datchoua-Tirvaudey explain that academic–practitioner knowledge exchange has often been a contributing factor in continued climate injustice.47 The existing patterns of this knowledge exchange on climate governance are dependent on hierarchies of knowledge, namely, the valorization of western/‘scientific’ knowledge production at the expense of the needs and knowledges of the Indigenous and local communities most affected by climate change (i.e. the community-based practitioners, rather than the institutional/state ones). Moreover, the spaces where such knowledge exchange takes place are often exclusionary (in who is invited, in the parameters of discourse and/or in the extortionate costs of participating), producing an intra-elite debate.48 Having identified these racialized patterns, they offer a corrective decolonial strategy for ethical climate governance, founded on practice-based knowledge and diverse ways of knowing that bring in those excluded insights.

The article by Rivas and Safi also provides an example of how the academic–practitioner nexus can be ‘decolonized’, one in which everyday knowledges of Afghan women, in all their diversity and complexity, are centred in peacebuilding efforts.49 Their article, co-written by an academic and a local practitioner, offers a methodology of how to take into account the internal hierarchies of positionality, interests and knowledges that are always present when engaging with grassroots communities for the sake of ‘research’. Rivas and Safi also demonstrate the importance of registering and valuing the unlooked-for, atypical knowledges from below, such as the subtle observations offered by Afghan women in rural areas that, contrary to wider assumptions, reflect their political engagement and interest.

Caution against extractivism in the search for such local knowledge exchange is at the forefront of both the above contributions.50 Thus academics should remain reflexive in what the purpose of their research is, and who really benefits. Moreover, a praxis of decolonizing such research necessarily entails taking time in a way that is at odds with the current culture of speedy and multitudinous productivity in academia: the rapid churning out of articles from ‘the field’ should raise appropriate questions about how, why and for whom that research is being conducted.

Of course, at issue is not just whom but also what we consider as worthy of scholarly and policy attention, and how inclusive we are of alternative methodologies. Dependence on state and official archives, ‘canonical’ theorists, written records and English-language sources all reproduce the racialized hierarchies inherent in the prioritization of certain types of knowledge and transmission.51 These factors also close the door on appreciating the power—both practical and ideational—generated by collective social action, whose impact cannot (and should not) be individualized to one or a few visible and often romanticized protagonists. Recognizing all this and reading into the silences of the archives should encourage greater attention to non-hegemonic record-keeping, story-telling and witnessing beyond elitist and prohibitive barriers—from oral histories, to poetry, art and independent publishing on paper and online. As anti-colonial and anti-racist thinkers and activists have long argued, these are the ways in which those who are dispossessed and marginalized, but also, consequently, autonomous, have kept their identities, cultures and memories alive, and sought to prevent their experiences from being suppressed and erased.52 In the face of systematic racism and the colonial dismantling of their histories, those who are marginalized are not, in fact, silent but continue to cultivate and share knowledge, even if they may lack the resources and type of support received by hegemonic knowledges (and people).53 Recognizing the equal validity of marginalized forms of knowledges in both academic and policy realms pushes back against the de-representation in knowledge exchanges within elite spaces and formats.

However, it would be erroneous to assume from these arguments that knowledge produced by so-called elite communities is always bad, and that knowledge or cultural production from the bottom up is always more authentic and supports the cause of justice. Srdjan Vucetic's article unsettles multiple binaries, between the elite and the ‘masses’, as well as between academics and practitioners.54 Drawing on the work of Stuart Hall, he complicates what we read as knowledge production and who we see as its progenitors, challenging the notion of purely top-down (and imperialist) identity construction. Exploring the role (and popularity) of nationalistic films and novels as signifiers of this consensus between policy-makers and wider society, Vucetic demonstrates that it is not enough to hold accountable only those deemed to possess political capital, be they policy-makers or academics. Rather, it is necessary also to challenge the broader pressures and expectations of the public that produce a collusion between elite and mass discourse, and help to foreclose the adoption of more critical, justice-oriented policies. Thus, if we focus solely on academics and practitioners in any anti-racist work, we miss the uncomfortable reality that narrow, exclusionary nationalism that foments such racism and imperialist foreign policies actually enjoys substantial ‘buy-in’ from people and may be an accepted part of a local (in this case British) identity.

This observation reinforces the need outlined above for a more expansive approach to defining knowledges, but this time when interrogating the generators of coloniality. This in turn allows us to bring into equal focus other facilitating institutions and mediums of knowledge dissemination, many of which play a pivotal role in making colonial tropes and erasures more palatable, accessible, even culturally and economically valuable. This theme runs through several of the articles in this special issue. As noted above, Vucetic's article focuses on cultural output; Antweiler looks at museums and schools; Baji considers the instrumentalization of local folklore for imperialist ideologies in Japan; Plonski and Manchanda examine the power of racial capitalism via Israel's surveillance industry and marketing; and Gani scrutinizes the impact of journalistic discourse and think tanks.

Thus far, a lot of responsibility for challenging the racial and colonial dynamics of the academic–practitioner nexus has been placed with knowledge producers, whether within or outside academia. But it is necessary to emphasize that efforts have already been under way, not only to ‘decolonize’ our academic disciplines, but to bring that discourse into the public realm. At that point practitioners need to carry their share of responsibility in listening to and applying the expertise (whether academic or community-based) that can foster more just policies. Instead, the attention policy-makers give to expertise is often selective and politicized, based not on what can actually improve people's lives but on what helps to justify the existing approaches adopted by governments. The current denigration and growing securitization of critical race theory, especially in the United States but increasingly elsewhere, is an example of attacks on emancipatory knowledges that challenge power and oppression. Offering another stark example of this, Amal Abu-Bakare explores in her article the lack of any serious attempts to confront Islamophobia in society, despite the wealth of research and expert advice from scholars and community-based practitioners available to policy-makers.55 Focusing on the cases of the UK and Canada, she highlights the way in which practitioner intervention, in this case that of security and police officials, has actively prevented the adoption of expert guidelines on tackling Islamophobia on the grounds that they might interfere with their counterterrorism strategies. In many ways this is a blatant acknowledgement from policy-makers that their counterterrorism strategy is inherently built upon racial tropes and discrimination. In contrast, so-called ‘neutral’ research on terrorism and/or counterterrorism is embraced by practitioners, precisely because such research might not ask uncomfortable questions about the racial foundations or assumptions that are necessary to enact their policies.

Abu-Bakare's article offers an example of the limitations of academic–practitioner knowledge exchange. Exhorting scholars to make their research policy relevant does not address the unequal receptivity towards critical research that may challenge policy. Nor does it sufficiently take into account the implicit disciplining that can take place in that process of knowledge exchange. Those very spaces or channels that are created to facilitate sharing, listening and negotiation between knowledge producers and practitioners (through all the blurred boundaries between them) may reproduce and reify hierarchies through unequal interactions. Is real dialogue possible if power dynamics render the interlocutors unequal?56 Or, in their efforts to be heard, taken seriously, and make their presence worthwhile, academics and other knowledge producers may find themselves being subtly socialized into the very modes of speech and thought that they sought to criticize. This can also happen in reverse when grassroots practitioners share spaces with scholars and elite institutions. The path-breaking and radical ideas needed to initiate change on some of the most deep-seated problems in politics and society may be diluted in such spaces for the sake of pragmatism and communication, undermining the ability to imagine real alternatives to the status quo. This is not to say that knowledge producers, whether academic or community-based, should not engage with policy-makers, but rather that they should be clear in what they seek to achieve—if, for example, constructive dialogue or receptivity to expertise is unlikely, it is at times necessary and an ethical responsibility simply to register alternative ideas or contestation. Returning to the point made at the start of this piece, this cautions us in how we champion ‘impact’ and knowledge–policy engagement, especially if we only recognize engagements that supplement and are ‘useful’ to systems of power rather than those that hold them to account.

Conclusion

This special issue introduces the readers of International Affairs to the relatively undertheorized and underhistoricized relationship between race, knowledge production and policy-making. The articles demonstrate the ways in which practitioners have historically relied on research produced within the academy to inform policy, initiating the establishment of departments and disciplines for this purpose, but they also show the reverse to be equally true: that policy, both foreign and multilateral, influences the possibilities and parameters of research, funding and recruitment practices, and retention of jobs.57 A key goal of this special issue has been to foster reflection on the ways in which knowledge production (in its multifaceted forms) contributes to or challenges the practice of racism and coloniality; and the ways in which policy and practice shape, validate, limit or ignore knowledge production—in ways that either perpetuate or interrogate coloniality. As the three categories delineated above show, the academic–practitioner nexus is best captured as a series of foreclosures that actively work to uphold narrowly espoused evolutionary myths of the discipline and entrench a naturalization of white-racialized subject positions in academic discourse on the ‘international’, while sidelining scholars and activists, notably women and people of colour, who have made undeniable contributions to analysis of the contemporary world.58 All this brings into view, as one scholar puts it, ‘the fundamental ways in which IR already is, and always has been, complicit in ordering politics’.59

As we have argued in this introductory piece, the exposure in this special issue of the deep academic–practitioner nexus confronts and challenges the ‘gaps’ discourse advanced at the expense of making visible the existing reciprocity that disciplines the boundaries of acceptable enquiry. The outcome of this disciplining at the theoretical level can be seen in the construction of paradigms that normalize Eurocentric presuppositions on ‘how the world is’. But such outcomes are also made manifest through material implications generated by narrow policy responses and policy instruments.

The special issue is not just an exposure, though; it is also a call for repair. To embark on a project of repair, those involved in knowledge production, dissemination and application—within academia, think tanks, museums, schools, cultural production and policy—first and foremost need to recognize that their work is not detached from the real world, even if they seek to make it so. If the articles in this special issue have shown anything, it is that there can be no realistic and honest demarcation between political and apolitical knowledge: to assert neutrality is like offering a blank slate that will inevitably be written over. It is worth knowing that even with the best intentions, a scholar's work is likely to be co-opted for political ends; and that one's erasures and blind spots regarding injustice, even if innocently produced, will be taken as justification for inaction and marginalization of these injustices in the real world.

Sincerity in seeking to prevent racist or imperialist co-optation necessitates more open interrogations of power and commitments to justice: and without doubt IR, whether ‘analytical’ or ‘critical’, and academia more broadly, are filled with sincere and honourable scholars who care about the world they live in and have the capacity to enact positive change. Questioning and challenging accepted and expected modes of academic enquiry requires courage and creativity, both of which are aided through collective effort. This special issue, then, is an invitation to adopt that courage and creativity in how we cultivate knowledge, in questioning the purpose and the ends of that knowledge, and to be discerning in how we try to put it into practice.

## Indigenous Regimes

### Turn---1NC

#### Their discourse of development *is* colonialism---guarantees global environmental devastation and absolute erasure of non-Western others

Carrasco-Miró 17, PhD Postcolonial and Gender Studies, Utrecht University (The Netherlands) Professor at Central European University (Gisela Carrasco-, “EcoSImies of care: a proposal for decolonizing ‘sustainable development’,” *From the European South*, 2)

The discipline of Economics has an unmistakable allure and authority in ‘development’ and its imagination as part of western modernity, 6 which stems from its self-presentation as a rational science supported by empirically tested methods and professional management techniques. This means that implementing ‘sustainable development’ projects and programmes in the so-called ‘developing countries’ embodies not only the institutional and financial power of its proponents (e.g. the UN, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund), the upgrading of living standards, and the modernization of the productive apparatus, but also the cultural weight and discursive authority of Economics. That is, ‘sustainable development’ contains specific ideas, practices, and forms of knowledge as its essential components, since development “entails a learning process” (Zein-Elabdin 2003, 31). In this sense, the notion of ‘development’ has functioned discursively since post-World War II as a regulated space that has ultimately provided the conditions for the possibility of knowledge and justification for political intervention in postcolonial and non-western societies (Escobar 1995). This means that ‘development’ has organized what it means to be poor or wealthy, just or unjust, with or without ‘development’, and has classified, in this way, certain subjectivities and knowledges as ontologically and epistemologically inferior. Thus, it is not surprising that ‘development’, dominated by the discourse of Economics, is seen to be closely associated with colonialism. In this regard Eiman O. Zein-Elabdin and S. Charusheela (2004) maintain that [e]conomics is epistemologically comfortable with the notion of colonialism and imperial domination [… It] can thus be soundly characterized as a colonial discourse grounded in exclusion and erasure of the unfamiliar. (2-3) In other words, ‘development’ is premised by the belief that some people of the world are ‘developed’ while others are ‘underdeveloped/developing’ making domination possible through a series of ‘deficits’ and a catalogue of ‘needs’. In this context, it is worth noting the similarities between the concept of ‘sustainable development’ and the Anthropocene – a narrative widely deployed within Euro-Austro-USA academic environmental studies and politics that invokes a pan-human species responsibility for the current climate crisis – and the parallels between the problems that ‘sustainable development’ and the Anthropocene pose and encounter. The Anthropocene and ‘sustainable development’ stories have surfaced together at the height and expansion of neoliberalism, when climate action has been relegated to ‘adaptation’ and capital has corrupted the autonomy, discourse and activist charge of the mainstream environmental movement, turning it into an ally of private wealth. From the ‘Welcome to the Anthropocene’ Rio+20 keynote video to the current United Nations Environment Programme “Stories from the Anthropocene,”7 the Anthropocene in ‘sustainable development’ turns out to be a view ‘from nowhere’ that tends towards normalizing the story of human exceptionalism, colonialism, and planetary decline, leading not to better stories imagining more liveable presents and more liveable futures but often, instead, more of the same Anthropos – i.e. ‘man’ as the supreme exception capable of fashioning his world and his own autonomous self. Activists from environmental justice, climate justice, and indigenous organizations do not invoke the ‘new’ Anthropocene’s rhetoric of humans as destroyers or masters of nature. Rather, these groups provide examples of socially and ecologically sustainable communities. Natureculture8 histories are not homogeneous and the story of the rise of modernity and climate change is rooted in social and economic injustice as much as in the exploitation of nonhuman nature (Haraway 2016) and in the histor(ies) of colonial violence and appropriations. There is, therefore, a specific type of ‘man’ connected to a particular culture (i.e. the logocentric homo economicus) that is destroying the planet. The Anthropocene portrayed in ‘sustainable development’ helpfully poses the question of the Nature/Society dualism, but cannot resolve that dualism since it accepts its selfdefinition – as a marker abstracted from the web of life. Thus, the Anthropocene story in ‘sustainable development’ is unlikely to guide us helpfully towards sustainability. Instead, I find the notion of Capitalocene (Moore 2016; Haraway 2016) useful insofar as it better describes the modernist rhetoric of ‘sustainable development’ and suggests a new synthesis beyond the nature/society dualism and the practice of ‘human exceptionalism’. In this regard, Capitalocene is figured as a critical zone rather than one grand mess that includes all of humanity. It is, therefore, an argument about thinking the ecological crisis (Moore 2016) rather than an argument about geological history – although of course the two are related. Rethinking capitalism in the web of life as suggested by Donna Haraway (2016) and Jason W. Moore (2016) locates the current crisis of climate and environmental change in our planet beyond human species-being. As pointed out by Jason W. Moore (2016), Capitalocene does not stand for capitalism as an economic and social system. […] Rather, the Capitalocene signifies capitalism as a way of organizing nature – as a multispecies, situated, capitalist world-ecology. (6) Thus, understanding development as a colonial discourse in the Capitalocene, exercising power through an articulation of racial or cultural difference, rather than as an analysis that begins with undifferentiated humanity and a culturally neutral path of an economy, becomes crucial to locate climate change and the transformation of the environment in the twenty-first century. In this sense, ‘sustainable development’ needs to be situated not merely in relation to fossil fuels, but within complex and interrelated processes of global-scale economicpolitical organizations stretched over histories of enclosures, colonialisms, patriarchy, industrializations, and globalizations. 2. The unsustainable ‘sustainable development’ framework The mantra of ‘development’ that ‘growth is good’ has been repeated so many times that it has the feeling of common sense. Again, the ‘new’ Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development directs us towards endless Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth based on extraction and consumption. For example, Target 17.19 of the SDG says only that ‘development’ will, by 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement GDP (UN 2015). Yet over the last sixty years under the ‘growth is better’ narratives, more natural resources have been raided by (some) humans than in all previous centuries together (Arns et al. 2015). Large-scale mining is penetrating ever deeper layers, multinational land grabs are advancing to remote corners, and the race is on for the division of the seabed and the resources in it (Klein 2014). This frantic rhythm of ‘progress’ has spurred images of crisis and doom while firing up the competitive rush for new frontiers. Why must the sole measure of progress be growth and measured in price? Who benefits from this single story? There are plenty of non-growth options and stories to be told, all of which have been ignored in the SDGs and Agenda 2030. In this regard, Victoria TauliCorpuz (2015), UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, claims that [a]s they stand now, the SDGs are a step backwards from these achievements [global recognition of Indigenous Peoples rights]. Indigenous Peoples have been all but erased from the development agenda. Include us, so that we can protect our traditions and territories for our children and protect the planet’s biodiversity for all the world’s children. Don’t leave us behind.

#### AND guarantees a permanent war against the periphery and biosphere

Carrasco-Miró 17, PhD Postcolonial and Gender Studies, Utrecht University (The Netherlands) Professor @ Central European University (Gisela, “EcoSImies of care: a proposal for decolonizing ‘sustainable development’,” *From the European South*, 2)

‘Development’ helps to produce a generous and benevolent national community or western identity, building unity and pride. Yet “benevolent first-world appropriation and reinscription of the Third World as an Other” (Spivak 1988) does not want to encounter the global South in its own terms but for other, usually global, Northern purposes. Yet, how to live together in a way that living is worthy and just for all? I suggest here, first of all, commitment. To further understand the nature of commitment I may use Amartya Sen’s (1977) interesting distinction between sympathy and commitment. If I am disturbed by the idea of others being poor, following Sen’s argument, this is a case of sympathy. If, on the other hand, this idea does not make me personally uncomfortable or distressed, but still makes me think there is something deeply wrong with it, it is a case of commitment. Following this definition, commitment is not primarily or chiefly motivated by individualized sentiments of, for example, ‘how to feel good about poverty.’ 12 In other words, commitment does not radiate from the individualized emotional self and does not aim at satisfying ongoing emotional aspirations of development’s ‘feeling good’ agendas and goals. Commitment is the willingness to let ourselves be committed, to be put in a commitment for an unforeseen problem that challenges us. Commitment, thus, is not resolved in a declaration of intentions or set of goals but it sets in motion a difficult process. Commitment rips us from what we are or what we believed to be (Garcés 2013) and incorporates us into a space that we do not control at all. We are involved in a situation, a dialogue, that exceeds us and that demands, finally, that we take a position. Taking a position is not just taking sides (for or against) or making a judgment (I like, I do not like). It is to have to invent an answer that we do not have and that, whatever it is, it will not leave us equal. Taking position is to attend the incompleteness of all knowledge, the infinite richness of ecoSImic imaginaries, and beginning to heal what Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) calls: the colonial wound. That is, a commitment to ways of knowing from the perspectives of those who have systematically suffered the injustices, dominations and oppressions caused by colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy. 4. Final remarks According to the tenets of the current dominant sustainable development discourse and project, nature should be valued economically if we are to protect it globally. Yet why is economic estimation the only option presented in ‘sustainable development’ to value nature? This article has considered the current global development Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development and has analysed ‘sustainable development’ discourse and its key dimensions: environmental (natural capital), economic (inclusive-green economy) and social (poverty eradication). I have argued that ‘sustainable development’ haunts a totalizing modernity story with capitalism as its universal telos, and that it hinders the possibility of accessing the critical insights of those who have been ‘left behind’, colonized, or bulldozed over in the Capitalocene. At the same time, there is urgent need to think what a life worth living is and how to live and die well as mortal critters, in a moment when the edges of the human are in question under the Capitalocene. The UN jointly with other ‘development’ actors claim that the global Agenda 2030 on sustainable development offers “hope in a world beset by crisis” (UN News Centre 2016). Yet, if ‘sustainable development’ solely attempts to ‘culturalize’ the ‘development’ discourse regarding the physical and chemical transformations our planet is undergoing, it fails to address a deeper problem and contributes, in this way, to modernity’s permanent war on the biosphere. Rather than looking hopefully to a day when these tensions are resolved either in a final moment of posthuman vanquishing of ‘man’ or the technological triumph of human survival, I reject hope as a political strategy. Relying upon hope would be to resurrect the presumption that ‘economic man’ as the fundamental unit is thinkable, which, as Haraway’s states, makes doing good work impossible.

#### Development heightens poverty and is a ruse for global financialization

Langan 18, senior lecturer in International Politics at Newcastle University, UK (Mark, “The UN Sustainable Development Goals and Neo-Colonialism. In: Neo-Colonialism and the Poverty of 'Development' in Africa,” Contemporary African Political Economy, p. 177-205)

As Pingeot (2014) alludes to, however, there has already been a strong focus on PSD and the role of business throughout the broader history of donor interventions in developing countries. The OECD, for example, has played a key historical role in cementing donor commitment to PSD rationales from the mid-1990s onwards. A series of OECD publications in that timeframe emphasised that the creation of a business enabling environment, and engagement of private sector actors, was an essential component of sustainable development. For instance, an OECD (1995: 3) publication, Private Sector Development: A Guide to Donor Support, has striking resemblance to the PSD/growth discourse of the current UN SDGs. This document stressed that: consensus is now emerging on a new model for sustainable development… key features of the new model are the changing roles of the state and the private sector. Increasingly, the creation of wealth and the generation of employment are seen to involve the state primarily as the architect of a positive enabling environment. The free market and pro-business discourse of the SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals] is therefore not something novel. It is instead a regurgitation of long-standing donor norms concerning the need to align poverty reduction strategies to the interests of the private sector. While the UN MDGs marked a shift towards a human needs framework (often associated with Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum), the UN SDGs by contrast mark a return to a more solidly free market focus. This is also not to say that free market policies designed to support business were not pursued in the timeframe of the UN MDGs (2000–2015). The launch of the WTO Doha Development Agenda (DDA) in this period is but one example of donors’ long-standing commitment to the promotion of business in ‘development’. The DDA was pursued in the language of pro-poor PSD, emphasising that its conclusion would be conducive to both FDI and the MDGs in developing countries. The creation of the UN Global Compact during the UN MDGs also demonstrates that this earlier framework did not omit private sector concerns (Gregoratti 2010). The SDGs, in this context, are a reifcation and extension of existing donor norms concerning the inclusion of corporations within development strategies. Mawdsley (2015: 344) articulately makes this point: economic growth is being ideationally and institutionally reinstated as the central and prior condition for “development”. This is not just deepening the existing poverty reduction-era focus on “bottom billion capitalism”… but extending towards new and expanding goals of large-scale public–private partnerships, donor support for major commercial investments, private equity initiatives and deepening fnancialisation.

#### “Failed states” risk is constructed---it shapes military interventions to prop up regimes that favor US policy.

**Logan** and Preble **10**, Justin is associate director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute. He holds a master’s degree in international relations from the University of Chicago and a bachelor’s degree in international relations from American University and Christopher is director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute. He holds a PhD in history from Temple University and a BA in history from George Washington University. “Washington’s Newest Bogeyman Debunking the Fear of Failed States” Strategic Studies Quarterly, Summer 2010

