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### 1NC---T Statutory Exemptions

#### “Expanding scope” requires prohibiting practices that are currently legislatively exempted from antitrust laws

Garubo, citing Supreme Court, 84, Senior Vice President and Corporate Secretary, Commercial Credit Group, Juris Doctor, magna cum laude, from California Western School of Law (Angelo, “Severing the Legislative Veto Provision: The Aftermath of Chada,” *California Western law Review,* 21.1)

A proviso is a clause engrafted on an enactment to restrain or modify the enacting clause or to except from its operation something which otherwise would have been within it. It also acts to exclude or prevent possible grounds of misinterpretation. It is designed to prevent an interpretation which extends that statute to cases not intended by the legislature to be brought within its purview.140 By its very nature a veto provision can be considered as a proviso to the rest of the statute. The function of a veto provision is to allow Congress to exercise post enactment control over the executive. 141 It allows them to prevent officials of the executive branch from implementing a statute in a way which is inconsistent with the intent of the legislature.142 By "vetoing" an act of the executive branch, Congress could insure that any implementation of a statute was consistent with the purview of that statute. 143 The Department of Education Organization Act' 44 authorized the Secretary of Education, an executive official, to prescribe rules and regulations as he determines are necessary to administer and manage the functions of the department. 145 The statute also contained a veto provision which stated that rules and regulations promulgated under the Act could be disapproved by a concurrent resolution of Congress.146 As this example indicates, veto provisions act as provisos to the main body of a statute by allowing Congress to retain control over the implementation of the statute by the executive branch. Since a veto provision can qualify as a proviso, the rule in Davis v. Wallace 147 and Frost v. Corporation Commission 148 can be applied to show that the legislative intent test is inadequate to determine if a veto provision should be severed. In Davis and Frost, the Supreme Court ruled that a proviso could not be severed if it was originally written into the statute. 149 The Court reasoned that severing such a provision would result in an extension of the scope of the statute.' 50 Such an extension would be contrary to the legislative intent of a statute by including subject matter which the legislature expressly chose to exclude.151 The Davis and Frost analysis can be applied to the "congressional veto" because (1) the veto provision can be considered a proviso 152 and (2) severing a veto provision will expand the scope of the statute contrary to legislative intent. 5 3 By severing a veto provision the executive branch would be free to expand or limit the scope of a statute through its implementation. Such an expansion or limitation would constitute a defacto contradiction of legislative intent by altering the purview of the statute.' 54 A veto provision is a control mechanism.' 55 Its mere presence in a statute indicates the legislature's desire to restrict the scope of that statute. 5 6 By removing it, the court would affect a fundamental change in the nature of the statute, which was not accounted for when the legislature enacted the law. 157 Because a veto provision is a proviso, its excise from a statute would contradict legislative intent. A test which uses legislative intent to determine if a veto provision is severable could only find that the provision is not severable. Thus, when literally applied, the legislative intent test is not adequate to determine if a veto provision should be severed from its statutory framework.

#### VIOLATION---the plan does not reverse a statutory exemption.

#### VOTE NEG:

#### 1---Predictable limits and ground. Any other interp makes “stronger enforcement” topical, which justifies limitless sub-industry of the week and each of which has zero link uniqueness.

#### 2---Precision---Supreme Court definitions are the gold standard [our ev cites Davis v. Wallace and Frost v. Corporation Commission]

#### 3---Resolutional synergy. Our interp gives independent meaning to “scope of laws.”

### 1NC---K

**The World Computer is the system of computational racial capitalism that presents the world as we know it through the process of *real abstraction*, where information and meaning is quantified from social qualifiers in order to extract value in the form of capital risk. The meta-structure of the World Computer overdetermines sociality and conscripts thought into algorithms of profit – that sediments algorithmic racism and fascism.**

**Beller 21** (Jonathan Beller = Professor of Humanities and Media Studies and Critical and Visual Studies at Pratt Institute, “*The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism”*, Duke University Press, BEH)

