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### 1

#### Interpretation: Every plank of the plan must in a vacuum be topical. That means every plank must increase prohibitions, because that is the ceiling of the resolution.

#### Violation: “expanding enforcement resources for…its core antitrust laws” does not increase prohibitions.

#### Their plan is written confusingly for a reason, you should think of it as three parts

The United States federal government should

* Expand enforcement resources for its core antitrust laws
* Expand the scope of its core antitrust laws
* Increase prohibitions on domestic export cartels that operate in foreign nations without protections for export cartels

#### The plan may make enforcement more effective, but does not increase prohibitions. If the plan text were only “expanding enforcement resources for…its core antitrust laws” it would universally lose on T-prohibit. That should apply equally in this case.

#### Increase means to make greater in size or number

Supreme Court of Kentucky 21 (Chief Justice MINTON decision in JEFFERSON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE v. Kentucky Retirement Systems, No. 2019-SC-0315-DG (Ky. June 17, 2021). Google Scholar Caselaw, date accessed 7/18/21)

Creditable compensation is defined under KRS 61.510, in the simplest terms for our purposes, as an employee's gross annual compensation, a numerical figure that typically appears on an employee's W-2 form each year.[6] But a related word increase was left undefined in its statutory context. So the meaning of the term increase under KRS 61.598 must derive its meaning implicitly from its context and legislative intent. We ascribe an ordinary meaning to the word.[7] Merriam-Webster defines increase as a verb, "to make greater in size, amount, or number," and as a noun, "something added (as by growth)."[8] Some common synonyms of the word include "augment, enlarge, or multiply."[9] Consistent with these definitions, the term increase appears to be used under KRS 61.698 to refer to an upward change in creditable compensation between fiscal years. In neither its ordinary use as a verb or noun do we find JCSO increased Duncan's pay or that the change between FY12 and FY13 constituted an increase. For KRS 61.598 to apply, there must be an increase in gross compensation, not merely a change.

#### Prohibit means forbid

Georgia Court of Appeals 64 (FRANKUM, Judge. Opinion in Andrews v. GEORGIA MUTUAL INS. CO., 137 S.E.2d 746, 110 Ga. App. 92 (Ct. App. 1964). Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/13/21).

1. Chapter 56-24 of the present Insurance Code is applicable to all insurance policies. Code Ann. § 56-2402 provides: "`Policy' means the written contract of or written agreement for or effecting insurance, and includes all clauses, riders, endorsements and papers attached or issued and delivered for attachment thereto and a part thereof." Code Ann. § 56-2419 provides: "Every insurance contract shall be construed according to the entirety of its terms and conditions as set forth in the policy and as amplified, extended, or modified by any rider, endorsement, or application made a part of the policy." "`Insurance contracts are governed by the same rules of construction or interpretation, for the purpose of ascertaining the intention of the parties, as apply to other contracts. Code § 56-815; Golden v. National Life & Accident Insurance Co., 189 Ga. 79 (2), 87 (5 SE2d 198, 125 ALR 838). Where the terms and conditions of an insurance policy are unambiguous, the court must declare the contract as made by the parties. Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. v. Marshall, 49 Ga. App. 287 (1) (175 SE 412). Where the meaning is plain and obvious, it should be treated as literally provided therein. Daniel v. Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co., 52 Ga. App. 620 (2) (184 SE 366).' Genone v. Citizens Ins. Co. of N. J., 207 Ga. 83, 86 (1) (60 SE2d 125)." Queen Ins. Co. v. Nalley Discount Co., 215 Ga. 837, 838 (1) (114 SE2d 21). Code Ann. § 56-3201 provides in part: "No policy of fire insurance covering property located in Georgia shall be made, issued or delivered unless it conforms as to all provisions and the sequence thereof with a standard or uniform form prescribed by the [Insurance] Commissioner, . . ." The plaintiff concedes that the standard form or fire policy prescribed by the Insurance Commissioner contains the clause 95\*95 quoted in the statement of facts, but contends that the provisions of the rider or endorsement attached to the policy sued upon with respect to the prohibition against other insurance is null and void and against public policy. We do not agree with this contention. The word "prohibit" means to "forbid by authority." 34 Words & Phrases 458, and cits. It would render meaningless the language contained in the standard policy to the effect that "other insurance may be prohibited by endorsement" to hold that such endorsement prohibiting other insurance could not carry with it the "authority" to enforce its provisions by providing for forfeiture of the policy for violations of such prohibition. The rider or endorsement which forms a part of the policy is not prohibited by law, is not in conflict with any provision required to be included in the policy, is unambiguous, and is a part of a binding contract between the parties to the policy. When the plaintiffs procured fire insurance from Cotton States Mutual Insurance Company in violation of the provisions of the policy sued upon, such action by the plaintiffs nullified and abrogated the policy in question.

#### **Anticompetitive practices are practices that restrict competition**

CTC 7 (Published by the Competition and Tariff Commission, “Zimbabwe: Introduction to Competition Law” , *AllAfrica,* 19 JULY 2007, <https://allafrica.com/stories/200707190109.html> , date accessed 9/4/21)

Restrictive business practices, also known as anti-competitive practices, refer to a wide range of business practices in which a firm or a group of firms may engage in order to restrict inter-firm competition so as to maintain or increase their relative market position and profits without necessarily providing goods or services at lower cost or of higher quality to the consumer.

#### They’ll say that “at least” justifies extra-topical action. But that mistakes floor and ceiling. The first half of the resolution requires that every element of the plan increase prohibitions. It doesn’t provide free reign for actions beyond prohibition, otherwise literally any action would be topical.

#### VOTE NEG:

#### FIRST---Plan spikes. Adding extra and non-topical planks moot core disads. Resource tradeoff, confirmation DAs, politics, and courts DAs --- all are nullified by 8 words in the plan. Topicality is the reciprocal cost to that benefit.

#### SECOND---Extraneous advantages. Non-topical planks produce unpredictable advantages. If you give a 2a an inch, they’ll take a mile. Assume the worst because they have no incentive to preserve neg victories.

### 2

#### Anti-trust’s promise of reformed capitalist competition is a ruse to solidify American domination. Western academics erase imperialism from consideration, ensuring anti-trust cases will always hinge on American interests and never consider global impact.

Kwet 22, PhD in Sociology from Rhodes University, visiting professor @ Yale Information Society Project (Michael, 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.

#### Capitalism spreads American empire globally, ensuring endless interventions and forced liberalization to extract profits for Western corporations.

Bhattacharya 21, Co-chair of the Political Education Committee at Central Jersey DSA and is a writer based in New Jersey, having been published in Current Affairs, Cosmonaut, New Politics, Reappropriate, and The Aerogram, among other outlets. Prior to pursuing a PhD in Political Science at Rutgers University, he had worked full-time as a reporter across the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast (Sudip, October 22nd, “The US Empire: Coercion and Consent,” *Counter Punch*, <https://www.counterpunch.org/2021/10/22/the-us-empire-coercion-and-consent/>, Accessed 11-25-2021)