Given the growing acceptance of arguments about failed states and the fact that these ideas have begun to affect US foreign policy, it is striking how ill-defined the terms of debate have been. How can we measure state failure? What are the historical correlations between the attributes of failed states and the supposed security threats they pose? Below we show that by the established definitions of state failure and a reasonable interpretation of the word “threat,” failed states almost always miss the mark. Impressionism as Social Science A survey of the formal studies of state failure reveals a methodological wasteland. Analysts have created a number of listings of failed states, which have, in fairness, overlapped considerably; all are populated by poor countries, many of which have been wracked by interstate or civil violence.48 However, instead of adhering to basic social-scientific standards of inquiry, in which questions or puzzles are observed and then theories are described and tested using clearly defined independent and dependent variables, analysts began by drawing up a category—failed state—and then attempted to create data sets from which theoretical inferences could be induced. To take one prominent case, the authors of the State Failure Task Force Report contracted by the Central Intelligence Agency’s Directorate of Intelligence chose to adjust their definition of “failed state” after their initial criteria did not produce an adequate data set for the quantitative tests the researchers wanted to perform. After dramatically expanding the definition, the task force produced almost six times more countries that could be coded “failed” as compared with their original criteria and then proceeded with their statistical analysis. They justified this highly questionable decision on the judgment that “events that fall beneath [the] total-collapse threshold often pose challenges to US foreign policy as well.”49 Subsequently, the task force changed its name to the “Political Instability Task Force” and appeared to back away from the term failed state.50 Beyond methodological shortcomings, the lists of failed states reveal only that there are many countries plagued by severe problems. The top 10 states in the 2009 Fund for Peace/Foreign Policy magazine Failed States Index include two countries the United States occupies (Iraq and Afghanistan), one country without any central government to speak of (Somalia), four poor African states (Zimbabwe, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the Central African Republic), two resource-rich but [ 26 ] Washington’s Newest Bogeyman unstable African countries (Sudan and Guinea) and a nuclear-armed Muslim country, population 176 million (Pakistan). The sheer diversity of the countries on the lists makes clear that few policy conclusions could be drawn about a country based on its designation as a failed state. In fact, what has happened is that analysts have seized on an important single data point—Afghanistan in the 1990s and 2000s—and used it to justify a focus on failed states more broadly. Because Afghanistan met anyone’s definition of failed state and because it clearly contained a threat, analysts concluded en masse that failed states were threatening. When confronted with the reality that the countries regularly included on lists of failed states include such strategic non-entities as the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, and East Timor, advocates of focusing on state failure routinely point back at the single case that can be justified directly on US national security grounds: Afghanistan.51 Even in Afghanistan, however, remedying the condition of “state failure” would not have eliminated the threat, and eliminating the threat—by killing or capturing Osama bin Laden and his confederates—would not have remedied the “failure.” The fact that expansive claims about the significance of state failure have been used to market studies of the subject, when viewed in light of the diverse and mostly nonthreatening states deemed “failed,” leaves the impression of a bait and switch. For instance, the 2007 update of the Failed States Index promises on the magazine’s cover to explain “why the world’s weakest countries pose the greatest danger.” The opening lines of the article declare that failed states “aren’t just a danger to themselves. They can threaten the progress and stability of countries half a world away.” Strikingly, then, the article does little to back up or even argue these claims. It instead shrugs that “failing states are a diverse lot” and that “there are few easy answers to their troubles.” By 2009, the index was conceding that “greater risk of failure is not always synonymous with greater consequences of failure,” and that the state failure-terrorism link “is less clear than many have come to assume.”52 Given these concessions undermining the idea that state failure is threatening, one wonders why scholars continue to study failed states at all. As seen above, the countries on lists of failed states are so diverse that it is difficult to draw any conclusions about a state’s designation as failed. But the purpose, one would think, of creating a new category of states would be to unify countries that share attributes that can inform either how we think about these states or how we craft policies toward these states. Instead, the scholarship on state failure has arbitrarily grouped together countries that have so little in common that neither academic research nor policy work should be influenced by this concept. Despite repeated claims to the contrary, learning that a task force has deemed a particular state “failed” is not particularly useful. Start with the Conclusions and Work Backward Existing scholarship on state failure seems to indicate that the conclusion led to the analysis, rather than vice versa. Scholars who argue that “failed state” is a meaningful category and/or indicative of threat provide a rationale for American interventionism around the globe. Given the arbitrary creation of the category “failed state” and the extravagant claims about its significance, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that research on failed states constitutes, as one analyst put it, “an eminently political discourse, counseling intervention, trusteeship, and the abandonment of the state form for wide swaths of the globe.”53 The policy proposals offered by state failure theorists certainly meet this description. In 2003 retired diplomats James Hooper and Paul Williams argued for what they called “earned sovereignty”—the idea being that target states would need to climb back into the good graces of the intervening power to regain their sovereignty. In some cases, this would mean that domestic governments would perform whatever functions were allowed by the intervener, but other duties would be retained by the outside actor. “The element of shared sovereignty is quite flexible . . . as well as the time frame of shared sovereignty. . . . In some instances, it may be indefinite and subject to the fulfillment of certain conditions as opposed to specified timelines.”54 The premise seems to be that countries will be returned to the control of their indigenous populations when the intervener decides it is appropriate. James Fearon and David Laitin, both political science professors at Stanford University, promote a new doctrine that “may be described as neotrusteeship, or more provocatively, postmodern imperialism.”55 As they see it, this policy should not carry the stigma of nineteenth- or twentieth-century imperialism. “[W]e are not advocating or endorsing imperialism with the connotation of exploitation and permanent rule by foreigners.” [ 28 ] Washington’s Newest Bogeyman On the contrary, Fearon and Laitin explain, “Postmodern imperialism may have exploitative aspects, but these are to be condemned.”56 While perhaps not intentionally exploitative, postmodern imperialism certainly does appear to entail protracted and quasi-permanent rule by foreigners. Fearon and Laitin admit that in postmodern imperialism, “the search for an exit strategy is delusional, if this means a plan under which full control of domestic security is to be handed back to local authorities by a certain date in the near future.”57 To the contrary: “for some cases complete exit by the interveners may never be possible”; rather, the endgame is “to make the national level of government irrelevant for people in comparison to the local and supranational levels.”58 Thus, in Fearon and Laitin’s model, nation building may not be an appropriate term; their ideas would more accurately be described as nation ending, replacing national governments with a supranational governing order. Stephen D. Krasner, director of the State Department’s policy planning staff under George W. Bush and a leading advocate of focusing the department increasingly on state building, believes that the “rules of conventional sovereignty . . . no longer work, and their inadequacies have had deleterious consequences for the strong as well as the weak.”59 Krasner concludes that to resolve this dilemma, “Alternative institutional arrangements supported by external actors, such as de facto trusteeships and shared sovereignty, should be added to the list of policy options.”60 He is explicit about the implications of those policies and admits that in a trusteeship, international actors would remain in control indefinitely. The intervening power would maintain the prerogative of revoking the target’s sovereignty and should make no assumptions of withdrawal in the short or medium term.61 Krasner’s candor about the implications of his policy views, however, was not equaled by a willingness to label them accurately. “For policy purposes, it would be best to refer to shared sovereignty as ‘partnerships.’ This would more easily let policymakers engage in organized hypocrisy, that is, saying one thing and doing another. . . . Shared sovereignty or partnerships would make no claim to being an explicit alternative to conventional sovereignty. It would allow actors to obfuscate the fact that their behavior would be inconsistent with their principles.”62 Development experts with an interest in state failure agree that seizing political control of weak states is the answer. Paul Collier, for example, writes that outside powers should take on the responsibility of providing [ 29 ] public goods in failed states, including security guarantees to indigenous governments that pass Western democracy tests, and the removal of guarantees coupled with the encouragement of coups against governments that fail such tests.63 In part, these sweeping admonitions to simply seize politico-military control of the countries in question result from the failure to determine which of the “failedness” indicators should be addressed first or whether there is any order at all. While some studies have proposed hierarchies of objectives, starting with security and ending with development,64 it is clear that for many analysts, the causal arrows zigzag across the diagram. Each metric is tangled up with others, forcing those arguing for intervention to advocate simultaneous execution of a number of extraordinarily ambitious tasks. David Kilcullen lists “cueing and synchronization of development, governance, and security efforts, building them in a simultaneous, coordinated way that supports the political strategy” as only one of eight “best practices” for counterinsurgents.65 In Afghanistan, the flow chart of the December 2009 strategy seeking to repair that state looked more like a parody:66 Discussing this dilemma of interlocking objectives in the context of Afghanistan, Rory Stewart remarks that: Policymakers perceive Afghanistan through the categories of counter-terrorism, counter-insurgency, state-building and economic development. These categories are so closely linked that you can put them in almost any sequence or combination. You need to defeat the Taliban in order to build a state and you need to build a state in order to defeat the Taliban. There cannot be security without development, or development without security. If you have the Taliban you have terrorists, if you don’t have development you have terrorists, and as Obama informed the New Yorker, “If you have ungoverned spaces, they become havens for terrorists.”67 Not only do all bad things go together in these analyses, but it also becomes difficult if not impossible to discern which objective should be the primary focus of state-building efforts. Similarly, on the issue of state building and democracy, Francis Fukuyama informs readers that “before you can have a democracy, you must have a state, but to have a legitimate and therefore durable state you must have democracy.” Acknowledging the circularity of this argument, Fukuyama offered only the rather unsatisfying concession that the two ends “are intertwined, but the precise sequencing of how and when to build the distinct but interlocking institutions needs very careful thought.”68 This is a platitude and should be cold comfort to policymakers who are being urged forward by the same experts to perform these ambitious tasks. The High Costs of Targeting State Failure We have argued that the “failed state” category is a vacuous construct and that the countries frequently referred to as failed states are not inherently threatening. For those whom we have not convinced, however, we now examine the historical record and attempt to examine the costs of a national security policy that placed a high priority on attempting to fix failed states. It is of course impossible to determine the precise cost of any mission beforehand. Historically, however, such operations have been extremely costly and difficult. In a study for the RAND Corporation, James Dobbins and his coauthors attempt to draft a rule-of-thumb measure for the costs of nation building in a hypothetical scenario involving a country of five million people and $500 per capita GDP.69 For less ambitious “peacekeeping” missions, they calculate the need for 1.6 foreign troops and 0.2 foreign police per 1,000 population, and $1.5 billion per year. In the more ambitious [ 31 ] Justin Logan and Christopher Preble “peace enforcement” scenarios, they figure 13 foreign troops and 1.6 foreign police per 1,000 population, and $15.6 billion per year.70 Curiously, though, Dobbins et al. approach this problem by deriving average figures from eight historical nation building (“peace enforcement”) missions, five of which they had coded in a previous study to indicate whether or not they had been successful. One of these (Japan) they coded as “very successful,” two (Somalia and Haiti) were “not successful,” one (Bosnia) was a “mixed” result, and one (Kosovo) was a “modest success.”71 The authors then simply averaged the costs of these missions and deemed the resulting figures to be a rule of thumb.72 It is unclear why future missions should be based on historical experience when the historical examples used to derive the figures produced successes, failures, and results in between. Our methodological criticism notwithstanding, even taking Dobbins et al. on their own terms reveals how remarkably costly it is to attempt to fix failed states. Using the model laid out in Dobbins et al., we calculated the cost of nation building in three countries: Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan. A peace enforcement mission in Yemen would cost roughly $78 billion the first year, whereas a peacekeeping mission would cost roughly $12 billion the first year. Similar missions in Somalia, with a smaller population and a smaller per capita GDP, would only cost around $30 billion and $3 billion, respectively.73 In the case of a larger country, like Pakistan, the costs would be significantly higher. A peace enforcement operation in Pakistan would cost approximately $582 billion the first year, while a peacekeeping operation would cost around $81 billion. In all these examples, the peace enforcement numbers contain very high military costs. According to Dobbins’ model, a peace enforcement operation in Pakistan would require more than two million international soldiers, costing about $200,000 each.74 Analysts Frederick Kagan and Michael O’Hanlon suggest that even for the minimal task of trying to tip the balance of an intra-Pakistani conflict, the “international community” would need to contribute between 100,000 and 200,000 troops (only 50,000—100,000 of whom would be US, they suggest), and this represents “the best of all the worst-case scenarios.”75 As quickly becomes clear, intervening in any of the frequently mentioned failed states implies significant costs. As Kilcullen observes in the context of counterinsurgency, a corps of state builders should be available to stay in the country indefinitely. He proposes that “key personnel (commanders, ambassadors, political staffs, [ 32 ] Washington’s Newest Bogeyman aid mission chiefs, key advisers, and intelligence officers) in a counterinsurgency campaign should be there ‘for the duration’.”76 But it is unlikely that Western governments possess large pools of workers willing and well-equipped to deploy to Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or Haiti “for the duration.” Western civil services—and even most, if not all, Western militaries—are not comprised of a separate class of citizens who live their lives in far-flung locales, away from family and country, indefinitely. It is for this reason that, in addition to the structural changes highlighted above, a number of policy reports have called for radical overhauls of the national security establishment in the United States so that it can be better tailored to repair failed states.77 Failed Thinking, Not Failed States From new military doctrines and budget priorities, to state-building offices in the State Department, to the myriad proposals for transforming the entire US national security establishment, a long-term strategy of fixing failed states would entail dramatic change and high costs. More appropriate—and far less costly—than such dramatic changes would be a fundamental rethinking of the role of nation building and the relevance of state failure to national security planning. However, this does not appear likely. Thrust forward by the claims of threat, but unequipped with the expensive tools necessary for the task, policymakers look likely to persist in the failed approach to the subject that they have applied in recent years. If we intend to seriously embark on a plan to build nations, we must be prepared to bear heavy costs in time, money, and lives—or we must be prepared to fail. Moreover, no matter how evenhanded the United States may attempt to be, if US personnel are on the ground in dangerous parts of the world, Americans could be forced to choose sides in other countries’ internal conflicts, and the nation could become entangled militarily when its vital interests are not at stake.78 For instance, if our nation builders are killed in the line of duty, will there be a US military response? It seems likely that Congress and the American people would demand military retaliation, and at that point, the United States could find itself facing a choice of either a spiraling military escalation (as in Vietnam) or a humiliating retreat (as in Somalia). Both of those prospects are troubling but may emerge if policymakers pursue a strategy of fixing failed states without broad public support. The essence of strategy is effectively balancing ends, ways, and means. Squandering scarce resources on threats that exist primarily in the minds of policymakers is one indication that, as Richard Betts has pointed out, “US policymakers have lost the ability to think clearly about defense policy.”79 The entire concept of state failure is flawed. The countries that appear on the various lists of failed states reveal that state failure almost never produces meaningful threats to US national security. Further, attempting to remedy state failure—that is, embarking on an ambitious project of nation or state building—would be extremely costly and of dubious utility. Given these connected realities, policymakers would be wise to cast off the entire concept of state failure and to evaluate potential threats to US national security with a much more critical eye.

### Failed States---1NC

#### 1AC Brown uses the discourse of failed states AND they use the logic in their tags — that discourse legitimizes an interventionist epistemology that effaces difference, makes north-south inequality inevitable, and is self-fulfilling

Eisenträger 12 (Stian Eisenträger, MA student in IR, board member at International Reporter, a Norwegian NGO, 3-27-12, “Failed State or Failed Label?: The Concealing Concept and the Case of Somalia,” <http://www.e-ir.info/2012/03/27/failed-state-or-failed-label-the-concealing-concept-and-the-case-of-somalia/>) gz

The end of the Cold War shaped a new international political context where the issues of democracy and human rights were brought out from the internal to the external scene. The weakened role of the Soviet Union gave the United States the possibility to increase its global influence. In this context *the absence of effective government* emerged on the world political agenda together with the concept of the “failed state” (Akpinarli 2009). Boutros Boutros-Gali and Kofi Annan, the former Secretaries-General of the UN, used the “failed state” term as early as in 1990, although the General Assembly or the Security Council never used it. Somalia, which was a typical case of the absence of effective government, was described by the UN without the use of the term “failed state”. The concept was then applied for the first time in the article “Saving Failed States” published in the winter edition of Foreign Policy Magazine in 1992-1993 (Helman & Ratner). This article, which was written in the post-Cold War context with its high aspirations for democracy, human rights, the more active role of the United Nations in safeguarding collective security and the emergence of the United States’ as the leading agenda-setting actor, established the basic concept and the paradigm. Although some have tried to incorporate “failed states” in international law, the term is highly debated because of the neo-colonial notion attached to it (Akpinarli 2009, 87-89). According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, the word “fail” can have a range of different meanings: “to lose strength”, “to fade or die away”, “to stop functioning normally”, “to fall short”, “to be or become absent or inadequate”, “to be unsuccessful” and “to become bankrupt or insolvent” (Merriam-Webster 2011). Thus, I would argue that the word is too imprecise to be meaningful in our attempt to broaden our understanding of the world. In addition, the word is heavily value-laden and has loads of negative connotations attached to it, and therefore I find it unsuitable to use in science. That journalists and politicians still use the term, which is both catchy and tabloid, is understandable when we take into consideration the rather brutal limitations of time and space these two occupational groups have in their struggle to reach their audiences. Nevertheless, numbers of scholars have used and still use the failed state label, many even without engaging critically with the term (Bates 2008; Ghani & Lockhart 2008; Holzgrefe & Keohane 2003, just to mention a few). The urge to “fix”: Securitization and intervention The failed state paradigm implies that there is something that needs to be “fixed” or “saved” – of course by “good” liberal democratic external forces. “Preventing states from failing, and rescuing those that do fail, are (…) strategic and moral imperatives”, Robert I. Rotberg (2002) proclaims in an article with the dramatic title “Failed States in a World of Terror” (the argument is elaborated in his book, bearing the same title). One can feel the notion of “the white mans burden”. One of the most neoliberal contributions in the failed states debate is probably that of Ashraf Ghani & Clare Lockhart (2008, 124) who in their book “Fixing failed states” boldly declare that “today states must fulfil their citizens’ aspirations for inclusion and development and also carry out a constellation of interrelated functions”. They conclude that states “in the world today” should perform ten key functions, which are: 1) Rule of law; 2) A monopoly of the legitimate means of violence; 3) Administrative control; 4) Sound management of public finances; 5) Investments in human capital; 6) Creation of citizenship rights through social policy; 7) Provision of infrastructure services; 8) Formation of a market; 9) Management of public assets; 10) Effective public borrowing. So now when we have the list, can we just go out in the world and start “fixing”? Fixing “failed states” is a dangerous exercise: For many policymakers the failed state label contributes to open up for and make a good excuse for military and other interventions. Petra Minnerop shows how the US throughout the second half of the 20th century developed several terms, for example “rogue states”, for “states to which it ascribed a high threat potential as regards the United States and international security” (2003). In the years to follow after the 1992 article in Foreign Policy Magazine the international community, with the US in the leading role, carried out military interventions in Somalia, Afghanistan and Iraq on the basis that the chaotic situation in these states poses a threat to the US and international security in general. The terms “failed state”, “rogue state” and “war on terror” have all been given prominent roles in the public debate. As Akpinarli also remarks, these concepts have been invented by the North to “solve” problems in the South, as well as to advocate for and justify military interventions to protect international peace and security (Akpinarli 2009). I would argue that the concept rather causes more trouble than it solves – not only in terms of military intervention, but also by keeping “failed” states in the margins of international relations. It would not be an exaggeration to claim that the labelling of “failed states” is a prime example of what the Copenhagen School of Security has dubbed *securitization*. The founding fathers of this concept point out that “a discourse that takes form of presenting something to an existential threat to the referent object does not by itself create securitization – this is a *securitizing move*, but the issue is securitized only if and when the audience accepts it as such.” (Buzan et al. 1998, 25). The audience – in this instance, ordinary citizens in the North – has to a large extent accepted the “failed state” paradigm, especially with reference to Somalia. Both the media and the large organizations working with/in/for the “failed state” are acting as agents for the securitizing actors – that is the governments in the North, especially the United States’ government. Somalia has been among the top five on the list since the first Failed States Index was published in 2005, and since 2008 Somalia has had the dubious honour of being the world’s “most failed state”. Whether it is possible to measure a state’s “failure” is a question that probably requires a book to be answered. Since 2005 the magazine and Fund for Peace have ranked the world’s countries after measuring the following variables: Demographic pressures, refugees/IDPs, group grievance, human flight, uneven development, economic decline, delegitimization of the state, public services, human rights, security apparatus, factionalized elites and external intervention (Fund for Peace 2011). No doubt that all these measurements may give a good indicator of how the situation is in a number of countries. However, my point and critique is that the index fails in grasping the vast empirical variations within the research object itself in the case of Somalia. Using the juridical state of Somalia as the object of analysis without looking under the surface becomes a serious hindrance of capturing the full picture. Somalia’s image problem As Michael C. Williams (2003, 527) excellently points out, “Security policies today are constructed not only with the question of their linguistic legitimation in mind; they now are increasingly decided upon in relation to acceptable image-rhetorics”. In this context we can identify the visualization of the verbal rhetoric of the failed state paradigm. The presentation of ”failed states” is often accompanied with depictions of a war-torn hell-hole, and the Foreign Policy Magazine takes the lead by presenting the Failed States Index together with a collection of photos appearing under the splash heading: “Postcards from Hell” (Foreign Policy Magazine 2011). When the Failed States Index is referred to by other news outlets, this kind of presentation is reproduced (for a recent example, see: BBC 2011a). I have yet to see an example of any media organization to examine the Index more closely. Only telling one side of the story is a serious problem. We can compare the use of the “failed state” label with how Somalia is depicted in the daily media coverage. How many times can you remember to have seen the pictures from Somalia, the disaster zone, with starving children, heavily armed Islamist fighters and dead people being dragged through the streets by a cheering mob? Quite a few times, I suppose. On the other hand, how many times have you seen pictures from Somalia showing farmers working in their fields, smiling and playful children, or the beach in Mogadishu crowded with both men, women and children? Probably not at all. Of course, the pictures of the disaster zone of Somalia are real and by every journalistic standard it is right to publish such pictures. The practice becomes a problem when these are the only pictures that are being shown, when the stories about starving children and dangerous terrorists are the only stories that are being told about Somalia outside Somalia. This misrepresentation in the media can for a large part be attributed to the “failed state” label that is burn-marked on the country, and which pay so little attention to the variations within the geographical area that makes up the state of Somalia. When a statement is repeated enough times, it becomes a “truth”. Politicians and scholars, as well as the media itself are responsible for this brand marking, and the process is self-reinforcing. The situation has reached the point where members of the Somali diaspora community in Norway has established an organization with one of its main goals to adjust the picture that has been made of Somalia and the Somali people (Iftiin – somalisk-norsk kunnskapssenter 2011). Somalia has a serious image-problem – literally. Not only does this put the country in risk of external intervention, it also contributes to keep Somalia and much of its population in the margins of international relations. There is a lack of representation of the people inhabiting the territory of the Somali Republic, both because the TFG lacks authority, but also because of the non-recognition of the de facto states of Somaliland and Puntland. Here we have to functional geopolitical entities that are not represented in the UN nor in other global or regional institutions. Furthermore foreign investors and tourists stay away because of the perception and understanding of the whole of Somalia being a ”failed state”. Africaand the Knowledge of Non-Being In his classic work Orientalism, Edward Said (2003 [1978]) scrutinize the history and nature of Western attitudes towards the East. He argues that orientalism is a powerful European ideological creation and a way for dealing with the “otherness” of Eastern culture, customs and beliefs. Achille Mbembe applies much of the same argumentation in his critique of Africanism. He says that historically, the West has constructed its own civilization, enlightenment and progress through the “others”, thus non-Western cultures, and especially Africa. Mbembe argues that: “Africa as an idea, a concept, has historically served, and still continues to serve, as a polemical argument for the West’s desperate desire to assert its difference from the rest of the world” (Mbembe 2001, 2). One of the challenges in grasping how things work outside the Western world is that many, if not even all, of the concepts we use when describing the universe of International Relations is based in Western history and thinking. Max Weber’s famous definition of the state as “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory (Weber et al. 1991, 78). In Western thinking, Weber’s definition represents the *idea* of an “ideal state”, and it seems like many have the perception that Western states fit into this idea or norm. When analyzing states in Africa, this is revealed when African states are compared with the *idea* of an “ideal state”, which is believed to be a prototype of a Western state – leading to the focus on African states’ absences, lacks and incompleteness, as weak or failed. In this way Mbembe’s analysis is straight to the point when he states that “while we feel we know nearly everything that African states, societies, and economies *are not*, we still know absolutely nothing about *what they actually are*”. Our knowledge of Africa is to a large degree based on the knowledge of non-being (Mbembe 2001, 9). But claiming that the “Western state” resembles the Weberian state, or even that the “Western state” is the norm, is highly problematic. First of all, every state has its own specific features, and the higher the degree of generalization, the more problematic it is. Secondly, Weber’s state is an idea of a state that has never existed in practice – even not in Europe or North America – for example when we take into account the important fact that private violence and private security has existed through modern history, and even today. Abrahamsen & Williams (2010), Colás & Mabee (2010) and Thomson (1994) are among several scholars who have demonstrated how private violence and private security takes form in e.g. private companies, criminal organizations and vigilante groups. If the states in Europe and North America are to be judged by the same standards as the states in Africa, many of these could get the “failed” label as well. Noam Chomsky, for example, has turned the tables in his book “Failed States”, where he shows that the US shares features with other “failed states” (2007). But does the “failed state” label provide us with more and better insight into how different states work; does it enlighten us in any way? Definitely not. The label conceals more than it enlightens. Abrahamsen & Williams (2010) argues that we must look beyond the state when analysing security issues in Africa. I would argue that we must look both beyond and within the state also when we want to analyse states in Africa, and especially Somalia.

### Developing---1NC

#### Their entire first advantage relies on the discourse and idea of developed versus developing —

#### It’s dehumanizing, inherently violent, and not semantics

Koehrsen 19, Data Scientist at Cortex Intel, Data Science Communicator. (Will, The Myth of Us vs Them, <https://towardsdatascience.com/the-myth-of-us-vs-them-e0bfccb62f41>)

Conclusions You might argue that at the end of the day, this is only semantics. However, the “developed vs developing” dichotomy is more than a choice of words, it’s a mindset. At its core, a binary worldview is intellectually lazy because it means not looking at the data and it’s inhumane because it leads us to see individuals as the dreaded other rather than as people fighting for the same things that we are — health, prosperity, and a better life for those in the next generation.

## Judicial Avoidance

### Turn---1NC

#### The aff’s narrative that the US is falling behind is fabricated bullshit written for the express purpose of winning weapons contracts for the think tank’s funders.

Shirazi & Johnson 20, Nima Shirazi: Editor at Muftah, a digital foreign affairs magazine, and co-host of the media criticism podcast, Citations Needed. Adam Johnson: Host, The Appeal podcast. Media analyst at FAIR.org and host of the Citations Needed podcast (September 9th, “Episode 117: The Always ‘Lagging’ U.S. War Machine,” *Citations Needed*, <https://citationsneeded.medium.com/episode-117-the-sl-lagging-u-s-war-machine-52b8960aedc3>, Accessed 09-23-2021)

Nima: The Guardian proclaims, “U.S. military tactics falling behind those of adversaries, Pentagon official warns.” “Russian Propaganda Is Pervasive, and America Is Behind the Power Curve in Countering It,” reads a report from the RAND Corporation. “U.S. falling behind in new space race, says CIA’s former head of science and tech,” cautions CBS News.

Adam: Repeatedly, US media characterizes the United States — a country with nearly 800 military bases worldwide and an ever-climbing annual defense budget north of one trillion dollars — as the world’s scrappy underdog. Somehow we are always quote-unquote “lagging behind” perennial bad guys Russia, China and evil Muslim terrorists in everything from nuclear weapons, psy-ops, internet security, ice cutters, missiles, drones, outer-space exploration, and the always reliable and equally vague “military readiness.”

Nima: Now this scam typically goes something like this: a weapons contractor and military-funded think tank writes a supposedly neutral “report” or a handful of “US officials” run to a media outlet insisting the US is “lagging behind” in a sector that incidentally coincides with said “report’s” funders or government entity’s interests, American media mindlessly reports on this report or these wordings and everyone acts panicked, treating these reports or military brass’ warnings like a work of sober objective analysis. Congress then reacts and uses this media coverage and secondary cable news coverage to rationalize more money flowing to the very funders and sources of said warnings, further bloating the Pentagon, State Department or CIA budget. Rinse and repeat, rinse and repeat, all the while portraying the US’s gargantuan defense expenditures as insufficient.

Adam: On today’s episode, we’ll parse the trope of the always “lagging” American empire, who pushes it, who funds it, who benefits from it and ask why the inverse question — what if the United States is too powerful and exerts too much domination over the rest of the world? — is never broached by US media, much less honestly discussed.

Nima: Later on the show, we’ll be speaking with Jim Naureckas of Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting, where he has edited FAIR’s print publication Extra! since 1990.

[Begin Clip]

Jim Naureckas: Corporate media relies super heavily on think tanks for their quote-unquote “matters of military and security.” They pose as academics without a college, but in reality, they are set up by corporate funders to launder their promotional pitch through the veneer of an academic think tank and it is the quintessential story that you want to tell if you are in the business of not just selling arms, but selling more arms, because as a capitalist enterprise, it’s not enough to make the same profit year after year, you have to increase your profit, because that’s how capitalism works.

#### U.S. hegemony is a smokescreen for imperialism---their authors wish away millions of avoidable casualties caused by U.S. interventions to uphold hierarchal domination.

Morefield 19, Professor of Politics at Whitman College and will soon join the Department of Political Science and International Studies at The University of Birmingham. She is the author of Empires Without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection and Covenants Without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire (Jeanne, January 8th, “Trump’s Foreign Policy Isn’t the Problem,” *Boston Review*, <https://bostonreview.net/politics/jeanne-morefield-trump%E2%80%99s-foreign-policy-isn%E2%80%99t-problem>, Accessed 10-16-2021)

In that reality, the United States has long been an imperial power with white nationalist aspirations. Given the racialized nature of U.S. imperial expansion, it makes sense that Alexis de Tocqueville predicted, in a chapter entitled “The Three Races of the United States,” that the United States would one day govern “the destinies of half the globe.” In its early days, while still a slave-holding country, the United States asserted its sovereignty through genocide on a continental scale and annexed large portions of northern Mexico. The country went on to overthrow the independent state of Hawaii, occupied the Philippines and Haiti, exerted its regional power throughout Latin America, expanded its international hegemony after World War II, and became what it is today: the world’s foremost military and nuclear power with a $716 billion “defense” budget that exceeds the spending of all other major global powers combined.

“Taking over from the British Empire in the early twentieth-century,” argues James Tully, the United States has used its many military bases located “outside its own borders”—now nearly 800 in over 80 countries— to force open-door economic policies and antidemocratic regimes on states throughout the formerly colonized world. An extremely partial list of sovereign governments that the United States either overthrew or attempted to subvert through military means, assassinations, or election tampering since 1949 includes Syria, Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, the Congo, Cuba, Chile, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Grenada, Cuba, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Iraq, Yemen, Australia, Greece, Bolivia, and Angola. Such interventionist policies have contributed substantially to today’s inegalitarian world in which an estimated 783 million people live in profound poverty. In sum, for untold millions of humans in the Global South, the seventy years of worldwide order, security, and prosperity that Ikenberry and Deudney associate with Pax Americana has been anything but ordered, secure, or prosperous.

And yet the norm against noticing prevents foreign policy analysis from even acknowledging—let alone grappling with—the relationship between race and imperialism that has characterized U.S. international relations from the country’s earliest days. This regime of politely un-seeing—of deflecting—connections between U.S. foreign policy, race hierarchy, and colonial administration was clearly not in effect when Foreign Affairs was released under its original name: the Journal of Race Development. This began to change, however, in the 1920s. Among other contributing factors, World War I, the rise of anti-colonial revolutions, and the emergence of liberal internationalism as a popular ideology helped convince foreign policy experts in the United States and Europe to adopt a policy language oriented toward “development” rather than imperialism or racial difference. Mainstream international relations scholarship today remains committed to a narrative in which the discipline itself and U.S. foreign policy has always been and remains race blind, concerned solely with the relationship between sovereign states who cooperate, deter, or compete with one another in a global system in which the United States is simply, like Caesar, the “first citizen” (Ikenberry) or “the luckiest great power in modern history” (Walt). For liberals, this involves a studied erasure of the imperial origins of twentieth-century internationalism in the League of Nations’ Mandate system and the complicity of Woodrow Wilson in preserving, as Adom Getachew puts it, “white supremacy on a global scale.” For realists, it requires both forgetting the anti-Enlightenment origins of postwar realist thought and reinserting the “security dilemma” back into history so that, with the help of Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes, the world can—as Slavoj Žižek says—“become what it always was.”

International relations experts will acknowledge U.S. violence and overreach when necessary, but routinely read the illiberalism of U.S. foreign policy as an exception that is not at all representative, in Anne Marie Slaughter’s words, of “the idea that is America.” Slaughter, with Ikenberry, can consider bad behavior only briefly and only in the service of insisting that what matters most is not what the United States actually does with its power but what it intends to do. Yes, “imperialism, slavery, and racism have marred Western history,” Ikenberry and Deudney argue, but what matters is that liberalism “has always been at the forefront of efforts—both peaceful and militant—to reform and end these practices.” Indeed, even those public intellectuals such as Niall Ferguson and Michael Ignatieff who, after September 11, called for the United States to embrace its status as an imperial power, framed their arguments in deflective, liberal terms. By contrast, because realists project the security dilemma retroactively into history (while also simultaneously excising imperialism) they can only see the U.S. destabilization of Third World economies, assassinations, and secret bombings as tragic necessities (great powers, claims Mearsheimer, “have little choice but to pursue power and to seek to dominate the other states in the system”) or as the result of liberals’ ill-advised desire to force “our” values on other nations. Both of these deflective strategies reinforce the illusion that we live, in Nikhil Pal Singh’s words, in an “American-centered, racially inclusive world, one organized around formally equal and independent nation states” where some states just happen to have more power than others, and where the alternative—Russian or Chinese hegemony—is too frightening even to contemplate.

That deflection would play such an outsized role in supporting the ideological edifice of international relations today is hardly surprising. Turn-of-the-century British liberals who supported their empire also drew upon a variety of different deflective strategies to reconcile the violence and illiberalism of British imperial expansion with the stated liberal goals of the Empire. Such deflection made it impossible for these thinkers—many of whom would go on to work as some of the first international relations scholars in Britain and help found The Royal Institute of International Affairs—to link the problems of empire with the violence and disruption of imperialism.

Similarly, deflection within international relations today obscures the U.S. role in maintaining the profoundly hierarchical, racist, insecure, deeply unjust reality of the current global order. It also makes it impossible to address how U.S. foreign policy (covert and overt) has contributed to the destabilization of that order by creating the circumstances that give rise to “failed states,” “rogue regimes,” and “sponsors of terrorism.” Moreover, it impedes any theorizing about how the widespread appeal of Trump’s xenophobia at home might, in part, be the product of U.S. foreign policy abroad, the bitter fruit of the War on Terror and its equally violent predecessors. In other words, in the grand tradition of liberal empire, U.S. foreign policy deflection actively disrupts the link between cause and effect that an entire science of international relations was created to explain.