Information as Real Abstraction Taking the **notion that Capital was always a computer as a starting point** (Dyer-Witheford, 2013), The World Computer understands the **history of the commodification** of life as a process of encrypting the world’s myriad qualities as quantities. Formal and informal techniques, from double-entry bookkeeping and racialization, **to the rise of information and discrete state machines**, imposed **and extended the tyranny of racial capital’s relentless calculus of profit.** By means of the **coercive colonization of almost all social spaces, categories, and representations**—where **today language, image, music, and communication all depend upon a computational substrate** that is an outgrowth of fixed capital—all, or nearly all, expressivity has been captured in the dialectic of massive capital accumulation on the one side and radical dispossession on the other. **Currently the money-likeness of expression**—**visible as “likes”** and in other attention metrics that treat attention and affect as currency—is symptomatic of the financialization of daily life (Martin, 2015a). **All expression,** no matter what its valence, **is conscripted by algorithms of profit** that intensify **inequality by being put in the service of racial capitalism**; consequently, we are experiencing a near- apocalyptic, world-scale failure to be able to address global crises including migration for reparations, carceral systems, genocide, militarism, climate racism, racism, pandemic, anti-Blackness, extinction, and other geopolitical ills. The colonization of semiotics by racial capital has rendered **all “democratic” modes of governance outmoded** save those designed for the violent purpose of extracting profits for the enfranchised. Culturally these modes of extraction take the form of fractal fascism. An **understanding that informationalized semiotic practices** function as financial derivatives may **allow for a reimagining of the relationship between** language, visuality, and that other economic medium, namely **money, in an attempt to reprogram economy** and therefore the creation and distribution of value**—and thus also the politics and potentials of representation.** In what would amount to an end to postmodernism understood as the cultural logic of late capitalism, our revolutionary politics require, as did the communisms of the early twentieth century, a new type of economic program. In the age of computation, putting political economy back on the table implies a reprogramming of our cultural logics as economic media for the radical redress of the ills of exploitation and the democratization of the distribution of the world social product. **Sustainable communism requires the decolonizaton of abstraction** and the remaking of the protocols of social practice that give rise to real abstraction. **Though in this section we will more narrowly address the issues of money, race, and information as “real abstraction,” and their role in computational racial capitalism**, we note the overarching argument for the larger study: **1 Commodification inaugurates the global transformation** of qualities into quantities and gives rise to the world computer. **2 “Information” is not a naturally occurring** reality but emerges in the footprint of price and is always a means to posit the price of a possible or actual product. 3 **The general formula for capita**l, M-C-Mʹ, where M is money, C is commodity, and Mʹ is more money) can be **rewritten M-I-Mʹ,** where I is information. 4 “Labor,” Attention, Cognition, Metabolism, **Life converge as “Informatic Labor” whose purpose,** with respect to Capital, **is to create state changes in the Universal Turing Machine** that is the World Computer— racial capital’s relentless, granular, and planetary computation of its accounts**. 5 Semiotics, representation, and categories of social difference** function as financial derivatives—as wagers on the economic value of their underliers and as means of structuring risk for capital. 6 **Only a direct engagement with the computational colonization** of the life-world through a reprogramming (remaking) of the material processes of abstraction that constitute real abstraction can secure victory—in the form of a definitive step out of and away from racial capitalism—for the progressive movements of our times. Such a definitive movement requires an occupation and decolonization of information, and therefore of computation, and therefore of money. Only through a remaking of social relations at the molecular level of their calculus, informed by struggle against oppression, can the beauty of living and the fugitive legacies of creativity, community, and care prevail. The mode of comprehension, analysis, and transformation proposed here will require an expanded notion of racial capitalism. It interrogates the existence of deep continuities and long-term emergences—what one could correctly call algorithms of extractive violence—in the history of capitalism. These algorithms of violence include the reading and writing of code(s) on bodies, their surveillance and overcoding by informatic abstraction. Such algorithms of epidermalization or “the imposition of race on the body” (Browne: 113) are inscribed and executed on the flesh (Spillers 1987); and they are executed by means of codification processes that violently impose both a metaphysical and physical reformatting of bodies. As Simone Browne shows, epidermalization is given “its alphanumeric form” (99) through a vast array tools of marking, scarification, discipline, and surveillance that include branding irons, implements of torture, auction blocks, ship design, insurance policies, newspaper ads for runaway “property,” photographs in postcard form and a panoply of other media of dehumanization. Executable code is imposed as social categories of race, gender, religion and property, as ideologies, psychologies, contracts, brands, communication theories, game theories, and quantities of money—these abstractions work their ways into and are indeed imposed by the machines of calculation—and their avatars. We confront a continuous process of unmaking and remaking using all means available; it is violently inscribed on bodies. Sylvia Wynter, in her post– Rodney King piece “No Humans Involved: An Open Letter to My Colleagues” writes, “Both W. E. B. Du Bois and Elsa Goveia have emphasized the way in which the code of ‘Race’ or the Color Line, functions to systemically predetermine the sharply unequal re-distribution of the collectively produced global resources; and therefore, the correlation of the racial ranking rule with the Rich/Poor rule. Goveia pointed out **that all American societies are integrated on the basis of a central cultural belief** in which all share. This belief, that of **the genetic-racial inferiority** of Black people to all others, functions to enable our social hierarchies, including those of rich and poor determined directly by the economic system, to be perceived as having been as pre-determined by ‘that great crap game called life,’ as have also ostensibly been the invariant hierarchy between White and Black. Consequently in the Caribbean and Latin America, within the terms of this sociosymbolic calculus, to be ‘rich’ was also to be ‘White,’ to be poor was also to be ‘Black’ ” (Wynter: 52). “To be ‘rich’ was also to be ‘White,’ to be poor was also to be ‘Black.’ ” The real abstraction imposed by executable code—the “**code of ‘Race’ ” that “functions to systematically predetermine** the structurally **unequal redistribution of global resources**” is beholden to mediating capitalist exchange while embarking on a radical reformatting of ontology. This reformatting, the supposed result of “that great crap game called life,” brutally correlates race and value, but not entirely by chance, while racial capitalism embarks on imposing this calculus globally. Racial abstraction is endemic to what we will further explore as “real abstraction”; the evacuation of quality by abstract categories and quantities is, as we shall see in more detail, a “necessary” correlate to a world overrun by the calculus of money. Such algorithms of violence encode social difference, and although they may begin as heuristics (“rules of thumb”), they are none the less crucial to the **calculated and calculating expansion of racial capital**. Its processes and processing structures the meanings that can be ascribed to— and, as importantly, what can be done to—those of us whose data profiles constitute us as “illegal,” “Mexican,” “Black,” “[Roma] Gypsy,” “Jew,” and a lexicon of thousands of other actionable signs. This codification process draws from the histories of slavery, of colonialism, of state formation, of genocide, of gender oppression, of religious pogroms, of normativity, and again from the militarization and policing and the apparatuses of calculation that have developed within states and parastates in their own biometric pursuit of capital—power. Their violent destruction and remaking of the world. The **internalization of these codes**, including the struggles with them and the ways in which they license and/or foreclose various actions, exists in a recursive relationship to their perilous refinement. **Their analysis, a code-breaking of sorts,** will therefore demand some drastic modifications in many of the various anticapitalist, antistate warrior-stances practiced to date, particularly in a large number of their European and U.S. incarnations that until very recently remained blind to their own imperial violence and are too often complicit with hegemonic codes of masculine, unraced agency, imperialist nationalism, and default liberal assumptions in relation to questions of race, gender, sexuality, coloniality, and other forms of historically institutionalized oppression.3 The analytic, **computational racial capital, would identify the field of operations** that emerges around the embryonic form of the commodity and coarticulates with racial abstraction to formalize its code, code **that serves as operating system for the virtual machine here hypostasized as “the world computer”** and by inscribing itself on bodies and everything else. The commodity, the analysis of which famously begins volume 1 of Marx’s Capital, expressed the dual being and indeed dual registration of the humanly informed object as both quality of matter and quantity of exchange-value, along with the global generalization of this form. “The wealth of societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails appears as an immense collection of commodities” (125). Commodities were (and with some modifications to be discussed further on, still are) humanly informed materials with a **use-value and an exchange-value— humanly informed qualities indexed by quantities**. “Computational racial capital,” as a heuristic device, stages an analysis of the convergence of what on the one side often appeared as universal: **the economic, abstract, and machinic operating systems of global production** and reproduction endemic to the commodity form and its calculus, with what on another side, sometimes appeared as particular or even incidental: racism, colonialism, slavery, imperialism, and racialization. The concept organizes this dramaturgy of analytically reunifying elements that were never materially separate in light of the study that the late Cedric Robinson conducted and recorded as Black Marxism. Robinson writes, “The development, organization and expansion of capitalist society pursued essentially racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force, then, it could be expected that racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalism. I have used the term ‘racial capitalism’ to refer to the development and to the subsequent structure as an historical agency” (1983: 2–3). The World Computer takes what Robinson saw as “civilizational racism,” and its central role in the development of capital as axiomatic,—and sees that this role extends to and deeply into capitalist calculation and machinery during the entire period in which the world economic system seems to have moved form the paradigm of the commodity to a paradigm of information. “**Computational racial capitalism” would** **thus understand the generalization of computation** as an extension of capital logics and practices that include and indeed require the economic calculus of the dialectics of social difference. These differences, both economic and semiotic, would include those plied by slavery, anti- Blackness and other forms of racism during the past centuries. Computation must **therefore be recognized** as not a mere technical emergence but the **practical result of an ongoing and bloody struggle** between the would-have- it-alls and the to-be-dispossessed. Developed both consciously and unconsciously, computational racial capitalism is, when seen in the light of ongoing racialization and value extraction, “the subsequent structure as an historical agency.” The racial logic of computation must be pursued when considering finance, surveillance, population management, policing, social systems, social media, or any of the vast suite of protocols plying difference for capital. The local instance of computation, a specific 1 or 0, may seem value neutral, a matter as indifferent as lead for a bullet or uranium for a bomb. But we are looking at computation as the modality of a world- system. Computation emerges as **the result of struggles that informed “class struggle**” in all its forms, recognized or not by the often spotty tradition(s) of Marxism, including those struggles specific to the antagonisms of colonialism, slavery, imperialism, and white supremacist heteropatriarchal capitalism more generally. It is the result of struggles indexed by race, gender, sexuality, nationality, and ethnicity, along with additional terms indexing social differentiation too numerous to incant here but that together form a lexicon and a grammar of extractive oppression—and as we have said and as must always be remembered, also of struggle. The lexicon includes compressions that result in many of history’s abstractions including a perhaps singularly pointed abstraction: “a history whose shorthand is race” (Spillers 1997: 142). The grammar for that lexicon depends upon the deployment and execution of forms of differentiating abstraction that are lived—lived processes of abstraction and lived abstraction organized by the increasingly complex and variegated calculus of profit and thus of domination. “**Real abstraction,”** then**, emerges** not just as money in Sohn-Rethel’s sense, but **as the codification of race, gender, sexuality, geography, credit and time**—and gives rise to a “grammar,” in Hortense Spillers’s (1987) use of the term, that not only structures meaning and redounds to the deepest crevices of being smelted by social practices, but also, and not incidentally, prices differentials indexed to social difference.4 “Real abstraction,” as Sohn-Rethel spent his life deciphering, takes place “behind [our] backs” as the practical and historical working out of the exchange of equivalents within the process of the exchange of goods (33). For him, the development of the money-form, of the real abstraction that is money, is Exhibit A of the abstraction process mediating object exchange. This capacity for abstraction, realized first in “the money commodity” and then as money provided the template for further abstraction, not least in the conceptual formations of Western philosophy itself (1978). Sohn-Rethel develops this argument that practices of exchange precede the abstraction of value in Intellectual and Manual Labour, providing the full quotation from Marx: “Men do not therefore bring the product of their labour into relation with each other as value because they see these objects merely as the material integuments of homogeneous human labour. The reverse is true: by equating their different products to each other in exchange as values, they equate their different kinds of labour as human labour. They do this without being aware of it. (Marx 1990: 166 in Sohn-Rethel 1978: 32). Here is Sohn- Rethel’s commentary: People become aware of the exchange abstraction only when they come face to face with the result which their own actions have engendered “behind their backs” as Marx says. In **money the exchange abstraction achieves concentrated representation**, but a mere functional one— embodied in a coin. It is not recognizable in its true identity as abstract form, but disguised as a thing one carries about in one’s pocket, hands out to others, or receives from them. Marx says explicitly that the value abstraction never assumes a representation as such, since the only expression it ever finds is