THE U.S. EMPIRE: FORM & FUNCTION Contrary to the myth, which has been eroded due to pressure from activists and historians, the U.S. has always depended on modes of violence to quell certain populations, to expand from its original thirteen colonies. The violence included the murder of indigenous peoples, with the enslavement of Africans, and the repression of those who would resist against the dominant social order of private property, racialized terror, and the right for businesses to turn a profit above nearly all other demands. Historian Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz writes, The origin of the United States in settler colonialism—as an empire born from the violent acquisition of indigenous lands and the ruthless devaluation of indigenous lives—lends the country unique characteristics that matter when considering questions of how to unhitch its future from its violent DNA. To this day, particular populations in the country, African Americans who are working poor or working class, those who are trying to create a more egalitarian society, one that provides for what people need to live, immigrant workers who stand up for themselves against the tyranny of agricultural capitalists, are oftentimes suppressed through physical force. This was most evident during last year’s protests against the police, in which protestors were pushed, mauled, and attacked by law enforcement. Tear gas and Billy clubs were unleashed the moment people spilled into the streets, demanding that the social order change. When people started to attack businesses, the police responded with extreme force, willing to crack some skulls for some “peace”. As the U.S. expanded its empire overseas, violence remained a critical tool, as countries hoping to rehabilitate and create economies that European colonialists had ruined, were one-by-one occupied and coerced through other forms of U.S. force. As countries in the Third World witnessed the rise of socialists and Leftists, those who identified the need for redistribution of land and resources, and were willing to challenge the dominant role that U.S. and European companies played in their respective nations, the U.S. helped lead right-wing coups (like the one in Indonesia in which were millions were killed overnight), as well as apply other coercive tactics, such as sanctions on Cuba following their own revolution that overthrew the U.S.-supported dictator, Fulgencio Bautista, which have prevented the Cuban economy from receiving access to critical resources to mass produce their own Covid-19 vaccine. Of course, the U.S.’s brutal methods have been in bloody display through its invasions and occupations of territories overseas, from the Philippines to Vietnam to Grenada to Afghanistan and Iraq. Mai Elliot expressed in a piece about the heavy toll of the Vietnam War on the Vietnamese people at the hands of the U.S. and its South Vietnamese trained forces, By the time of the cease-fire in Vietnam in 1973, more than 10 million South Vietnamese, mostly from rural areas — well over half of the estimated total population of 17 million — had been driven from their homes by the war. The United States Senate subcommittee on refugees estimated that by 1974, over 1.4 million civilians had been killed and wounded, and attributed over 50 percent of these casualties to the firepower of American and South Vietnamese forces. These displacements and casualties were not just the byproduct of warfare but also a result of deliberate policies by the United States and South Vietnamese governments. Violence was directly harnessed by the U.S., time and time again, to “pacify” populations that needed to be held in check for U.S. interests and that of its allies to spread. The existing social order we have now, of global capitalism led by the U.S. and supported by its allies across Europe and Japan and other regions of the globe, would not have been made possible without this level of violence, coups or otherwise. However, the U.S. has also achieved its interests, such as maintaining a global capitalist system that all countries must either assimilate to or contend with in some manner (even if that means deciding to not liberalize their economies which leads to losing access to critical resources, such as foreign investment), by cultivating forms of consent to its leadership. As much as the U.S. relies on violence, its empire does not function the same way as did empires from Europe. For one thing, the Europeans usually administered direct control of their territories as a means of pacification. Hence, English officers were sent to India, to manage its bureaucracy and day-to-day policy. “Having set up the police, army, civil service, and judiciary on African soil, the colonizing powers were in a position to intervene much more directly in the economic life of the people than had been the case previously”, the anti-colonialist scholar Walter Rodney explained in his classic survey of European dominance in Africa, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (a formidable text that everyone should read). The U.S., at first, would directly administer policies in overseas territories, as it did in its brutal occupation of the Philippines and Haiti, but unlike the Europeans, would look forward in drawing back some of its military forces, and instead, seek other ways to dominate and influence the regions it once occupied. The U.S. would accomplish its mission of retaining influence by leaving behind military bases scattered across the globe (just in case it would need to help with suppressing local revolts), as well as seeking to shape the broader political environment that countries must contend with. Bessner states, The American empire functions in a different way. It is an empire of bases, pinprick bases all around the world. It is an empire of institutions that tries to govern global trade, global security. It doesn’t exactly mirror the empires of old. U.S. foreign policymakers viewed its interests as being tied with the creation of a global capitalist order, especially during the Cold War. This is different from the era of European colonization where indeed, Europeans would collude to suppressed non-white populations globally, but ultimately, would continue to compete against one another for territory. Such competition would lead to bloody skirmishes and wars, whether it was the British fighting the Dutch “settlers” in South Africa to bloody battles between the French, the Belgian and the British across Africa more generally to scrambles over territory during WWI between the British, the French, the Germans, and Italians. The U.S., as it emerged relatively unscathed from WWII, viewed itself as the vanguard of global capital, and desired others to join its mission of creating a global order that rewarded countries who liberalized their economies, from Europe to Japan to parts of Latin America and Asia, and over time, parts of Africa. Thus, it set upon creating global institutions, along with its allies in Europe and Japan, that could shape the globe for global capitalist interests overall. Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin write in The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire, The wide international range of US firms, as well as the relative size and importance of US markets, gave American state authorities ‘tremendous leverage in pressuring foreign firms and regulatory authorities’ to adopt these rules and practices. But the inherent limits on the extraterritorial application of US law in a world of formally sovereign states also gave rise to extensive coordination of national regulations through international institutions like the newly created WTO, the World Bank, the Bank of International Settlements, and the IMF. Essentially, the U.S., knowing the limits of directly administering control overseas, sought to apply pressure on countries following WWII, including countries that were now independent from Europe, by creating a global capitalist system that horded access to critical investments and resources, such as loans and foreign investment. Immanuel Ness, professor of political science at Brooklyn college of the City University of New York, and author of Organizing Insurgency: Workers Movements in the Global South, explained how the U.S. and its allies were successful in creating a global economic system that prioritized the interests of multinational companies, of capitalists worldwide. After all, following the end of WWII, much of the globe had been ravaged, either by the war directly or by the legacy of European and U.S. imperialism (i.e. Latin America). Most importantly, countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, lacking the industrial capacity to extract and manufacture their own goods and products, or in some cases, still relying on a global marketplace to sell their goods to, desperately needed financial help from Europe and the U.S. In turn, the U.S. and its allies created the WTO, the World Bank, the IMF, as a way of sustaining this inequality in terms of access to the market and to industrial capacity. Desperate countries could either agree to the demands that the U.S. global order wanted, such as allowing for multinational companies to extract mineral wealth, or receiving loans to perhaps sustain some financial stability, or face economic marginalization, such as being denied access to sell consumer goods to Europe and the U.S. “If you opt out of the system as a whole, one will end up being isolated internationally,” Ness said. Countries such as Cuba, Iran, and Venezuela are examples of this dynamic, in which nations are denied access to the global market for following a different economic model. After the fall of the U.S.S.R and the Eastern Bloc, the dominance of the global capitalist system that the U.S. and its allies had sustained grew even stronger, since countries now lack any real alternative to the global capitalist market. Thus, countries like Cuba and Venezuela are struggling tremendously, having been denied access to the world market and in the case of Venezuela, literally having a significant portion of its reserves seized by the U.S. and other global banking interests. In the end, the U.S. has created a global capitalist system in which it doesn’t need to rely on invasion or occupation to punish countries that step out of line. The U.S. achieved this global capitalist order through explicit violence, but also, through aligning with/supporting local interests across the globe who also believed that the U.S. would protect them from the so-called scourge of communism. Consequently, when we discuss the coups that the U.S. supported, such coups were a combination of U.S. tactical support, such as providing weaponry or training to those would undertake the coup, but were also made possible because there were constituencies in those respective nations, like in Chile and other parts of Latin America, who also sought to maintain a hierarchical political system to preserve their own social and economic interests. Unlike European empires, the U.S. leans more heavily on local allies to administer control and leverage power for the broader interests of capital. For the coups to succeed in places like Chile and Indonesia, the U.S. developed connections with local constituencies, whether it was the most regressive elements in society, or liberal capitalists fearing a so-called communist takeover. Figures like Pinochet did represent a constituency of lunatics and sociopaths (a.k.a. the rich and segments of the middle class) but nonetheless, a constituency did exist, that the U.S. was more than eager to side with and bolster. “And yet in Chile, as much as one-third of the population stood with Pinochet to the end,” stated a report by NPR (the leader of finding both sides on every issue) on the legacy of Pinochet in Chile. To this day, this strategy continues, as demonstrated by the U.S. support of figures such as Jair Bolsonaro and Rodrigo Duterte, both of whom are exceedingly repulsive, and yet, still retain some measure of support/constituency for their horrid actions. Again, such figures do not necessarily represent what the majority of people desire in Brazil (Bolsonaro is slated to lose to Lula in the upcoming presidential elections) or in the Philippines, but they do inspire a level of loyalty and support among segments of the population, such as among social conservatives (anti-feminists and anti-queer) and of course, among the wealthy and segments of the middle class and the more conservative elements of the working class as well. Indeed, there was rampant support for even Duterte’s so-called war on drugs, which has meant a war on the poor, and the murder of countless people, including addicts. Even after the dreadful mismanagement of Covid-19 in the Philippines, there is still a constituency supporting Duterte, as Ted Regencia at Al Jazeera notes, writing, “Yet Duterte has continued to be hugely popular during his last 11 months. In a Pulse Asia survey on vice presidential contenders conducted this month, Duterte came out tops, while a Publicus Asia survey in July gave him an approval rating of 58 percent and a trust rating of 55 percent.” In turn, the U.S. has continued to also support for the Philippines government, which includes continuing to train its military. “While the Biden administration has declared human rights the centerpiece of its foreign policy, it has carefully avoided publicly calling out the Philippines over its controversial drug war and other alleged abuses,” Julie McCarthy at NPR writes. Despite the abuses under Bolsonaro and Duterte, and other U.S. allies, such as Narendra Modi of India, which far exceed that of countries like Cuba, they are not excluded from the global market. They are not sanctioned. They are not facing intense economic or political pressure by the U.S. and its allies. Overall, through this global capitalist system, local capitalists in countries like Brazil, the Philippines, Bangladesh and Indonesia are provided contracts by U.S. and other multinational companies to build the factories and to reap some profit as well. Through the global capitalist system, local governments feel they have very little option other than allow particular interests to continue to extract resources without paying a living wage to local workers, like in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Thus, those who would support this extractive process seek to preserve it and over time, receive some revenue for themselves as well. Through this global capitalist system, elites are allowed to reap some financial reward by also having access to the financial hubs in the U.S. and Europe. Even for countries as poor as India, the rising crop of elites find value in the way in which the global economic system is currently structured, as they’re also allowed to store their wealth in the same tax-havens and financial hubs as elites in the U.S and Europe. “The capital that they hold is not held in New Delhi or Mumbai,” Ness expressed, “It is held in London and New York more likely.” Thus, without ever having to invade, occupy or bomb, the U.S. has found other ways to maintain a global capitalist system beneficial for its interests, from building alliances among the sociopathic/selfish to rewarding those who follow its leadership, ultimately willing to hand off the role of destroyer for others to fill.

#### The alternative is a worker’s international. Latent unrest exists globally, international movements directed by the Global South can counter capitalist imperialism.

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

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.

### Trade Advantage

#### 1. Interdependence doesn’t solve war—their stats are bad:

#### a. correlation—they don’t assume other factors

Miller 14

(Charles Miller, lecturer at ANU’s Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, “Globalisation and war,” <http://www.aspistrategist.org.au/globalisation-and-war/> , April 2014)

John O’Neal and Bruce Russett’s work is perhaps the best known in this regard—and Steven Pinker cites them approvingly in his book The Better Angels of Our Nature. Analysing trade and conflict data from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries, they found that trade flows do have a significant impact in reducing the chances of conflict, even when taking a variety of other factors into account. But their conclusions have in turn been questioned by other scholars. For one thing, their model failed to take three things into account. First, it’s quite possible that **peace causes trade rather than the other way around**—no company wants to start an export business to another country if it anticipates that business linkages will be cut off by war further down the line. Second, conflict behaviour exhibits what’s called ‘network effects’— if France and Germany are at peace, chances are Belgium and Germany will be too. And third, both the likelihood of conflict and the level of trade are influenced by the number of years a pair of countries has already been at peace—because prolonged periods of peace increase mutual trust. Take **any of these factors** into account, and studies have shown (here and here) that the apparent **relationship between trade flows and peace disappears**. Perhaps, though, conceiving of globalisation solely in terms of trade flows is mistaken. Alternative indicators of globalisation include foreign direct investment, financial openness and the levels of government intervention in economic relations with the rest of the world. Data on those variables is less extensive than on trade flows, usually dating back only to the post World War II period. But some analysts, such as Patrick McDonald and Erik Gartzke, have argued that a significant correlation can be found between them and a reduction in the probability of conflict. Those findings, newer than O’Neal and Russett’s, haven’t yet been subjected to the same intense scrutiny, so may in turn be qualified by future research. What does all that mean for the policy-maker? The statistical evidence certainly doesn’t tell us that globalisation has made war in East Asia impossible. ‘Cromwell’s law’ counsels us that a logically conceivable event should never be assigned a probability of zero. The most we could conclude is that globalisation has made such an occurrence much less likely. There’s some hopeful numerical evidence that globalisation does indeed have that effect, but the evidence isn’t so compelling that we can substitute an economic engagement policy for a security policy. By all means, let’s continue to promote trade in the Asia-Pacific. But we should also continue to be prepared for scenarios which are unlikely but would be hugely damaging if they were to occur.

#### Trade causes existential warming — increases emissions and deters policy solutions---they read the impact card for us

EIU 19 — The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) is the research arm of The Economist Group, publisher of The Economist. Contributors include: Conor Griffin – Project director; Diana Hindle Fisher – Project manager; Ailia Haider – Researcher; Kamala Dawar – Contributing researcher; Adam Green – Contributing author; Gareth Owen – Graphic designer; Professor Petros Mavroidis, Columbia University Assistant Professor; Antonia Eliason, University of Mississippi; André Sapir, Bruegel and Université libre de Bruxelles; Professor Robert Howse, New York University; Mark Sanctuary, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute; Professor James Bacchus, University of Central Florida. (Climate change and trade agreements Friends or foes? *The Economist*; <https://iccwbo.org/content/uploads/sites/3/2019/03/icc-report-trade-and-climate-change.pdf>; Accessed 03-04-2021)

Executive Summary

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has shone a spotlight on the devastating humanitarian consequences the world can expect if global warming exceeds 1.5°C. Despite the 2015 Paris Agreement, most countries’ climate policies show a chronic lack of ambition and the world remains on track for temperature increases of more than 3°C.

Against this backdrop, the world needs transformative solutions. In climate policy discussions, relatively little attention is paid to the global trade architecture. Bilateral, regional or World Trade Organisation (WTO) trade agreements could help to meet climate goals—for example, by removing tariffs and harmonising standards on environmental goods and services, and eliminating distortionary and poorly designed subsidies on fossil fuels and agriculture.

Despite the potential for trade–climate synergies, the weight of historical evidence is heavy in the other direction. Universal tariff reduction has increased trade in carbon-intensive and environmentally destructive products, such as fossil fuels and timber, more than it has for environmental goods. In some cases FTAs can also shrink the “policy space” available to countries to pursue environmental goals, for example if they prohibit, or are perceived to prohibit, a country’s ability to distinguish between products according to emissions released during their production.

This report assesses the degree to which the WTO and four contemporary free trade agreements (FTAs)—CPTPP, EU–Singapore, EU–Canada and Korea–Australia—support seven opportunities for boosting climate-friendly trade flows (see graphic below).

We find that the four contemporary trade agreements are more supportive of these climate goals than their traditional counterparts. For example, the EU-Singapore FTA recognises the need for parties take “proper account” of the need to reduce GHG emissions when designing subsidy systems. The CETA and CPTPP agreements permit parties to promote environmental standards and objectives in their tender specifications. However, overall, the agreements largely fail to support the seven opportunities. Most clauses are based on cooperation, consultation, and best endeavour. Specific or immediate actions are lacking. Transformative policies, such as border adjustment carbon taxes, are largely ignored.