#### U.S. hegemony provokes blowback aggression due to status insecurity, sanitizes imperialism, and dooms international cooperation

Pampinella 19, Stephenis Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the State University of New York (SUNY) at New Paltz (Stephen, January 23rd, “The Internationalist Disposition and US Grand Strategy,” *The Disorder of Things*, <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2019/01/23/the-internationalist-disposition-and-us-grand-strategy/>, Accessed 10-25-2021)

Why Liberal Internationalism Will Fail (Again)

But in recent weeks, mainstream US foreign policy experts have provided their own spin in progressive internationalism. Advocates and practitioners of a traditional hegemonic foreign policy have sought to co-opt progressive internationalism in a series of essays which argue for the necessity of American power and global influence. These writers embody the post-Cold War centrist foreign policy coalition of liberal internationalists and neoconservatives. For them, that the greatest threat to the democratic “free” world created by the United States remains the autocratic governance model of Russia and China. While Washington should pursue cooperation on transnational governance issues where possible, they argue it cannot do so at the expense of making security concessions which would reward revisionist behavior by great power rivals. As in the past, American exceptionalism remains the identity narrative justifying a return to US hegemony, with Anglo-American norms serving as the basis for hegemonic socialization and cooperation.

The internationalist disposition is a reminder of why a mere social democratic twist on US hegemony will fail to provide actual security for the United States and its allies. Establishment voices continue to rely on state-centric assumptions about IR and ignore how state identities and interests are a function of their relationship with each other. Or, as Jennifer Mitzen and Michelle Murray might argue, the revisionist intentions of Russia and China are a product of their ontological insecurity. A hegemonic United States defending an Anglo-American order denies them recognition of their own great power identities and their right to participate in all deliberations about global order. From this perspective, we should challenge the implicit assumption made by Anthony Blinken and Robert Kagan that Russia is revisionist by nature. An internationalist perspective suggests that Russia has adopted those intentions in relation to a Wilsonian United States which seeks domination over Moscow and the transformation of its political system. The same is true for China, which rejects being cast as a “responsible stakeholder” by Washington which would eventually accept democracy following its internal transformation by global capitalism. In other words, the very terms of US relations with these states over the past 25 years is the source of their revisionist intentions, and not some essentialized feature of their domestic politics.

Further, a liberal exceptionalist narrative that contrasts “Eastern autocracy” with “Western freedom” masks how the United States has perpetuated its own systems of illiberal dominance throughout its history. Those same structures of oppression are the greatest threat to contemporary US democracy and also serve as glaring evidence of US hypocrisy. In his defense of American exceptionalism, Jake Sullivan represents institutional racism as a bug rather than a feature of the American political system by emphasizing the liberal ideals of the Founders and casting Donald Trump’s white ethnonationalism as an aberration. But this telling of the American story whitewashes the long history of an exclusive, white ethnic US identity dating back to the early 19th Century and its role in generating the modern United States. Scholars of American political development and US history have long demonstrated that institutions of slavery and land conquest constituted US society and made possible its economic prosperity rather than some kind of intrinsic tendency toward freedom.

Fast-forward to the present: liberal exceptionalism further denies how economic globalization made possible the rise of authoritarianism. Nils Gilman and David Klion rightly argue that the kleptocratic alliance between autocrats and oligarchs is the true threat to democracy and rule of law. Their ability to concentrate political and economic power has been enabled by the emergence of an integrated global market that privileges the freedom of capital over the needs of ordinary people, one created by the United States when liberal internationalism went global after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Finally, attempts to revive US hegemony will doom transnational efforts to deal with existential non-state threats. Hegemonists like Thomas Wright argue that Russia and China are the greatest threat to the United States, and that Washington should never make concessions to either power as a means of ensuring cooperation on issues of global governance. However, “ring-fencing” global capitalism and climate change as separate issues will fail to achieve the necessary level of cooperation to cope with these threats. National security policymakers cannot recognize that the greatest dangers faced by US citizens are non-state economic and ecological global processes that shape domestic politics from the inside-out, and not rival sovereigns. Economic destitution to the point of embracing fascist dictators coupled with environmental collapse are near-certain non-state threats which transcend our boundaries – in fact, as a global power, the United States has been complicit in creating them.

The internationalist disposition would suggest that the priorities of US foreign policy must change. Regulating global processes should be the primary objective, and it requires that the United States pursue intense macro-levels of cooperation with all other states, including its rivals, to achieve them. Yet it will be unlikely to do so if it remains wedded to liberal hegemony and consumed by great power competition. Short-term incentives to accumulate resources and power will override the long-term need for global governance. The result will be a world whose people live in precarity, ravaged by climate change, and constantly on the verge of great power war.

From “Disposition” to “Grand Strategy”

The internationalist disposition clearly illustrates why old US strategies are incompatible with the progressive internationalism of the US left. However, contra Colás, progressives should not avoid developing of a positive vision for foreign policy due to the diverse range of radical perspectives. To do so would cede pro-restraint arguments to structural realist and libertarian advocates of offshore balancing who offer no template for global engagement or institutional cooperation. What progressives must do is articulate a grand strategy, or a plan that mobilizes all elements of national power and influence, grounded in a relationalist ontology that combines restraint with internationalism. This strategy must be post-hegemonic (a term even Ikenberry has flirted with), post-statist, and supportive of intense international cooperation based on the diversity of identities and values otherwise ignored by the universalist pretenses of Anglo-American liberalism. If our very existence is mutually dependent on others, then we need a foreign policy based on solidarity in response to collectively experienced threats.

I think there is a strategy consistent with the international disposition: great power concert. A concert strategy requires that all great powers pursue mutual accommodation and recognize each other’s interests as part of a larger commitment to maintain international stability. Patrick Porter and Amitav Acharya argue that a great power concert strategy is the best suited to adapt to the transfer of wealth and power to Asia along with the “multiplex” nature of world politics (not to mention a global perspective on international relations). The emergence of a diverse range of state and non-state actors bound together by extreme interdependence makes it impossible for any one actor, such as the United States, to establish rules for global governance which can mobilize all others. On this basis, a concert strategy would lead the United States to collaborate with others on the basis of mutual co-existence and embrace joint decision-making at the global level for coping with macrostructural processes that threaten all peoples around the world. In this way, a concert strategy is firmly grounded the international disposition and can serve as the realization of progressive internationalism.

Security and The Balance of Power

A concert strategy can do what establishment foreign policy cannot, namely de-escalate great power competition by giving up US hegemony. If adopted, the United States would treat other great powers, like Russia, China, and Iran, as equal partners in the maintenance of global stability and incorporate their interests into regional security agreements. The United States would give up its self-assumed role as an unrivaled global hegemon and seek a balance of power based on mutual respect with other great powers as partners rather than enemies. This kind of international posture would result in a more horizontal great power system, one that Stacie Goddard as identified as being productive of status quo rather than revisionist intentions. It would be compatible with recognition of the great power identities of other states and provide them with ontological security.

## Cartels

### Solvency---1NC

#### The aff’s reliance on class action for relief is a reliance on a fundamentally capitalist tool

Redish 14, Professor of Law and Public Policy, Northwestern University School of Law. (Martin, 2014, Rethinking the Theory of the Class Action: The Risks and Rewards of Capitalistic Socialism in the Litigation Process, 64 Emory L. J. 451 (2014). <https://scholarlycommons.law.emory.edu/elj/vol64/iss2/15>)

Despite all of the controversial scholarship that has been published in recent years concerning the modern class action, it is both puzzling and disappointing how little of it has sought to grasp the deep structural precepts underlying the device. All too often, the scholarly debate, not to mention the political debate, has broken down along ideological lines: the political left has reflexively favored the device and the political right has reflexively opposed it. Virtually all of even the serious scholarly work done on the subject has, for the most part, been superficial, failing to pursue, much less to grasp, the practice’s underlying foundational purposes. The goal of this Article is to seek to understand those foundational purposes. The Article argues that the DNA of the modern class action fundamentally differs from that of the traditional one-on-one litigation process. The relationship between class attorney and class member, for example, is significantly different from the normal relationship between attorney and client. Recognition of these foundational differences should force us to recognize that the attorney–client relationship in the class action context is more like a guardian–ward relationship than a traditional relationship between client and attorney. This insight does not necessarily mean that the class action is inherently improper. Indeed, in some ways recognition of the guardian model of the modern class action underscores the procedure’s value. But it also underscores the need to recognize the inherently capitalistic nature of that guardian relationship. Where profit incentives for the attorney are in accord with the interests of the class members, the practice should work well. However, all too often, modern class action procedure is plagued by externalities and perverse economic incentives, allowing class attorneys to profit even when class members will benefit virtually not at all. The goal of class action doctrine and rulemaking, then, should be to remove those economic perversions to insure that the capitalistic nature of the process functions effectively.

### Turn---1NC

#### Capitalist agriculture undergirds global imperialism. National reforms reify global dispossession while reproducing world hunger and ecological collapse.

Ajl 21, Associated researcher with the Tunisian Observatory for Food Sovereignty and the Environment and a postdoctoral fellow with the Rural Sociology Group at Wageningen University (Max, A People's Green New Deal, *Pluto Press*)

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE

The modern agriculture and food system is the fruit of settler-colonial advance, capitalist primitive accumulation, and accumulation on a world scale, leading to ecocidal landscape destruction and devastating health outcomes. From the outset, the huge plains of Australia and the Americas, including Canada, the world’s breadbaskets, came into being as a result of colonial genocide inflicted upon Indigenous peoples.11

The US food system, and to a lesser extent, the world food system, is oriented to production not for people, but for profit. On a world scale, 84 percent of farms are smaller than two hectares, but they only operate around 12 percent of farmland. The largest 1 percent of global farms operate over 70 percent of global farmland. And the trends North and South are worsening, not improving: in the US, the largest 7 percent of farms produce 80 percent of production value. In the EU, fewer than 3 percent of farms cover over 50 percent of the farmed land. In agricultural Tanzania, 108 recently imposed large farm investments control more land than the smallest two million total farm entities.12 The foundation of capitalist agriculture is private and highly concentrated ownership of the most basic element in production: the land.

Despite all that, on the one hand, on the global level, at least 50 percent of food, maybe more, is grown on smaller family farms, using various amounts of capital-intensive inputs.13 Many of these farms have at least a foot in agroecology.14 The remainder is grown by massive agribusiness corporations, or far larger farms which sell directly to those corporations. These farms are ever growing, gobbling up neighboring land and leading to ever more marked property concentration worldwide. And they use highly capital-intensive methods. Their aim is to produce as cheaply as possible in terms of dollar prices. At the same time, they are woven into a global corporate system. Seed, fertilizers, pesticide, farm equipment, and irrigation-technology companies are highly concentrated. Those firms want as many farmers as possible to buy and use and rely upon their technology. The buyers of agricultural commodities – soy, wheat, corn – and those companies which supply supermarkets want to buy farm products as cheaply as possible. None of those companies are interested in farmers or farmworkers earning a living wage or ensuring that the food people eat comes from healthy crops.

Furthermore, because margins are often very low, the companies need to buy and sell a lot of crops to make money. In this way, as capitalism enters and reshapes agricultural production, larger and smaller farmers alike produce and overproduce, in part because they are often trying to get out of debt. Government subsidies for cereals also lead to overproduction. Such cereals – corn, for example – are often processed into highly unhealthy corn syrup. Or soy into soy oil. Overproduction of wheat and soy led to US dumping of wheat and soy oil onto the Third World, from the 1950s onwards. In countries like Colombia, Tunisia, and Egypt, this policy damaged smaller farms, held land-to-the-tiller agrarian reform at bay, and destroyed national capacities to feed themselves, while Africa from the 1970s onwards became a structural food importer.15 In the Third World, most countries opted for focusing on agro-export. They emplaced Green Revolutions in their cereal sectors from the late 1960s onwards, using input-intensive methods, rather than trying to develop in different ways using their own capacities. This northern-assisted decision, too, was a great boon to the huge northern conglomerates which cornered the supply of those inputs. In the 1980s and the 1990s, this process accelerated. Southern agricultures, under pressure of the international financial institutions, opened up even more as a result of structural adjustment policies. Countries stopped supporting even medium-sized farmers and dismantled strategic grain reserves, while the Western-celebrated collapse of the Soviet bloc led to a collapse in world grain demand, helping keep prices lower at the costs of shattered lives in the former Second World.16 In 1995, the World Trade Organization began to promote “intellectual property rights” worldwide for genetically modified soybeans and maize, making southern agricultures even more dependent on northern inputs. In the process, major monopolies such as Monsanto, Bayer, and Syngenta, as well as Cargill, Coca-Cola, ArcherDanielsMidland, Tesco, Walmart, and Carrefour compounded their power over the world food system.17 They are, of course, sited in the North.

Finally, there is the imperial division of labor. During the colonial period, the Third World produced commodities like spices or coffee which could never be grown under any conditions in the First World. They were then drained from the Third World, producing widespread famine.18 That process slowed but did not stop with decolonization – which raises the centrality of national liberation to a reformed food system. With the advent of neoliberalism, dollar-cheap but land-and-labor-intensive tropical food imports, such as out of season fruits, vegetables, and other tropical goods, have been grown ever more on Third World lands.19 These crops simply cannot be produced in the North (except in small quantities in greenhouses). They rely on ultra-cheapened labor in the periphery and represent claims on the land and water and lives of those countries. Part of how that labor is made cheap is through vast labor reserves, which are maintained, and land cordoned off for export crops, through ruinously unequal rural agrarian structures, widespread malnourishment, and of course, punishment and siege against countries which defy the capitalist or colonial agrarian structure.20 The prerequisite for such a system of feeding has been preventing agrarian reform. As we will see, changing the food and agriculture system means changing who owns land.

The ecological and social consequences of these policies have been enormous. Modern agriculture uses artificial and resource- and energy-intensive fertilizers, which leach into water tables, poisoning groundwater. They produce massive run-off, inciting algal blooms at riverine termini. Modern agriculture compacts or over-tills the soil, causing erosion or other forms of soil damage. The land can no longer absorb water, in contrast to healthy soil, which is produced by mixes of animals and poly-crops, cover crops, and no-till farming. The effects in the US are not hypothetical: the massive 2019 floods that inundated the Midwest would largely have been avoided if the soil had been healthier. Whereas traditional agriculture suppresses pests through promoting predator-healthy habitats, industrialized agriculture soaks fields and their watersheds in pesticides, leading to bird and insect apocalypse, and infiltrating human tissue.21 Losing insects leads to declines in pollination and nutrient cycling. As insects die, so do the creatures that rely on them for food, including birds which play a vital role in seed distribution.

Furthermore, agriculture’s energetic basis is now topsy-turvy. So-called “traditional” agriculture relies on plants’ capacity to efficiently gather solar energy and convert it into forms usable by humans, an organic machine of absolute brilliance and grace. The new energetic basis of agriculture turns that logic on its head, using past flows of heat and light from the sun in the form of fossil fuels: “a change from ‘using sun and water to grow peanuts’ to ‘using petroleum to manufacture peanut butter.’”22 Corn in the US in 1970 produced just 2.6 calories per calorie invested.23 People estimate that now, advanced industrial societies use 4 and 15 calories for each unit of food they produce (interestingly, as little as 8 percent from mechanization).24 Such energetic inefficiency is only very partially due to industrialization. Of the energy used in the food system, a third is for production, a third for processing and packaging, and a third for distribution and preparation. Importantly, such interlinked chains do not manacle peoples and environments nearly as much in the “underdeveloped” countries.25

The North is “adept” at growing cereals, provided we do not mind topsoil blowing and silting up rivers, nitrogen fertilizers inciting hypoxic dead-zones in the Gulf of Mexico, and the specter of silenced springs as biodiversity evaporates in such factories-in-the-field. Such farming skill is one that treats living soil as dead. When we do so, we ought not to be surprised when the graveyards spread.

Furthermore, the quality of much of the food we eat lacks taste and nutrients, blights that worsen along lines of class and race: the poor with highly processed fast food (served to them by other segments of the poor) or other food soaked and laden in trans fats, doused in sugars, and otherwise ludicrously unhealthy even if affordable in dollar terms. It is furthermore overwhelmingly the poor who are forced to eat the products of the US agro-industrial food system: grain-stuffed and hormone-pumped animals versus the sustainable and grass-fed steers which are better for the environment but cost far more than poorer consumers can afford.

Modern food chains are also wasteful, substantially because of capitalist overproduction: if we produce more than we need, much of it will go to waste, whether (over)processed into ethanol or nutrient-free spongy bread, or fruits and vegetables discarded for not meeting aesthetic standards of one kind or another.26 In the US, around 6,000 calories of food are produced per person per day; 30–40 percent of it is lost, including in the many stages of capitalist production and transport, and around 10 percent goes to animal feed. This leaves around 3,700 calories per person. Humans need far less than that, although perhaps a more active and nature-engaged population would be a hungrier one, too. On a global basis, total calories available per person are closer to 3,100, with less food waste, especially in the Third World, including China and Greece. Food waste is intimately related to the syndrome of production that links industrial monocrops to urban and slum consumers. Elongated production chains are blighted with weak links and rust. They only make sense from the perspective of the monopolies that forge them and use them to strangle the planet and its poor. In rural areas, food waste is far lower. The longer the commodity loops are, the more food is wasted, the more such waste cannot return to the soil to restore its fertility, and the more carbon dioxide is produced when shipping and flying such foods around the world. City planning plays its part in inducing more food waste, while also removing that waste from the nutrient cycle.

Industrial agriculture has also meant farms without people. From 1940 to 1970, the push-pull factors of oil replacing rural labor, the seductions of suburban modernity, and evermore onerous difficulties of rural life halved the number of US farms. They went from about six to three million, and from 23 percent of the US population to 4.7 percent by 1970. By 1995, it was 2.2 million and 1.8 percent. Along racial lines, de-agrarianization was even sharper – Black farmers were 14.3 percent of farm operators in 1920 and 1 percent in 2000.27 Farmworkers themselves are predominantly Latino – a workforce partially made by the attack on the Latin American countryside through free trade agreements.28 Additionally, while the US has literally de-agrarianized, if one counts the number of workers elsewhere occupied in the food chain – in slaughterhouses mechanically ripping at chicken carcasses until their hands are quivering with carpal tunnel syndrome, as vividly recounted in the work of feminist geographer Carrie Freshour – or in the fast food industry, or for that matter at Walmart, the US’s largest employer, then the proportion of the US population working in the food industry overall is not all that much lower than the percentage of some Third World countries working in the agriculture sector.29 Labor in the food process has been displaced by machines, but labor is still quite present in the food system, and once again, it is very tough labor. “Modernization” has hardly meant the bettering of peoples’ lives.

Finally, “modernization” of agriculture has not saved people from hunger. Worldwide in 2019, two billion people did not have regular access to nutritious, safe, and sufficient food. Overwhelmingly, those people are concentrated in the Third World, including in countries which have seen a great deal of agricultural “modernization,” like India’s Green Revolution.30 Fourteen percent of India and the Philippines are undernourished.31 In Yemen, under a US-planned assault, 16 million people are food insecure, a telling example of why “the national question,” or freedom from foreign intervention, is still the foundation of popular development.32 Meanwhile, the capitalist organization of food supply doesn’t just produce problems of quantity, but also quality. As the Food and Agriculture Organization reports, “overweight increases in lower-middle-income countries are mainly due to very rapid changes in food systems, particularly the availability of cheap, highly processed food and sugar-sweetened beverages.”33

#### The plan increases labor exploitation. Agricultural anti-trust misidentifies the source of the problem and only benefits well off farmers at the expense of exploited farmworkers.

Rosenberg 21, visiting scholar at the Harvard Food Law and Policy Clinic and an adjunct professor at the University of Iowa College of Law. Bryce Stucki is an independent journalist based in Washington, DC who writes about food and agriculture. (Nathan, “Don’t Trust the Antitrust Narrative: Farmers Benefit from Industrial Ag. Workers Do Not.,” Jacobin, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/06/antitrust-farmers-farmworkers-exploitation-agribusiness-low-pay-dangerous-working-conditions)

Class Conflict in the Fields

The antitrust movement is aware of many of these problems of worker exploitation and will readily concede the need for greater labor protections. But their unmistakable focus is on farmers, which has led them to endorse a trickle-down theory in which farmers, post-trust-busting, will grant their workers a cut of the extra profits.

According to antitrust advocates Sandeep Vaheesan and Claire Kelloway, “Reducing the oppressive buyer power of massive retailers like Walmart, and dominant meat processors, like Tyson, would help return a larger share of the food dollar to producers, and, by extension, their workers.” This sounds logical — if farmers had more money, they’d have more of it to give to their workers — but it quickly falls apart under scrutiny.

Farmers have plenty of income to share with their workers already, yet, as private businesses are wont to do, they share as little of it as they can. When profits spiked in the mid-2000s, wages didn’t budge. When they jumped again in the early 2010s, wages rose only a modest amount, with the largest hikes actually coming after farm income dipped again. Philip L. Martin, the scholar of farm labor, attributes a recent uptick in wages to a decline in immigration and state-level increases in the minimum wage, rather than generosity among hiring managers.

Agricultural workers don’t need wealthier bosses, they need more rights — to unionize, to be free of harassment and mistreatment, to decent food and housing, and to collectively own the land they work.

The antitrust approach also does little to solve more fundamental problems in agriculture. In 1524, the German peasant leader and preacher Thomas Müntzer lambasted the nobility for taking living creatures as their private property. He wrote, outraged, “that all creatures have been turned into property, the fish in the water, the birds in the air, the plants on the earth — all living things must also become free.”

Karl Marx approvingly cited Müntzer three hundred twenty years later, when he argued that capitalism not only degrades how we relate to each other, but also how we relate to nature. As long as we treat living things as commodities, neither they, nor we, will be free.

A programmatic path to the liberation of all things is beyond the scope of this essay — instead, we offer a critique. Antitrust enforcement can be a useful and even necessary tool at times. With at least two-thirds of farmland in the hands of the same wealthy owners responsible for 90 percent of sales, the antitrust movement would be well-served to renew calls for land reform that were popular with earlier US agrarian and left-populist movements.

But when antitrust proponents use concentration to explain all the ills of agriculture, they distort reality. The break ’em up response to industrial agriculture may distribute human and animal misery more evenly (at best), but it does not address the root of this misery: exploitation.

The standard antitrust analysis posits that tending to the needs of a small, highly conservative, and well-off constituency will ultimately benefit their workers and society. This is a mistake. Not only are there far more farmworkers than farmers — at least 2.5 times as many as there are farm businesses — farmers are already at the forefront of movements against environmental abuses and labor violations by their employers: that is to say, farmers.

In recent years, farmworkers and their families have won collective bargaining rights in New York State, a new union in Washington, and safer pesticide regulations throughout the country, despite massive institutional and legal disadvantages. Still, farmworkers lack basic labor protections in most of the country, much less the kind of extravagant public support that farmers receive.

Farmworkers understand that the size of a farm tells us next to nothing about its labor or environmental practices. As Margaret Gray and others have documented, smaller-scale and local farms often have among the worst working conditions and wages. Instead of idealizing yeoman farmers, we must fight for a future where we collectively hold the land together, and farmworkers labor for no one but themselves. Only they have the ability, through withholding and redirecting their labor, to shut down and reshape food production in the United States.

Antitrust writers argue that breaking up agribusiness will help farmers and farmworkers alike. They dream of a cross-class alliance, but deny the intense conflict already with us, playing out every day in fields and farmhouses across the country.
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#### 2. Their framing sacrifices billions at the altar of extinction and elites

Torres 21, PhD candidate at Leibniz Universität Hannover. Previously studied at Harvard University and Brandeis University. Author of Morality, Foresight, and Human Flourishing: An Introduction to Existential Risks (Phil Torres, 7-28-2021, “The Dangerous Ideas of ‘Longtermism’ and ‘Existential Risk’,” Current Affairs, <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2021/07/the-dangerous-ideas-of-longtermism-and-existential-risk>, accessed: 10-27-2021)

It’s this line of reasoning that leads Bostrom, Greaves, MacAskill, and others to argue that even the tiniest reductions in “existential risk” are morally equivalent to saving the lives of literally billions of living, breathing, actual people. For example, Bostrom writes that if there is “a mere 1 percent chance” that 10^54 conscious beings (most living in computer simulations) come to exist in the future, then “we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.” Greaves and MacAskill echo this idea in a 2021 paper by arguing that “even if there are ‘only’ 1014 lives to come … , a reduction in near-term risk of extinction by one millionth of one percentage point would be equivalent in value to a million lives saved.”

To make this concrete, imagine Greaves and MacAskill in front of two buttons. If pushed, the first would save the lives of 1 million living, breathing, actual people. The second would increase the probability that 10^14 currently unborn people come into existence in the far future by a teeny-tiny amount. Because, on their longtermist view, there is no fundamental moral difference between saving actual people and bringing new people into existence, these options are morally equivalent. In other words, they’d have to flip a coin to decide which button to push. (Would you? I certainly hope not.) In Bostrom’s example, the morally right thing is obviously to sacrifice billions of living human beings for the sake of even tinier reductions in existential risk, assuming a minuscule 1 percent chance of a larger future population: 1054 people.

All of this is to say that even if billions of people were to perish in the coming climate catastrophe, so long as humanity survives with enough of civilization intact to fulfill its supposed “potential,” we shouldn’t be too concerned. In the grand scheme of things, non-runaway climate change will prove to be nothing more than a “mere ripple” —a “small misstep for mankind,” however terrible a “massacre for man” it might otherwise be.

Even worse, since our resources for reducing existential risk are finite, Bostrom argues that we must not “fritter [them] away” on what he describes as “feel-good projects of suboptimal efficacy.” Such projects would include, on this account, not just saving people in the Global South—those most vulnerable, especially women—from the calamities of climate change, but all other non-existential philanthropic causes, too. As the Princeton philosopher Peter Singer writes about Bostrom in his 2015 book on Effective Altruism, “to refer to donating to help the global poor … as a ‘feel-good project’ on which resources are ‘frittered away’ is harsh language.” But it makes perfectly good sense within Bostrom’s longtermist framework, according to which “priority number one, two, three, and four should … be to reduce existential risk.” Everything else is smaller fish not worth frying.

If this sounds appalling, it’s because it is appalling. By reducing morality to an abstract numbers game, and by declaring that what’s most important is fulfilling “our potential” by becoming simulated posthumans among the stars, longtermists not only trivialize past atrocities like WWII (and the Holocaust) but give themselves a “moral excuse” to dismiss or minimize comparable atrocities in the future. This is one reason that I’ve come to see longtermism as an immensely dangerous ideology. It is, indeed, akin to a secular religion built around the worship of “future value,” complete with its own “secularised doctrine of salvation,” as the Future of Humanity Institute historian Thomas Moynihan approvingly writes in his book X-Risk. The popularity of this religion among wealthy people in the West—especially the socioeconomic elite—makes sense because it tells them exactly what they want to hear: not only are you ethically excused from worrying too much about sub-existential threats like non-runaway climate change and global poverty, but you are actually a morally better person for focusing instead on more important things—risk that could permanently destroy “our potential” as a species of Earth-originating intelligent life.

#### Their framing causes genocide AND links

Santos 3, Professor of Sociology at the University of Coimbra (Boaventura de Souza Santos, 2003, “Collective Suicide?”, Bad Subjects, Issue # 63, http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php)

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage" , to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

### 2NC ⁠— Link (0:30)

#### 2. Turns case AND predictions fail

Rozga 20, J.D. at BU, former FTC merger review and litigation expert (Kai Rozga, 8-31-2020, “How tech forces a reckoning with prediction-based antitrust enforcement,” Tech Law Decoded, <https://techlawdecoded.com/how-tech-forces-a-reckoning-with-prediction-based-antitrust-enforcement/>, accessed: 9-12-2021)

The unproven and perhaps unprovable premise of Economism

Despite forming its foundational underpinning, the bedrock assumption in modern antitrust that lawyers supported by economic experts are capable of understanding and predicting complex markets remains unproven—if it is even provable. To the contrary, there is good reason for reserving doubt.

In Antifragile, uncertainty expert Nassim Taleb writes: “[Artificial] Man-made complex systems tend to develop cascades and runaway chains of reactions that decrease, even eliminate, predictability … the modern world may be increasing in technological knowledge, but, paradoxically, it is making things a lot more unpredictable.” Taleb is skeptical of what he calls “superfragile” predictions guided by economic theory and models which are inherently “unreliable for decision-making.” To him, “economics is like a fable—a fable writer is there to stimulate ideas, indirectly inspire practice perhaps, but certainly not to direct or determine practice.”

According to Taleb, policymaking that uses economic models to manage complex systems in a top-down fashion is bound to fragilize things—no matter how well-intentioned the intervention might be. His most poignant examples of the dangers of expert-guided prediction-making come from looking at economic policy which, in an attempt to minimize short-term gyrations in the economy and financial markets, instead sets them up for larger blow-ups with systemic consequences. He concludes that “even when an economic theory makes sense, its application cannot be imposed from a model, in a top-down manner.”

In Thinking, Fast and Slow, behavioral economist and decision-making researcher Daniel Kahnemann endorses a similar skepticism about relying on expert judgments to evaluate and make predictions about complex environments. Kahnemann summarizes research in various domains (medical, economic, etc.) finding that, due to limits and biases innate to human cognition, expert judgments amidst uncertainty and unpredictability—what he calls “low-validity” environments—are a dependably ineffective way to predict the future.