the equation of one commodity with the use- value of another. The gold or silver or other matter which lends to money its palpable and visible body is merely a metaphor of the value abstraction it embodies, not this abstraction itself. (33–34) Exchange-value is “in our heads” but is not the creation of any individual. Alongside use-value it is the other, abstract component of the “double being” of the commodity-form. Like Norbert Wiener’s (1961: 132) definition of information but, strictly speaking, emerging long before the idea of information proper, real abstraction is “not matter or energy.” There is not an atom of matter in exchange-value, or, as Marx puts it, “Not an atom of matter enters into the objectivity of commodities as values; in this it is the direct opposite of the coarsely sensuous objectivity of commodities as physical objects” (1990: 138). And a bit on, “So far no chemist has ever discovered exchange-value in a pearl or diamond” (177). But unlike in Wiener’s naturalist definition of information, exchange-value is an index of a social relation, an historical outcome. It indexes “abstract universal labor time,” a third term that forms the basis of comparison between two ostensibly incomparable and therefore incommensurable commodities, and, because common to both, creates the ratio of value that renders them quantitatively commensurable. **This distinction between the social basis of exchange-value and the universal character** of information should give us pause. As we shall have occasion to observe, information, as it is today (mis)understood, is thought to be a naturally occurring additional property of things—neither matter nor energy—rather than a domain of expression constituted by means of a technological and economic repression of its social dimension. Notably, Sohn-Rethel “set[s] out to argue that the **abstractness operating in exchange and reflected in value does nevertheless find an identical expression**, namely the abstract intellect, or the so-called pure understanding—the cognitive source of scientific knowledge” (34). For him, it gives rise to the abstract capacities of the subject of philosophy as well as the quantitative capacities of the subject of science and mathematics that in the twentieth century move toward a paradigm of information. Echoing Sohn-Rethel, we could say then that information is in our machines but not the creation of any individual machine. Not an atom of matter enters into information, though, like value, it is platformed on matter and requires energy for creation. This thesis will take on particular importance as we consider social differences whose descriptors, it turns out, are executable in a computational sense, at least from the point of view of financial calculus, but platformed on matter, and indeed, on living matter, on life. Beyond the intention of any individual, abstraction as “exchange-value” in “money” occurs in and as the process and processing of exchange in accord with an emerging standard. This standard, which economists call “exchange-value,” and which, in Marx is based on abstract universal labor time (the historically variable, socially necessary average time required to produce a commodity), persists alongside and within the specific qualities of the commodity (its use-value) and creates the commodity’s dual being. Though without chemical or material basis, **this standard, exchange-value, is a social relation**—a social relation as an abstraction—that inheres in the commodity-form itself and is formalized with the rise of the money commodity. The money commodity, in becoming a general equivalent, standardizes and thus renders fully quantifiable the exchange-value of commodities—exchange-values denominated in quantities of money. The quantification of value in a measure of money is an abstraction enabled by money itself which, as we have seen, is a real abstraction. It is a calculation that has occurred behind our backs, and indeed produces what Hayek (1945) identifies as the price system. When we recognize the differences in wages among people who are raced, gendered, nationed, and classed by various matrices of valuation, we also recognize that the calculus performed by and as real abstraction includes racial abstraction and gender abstraction. It is part of the calculus of **capital that provides it with an account of and discounts on the rate of exchange** with the labor power of marked people(s) —by discounting people(s) (Beller 2017b; see also Bhandar and Toscano 2015: 8–17). Racial abstraction provides capital with an index that measures a deviation from the average value of human life (itself historically driven down by the falling rate of profit). In this, computational racial capitalism is not merely a heuristic or a metaphor for the processes of a virtual machine; it is a historical-material condition. As we shall see, and as is obvious at least in the general case to anyone who has thought seriously about it, whiteness (and the fascist masculinity endemic to it) is not only operating where one finds “race”: it is operating everywhere in the imperium that it can be imagined (by some) that race is not a factor—**in medicine, in science, in statistics, in computation, in information**. As I wrote—resituating Bateson’s (1972) definition of information—in The Message Is Murder, **information is not merely “a difference that makes a difference”; it is a difference that makes a social difference**. **This slight difference in expression situates information historically.** While in keeping with Bateson’s far reaching ideas regarding an ecology of mind **(“If I am right, the whole thinking about what we are and what other people are has got to be restructured”;** 468), ideas that at **once problematize any distinction between inside and outside** and that make him dubious of any thought that presupposes sovereign subjectivity, my interpolation of “social” in his formulation “a difference that makes a social difference” **shifts the emphasis somewhat by insisting on the always already sociohistoricity** of any possible knowledge. Bateson believed that his understanding of information and systems ecology promised a new mode of thinking that he himself, as a twentieth-century bourgeois white man, did not feel capable of really embodying. Thus our interpolation, in keeping with Bateson but made compatible with Marx is, in keeping with Marx, designed to “transform ... the problem of knowledge into one of social theory” (Postone 2003: 216). Such a transformation **situates knowledge and now also information in the sociohistorical milieu**, the ecology such that it is, of racial capitalism, and therein finds information’s historical conditions of possibility. Here we advance the argument for the ultimately determining instance of social difference (and up the ante for the bet against whiteness) by **proposing that information is the elaboration of real abstraction**, of abstraction that results from collective practices of economic exchange and therefore from the general management of value as a social relation. I argue that set out in logical sequence, information is posited by, then posits and then presupposes the human processes of exchange that Sohn-Rethel, following Marx, argues are the practices that first give rise to the money- form and to real abstraction. For Sohn-Rethel the result of the activities of comparison, adequation, and trading of specific things that have qualities— which are, strictly speaking, incomparable—resulted over time in a process of finding a relation of equivalence and then general equivalence indexed to abstract labor time, what was in effect socially average human labor time. Exchange-value was a quantitative measure of that abstract time—the average socially necessary time to create commodity X denominated in money. This real abstraction was no one’s invention but was the practical result of exchange—of people’s activity—and thus emerged as a nonconscious result that nonetheless interceded on conscious process. Consequently, real abstraction was for Sohn-Rethel also the precursor to conceptual abstraction, including philosophy, science and mathematics. He writes: **The essence of commodity abstraction, however, is that it is not thought-induced**; it does not originate in ~~men’s~~(people’s) minds but in their actions. And yet this **does not give “abstraction” a merely metaphorical meaning. It is abstraction in its precise, literal sense.** The economic concept of value resulting from it is characterized by a complete absence of quality, a differentiation purely by quantity and by applicability to every kind of commodity and service which can occur on the market. These qualities of the economic value abstraction indeed display a striking similarity with fundamental categories of quantifying natural science without, admittedly, the slightest inner relationship between these heterogeneous spheres being as yet recognizable. While **the concepts of natural science are thought abstractions, the economic concept of value is a real one**. It exists nowhere other than in the human mind but it does not spring from it. Rather it is purely social in character, arising in the spatio-temporal sphere of human interrelations. It is not people who originate these abstractions but their actions. “They do this without being aware of it.”5 The practical rise of a form of abstraction indifferent to particular qualities is key here and is to be understood as a precursor to the content- indifferent abstractions of a variety of types. As Simmel notes in The Philosophy of Money, law, intellectuality, and money “have the power to lay down forms and directions to which they are content indifferent” (441–2). Without doubt, such power informed the racial categories of the Humanism of Ernst Renan, Roger Caillois, and others so brilliantly excoriated by Aimé Césaire in his Discourse on Colonialism. We add here the hypothesis that **the rise of information as the content-indifferent assignation of numerical index to any social relation** whatever, is a development of the abstraction necessary for economic exchange to persist under the intensive “developmental” pressure of global racial capitalism—information is derived from the increasingly complex things that people do through and as exchange and as such is both precursor and corollary to financialization— **the social conditions that sustain what is fetishistically apprehended as “finance capital”** and its seeming capacity to derive wealth from pure speculation and risk management in ways that (incorrectly) appear to be fully detached from labor and labor time. In this light, information reveals itself as **neither naturally occurring nor the creation of anyone in particular**, but, in keeping with Sohn-Rethel’s Marxian formulation of real abstraction, is likewise invented “**behind our backs” as a result of ~~“man’s”~~ “People’s” practical activity**. Information enables a complexification and further generalization of what will turn out to be monetary media, media that would be adequate to, and indeed are adequate (from the perspective of capital) to contemporary forms of exchange—what people do when they interact with one another in what is now the social factory. In brief, information is the extension of a monetary **calculus adequate to the increasingly abstract character of social relations and social exigencies**. It is an interstitial, materially platformed, calculative fabric of abstraction that through its coordinated capillary actions orchestrates social practice and provides interface for the uptake of value production. Once this idea is fully grasped, it becomes pointless to look for any other origin to the information age. Just as for Marx there is not a single atom of matter in exchange value (1990: 138), we say that there is not a single atom of matter in information.6 “All the phenomenon of the universe, whether produced by the hand of man or indeed by the universal laws of physics, are not to be conceived as acts of creation but solely as a reordering of matter” (Pietro Verri 1771, cited in Marx 1990: 133; note 13). Value is the socially valid informing of matter, so too is information. Economy then is society’s matter compiler and, approximately simultaneously with the advent of “man,” “history,” and “the world market,” “exchange value” emerges as a quantitative measure of the social value of material state changes indexed to human labour posited as “abstract universal labour time.” Marx’s famous example of the simple wooden table in Chapter 1 of Capital, which “transcends sensuousness” when leaving the clear-cut framework of use value and becoming a commodity and thus an exchange value, registers as “fetishism,” the “metaphysical subtleties,” “theological niceties,” and “grotesque ideas” (1990: 163), endemic in the table’s computability as value. In brief, just as **discreet states of matter embodying value as a network of commodities** mediated by markets and tied to labor give rise historically to the discrete state machine, otherwise known as the computer, exchange value gives rise to computable information and then to computation itself, becoming interoperable with it. Even before the rise of information proper, **exchange value operates as information** (and thus, necessarily information processing) —and then, as synthetic finance and contemporary forms of computer- mediated accounting and production readily testify, by means of it. Computation is the extension, development, **and formalization of the calculus of exchange value**—the ramification of its fetish character—and becomes in spirit and in practice, a **command control layer for the management of the profitable calculus of value**. Platformed on states of matter, information, not matter but rather difference between and among states of matter, extends, grammartizes, and granularizes the calculus of value regarding the organization of matter. **Commodities and computation thus run the same basic operating system**—state changes in matter driven by human practices—the value of which in any given state is expressed in the context of an informatic network and indexed to labor time. As such, information is the processing power of money itself and is inexorably beholden to abstract labor time and thus to racial capitalism. It is, in brief, an outgrowth of the money form. The cost of computation, the **arrival at a discrete state, is a derivative operation**, indicating an investment, that is explicitly a risk on the future value of an underlier, that is, on value itself. This argument for understanding the social as the ultimate referent and ground for any and all information, further advanced in chapter 1, is not content to serve **as a mere heuristic for cultural theorists to express a modicum of suspicion** with respect to truth claims backed by statistics and information. It is a **thoroughgoing indictment of information as a technique of value extraction**, racialization, and instrumental social differentiation. As a first approximation, actually existing information, like actually existing money, can indeed be said to be the root of all evil—in as much as the fact of its existence is a symptom of a far more complex historical process than what would seem to be discernible from the fact of the coin or the bit. The problem, of course, is that your metabolism (and mine), cannot easily extend into the future without access to both. I develop this idea here to say that everywhere computation operates, so too does racial capitalism—at least until proven otherwise. The repressive apparatus of capital clearly assumes this role for information, even if it does so at a level that most often exceeds ordinary default “human” (white) understanding: **the net result to date of the number crunch of “the world computer**” is a hierarchy of valuations inseparable from the violence of racialization and its attendant dispossession, and inseparable again from what Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2007: 28) in her classic and statistically attuned definition of racism calls “the state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group- differentiated vulnerability to premature death.” Today, we argue, no calculation**, networked as it is with the world computer, is fully separable from informatics and its basis in racial capitalism.** We will argue for this logical and also horrific history of abstraction in more detail below as we explore the interoperability of digital systems and their colonization of the semiotic, corporeal and material domains. The global learning curve of revolutionary praxis must attend to this modal innovation of systemic oppression, an oppression which is at once beyond all calculation and one with it.7