We also find that the WTO’s efforts to pursue climate and environmental goals have largely stalled and its cooperation with international climate policy actors is limited. Post-Paris there is a real concern that ambitious climate policies will fall foul of WTO rules if they are perceived to arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against third countries.

#### Interdependence makes catastrophic disease inevitable.

Morand & Walther 20, \*Serge Morand; PhD, disease ecologist @ Kasetsart University; \*\*Bruno A. Walther; DPhil, Taipei Medical University (4/20; “The accelerated infectious disease risk in the Anthropocene: more outbreaks and wider global spread”; pg. 3-4; Accessible at: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.20.049866>) \*”to” added to preserve grammatical integrity, brackets denote a change

We here want to draw attention to another important and noteworthy feature of the Anthropocene which greatly affects public health, human well-being, and economic performance. These findings are especially pertinent as the world reels from the health, social and economic impact of the current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (El Zowalaty and Järhult, 2020; Ghebreyesus and Swaminathan, 2020; Lorusso et al., 2020). The increasing connectivity of human populations due to international trade and travel (Guimerà et al., 2005; Colizza et al., 2006; Brockmann and Helbing, 2013; Gabrielli et al., 2019), the rapid growth of the transport of wild and domesticated animals worldwide (Rosen and Smith, 2010; Schneider, 2012; Rohr et al., 2019; Levitt, 2020), and other factors such as the increasing encroachment of human populations on hitherto isolated wild animal populations through loss and fragmentation of wild habitats (Patz et al., 2004; Despommier et al., 2006; Pongsiri et al., 2009; Myers et al., 2013) have led to a great acceleration of infectious disease risks, e.g., the increase in emerging infectious diseases and drug-resistant microbes since 1940 (Jones et al., 2008) and the increase in the number of disease outbreaks since 1980 (Smith et al., 2014). To expand the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014) to the beginning of the Anthropocene, we investigated whether the number of disease outbreaks has increased since the Second World War. In addition, we examined whether the global pattern of infectious disease outbreaks changed possibly due [to] the increasing connectivity of human populations. In other words, have the disease outbreaks become more globalized in the sense that these outbreaks are increasingly shared by countries worldwide? To investigate these questions, we used a the most complete, reliable, and up-to-date global dataset (GIDEON Informatics, 2020) which had already been used in the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014). This dataset can be used to enumerated the recorded annual number of disease outbreaks. To investigate the changing global patterns of disease outbreaks, we used this dataset to calculate two measures which have been recently introduced into ecological and parasitological studies. These two measures, namely modularity and centrality, quantify the connectivity of bipartite networks. Modularity is defined as the extent to which nodes (specifically, sites and species for presenceabsence matrices) in a compartment are more likely to be connected to each other than to other nodes of the network (Thébault, 2013). The calculation of a modularity measure is useful for global phenomena because it allows the overall level of compartmentalization (or fragmentation) into compartments (or clusters, modules, subgroups, or subsets) of an entire dataset to be quantified. High modularity in a global network means that subgroups of countries and disease outbreaks interact more strongly among themselves (that is, within a compartment) than with the other subgroups (that is, among compartments) (Bordes et al., 2015). Centrality is defined as the degree of the connectedness of a node (e.g., a keystone species in ecological studies; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010). In the context of our study, centrality is the degree of the connectedness of a country and those countries connected to it. We estimated the countries which are the potential centres of disease outbreaks by investigating the eigenvector centrality of a given country in a network of countries which share disease outbreaks among each other. Eigenvector centrality is a generalization of degree centrality, which is the number of connections a country has to other countries in terms of sharing disease outbreaks. Eigenvector centrality considers countries to be highly central if the connected countries to them through shared outbreaks are connected to many other well-connected countries (Bonacich and Lloyd, 2001; Wells et al., 2020). Modularity and centrality analyses have been used to investigate various ecological, parasitological and epidemiological questions (e.g., Tylianakis et al., 2007; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010; Anderson and Sukhdeo, 2011; Bascompte and Jordano, 2014; Poisot et al., 2014; Bordes et al., 2015; Genrich et al., 2017). Using a widely used world dataset on infectious disease outbreaks, we here present results which demonstrate that the accelerated number of disease outbreaks and their increased global spread are two further threatening aspects of the accelerated infectious disease risk associated with the globalization process which characterizes the Anthropocene.

#### Extinction---defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

### Resources Advantage

#### No correlation between food insecurity and social unrest

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

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

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

#### No nuclear terrorism.

Ward 18, analyst on the Defence, Security, and Infrastructure team at RAND Europe. Citing Dr Beyza Unal, a research fellow in nuclear policy at think tank Chatham House. (Antonia, 7/27/18, "Is Nuclear Terrorism Distracting Attention from More Realistic Threats?", *RAND*, https://www.rand.org/blog/2018/07/is-the-threat-of-nuclear-terrorism-distracting-attention.html)

Despite Obama's remarks in 2016 and these two incidents, experts and officials contest the viability of the nuclear terrorism threat. Dr Beyza Unal, a research fellow in nuclear policy at think tank Chatham House, argued there is currently no evidence that terrorist groups could build a nuclear weapon. Similarly, a report by the Council on Foreign Relations in 2006 emphasized how building a nuclear bomb is a difficult task for states, let alone terrorists. This is because of the issues involved in accessing uranium and creating and maintaining it at the correct grade (enriched uranium).

While nuclear terrorism is a concern, the majority of terrorist attacks are conducted with conventional explosives. The 2017 Europol Terrorism Situation and Trend Report states that 40 percent of terrorist attacks used explosives. These explosives originate from a wide variety of countries across the world. According to a study by Conflict Armament Research, large quantities of explosive precursor chemicals used to make bombs as seen in the 7/7 attack in London in 2005 and the 2017 Manchester Arena attack, have been linked to supply chains in the United States, Europe, and Asia via Turkey. The threat from the spread of chemical precursors prompted the EU to begin looking at ways to tighten the regulations of these chemicals (PDF).

A nuclear terrorist attack would have grave consequences, but it is currently not a realistic or viable threat given that it would require a level of sophistication from terrorists that has not yet been witnessed. The recent focus of terrorist groups has been on simplistic strikes, such as knife and vehicular attacks. If countries are concerned about nuclear terrorism, the best way to mitigate this risk could be to tighten security at civilian and government nuclear sites. But governments would be better off focusing their efforts on combatting the spread and use of conventional weapons.

#### No REM shortages---stockpiles, new deposits, and recycling.

Lovins 17, Cofounder and Chairman Emeritus of Rocky Mountain Institute, energy advisor to major firms and governments in 70+ countries for 45+ years, has written 31 books and more than 600 papers, advised major firms and governments worldwide, and received 12 honorary doctorates and many international awards. (Amory, 5-23-2017, "Clean energy and rare earths: Why not to worry", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, https://thebulletin.org/2017/05/clean-energy-and-rare-earths-why-not-to-worry/)

Rare earths’ uses are highly specialized but diverse. These elements are used in mobile phones, superstrong magnets and hence advanced motors and generators, some oil-refinery catalysts, certain lasers and fluorescent-lamp or flat-screen phosphors, some batteries and superconductors, and other technologies important to modern life. Some rare earths are particularly useful in energy applications. Around 2010, some articles and commentators warned that shortages of rare earths, or China’s near-monopoly on them, could choke off the West’s shift to renewable energy and other clean technologies. This was never true—but the myth persists.

Bubble and burst. Rare earths concerned only specialists until about 2009–10. In the mid-1990s, China had consolidated its control over most of the global rare-earth market, and the last US mine and mill, once the world’s dominant producer, closed in 2002 because it was unprofitable. China began imposing export quotas in 2006, and limited exports to Japan (a major user of rare earths for high-tech miniature motors) during a diplomatic spat in 2009–10, so global prices and anxieties soared. US government agencies published urgent reports about the rare-earth crisis and its threat to national security. Could China’s control of these crucial elements—roughly 97 percent at the time—block Washington’s ability to produce Tomahawk missiles, F-35 jets, and night-vision goggles, as some military writers warned, never mind electric vehicles and wind-power turbines?

As a technologist who had advised major mining companies, written two books on metal mining and a 445-page text on efficient motor systems, done rare-earth physics experiments at MIT Lincoln Laboratory, and consulted for MIT’s Francis Bitter Magnet Laboratory, I knew enough to be unconvinced by rare-earth alarm bells. It all felt like a commodity bubble, based more on a shortage of understanding—of rare earths, economic geology, and resource efficiency and substitution—than on a shortage of rare earths.

Sure enough, the debate was heavy on the supply of rare earths but light and often misinformed on the demand side. The few observers who focused more on demand suspected that rare earths’ price spike wouldn’t last long, whether or not it reflected mining-stock hype. I called the coming crash, to general ridicule, in 2010. Rare-earth prices soared through spring 2011—when a rare-earth bonanza was fondly predicted for Helmand Province in Afghanistan—but then plummeted.

US supplier Molycorp reopened its California rare-earth mine in 2012, but went broke in 2015 when low world prices wouldn’t support its high costs. By 2015, MIT Technology Review asked, “What Happened to the Rare-Earths Crisis?” It misleadingly called rare earths “crucial to the permanent magnets used in wind turbines and motors in hybrid or electric cars,” and concluded that worries about them had “seemingly dissipated without much fanfare” as “demand fell more than expected,” but never connected the dots by asking why demand did that. By 2016–17, the market was in the doldrums, with China planning to limit annual production to 140,000 metric tons beginning in 2020 to try to raise prices again. An investor in the rare-earth industry in 2007 would have lost 81 percent of her portfolio value after a classic decade-long boom-and-bust wild ride (see the chart at the top of this article from buyupside.com).

This is not how a durably scarce and valuable commodity behaves. What happened? Just what you’d expect of a thin market influenced by ignorance but ultimately tamed by reality. When prices soared, stockpiles rose, idle mines reopened, explorers sought and found new deposits, and recycling increased (for example, cerium in glass polishing). Most important, as customers from General Electric to Toyota to Ford sought to cut costs and boost performance, the costlier materials were used more frugally and often replaced with cheaper, better solutions—all as I’d predicted in 2010. Prices fell accordingly.