Antitrust operates in precisely the sort of environment that the works of Taleb and Kahnemann would suggest is poorly suited for subjective, predictive decision-making. The lawfulness of a merger is determined by predicting whether it will cause prices to go up, a monopolist’s abusive conduct by conjecturing whether prices were inflated over a surmised competitive level—everything heavily reliant on economic theories and models. And the fact-specific inquiry of every antitrust case—especially when any case involving dynamic tech markets—means that its practitioners never get exposed to the sort of “regularity” and “prolonged practice” that Kahnemann concludes is necessary for subjective expert judgments to acquire predictive validity. If anything, low validity is supercharged in digital markets operating in vast ecosystems of constantly-evolving and interrelated markets with complicated relationships among its players.

The works of Taleb and Kahnemann suggest that antitrust technocrats are on a fool’s errand that will result in inaccurate evaluations of market conditions and poor predictions about competitive effects. Bad competition policy will result, if for no other reason than the limits of human cognition and the complexities of the market environments being observed.

Pulling back the curtain on Economism in practice

Practitioners can also draw on their own experiences to find ample support for the skepticism that flows from the works of Taleb and Kahnemann about expert-based, predictive decision-making.

The pitfalls of Economism in antitrust can be seen in everyday practice. In merger cases, economic models are presented to predict future price increases by the merged companies. And parties looking to dodge enforcement actions in close-call cases hire economists to predict how a merger will lower costs, increase output, and improve innovation.

In private antitrust litigation, plaintiffs and defendants alike rely on armies of economists to make out the elements of a case or defend against it. Too often, the result is a series of warring expert reports submitted by uber-qualified economists with stellar reputations who—based on the exact same factual record—reach diametrically opposing positions about a market’s dynamics or likely competitive effects. Equally troubling is how the uncertainty of the expert opinions can be seen fading away by the time the court chooses a winner, as the prevailing view achieves a supreme prescience when cited by the judge in support of its decision.

Alarm bells should be going off. An academic field’s reputation would seem to be put in doubt, and with it the foundation of an influential body of law that shapes our economy and society. Instead, academics and policymakers are more likely to be heard describing the rigor and rationality that they believe neoliberal economic thinking has brought to antitrust enforcement. And while some reforms proposed by the mainstream antitrust community might seem dramatic within the existing paradigm, they are trivial when considering how none tackle the fundamental flaws of the status quo.

And so, paradoxically, as antitrust turns its focus on increasingly difficult-to-predict markets, it does so increasingly with Economism-driven prediction as its lodestar—like a captain that insists on navigating a ship with the stars even when it is obvious that clouds cover the night sky.

### AT: Go

#### Racial capitalism’ as an analytic mystifies social relations AND is foundationally inaccurate.

Julian Go 21, Professor, Sociology, University of Chicago, "Three Tensions in the Theory of Racial Capitalism," Sociological Theory, Vol. 39, Issue 1, pg. 38-44, 2021, SAGE.

The term racial capitalism is by now something of a buzzword. It has become especially prominent among historians who are rethinking the relationship between slavery and capitalism (Johnson 2018; Kelley 2017; Robinson 2000). It has also been used by legal scholars, health scholars, philosophers, ethnic studies scholars, political scientists, and, of course, sociologists (Dawson 2018; Fraser 2019; Leong 2013; Melamed 2015; Pirtle 2020; Virdee 2019). As a term, its origins lie in Marxist intellectuals and activists writing in the context of South African apartheid in the 1970s (Hudson 2018; Legassick and Hemson 1976; Nupen 1972). More recently, Robinson (2000) helped popularize the term in his analysis of the conditions under which the “black radical tradition” emerged.

Despite this emerging literature, the relevance of existing discussions of racial capitalism for sociological theory remains unclear. What might the racial capitalism literature teach us about theories or conceptual frameworks around race and capitalism? The problem is that the term racial capitalism does not refer to a “theory” in the sense of a “singular logically integrated causal explanation” (Calhoun 1995:5). The term refers broadly to relationships between racial inequality and capitalism, but the literature does not specify a single set of causal relations or connections between them. Nor does the literature offer uniform concepts or a shared conceptual apparatus. Given this, does the racial capitalism literature—by which I mean the scholars across different disciplines who centralize the term racial capitalism—have any relevance for theory at all?1

In this essay, I offer the beginnings of an answer by identifying three aporias, or theoretical tensions, in the existing literature. The first tension has to do with the concept of race itself. What does the signifier race in the term racial capitalism actually mean? The second has to do with the inadequacies of existing theory, particularly Marxist theories of capitalism, that the racial capitalism literature is meant to remedy. The third has to do with whether racism is immanent to capitalism or contingent, which in turn raises the issue of social difference in modern capitalism.

In highlighting these tensions, my point is not to criticize or disavow the racial capitalism literature but rather to highlight some of the main underlying themes or issues that I think are generative of further conceptualization, theorizing, and research. Accordingly, although I do not seek to fully resolve these three tensions, I offer some ways we might think about and work with them in a productive manner.

Defining Racial Capitalism

To start, a brief overview of the meaning of the term racial capitalism is warranted. This is difficult, however, because definitions in the existing literature are either murky or differ from one another. Pirtle (2020), writing on the racial inequalities of coronavirus disease 2019, used the term but did not define it. Leong (2013:2190) used racial capitalism to refer to how white institutions appropriate nonwhite identities as symbolic capital. Ralph and Singhal (2020) found that the term is used largely to “explain how racialism merged with capitalism . . . and to highlight coercion and productivity in capital investment and forms of exchange” (p. 857). The South African Marxists Legassick and Hemson (1976) and the National Union of South African Students were among the first to use the term before Cedric Robinson (2000) deployed it, but they used the term to specify the particularity of apartheid, whereas Robinson used it to refer to global capitalism as it first emerged in Europe.

Despite these complexities, it is possible to identify shared features of the term. First, racial capitalism implies that there are deep connections between racism or racial inequality and capitalism. Much of the literature refers to historical connections, such as those between precapitalist racial divisions in Europe and the subsequent development of capitalism (Kelley 2017; Robinson 2000) or between slavery and capitalist development (Johnson 2018, 2020). Maybe this is why so many historians have taken to the concept. But the term is also used by social scientists to refer to more recent connections. South African intellectuals’ and activists’ use of the term referred to how apartheid and the South African economy were mutually dependent. Other scholars use the term to highlight disparities within the working class, which was one of Robinson’s (2000) concerns (see also Melamed 2015:77). Others emphasize how capitalism is presently dependent on violence and dispossession—social relations that conventional theories of capitalism such as Marx’s treat as irrelevant to the system, aberrations from it, or precursors to it (Ralph and Singhal 2019:857). Throughout these usages, the overarching point appears to be to explore and disclose the ways “racial hierarchies can be functional for capitalist social orders” and vice versa (Dawson 2018).

A second component of the term racial capitalism is that it is typically used to refer to global relations rather than capitalism within a single national context. South African intellectuals used the term to capture South Africa’s particular situation, but they insinuated that South Africa exhibited a particular variant of a system that was replicated cross-nationally. Robinson, and others in the same tradition, from DuBois to Oliver Cox, all discussed race on a global scale, exploring histories of colonial conquest, imperialism, and dispossession to make visible capitalism’s relation to race. Historians have shown how slavery was a transatlantic system encompassing transnational and transimperial relations. Racial capitalism, in short, is also global capitalism. The world’s workers constitute, as DuBois (1935) famously put it, the “dark proletariat” (p. 15).

Finally, the racial capitalism concept has political implications. Discussions of racial capitalism among South African intellectuals and activists were explicitly about political projects. After all, if racism and capitalism are intertwined, the antiapartheid struggle also had to be an anticapitalist struggle—and vice versa. “We must come to grips with the assertions of the African masses for political rights and economic prosperity,” declared the National Union of South African Students, “and we must seriously investigate what changes there must be to South Africa’s particular brand of racial capitalism in order to accommodate the fulfilment of these aspirations” (Nupen 1972:2). Walzer (2020) made the political implications of the term even clearer. If racism and capitalism are interconnected, as the racial capitalism thesis holds, then the fight against racism is also a fight against capitalism. But if race and capitalism are not connected, antiracist struggles and anticapitalist struggles must be thought of as separate and distinct struggles, and the struggles must proceed accordingly.

What is the “Race” in Racial Capitalism?

We can now turn to the three tensions in the racial capitalism literature, beginning with the issue of race. This is critical. If the term racial capitalism is to have implications for social theory, it must offer rigorously defined concepts constituting a transposable conceptual apparatus. Surely one of those concepts would have to do with “race.” But what exactly is “race”? The problem is that “race” is not typically defined in the existing literature, so it is unclear whether other categories marking difference, such as ethnicity, are more appropriate than race. Should we be thinking about “ethnic capitalism” rather than racial capitalism?

Robinson’s (2000) work is a prime example. Nearly all scholars claim that one of Robinson’s key contributions is to show that capitalism was forged from precapitalist racial divisions in Europe. Capitalism is “racial,” according to Robinson, “because racialism had already permeated Western feudal society,” and capitalism was built upon that racialism (Kelley 2017; Táíwò and Bright 1996). The problem is that Robinson himself was not entirely clear that precapitalist social differences were actually “racial.” On one hand, he did use the term race in his analysis. “Racism,” Robinson (2000:2; see also pp. 26–27, 66–67) wrote, served to structure “the ‘internal’ relations of European peoples” prior to capitalism, and capitalism seized on racism as it developed. On other hand, when discussing some of the presumably “racial” groups in feudal Europe, Robinson (2000:10–11) referred to linguistic rather than phenotypical differences, thus equating racial groups with linguistic groups. In fact, when discussing how migratory and immigrant labor formed the basis for the armies of the Absolutist states and for the production of value in early agrarian capitalism, he oscillated between calling them “races” and “ethnic” groups. For instance, Robinson (2000:23) used the phrase “ethnic divisions of sixteenth century immigrant labor,” and he referred to “national” differences when presumably speaking about premodern “racial” differences.

Given these ambiguities, Robinson’s argument could be read differently from how it is conventionally taken. It is not that capitalism was built on prior racial differences; rather, capitalism served to racialize the preexisting ethnic division of labor, thereby turning religious, cultural, or linguistic differences into “racial” ones to legitimate its new exploitative structure. In this view, racialization—the process of turning groups into biological entities called “races”—was a part of modern capitalism, not its precursor (cf. Omi and Winant 1986). In some passages, Robinson (2000) said this exactly: “the tendency of European civilization through capitalism was thus not to homogenize but to differentiate—to exaggerate regional, subcultural, and dialectical differences into ‘racial’ ones” (p. 26).

Of course, whether “race” preexisted capitalism does not alter the larger argument of the racial capitalism approach, which is that racial differentiation and capitalism are mutually supportive. Still, the tension in Robinson’s work manifests the deeper issue of whether “racial” capitalism refers to race or other identities. This issue permeates Walzer’s (2020) recent criticism of the racial capitalism concept. Walzer points to examples such as Russia and China, where capitalism does not rely on racial differences
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but rather on ethnic and religious differentiation. “It may be that Muslims are among the most exploited workers in Russia,” he wrote, “but they are mostly Caucasian (some of them the original Caucasians), so we would have to talk about religious capitalism—where Orthodox Christians, not white people, are the privileged group.” On this basis, Walzer rejected the racial capitalism concept as limited at best and analytically debilitating at worse.

Skeptics of Walzer have offered a rebuke: his argument misses the global dimensions of capitalism. At issue is not whether racial stratification articulates with capitalism within any single country but whether it permeates the world-capitalist system. Proponents of this argument could readily assemble evidence to show that, on a global scale, the vast majority of the world’s proletariat, subproletariat, and dispossessed—whether cultivating grapes or coffee on the farms of the Americas, cleaning up office floors in London, or making clothes in the sweatshops of New Delhi—are, to borrow DuBois’s (1935) phrase, “yellow, brown and black.” Against Walzer, this would retain the main claim of the racial capitalism approach that race and capitalism are intertwined.

Yet this scaling upward of capitalism to a global level brings its own complications. It carries the danger of what Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999) called “the cunning of imperialist [racialist] reason”: an analytic operation by which U.S.-centered scholars impose presumably U.S.-centric classifications (in this case, “race”) onto the rest of the world, thereby imposing racial classifications into contexts where they might not be operative. We would be obliged, for instance, to impose racial classifications onto Latin American contexts such as Brazil, where the salience of racial classifications is debatable (Loveman 1999; Wimmer 2015). In short, if we are to insist on the global character of racial capitalism, we must assume that analysts’ racial classifications are global as well. They may very well be, but racial capitalism’s founding texts, and more recent discussions, have not sufficiently problematized this tension.2

Can this tension be resolved? One way to do so is to raise the possibility that the racial capitalism concept works best for groups that have been undoubtedly racialized, such as members of the African diaspora in North America.3 Racial capitalism would thus refer mainly to the black ex-slave population, which has suffered some of the clearest and most virulent forms of racism. This might explain why the literature on racial capitalism has focused on African Americans and transatlantic slavery rather than other groups elsewhere in the world. Yet this seeming resolution would significantly reduce the scope of the racial capitalism concept. Racial capitalism would no longer depict a global system.

Perhaps the best resolution is one that arrives through more reflexive research. We can explore how “race” is connected to capitalism in diverse sites and across historical periods, but we must be more conscious about whether we are referring to analysts’ definition of race or a category of practice. Put simply, we can arrive at a resolution only through careful research that more clearly defines “race.”

The Inadequacy of Existing Theory

A second tension in the racial capitalism literature has to do with the relationship between this literature and existing social theories of capitalism, in particular, Marxian theories of capitalism. Animating the racial capitalism approach is the claim that Marxian theories of capitalism are inadequate because they obfuscate the racial foundations of capitalism. For Robinson (2000), “Western Marxism . . . has proven insufficiently radical to expose and root out the racialist order that contaminates its analytic and philosophic applications” (p. 317). Historians’ use of the racial capitalism approach is premised on the idea that Marxism does not adequately acknowledge slavery’s role in capitalism or the ongoing importance of colonialism and “primitive accumulation,” which Marx presumably relegated to the margins of his theory (Smallwood 2018). This is exactly why scholars in this tradition insist on the term racial capitalism: because Marxian theory fails to theorize race, we must add the qualifier race to the signifier capitalism.

But what if Marxian theory does in fact take into account race, slavery, imperialism, and colonialism, and proponents of the racial capitalism approach merely misread Marx? If so, the warrant, if not the entire premise, for Robinson’s and others’ work on racial capitalism would crater by an unfortunate misreading of Marxian theory. A number of scholars, in fact, already push against the notion that Marxist thought does not account for race, slavery, or colonialism. Drawing largely on Marx’s journalistic writings, they show that Marx not only discussed race, slavery, and colonialism but saw them as central for capitalism. According to this argument, Marx saw race as so crucial for capitalism that his theory saw the true proletariat as black, brown, and yellow—directly contrary to Robinson’s claim that Marxist theory only saw the white European proletariat as the true subject of history (Anderson 2010; Foster, Holleman, and Clark 2020; Ralph and Singhal 2019). If true, the racial capitalism literature is based on a “misguided reading of Marx” (Ralph and Singhal 2019:864).

How might this apparent aporia in Marxian theory be resolved, if at all? It is imperative here to register a distinction between Marx’s theory of capital and his theory of capitalism.4 The former is sketched in Marx’s mature social theory in Capital and related writings such as The Grundrisse (Postone 1996). These writings offer a formalized and abstract representation of the inner workings of capital, its accumulation, its contradictions, and its necessary demise through a series of central categories that capture the key elements of the capitalist system. At this level of abstraction, the main categories of the theory (e.g., “value,” “surplus value,” “concrete labor,” “abstract labor,” “capital,” “socially necessary labor time”) are devoid of any historical specificity or social content and as such can be applied to distinct historical phases or social formations (e.g., capitalism in the eighteenth-century transatlantic world or Russia in 1998, or the twenty-first-century global system). Categories of race, gender, or ethnicity are therefore not central, because they are too concrete.

Alternatively, a theory of capitalism refers to capitalist development and dynamics in their empirical specificity. It is meant to explain and describe specific capitalist formations and developments as they really exist in the world, not their abstract conceptual form. This theory can be extracted from Marx’s journalistic writings and other essays, and it is here where issues such as slavery and ethnicity arise: the essays refer to real events and pressing issues in actually existing capitalism, such as the Civil War or the Irish question (Anderson 2010). But these observations or statements on concrete processes and relations such as slavery in actually existing capitalism—that is, Marx’s theory of capitalism—do not disturb or reconfigure his theory of capital, which remains focused on the relations of wage labor induced to a highly abstract level from his analysis of textile production. If and when he did discuss things such as slavery, such as in “The Working Day” section in Capital, he treated slavery as a passing phase or outside capital’s inner logic, a sort of heuristic to better apprehend and illuminate the latter (Marx [1867] 1906:328–30; on slavery as a heuristic, see Smallwood 2018).

This distinction between Marx’s theory of capitalism and his theory of capital helps us better approach the debate generated by the racial capitalism literature. When Robinson or other proponents of the racial capitalism idea critique Marx’s theory for eliding or deliberately occluding race, slavery, and colonialism, they are critiquing his theory of capital, not his theory of capitalism. Here proponents of the racial capitalism approach are on solid ground. Marx’s theory of capitalism does take into account race, slavery, and colonialism, but his theory of capital renders these things marginal at best.5 Hence the warrant for the racial capitalism approach: because Marx’s theory of capital does not center race, the racial capitalism concept and the research and theorizing that go under its banner can fill the void. The concept may provide the basis for an alternative theory not only of racial capitalism but also of racialized capital.

Necessity, Contingency, and Difference

The final tension within racial capitalism is whether the interconnectedness of racial difference and capitalism is a logical or contingent necessity.6 If, as the racial capitalism literature suggests, slavery and its associated logics of racism have been crucial for the development of capitalism, and if global capitalism today remains intertwined with racial stratification, to what extent are these relations intrinsic to capitalism or accidental? Put differently, is capitalism necessarily racist (Fraser 2019; Lemann 2020)?7

For some, the relationship is only contingent. Walzer (2020) argued that in some countries, capitalism proceeds along just fine without racial difference, and if there is racial difference on a global scale, it is historically contingent. Although the vast majority of workers are nonwhite, Walzer suggested that this is not due to any intrinsic logic of capitalism but rather the accident of demographics (because most of the world is nonwhite, the majority of the world’s workers will be nonwhite). For this reason, Walzer suggested we disavow the racial capitalism concept. Alternatively, others claim that racism is indeed intrinsic to capitalism.8 There are two versions of this claim. One is that racism is necessary to divide the working class and legitimate the rule of the bourgeoisie. Racism is an ideological necessity of capitalism, justifying its unequal relations (Camp, Heatherton, and Karuka 2019; McCarthy 2016; Taylor 2016). “Capitalism requires inequality,” suggested Gilmore (2015), “and racism enshrines it.” A very different version, coming most predominantly from Fraser (2019), is that capitalism necessarily entails relations of exploitation and expropriation that feed off each other. Exploitation is the extraction of value from “free subjects” through wage labor. But expropriation, which includes slavery and colonialism, extracts value from racialized “dependent subjects” and is what enables exploitation to happen in the first place. Expropriation is “a necessary background condition for the exploitation of ‘workers’” (Fraser 2019) and therefore for capitalism itself. Capitalism is thus logically dependent upon racism.9

So what is the answer? Again, it helps differentiate between a theory of capital and a theory of capitalism. A theory of capitalism might demonstrate that race has been historically necessary for capitalist accumulation by reference to empirical reality: historically, capitalism and race have always been intertwined. But the claim that race is a logical necessity to capitalism would have to derive from a theory of capital, not from empirics alone. One would have to deduce, from the categories of Marx’s theory, the necessity of racism or racial differentiation in society. On this score, the arguments for the logical necessity of capitalism’s entanglements with race fall short.

Consider the argument that racism is necessary for capitalism because capitalism requires racist ideology to divide the working class. This is a functionalist argument that is not functionalist enough, for it effaces the logical possibility of functional substitution. We may find that racism has historically always functioned to divide the working class, but in theory other “isms” could serve the same function. There is nothing inherent to the logic of capital that requires race to be the ideology of division (Lebowitz 2006:39).10 Why not ethnicity? Why not sexuality? Consider Fraser’s argument that expropriation is intrinsic to capitalism and that racial differentiation must be too. It is plausible and indeed persuasive to claim that expropriation is necessary for capitalism, but it is less persuasive to claim that racial difference is logically necessary for expropriation. Gender could easily serve as the main axis of dependent classification (and, to feminist-Marxist thought, it has served that function), as could ethnicity, religion, sexuality, or citizenship. Fraser would have to show that expropriation, and hence capitalism, requires a racial classification as opposed to other social categories. This is a task left unfulfilled.11
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#### 2. Populist wars

⁠— specifically indicts interdependence theory.

Gonzalez-Vicente 18, University Lecturer in Global Political Economy @ U Leiden (Ruben, “The liberal peace fallacy: violent neoliberalism and the temporal and spatial traps of state-based approaches to peace,” *Territoriality, Politics, Governance*, 8.1)

Yet, the contemporary ascension of nationalist and populist movements and leaders that herald deeply illiberal views (Xi included) must come as no surprise after decades of neoliberal triumphalism and the promotion of a transnational order that placed the crafting of a world market above the needs of societies themselves. In such a context, the contemporary rise of nationalism and populisms across the world is not some liberal order antithesis emerging from a vacuum, but rather a logical consequence of this liberal order, constituting an often reactionary ‘counter movement’ that cannot be tackled with liberal prescriptions for increased market globalization (Polanyi, 2001). This paper takes aim at the now long-held and recently revitalized argument for a liberal peace. While not attempting to predict any specific outcome regarding the future of global peace, it argues that the rise of illiberal and reactionary discourses that we now observe, and their potential corollaries, must be understood in a dialectical sense as the result of a liberal market-oriented inter-state order that failed to tackle the great social dislocation that it played a fundamental role in fomenting.

To develop this critique, I draw upon three main bodies of literature that, despite their apparent affinities, are seldom brought together. These include Polanyi and Gramsci-inspired understandings of hegemonic crisis, counter-movements, and the rise of nationalism and populism (Gill, 2015; Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017); critical political economies of social conflict within a context of neoliberal globalization (Harvey, 2005; Springer, 2015); and political geography analyses of international relations theory (IRT), and more specifically critical geographies of peace (Agnew & Corbridge, 1995; Flint, 2005; Koopman, 2016; McConnell, Megoran, & Williams, 2014; Megoran, 2011; Nagle, 2010; Williams & McConnell, 2011). Elaborating upon these, I contend that the methodological nationalism of the disciplines of economics and international relations – in which much of the liberal view is based – has left them in a sorry state in making sense of recent political development throughout the world, specifically when addressing the contemporary rise of reactionary forms of populism.

In this sense, the high degrees of violence and vulnerability associated with processes of market integration have often escaped the radars of economics and IR analyses, fixated as they are with mono-scale scrutiny of national economies and state-to-state relations. Although some liberal IR scholars have laid the grounds for a less normative paradigm that incorporates domestic variables and bottom-up societal processes into the understanding of state action, the assumption remains that policy interdependence and compatibility between states, combined with the Pareto-efficient outcomes of globally integrated production and trade, result in ‘strong incentives for coexistence with low conflict’ (Moravcsik, 1997, p. 521; see also Oneal & Russett, 1997; McDonald & Sweeney, 2007). Recent developments suggest there are fundamental flaws with this largely deductive hypothesis. Whereas on aggregate terms, and according to some measurements, nation-states may have benefitted more or less from globalization, social conflict occurring at multiple scales – and indeed in a class-based dimension – is an undeniable constitutive element of state action, the latter reflecting and/or attempting to contain particular constellations of social forces and their interests. In this way, the damage inflicted upon many by increasingly disembedded markets and post-political states that shield policy from popular deliberation (both the products of the liberal agenda) are at the very root of the current crisis of liberal hegemony (Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017).

In what follows, I draw upon a variety of cases to explain how a dialectical approach to liberalism, neoliberalism and their illiberal responses,1 and a multi-scalar analysis of market violence are indispensable in explaining much of the turbulence that world politics faces today. To be clear, the paper’s goal is not to deny that state leaders factor in the economic repercussions of conflict when they contemplate its possibility – a logical assumption of liberal international relations scholarship. The aim is instead to argue that these calculations tell very little about the nature of peace and conflict as historically bounded processes that need to be studied in relation to broader transformations in the global political economy, the latter affecting state behaviour in terms of both economic policy and inter-state rivalry. In this way, and crucially, I also wish to refute the liberal argument that the pursuit of economic integration at any (social) cost will unequivocally lower the prospects for international conflict or, indeed, structural violence more broadly understood as a multi-scalar phenomenon.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section problematizes the concept of peace in IRT, with a more detailed discussion of economic liberalism. The following section presents a temporal critique, contextualizing the contemporary rise of illiberal politics within the transformation of the global political economy under world market capitalism. After this, I build upon Agnew (1994) to develop a scalar critique and argue that liberalism’s methodological nationalism hampers a proper assessment of the transnational dimensions of processes such as development, violence or peace. I chart various scales of market-induced violence and vulnerability (as a form of economic violence) in the global era, tracing the rescaling of violence and risk from the interstate scale to the individual sphere. I conclude by discussing the transition from a ‘durable disorder’ (Cerny, 1998) to an emerging (albeit contested) new populist order under world market capitalism. To do so, I echo Polanyi and Marx in contending that processes of marketization, replete as they are with contradiction, cannot engender liberal or capitalist peace, but result instead in anti-liberal reactions of various kinds (what Polanyi called ‘counter movements’) to the violence of unrestrained markets. Importantly, these counter movements can often take reactionary characteristics, as people under threat or the perception of threat retreat into culture and nationalism against the ‘other’ and internationalism in all its variants.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE LIBERAL PEACE

While the pursuit of peace is a central preoccupation for progressive IR scholarship, peace as a concept and as an actual manifestation is rarely discussed in the IR literature. Instead, peace often appears as a negative occurrence, intuitively understood as the avoidance of war or an absence of overt inter-state violence (Galtung, 1969; Richmond, 2016, p. 57). Thereby, most IR literature focuses on the challenges to state-based peace, with commentary typically dominated by the two main competing schools, realism and liberalism, both subdivided into further dissenting subcamps. Conventional realist approaches take the ‘anarchic’ or violent nature of international politics as a given and place their focus on states’ survival strategies. Offensive realists warn of the disruptive effects of ‘power transitions’ and in the contemporary context claim, for example, that as China grows economically and militarily, and as its interests expand and it seeks greater influence, tensions with other countries are certain to arise (Mearsheimer, 2014). Defensive neorealists hold similar assumptions about the foundations of the international system, yet contend that states privilege security over domination and that the incentives for conflict are contingent rather than endemic, with balances of power potentially keeping states at bay and preventing conflict (Waltz, 1979).

Liberal theorists dispute these interpretations and reject that competition alone guides state behaviour. Elaborating on the Kantian ideal of ‘perpetual peace’, and drawing upon Adam Smith, David Ricardo or John Stuart Mill, liberal theories contend that economic integration and institutional enmeshment or socialization exercise a constraining force on conflict and are conductive to peaceful scenarios (Doyle, 1986; Howard, 1981; Johnston, 2008; Keohane & Nye, 1977). While there is no absolute agreement on the exact shape that such ‘interdependence’ should take (Mansfield & Pollins, 2001), liberal IR scholars often hold that large-scale conflict in the 21st century can be avoided if the liberal world order survives the relative decline of the United States and manages to assimilate rising powers such as China. The emphasis is placed both on institutions and norms of reciprocity, on the one hand, and on economic integration, on the other. Regarding the latter, and evoking Smithian language, the agenda for a ‘capitalist peace’ assumes that free markets represent ‘“a hidden hand” that  …  build(s) up irrevocable and peaceful connections between states’ (Gartzke, 2007; Richmond, 2008, p. 23), and that ‘put simply, globalisation promotes peace’ (Gartzke & Li, 2003, p. 562). The theory is in many ways deductive, but relies also on the statistical data that on aggregate tends partially to support the liberal peace argument (except for the period leading to the First World War; see also Barbieri, 1996) and on the ‘logic’ that national leaders are not expected to act irrationally or be insensitive ‘to economic loss and the preferences of powerful domestic actors’ (Hegre, Oneal, & Russett, 2010, p. 772).

A more nuanced exposition of the liberal argument suggests that what brings nations together and heightens the opportunity cost of conflict is market integration according to a set of commonly devised regulations – rather than the realization of an ideal ‘free’ trade archetype (Moravcsik, 2005). This results in a sort of ‘embedded liberalism’, with the successful integration of post-Soviet states and China in world market capitalism through World Trade Organization (WTO) membership and other liberalizing initiatives understood as a deterrent to military action and, hence, as an effective strategy for both global growth and security, particularly in the face of China’s rising economic and military might (Funabashi, Oksenberg, & Weiss, 1994). From this perspective, not only is violence avoidable but also peace may indeed be engineered with the creation of a world market society being key to this endeavour as well as to the broader goal of crafting a liberal hegemony able to deliver a veritable ‘end of history’ where markets and functioning liberal democracies prevail (Fukuyama, 1992). The engineering of market-orientated democracies has indeed often been the main task of liberal peace- and state-building operatives in post-conflict areas (Campbell, Chandler, & Sabaratnam, 2011).