#### Data, not antitrust, controls the free market -- circulation is the site of profit accumulation which increasingly lacks physical reference.

Halpern et al., 22 [Orit Halpern is an associate professor in sociology and anthropology at Concordia University. She is also the director of the Speculative Life Research Cluster and D4 : The Disrupting Design Research Group, laboratories bridging the arts, environmental sciences, media, and the social sciences. She is the author of Beautiful Data: A History of Vision and Reason since 1945 (2015). Patrick Jagoda is a professor in the Departments of English Language and Literature, Cinema and Media Studies, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and the College at the University of Chicago. He is executive editor of Critical Inquiry and director of the Weston Game Lab. He is the author of Network Aesthetics (2016), The Game Worlds of Jason Rohrer (2016, cowritten with Michael Maizels), and Experimental Games: Critique, Play, and Design in the Age of Gamification (2020). He is also a recipient of a 2020 Guggenheim Fellowship. Jeffrey West Kirkwood is an assistant professor in the Department of Art History at Binghamton University, State University of New York. He is the author of Endless Intervals: Cinema, Psychology, and Semiotechnics around 1900 (2022). Leif Weatherby is associate professor of German and director of the Digital Theory Lab at New York University. He is the author of Transplanting the Metaphysical Organ: German Romanticism between Leibniz and Marx (2016)., “Surplus Data: An Introduction,” Winter 2022, Critical Inquiry, volume 48, number 2, p 197-210]//Townes