### Outreach Advantage

#### No modelling---dozens of past violations destroys any US credibility

ABA 16, American Bar Association. (2-10-2016, “The United States and Human Rights Treaties: Can We Meet Our Commitments?”, <https://www.americanbar.org/publications/human_rights_magazine_home/2015--vol--41-/vol--41--no--2---human-rights-at-home/the-united-states-and-human-rights-treaties--can-we-meet-our-com/>)

Despite these deficiencies, the United States thinks too highly of itself to treat international human rights law—at least when applied to us—as law. We ratify few human rights treaties. We attach multiple conditions (called “reservations, understandings, and declarations”) to those we do ratify. We declare even those treaties “not self-executing,” which renders them generally unenforceable in our courts (although they can still be used as interpretive guides for U.S. laws). And we decline to accept individual complaint procedures or clauses referring disputes under the treaties to the International Court of Justice. That said, a trio of treaties ratified during the terms of the first President Bush and President Clinton commit the United States internationally to respect and protect a wide range of human rights. Two decades later, however, Washington is unwilling or unable to live up to key promises it made under those treaties, at least in the view of the committees of international experts set up to oversee them. The three treaties are the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), both joined by the United States in 1992; and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), joined by the United States in 1994. (We have ratified other human rights treaties on specific topics, such as the Genocide Convention and Protocols on child soldiers and child trafficking.) Civil and Political Covenant The ICCPR requires each of its 168 state parties “to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction” a menu of civil and political rights, without discrimination. For example, the ICCPR protects the rights to life, liberty, humane treatment, fair trial, and privacy. States must also ensure that victims of violations have an effective remedy. In grave public emergencies, certain ICCPR rights, including liberty and due process—but not freedom from torture—may be restricted. However, both the emergency and the restrictions (called “derogations”) must be formally notified to the UN. The restrictions must also be limited to the extent and duration strictly required. The United States has never derogated from the ICCPR. Convention against Race Discrimination CERD’s 177 state parties are barred from allowing distinctions based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin, whose “purpose or effect” is to nullify or impair the equal exercise of human rights. Parties undertake to pursue a policy to eliminate racial discrimination. They must ensure equal treatment with respect to a broad range of rights, such as the right to vote and the right to security against police violence. Victims of violations must have effective remedies, including “just and adequate reparation.” Affirmative action—within limits—is encouraged. CERD authorizes “special measures” for the purpose of securing “adequate advancement” of certain racial groups, so long as the measures do not lead to the “maintenance of separate rights” and do not continue after their goals are achieved. The CERD expert committee (see below) interprets this as an “obligation” to adopt special measures when warranted to eliminate “persistent” racial disparities. Convention against Torture CAT categorically prohibits torture: “No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.” Each of CAT’s 158 state parties is mandated to take effective measures to prevent, punish, and redress torture. Treaty Reporting and Expert Committees All three treaties require state parties to submit periodic reports on compliance to committees of experts. The committees also receive “shadow reports” from nongovernmental groups—from scores of groups in the case of the United States. After public hearings in which committee members question and dialogue with government delegations, the committees issue “concluding observations” and ask that follow-up reports be submitted one year later. The committees have long had distinguished U.S. members. The current U.S. member of the Human Rights Committee, which oversees the ICCPR, is Professor Sarah Cleveland of Columbia Law School. The U.S. member of the CERD committee is Professor Carlos Vázquez of Georgetown Law, and of the CAT committee, Felice Gaer, director of the Jacob Blaustein Institute. CAT committee chair Claudio Grossman, the Chilean member, is dean of Washington College of Law at American University. Treaty Norms vs. U.S. Norms In 2014, all three committees issued concluding observations on U.S. reports. They began by commending positive steps taken by the United States since the previous round of reporting, such as the Supreme Court decision in Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005), ruling the juvenile death penalty unconstitutional; President Obama’s 2009 executive order prohibiting torture; his ongoing efforts to close Guantanamo; and the 2010 Fair Sentencing Act, which reduced racial sentencing disparities for crack cocaine versus powdered cocaine. Each committee then elaborated its “concerns.” From a U.S. perspective, one might group them in three broad categories: (1) U.S. rejection of treaty norms for reasons that many U.S. human rights lawyers would applaud; (2) U.S. rejection of treaty norms for reasons deeply embedded in U.S. legal and political culture; and (3) U.S. violations of treaty norms, even where they are consistent with American culture and values. In the first category—laudable U.S. departures—one might place overbroad bans on hate speech. CERD requires criminalization of “all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred.” The ICCPR bans all “advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence.” The United States adopted reservations to these provisions on First Amendment grounds. Nonetheless the CERD committee urges the United States to consider criminalizing racist hate speech, even when it does not incite imminent violence or “true threats” of violence. Many U.S. human rights lawyers would support the U.S. position to allow hate speech that falls short of such incitement. In the second category—norms incompatible with embedded U.S. culture—one might place the Human Rights Committee’s call for the United States to consid

er acceding to an Optional Protocol to the ICCPR abolishing the death penalty. Another candidate might be the CERD committee’s call for the United States to redefine racial discrimination across the board in order to meet CERD’s “purpose or effect” definition. The Supreme Court has held that the test for violating constitutionally mandated equal protection of the law is a purpose test, not an effects test. While some U.S. laws use a “disproportionate impact” test, most do not. U.S. law is unlikely to move toward an “effects” test anytime soon. This reality neutralizes many CERD committee recommendations to the United States. CERD committee concerns rest on disproportionate impact in such areas as denial of voting rights to convicted felons, gun violence, aspects of criminal justice and juvenile justice, and inadequate legal aid. While there are serious racial gaps in all these areas, and CERD may help focus attention by placing them under an international spotlight, the United States is more likely to treat them as policy problems than as unlawful discrimination. On the other hand, CERD concerns about disparate racial impacts in housing—resulting from urban environmental pollution, criminalization of homelessness, and mortgage-lending practices and foreclosures—may prove to be in sync with the “disparate impact” test under the U.S. Fair Housing Act as recently interpreted by the Supreme Court in Texas Department of Housing & Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc., 135 S. Ct. 2507 (2015). Fair housing may thus potentially fit within the third category of issues, where human rights treaties are consistent with both U.S. national values and our legal culture. In these areas, Washington should live up to our international commitments without delay. The following are illustrative: Torture and Accountability CAT requires the United States to: prevent torture “in any territory under its jurisdiction”; criminalize all acts of torture; make these offenses punishable by penalties that “take into account their grave nature”; establish jurisdiction over torture by U.S. nationals; ensure a “prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed in any territory under its jurisdiction”; ensure that victims of torture obtain redress and fair and adequate compensation; and refrain from sending someone to a country if there are “substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture.” Since 2001, the United States has violated all these treaty commitments. In December 2014, the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a 500-page executive summary of its report on CIA detention and interrogation. In a foreword, Committee Chair Dianne Feinstein expressed her “personal conclusion that, under any common meaning of the term, CIA detainees were tortured.” She was correct. The Committee found, for example: “Sleep deprivation involved keeping detainees awake for up to 180 hours, usually standing or in stress positions, at times with their hands shackled over their heads. At least five detainees experienced disturbing hallucinations . . . .” “The waterboarding technique was physically harmful, inducing convulsions and vomiting.” One detainee “became ‘completely unresponsive, with bubbles rising through his open, full mouth.’ Internal CIA records describe the waterboarding of [another prisoner] as . . . a ‘series of near drownings.’” Techniques such as slamming detainees against a wall were used “with significant repetition for days or weeks at a time” “in combination, frequently concurrent with sleep deprivation and nudity.” One detention facility was a “dungeon,” the chief CIA interrogator said. Detainees were “in complete darkness and constantly shackled in isolated cells with loud noise or music and only a bucket to use for human waste. Lack of heat . . . likely contributed to [a detainee’s] death.” The Committee also found that the CIA repeatedly misled the Justice Department about interrogation techniques and confinement conditions. The CIA’s “inaccurate and incomplete” information impeded effective oversight by the White House and Congress. CIA misinformation “complicated, and in some cases impeded” the national security work of the FBI, Director of National Intelligence, and State Department. Against this backdrop, the United States should heed the recommendations of the CAT committee. The first set of recommendations concerns inadequate legislation. The U.S. Code criminalizes torture abroad but not in the United States. The CAT committee “regrets that the specific offense of torture has not yet been introduced at the federal level.” Even where torture is a crime, the committee “regrets” that the United States restrictively interprets CAT by narrowing the definition of “mental harm” that can qualify as torture (although the Senate Committee findings reveal that the CIA tortured even by that narrower definition). Legislation is critical. The CAT committee welcomed the United States’ “unequivocal commitment to abide by the universal prohibition of torture and ill-treatment everywhere,” as well as U.S. assurances that its personnel are legally barred from committing torture and ill-treatment “at all times and in all places.” However, this bar rests in part on executive orders overturnable at the stroke of a pen. The committee recommended that the United States amend its laws and withdraw its reservation implying a territorial limitation on CAT applicability. In November 2015, President Obama signed into law, as part of the FY 2016 defense authorization bill, the McCain-Feinstein amendment to effectively prohibit torture by U.S. government agencies. Even so, the new law does not address the CAT committee’s concern for lack of accountability and redress. No CIA or military personnel have been prosecuted for torture per se (although low-ranking military personnel have been prosecuted for lesser offenses). Nor has there been civil redress. In 2014, the D.C. Circuit ruled that Congress had barred a civil damages remedy for a detainee allegedly tortured at Guantanamo. Janko v. Gates, 741 F.3d 136 (D.C. Cir. 2014), cert. denied, 135 S. Ct. 1530 (2015). Secret Detention For at least five years after 2001, the CIA held detainees in secret “black sites” overseas. While a 2009 Executive Order directed that the CIA close its sites and not open any new ones, that order is not embodied in legislation. The CAT committee recommended that the United States “[e]nsure that no one is held in secret detention anywhere under its de facto effective control.” The committee reiterated that secret detention is a per se CAT violation. Indefinite Detention without Trial The CAT committee reminded the United States that “indefinite detention without trial constitutes, per se, a violation” of CAT. It noted that during the period under review nine deaths occurred at Guantanamo, including seven suicides, as well as repeated suicide attempts and mass hunger strike protests. In March 2015, the United States reported to the UN Human Rights Committee that of the 122 prisoners still at Guantanamo, 56 were cleared for transfer, had not yet been transferred, and had no immediate relief in sight; 10 were involved in some form of criminal justice; and the remaining 56 were “eligible for review” by the Periodic Review Board—i.e., they are still detained indefinitely without trial. The Human Rights Committee expressed concern that detainees at Guantanamo “are not dealt with through the ordinary criminal justice system after a protracted period of over a decade, in some cases.” It recommended that the United States should “ensure either their trial or their immediate release.” Military Commission Trials In March 2015, the United States reported to the Human Rights Committee that 10 Guantanamo detainees were currently facing charges, awaiting sentencing, or serving sentences imposed by military commissions. Although the United States contends that military commission trials are fair, the Committee recommended that the United States ensure that any criminal cases against detainees at Guantanamo be “dealt with through the criminal justice system rather than military commissions.” Drone Deaths As highlighted by President Obama’s recent apologies to families of two American hostages killed in drone attacks, the use of armed drones endangers innocents and raises serious questions under international law. The Human Rights Committee recommended that the United States: “revisit its position regarding legal justification”; ensure compliance with the principles of “precaution, distinction and proportionality”; disclose, subject to operational security, the criteria for drone strikes, the legal basis for specific attacks, the process of target identification, and the circumstances in which drones are used; provide “independent supervision and oversight” of drone attacks; take “all feasible measures to ensure the protection of civilians” in specific attacks; track and assess civilian casualties; investigate and bring to justice anyone responsible for violations of the right to life; and provide victims with effective remedies and compensation. Intelligence Surveillance The Human Rights Committee expressed its concern over NSA surveillance, including the bulk phone metadata surveillance program. It recommended that the United States ensure that interference with privacy comply with “principles of legality, proportionality and necessity, regardless of the nationality or location of the individuals whose communications are under direct surveillance.” While the recently enacted USA Freedom Act is a step toward that goal, more safeguards are needed. See, e.g., Neema Singh Guliani, What’s Next for Surveillance Reform after the USA Freedom Act, ACLU (June 3, 2015), https://www.aclu.org/blog/washington-markup/whats-next-surveillance-reform-after-usa-freedom-act. Police Killings The CERD committee expressed “concern at the brutality and excessive use of force by law enforcement officials against members of racial and ethnic minorities, including against unarmed individuals.” It recommended improved investigations, reporting, and redress. Criminal Justice The Human Rights Committee and CERD committee expressed a range of concerns about racial disparities in the criminal justice system, including racial profiling, stop-and-frisk arrests, and racial disparities in sentencing, including the death penalty. Voting The Human Rights Committee expressed concern over obstacles to voting, including burdensome voter identification and eligibility requirements. It recommended that voting rights be restored to felons who have completed their sentences, and that states “review automatic denial of the vote to any imprisoned felon, regardless of the nature of the offence.” Conclusion The foregoing is only a sampling of treaty committee recommendations, constrained by limitations of space. Interested readers can find the full committee reports and extensive documentation at http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/HumanRightsBodies.aspx. For anyone concerned about human rights in the United States, the inquiry is well worth the effort.