Yet, decades of neoliberal integration have not brought Fukuyama’s prophecy closer to its realization. Across the world, liberal market integration has facilitated convivial relations among key countries and paid important dividends to elites, yet it has also resulted in the concentration of wealth in ever fewer hands, rising inequalities within countries (although not between them) and higher concentration of wealth at the top, and increased risks and vulnerability as the logic of market competitiveness takes hold of many aspects of our lives (Anand & Segal, 2015; Lynch, 2006). The relation between the United States and China or the processes of economic integration in the European Union are clear examples of these trends. In these places as well as others, inequalities, precarization and economic insecurity have given way to a populist and nationalist momentum that can be interpreted both as a popular response to the extreme and diverse forms of violence engendered by processes of market integration, or as a manoeuvre to channel discontent towards the ‘other’ in order to protect elite interests (Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017). By prescribing ever more market globalization to counter populist politics and avoid conflict, liberal elites add fuel to the fire as they sever the very conditions that led to the disfranchisement of significant segments of the population in the first place. Thereby, it is crucial to understand how the argument for capitalist peace fails to factor in the crisis-prone and socially destructive tendencies of capitalism, particularly in a context of unfenced global competitiveness along market lines.2

Two of the underlying problems in the liberal peace argument stand out. The first has to do with the statistical selection of fixed points in time that suggest correlations between growth in trade and diminished conflict – while failing to discern mechanisms of causation (Hayes, 2012). A wider temporal lens is needed to situate the contemporary rise of mercantilist and illiberal politics in the context of neoliberal globalization, representing the same sort of ‘counter movement’ that Polanyi had warned of in his reading of the 19th-century downward spiral towards war – aided in our contemporary case by the demise of the traditional left (Blyth & Matthijs, 2017; Carroll & Gonzalez-Vicente, 2017). The second problem relates to liberal international political economy and IRT’s scalar fixation on inter-state matters and hence their inability to factor in violence in the absence of war. I turn now to these two points.

NEOLIBERALISM’S ILLIBERAL MOMENT AS COUNTER MOVEMENT

On paper, the two intertwined arguments for liberal peace would seem to make sense: if countries remove the barriers to trade and investment and choose to specialize in their comparative advantages, international productivity will be raised and we will enjoy a more prosperous global economy with satisfied consumers and states; also, if states develop close economic linkages, they will have important material incentives to avoid conflict with one another. In the real world, competition between jurisdictions and social groups implies often that the development and prosperity of some is based on the exploitation and vulnerability of others, as typically emphasized by the extensive literature on bifurcated economies, temporally constrained and contradictory growth patterns, and uneven and destructive forms of development. In this way, it is not that economic interdependence, when removed from its social context and put under the microscope, does not raise the costs of conflict. However, the political choices and social transformations needed to achieve interdependence are a key variable to understanding a state’s behaviour and predisposition to conflict. And while governments may in many junctures align with the interests of capital, they are not immune to crises of legitimacy, and will need to mediate issues of accumulation and social cohesion when people perceive the social transformations required to achieve interdependence to have a negative impact on their lives (Jessop, 2016, p. 189). This will reflect in a way or another on state behaviour as political elites, current and prospective, jostle for votes and/or legitimacy.

A key problem with the argument for liberal peace lies in its emphasis on narrow temporal correlations between trade and (lack of) conflict, which removes interdependence from its broader political economic context, disembedding peace and conflict from the broader set of historically bounded and politically contingent social relations that underpin them. A widened analytical timeframe renders clear the dialectical relationship between (neo)liberal social projects and their social responses, both progressive and reactionary. Whereas high volumes of trade may coincide at a particular ‘optimal’ period of liberal expansionism with interstate peace, they may also transform societies in ways that engender the conditions for a potential ‘illiberal’ turn or counter movement resulting in a higher risk of conflict as beggar-thy-neighbour positions emerge and new enemies need to be sought by political elites to bind national-constrained constituencies to their agendas to maintain power.

We can observe this temporal incongruity in the work of some of the key proponents of the capitalist peace. For example, Oneal and Russett (1999, p. 439) argue that trade ‘sharply reduces the onset of or involvement in militarized disputes among contiguous and major-power pairs’, which are identified by Maoz and Russett (1993) as the set of countries more likely to enter into conflict with each other. Despite Oneal and Russett’s sophisticated approach to the data (modelling, for example, to avoid ‘false negatives’ by factoring in geographic contiguity, or controlling for alliances) and the attention paid to statistical rejections of the liberal peace argument, trade interdependence and the occurrence of conflict are analyzed on a year-by-year basis (Oneal & Russett, 1999, p. 428). This is also the case with other comparable studies (Hegre, 2000; Oneal & Russett, 2001; Souva & Prins, 2006). This temporal frame is problematic, as inter-national conflict tends to build up over prolonged periods of time, and the adverse impacts of interdependence and liberal integration are more likely to result first in crisis and social dislocation, followed by some sort of economic distancing (perhaps under a new administration that replaces the one that embraced liberalization) and a wide range of policy measures, before leading to military conflict – underpinned either by the state that perceives that liberal integration is having negative impacts on socioeconomic development, or more often than not by the one which wants to prevent the deterioration of important trade and investment links.

Here, one vital issue often left out of the liberal peace equations is the fact that most military interventions in the post-Second World War period were aimed at disciplining countries that opted out of the United States’ global liberalizing project and sought to pursue a variety of indigenous pathways to modernity, often including many that did so under the rubric of socialism, democratically achieved or otherwise. The reverse is also true, as countries that chose to ally with the United States during the Cold War were shielded from attacks, and in some cases given preferential trade access, technology transfer and allowed to engage in market protection. In this context, associating conflict with the lack of strong trade links, rather than to the meticulous unfolding of a market-based imperial agenda, would be tantamount to concluding that low opium consumption was responsible for British military expeditions in 19th-century China. While there is certainly a correlation between China’s ban on opium and British intervention, nobody could seriously suggest that opium consumption reduces interstate conflict. Similarly, in many of these cases, it is not that the absence of trade results in conflict, but on the contrary, that military intervention has often been aimed at expanding markets and protecting investment.

#### 3. Causes lash-out and war-making

Karatasli 13, UNC Greensboro sociology professor (Şahan Savaş Karatasli, 2013, “Financialization and International (Dis)Order: A Comparative Analysis of the Perspectives of Karl Polanyi and John Hobson,” https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b2c7/0e6f15bb11e226494d7df7dc0057c318ea1b.pdf)

Interestingly, however, during the contemporary era of financialization, the terms “imperialism”, “new-imperialism” and “empire” have also come back to the literature (Go 2011: 206-234; Harvey 2003; 1 In The Great Transformation, haute finance (high finance) refers to big "international" banks and bankers (e.g. Rothschild family or J. P Morgan) located at the center of global capital markets (e.g. London in the nineteenth century). Polanyi ([1944] 2001: 10) distinguishes haute finance from ordinary banks and bankers based on their economic and political power, their independence from single governments (even from the most powerful ones) and from the central banks. Although they are independent from all of these actors, they can influence these actors (see Polanyi ([1944] 2001: 10-14). The content of the term is similar to Hobson's "big financiers". 42 BERKELEY JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY Johnson 2004; Steinmetz 2006; Arrighi 2007). For many, this intensification of imperialist aggression led by the declining hegemonic power is closely linked to various aspects of financialization (Harvey 2003; Steinmetz 2006; Martin 2007; Arrighi 2007). Giovanni Arrighi (1994; also see Arrighi and Silver 1999) emphasized that during the contemporary period of financial expansion, as during previous periods of financialization in historical capitalism, profit-making activities shift from productive to non-productive sectors, including war-making activities, most notably the lending of money to states to pay for military build-ups and open warfare. David Harvey has argued that the rise of the neoconservative “new imperialism” in the twentyfirst century is associated with the consequences of neoliberal imperialist policies implemented after the turn to financialization (Harvey 2003: 183- 212). Based on Tim Mitchell's (2002) interpretation of the relationships between oil and US foreign policy, Steinmetz (2005) suggests that the war in Iraq must be seen as a part of a larger historical trend toward financialization which is inherently linked to postfordist neoliberalism. While it is true that the contemporary era of financialization is characterized by attempts to establish self-regulating markets and an increasing commodification of land, labor, and money, it is also characterized by increasing militarization and interstate warfare. In the literature it is not uncommon to find that scholars who wish to emphasize both trends often refer to Karl Polanyi side by side with a rich literature on the role of finance capital and imperialism - including Hobson's Imperialism: A Study. Although such interpretations are feasible and even useful, especially for explaining the emergence of vicious cycles of economic, social and political destruction of human society in national and international spheres during periods of financialization, the theoretical framework set up by Polanyi in The Great Transformation does not permit such readings. In the Polanyian schema, selfregulating markets destroy human society, the environment, and production on national levels, where haute finance assumes the role of protecting global peace and order. That's why a direct adaptation of Polanyi's arguments for the contemporary era of financialization presents important problems which must be addressed. Our study discusses Polanyi's arguments regarding haute finance and the rivalry among the great powers during the nineteenth century in comparison to John Hobson's ([1902] 1988) study of imperialism. This comparative analysis, which takes Hobson's paradigm as the reference for comparison, is critical for understanding Polanyi's line of reasoning in The KARATASLI AND KUMRAL 43 Great Transformation, as well as for overcoming difficulties in the adaptation of certain arguments in the same work to the contemporary era of financialization. Among all alternative explanations regarding the relationship between haute finance and imperialism, Hobson's paradigm is a more fruitful source for comparison because both Hobson and Polanyi took as their case the United Kingdom (more specifically the London capital markets and the House of Rothschild) during the last thirty years of the 19th century2 . Although Hobson and Polanyi looked at the effects of the same financial actors, the contrast in their conclusion is stark. Hobson regarded financial interests as the “governor of [new] imperialism”, whereas Polanyi saw the same financial actors as the protectors of peace and order3 .

### 2NC ⁠— AT: Cap Inevitable (0:30)

#### 1. Cult of Inevitability---naturalizes elite narratives crafted to deny agency to marginalized groups fighting capitalism---that’s [Gani] and…

Tavan 21, Host of Red Flag Radio Podcast (Luka Tavan, 3-7-2021 “Worldwide revolution is possible and necessary,” Red Flag, <https://redflag.org.au/article/worldwide-revolution-possible-and-necessary/>, accessed: 10-12-2021)

But capitalism’s global nature means that revolts tend to spread across national borders. Workers today share increasingly similar experiences: conditions of work, forms of consumption, lifestyles and political cultures. And the global integration of production serves to transmit struggle from one country to another. In 1974, for instance, resistance to the brutal military dictatorship in Chile spread to East Kilbride, Scotland, of all places. Workers at the Rolls Royce factory there learned that the engines they were repairing were being used by the Chilean air force to drop bombs on workers resisting the coup. They downed tools and refused to work on the engines, keeping them out of the hands of the military junta for four years.

While nationalism still has a powerful hold on the consciousness of many, it’s increasingly clear that the real line of polarisation across the globe is between the minority ruling class and the majority working class. And when revolts break out in one part of the world, people can identify with the causes and motivations of their struggles, and draw comparisons with their own situation. “Languages remain different,” observed UK Marxist Chris Harman in 1992, “but what they say is increasingly the same”. Harman’s words ring true in every wave of political radicalisation.

1968 is remembered as a year of global revolt, when millions of workers, students and oppressed people drew inspiration from each other’s movements. Activists in the US were radicalised by the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people to American imperialism. Irish civil rights activists emulated the militant politics of the Black Panthers. When students and workers united to launch a massive general strike in France in May, it taught student radicals in Australia that they needed to link up with the power of the organised working class in order to win.

The movements of 1968 united people across superficially very different societies. For decades, Cold War common sense had dictated that the greatest divide on the planet was between Western liberal capitalism and Stalinist “Communism”. But in 1968, both sides of the iron curtain exploded in revolt. The triggers for the struggles may have been different, but they were all responses to similar issues: inequality, exploitation and war, imposed by monstrous bureaucratic states.

In 2011, a poor Tunisian street vendor set himself alight to protest against police harassment. Within days, his act had inspired anti-government protests across the country. Within weeks, the protests escalated into a regional revolt that challenged regimes across the Arab world. One small act tapped into resentment against inequality, unemployment and state violence that engulfed an entire region. The radical wave spread even further: at a massive demonstration against an anti-union bill in the US city of Madison, Wisconsin, a man held up a poster with a picture of Egyptian dictator Hosni Mubarak beside Republican Governor Scott Walker. The caption read: “One dictator down. One to go”. The Arab revolutions went on to inspire the Occupy movement, which spread to more than 80 countries.

Today, more than ever, insurgent social movements and working-class uprisings are spurring action in other parts of the world—from Hong Kong to Chile, from Lebanon to France. One placard at a memorial for protesters murdered while resisting the military coup in Myanmar took up Marx’s incitement: “Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains”.

While the Russian Revolution is cynically held up by capitalist ideologists as the ultimate argument against international revolution, it actually proves the opposite. It shows that the goal is not only necessary, but also that it’s possible. The news of workers seizing power in Russia, overthrowing their capitalist government and declaring their withdrawal from WWI, created shock waves across the planet. Workers in Germany rose in revolt a year later, ending the war for good and building soviets, a form of radical working-class democracy inspired by the Russian example. This was followed by uprisings in France, Italy and Hungary.

The revolutionary wave spread further. A classified British government report from 1919 noted a “very widespread feeling among workers that thrones have become anachronisms, and that the Soviet may be the best form of Government for a democracy”.

The rising tide of radicalism had an impact in Australia too. Meatworkers in the Queensland city of Townsville donned red jumpers, stormed the local police station to free jailed unionists, and placed the city under workers’ control. The editor of the conservative Townsville Daily Bulletin lamented: “Townsville for the last year or so has been developing Bolshevism ... the mob management of affairs in this city, differs very little, from the Petrograd and Moscow brand”.

The Russian Bolsheviks, the revolutionary working-class party that led the revolution to victory in 1917, didn’t just passively wait for revolutions elsewhere. They actively organised to spread the revolt. In 1919, they established the Communist International, an organisation for debate, discussion and coordination between different revolutionary workers’ parties. Revolutionaries in Russia, Italy, France, Germany, the US, Australia and elsewhere attempted to clarify and develop a strategy for overthrowing capitalism everywhere. In none of these countries was there a party like the Bolsheviks, steeled in years of organising working-class struggle to overthrow the state, and capable of leading a revolution. But for a number of years, workers came close to overthrowing capitalism in several countries.

In periods of stability, when social conservatism dominates, international revolution can seem like a pipe dream. Defenders of the status quo actively work to reinforce this illusion. But history proves that the crises that the system generates are international, and that they will inevitably provoke international resistance.

Capitalism is a global system. It requires a global movement to tear it up, root and branch. But it also makes global revolution more possible, and more likely. The most important thing that socialists can do, whether you live in Hong Kong or France, Myanmar or Australia, is to get stuck into organising for it today.

#### 2. Coordinated strikes solve---they disrupt global supply chains that are key to capitalism---that’s [Foster] and…

Fox-Hodess 21, Sociologist and cofounder of the International Labour and Logistics Research Network (Katy Fox-Hodess, 6-16-2021, “Logistics Workers Make Global Capitalism — and They Can Break It, Too,” Jacobin Magazine, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/06/logistics-industry-capitalism-unions>, accessed: 11-08-2021)

The logistics industry is key to the global circulation of goods under capitalism. Workers have immense power within it to grind that circulation to a halt — if they can get organized.

Over the past several decades, capitalism has broken up the production process into individual steps carried out in separate work sites scattered across the globe. As a result, logistics, the systems that organize the physical movement of goods through space and time, has become more central to global capitalism than ever, and that gives workers in the logistics sector — including ports, rail, trucking, and other industries — tremendous potential leverage over the capitalist class. Any attempt to think strategically about strengthening working-class power must therefore grapple with the sector and how it works.

### 2NC ⁠— AT: Socialism Fails (0:10)

#### 2. There’s no one-size-fix-all alt---our task is shaping the best proposals into a unified alternative to capitalism

Monbiot 19, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science) (George Monbiot, 4-25-2019, "Dare to declare capitalism dead – before it takes us all down with it," The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/apr/25/capitalism-economic-system-survival-earth/)

So what does a better system look like? I don’t have a complete answer, and I don’t believe any one person does. But I think I see a rough framework emerging. Part of it is provided by the ecological civilisation proposed by Jeremy Lent, one of the greatest thinkers of our age. Other elements come from Kate Raworth’s doughnut economics and the environmental thinking of Naomi Klein, Amitav Ghosh, Angaangaq Angakkorsuaq, Raj Patel and Bill McKibben. Part of the answer lies in the notion of “private sufficiency, public luxury”. Another part arises from the creation of a new conception of justice based on this simple principle: every generation, everywhere, shall have an equal right to the enjoyment of natural wealth.

I believe our task is to identify the best proposals from many different thinkers and shape them into a coherent alternative. Because no economic system is only an economic system but intrudes into every aspect of our lives, we need many minds from various disciplines – economic, environmental, political, cultural, social and logistical – working collaboratively to create a better way of organising ourselves that meets our needs without destroying our home.

## “Indigenous” Regimes

#### It is more imperialist to vote neg.

Michaels ’16 [Ralf; 2016; Arthur Larson Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law; “Supplanting Foreign Antitrust,” <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4808&context=lcp>; KS]

These concerns must be taken seriously, but they can be answered and at least some of the expected problems can be avoided. Western hegemonialism today consists not only, or not even primarily, of the expansion of Western laws—it consists of the expansion of Western economic power. This is clearest where Western corporations are engaged in anti-competitive conduct. In this case, an expansion of Western law is not hegemonialist in itself; it merely follows the expansion of such economic power. In offering their laws to those injured by the conduct of their corporations, developed countries are not primarily hegemonialist—they largely re-establish the balance between economic freedom for corporations and protection of consumers that are taken for granted in those countries themselves.98 If anything, it is hegemonialist to allow corporations to raid foreign markets and not offer recourse in those corporations’ home courts. The fact that developing countries often do not object to such regulation by institutions in developed countries may be a sign that they approve. Indeed, foreign countries are often even plaintiffs in U.S. courts.99

#### In transnational actions the courts will force opt out on international plaintiffs

Monestier 11, In most U.S. class actions, plaintiffs seek certification . (Tanya, r, Transnational Class Actions and the Illusory Search for Res Judicata, 86 Tul. L. Rev. 1, 80 (2011), https://docs.rwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1123&context=law\_fac\_fs)

The jurisdiction issue, however, takes on an added dimension in the class action setting. The nature of a Rule 23(b)(3) class action is such that class members are presumptively included within the class unless they take affirmative measures to request exclusion, or opt out. Unlike the plaintiff in traditional litigation, the plaintiffs in class litigation have not actively consented to the jurisdiction of the U.S. court. As such, a foreign court will likely need to consider whether the U.S. court has personal jurisdiction over foreign absent class members. In the United States, this issue was definitively addressed over twentyfive years ago in Phillips Petroleum Co. v Shutts, where the Supreme Court held that a court has personal jurisdiction over absent plaintiffs as long as they have been provided with adequate representation, notice, and the opportunity to opt out of the class action."' In other countries, however, the question of personal jurisdiction over plaintiffs is a decidedly alien one. That is, because most other jurisdictions do not have anything akin to U.S.-style class action litigation, the issue of personal jurisdiction over plaintiffs has simply not arisen."' For instance, the Southern District of New York noted in Vivend "[The] English authorities consistently discuss the competency of a foreign court in terms of whether there was jurisdiction over the defendant""' In the vast majority of circumstances where foreign law is silent on the question of personal jurisdiction over absent plaintiffs, U.S. courts are left in an uncomfortable position: they can ignore the issue altogether; they can assume that the foreign court would extend general principles of jurisdiction over the defendant to the class of absent plaintiffs; or they can assume that a foreign court would adopt U.S.-style Shutts reasoning to the issue. Clearly, none of these options is entirely satisfactory; they either result in U.S. courts ignoring a critical recognition issue or "making up" foreign law based on limited information.

#### Transnational class actions are a ruse that violates the autonomy of those in other countries by forcing them into the opt out class

#### Other countries reject the U.S. opt out model because it violates litigant autonomy

Monestier 11, In most U.S. class actions, plaintiffs seek certification . (Tanya, r, Transnational Class Actions and the Illusory Search for Res Judicata, 86 Tul. L. Rev. 1, 80 (2011), https://docs.rwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1123&context=law\_fac\_fs)

Nearly all legal systems provide a basis for not recognizing or enforcing a foreign judgment where to do so would violate the forum's public policy.120 The public policy defense to recognition (sometimes referred to by the French term "ordrepublid') is generally regarded as connoting something more than simply a distaste of a foreign law or some aspect of the foreign judgment.12' Rather, public policy is seen as protecting against the enforcement of judgments that grossly offend a sense of universal justice or basic morality.1' At the forefront of concerns about class actions is the issue of whether the opt-out feature of U.S. class actions is compatible with the public policy of foreign countries. In the words of one European commentator, "Even if the legal grounds are not always the same, it is clear that everywhere in Europe the main problem with US class actions is the opt-out mechanism and its asserted contrariety to the domestic foundations of civil procedure."'23 The argument regarding public policy manifests itself in several ways, but all revolve around the central theme that a plaintiff can only become a party to the litigation (and therefore be bound by any result) where he has affirmatively engaged the processes of the court. The court in Vivendi elaborated upon how recognition of a U.S. opt-out class judgment might be counter to public policy in France: First, it is an accepted principle of French law that no one may claim in court by proxy This principle-in French, nul ne plaide par procureurprocedurally requires anyone acting as a plaintiff or defendant in a lawsuit to make his identity known individually in the legal proceedings. As a result, defendants' [sic] argue, the fact that not all members of the putative class will be identified by name, but instead represented by court-appointed class representatives, will be fatal to recognition of a U.S. judgment in this case by a French court. Defendants further argue that the failure to identify each plaintiff individually contravenes French notions of due process. This is because of a "strong principle" of French law that no one should be a plaintiff without consenting affirmatively to do so. Members of an opt-out class, of course, are not required to take any steps to be included in this class. Defendants also argue that the opt-out class is inconsistent with the fundamental principle of adversarial proceedings, le principe du contrdictoire, which gives every litigant the "personal freedom" to appear and be heard during any proceeding affecting his rights. Particularly where individual notice is not required (as is permissible under Rule 23), a class member could be deprived of his fundamental right to appear without ever having received actual notice.124 The public policy debate over the recognition of the U.S. opt-out mechanism takes on a similar flavor in other jurisdictions. In Germany, for instance, the argument might be that a U.S. class action judgment violates Article 103 of the German Constitution, which establishes the right of citizens to participate and be heard in legal proceedings.125 Or, in Sweden, claimants may resist the recognition of a U.S. class judgment on the basis that the opt-out feature of Rule 23 violates "the Swedish principle that people have the right to decide for themselves whether they want to file a suit or not."l26 In short, the public policy defense to recognition requires U.S. courts to confront the intricate issue of whether the opt-out feature of U.S.-style class actions is fundamentally incompatible with core principles of procedure in foreign states-a feat which involves delving deep into foreign procedural and constitutional law.

#### 1AC Michaels says:

Michaels ’16 [Ralf; 2016; Arthur Larson Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law; “Supplanting Foreign Antitrust,” <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4808&context=lcp>; KS]

legal culture, a lack of competition culture, and underdeveloped

#### This is the racist rhetoric used in development that deems African countries as non-cultured “savages”

#### The 1AC is just the Michigan girlboss version of calling

#### 1AC Nwuneli ev on Advantage 2 says:

Nwuneli ’18 [Ndidi; August 7; Co-Founder of AACE Food Processing & Distribution, Managing Partner of Sahel Consulting Agriculture & Nutrition, Founder of LEAP Africa, and a 2018 Aspen Institute New Voices fellow; Project Syndicate, “The High Cost of Food Monopolies in Africa,” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/africa-monopoly-food-prices-by-ndidi-okonkwo-nwuneli-2018-08>; KS]

According to the World Bank, more than 70% of African countries rank in the bottom half globally for efforts to protect “market-based competition.” While 27 African countries and five regional blocs do have antitrust laws on the books, enforcement is rare. The remaining countries have no regulations at all and have made little progress in drafting them.

### 2NC ⁠— AT: QoL (0:50)

#### Capitalism increases violence---better living in the West comes at the expense of the Global South AND inequality’s increasing---structural adjustment policies and net outflows have reversed progress and stagnated growth

Hickel et al. 18, \*Anthropologist, author, and fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. He serves on the Labour Party Task Force on International Development and works as Policy Director for The Rules collective \*\*Editor at Muftah, a digital foreign affairs magazine, and co-host of the media criticism podcast, Citations Needed \*\*\*Host, The Appeal podcast. Media analyst at FAIR.org and host of the Citations Needed podcast (\*Jason Hickel \*\*Nima Shirazi \*\*\*Adam Johnson, 11-28-2018, “Episode 58: The Neoliberal Optimism Industry,” Citations Needed, https://citationsneeded.medium.com/episode-58-the-neoliberal-optimism-industry-and-development-shaming-the-global-south-cf399e88510e, accessed: 09-25-2021)

Nima: Can you dig a little deeper into, based on your work Jason, how the terms “development” and “growth” are really, not only misunderstood, but often deliberately misrepresented both in a political context and also throughout the media, like who do these misperceptions benefit?

Jason Hickel: So I think that there’s a narrative out there that poor countries are basically effectively catching up to rich countries, right? Because we know that, there’s China and they’re becoming a powerful player in the world stage and so on. And we’re seeing people lift out of poverty in China and India also, you know, a booming tech industry and whatnot. So clearly, you know, the gap between the rich and the poor on the global stage is shrinking. This is the dominant narrative we have. And unfortunately it’s simply not true. There are, in fact, was a period when that gap was shrinking, in the immediate postcolonial decades in the 1960s and the 1970s when newly independent governments were rolling out progressive economic reforms using Keynesian policy, protecting their economies with tariffs, using subsidies to promote infant industry developments, etcetera, etcetera. But, you know, and using land reform and labor laws to improve wages and so on. But these policies turned out to be a threat to Global North investors. Which, during the colonial years had enjoyed really easy access to cheap labor and raw materials and so on in those countries. And that was being cut off. And so they responded during the 1980s and 1990s by rolling back those progressive policies through structural adjustments imposed by the World Bank and the IMF, right? Which basically forced Global South countries to privatize public assets, to get rid of tariff barriers and subsidies, to cut spending on education and healthcare. Like all of the crucial elements necessary for real developments were basically denied to Global South countries. The vast majority of them at least. So that’s not true of East Asia and in China, and as a consequence, that region of the world did remarkably well, but what we see in the rest of the world is that the per capita income gap between the Global North and the Global South has tripled since 1960 in real terms and shows no sign of slowing down. I mean, there’s basically been, on per capita level, virtually stagnation in the Global South since the 1980s. And that’s, you know, that’s really not part of our narrative and that’s something that is a structural consequence of the way that the economy was organized during those decades.

Nima: Yeah. I think that actually leads into something that I’ve been so fascinated about while reading your work, which is that the conception that wealthy countries, countries that have historically colonized most of the world are now in a position to give back, right? To, to help out through aid or debt relief or whatever poorer countries in the Global South. So can you tell us how that view of things, that colonialism is a thing of the past that there’s no more extraction or exploitation, but now rather resources are flowing North to South from rich to poor, can you tell us how that might not exactly be true?

Jason Hickel: The dominant narrative development is that rich countries became rich kind of by their own hard work, their good institutions, their scientific inventions and so on, and poor countries are poor and remain poor because they have whatever bad governance or corruption, or maybe they’re lazy or have backwards cultural values in the more racist sense of the narrative, etcetera. But the idea is that rich countries, because they have this surplus, they’re able to sort of reach across the divide and give generously of their surplus to help poor countries up the development ladder. What I argue is that this narrative gets virtually everything about the story wrong, right? First of all, the determinants of success and failure in various countries around the world can’t be entirely attributed to only internal conditions, right? We live in a global economic system. We have done since at least the past 500 years since the onset of colonialism, and so we have to think about how the rules of that economy, of that global economic system affect the outcomes that we see around the world, right? You know, of course, that’s very easy to see during the colonial period, during the structural adjustment period in the 1980s and 1990s as well. And we can see it very clearly now in the way that capital flows around the world, right? And so if we look at total flows of money around the world right now, between the Global North and the Global South, we see something quite remarkable. This is using 2012 data, which is the last data that we have on this. But in 2012, developing countries received a total of $2 trillion US dollars in total inflows from the Global North, right? That includes aid, foreign investments, loans, remittances, everything, every bit of money, which is a lot, but in the same year, some $5 trillion flowed the other direction from South to North. So in that year there were $3 trillion in net outflows from South to North, so the South is in fact a net creditor to the North rather than the other way around. So we might be able to say that it’s, in fact, the Global South that’s developing the North rather than the North developing the South. And that really does flip the aid narrative on its head. And if we compare those outflows to aid, what we see is that for every dollar of aid that the South receives from the North, they lose $24 in net outflows, which is a tremendous reversal of the way we normally think about the situation. There’s lots of ways we can see this kind of reverse flow happening that are important to pay attention to. So one of course is the most obvious one, which is, you know, interest payments on exportable debts, which in and of itself outstrips the global aid budget, you know, almost twice over. But then we also have profit repatriation for multinational companies from host countries back to where they’re listed, which is about $500 billion per year. Sometimes even outstrips foreign direct investment flows themselves, but probably the biggest single cause of this in that outflow situation is illicit financial flows, which are largely through, you know, for the sake of tax evasion by multinational companies who are using basically tax havens and secrecy jurisdictions which are almost entirely in Global North countries controlled by Global North governments in order to secret money out of developing countries into Western bank accounts.