Surplus Derivation

“Data is the new capital asset of the 21st century,” announces Tom Wheeler, former chairman of the US Federal Communications Commission, commenting on the rise of Amazon over companies like Walmart.25 We can further extend this line of thinking to consider Facebook, Alphabet, and Twitter’s role in the Capitol riots of January 2021. Democratic members of Congress have suggested that the mayhem that day was driven by informational excesses, whose exploitation was responsible for simultaneously destabilizing the American political system and generating a huge windfall for the largest tech companies. According to Wheeler, such situations lay bare the inadequacy of old regulatory concepts for capturing new technological, social, and commercial realities. The regulation that Wheeler and others are accostomed to is based on “industrial antitrust, anti-centralization kinds of concepts.”26 What Wheeler suggests is that our contemporary situation in both politics and economy no longer functions according to the ideals of efficiency, energy, and scarcity that preoccupied industrial economies. Surplus data is the condition that Wheeler places beyond the industrial, and its paradigm is derivation. It was once the imagined limits to resources and energy that shaped industrial conceptions of efficiency, energy, and labor power.27 In the early twenty-first century, data capitalism changes this formula by putting the derivative before the source. Derivation takes the place of extraction, and where there was efficiency, there is now optimization.28

We glimpse the centrality of such inefficiency and derivation in the highprofile case of the r/wallstreetbets subreddit, whose members in January 2021 (and again in February and again in June) strategically bought up shares of dying brick-and-mortar companies, such as GameStop and AMC Theatres, which had high levels of short interest. These actions triggered a massive short squeeze that nearly drove some hedge funds, like Melvin Capital, out of business. The improbably parabolic price movement was made possible by ferreting out the unhedged positions of (ironically) hedge funds in the share interest data and mobilizing a vast army of traders invisibly in plain sight. What had come to feel like a guarantee of endless surplus to mega-money investment firms was, in a matter of days, undone by a data overload in the form of digital buy orders sent by retail traders on desktop and smartphone trading apps. The amount of trading data was so great that it created liquidity problems for brokerages, who decided to block buying of some popular meme stocks at various times. Conspiracy speculation took root on the Reddit boards, which then passed to mainstream attention and finally to hearings in Congress.

As this case demonstrates, the actions of the masses are now a resource for capital. Robinhood, a trading app launched in 2015 that advertises a dark utopian mission to “democratize finance for all,” offers commission-free trading and became the popular vehicle for the retail traders who joined the GameStop mania.29 But, as Richard Serra and Carlota Fay Schoolman contended in their 1973 piece, Television Delivers People, producing a statement that has since become a foundational principle of media studies: when something is free, you are not the consumer, “you are consumed.”30 And sure enough, Robinhood makes much of its money from selling traders’ order flow data to market makers like Citadel, whose CEO had invested $2 billion in Melvin Capital, the very hedge fund that was caught in the short squeeze. Beneath the David and Goliath story of Main Street investors sticking it to Wall Street villains was a more nefarious revelation that the real surplus at work in the meme stock affair was reaped as data that helped shore up the more traditional forms of surplus among big institutional firms that control the very contours of a supposedly free market. Moreover, the qualitative, affective response to such market dynamics, as recorded on Reddit and Twitter, have now become a tactical resource of hedge funds, who have learned to profit from even the best attacks against them. Quantitative trading algorithms analyzing massive amounts of social media data using advanced natural language processing are deployed to perform sentiment analysis and opinion mining. And so the cycle of surplus continues from data to affect to data, ad infinitum—each derived from the last with the derivative more fundamental than the putative source of derivation.