#### No war in Asia---numerous checks.

Green 20, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Cincinnati. (Brendan, 5-6-2020, "Security Threats in Contemporary World Politics: Potential Hegemons, Partnerships, and Primacy", Published in *A Dangerous World? Threat Perception and U.S. National Security*, https://www.cato.org/publications/publications/security-threats-contemporary-world-politics-potential-hegemons#dangers-american-alliances)

Primacy and the Goldilocks Problem

A broad range of research in international relations suggests that, under most circumstances, great power politics in Asia is likely to be peaceful. Defensive realists have long argued that the costs of conquests are extraordinarily high; their theories are especially relevant in Asia, where maritime geography and the likely presence of secure nuclear arsenals provide a large defensive advantage.21 Liberal arguments often come to the same conclusion by a different route: economic exchange has skyrocketed in Asia, creating the capitalist interdependence that is often said to incentivize peace. Modern economies have become more difficult to exploit, meaning that fewer economic gains are to be had from conquest.22

One could further add cognitive, normative, and biological arguments: Steven Pinker has recently argued that humans are moving away from warfare for all those reasons, while John Mueller has contended that major war among modern, industrial societies has already gone the way of dueling among people.23 Even the Asian absence of two traditional liberal causes of peace—widespread democracy and dense institutionalization—has become a less compelling worry. Although Asia lacks the institutionalization of European politics, it is not exactly devoid of institutions, which have increased in number, membership, and overlapping linkages since the end of the Cold War.24 More Asian regimes are democracies than ever before, and China’s autocratic regime appears to bias its external politics in favor of compromise, so that it can maintain domestic control.25

#### ASEAN fails to moderate conflict

Hartcher 17, Australian journalist and the Political and International Editor of the Sydney Morning Herald, visiting fellow at the Lowy Institute, a Sydney-based foreign policy think tank (Peter Hartcher, 8-28-2017, "ASEAN: The Asian strategic player that stinks," Sydney Morning Herald, https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/asean-the-asian-strategic-player-that-stinks-20170828-gy5g7f.html)

The hope of a better Myanmar under the much-admired Aung San Suu Kyi now looks forlorn. The crisis of Myanmar's Muslim minority community, the Rohingya, continues to escalate. Since Friday, news has been emerging of mass violence between the Myanmar army and Rohingya militants. At least 90 people are reported dead. The Rohingya are the world's biggest community of stateless people. Somewhere around 1 million of them live among Myanmar's 50 million Buddhists.They've lived in northern Myanmar's Rakhine state for centuries yet are despised and denied the right to citizenship. Some reported being called "Bengal bastards" as their Buddhist neighbours joined the army in clubbing them on the weekend. Thousands of Rohingya civilians responded to the fighting by trying to flee the country, crossing the Naf River into Bangladesh. Some made it but the Bangladeshis are turning most back.The Rohingya are not blameless; their militia reportedly started the violence on Friday by attacking 30 police stations in Myanmar. But they are not the sole culprits. In fact, it seems that the Rohingya resistance is fighting back after brutal years-long repression by the authorities. Late last year the government forces committed crimes of rape and murder and arson against the Rohingya that "seem to have been widespread as well as systematic, indicating the very likely commission of crimes against humanity," according to a February report by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Aung San Suu Kyi's response? The State Councillor and de facto ruler of Myanmar said the reports were made up. Consistently, she blames the Rohingya and refuses to accept any government responsibility. While Suu Kyi was an outstanding ambassador for her repressed opposition party while it suffered under the heel of the military regime, she seems quite indifferent, even hostile, to the oppressed minority suffering under the heel of her regime. The news across the border in Thailand on Friday wasn't terribly good either. The former prime minister, Yingluck Shinawatra, fled the country rather than face the verdict of the Supreme Court on a charge that she was negligent in operating a national rice-buying scheme. Not that she had any chance of a fair hearing. She'd already been fined $1 billion over the same matter. She was facing 10 years in prison. The case against her was merely part of the military junta's consolidation of power. Sadly, Thailand's conservative establishment simply refuses to allow the people to choose their own government. It will sometimes allow elections but then overturns them if it doesn't like the result. First her brother's popular, pro-poor government was overthrown by a military coup in 2006. Then, when she replaced him as head of his party and had the temerity to win an election, it was her turn. Now it seems she will join him in exile, living between Dubai and London. The Bangkok court ruling was to merely tidy up, by firmly taking her out of future politics. It wasn't so much the rice-buying scheme that the establishment objected to, although it was a botch job that collapsed leaving the government billions in debt. Their real complaint was that Yingluck Shinawatra used the scheme to redistribute income to farmers - mostly poor family enterprises - by paying above-market prices for their harvest. That, while disdaining the rich elites, was her true crime. Democracy, good governance, political freedom, personal liberty from the state are in shabby condition in both Myanmar and Thailand. And looking a little further, the state of the neighbourhood isn't much better, unfortunately. "There are brief moments of exuberance and optimism," says an ANU expert on South-east Asia, Nicholas Farrelly, "but when you look at the deep structure of forces across the board you see that democracy across South-east Asia is very shallow and nobody is really prepared to give it the nourishment it needs. "As recently as the mid-2000s there were plenty of powerful voices across the region looking for a different kind of politics; they have gone quiet," says Farrelly, founder of the New Mandala website on South-east Asian affairs. Farrelly ranks the 10 principal countries of the region according to their success as democratic systems, and "there is not much dissent among experts that Indonesia is on the top rung". Next, he says, is the Philippines, despite President Rodrigo Duterte's startlingly brutal human rights abuses and the advent of a new Daesh, so-called Islamic State, outpost. This is followed by Myanmar, and then the two neighbouring quasi-autocracies of Malaysia and Singapore. Sixth place in Farrelly's reckoning is Thailand: "If you have a hardline military dictatorship and you're prepared to give it mid ranking in the democracy stakes, that tells you a lot about the state of the region." Last are Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and Brunei. But what of their regional association, the much-vaunted Association of South East Asian Nations? This is ASEAN's 50th anniversary and there's been much gushing about its success. But which of the region's crises has it solved, and which is it attempting to tackle? The truth is that, whether it's the region's economic crisis of 1997, the Rohingya refugee crisis of today or anything in between, ASEAN is next to useless. But isn't ASEAN a key strategic player that can help manage China's ambitions and maintain the peace in South-east Asia? That's the claim of its boosters. Unfortunately not. Splitting ASEAN was child's play for Beijing. Two of China's client states, Laos and Cambodia, object whenever other ASEAN members try to complain about China's conduct. So ASEAN can't even issue a communique that breathes the least criticism of Beijing, much less takes any action. China has picked off the ASEAN states one by one in the South China Sea while ASEAN looks on uselessly. ASEAN is useful for intermediating between the elites of the region's capitals, says Farrelly, "keeping a certain kind of conversation. But for a serious crisis, there's simply no way ASEAN can play a serious role."ASEAN is a bit like South-east Asia's so-called king of fruits, the durian. Looks impressively large and spiky from a distance. On closer inspection it stinks.

## 2NC

### T

#### Vote neg. Extra-topical planks moot core DAs and lead to extraneous advantages. They did this for a reason---FTC is the only core DA on the topic. It’s try-or-die to protect the neg, because the topic is already overwhelmingly large WITHOUT an expansive interpretation of “at least”

Waller 20, John Paul Stevens Chair in Competition Law, Professor, and Director of Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies at the Loyola University Chicago School of Law, and Jacob E. Morse, J.D. Candidate at the Loyola University Chicago School of Law (Spencer Weber, “The Political Face of Antitrust”, Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial, and Commercial Law, Volume 15, July 2020, <https://awards.concurrences.com/IMG/pdf/_11_weber_waller_v21_formatted_1_.pdf?68864/b1fc17637de92baef13f2a93eb750f872a721091>)

IV. Antitrust in Civil Society

Competition issues are also part of the general civic discourse separate from the campaign rhetoric and legislative proposals offered by politicians. This is also a significant sign that antitrust has begun to be an important source of small “p” politics that engages substantial segments of the public at large.

One example is the increased number of non-technical books intended for a lay audience that deal with the role of antitrust in a healthy economy and democracy. Recent and forthcoming books dealing with these themes include Tim Wu’s “The Curse of Bigness,”109 Matt Stoller’s “Goliath,”110 Maurice Stucke and Ariel Ezrachi’s “Competition Overdose,”111 Zephyr Teachout’s “Break ‘em Up,”112 and David Dayan’s “Monopolized.”113 On the academic side, there are a plethora of government and NGO studies of competition policy on digital competition114 and new works are flourishing which explore the broader ramifications of antitrust and competition in society.115

Long form and more mass-market journalism have also taken up the mantle of exploring the role of antitrust and competition policy. Such diverse magazines as The Atlantic,116 Time,117 New Republic,118 American Prospect,119 Rolling Stone,120 New York Times magazine,121 Variety,122 National Review,123 Foreign Policy,124 and other policy and opinion magazines have all run recent stories or profiles of individuals involved in antitrust issues. Before the COVID-19 pandemic effectively monopolized press coverage in the United States, there were thirty-three antitrust related stories on the front page of the New York Times or the front page of its business section over a three-month period in late 2019.125 A majority of the stories focused on tech giants such as Apple, Microsoft, Google, Amazon, and Facebook.126 In addition, the New York Times also covered stories about mergers, merger policy, local issues such as the Chicago taxi market, and various smaller industries.127 This is separate from coverage during the same period of campaign issues and candidate statements relating to the field.

A similar increase in coverage during this same period can be observed anecdotally in more business-oriented publications like Forbes, Barron’s, Wired, and the Wall Street Journal; general newspapers like USA Today, Washington Post, and Huffington Post; more local newspapers; as well as radio and television.128 Web pages and social media accounts on these issues have similarly proliferated on all ideological perspectives.129

Lobbying and public policy groups are growing in number and influence. Beyond the traditional trade associations and general think tanks there are now a number of active groups with antitrust as a large part of their focus. These include the Open Markets Institute,130 American Antitrust Institute,131 Anti-Monopoly Fund,132 Institute for Self-Reliance,133 Public Citizen,134 Public Knowledge,135 Demos,136 and the International Center for Law and Economics.137

At the more technical legal end of the debate, antitrust is similarly flourishing as a field. One sees increased law school hiring in the field for the first time in decades. Academic institutes and centers abound with a wide variety of perspectives ranging from libertarian to enforcement oriented.138 Most major antitrust cases now feature multiple amicus briefs from legal and economic experts on both sides of an issue both in the Supreme Court or the Courts of Appeals.139

Conclusion

Antitrust has always been political in nature. Antitrust law provides broad legal commands dealing with how governments and private individuals can challenge different types of market behavior. In this way, antitrust has not changed.

Antitrust will never take the place of sports, the Dow Jones index, or the weather for conversation at the breakfast table, but it has become a meaningful part of the political and policy debate for candidates, the legislature, and important segments of civil society. What has changed, however, is the degree that antitrust has reentered the political arena. Once mostly the domain of technocrats, antitrust issues have been proposed and debated by Presidential candidates, political parties, legislators, pundits, journalists, lobby groups, and voters alike. There are also a flurry of serious proposals and investigations that would make significant changes to the current system if adopted.

#### “By At least” DOES NOT IMPLY that the following action is SUFFICIENT

Longman Dictionary (of Contemporary English, <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/at-least>) //Snowball

at least

a) not less than a particular number or amount

It will take you at least 20 minutes to get there.

He had at least £100,000 in savings.

at the (very) least (=not less than and probably much more than)

It would cost $1 million at the very least.

b) even if something better is not true or is not done

At least he didn’t lie to me.