#### Sustainability doesn’t solve QoL (quality of life) BUT proves ecological overshoot---cites data (graph)

Fang 21, School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China (Kai Fang, 11-18-2021, “Moving away from Sustainability,” Ecological Economics, Nature Sustainability, 5, 5-6 (2022))

The doughnut-shaped Safe and Just Space framework describes the need for attaining minimum social standards while also limiting pressure on the planet1 . By assembling both social and planetary boundaries as two concentric radar charts2 , it challenges the received economic wisdom that seeks endless growth without considering the Earth’s biophysical limits. The framework is useful to monitor (un)sustainable trends and calls for a new development model in which social shortfall and ecological overshoot are eliminated simultaneously. The Doughnut framework has succeeded in fuelling an interesting and necessary discussion on the sustainability performance of cities, regions, nations and the world3,4 . Previous research has shown that no country satisfies its social requirements in an environmentally sustainable way, but the historical and future trends in sustainability performance of the world’s nations were unknown. Writing in this issue, Fanning and co-authors5 tracked the sustainability performance of over 140 countries in the period 1992–2015 and conducted a projection of current trends to 2050.

To provide a clear and consistent picture of the world’s social progress and ecological degradation over time and space, Fanning et al. traced the trajectories of 11 social and six biophysical indicators (Fig. 1), informed by the Doughnut framework. They found that, on the global scale, eight out of ten social objectives are yet to be achieved, while five out of six planetary boundaries had been transgressed as of 2015. In 1992, the proportions were 90% and 67%, respectively. At the national level, 25% of the countries have failed to fulfil half of the social objectives while overshooting half of the biophysical boundaries, downscaled from the planetary-scale value to a per capita share. Generally, countries that exhibit good performance on social achievement do not operate in an environmentally sustainable way, while environmentally sustainable ones suffer from serious social shortfall. In addition to understanding which countries transgress the two sets of boundaries, the work also focuses on the extent of ecological overshoot and social shortfall. Overall, ecological overshoot increases faster than the decrease in social shortfall. Although two countries (Uzbekistan, and Trinidad and Tobago) seem to have approached the safe and just space between social and planetary boundaries, none has managed to reduce social shortfall without exacerbating biophysical exploitation. This finding is highly policy relevant, particularly for those economies that have transgressed all of the biophysical boundaries, because once a society transgresses all biophysical boundaries, monitoring the extent of this overshoot becomes urgent.

The outlook is challenging. To contribute to early warning and precautionary approaches, Fanning et al. also predicted possible trajectories for the countries’ social–ecological systems. By analysing time-series data on both biophysical and social indicators for all of the countries in the period 2016–2050 (Fig. 1), they find that, if historical trends continue, in 2050 the number of countries transgressing biophysical boundaries will increase by 10–27% for nitrogen, ecological and material footprints, and land-system change and by 40% for carbon emissions. As for the social indicators, while 63% of countries would achieve at least one additional social objective, there are four objectives that 72% of countries will not be able to achieve, which include life satisfaction, social support, democratic quality and equality.

A major contribution of the research by Fanning and colleagues is that it bridges science and policy to open a new way of tracing and projecting the sustainability of social–ecological systems. Future studies can build on and extend this to consider the following issues. First, the Sustainable Development Goals approved by all member states of the United Nations provide a systematic and comprehensive means of setting goals and indicators that contribute to sustainable well-being6 and can therefore serve as a reference to update the social and biophysical indicators employed by this study. Second, interactions within and between the various biophysical processes and social responses have been found to be ubiquitous, complex and dynamic7,8 . The COVID-19 pandemic is probably one example of social disruption associated with long-term ecological overshooting. Therefore, taking these interactions into account is a promising next step. Third, both the biophysical and social indicators can experience dramatic changes derived from nonlinear dynamics and thresholds9 . Such nonlinearities can hardly be anticipated using ordinary statistical models based essentially on historical data. One way to improve prediction is to combine scenario analyses with data-driven technologies, such as data mining and machine learning algorithms10

Human societies have a tradition of aiming to maximize welfare within planetary boundaries. For example, the traditional Chinese philosophy ‘harmony between humans and nature’ (tian-ren-he-yi) emphasizes the need for humankind to coordinate their activities with the environment. However, the research by Fanning et al. suggests the opposite: we are moving away from, not towards, sustainable societies, after decades of sustainability education and initiatives worldwide. Each of the social objectives is fulfilled at the cost of overstepping one or more additional planetary boundaries, and countries have already transgressed most, if not all, of the boundaries before achieving most social objectives. Moreover, this trend is likely to remain unchanged or to worsen if no immediate, radical transition activities are implemented. Concluding that current trajectories are neither environmentally sustainable nor socially sufficient from the Doughnut perspective, the authors deepen our understanding of how ecological overshoot would eventually offset social achievement. These findings are disappointing indeed, but not making any changes would be even more so, and potentially catastrophic for humanity.
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Fig. 1 | Changes in the national sustainability performance relative to social objectives and biophysical boundaries. a,b, Summary of the data5 for 148 countries from 1992 to 2015 (a) and 2016 to 2050 (b). Blue and red cells represent positive and negative changes in indicators, respectively, and white cells indicate that no data were available. For social indicators (S), the changes are calculated as ΔS = log S2015 S1992 (a) and ΔS = log S2050 S2016 (b); for biophysical indicators (B), the changes are calculated as ΔB = log B1992 B2015 (a) and ΔB = log B2016 B2050 (b)

#### AND their ev ignores colonialism

Hickel 19, academic at the University of London and a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts (Jason Hickel, 1-29-2019, “Bill Gates says poverty is decreasing. He couldn’t be more wrong,” *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jan/29/bill-gates-davos-global-poverty-infographic-neoliberal>, accessed: 07-12-2021)

There are a number of problems with this graph, though. First of all, real data on poverty has only been collected since 1981. Anything before that is extremely sketchy, and to go back as far as 1820 is meaningless. Roser draws on a dataset that was never intended to describe poverty, but rather inequality in the distribution of world GDP – and that for only a limited range of countries. There is no actual research to bolster the claims about long-term poverty. It’s not science; it’s social media.

What Roser’s numbers actually reveal is that the world went from a situation where most of humanity had no need of money at all to one where today most of humanity struggles to survive on extremely small amounts of money. The graph casts this as a decline in poverty, but in reality what was going on was a process of dispossession that bulldozed people into the capitalist labour system, during the enclosure movements in Europe and the colonisation of the global south.

Prior to colonisation, most people lived in subsistence economies where they enjoyed access to abundant commons – land, water, forests, livestock and robust systems of sharing and reciprocity. They had little if any money, but then they didn’t need it in order to live well – so it makes little sense to claim that they were poor. This way of life was violently destroyed by colonisers who forced people off the land and into European-owned mines, factories and plantations, where they were paid paltry wages for work they never wanted to do in the first place.

In other words, Roser’s graph illustrates a story of coerced proletarianisation. It is not at all clear that this represents an improvement in people’s lives, as in most cases we know that the new income people earned from wages didn’t come anywhere close to compensating for their loss of land and resources, which were of course gobbled up by colonisers. Gates’s favourite infographic takes the violence of colonisation and repackages it as a happy story of progress.

But that’s not all that’s wrong here. The trend that the graph depicts is based on a poverty line of $1.90 (£1.44) per day, which is the equivalent of what $1.90 could buy in the US in 2011. It’s obscenely low by any standard, and we now have piles of evidence that people living just above this line have terrible levels of malnutrition and mortality. Earning $2 per day doesn’t mean that you’re somehow suddenly free of extreme poverty. Not by a long shot.

Scholars have been calling for a more reasonable poverty line for many years. Most agree that people need a minimum of about $7.40 per day to achieve basic nutrition and normal human life expectancy, plus a half-decent chance of seeing their kids survive their fifth birthday. And many scholars, including Harvard economist Lant Pritchett, insist that the poverty line should be set even higher, at $10 to $15 per day.

So what happens if we measure global poverty at the low end of this more realistic spectrum – $7.40 per day, to be extra conservative? Well, we see that the number of people living under this line has increased dramatically since measurements began in 1981, reaching some 4.2 billion people today. Suddenly the happy Davos narrative melts away.

Moreover, the few gains that have been made have virtually all happened in one place: China. It is disingenuous, then, for the likes of Gates and Pinker to claim these gains as victories for Washington-consensus neoliberalism. Take China out of the equation, and the numbers look even worse. Over the four decades since 1981, not only has the number of people in poverty gone up, the proportion of people in poverty has remained stagnant at about 60%. It would be difficult to overstate the suffering that these numbers represent.

This is a ringing indictment of our global economic system, which is failing the vast majority of humanity. Our world is richer than ever before, but virtually all of it is being captured by a small elite. Only 5% of all new income from global growth trickles down to the poorest 60% – and yet they are the people who produce most of the food and goods that the world consumes, toiling away in those factories, plantations and mines to which they were condemned 200 years ago. It is madness – and no amount of mansplaining from billionaires will be adequate to justify it.

#### \*\*1AC Brown uses the discourse of failed states AND they use the logic in their tags — that discourse legitimizes an interventionist epistemology that effaces difference, makes north-south inequality inevitable, and is self-fulfilling

Eisenträger 12 (Stian Eisenträger, MA student in IR, board member at International Reporter, a Norwegian NGO, 3-27-12, “Failed State or Failed Label?: The Concealing Concept and the Case of Somalia,” <http://www.e-ir.info/2012/03/27/failed-state-or-failed-label-the-concealing-concept-and-the-case-of-somalia/>) gz

The end of the Cold War shaped a new international political context where the issues of democracy and human rights were brought out from the internal to the external scene. The weakened role of the Soviet Union gave the United States the possibility to increase its global influence. In this context *the absence of effective government* emerged on the world political agenda together with the concept of the “failed state” (Akpinarli 2009). Boutros Boutros-Gali and Kofi Annan, the former Secretaries-General of the UN, used the “failed state” term as early as in 1990, although the General Assembly or the Security Council never used it. Somalia, which was a typical case of the absence of effective government, was described by the UN without the use of the term “failed state”. The concept was then applied for the first time in the article “Saving Failed States” published in the winter edition of Foreign Policy Magazine in 1992-1993 (Helman & Ratner). This article, which was written in the post-Cold War context with its high aspirations for democracy, human rights, the more active role of the United Nations in safeguarding collective security and the emergence of the United States’ as the leading agenda-setting actor, established the basic concept and the paradigm. Although some have tried to incorporate “failed states” in international law, the term is highly debated because of the neo-colonial notion attached to it (Akpinarli 2009, 87-89). According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, the word “fail” can have a range of different meanings: “to lose strength”, “to fade or die away”, “to stop functioning normally”, “to fall short”, “to be or become absent or inadequate”, “to be unsuccessful” and “to become bankrupt or insolvent” (Merriam-Webster 2011). Thus, I would argue that the word is too imprecise to be meaningful in our attempt to broaden our understanding of the world. In addition, the word is heavily value-laden and has loads of negative connotations attached to it, and therefore I find it unsuitable to use in science. That journalists and politicians still use the term, which is both catchy and tabloid, is understandable when we take into consideration the rather brutal limitations of time and space these two occupational groups have in their struggle to reach their audiences. Nevertheless, numbers of scholars have used and still use the failed state label, many even without engaging critically with the term (Bates 2008; Ghani & Lockhart 2008; Holzgrefe & Keohane 2003, just to mention a few). The urge to “fix”: Securitization and intervention The failed state paradigm implies that there is something that needs to be “fixed” or “saved” – of course by “good” liberal democratic external forces. “Preventing states from failing, and rescuing those that do fail, are (…) strategic and moral imperatives”, Robert I. Rotberg (2002) proclaims in an article with the dramatic title “Failed States in a World of Terror” (the argument is elaborated in his book, bearing the same title). One can feel the notion of “the white mans burden”. One of the most neoliberal contributions in the failed states debate is probably that of Ashraf Ghani & Clare Lockhart (2008, 124) who in their book “Fixing failed states” boldly declare that “today states must fulfil their citizens’ aspirations for inclusion and development and also carry out a constellation of interrelated functions”. They conclude that states “in the world today” should perform ten key functions, which are: 1) Rule of law; 2) A monopoly of the legitimate means of violence; 3) Administrative control; 4) Sound management of public finances; 5) Investments in human capital; 6) Creation of citizenship rights through social policy; 7) Provision of infrastructure services; 8) Formation of a market; 9) Management of public assets; 10) Effective public borrowing. So now when we have the list, can we just go out in the world and start “fixing”? Fixing “failed states” is a dangerous exercise: For many policymakers the failed state label contributes to open up for and make a good excuse for military and other interventions. Petra Minnerop shows how the US throughout the second half of the 20th century developed several terms, for example “rogue states”, for “states to which it ascribed a high threat potential as regards the United States and international security” (2003). In the years to follow after the 1992 article in Foreign Policy Magazine the international community, with the US in the leading role, carried out military interventions in Somalia, Afghanistan and Iraq on the basis that the chaotic situation in these states poses a threat to the US and international security in general. The terms “failed state”, “rogue state” and “war on terror” have all been given prominent roles in the public debate. As Akpinarli also remarks, these concepts have been invented by the North to “solve” problems in the South, as well as to advocate for and justify military interventions to protect international peace and security (Akpinarli 2009). I would argue that the concept rather causes more trouble than it solves – not only in terms of military intervention, but also by keeping “failed” states in the margins of international relations. It would not be an exaggeration to claim that the labelling of “failed states” is a prime example of what the Copenhagen School of Security has dubbed *securitization*. The founding fathers of this concept point out that “a discourse that takes form of presenting something to an existential threat to the referent object does not by itself create securitization – this is a *securitizing move*, but the issue is securitized only if and when the audience accepts it as such.” (Buzan et al. 1998, 25). The audience – in this instance, ordinary citizens in the North – has to a large extent accepted the “failed state” paradigm, especially with reference to Somalia. Both the media and the large organizations working with/in/for the “failed state” are acting as agents for the securitizing actors – that is the governments in the North, especially the United States’ government. Somalia has been among the top five on the list since the first Failed States Index was published in 2005, and since 2008 Somalia has had the dubious honour of being the world’s “most failed state”. Whether it is possible to measure a state’s “failure” is a question that probably requires a book to be answered. Since 2005 the magazine and Fund for Peace have ranked the world’s countries after measuring the following variables: Demographic pressures, refugees/IDPs, group grievance, human flight, uneven development, economic decline, delegitimization of the state, public services, human rights, security apparatus, factionalized elites and external intervention (Fund for Peace 2011). No doubt that all these measurements may give a good indicator of how the situation is in a number of countries. However, my point and critique is that the index fails in grasping the vast empirical variations within the research object itself in the case of Somalia. Using the juridical state of Somalia as the object of analysis without looking under the surface becomes a serious hindrance of capturing the full picture. Somalia’s image problem As Michael C. Williams (2003, 527) excellently points out, “Security policies today are constructed not only with the question of their linguistic legitimation in mind; they now are increasingly decided upon in relation to acceptable image-rhetorics”. In this context we can identify the visualization of the verbal rhetoric of the failed state paradigm. The presentation of ”failed states” is often accompanied with depictions of a war-torn hell-hole, and the Foreign Policy Magazine takes the lead by presenting the Failed States Index together with a collection of photos appearing under the splash heading: “Postcards from Hell” (Foreign Policy Magazine 2011). When the Failed States Index is referred to by other news outlets, this kind of presentation is reproduced (for a recent example, see: BBC 2011a). I have yet to see an example of any media organization to examine the Index more closely. Only telling one side of the story is a serious problem. We can compare the use of the “failed state” label with how Somalia is depicted in the daily media coverage. How many times can you remember to have seen the pictures from Somalia, the disaster zone, with starving children, heavily armed Islamist fighters and dead people being dragged through the streets by a cheering mob? Quite a few times, I suppose. On the other hand, how many times have you seen pictures from Somalia showing farmers working in their fields, smiling and playful children, or the beach in Mogadishu crowded with both men, women and children? Probably not at all. Of course, the pictures of the disaster zone of Somalia are real and by every journalistic standard it is right to publish such pictures. The practice becomes a problem when these are the only pictures that are being shown, when the stories about starving children and dangerous terrorists are the only stories that are being told about Somalia outside Somalia. This misrepresentation in the media can for a large part be attributed to the “failed state” label that is burn-marked on the country, and which pay so little attention to the variations within the geographical area that makes up the state of Somalia. When a statement is repeated enough times, it becomes a “truth”. Politicians and scholars, as well as the media itself are responsible for this brand marking, and the process is self-reinforcing. The situation has reached the point where members of the Somali diaspora community in Norway has established an organization with one of its main goals to adjust the picture that has been made of Somalia and the Somali people (Iftiin – somalisk-norsk kunnskapssenter 2011). Somalia has a serious image-problem – literally. Not only does this put the country in risk of external intervention, it also contributes to keep Somalia and much of its population in the margins of international relations. There is a lack of representation of the people inhabiting the territory of the Somali Republic, both because the TFG lacks authority, but also because of the non-recognition of the de facto states of Somaliland and Puntland. Here we have to functional geopolitical entities that are not represented in the UN nor in other global or regional institutions. Furthermore foreign investors and tourists stay away because of the perception and understanding of the whole of Somalia being a ”failed state”. Africaand the Knowledge of Non-Being In his classic work Orientalism, Edward Said (2003 [1978]) scrutinize the history and nature of Western attitudes towards the East. He argues that orientalism is a powerful European ideological creation and a way for dealing with the “otherness” of Eastern culture, customs and beliefs. Achille Mbembe applies much of the same argumentation in his critique of Africanism. He says that historically, the West has constructed its own civilization, enlightenment and progress through the “others”, thus non-Western cultures, and especially Africa. Mbembe argues that: “Africa as an idea, a concept, has historically served, and still continues to serve, as a polemical argument for the West’s desperate desire to assert its difference from the rest of the world” (Mbembe 2001, 2). One of the challenges in grasping how things work outside the Western world is that many, if not even all, of the concepts we use when describing the universe of International Relations is based in Western history and thinking. Max Weber’s famous definition of the state as “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory (Weber et al. 1991, 78). In Western thinking, Weber’s definition represents the *idea* of an “ideal state”, and it seems like many have the perception that Western states fit into this idea or norm. When analyzing states in Africa, this is revealed when African states are compared with the *idea* of an “ideal state”, which is believed to be a prototype of a Western state – leading to the focus on African states’ absences, lacks and incompleteness, as weak or failed. In this way Mbembe’s analysis is straight to the point when he states that “while we feel we know nearly everything that African states, societies, and economies *are not*, we still know absolutely nothing about *what they actually are*”. Our knowledge of Africa is to a large degree based on the knowledge of non-being (Mbembe 2001, 9). But claiming that the “Western state” resembles the Weberian state, or even that the “Western state” is the norm, is highly problematic. First of all, every state has its own specific features, and the higher the degree of generalization, the more problematic it is. Secondly, Weber’s state is an idea of a state that has never existed in practice – even not in Europe or North America – for example when we take into account the important fact that private violence and private security has existed through modern history, and even today. Abrahamsen & Williams (2010), Colás & Mabee (2010) and Thomson (1994) are among several scholars who have demonstrated how private violence and private security takes form in e.g. private companies, criminal organizations and vigilante groups. If the states in Europe and North America are to be judged by the same standards as the states in Africa, many of these could get the “failed” label as well. Noam Chomsky, for example, has turned the tables in his book “Failed States”, where he shows that the US shares features with other “failed states” (2007). But does the “failed state” label provide us with more and better insight into how different states work; does it enlighten us in any way? Definitely not. The label conceals more than it enlightens. Abrahamsen & Williams (2010) argues that we must look beyond the state when analysing security issues in Africa. I would argue that we must look both beyond and within the state also when we want to analyse states in Africa, and especially Somalia.
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#### Profit link---Agriculture has transitioned to the sole purpose of profit accumulation---the commoditization of food is a classic feature of capitalism that causes environmental destruction and turns case.

Gerardo Patron-Cano 15. Graduate Studies @ University of Denver. MODERN CAPITALISM AND FOOD COMMODITIZATION: THE LIMITATIONS OF INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHALLENGES OF SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVES. Faculty of Social Sciences. June 2015. Pg.1-3

The UN predicts that around two billion more people will populate the world by 2050, half of who will be born in sub-Saharan Africa and 30 percent in Southeast and South Asia (United Nations, 2013). Malnutrition remains common in these areas even though global food production is abundant; this is mainly because food is considered a commodity to be traded on liberalized markets (Magdoff, 2012). The capitalist process has spurred farmers to produce for the sole purpose of profit accumulation, instead of production for use (Foster, 2002). In other words, food has been commoditized to a money metric like any other commodity that is traded and sold for profit. Instead of growing food for consumption, commodity crops are cultivated to be sold in international markets (de Janvry & LeVeen, 1986). Food was commoditized with the liberalization of trade markets after the Second World War. Since then, the commodity nature of the prevailing agricultural system contributes to the poor being dependent on market fluctuations for food. Poverty and malnutrition in the US is also borne out of the capitalist principles that have commoditized food systems worldwide. Even though food is plenty in the US, the poor do not have the financial means to demand food; in fact, about 50 million people in the US are considered “food insecure” while 40 percent of the food in the US goes uneaten (Magdoff, 2012, Gunders, 2012). Since food is a commodity sold for profit accumulation, the poor in the US must skip meals, rely on food stamps, buy food of lower nutritional value, or receive food assistance from charities (Magdoff, 2012). The expansion of capitalism has induced farmers to specialize and export their farms’ yields. The cultivation of commodity crops typically depends upon industrialized growing methods, which involve the application of chemical inputs that pollute the land, water, and air. US food and farm policies have financially supported the capitalist expansion of industrial agriculture.1 Proponents of industrial agriculture call attention to the improvements in food production that allowed US farmers in 2000 to produce an average 12 times more farm yield per hour than US farmers did in 1950 (Fuglie, MacDonald, & Ball, 2007). While industrialized processes proved successful in producing unprecedented yields, conventional agribusiness growing practices became dependent on environmentally harmful chemical inputs (Leo, Lawrence, & Walker, 2002). Post-WWII, farms replaced natural ecosystem services with chemical inputs to maintain pests, diseases, and weeds (Ikerd, 1993). Today, agribusinesses do not utilize local ecosystem services to produce crops because producing biologically is not profitable; indeed, industrial agriculture’s main purpose is to produce profits, not sustainably grown food. As such, it relies on the application of chemical inputs such as artificial fertilizers, pesticides, or herbicides in order to successfully produce its monocultures. Before the commoditization of food, most farmers selected the plant varieties most compatible with the farm’s local conditions; diversified crop production to hedge against any failures; managed the soil and protected its quality; did not rely on intensive inputs; and finally, considered the production-consumption cycle’s externalities (Feenstra, 2014).

#### Regulation can’t solve---capitalism trends toward monoculture and profit---alt solves best.

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

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

As they put it:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COVID-19 and the Capitalist Food System

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

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

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

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

### Alt Cause---1NR

#### South African market failure is rooted in apartheid era racism, and monopolies are state owned so they can’t be prosecuted

1AC Nair ’19 [BLUE] [Gaylor Montmasson-Clair and Reena; Senior economist at Trade and Industrial Policy Strategies (TIPS), a South Africa based economic policy think-tank, where he leads work on sustainable growth. He has done extensive research on the transition to a sustainable development pathway from a developing country perspective; Founding director of and principal consultant at Optimal Competition and Compliance Solutions based in Lusaka, Zambia. He served as CEO of the Competition Authority in Botswana from 2011 to 2016 and as Executive Director of of the Competition and Consumer Protection Commission of Zambia during the period 2008–2011; Competition Law and Economic Regulation Addressing Market Power in Southern Africa, “Cartel Enforcement in the Southern Africa Neighborhood,” pg. 191-192; KS]

Economic regulation, competitive outcomes and inclusive growth

The presence and persistence of a range of market failures is the most prominent justification for economic regulation. Market failures arise when resources are not allocated or priced efficiently, and when a more optimal outcome would result from reallocating resources and altering prices. Market failures, along with other constraints, impede the poor and marginalised from accessing markets and benefiting from growth, thereby perpetuating inequality and non-inclusive growth (Ali and Son, 2007; Ianchovichina and Lundstrom, 2009; see also chapter 5, this volume).

One type of market failure, and a persuasive justification for regulation, is the presence of natural monopolies. Typical industries that have natural monopoly characteristics and that are commonly subject to regulation include electricity transmission, liquid fuel pipelines, telecommunication infrastructure and water supply systems. In South Africa, economic regulation has focused on regulating the natural monopoly parts of these value chains, which were formerly stateowned and subsequently privatised (Roberts and Mondliwa, 2014).

Another type of market failure arises from non-competitive markets. This can occur when a single firm or groups of firms possess persistent market power which results in less than optimal output being produced with higher resultant prices. The lack of effective competition could result in dominant firms abusing their market power or engaging in collusive behaviour, obtaining rents at the expense of consumers and potential competitors. This has negative implications for productivity and job creation. Uncompetitive markets also result in lower levels of innovation, reduced choice for consumers and poorer quality of goods or services. Not only are direct consumers harmed, but the viability of downstream industries is affected if the product in question is an intermediate input. Furthermore, firms with market power that control essential facilities that cannot easily be replicated or that control key inputs could abuse their dominance by limiting access to their facilities, thereby creating barriers to entry. Regulation can be a way to curb excesses in market power by regulating access to infrastructure as well as other market outcomes, including prices (Viscusi et al., 2000, in Roberts and Mondliwa, 2014).

South Africa’s history and economic policies under apartheid created markets that are highly concentrated, with a few firms in strategic industries possessing considerable market power. Economic opportunity only catered to the interests of minority groups. The state owned and controlled several strategic sectors, such as energy, telecommunications, mining, agriculture and several intermediate industrial product markets. Even following the liberalisation and privatisation trends of the 1990s, most of these industries continue to be highly concentrated while some remain state-owned (Makhaya and Roberts, 2013). Participation by new entrants has typically been constrained through structural or strategic barriers to entry (or both).

## Judicial Avoidance

#### 3---There’s a unique opening for reversing primacy now.

Brown 20, policy associate at Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation. (Zack, 10-31-2020, "The Myth of American Primacy", *National Interest*, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/skeptics/myth-american-primacy-171760)

Wertheim acknowledged that stepping back from our commitment to primacy won’t be easy—nor should it happen overnight. But he does see an opening for change. A big part of it will depend on whether Americans believe that primacy—perhaps necessary in the twentieth century—still pays in the twenty-first.

Increasingly, he said, they’re deciding that it doesn’t.

“There’s a core security argument that has failed the American people: that globe-spanning dominance makes us safe,” Wertheim explained. “It makes us less safe. It creates enemies, antagonisms, and leaves us helpless against the threats of the twenty-first century, as we see in the midst of this pandemic.”

“So, I would wager that the vast majority of Americans think that whatever possible good the United States might do projecting its armed forces permanently around the globe, it’s just outweighed by our urgent needs at home.”

#### 4---Pursuit isn’t inevitable---public beliefs are malleable and shifting.

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

Nearly immune, however, is not immune. Even the most deeply held beliefs find it difficult to survive sustained, long‐​term assaults of contradictory information. Psychologists who have studied evolution in beliefs report that despite occasional epiphanies that instantly change minds, like that of Saul on the road to Damascus, generally speaking the process is very gradual, and sometimes imperceptible.53 Individuals often recognize that a change in their beliefs has occurred after the fact, and they resist admitting that their minds are evolving while the process is under way. There are examples of gradual, even generational evolution of beliefs that can give hope to those seeking to expunge fear and indispensability from U.S. foreign policy.

“Social Darwinism,” for instance, poisoned international politics for decades. The belief that humanity was split into a number of distinct “races” in a perpetual existential struggle where only the fittest survive shaped the worldview of generations of leaders.54 Social Darwinism helped justify any number of pathological policies, from imperialism to the Holocaust, but over time, it collapsed under the weight of rational counterargument and evidence. The identification of DNA and the understanding of the genome allowed science to put social Darwinism and its cousins, eugenics and phrenology, to rest once and for all.55 Previously, internalized beliefs about the inevitability of competition between races were slowly changed by the onslaught of evidence and reason, and the understanding that differences among peoples were cultural rather than genetic. The edifice did not collapse all at once or with equal speed everywhere, but over time arguments based on the foundation of social Darwinism stopped winning popular debates on that “battlefield of beliefs,” and foreign policy behavior changed. Precedent, then, exists for evolution in fundamental beliefs, enough for one to hope that a similar process could eventually change popular perceptions toward modern, counterproductive irrationalities.

Precedent does not supply the only encouragement. Changing the dominant U.S. foreign policy belief system is perhaps not as daunting a challenge as it may at first seem, for a number of reasons. First, as already discussed, only a small number of opinions would have to be altered to have a significant effect. As nice as it is to imagine that the United States runs a democratic foreign policy, in reality not all opinions are equally important. Altering the beliefs of the masses may be quite difficult, but it is those of the elite that are decisive in foreign policy; affecting elites, if only because they are fewer in number, might not prove to be an insurmountable task. As influential as NSC 68 was, for instance, it was an internal document read only by senior government officials, and it remained classified until 1975. The various incarnations of the Committee on Present Danger concentrated their efforts solely on the upper echelons of the foreign policy community, and they were quite successful in affecting foreign policy debate and practice. Success in minimizing pathological foreign policy behavior can occur long before majorities alter their beliefs.