Surplus Politics

During the COVID-19 pandemic, an unprecedented portion of the population was confined to their homes, producing and consuming data in a state of hermetic globalism, straining the already overloaded bandwidth of global data transfer.31 On 6 January 2021, a group of right-wing supporters of Donald Trump attacked the Capitol building in Washington, D.C., fueled by the conspiracy theory of the group QAnon, a widespread online network surrounding a putative source high up in the “deep state” (the figure known as Q) and propagating racist, anti-Semitic, and xenophobic propaganda. As we see in Cullen Hoback’s documentary about the movement, Q: Into the Storm (2021), Q operates on the suspicion that the truth is in hidden byways of digital data, sometimes yielding deadly consequences. To witness Hoback accompany Jim Watkins—a businessman and the operator of 8Chan, the main platform on which Q, an alleged intelligence officer, posted his “drops”—laughing as the crowd breaks into the Capitol building is to see the conflation of the digital and the social all too directly.32 Q has created a semiotic world of clues that severs itself and its followers from the fabric of social reality altogether, gamifying it as Hoback suggests in a comparison to Cicada 3301, alternately characterized as an actual secretive organization or a fictional alternate reality game that has run complex digital scavenger hunts since 2012. 33 Q’s game indeed has rules, a perverse affective sense of fun, and easter eggs that provide domesticated surprise. QAnon’s slogan “‘do your own research’” might be taken as a command to surf your own surplus data channels.34And the Q movement has one thing right: data is worldly; digital channels do shape the world and are in excess of any heuristic intent. Events like the Capitol riot reify the data surround, among other things giving rationale to the increasingly datafied police to expand their quantitative vision.35 The events themselves are shocking and somehow predictable all at once: it is as though image boards (4Chan, 8Chan, 8kun) premeditate events by sniffing them out of the back alleys of data and insinuating them into reality.

This eruption of conspiratorial violence reminds us that data has inherited the legacy of biopolitics, particularizing its manipulation of society as a mass. As Rob Kitchin has argued, it is not just size that makes data big. Even speed of transfer and variety of format make up necessary but insufficient conditions for the revolution we were promised. Data deserving the name big also has to be “flexible” and “relational”—open to the inclusion of new fields—and, crucially, both “exhaustive” and “fine-grained.”36 The usefulness of data was traditionally attached to the precision with which it was gathered and defined. Sparse data, very exact, could create predictions to guide action by means of averages. The resulting categories, like those in an actuarial table, did not apply to individuals directly but at the level of the mass. This type of data was a crucial technique of what Michel Foucault called biopolitics, governance not of the individual body but at the level of generality. However, if biopolitics still relied on the assumed reality of demographic data, surplus data is something entirely novel. What was once a disjunction between individual and mean has become a partly automated loop between machine vision (or more generally, categorization) and its application to singular states of affairs. This logic stretches from FICO scores to healthcare data, from global logistics to finance capital.

Data has indeed become big and granular, and it has gained the ability to move from particulars to generalities and back again. Ecological fallacies emerging from large data sets now simply become new sources of value in both markets and politics. Without norms or quantifiable risks, we enter endless loops of uncertainty. David Bering-Porter, in his contribution to this issue, juxtaposes W. E. B. Du Bois’s data visualizations and speculative fictions with the famous case of Judge Schreber’s paranoid fantasies. Extrapolating into our present, we might imagine the paranoid conspiratorial politics of QAnon as occupying the space of paranoic dreams, ones of absolute counting, datafication, and control of the future, aspirations whose impossibility always drives violent forms of speculation and politics. But, Bering-Porter suggests, there are other pathways available. In the quantitative countermyths put forth by Du Bois to document racism in America, there was also an alternative aspiration “to reconcile the aims of visuality and data in two senses: as sight and apparition, evidence and aspiration.”37 Perhaps there is a future in which data stories offer evidence of a reality surplus data seems to foreclose in the present, the reality of the Black lives that Du Bois highlights and that have taken center stage in US politics today. It is the new task of a progressive politics to turn the endless extendable and colonizing frontiers of machine learning systems into something other than conspiratorial derivative instruments. In the surplus of data, any faith in the singularity of the real has been shattered—but these systems might harbor another way to encounter the world, one grounded in the experiences and data of the diverse multitudes. Our machines make technically visible what perhaps has always been there—the social nature of our technical lives. They need only be turned toward that future.

#### 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.

#### Trade is actively detrimental to economies in the global south---unequal exchange is the principal way countries in the imperialist core extract wealth

**Samaha 21** , Lebanese-Australian writer living in Aotearoa. She works in adult education and studies history and politics at Victoria University, Wellington. (Amal, 5/19/2021, “Understanding Unequal Exchange: How does trade imperialism affect the global working class?” *Anticonquista*, <https://anticonquista.com/2021/05/19/understanding-unequal-exchange-how-does-trade-imperialism-affect-the-global-working-class/> Date Accessed: 2/25/2022)

Unequal exchange was once considered one of the most important new developments in imperialism studies of the 20th century. The theory, first proposed by French-Greek theorist and resistance fighter Arghiri Emmanuel in the 1960s, was quickly taken up by many of the underdevelopment and imperialism theorists of the day, from Walter Rodney to Samir Amin. Dependency theorists like Andre Gunder Frank had proven that the imperialism had developed to a point where empire was best understood not in terms of capital exports from the core (as in Hobson, Bukharin, Hilferding and Lenin’s models), but in terms of the wealth extracted from the periphery. However, they were not always clear on how this wealth was generated. Emmanuel was the first to propose an original theory of where exactly that extracted wealth came from. This was the theory of unequal exchange, the idea that the bulk of imperialist superprofits stemmed not from monopolies, noncompetition or securing captive markets, but rather from the difference in wages between nations.

To Emmanuel, Marx’s factors of production were not only fixed quantities of labour and material inputs, they also represented the stake each class holds in the total surplus value produced by a society (whether this stake is recognised is another matter). A given quantity of labour hours invested in production represents a stake workers hold over an end product, while a given quantity of raw materials or fixed capital represents the stake a capitalist holds.

 In pre-capitalist artisanal production, the labourer is the only one who holds a stake over the end product of their labour. The labourer controls both the tools and the resources required for production, and can work whenever they choose. The labourer can move freely between industries, and will move to whichever one yields the best prices. Many artisans will move into an industry if the prices are very high, and begin producing greater quantities of that commodity, forcing prices down. In pre-capitalist production, the market will reward labourers for fulfilling particular needs, and that reward falls in relation to the degree that need is met, and so wages and profitability both equalise freely.

All that changes in a society with two classes involved in production. Under capitalist production, both the labourer and capitalist have stakes in the final product, and thus the degree to which wages and prices equalise depends on different factors. When capital moves freely between industries, this tends to equalise the rate of profit. When labour moves freely between industries, this tends to equalise wages. Both wages and profitability must be considered when setting prices.

This is all well and good in the context of individual countries. In most countries, labour and capital moves freely between industries, and so wages, profitability, and prices are all relatively consistent between towns and cities in one country.

On an international level however, wages, profitability and prices are often completely inconsistent, especially between richer and poorer countries. This is because capital often moves freely between the core and the periphery, shifting to wherever has the highest rate of profit, while labour is constrained. Workers cannot move between countries due to militarised borders, repressive governments, and migration quotas. In the end, the rate of profit slowly equalises between countries, while wages only become more and more dissimilar between countries due to different levels of unionisation, and other “historical and moral determinants” like the degree of reactionary violence, market suppression and underdevelopment.