I don’t expect you to pay me, but you could at least cover my expenses.

The house still needed a lot of work, but at least the kitchen was finished.

#### “At least” implies NECESSITY, but not SUFFICIENCY.

Hanks no date (Craig, Chair of Philosophy at Texas State University, “Confusion of Necessary with a Sufficient Condition,” <https://www.txstate.edu/philosophy/resources/fallacy-definitions/Confusion-of-Necessary.html>) //Snowball

Confusion of Necessary with a Sufficient Condition

A causal fallacy you commit this fallacy when you assume that a necessary condition of an event is sufficient for the event to occur. A necessary condition is a condition that must be present for an event to occur. A sufficient condition is a condition or set of conditions that will produce the event. A necessary condition must be there, but it alone does not provide sufficient cause for the occurrence of the event. Only the sufficient grounds can do this. In other words, all of the necessary elements must be there.

Examples:

Juan: "How do you think you'll do on our philosophy exam tomorrow?" Monique: "Great, I read all the books." Juan: "Yeah but do you understand this stuff?" Monique: "I said I read all the books, didn't I?"

Don't let all the talk about the necessity of exercise to a long life mislead you. Jim was a jock all his very short life.

Who said food keeps us alive? Tom died a few days ago and he was not short of good food.

I don't know why the car won't run; I just filled the gas tank.

Why don't you want to spend your life with me? I love you, and am I not good to you?

The counselor told me that if I wanted to graduate I must have at least 128 credit hours. Well, I've got that, but they're saying I won't walk this semester. How misleading!

#### That means meeting “expand the scope” does not necessarily “prohibit anticompetitive business practices”

Dul 15 (Jan, Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Necessary Condition Analysis (NCA): Logic and Methodology of “Necessary but Not Sufficient” Causality, 15 July 2015, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115584005>) //Snowball

Although scholars often confuse necessity and sufficiency (Chung, 1969; Goertz & Starr, 2003), the two are totally different.1 A necessary cause allows an outcome to exist; without the necessary cause, the outcome will not exist. A sufficient cause ensures that the outcome exists; it produces the outcome. A student who wants to be admitted to a U.S. graduate school (the outcome) needs to have a high score on the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) test: An adequate GRE score is necessary for the outcome. Necessary causes are not automatically sufficient. An adequate GRE score is not sufficient for admission because also other admission requirements play a role (e.g., the student’s motivation letter, a good TOEFL score, reputation of the student’s bachelor program, recommendation letter). However, if the student’s GRE score is too low, there is guaranteed failure, independently of the student’s performance on the other requirements. Therefore, a necessary cause is a constraint, a barrier, an obstacle, a bottleneck that must be managed to allow a desired outcome to exist. Each single necessary cause must be in place, as there is no additive causality that can compensate for the absence of the necessary cause. Prevention of guaranteed failure and increased probability of success are core constituents of the “necessary but not sufficient” logic of “X causes Y.”2

#### **They don’t meet “expand the scope”**

#### **Expand means make greater**

Maine Supreme Court 2k (SAUFLEY, J. Opinion in Bangs v. Town of Wells, 760 A. 2d 632 - Me: Supreme Judicial Court 2000. Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/12/21).

[¶ 19] Wells's interpretation of subsection 3(M) is not consistent with the plain language of the statute. See Kimball, 2000 ME 20, ¶ 18, 745 A.2d at 392 (explaining the rules of statutory construction). The plain meaning of the word "expand" means "to make or become greater in size."[9] WEBSTER'S II NEW RIVERSIDE DICTIONARY 241 (1996). Further, the language of the statute requires that municipalities give reasonable consideration to the expansion of existing "mobile home parks" as opposed to allowing "mobile home park lots" or "mobile home park density" to expand. Therefore, a logical and consistent reading of the statute encompasses mobile home parks' growth in physical area rather than merely in density. See Town of Madison, Dep't of Elec. Works v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n, 682 A.2d 231, 234 (Me.1996).

#### **Scope means range**

Wisconsin Court of Appeals 20 (BLANCHARD, J. Opinion in APPLEGATE-BADER FARM, LLC v. Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Appeal No. 2018AP1239 (Wis. Ct. App. Jan. 30, 2020). Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/21/21).

¶45 Returning to the text of WIS. STAT. § 227.135(4), we identify the meaning of the term "scope." Neither WIS. STAT. § 227.01 nor § 227.135 define "scope." Therefore, we resort to dictionary definitions that appear to be pertinent. "Scope" in § 227.135(4) means the range or extent of the subject involved in the "proposed rule."[13] We now address the wider context of WIS. STAT. ch. 227 as a whole, which demonstrates that the range or extent of a subject referenced in § 227.135(4) cannot reasonably be read to focus narrowly on any "meaningful or measurable" changes to draft rules.

#### **Core antitrust laws are the Sherman, Clayton, and FTC Acts**

Sukesh 20 (Rahul Sukesh-Fordham University. “Investigating a Mega-Merger: Contextualizing the T-Mobile Merger to the Consumer Welfare Standard and the Competition Standard“ , Fordham Undergraduate Law Review, Volume 2, Article 6, 2020, <https://research.library.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=fulr> , date accessed 9/4/21)

As the basis for the lawsuit and pending concern against the merger between T-Mobile and Sprint cited issues of antitrust law, having a general understanding of antitrust law will shed light on the breath of the issue. In practice today, there are three core antitrust laws: the Sherman Act of 1890, and the more recent Federal Trade Commission Act (FTCA) and Clayton Act both of 1914.226 The Sherman Act and Clayton Act are more significant to the implications of this case. In detail, the Sherman Act outlaws any attempt to restrict or monopolize trade within reasonable measure. Seemingly vague, this act applies to action that would hinder competition. Added to supplement the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act “addresses specific practices… such as mergers… the Sherman Act does not clearly prohibit” that would still hinder competition.”227

#### Contextually, “expand the scope of antitrust law” refers to proposals which change how companies are forced to operate

Agarwal 21 (Asheesh Agarwal is an alumnus of the Federal Trade Commission. “The New Google Suits” , <https://lawliberty.org/the-new-google-suits/> , JANUARY 13, 2021, date accessed 9/3/21)

These lawsuits, along with two suits against Facebook, firmly move the antitrust debate from Congress to the courts. Many reformers, particularly on the left but also on the right, are seeking to expand the scope of antitrust law. Some proposals would force companies to separate into single lines of business, hamper certain firms’ ability to acquire other companies, and even have antitrust law take into account amorphous values like “fairness” and “democratic ideals.” With these lawsuits pending, Congress is less likely to enact major antitrust legislation. Many reformers, such as House Judiciary Chairman Jerrold Nadler, praised the lawsuits as an “important step” in preserving competition online. Given that the existing laws, as written, may well allow the courts to address any competitive concerns, antitrust reformers will have a harder time persuading their colleagues that Congress must overhaul the antitrust laws now. At the very least, given that the most significant antitrust cases in two decades are now in the courts, Congress should take a deep breath before trying to rewrite a century of antitrust law.

#### Finite resource tradeoffs is a core controversy in the antitrust literature

Sokol 20, University of Florida Research Foundation Professor of Law, University of Florida (Daniel, “Antitrust's "Curse of Bigness" Problem ,” <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2020&context=facultypub>)

Antitrust works well because it is technocratic in that a singular (but flexible within its economics) goal is administrable institutionally. To introduce the world of political imperfections into a technical process that examines markets would create further distortions affecting consumers.152 Antitrust does well dealing with antitrust problems. To the extent that there are other related problems, the right answer is not to create an antitrust that lacks democratic accountability (because antitrust becomes regulation via the backdoor) and exceeds its mandate of the past forty years. Rather, the better solution is to identify the underlying problem and solve it with more effective tools. If the problem is one of redistribution, tax is a better choice than antitrust.153 If the problem is one of privacy, strengthen privacy laws. 154 If the problem is one of financial institutions or sector regulators not doing what they need to do, correct structural problems with sector regulators. Antitrust has increasingly moved out of sector regulation 155 and toward advocacy. 156 The advocacy budget of the antitrust agencies is tiny, and to the extent that the problem is the rules of the game for particular industry sectors, Wu falls short by not suggesting greater competition advocacy. Wu’s concern with big tech companies because they are big (p. 126) is as misplaced now as it was earlier in antitrust history. Antitrust has gone through various moments in which it had reevaluated whether it has the proper tools to combat anticompetitive behavior in technology-related markets.157 It does have such tools and can bring important cases in these markets.158 It was just a decade ago that we were told that Walmart was taking over shopping, that eBay was the largest online marketplace, or that Facebook was the primary way in which users shared information. Today, Uber competes with Lyft, Amazon has eclipsed eBay, Facebook is a legacy service, and younger people use any other set of applications to share information— such as Pinterest, Twitter, or Snapchat. In a world of continuous change, antitrust is what remains constant. It has the tools to police against unlawful exercise of monopoly power and adapts to changes in economic theory and empirics. To ask antitrust to go beyond its institutional capacity sets up antitrust to fail, because Wu’s deeper concern is with how society is structured. That structure can be changed through elections to the presidency and Congress and through changes as to the makeup of the Supreme Court. Antitrust history shows that it is the Supreme Court that changes antitrust law and policy the most because of antitrust’s common law–like nature. 159

### Trade Advantage

#### It can’t prevent escalation

Goldsmith 12

Benjamin, Associate Professor in the Department of Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney, International Trade and the Onset and Escalation of Interstate Conflict: More to Fight About, or More Reasons Not to Fight?, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2074894>, 6/4/12, PC, MM

However, at the stage of conflict escalation, trade interdependence should not have much further role. Factors like interdependence, observable to each side prior to militarized conflict onset, will be discounted by both states after force is threatened, as they engage in crisis communication either leading to escalation to deadly violence, or not. Resolve to fight cannot be observed before force is threatened, but once a militarized crisis begins, each side will try to understand how resolved the other is, while portraying itself as very resolved (Fearon 1995). The level of dependence alone will not provide sufficient information to distinguish states which are genuinely highly resolved, as Georgia seemed to be in its territorial confrontation with Russia, from those which are not. If trade were to play a role in this second stage of the process, it would likely be based on tools which could provide additional ways to communicate resolve. Thus, because interdependence should already be factored into the strategic calculations at the onset stage, its effect on the likelihood of escalation will be minimal.

#### their authors don’t assume economic benefits to conflicts

Rotte 4

Dr. Ralph Rotte (Department of Political Science, RWTH Aachen University, Germany). “Economics as an Instrument of Peace or Cause of War.” May 2004. <http://www.ipw.rwth-aachen.de/pub/paper/paper_04.pdf>

3.4 Historical examples Given those empirical problems, it is no surprise that economic history provides some interesting points indicating that the Liberal Peace might not be as straightforward as its theory suggests. In fact, the two world wars have demonstrated that exploitation of occupied territories can be profitable if the conqueror is reckless enough. Modern industrial economies even seem easier to control and exploit than agrarian societies because people in a complex system based on division of labour are less self-sufficient. Control of foodstuffs and basic living conditions make it relatively easy to enforce some minimum economic performance on behalf of the occupying power. It has been estimated, for example, that Germany extracted about 8 to 9 per cent of her GNP from occupied France in 1943. Although overall economic performance declined during the wars, taxes, industrial production, raw materials, forced labour and loot from the occupied territories in western and eastern Europe contributed massively to the German economy in 1915-1918 and 1940-1944. Similar results have been found for the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, Japan ’ s occupation of Korea until 1945, and the Soviet dominance of eastern Europe until 1989. One has to distinguish direct occupation costs from costs to continue the war on other fronts. In other words, if a war can be won, it might be profitable even in modern times. **It is therefore not per se economically irrational for decision-makers to expect economic benefits from warfare**. Ultimately, the crucial question about the Liberal Peace is a military and political, not an economic one: Is it possible to win the war fast and with limited damage?