Second, there is reason to believe that foreign policy beliefs are not as entrenched as some others. Many modern American politicians — to say nothing of the people they lead — know very little about foreign policy. The U.S. Congress is a wasteland of parochialism, where members can even be punished for appearing to know too much about the rest of the world.56 Those at the top of the executive branch have been little better. The past three U.S. presidents had no background in foreign affairs before coming into office. Bill Clinton even managed to turn his opponent’s foreign policy expertise into a liability in 1992, claiming that it demonstrated that the elder Bush did not pay adequate attention to domestic concerns. Eight years later, voters were unfazed about George W. Bush’s disinterest in the outside world, as manifest in a record of foreign travel stunningly low for a child of privilege, inability to name leaders of key countries, and devotion of only three pages in his campaign memoir to foreign affairs.57 Although Barack Obama spent large portions of his life abroad, he had no direct foreign policy experience before 2008, and his 2012 opponent had even less. So although 21st-century U.S. presidents have some predetermined beliefs about foreign policy, their beliefs are probably more malleable than those of presidents who have come to office more seasoned in matters of state. Some of the most important, influential minds may not prove to be those most resistant to change.

A third reason for hope can be found in the early indications from the changeover in generations. Generally speaking, young people are more susceptible to the possibility of change, whereas senior members of any generation are much less likely to admit that their long‐​held theories might be wrong. That is particularly true for senior scholars, as Thomas Kuhn has pointed out in his study of paradigms, because they rarely prove eager to adjust the belief systems that have served them well for so long.58 Junior members of any field are much more likely to adopt new theories and beliefs, because they are not as invested in old ways, and they may gain a certain bit of pleasure in tearing down the old shibboleths.59 Public‐​opinion polling has suggested that the youngest generation of adults, the so‐​called millennials, is less concerned about terrorism and less supportive of an activist foreign policy than are its predecessors. Those between the ages of 18 and 29 are half as likely to be concerned about Islamic fundamentalism as those over 60.60 They also appear to be less patriotic.61 It is often said that racism is going away one funeral at a time; perhaps, too, generational change is necessary to relieve some of the pathological popular pressures in the arena of U.S. foreign policy debate.

Finally, it is worth emphasizing that the target of this work is the marketplace of ideas, not the beliefs of every individual who contributes to it. The United States does not always act pathologically, after all. Rational forces are present alongside pathological ones in all foreign policy discussions, and they often win the battle over the direction of policy. It will not require a complete ideological revolution for the United States to minimize the irrational beliefs that plague its foreign policy behavior. Planting the seeds of doubt in influential minds, seeds that can germinate and grow over time, may well prove to be enough to tilt the balance of national debate toward reason. The task of inspiring gradual improvement in U.S. foreign policy performance, therefore, may not be as daunting as it at first seems. In the long run, there is hope, even if few minds will change any time soon.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote, “If we think [the people are] not enlightened enough to exercise control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform that discretion.“62 One of the crucial tasks facing policymakers must be to inform the general public, however slowly and indirectly, of the evidence that might force its members to reexamine their foreign policy beliefs. Because an informed public is one of the central sine qua nons of a healthy, functioning democracy, U.S. leaders ought to repeat the facts about the decline of warfare — and of the real risks associated with terrorism — as many times as necessary for them to become accepted.63 Although simply correcting misinformation will not alter beliefs immediately, over time the constituency for reason will grow.64

Though beliefs are exceptionally slow to change, they eventually do. Few people still believe that the earth is at the center of the universe, for instance, or that insults to honor must be answered by a duel to the death. Assuming for a moment that the current pacific trends in international politics turn out to have staying power, empirical realities will eventually trump pathological geopolitical fear. Even the most deeply held collective beliefs find it hard to persist forever in the face of a sustained onslaught of countervailing evidence. Over time — and perhaps with the change of generations — pure reason can win the battle of beliefs, even if its victory is never certain.

### AT: Transition Wars---1NR

#### 1---Fear of transition wars stem from unbridled American exceptionalism that justifies imperialism---the transition will be peaceful unless we cling to dominance.

Glaser 12, Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (John, April 17th, “American Decline: What the Foreign Policy Elite Really Fear,” *Anti-War Blog*, <https://www.antiwar.com/blog/2012/04/17/american-decline-what-the-foreign-policy-elite-really-fear/>, Accessed 10-20-2021)

There is a fixation in elite foreign policy circles these days to speculate on the impending decline of America’s global economic and military hegemony and to lament that decline as the dangerous end to international order. Without global American dominance, goes the thinking, lawless competition and chaos will rule.

Former Carter administration national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski’s latest book Strategic Vision goes through this lament. He worries that, absent U.S. hegemony, regional powers will be less restrained. Russia will bully tiny Caucasian states like Georgia; China will bully Taiwan; North Korea will threaten South Korea; diminished unilateral support for Israel would destabilize the Middle East; et cetera.

Thomas P.M. Barnett in World Politics Review takes a look at Ian Bremmer’s forthcoming book Every Nation for Itself, another lament of American decline. Post-hegemony, states will be “superseded by a generalized anarchy” in “an era [that] begets a ‘free for all'” and witnesses Asia’s rise, or even more ominously, China’s rise. Bremmer fears a world without the “global leadership” of America to “keep the peace.”

Indeed, this is the most interesting insight I drew from Bremmer’s book: The real danger of a G-Zero world is not the accelerated decline of the West but the unbridled — and unpoliced — appetites of the East. As Bremmer points out repeatedly, Western states need not fear a “world of regions,” his term for an era of pronounced regionalism. By and large, their national structures are more than robust for that scenario. But if it’s regionalism run amuck, the clash of civilizations most unlikely to unfold is not East versus West or West versus South, but East versus South — without a West as referee.

To buy into this is to have very little ability to self-criticize. This line of thinking assumes that the West, and America specifically, has acted like an impartial referee over the international system, which is really an absurd suggestion. What people like Brzezinski and Bremmer and Barnett really fear is not that the Benevolent Empire and the “global order” it preserves will be no more. Rather, the fear is that the selfish, unscrupulous, hypocritical, coercive disposition of other states will prevail instead of the U.S. government’s selfish, unscrupulous, hypocritical, coercive behavior. Other states will get to do the horrible things that only we’ve been able to do for decades.

Overthrowing governments that threaten the state’s supremacy, supporting the world’s worst dictators, committing the supreme international crime of unprovoked war, military bases spanning the globe…these things will no longer be solely American prerogatives.

“The concern over “’decline,'” writes Nikolas Gvosdev, ” is not that the U.S. is about to stop being a superpower; it is that future likely adversaries are not going to be the pushovers the U.S. has gotten used to for the past 20 years.” Daniel Larison comments:

What doesn’t make much sense about “anti-declinist” fearmongering along these lines is that relative decline isn’t something that the U.S. can avoid by making certain policy choices rather than others. It’s certainly possible to sap and exhaust U.S. resources in the fruitless quest to reclaim an unsustainable position. We have spent the last decade doing just that.

The U.S. can react to a multipolar world by demonizing and vilifying other major powers and by punishing them when they fail to fall in line on every international issue, which seems to be the preferred response of the most vocal “anti-declinist” presidential candidate, or it can attempt to find common interests with these other powers. The latter seems advisable, not least because a multipolar world is one in which the demands on and costs to the U.S. are fewer.

#### 2---“Accomodation fails” is elite blackmail that prevents any critical interrogation of American intentions, turns case and justifies the worst forms of oppression and papers over historical violence.

Morefield 19, Associate Professor of Political Theory @ Oxford’s Department of Politics & International Relations (Jeanne, “Challenging Liberal Belief Edward Said and the Critical Practice of History,” Empire, Race and Global Justice, *Cambridge University Press*, pp. 194-197)

This presentist fixation with preserving order because the alternative to American hegemony is always worse stops inquiry in its tracts and demands action, action that, in Said’s words, usually entails “more destruction and death for distant civilizations.”37 There is never time in a disordered world on the brink of catastrophe to reflect on the nature of Sykes–Picot, to stop and think seriously about the history of power lurking behind the looming crisis. Rather, in the minds of liberal internationalists, America is both the hegemonic power that sews together the strands of liberal civilization in a disordered world and perennially in peril.38 This temporally compressed vision reduces the aspirations of all the people in a region as fraught with recent imperial history as the Middle East to a feedback loop of order versus disorder that inadvertently strips democratic protestors, rebel fighters, stateless civilians, children, ethnic minorities, soldiers, and refugees alike of historical context and lived experience. By this logic, if the end of American hegemony signifies the end of the world, any narrative that calls the good intentions of that hegemon into question – whether that narrative issues from anticolonial theorists, “hostile revisionist powers,” or Donald Trump himself – becomes complicit in a project that can only end in Armageddon.39

#### 3---Chinese leadership only threatens American imperialism.

Singh 18, Journalist, and graduate student. He is a contributing author to Keywords in Radical Philosophy and Education: Common Concepts for Contemporary Movements. His work has appeared in The Grayzone, Truthout, teleSUR English, NewsClick, and The Hampton Institute (Ajit, April 9th, “China’s rise threatens U.S. imperialism, not American people,” *Monthly Review Online*, <https://mronline.org/2018/04/09/chinas-rise-threatens-u-s-imperialism-not-american-people/>, Accessed 10-17-2021)

The unipolar-multipolar struggle

The importance of U.S.-China relations cannot be overstated, with the two countries at the core of a broader unipolar-multipolar struggle over the shape of the international order. While the U.S. seeks to secure global dominance, China’s rise is central to a multipolarisation trend, in which multiple centres of power are emerging to shape a negotiated, more democratic world.

China’s political orientation has been fundamentally shaped by its history of subjugation to foreign powers during its “century of humiliation” and anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, China has always identified itself as part of the Third World or global South and the collective struggle of formerly colonized and oppressed nations against the global inequality wrought by imperialism.

Under the banner of “South-South cooperation”, China continues to champion this collective struggle today, promoting greater say for developing countries in global governance and the construction of a rules-based international order in place of the unilateral actions of major powers, in particular the U.S. More than mere rhetoric, China provides crucial investment, infrastructure construction, technology transfers, debt forgiveness, and diplomatic support to developing countries. Most importantly, unlike the U.S. and West which engage in destructive foreign interventions, China abides by the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and does not impose conditions on its relations.

China’s respect for the self-determination of other countries has made it an indispensable partner for nations resisting foreign domination and pursuing independent development, including Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia, Zimbabwe, Syria, Iran, and North Korea. It is for this reason that the late Cuban revolutionary Fidel Castro declared in 2004 that “China has objectively become the most promising hope and the best example for all Third World countries … an important element of balance, progress and safeguard of world peace and stability.” Venezuelan foreign minister Jorge Arreaza echoed these sentiments last December, saying “Thank God humanity can count on China,” as his country faces sanctions, economic sabotage, and threats of regime change from the U.S.

Contributing to the declining global authority of the U.S, China’s international relations have prompted Washington to cynically accuse China of fostering dependency in Africa and being an “imperial power” towards Latin America. In fact, rather than behaving in a predatory manner, China provides sorely needed funding, on favorable terms, to African borrowers, and as we have seen above China supports Latin America’s struggle against imperialism. That China is praised by fiercely independent nations of the global South and faces such charges from the U.S.—the most powerful empire in history—reveals the absurdity of such claims. Anxious about its own decline, the U.S. seeks to both drive a wedge between China and the South, and also restrict the right of developing nations to choose their own partners and path. China has demonstrated that its rise is compatible with the self-determination of other nations—whether capitalist or socialist; what it comes into contradiction with is U.S. imperialism.

It is important to recognize that U.S. hostility towards China is not simply a product of narrow competition with the Asian power, it is a resistance to the empowerment of the global South and democratization of international relations. China is the primary target of U.S. imperialism because of its strategic importance at the heart of the world multipolarisation trend, which threatens to bring an end to U.S. international supremacy and 500 years of Western global dominance.

#### 4---China fear rhetoric is capitalist propaganda premised on a belief in the US as global arbiter of right and wrong, any heg bad arg we win is defense because it disproves the theory that US arbitration is good

1AC Schuman 21 Michael Schuman is a nonresident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council’s Global China Hub, and the author of Superpower Interrupted: The Chinese History of the World and The Miracle: The Epic Story of Asia’s Quest for Wealth. “China Wants to Rule the World by Controlling the Rules,” *The Atlantic,* 12/9/21. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/12/china-wants-rule-world-controlling-rules/620890/

To truly understand the contours of the growing competition between the United States and China, look beyond the corridors of power in Washington and Beijing, past the tensions in the waters and skies around Taiwan, away from the bellicose rhetoric at international forums, and even off the tennis court, the new front opened by the trauma of Peng Shuai. Instead, look to the courtroom.

In the U.S. and much of the liberal West, the concept of the “rule of law” is vital to a properly functioning society—the idea (at least in theory) that the law is impartial, independent, and applied evenly and consistently to all, and that it serves to protect the innocent, including from the state. China’s leaders, however, follow the concept of the “rule by law,” in which the legal system is a tool used to assure Communist Party dominance; courts are forums for imposing the government’s will. The state can do just about anything it wants, and then find some helpful language in the “laws” to justify it.

To see these differing perspectives in action, consider the case of Meng Wanzhou, the chief financial officer of the Chinese telecom giant Huawei Technologies, who was arrested in Vancouver in late 2018 on behalf of the U.S. Justice Department, which indicted her for bank fraud. From the American point of view, the case was a matter of law enforcement: The Justice Department accused Meng of lying to a major international bank about Huawei’s business in Iran, causing financial transactions that violated Washington’s sanctions on that country. Prosecutors were vindicated when Meng confirmed the substance of the case in an agreement reached in September that allowed her to avoid a U.S. trial and return to China.

In Beijing, however, the case was never perceived as anything but political. China’s Foreign Ministry deemed Meng’s indictment “a political frame-up … designed to hobble Chinese high-tech.” Thus for Beijing, the case demanded a political solution. In July, when U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Wendy Sherman met with her Chinese counterparts, they handed her two lists of demands that included dropping the case against Meng. Her eventual release was heralded within China as a diplomatic triumph. (Huawei, in a comment attributed to Meng’s lawyer, William W. Taylor, noted that she did not plead guilty, and asserted that “we fully expect the indictment will be dismissed.”)

In a narrow sense, the episode illustrates rival superpowers seeking to pressure each other, just one part of a wider global conflagration. Yet this view misses the larger lesson of the case. Meng’s arrest and subsequent release point to something far deeper and longer-lasting, with the potential to reshape how the modern world works.

For 75 years, the United States has been the world’s self-anointed rule writer and enforcer. Intent on preventing another global bloodletting on the scale of World War II, Washington attempted to craft a world order cemented in shared norms, with international institutions to enshrine and uphold them. Backing it all up was the might of the American military. That order has been imperfect, subject to abuse by an array of countries—America included—but it has kept a lid on big-power conflict, while spreading economic prosperity and democratic principles across much of the globe. It’s an order that, though somewhat tattered, the Biden administration is striving to maintain with, for instance, today’s Summit for Democracy.

But the American monopoly on rule writing is now facing its stiffest challenge since the fall of the Soviet Union. As China rises in stature, Beijing is promoting its own concepts about global governance, development, and international relations, grasping influence at institutions such as the United Nations to infuse these concepts into global discourse, and using its growing wealth and military might to contest the existing norms of the American world system.

Ultimately, this is what the Meng dispute is really about: a widening confrontation between the U.S. and China over who sets the rules on trade and technology, climate change, and public health. Fundamentally, it is about the principles and precepts that guide how countries, companies, and individuals interact on a global scale, a competition over whether the world will be one of the “rule of law” or the “rule by law.”

The main purpose of the West’s original policy of engagement with China was to avoid this very situation. By integrating Beijing into the U.S.-led system, the thinking went, the Chinese leadership would see its benefits and come to support it. On a certain level, the plan succeeded. China has been a major beneficiary of the American order—perhaps the biggest of all. The security, trade, and cross-border investment fostered by the U.S. order propelled China’s rise from poverty, while Beijing eagerly immersed itself in U.S.-backed institutions such as the World Trade Organization.

Yet today, China’s paramount leader, Xi Jinping, appears to consider the U.S. system a constraint on Chinese power. For a proud autocracy, the American order can seem an unfriendly, even threatening place, one where liberal political values reign supreme, and the Chinese form of government is perceived as illegitimate, while Chinese companies and officials are vulnerable to foreign sanction and Chinese ambitions are hemmed in. From Xi’s perspective, it is critical that Beijing rewrite the rules to better suit its interests and, more broadly, those of authoritarian states. Simply, Xi intends to flip the global hierarchy, placing illiberal governments and ideals at its apex.

Xi “wants to dominate the rule of law,” Jerome Cohen, a longtime expert in Chinese law, told me. Xi believes that “you have to have rules that suit the interest of the majority of countries,” and “he sees the Anglo-Americans as being a minority now,” Cohen continued. “That minority should be governed by the autocracies of the world who are amenable to the Chinese point of view.”

The U.S. has faced a similar challenge before, from the Soviet Union during the Cold War. But because China is more integrated into the American order, especially economically, than the Soviets ever were, it presents a more dangerous threat. Beijing is attacking the world order in a pincer movement. From the outside, it markets its ideas, governance, and development model as superior to the West’s; from the inside, it works within the very institutions and networks that bind the U.S. order together.

Take, for instance, the Belt and Road Initiative, Xi’s pet program that finances and builds railways, power stations, and other infrastructure in developing nations. This undertaking is an effort to change the way international development is done by offering an alternative to the established practices of the Western powers and their institutions, such as the World Bank. Beijing’s state banks generally don’t follow the norms on lending to poor nations designed (after much trial and error) by other major creditor countries, nor has China participated in processes to manage that debt, such as the Paris Club. Instead, Chinese lending is based on China’s rules, often with less transparent terms and weaker standards on labor practices, corruption, and environmental protection. Kristen Cordell, a development policy expert, wrote in a 2020 report on Belt and Road that “the willingness of China to abide by international rules and processes for these investments has been secondary to its interest of shaping norms for its favor.”

Meanwhile, China’s inroads at the United Nations show how the country is eating away at the American order from its very core. Beijing is using its influence to promote Belt and Road. It also employs its growing clout to infuse the institution with its own ideological principles on issues such as human rights and state sovereignty. Last year, at the UN’s Human Rights Council, 53 countries sided with China on its controversial imposition of a national-security law on Hong Kong, which allowed authorities to crack down on the city’s prodemocracy movement; at this year’s UN General Assembly, more than 60 members trumpeted China’s position on human rights—essentially, that a nation’s rights violations are none of the world’s business. Taken together, these efforts, a 2019 report by the Center for a New American Security contended, “will hasten the export of some of the most harmful aspects of China’s political system, including corruption, mass surveillance, and the repression of individual and collective rights.”

Elsewhere, Beijing has ignored an international ruling and the protestations of its neighbors over its expansion in the South China Sea, a vital waterway for global trade that it claims is mostly China’s sovereign territory. There, Beijing is effectively attempting to rewrite the standard norms on territorial waters and free navigation, basing its position on China’s purported historical role in the area going back more than 2,000 years to the Han dynasty, and other dubious assertions. To solidify its grip, China has also utilized bullying and threats: Its coast guard harasses other nations’ ships, and its fishing vessels crowd into waters other governments contend they have the right to exploit. Beijing also built man-made islands in the region and stacked them with military installations. The nations that share the South China Sea, all smaller and in some cases poorer, have struggled to hold their own.

And then there is the Meng case. She was ostensibly a private citizen working for an ostensibly private company, but China used the full might of its government apparatus to defend her. Along with raising her case in the meeting with Deputy Secretary of State Sherman and through other channels, Beijing also held two Canadian citizens, the former diplomat Michael Kovrig and the businessman Michael Spavor, who were arrested in China only days after Meng was detained in Canada. The move was widely seen as an attempt to pressure authorities in Ottawa to intervene and short-circuit the extradition process, and the differing treatment of Meng and “the two Michaels” illustrates the gulf in the differing perceptions of the rule of law between the U.S. (and other democracies) and China. While Meng defended herself in public hearings, Kovrig and Spavor faced undefined spying charges in closed-door trials. As the process dragged on, the pair rotted in Chinese prisons while Meng cooled her heels in a Vancouver mansion and indulged in fancy dinners and lavish shopping sprees.

Beijing authorities pretended the affairs weren’t connected, but the truth that the two Canadians were no more than human bargaining chips was laid bare when the pair were immediately released upon Meng’s settlement with the Justice Department. In a postmortem of the affair, Scott Kennedy, senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, wrote that “Beijing’s actions reconfirmed the international community’s conclusion that China has no regard for rule of law.”

What xi’s world order might look like isn’t clear. He hasn’t elucidated a complete vision for a replacement system. On the surface, the language he proffers to describe the workings of a new order sounds innocuous enough. He talks of a “community of common destiny,” with diplomacy based on “win-win cooperation” and “mutual respect,” in which different social and political systems are accepted. But this is code for a downgrading of democracy. Unlike the current order, in which liberal democracy is held up as the sole legitimate form of governance, Xi’s version would raise authoritarianism to equal, or even superior, status. This would likely result in a world where Washington and its allies can’t decide which states deserve to be sanctioned for the global good, as they define it, one where Chinese executives such as Meng cannot end up in foreign courtrooms for allegedly violating the law. Such a system would suit Beijing’s preference to do business with anybody who wants to buy and trade.

Xi wants to usurp the U.S. role as arbiter of global rights and wrongs, based on an entirely different set of criteria, such as who does and does not support Chinese interests and power. Beijing regularly imposes sanctions of its own on countries it views as a threat to its interests. Australia, for example, has faced severe economic coercion, including effective bans on key exports, for supporting an independent investigation into the origins of the coronavirus pandemic, which Beijing considers an attempt to undermine Communist rule. When Lithuania recently cozied up toTaiwan, Beijing downgraded its diplomatic relations and blocked imports from the country.

“It’s really about replacing a rule-of-law, equality-between-states system with a hierarchical sensibility that privileges authoritarianism,” Matt Pottinger, chair of the China program at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies and deputy national security adviser in the Trump administration, told me. If Beijing succeeds, he added, “the international order would be far more Machiavellian, and the UN system would reward the most Mafia-like players.”

That’s bad enough for the U.S., but it’s downright dangerous for countries that aren’t superpowers—which means most of them. These countries seek protection in a rules-based order, one where they can (at least in theory) stand up to bullying from more powerful states by utilizing the rule of law. One reason the government of Australia has taken a hard line on aspects of Chinese foreign policy is its commitment to defending the current order. Former Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull wrote last year that “it was manifestly in our interests to maintain respect for the rule of law in our region because that was the only way we, and other smaller states, could be sure of preserving our own freedom and sovereignty.”

Confronted by this opposing set of global rules, Washington continues to try to uphold its own. Huawei is still facing Justice Department lawsuits, for theft of trade secrets and racketeering, among other charges. (A Huawei spokesperson said the company “will continue to defend itself” in the latter case but had no comment on the former.) The U.S. Navy routinely sends squadrons through the South China Sea to maintain freedom of navigation, shrugging off apoplectic tirades from Beijing. President Joe Biden has proposed an alternative to China’s Belt and Road Initiative that would strengthen standards of development and lending for needy nations. Washington also looks set to initiate a new regional economic partnership in Asia.

The United States might also consider joining and bolstering agreements such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Though considered a trade pact, TPP is, in fact, packed with standards on labor and environmental protections, as well as other key issues for the global economy.

In the end, the U.S. and China will likely never agree on what the global order should be, and they’re never likely to abide by the other’s rules. Ultimately, neither power can fully enforce its version of the rules, either. To a certain extent, they both prefer it that way. “The big powers don’t want impartial independent adjudication of their behavior under prevailing international norms,” Cohen pointed out. “They want to settle things themselves.”

The battle over rules is really about power—which country has it, and which country can project it. The U.S. has held this power for decades; the Chinese now want it for themselves.
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An even deadlier phase may be dawning. Because the United States pursues armed dominance as a self-evident good, the establishment feels threatened by a rising China and an assertive Russia. “Some of you will join the fight on the Korean Peninsula and in the Indo-Pacific,” Mr. Pence told the cadets, noting that “an increasingly militarized China challenges our presence in the region.” But China’s rise invalidates primacy’s rationale of deterrence and shows that other powers have ambitions of their own. Addressing the rise of China responsibly will require abandoning nostalgia for the pre-eminence that America enjoyed during the 1990s.

Despite Mr. Trump’s rhetoric about ending endless wars, the president insists that “our military dominance must be unquestioned” — even though no one believes he has a strategy to use power or a theory to bring peace. Armed domination has become an end in itself. Which means Americans face a choice: Either they should openly espouse endless war, or they should chart a new course.

As an American and an internationalist, I choose the latter. Rather than chase an illusory dominance, the United States should pursue the safety and welfare of its people while respecting the rights and dignity of all. In the 21st century, finally rid of colonial empires and Cold War antagonism, America has the opportunity to practice responsible statecraft, directed toward the promotion of peace. Responsible statecraft will oppose the war-making of others, but it will make sure, first and foremost, that America is not fueling violence.

On its own initiative, the United States can proudly bring home many of its soldiers currently serving in 800 bases ringing the globe, leaving small forces to protect commercial sea lanes. It can reorient its military, prioritizing deterrence and defense over power projection. It can stop the obscenity that America sends more weapons into the world than does any other country. It can reserve armed intervention, and warlike sanctions, for purposes that are essential, legal and rare.

Shrinking the military’s footprint will deprive presidents of the temptation to answer every problem with a violent solution. It will enable genuine engagement in the world, making diplomacy more effective, not less. As the United States stops being a party to every conflict, it can start being a party to resolving conflicts. President Obama’s nuclear agreement with Iran and, to a lesser extent, President Trump’s opening with North Korea suggest that historical enmities can be overcome. Still, these steps have not gone far enough to normalize relations and allow us to get on with living together in a world whose chief dangers — climate change, disease, deprivation — cross borders and require cooperation.

Hawks will retort that lowering America’s military profile will plunge the world into a hostile power’s arms. They are projecting, assuming that one rival will covet and attain the kind of armed domination that has served America poorly. Russia, with an economy the size of Italy’s, cannot rule Europe, whatever it desires. China bears watching but has so far focused its military on denying access to its coasts and mainland. It is a long way from undertaking a costly bid for primacy in East Asia, let alone the world.

In any case, local states are likely to step up if the American military pulls back. The world conjured by the Washington establishment is an empty space, a “power vacuum,” waiting passively to be led. The real world is full of people ready to safeguard their freedom. Today a world with less American militarism is likely to have less militarism in general.

Hawks also warn that restraint will produce chaos, dooming the “rules-based,” “liberal international order.” Ambassador James F. Jeffrey, President Trump’s envoy for Syria, recently told a version of this tale when he pounded the table in anger at Americans’ objections to “endless war.” “Literally scores and scores of American military operations,” he said, “undergird this global security regime and thus undergird the American and Western and U.N. values system.”

But there’s a reason no one can connect the dots from unceasing interventions to a system of law and order. After decades of unilateral actions, crowned by the aggressive invasion of Iraq, it is U.S. military power that threatens international law and order. Rules should strengthen through cooperation, not wither through imposition.

In truth, the largest obstacle to ending endless war is self-imposed. Long told that the United States is the world’s “indispensable nation,” the American people have been denied a choice and have almost stopped demanding one. A global superpower — waging endless war — is just “who we are.”
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Yet, the contemporary ascension of nationalist and populist movements and leaders that herald deeply illiberal views (Xi included) must come as no surprise after decades of neoliberal triumphalism and the promotion of a transnational order that placed the crafting of a world market above the needs of societies themselves. In such a context, the contemporary rise of nationalism and populisms across the world is not some liberal order antithesis emerging from a vacuum, but rather a logical consequence of this liberal order, constituting an often reactionary ‘counter movement’ that cannot be tackled with liberal prescriptions for increased market globalization (Polanyi, 2001). This paper takes aim at the now long-held and recently revitalized argument for a liberal peace. While not attempting to predict any specific outcome regarding the future of global peace, it argues that the rise of illiberal and reactionary discourses that we now observe, and their potential corollaries, must be understood in a dialectical sense as the result of a liberal market-oriented inter-state order that failed to tackle the great social dislocation that it played a fundamental role in fomenting.

To develop this critique, I draw upon three main bodies of literature that, despite their apparent affinities, are seldom brought together. These include Polanyi and Gramsci-inspired understandings of hegemonic crisis, counter-movements, and the rise of nationalism and populism (Gill, 2015; Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017); critical political economies of social conflict within a context of neoliberal globalization (Harvey, 2005; Springer, 2015); and political geography analyses of international relations theory (IRT), and more specifically critical geographies of peace (Agnew & Corbridge, 1995; Flint, 2005; Koopman, 2016; McConnell, Megoran, & Williams, 2014; Megoran, 2011; Nagle, 2010; Williams & McConnell, 2011). Elaborating upon these, I contend that the methodological nationalism of the disciplines of economics and international relations – in which much of the liberal view is based – has left them in a sorry state in making sense of recent political development throughout the world, specifically when addressing the contemporary rise of reactionary forms of populism.