At the end of the day, a situation is produced wherein, as Charles Bettleheim explains, “on the world market the poor nations are obliged to sell the product of a relatively large number of hours in order to obtain in exchange from the rich nations the product of a small number of hours of labour.”

This inequality in trade can be further explored in a number of ways. In the past, unequal exchange has been explained through equations and figures, but this topic is too important to be bound up in academic language and convention. What follows is my attempt to explore the consequences of unequal exchange through the eyes of two fictional workers in countries separated by a small stretch of South Pacific ocean.

An example: Natia and Tim

Unequal Exchange can be hard to understand in human terms. By its nature it deals with abstract transfers of wealth in the spaces between nations, never really connecting with our human experience of work and life. But it does have a human dimension, and it extends outwards from a web of interconnected human experiences and struggles. Compare Natia and Tim.  
  
Natia works at a copra plantation in Savai’i, in Samoa. She spends her day collecting coconuts, halving them, and leaving them out to dry in the sun in large batches. Sometimes she helps at the kilns, where the sun-dried coconuts are fully dried, and the desiccated meat is crushed into oil and meal. It is a hard process, and sometimes whole batches develop mold and have to be thrown out. The market for the meal is shrinking, as the New Zealand farmers who used to buy it as animal feed have now shifted to Palm Kernel Expeller, much of it [grown by debt slaves in Malaysia.](https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/24-11-2020/the-searing-report-linking-popular-nz-brands-to-sexual-abuse-and-slavery/)

In the end, Natia gets about $350 USD per month for her full-time labour. It’s considered a decent wage in Samoa. Her employer has few ongoing costs aside from her low wages. However, considering the need to compete with PKE and other copra producers, the employer can only sell the copra meal for a very low price: just above the amount needed to pay for Natia and the other workers’ labour.

3,000 kilometres away from Natia, Tim is just starting his shift. He works at a plastics factory in Auckland, New Zealand. The factory is designed to turn mineral oil into a range of commodity plastics and tupperware, and while Tim works hard, his productivity is mostly due to the wide variety of factory machines at his disposal. Tim is able to produce a large amount of plastic products in just one hour, and the market for the products is always high, since the factory is generally able to out-produce and out-compete its smaller competitors.

Tim has been working at the company for a while, and has always participated in his union. The most recent strike was 2 years ago, when the union representatives were able to secure a new collective bargaining agreement that raised Tim’s wages to $3,150 USD per month. It’s nowhere near as much as his many managers get, but Tim is pretty thankful, since it’s considered a living wage by New Zealand standards. The company fought tooth and nail against the pay increase, but in the end it didn’t hurt business too much, and they were able to compensate by raising prices, thanks to their healthy market share.

The products of Natia and Tim’s labour are often exported around the Pacific. A handful of New Zealand farmers still import Pacific copra meal, while stores in Savai’i often stock the tupperware containers and commercial plastics Tim produces. The problem is that the products of their equivalent labour hours are sold at wildly different prices. The amount of tupperware that Time produces in one labour hour gets sold for enough to pay for nine hours of Natia’s work.

Is Tim’s labour itself worth nine times more than Natia’s? Not really; if Natia went to New Zealand and performed similar agricultural work, she would be paid at a rate much more comparable to Tim, if only due to labour laws and the higher cost of living in New Zealand. The product of her labour would also be exchanged at a vastly higher rate, even without additional machinery to help her. The real problem is that Natia could only access those wages if she won a visa through the ballot system, and only a few were given out each year, even before it was shut down entirely due to Covid.

The disparity between the two only becomes more extreme as time goes on. Thousands of other workers produce commodities that are traded between New Zealand and Samoa, and all of them have very similar wages to Natia and Tim. Samoa is limited in how many New Zealand imports it can buy, since its products are worth nine times less than New Zealand’s by default. Meanwhile, New Zealand exporters are making a killing: their products could buy nine times their own value in Samoan commodities! Over time, Samoan industry becomes more and more specialised and export-oriented, and less able to supply domestic consumers with cheaper local goods, processes covered by Samir Amin in Unequal Development. Instead, imported western goods become the norm, and Natia is forced to spend much more on necessities. Competition in the animal feed market threatens to force Natia’s wages down further, or even put the plantation out of business entirely.

Meanwhile, Tim’s wages are enough to buy plenty of consumer goods. He can’t always afford the boutique local brands, but he can afford as much imported produce as he could ever need. Over time, his wages are supplemented by these cheaper goods, and he can afford to save. In addition, the state mandates access to a superannuation fund for workers, and Tim’s contributions are invested in all sorts of foreign industry and international trade futures. Tim doesn’t ever have enough to stop working for a living, but he has enough to perhaps retire comfortably, or even to ensure that his kids don’t have to work as hard as he did. He is secure in the knowledge that in the long run, things seem to be getting better.

Workers like Natia represent the bulk of the global working class, labouring in low-paid labour producing much of the world’s most basic commodities. Their conditions are deteriorating due to the increased dependency, specialisation, and export-orientation of industry in the global periphery, as this means there is less local industry devoted to local needs. They are unable to save, or move to countries with better conditions. Their main hope is an increase in the total global mobility of labour, which might equalise wages and prices between countries. For them, freedom of migration is liberation, as even if they don’t migrate themselves, the resulting wage equalisation benefits everyone.

Workers like Tim represent a minority in the global working class: [he is at the bottom end of a labour aristocracy](https://anticonquista.com/2021/04/27/dissecting-global-economic-apartheid-western-monarchies-and-labour-aristocracies/). As we have seen, Tim’s conditions aren’t wonderful, or somehow post-scarcity, but he has the ability to save, to move between industries freely, to invest his surplus wages, and to send his kids to be educated. These are all rights Tim ought to enjoy, ones which he fought hard to keep, but the institutions which enable those rights are also unwittingly contributing to global inequality.

In rich countries, prices and wages are caught in an upward death spiral. Since prices are determined by the interrelationship between wages and profitability, and wages tend to gravitate around the ability to purchase a fixed number of commodities, we can see how wages might push prices higher and vice versa. Other factors push wages and prices higher, including the efforts by unions to stay ahead of the cost of living, and increases in the overall standard of living enabled by external debt.

To break out of that spiral means acting internationally, securing better wages for all workers up and down the supply chain. An alternative approach would involve pressuring western governments to impose price ceilings: a hard limit on the cost of living set in a fixed number of commodities. Theorists like Emmanuel singled out western unions as a major cause of unequal exchange, and it is certainly true that many cannot be relied upon, but it is not necessarily unions themselves so much as the underlying upward spiral of prices and wages. A world with fewer unions, even the most compromised ones, is nonetheless one in which workers wield less power, and have less potential energy to turn towards international organisation.