#### there’s no risk of painful “cut-offs”

Goldstone 7

P.R. Goldstone (PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science and a member of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a non-resident research fellow at the Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University). “Pax Mercatoria: Does Economic Interdependence Bring Peace?” MIT Center for International Studies. August 2007. <http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit_08_07_Goldstone.pdf>

The emergence of truly global markets makes it all the less plausible under most circumstances that a revisionist state will be unable to find some alternative source of resources or outlet for its goods. Ironically, the more the international economy resembles a true global marketplace rather than an oligopolistic economic forum, the less likely it would appear that aggressors must inevitably suffer lasting retaliatory cut-offs in trade. **There will always be someone else with the capability to buy and sell**.12

#### Trade skyrockets emissions — deals systematically ignore the environment.

Kucik 18 — Assistant professor in the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona (Jeffrey; December 22nd; “Trade deals have glaring omission: Environmental standards”; *The Hill*; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/422458-trade-deals-have-glaring-omission-environmental-standards>; Date Accessed 03-04-2021)

Unfortunately, cooperation on the environment still lags in other areas. The international agreements that govern free trade still fail to adequately address climate change.

Trade plays an important role in global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. To start, there are the emissions associated with production. Emissions from industry account for around 20 percent of GHG output in both the United States and the European Union.

And, as production has moved out of the OECD to elsewhere in the world, GHG output has increased in emerging markets. The European Commission reports that, between 2000 and 2015, emissions grew by 45 percent in Brazil and 130 percent in India.

In those countries, changes in land use to promote agriculture exports and industrialization are major contributors to climbing emissions.

The spread of production around the world also increases emissions from transportation. Parts and components cross borders multiple times before a finished product appears on our shelves. Each step in that process contributes a little more to overall emissions.

What are recent trade agreements doing to confront these trends? The answer appears to be: not enough.

Trade deals suffer from two main shortcomings. First, they fail to recognize that climate change is a problem. The Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the EU probably scores best on this front.

It acknowledges 1972's Stockholm Declaration and "Agenda 21" — a broad commitment to sustainable development that came out of the Earth Summit.

But CETA shares a trait with other recent deals, including the revised Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). Despite lengthy passages about the environment, these deals never say the words “climate change,” and they are largely silent on the issue of GHG emissions.

Silence on this issue isn’t just a point of principle. Failing to recognize climate change has a policy implication, namely, the world’s trade deals do not lock members into more responsible practices.

Rather than binding commitments, there are only general aspirations, such as CPTPP’s call for “low emissions technologies.” That’s not a very significant step beyond the promises made decades ago in Rio.

#### Increased screening incentives outweigh opportunity costs.

Spaniel & Malone 19 — William Spaniel: Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh. Iris Malone: Department of Political Science, Stanford University (March 5th; *The Uncertainty Tradeoff: Re-Examining Opportunity Costs and War*; <https://wjspaniel.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/uncertainty-tradeoff-final.pdf>; Date Accessed 03-04-2021)

Conventional wisdom about economic interdependence and international conflict predicts increasing opportunity costs make war less likely, but some wars occur after costs grow. Why? We develop a model that shows a nonmonotonic relationship exists between the costs and probability of war when there is uncertainty over resolve. Under these conditions, increasing the costs of an uninformed party’s opponent has a second-order effect of exacerbating informational asymmetries about that opponent’s willingness to maintain peace. We derive conditions under which war can occur more frequently and empirically showcase the model’s implications through a case study of Sino-Indian relations from 1949 to 2007.This finding challenges how scholars traditionally believe economic interdependence mediate incentives to fight: instruments like trade have competing effects on the probability of war.

Introduction

What is the relationship between opportunity costs and war? Most political scientists invoke the “opportunity cost mechanism” to explain why commerce, trade ties, and other economic transactions decrease the probability of conflict.1As potential gains from interdependence increase, opportunity costs also rise. The range of mutually preferable settlements expands and the probability of war correspondingly drops (Fearon 1995; Oneal and Russett 2001; Polachek and Xiang 2010). In sum, changing opportunity costs underscore one of the most popular theories of war.

However, not all scholars believe opportunity costs are a panacea for war.2 The historical record contains empirical inconsistencies in this relationship. At times, conflicts have arisen despite increased economic interdependence between parties, fueling concerns over when and whether opportunity costs reduce conflict. We therefore ask a simple question: holding all else equal, does increasing opportunity costs for war decrease the probability of conflict?3

In this paper, we develop a model that reconciles this puzzle by showing both proponents and skeptics of the opportunity cost mechanism are right. Instruments like trade have competing effects on the probability of war. How is this true? Despite raising the price of war, opportunity costs also have an indirect, second order effect of exacerbating uncertainty about a state’s resolve, which is among the most popular mechanisms that explain war.4Which effect is stronger? We show that the latter effect can dominate in equilibrium—that is, the probability of war increases despite raising opportunity costs.

The intuition falls back on screening models where a proposer is uncertain about its opponent’s willingness to fight. Broadly, the uninformed state can pursue two strategies under these conditions. First, it can offer a generous amount that resolved types would accept. This has the benefit of avoiding the costs of war. Alternatively, it can propose a stingy settlement and screen the opponent’s willingness to fight, causing unresolved types to accept while inducing resolved types to reject. The latter benefits the proposer by giving it a large share of the settlement when the opponent accepts, but also forces it to pay the costs of war if its screening offer backfires.

When the difference between the costs of war for types is small, the proposing state has less incentive to screen. Why? Screening still forces the proposer to risk war, but the prospective gains from such a settlement are minimal. However, as the costs of conflict grow, a state is more likely to issue more aggressive demands because of a divergence in relative valuations among types. As the difference in relative costs between types increases, stingy offer strategies become more attractive. For the proposer, the increased screening incentives can outweigh the increased opportunity cost of conflict. This causes the proposer to risk war and trade breakdown by making more aggressive demands. Thus, increasing opportunity costs can have a countervailing effect of raising the risk of war even though these costs are common knowledge.

Our model verifies this counterintuitive relationship. It also generates comparative statics on when the uncertainty effect dominates over the opportunity cost effect. We focus on the role of opportunity costs in economic interdependence theory given its popularity. To preview, the effect arises as trade flows increase because a state cannot observe how its opponent weighs the benefits of trade relative to the costs of fighting. The probability of war increases when the state facing this uncertainty internalizes a larger portion of the military costs than the benefits of trade relative to their opponent’s internalization. The conditional effect introduced here suggests caution in making broad claims about the relationship between trade and war, though the scope conditions the model generates provide a straightforward substantive interpretation that scholars can exploit.

## 1NR

### Outreach Advantage

#### US cred is doomed no matter what.

Kirshner 1-29-2020, Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Boston College. (Jonathan, "Gone But Not Forgotten: Trump’s Long Shadow and the End of American Credibility", *Foreign Affairs*, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-01-29/trump-gone-not-forgotten)

This is why even though Donald Trump has become a member of a rather exclusive club—one-term U.S. presidents—the Trump presidency will have enduring consequences for U.S. power and influence in the world. Leo Tolstoy warned that “there are no conditions to which a man may not become accustomed, particularly if he sees that they are accepted by those around him,” and it is easy, especially for most insular Americans, to implicitly normalize what was in fact a norm-shattering approach to foreign policy. Level whatever criticisms you may about the often bloodstained hands of the American colossus on the world stage, but Trump’s foreign policy was different: shortsighted, transactional, mercurial, untrustworthy, boorish, personalist, and profoundly illiberal in rhetoric, disposition, and creed.

Some applauded this transformation, but most foreign policy experts, practitioners, and professionals are breathing a sigh of relief that a deeply regrettable, and in many ways embarrassing, interlude has passed. (It is exceedingly unlikely that any future president will exchange “beautiful letters” with and express their “love” for the North Korean leader Kim Jong Un.) But such palpable relief must be tempered by a dispiriting truth, rooted in that notion of anarchy: the world cannot unsee the Trump presidency. (Nor, for that matter, can it unsee the way members of the U.S. Congress behaved in the final weeks of the Trump administration, voting opportunistically to overturn an election and helping incite violence at the Capitol.) From this point forward, countries around the globe will have to calculate their interests and expectations with the understanding that the Trump administration is the sort of thing that the U.S. political system can plausibly produce.

Such reassessments will not be to the United States’ advantage. For 75 years, the general presumption that the United States was committed to the relationships and institutions it forged and the norms it articulated shaped the world in ways that privileged U.S. interests. If it is increasingly perceived to be feckless and self-serving, the United States will find the world a more hazardous and less welcoming place.

POWER AND PURPOSE

One country tries to anticipate the foreign policy behavior of another by making assessments about two factors: power and purpose. Measuring the former seems straightforward, although it is often not. (France seemed to boast a formidable military in 1939, and the Soviet Union was considered a superpower a half century later, yet both countries suddenly and unexpectedly collapsed under pressure.) Measuring the latter—purpose—requires more guesswork in practice but is even more important. Is a country a friend or a foe, and in either case, for how long? Is a country’s word its bond, or are its commitments ephemeral and its pronouncements little more than shallow, opportunistic posturing? Ultimately, these are questions of trust and confidence that require judgment calls. And for better or worse, it is easier to partner with a country whose underlying foreign policy orientation is rooted in purposes that are reasonably consistent over time.

For U.S. partners in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East, however, Washington’s priorities on the world stage must now be interrogated, and any conclusions reached must be held with qualifications rather than confidence. And there is nothing that President Joe Biden and his team of immaculate professionals can do to stop that. From now on, all countries, everywhere, must hedge their bets about the United States—something that will unnerve allies more than adversaries. Whatever promises are made and best behaviors followed over the next few years, a resurgence of knuckle-dragging America firstism will loom menacingly in the shadows. That possibility will inevitably shape other states’ conclusions about their relations with the United States, even as nearly every world leader rushes to shake the hand of the new U.S. president.

Thus, even with the election of Biden—a traditional, centrist liberal internationalist, cut from the same basic foreign policy cloth of every U.S. president (save one) across nine decades—countries will now have to hedge against the prospect of an indifferent, disengaged, and clumsily myopic U.S. foreign policy. After all, anarchy also demands that states see the world as it is, not as they wish it might be. And the warning signs that the United States is perhaps not the country it once was could not be flashing more brightly.

Although the margin of victory in the 2020 U.S. presidential election was wide (the two candidates were separated by seven million votes, a 4.5 percent edge in the popular vote, and 74 electoral votes), it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, a renunciation of Trump. In 2016, some argued that Trump’s election was a fluke. This was always whistling past the graveyard, but the case could be made. After all, the election hinged on only about 80,000 votes, spread across three swing states. Even with that, but for the historically contingent geographic quirks of Michigan (the Upper Peninsula) and Florida (the Panhandle), those states would have gone blue. And the Democratic nominee, Hillary Clinton (who did walk away with the popular vote by a large margin), was, for some key constituencies, a suspect candidate.

The 2020 election put to rest the comforting fable that Trump’s election was a fluke. Trump is the United States—or at least a very large part of it. Many Americans will choke on that sentiment, but other countries don’t have the luxury of clinging to some idealized version of the United States’ national character. Trump presided over dozens of ethical scandals, egregious procedural lapses, and startling indiscretions, most of which would have ended the political career of any other national political figure of the past half century. But the trampling of norms barely registered with most of the American public. Nor did the sheer, horrifying incompetence of the administration’s handling of the gravest public health crisis in a century chase Trump from the political scene in disgrace. (Imagine what would have happened to Jimmy Carter, a decent man dealt a difficult hand by an oil shock and the Iranian hostage crisis. Those events were enough to have his approval rating plummet into the 20s and soon send him packing after his landslide defeat in 1980.) Rather, Trump characteristically treated a pandemic that killed well more than a quarter of a million of the people under his charge as a personal inconvenience, to be managed exclusively for perceived political advantage. Even so, 74 million people voted for him—nine million more than did in 2016 and the most votes ever cast for a U.S. candidate for president, with the exception of Biden, who garnered 81 million.