In this sense, the high degrees of violence and vulnerability associated with processes of market integration have often escaped the radars of economics and IR analyses, fixated as they are with mono-scale scrutiny of national economies and state-to-state relations. Although some liberal IR scholars have laid the grounds for a less normative paradigm that incorporates domestic variables and bottom-up societal processes into the understanding of state action, the assumption remains that policy interdependence and compatibility between states, combined with the Pareto-efficient outcomes of globally integrated production and trade, result in ‘strong incentives for coexistence with low conflict’ (Moravcsik, 1997, p. 521; see also Oneal & Russett, 1997; McDonald & Sweeney, 2007). Recent developments suggest there are fundamental flaws with this largely deductive hypothesis. Whereas on aggregate terms, and according to some measurements, nation-states may have benefitted more or less from globalization, social conflict occurring at multiple scales – and indeed in a class-based dimension – is an undeniable constitutive element of state action, the latter reflecting and/or attempting to contain particular constellations of social forces and their interests. In this way, the damage inflicted upon many by increasingly disembedded markets and post-political states that shield policy from popular deliberation (both the products of the liberal agenda) are at the very root of the current crisis of liberal hegemony (Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017).

In what follows, I draw upon a variety of cases to explain how a dialectical approach to liberalism, neoliberalism and their illiberal responses,1 and a multi-scalar analysis of market violence are indispensable in explaining much of the turbulence that world politics faces today. To be clear, the paper’s goal is not to deny that state leaders factor in the economic repercussions of conflict when they contemplate its possibility – a logical assumption of liberal international relations scholarship. The aim is instead to argue that these calculations tell very little about the nature of peace and conflict as historically bounded processes that need to be studied in relation to broader transformations in the global political economy, the latter affecting state behaviour in terms of both economic policy and inter-state rivalry. In this way, and crucially, I also wish to refute the liberal argument that the pursuit of economic integration at any (social) cost will unequivocally lower the prospects for international conflict or, indeed, structural violence more broadly understood as a multi-scalar phenomenon.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section problematizes the concept of peace in IRT, with a more detailed discussion of economic liberalism. The following section presents a temporal critique, contextualizing the contemporary rise of illiberal politics within the transformation of the global political economy under world market capitalism. After this, I build upon Agnew (1994) to develop a scalar critique and argue that liberalism’s methodological nationalism hampers a proper assessment of the transnational dimensions of processes such as development, violence or peace. I chart various scales of market-induced violence and vulnerability (as a form of economic violence) in the global era, tracing the rescaling of violence and risk from the interstate scale to the individual sphere. I conclude by discussing the transition from a ‘durable disorder’ (Cerny, 1998) to an emerging (albeit contested) new populist order under world market capitalism. To do so, I echo Polanyi and Marx in contending that processes of marketization, replete as they are with contradiction, cannot engender liberal or capitalist peace, but result instead in anti-liberal reactions of various kinds (what Polanyi called ‘counter movements’) to the violence of unrestrained markets. Importantly, these counter movements can often take reactionary characteristics, as people under threat or the perception of threat retreat into culture and nationalism against the ‘other’ and internationalism in all its variants.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE LIBERAL PEACE

While the pursuit of peace is a central preoccupation for progressive IR scholarship, peace as a concept and as an actual manifestation is rarely discussed in the IR literature. Instead, peace often appears as a negative occurrence, intuitively understood as the avoidance of war or an absence of overt inter-state violence (Galtung, 1969; Richmond, 2016, p. 57). Thereby, most IR literature focuses on the challenges to state-based peace, with commentary typically dominated by the two main competing schools, realism and liberalism, both subdivided into further dissenting subcamps. Conventional realist approaches take the ‘anarchic’ or violent nature of international politics as a given and place their focus on states’ survival strategies. Offensive realists warn of the disruptive effects of ‘power transitions’ and in the contemporary context claim, for example, that as China grows economically and militarily, and as its interests expand and it seeks greater influence, tensions with other countries are certain to arise (Mearsheimer, 2014). Defensive neorealists hold similar assumptions about the foundations of the international system, yet contend that states privilege security over domination and that the incentives for conflict are contingent rather than endemic, with balances of power potentially keeping states at bay and preventing conflict (Waltz, 1979).

Liberal theorists dispute these interpretations and reject that competition alone guides state behaviour. Elaborating on the Kantian ideal of ‘perpetual peace’, and drawing upon Adam Smith, David Ricardo or John Stuart Mill, liberal theories contend that economic integration and institutional enmeshment or socialization exercise a constraining force on conflict and are conductive to peaceful scenarios (Doyle, 1986; Howard, 1981; Johnston, 2008; Keohane & Nye, 1977). While there is no absolute agreement on the exact shape that such ‘interdependence’ should take (Mansfield & Pollins, 2001), liberal IR scholars often hold that large-scale conflict in the 21st century can be avoided if the liberal world order survives the relative decline of the United States and manages to assimilate rising powers such as China. The emphasis is placed both on institutions and norms of reciprocity, on the one hand, and on economic integration, on the other. Regarding the latter, and evoking Smithian language, the agenda for a ‘capitalist peace’ assumes that free markets represent ‘“a hidden hand” that  …  build(s) up irrevocable and peaceful connections between states’ (Gartzke, 2007; Richmond, 2008, p. 23), and that ‘put simply, globalisation promotes peace’ (Gartzke & Li, 2003, p. 562). The theory is in many ways deductive, but relies also on the statistical data that on aggregate tends partially to support the liberal peace argument (except for the period leading to the First World War; see also Barbieri, 1996) and on the ‘logic’ that national leaders are not expected to act irrationally or be insensitive ‘to economic loss and the preferences of powerful domestic actors’ (Hegre, Oneal, & Russett, 2010, p. 772).

A more nuanced exposition of the liberal argument suggests that what brings nations together and heightens the opportunity cost of conflict is market integration according to a set of commonly devised regulations – rather than the realization of an ideal ‘free’ trade archetype (Moravcsik, 2005). This results in a sort of ‘embedded liberalism’, with the successful integration of post-Soviet states and China in world market capitalism through World Trade Organization (WTO) membership and other liberalizing initiatives understood as a deterrent to military action and, hence, as an effective strategy for both global growth and security, particularly in the face of China’s rising economic and military might (Funabashi, Oksenberg, & Weiss, 1994). From this perspective, not only is violence avoidable but also peace may indeed be engineered with the creation of a world market society being key to this endeavour as well as to the broader goal of crafting a liberal hegemony able to deliver a veritable ‘end of history’ where markets and functioning liberal democracies prevail (Fukuyama, 1992). The engineering of market-orientated democracies has indeed often been the main task of liberal peace- and state-building operatives in post-conflict areas (Campbell, Chandler, & Sabaratnam, 2011).

Yet, decades of neoliberal integration have not brought Fukuyama’s prophecy closer to its realization. Across the world, liberal market integration has facilitated convivial relations among key countries and paid important dividends to elites, yet it has also resulted in the concentration of wealth in ever fewer hands, rising inequalities within countries (although not between them) and higher concentration of wealth at the top, and increased risks and vulnerability as the logic of market competitiveness takes hold of many aspects of our lives (Anand & Segal, 2015; Lynch, 2006). The relation between the United States and China or the processes of economic integration in the European Union are clear examples of these trends. In these places as well as others, inequalities, precarization and economic insecurity have given way to a populist and nationalist momentum that can be interpreted both as a popular response to the extreme and diverse forms of violence engendered by processes of market integration, or as a manoeuvre to channel discontent towards the ‘other’ in order to protect elite interests (Gonzalez-Vicente & Carroll, 2017). By prescribing ever more market globalization to counter populist politics and avoid conflict, liberal elites add fuel to the fire as they sever the very conditions that led to the disfranchisement of significant segments of the population in the first place. Thereby, it is crucial to understand how the argument for capitalist peace fails to factor in the crisis-prone and socially destructive tendencies of capitalism, particularly in a context of unfenced global competitiveness along market lines.2

Two of the underlying problems in the liberal peace argument stand out. The first has to do with the statistical selection of fixed points in time that suggest correlations between growth in trade and diminished conflict – while failing to discern mechanisms of causation (Hayes, 2012). A wider temporal lens is needed to situate the contemporary rise of mercantilist and illiberal politics in the context of neoliberal globalization, representing the same sort of ‘counter movement’ that Polanyi had warned of in his reading of the 19th-century downward spiral towards war – aided in our contemporary case by the demise of the traditional left (Blyth & Matthijs, 2017; Carroll & Gonzalez-Vicente, 2017). The second problem relates to liberal international political economy and IRT’s scalar fixation on inter-state matters and hence their inability to factor in violence in the absence of war. I turn now to these two points.

NEOLIBERALISM’S ILLIBERAL MOMENT AS COUNTER MOVEMENT

On paper, the two intertwined arguments for liberal peace would seem to make sense: if countries remove the barriers to trade and investment and choose to specialize in their comparative advantages, international productivity will be raised and we will enjoy a more prosperous global economy with satisfied consumers and states; also, if states develop close economic linkages, they will have important material incentives to avoid conflict with one another. In the real world, competition between jurisdictions and social groups implies often that the development and prosperity of some is based on the exploitation and vulnerability of others, as typically emphasized by the extensive literature on bifurcated economies, temporally constrained and contradictory growth patterns, and uneven and destructive forms of development. In this way, it is not that economic interdependence, when removed from its social context and put under the microscope, does not raise the costs of conflict. However, the political choices and social transformations needed to achieve interdependence are a key variable to understanding a state’s behaviour and predisposition to conflict. And while governments may in many junctures align with the interests of capital, they are not immune to crises of legitimacy, and will need to mediate issues of accumulation and social cohesion when people perceive the social transformations required to achieve interdependence to have a negative impact on their lives (Jessop, 2016, p. 189). This will reflect in a way or another on state behaviour as political elites, current and prospective, jostle for votes and/or legitimacy.

A key problem with the argument for liberal peace lies in its emphasis on narrow temporal correlations between trade and (lack of) conflict, which removes interdependence from its broader political economic context, disembedding peace and conflict from the broader set of historically bounded and politically contingent social relations that underpin them. A widened analytical timeframe renders clear the dialectical relationship between (neo)liberal social projects and their social responses, both progressive and reactionary. Whereas high volumes of trade may coincide at a particular ‘optimal’ period of liberal expansionism with interstate peace, they may also transform societies in ways that engender the conditions for a potential ‘illiberal’ turn or counter movement resulting in a higher risk of conflict as beggar-thy-neighbour positions emerge and new enemies need to be sought by political elites to bind national-constrained constituencies to their agendas to maintain power.

We can observe this temporal incongruity in the work of some of the key proponents of the capitalist peace. For example, Oneal and Russett (1999, p. 439) argue that trade ‘sharply reduces the onset of or involvement in militarized disputes among contiguous and major-power pairs’, which are identified by Maoz and Russett (1993) as the set of countries more likely to enter into conflict with each other. Despite Oneal and Russett’s sophisticated approach to the data (modelling, for example, to avoid ‘false negatives’ by factoring in geographic contiguity, or controlling for alliances) and the attention paid to statistical rejections of the liberal peace argument, trade interdependence and the occurrence of conflict are analyzed on a year-by-year basis (Oneal & Russett, 1999, p. 428). This is also the case with other comparable studies (Hegre, 2000; Oneal & Russett, 2001; Souva & Prins, 2006). This temporal frame is problematic, as inter-national conflict tends to build up over prolonged periods of time, and the adverse impacts of interdependence and liberal integration are more likely to result first in crisis and social dislocation, followed by some sort of economic distancing (perhaps under a new administration that replaces the one that embraced liberalization) and a wide range of policy measures, before leading to military conflict – underpinned either by the state that perceives that liberal integration is having negative impacts on socioeconomic development, or more often than not by the one which wants to prevent the deterioration of important trade and investment links.

Here, one vital issue often left out of the liberal peace equations is the fact that most military interventions in the post-Second World War period were aimed at disciplining countries that opted out of the United States’ global liberalizing project and sought to pursue a variety of indigenous pathways to modernity, often including many that did so under the rubric of socialism, democratically achieved or otherwise. The reverse is also true, as countries that chose to ally with the United States during the Cold War were shielded from attacks, and in some cases given preferential trade access, technology transfer and allowed to engage in market protection. In this context, associating conflict with the lack of strong trade links, rather than to the meticulous unfolding of a market-based imperial agenda, would be tantamount to concluding that low opium consumption was responsible for British military expeditions in 19th-century China. While there is certainly a correlation between China’s ban on opium and British intervention, nobody could seriously suggest that opium consumption reduces interstate conflict. Similarly, in many of these cases, it is not that the absence of trade results in conflict, but on the contrary, that military intervention has often been aimed at expanding markets and protecting investment.

### Global South Impact---1NR

#### Promoting U.S. leadership directly furthers imperialist exportation of neoliberalism---that locks the Global South into cycles of debt and austerity, trapping billions in abject poverty.

Gopalan 20, Ph.D. candidate in Social Anthropology at Harvard University researching the reproduction of inequality and poverty in rural western India. Her writing about development and the Global South can be found in Jacobin, The Nation, scroll.in, The Wire & Current Affairs (Aparna, Winter, “Socialist Internationalism as if the Global South Mattered,” *Socialist Forum*, <https://socialistforum.dsausa.org/issues/winter-2020/socialist-internationalism-as-if-the-global-south-mattered/>, Accessed 10-20-2021)

Who Is Global Economic Governance For?

From 1981 to 2017, the number of the world’s poor rose by one billion people. This rise in global poverty has been discussed by scholars such as Sanjay Reddy, Camelia Minoiu, Arjun Jayadev, and Rahul Lahoti, in addition to being thoroughly documented in Jason Hickel’s compelling new book The Divide. But it is not a fact that we would never even learn if we relied on numbers produced by the UN or other global bodies. This is because the very same institutions which want to claim the end of poverty have long been responsible for reproducing it. While claiming to prioritize development aid to the Global South, global economic institutions have engineered a world where the net flow of money is from poor to rich countries. For every dollar of aid poor countries receive, they send $24 back to rich countries in net outflows. Poor countries have been “developing” rich ones year after year, not the other way around.

The World Bank and IMF, both of which turned 75 in 2019, are tremendously important to this story. The Bank alone has a staff of 10,587 people. In 2017, it made loans and investments of $59 billion across the world. Since its founding it has lent about $1 trillion. Any debt is always the establishment of a power relationship and this is the case with the Bank as well. Its loans buy it influence over the economic policy of debtor countries, especially since no country is able to borrow from the World Bank without becoming susceptible to IMF conditions on and management of its economic performance. With the Bank as “good cop” and IMF as “bad cop,” we have reached a situation where, according to the UN, the richest fifth of the world’s population earned some 80 times more than the poorest.

One way to understand the power of the Bretton Woods institutions is to juxtapose an early case of their lending with a later one to understand how their power has grown since they were established in July 1944. In 1947, the Bank’s second president, John McCloy, approved a post-war reconstruction loan to France on the condition that it balance its budget, increase taxes, and cut luxury imports under U.S. supervision. France protested this as an infringement of sovereignty but acceded to all the conditions, including implicit ones like the removal of Communist leaders from Cabinet under the orders of the U.S. State Department. By contrast, in 1989 Jordan stopped making payments on its bilateral loans and approached the Bretton Woods institutions to reschedule its debt payments. In return for a five year plan to cut subsidies and privatize public goods, the IMF gave Jordan $125 million and the World Bank gave it $100 million. The price of fuel, bread, rice, milk, and sugar skyrocketed and protests broke out which cost many lives.

We can note four salient changes between 1947 and 1989. First, when the U.S. government and its key allies gathered at the Bretton Woods conference in New Hampshire, their aim was the economic restoration of war-torn Europe. The IMF provided short-term loans to offset balance of payments deficits and the Bank provided long term, lower-interest loans for rebuilding destroyed infrastructure. As a 1979 Senate Committee report readily acknowledges: “No arguments were made that these agencies would have a beneficial impact on economic development and growth in poor countries, and indeed [they] were not originally designed for that purpose.”

Second, in the early years Bretton Woods institutions were very cautious and risk-averse about lending and only lent when they felt assured of full and timely repayment. In contrast, by the 1980s their lending practices were rather profligate. This was because investors’ profits no longer came from the total repayment of debt but rather from the interest accrued during endless debt refinancing.

Third, the early history of Bretton Woods institutions had nothing to do with the thing for which they are now best known: poverty alleviation. Until the 1960s, lending went almost exclusively to capital projects – white elephants like dams and highways which were sure to yield safe returns. By contrast, since the1980s, an increasingly risk-immune World Bank and IMF have lent freely toward (privatizing) social sectors like health and education in addition to more profitable sectors like energy.

Finally, the early Bretton Woods institutions were concerned with keeping government spending up so as to avoid a depression, an agenda which has been totally reversed as the push to reduce all government spending took over in the 1980s.

All these significant changes in how they profit must be understood in context of the Bretton Woods institutions’ remarkable consistency in who they profit and whose interests they serve. As the third president of the World Bank (and former Chase bank executive) Eugene Black openly acknowledged:

Our foreign aid programs constitute a distinct benefit to American business…foreign aid provides a substantial and immediate market for United States goods and services… [it] orients national economies toward a free enterprise system in which United States’ firms can prosper.

The importance of these goals hasn’t changed, only intensified. Today’s Bretton Woods institutions remain committed to opening markets for big U.S. business and to defending U.S. lenders and investors abroad. They also remain tied to U.S. military and strategic interests, rewarding allies and punishing detractors.

The Silent Subprime Crisis: 1968-2020

Profiting off of Third World debt is a relatively new phase in the operations of the World Bank and IMF, and one that merits a closer look. The roots of this crisis, like the roots of the global neoliberal turn, lie in the 1970s. In the U.S., that decade opened in with falling rates of corporate profit, a Treasury strained by an unwinnable war in Vietnam, and intense social upheaval at home. When the OPEC cartel’s oil price hike was added to this explosive mix, things escalated very quickly. As Damien Millet and Eric Toussaint explain in their book Who Owes Who, “From 1973, the increase in oil prices…brought in comfortable revenues to the oil-producing countries which in turn placed them in Western banks. The banks offered to lend these ‘petrodollars’ to the countries of the South, with the incentive of low rates of interest.” Western banks’ investment motives dovetailed with Western governments’ desire to export more of their overproduced goods to the developing world, which it could only afford to buy with debt. Thus began the era of “go go banking,” where banks like Citibank and Chase would fly agents around the world to push loans onto Third World leaders, increasingly without much regard to their ability to repay.

The architect of this early subprime debt market was none other than Robert McNamara, former Ford Motor executive and the Secretary of Defense responsible for the U.S. invasion of Vietnam. Once appointed World Bank president from 1968 to 1981, McNamara was no less war-like in his approach to development lending. As Michael Goldman has shown, in his book Imperial Nature, McNamara was the president responsible for aggressively expanding the Bank’s lending portfolio. He did so ingeniously. McNamara turned to financial markets (e.g. European pension funds) to fund all new lending without requiring any paid-in capital from the U.S. and other economic powers. He managed to do this thanks to the rising hunger of investors for new venues of assured profit, thus insulating the World Bank from U.S. government funding and associated critics who worried about the viability of the Bank’s new “soft” portfolio of Third World poverty alleviation loans. Lending now became less cautious and less restricted to capital heavy projects, spreading to “risky” sectors like agriculture. McNamara expanded the Bank’s personnel by 120% and assessed his staff for promotions based solely on the size and turnover rate of their loan portfolio. As a result of his extraordinary efforts, the Bank granted more loans in his first year term than during its first 22 years combined. Right alongside their private go-go banker counterparts, World Bank staff got busy inventing, justifying, and selling new projects to poor countries.

A deeply indebted Third World thus came into being by the beginning of 1980. While interest rates were low, loan repayment continued. But in the early 1980s the Volcker shock changed everything. Paul Volcker’s tight-fisted monetary policy aimed at reducing inflation at all costs, causing interest rates in the U.S. to soar from 4-5% in 1970s to over 19% in 1981. This not only caused a severe recession at home but had devastating effects abroad. The low-interest loans that McNamara and his banker friends had pushed onto the Global South ballooned to unpayable proportions. Between 1968 and 1982, debts multiplied by a factor of 12, going from $50 billion to $612 billion. Debt stocks quadrupled, going from $400 billion in 1970 to more than $1.6 trillion in 1982. In many developing countries, debt levels rose to over 50% of GDP and to over 80% of tax revenues. In August 1982, Mexico reached the brink of default, precipitating the next and perhaps most deadly phase of the debt crisis.

“If we go back to the 1820s, the 1870s, and the 1930s,” Patrick Bond points out, “it is obvious that the periodic build-up of foreign debt required mass defaults, typically involving a third of all borrowing countries.” Against this backdrop, what happened in the debt crisis of the 1980s was truly extraordinary, as Bond explains:

The World Bank and the IMF have effectively centralized creditor power since the early 1980s. During earlier mass defaults, no such centralizing device existed, so individual sovereign debt-bondholders in London, Paris and New York took the hit. During the 1980s-90s, in contrast, Washington ensured the creditors were repaid, no matter how odious or foolish their loans, and the hit was taken by the people of developing nations.

The IMF did indeed launch a full-blown creditor advocacy campaign. It gave out new loans with which debtor countries could repay their private creditors, always insisting upon continual interest payments. Even speculative private investors, who were often the cause of economic volatility in developing countries, were to be repaid in full. Loans taken out by private entities in developing countries likewise had to be repaid, either by private borrowers or, incredibly, by their governments. Not only did the IMF refinance odious private loans to developing countries, it paved the way for new ones. IMF loans given to defaulting countries often did not cover the entire amount needed, thus merely acting as a “seal of approval,” a sort of insurance policy for additional private loans which were guaranteed repayment at all costs. Twenty-one of the largest U.S. banks took advantage of the free insurance, lending over $5 billion to Brazil and Mexico each to hedge against prior defaults. The World Bank soon joined in the fun of funneling more odious loans into developing countries while extracting interest payments for Western bondholders. Against all this collective action on the part of creditors, it was made very clear that debtors’ demands (or more appropriately, entreaties) would only be entertained on a case by case basis.

But this was not all. Not only did the Bank and IMF bail out private lenders and perpetuate a debt cycle, they also began the draconian Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) under which loan refinancing could only be obtained in exchange for market-fundamentalist reforms. A non-exhaustive list of such reforms includes privatizing basic services & introducing user fees for them; removing subsidies on everyday foodstuffs; removing tariff and customs protections; freezing government employee salaries and cutting down public sector jobs; devaluing currency; creating an export-oriented economy dependent on volatile markets; increasing foreign corporations’ market-shares; liberalizing banking, insurance & even defense sectors; removing labor protections; taxing the poor and middle class, not the rich; keeping high interest rates to attract private capital, impoverish local borrowers, and maintain the value of foreign debt, and more. Additionally, all of these measures were to be adopted without any input from citizens of borrower countries, which amounted to the Bretton Woods institutions undemocratically rewriting legislation, restructuring agencies, and reforming national budgets, all so they could pump out new loans used to repay already-unjust old loans.

Despite all these “adjustments,” which were ostensibly meant to reduce sovereign indebtedness, the debt crisis only got worse. As of 2006, Third World debt stands at $3.2 trillion. By most estimations, the debt has already been repaid several times over. For every $1 owed in 1980, poor countries have repaid $7.5 and still owe $4. Global South countries have paid $4.2 trillion in interest payments since 1980. By 1997, daily debt-service payments reached $717 million. In most indebted countries, up to a third of GDP has been sent off to service debts.

Meanwhile, citizens in over a hundred countries have faced devastating human consequences. The economist Robert Pollin estimates that Global South countries lost some $480 billion in GDP per year from 1980- to 2000 thanks to SAPs. Agrarian studies scholar Raj Patel and sociologist Philip McMichael point out that 146 food riots took place between 1976 and 1982, peaking between 1983 and 1985 as a result of SAPs. As sociologist Sarah Babb notes, between 1988 and 1994 the governments of the poorest countries transferred more than 3000 entities from public to private hands. Anthropologist Jason Hickel points out that the World Bank alone privatized more than $2 trillion of assets in developing countries between 1984 and 2012.

What this means is that many countries now spend more on debt servicing than on providing basic services to citizens. The historian Vijay Prashad notes in his book The Darker Nations that sub-Saharan African nations spent four times more on interest payments than on healthcare, and the New Economy Foundation observes that countries like Lebanon are spending more of their government budgets on debt service than on health and education combined. As a result of this SAPed world, universal basic services have withered away; small farmers and unorganized workers have lost assets, wages, jobs, and access to food and shelter; and already precarious groups like women and minorities are faring worse than ever. While national elites enrich themselves with commissions from selling off state services and corporations get rich from new profit streams, the poor barely survive. From time to time, everyday people rise up in fury and overthrow governments, but the international austerity machine behind it all, and the loans it continues to use as weapons, remain untouched.

What Global Justice Needs to Mean if it’s to be Global

Why does all this matter to a U.S. socialists today? It matters because the Bretton Woods institutions are a machinery of war on the world’s poor and working classes run by U.S. elites. The World Bank and IMF are headquartered in Washington, DC. Their membership includes 189 countries but they practice a “one dollar, one vote” model so the U.S., with the biggest GDP and 15% of votes, retains effective veto power over all decisions. Presidents of the World Bank are always American and Presidents of the IMF are always from Western Europe. The World Bank presidency is a prime example of the revolving door between Bretton Woods institutions and big banks, corporations, and the U.S. military, with presidents almost always coming from long careers in big business, Wall Street, and U.S. security services. As if this were not enough, until 2018 the Bretton Woods institutions enjoyed immunity from all lawsuits under the 1945 International Organizations Act. In 2018 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the World Bank’s private sector arm was not subject to this immunity, but the ramifications for the rest of the Bank and for the IMF are not clear.

By far the most important form of immunity that the World Bank and IMF enjoy is from U.S. voters, on whose behalf they supposedly “develop” poor countries. No Congress or Senate votes are necessary to approve loans backed by these institutions, nor are any votes necessary for imposing austerity measures on other countries. As an arm of the U.S. Treasury Department, Bretton Woods institutions sit safely in the executive branch, insulated from all democratic scrutiny and accountability. Indeed, the Bank’s habit of never having its power questioned is starkly visible in the anecdote below, told by the authors of the book Reinventing the World Bank:

When we contacted the Bank to invite the people we felt could best engage the issues we wanted to examine, we were referred to the Public Relations office, which expressed considerable surprise and dismay that a conference had been organized on the Bank without involving the institution from the start. “It’s like having all your neighbors gather to talk about what’s going on in your house,” a senior staff member in the office complained. “Perhaps so,” we responded, “with the small difference that all your neighbors pay your mortgage.”

No fight for socialism is complete without fighting this shadow government apparatus which has determined the fates of the majority of the world’s people for generations. Nor is this an abstract struggle -many practical measures can be implemented to rein in their power. The U.S. Left must demand that the government bring these institutions under the scrutiny of democratically elected, and especially local, officials in the U.S., and eventually in Global South countries. The institutions, if they are to continue existing, must be thoroughly democratized, with representatives voted in especially by vulnerable constituents from all member countries. All structural adjustment conditionalities must be suspended with immediate effect. All sovereign debts must be taken off bond markets, made untradeable and non-interest bearing, and then cancelled in their entirety.

### Turns Case---Democracy---1NR

#### Hegemony harms democracy globally.

Street, 18 — Paul; Holds a doctorate in U.S. history from Binghamton University. He is former vice president for research and planning of the Chicago Urban League. (3-1-2018; "The World Will Not Mourn the Decline of U.S. Hegemony;" *Canadian Dimension*; https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-world-will-not-mourn-the-decline-of-u.s.-hegemony)

“Democracy” was fine as a slogan and benevolent, idealistic-sounding mission statement when it came to marketing this imperialist U.S. policy at home and abroad. Since most people in the “third” or “developing” world had no interest in neocolonial subordination to the rich nations and subscribed to what U.S. intelligence officials considered the heretical “idea that government has direct responsibility for the welfare of its people” (what U.S. planners called “communism”), Washington’s real-life commitment to popular governance abroad was strictly qualified, to say the least. “Democracy” was suitable to the U.S. as long as its outcomes comported with the interests of U.S. investors/corporations and related U.S. geopolitical objectives. It had to be abandoned, undermined and/or crushed when it threatened those investors/corporations and the broader imperatives of business rule to any significant degree. As President Richard Nixon’s coldblooded national security adviser Henry Kissinger explained in June 1970, three years before the U.S. sponsored a bloody fascist coup that overthrew Chile’s democratically elected socialist president, Salvador Allende: “I don’t see why we need to stand by and watch a country go Communist because of the irresponsibility of its own people.”

The U.S.-sponsored coup government that murdered Allende would kill tens of thousands of real and alleged leftists with Washington’s approval. The Yankee superpower sent some of its leading neoliberal economists and policy advisers to help the blood-soaked Pinochet regime turn Chile into a “free market” model and to help Chile write capitalist oligarchy into its national constitution.

“Since 1945, by deed and by example,” the great Australian author, commentator and filmmaker John Pilger wrote nearly nine years ago: “The U.S. has overthrown 50 governments, including democracies, crushed some 30 liberation movements and supported tyrannies from Egypt to Guatemala (see William Blum’s histories). Bombing is apple pie.” Along the way, Washington has crassly interfered in elections in dozens of “sovereign” nations, something curious to note in light of current liberal U.S. outrage over real or alleged Russian interference in “our” supposedly democratic electoral process in 2016. Uncle Sam also has bombed civilians in 30 countries, attempted to assassinate foreign leaders and deployed chemical and biological weapons.