One cannot paint a picture of the American polity and the country’s future foreign policy without including the significant possibility of a large role for Trumpism, with or without Trump himself in the Oval Office. Looking ahead four years, America watchers must anticipate that the next U.S. presidential election could turn out quite differently. This does not bode well for U.S. interests and influence in world politics. As Mark Leonard, the director of the European Council on Foreign Relations, observed, “If you know that whatever you’re doing will at most last until the next election, you look at everything in a more contingent way.”

#### Safety norms aren’t liberal norms and the aff doesn’t codify them

1AC Daniel 20 – (\*Owen Cotton-Barratt \*\*Max Daniel and \*\*\*Anders Sandberg \*Research Scholars Programme Director @ Future of Humanity Institute @ Oxford University, DPhil in pure mathematics from Oxford University, worked as a Research Fellow at the University of Southampton \*\*Research Scholars Project Manager @ Future of Humanity Institute @ Oxford University, master’s in mathematics with a minor in philosophy from Heidelberg University \*\*\*Researcher @ Future of Humanity Institute @ Oxford University, Senior Research Fellow on the ERC UnPrEDICT Programme, Ph.D. in computational neuroscience from Stockholm University; published May 2020, Global Policy Volume 11, Issue 3, "Defence in Depth Against Human Extinction: Prevention, Response, Resilience, and Why They All Matter," doa: 11-8-2021) url: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1758-5899.12786

Accidents may be prevented by general safety norms that also help reduce unseen risk. In addition, building on our understanding of specific accident scenarios, we can design failsafe systems or follow operational routines that minimise accident risk. In some cases, we may want to eschew an accident-prone technology altogether in favour of safer alternatives. Accident prevention may benefit from research on high reliability organisations (Roberts and Bea, 2001) and lessons learnt from historical accidents. Where effective prevention measures have been identified, it may be beneficial to codify them through norms and law at the national and international levels. Alternatively, if we can internalise the expected damages of accidents through mechanisms such as insurance, we can leverage market incentives.6

### Resources Advantage

#### No causal evidence, only maybe true for the poorest countries, and government responses check—answers middle class protest

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### No loose nukes---countermeasures solve.

Mueller 20, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, member of the political science department and senior research scientist with the Mershon Center for International Security Studies at Ohio State University. (John, 06/24/20, “Nuclear Alarmism: Proliferation and Terrorism”, *Cato Institute*, <https://www.cato.org/publications/publications/nuclear-alarmism-proliferation-terrorism>)

Stealing or Illicitly Purchasing a Bomb: Loose Nukes

There has also been great worry about “loose nukes,” especially in postcommunist Russia — weapons, “suitcase bombs” in particular, that can be stolen or bought illicitly. A careful assessment conducted by the Center for Nonproliferation Studies has concluded that it is unlikely that any of those devices have been lost and that, regardless, their effectiveness would be very low or even nonexistent because they (like all nuclear weapons) require continual maintenance.39 Even some of those people most alarmed by the prospect of atomic terrorism have concluded, “It is probably true that there are no ‘loose nukes,’ transportable nuclear weapons missing from their proper storage locations and available for purchase in some way.“40

It might be added that Russia has an intense interest in controlling any weapons on its territory because it is likely to be a prime target of any illicit use by terrorist groups, particularly Chechen ones of course, with whom it has been waging a vicious on‐​and‐​off war for two decades. The government of Pakistan, which has been repeatedly threatened by terrorists, has a similar interest in controlling its nuclear weapons and material — and scientists. As noted by Stephen Younger, former head of nuclear weapons research and development at Los Alamos National Laboratory, “Regardless of what is reported in the news, all nuclear nations take the security of their weapons very seriously.“41 Even if a finished bomb were somehow lifted somewhere, the loss would soon be noted and a worldwide pursuit launched.

Moreover, finished bombs are outfitted with devices designed to trigger a nonnuclear explosion that would destroy the bomb if it were tampered with. And there are other security techniques: bombs can be kept disassembled with the components stored in separate high‐​security vaults, and security can be organized so that two people and multiple codes are required not only to use the bomb but also to store, maintain, and deploy it. If the terrorists seek to enlist (or force) the services of someone who already knows how to set off the bomb, they would find, as Younger stresses, that “only few people in the world have the knowledge to cause an unauthorized detonation of a nuclear weapon.” Weapons designers know how a weapon works, he explains, but not the multiple types of signals necessary to set it off, and maintenance personnel are trained in only a limited set of functions.42

There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were to fail, collapsing in full disarray — Pakistan is frequently brought up in this context and sometimes North Korea as well. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory; would still have locks (and in the case of Pakistan would be disassembled); and could probably be followed, located, and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The worst‐​case scenario in that instance requires not only a failed state but also a considerable series of additional permissive conditions, including consistent (and perfect) insider complicity and a sequence of hasty, opportunistic decisions or developments that click flawlessly in a manner far more familiar to Hollywood scriptwriters than to people experienced with reality.43

#### No nuclear terror---even if acquisition.

\* fear of backlash from supporters, internal division, and international retaliation = deterrence

McIntosh & Storey 18 (Christopher McIntosh is visiting assistant professor of political studies at Bard College, Ph.D. in 2013 from The University of Chicago, specializing in international relations and has an M.A. in Security Studies from Georgetown & Ian Storey is a fellow at the Hannah Arendt Center for Politics and Humanities at Bard College, Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago; Between Acquisition and Use: Assessing the Likelihood of Nuclear Terrorism, *International Studies Quarterly*, 19 April 2018, sqx087, https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx087)

Our approach offers a point of departure for strategically assessing the options, likely responses, and potential outcomes that could arise from the different paths available to a nuclear-armed non-state group. Too often analysts treat the decision by such groups to use nuclear weapons as if it occurs in a vacuum. In practice, terrorist groups face many short-term and long-term considerations. They are influenced by factors both external and internal to their organization. These include the potential for backlash among supporters, internal factionalization over nuclear strategy and doctrine, and an overwhelming response by the target state and the international community.

Moreover, we suggest a way to bring the recursivity of strategic choice into the account of terrorist organizational decision-making. These organizations must consider the long-term effects of a nuclear attack. An attack occurs in the context of an ongoing campaign by a well-established organization. Opportunity costs exist because escalating to nuclear attack forecloses future options. As well, conducting an attack may not only preclude other strategies, but the continued existence of the group itself. This changes the game significantly. In most cases, a nuclear attack must present not just an effective option for the moment, but the only strategic option worth pursuing going forward.

Once we take these considerations into account, the detonation of a nuclear weapon generally appears the least strategically advantageous option for non-state groups. Indeed, the factors presented here are analytically independent, adaptable, and scalable to particular threat contexts. We can therefore use our framework to study the opportunities and constraints faced by specific future groups. It should therefore assist in the process of planning responses to potential nuclear acquisition by terrorist groups.

Successive governments have now identified nuclear terrorism as a critical concern in the formulation of security policy. This line of thinking systematically underspecifies, or simply misunderstands, key considerations that terrorist organizations take into account. These include the group's organizational survival, opportunity costs, and the conflation of victory with the end of hostilities. Each factor presents strong disincentives to immediate nuclear attack. A nuclear-armed terrorist group is exceedingly dangerous, but for different reasons than normally assumed. The options available to the group that fall short of detonation or attack remain considerable, albeit less spectacular and immediate.

Just as scholars like Bunn et al. (2015) are careful to do, political actors and analysts should resist uncritically deploying the term “nuclear terrorism” in an umbrella fashion. This point goes beyond even the attempts at disaggregating “use” presented here. The threat of an attack involving an improvised nuclear device is vastly different than that of a “dirty bomb,” and both have little in common with the threat posed by an attack on a nuclear facility. Each deserves separate consideration when formulating policy, even if measures taken to address these concerns, such as controlling nuclear leakage, ultimately overlap. If any of the acquisition or threat scenarios we explore come to fruition, then potential target states will need strategies that potentially employ positive, as well as negative, incentives to lessen the attractiveness of nuclear attack. As we argue, a crisis involving a nuclear-armed terrorist group will be a negotiation—regardless of what the target state chooses to label it. Far from demonstrating weakness, employing threats while dangling the possibility of political concessions can widen internal divisions, heightening the overall organizational costs of escalating violence (Toros 2008; Cronin 2009).

Finally, efforts designed to improve intelligence capabilities both prior to and post-attack remain vital. Signature analysis as a forensic measure has shown promise as a way of identifying the origin of nuclear material—in some cases it can identify whether or not it was provided by a state (Kristo and Tumey 2013). These efforts would be improved with a more widespread international commitment via the IAEA to placing signature markers in weapons and weaponizable material (Korbatov et al. 2015, 70; Findlay 2014, 6).

Ultimately, when it comes to the threat of a nuclear attack by a terrorist, presumption should lie squarely on the side of skepticism rather than inevitability. While some terrorist organizations have some incentives for nuclear acquisition, paradoxically and thankfully, the most strategic uses of a nuclear weapon fall well short of actual nuclear attack. From a scholarly perspective, as well as a political one, we need to start to think through how states would act in a world with nuclear-armed non-state actors. In doing so, we should avoid assumptions that fit neither with known nuclear strategy nor the empirical behavior of non-state organizations. Like most clichés, the post–Cold War trope that the threat of attack is higher now than it was during the US-USSR arms race (Litwak 2016) obscures much more than it reveals.

#### REM scarcity is self-correcting---exploration, recycling, and innovation.

Lovins 17, Cofounder and Chairman Emeritus of Rocky Mountain Institute, energy advisor to major firms and governments in 70+ countries for 45+ years, has written 31 books and more than 600 papers, advised major firms and governments worldwide, and received 12 honorary doctorates and many international awards. (Amory, 5-23-2017, "Clean energy and rare earths: Why not to worry", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, https://thebulletin.org/2017/05/clean-energy-and-rare-earths-why-not-to-worry/)

Such examples illustrate the processes of resource efficiency and substitution (processes that extend far beyond rare earths). Scarcity, real or perceived, drives price, attention, R&D, and imagination. It elicits mineral exploration: At the market’s 2011 peak, some 190 companies were scouring the planet for potentially profitable rare-earth deposits. Scarcity makes end-uses more productive, durable, and closed-cycle, with recycling no longer an afterthought but a business imperative. It even drives the kind of basic research that in the United States (largely through the government agency ARPA-E) and in Japan has lately come up with even more powerful supermagnets based on iron nitride (Fe16N2) and containing no rare earths whatsoever. Sorry, China.

Remember when the 1973 and 1979 oil-price shocks triggered the development of mobility alternatives that are now coming to market and threatening to smother oil demand? The 2010-era rare-earth price spike set similarly subtle but irresistible forces in motion that will make sustained high rare-earth prices unsupportable.

Sloppy analysis. Together, these shifts in economic geology, resource use, and innovation are extremely powerful. This isn’t to say that no rare-earth issues remain: Price instability, for example, remains a long-term concern if greater efforts to supply the more-valuable “heavy” subfamily of rare earths co-produce too many less-valuable “light” ones. But serious concern about rare earths still lacks an informed basis in either scarcity or oligopoly. Only the echoes of less-informed prior concerns reverberate.