The global consequences of Unequal Exchange

The relationship between Natia and Tim is just one tiny part of the global problem of unequal exchange. The true scale of unequal exchange has only been explored relatively recently thanks to the work of Zak Cope, [in his book The Wealth of (Some) Nations](https://anticonquista.com/2019/06/29/revolutionary-reads-review-the-wealth-of-some-nations-by-zak-cope/), as well as [recent studies that have built upon his findings.](https://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/YQ9Y8PIUAF5I2H2QGVEA/full?target=10.1080%2F13563467.2021.1899153&)

Much of Cope’s recent work is devoted to quantifying and exploring various forms of imperialist superprofits (or the Imperial Transfer of Value). In Cope’s analysis, unequal exchange is not the sole form of imperialist superprofits, but it does constitute a majority. By measuring wage differentials between core and peripheral countries, and comparing those wages to a midpoint (the global median wage), Cope was able to find the total value gained each year through unequal exchange: roughly 2.8 trillion dollars per year.

To put this in perspective, the value gained through unequal exchange is 53.8% of all superprofits flowing from the periphery to the core. It is also 31.5% of the core’s profits available for reinvestment (calculated as the core’s GDP multiplied by rate of savings), in other words, nearly a third of all profits in the core are purely the result of being able to sustain higher wages.

Decades ago, Samir Amin predicted that as the rate of profit fell in core industries, unequal exchange would slowly come to be the dominant source of profits for western capitalists, locking the periphery into a permanent state of dependency in order to prop-up the decayed husk of domestic industry in the core. In many of the world’s richest nations, that prediction is being borne out today.

Shifting the locus of value creation from the core to the periphery means that the core relies less and less on the unprofitable exploitation of its own workers. Instead, many core workers are increasingly being placed in menial office and managerial jobs which produce little to no real value. Such workers are ostensibly there to increase the value of other labourers’ work – so-called “reflexive” labourers – [but in practice this is economically impossible](https://www.peacelandbread.com/post/innovators-bullshitters-or-aristocrats-towards-an-explanation-of-unproductive-work?fbclid=IwAR1J4FhEInB8P_YvjM7eJY8zVVhfv3biGWC38NignYElTFVGli5bEg3eYeU), and many of these managers, administrators, and functionaries are simply paid consumers, shifting and manipulating various forms of debt, sitting at the heights of increasingly top-heavy finance and tech juggernauts.

As the core [systematically underdevelops itself](https://www.peacelandbread.com/post/how-the-west-is-underdeveloping-itself), taking away its own ability to autogenously produce value, the periphery stands at a crossroads. Many nations are now choosing to promote trade between peripheral partners, effectively disengaging from the predatory trade imperialism of the core. This too has dangers, in that it risks imperialist intervention, and some peripheral nations still side with the core out of fear of repercussions, out of a bribed ruling class, or out of a lack of alternatives.

Workers in the core are still able to organise against trade imperialism directy, even if such activism will always be opposed by sections of the labour aristocracy. Pushing for increased migrant quotas and rights is one proven way to mitigate global wage inequality, as remittances and competition tend to raise peripheral average wages. To return to our Pacific example, compare Samoa with the Cook Islands: both nations were colonised and dominated by New Zealand imperialism, but the Cooks have at least gained an average wage more comparable to the core, entirely thanks to the ability to migrate to a core nation.

Another step would be to encourage labour organisation across national boundaries. As we have seen, a narrow-minded focus on only improving the wages of core workers can actively harm peripheral workers by encouraging greater differences in wages. If the entire supply chain of an industry can be organised, not only would workers exercise greater control over their workplaces by influencing the factors of production, they would also be able to raise the lowest-paid workers up to a greater standard.

One of the greatest lessons we can draw from recent advances in unequal exchange theory is that business-as-usual activism can have unintended consequences. Do we fight to perpetuate labour aristocracy, wealth extraction, and the further stratification of our class? Or do we fight to bring about unity between workers of all nationalities, no matter their position in the hierarchies of industry and empire?

#### The World Computer superimposes a failed imagination of risk arbitrage onto society that will cause extinction.

Haiven 2-3-22, Research Chair in the Radical Imagination at Lakehead University, Canada. His books include Revenge Capitalism, Art after Money, Money after Art, Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power and The Radical Imagination. (Max, “Financialization and failure: Lessons from the Anxious University”, <https://maxhaiven.com/failure/> Accessed 2/24/22)—js

Finance, in a sense, represents capitalism’s form of partial but functional self-awareness. Of course, capitalism is not a living human being capable of self-awareness. Yet it is a system that, increasingly globally, is replete with autonomous feedback mechanisms, ways of knowing the world.

For Hayek (2007), perhaps the most brilliant 20th century capitalist theorist, free markets ideally represent a uniquely perfect knowledge systems. For Hayek, markets operate as price discovery mechanisms where competitive bidders collectively determine the true value of commodities, otherwise unknowable to any single actor. In this sense, markets are, writ large, as Beller (2021) suggests, a kind of world-encompassing meta-computer, constantly calculating (though a million independent, competitive bets) the world. In Martin’s (2015) reading of Hayek, capitalism with advanced financial markets is not only the fairest system, but also the truest. Though no individual can “know” the sublime market (and, indeed, failure to perfectly know the market is what, ironically, drives the differential behaviour of market actors of which the market is composed), the market has a kind of perfect, superhuman knowledge of the world.

In a similar but distinct fashion, and from the opposite side of the ideological spectrum from Hayek, Marxist geographer Harvey (2018) proposes that financial markets represent the central nervous system of capitalism. Financial markets, writ-large, take in market signals from around the world and, in response, send out prompts for investment and divestment, a process exacerbated and accelerated by recent advances in computing and telecommunications technology. Financial firms compete to study and evaluate firms, industries, sectors and whole nations, the better to speculate on their future fortunes and thereby determine where to advance or withdraw capital. I have suggested that, in contrast to the “central nervous system,” the metaphor of imagination may be more appropriate because it connotes the chaotic, conjectural and hallucinatory aspect of finance’s reckoning of the world (Haiven 2012). Approaching finance as capitals’ imagination also helps bring into focus the way that financial speculation relies on a multitude of acts of the individual human imagination, a position echoed by Beckert (2016) and Komporozos-Athanasiou (2021). My approach builds on Castoriadis’s (1997) framework which frames the imagination not as an individual quality of mind but as a material social force from which the institutions of social reality are crafted. In this sense describing finance as capital’s imagination seeks to identify the process by which it comes to understand and shape the world.

If finance represents capital’s means of self-reflexivity, then this imagination is constantly failing to accurately measure the meaningful value of things. It suffers from a debilitating and destructive solipsism, within which all worldly things are imagined exclusively in terms of risk, yield, and speculative profitability. It’s not simply that Financialized markets are constantly misvaluing stocks, bonds, derivatives, currencies and other assets; this is already part of the system: the failure of accurate measurement is key to many bedrock financial activities, like arbitrage. More importantly and damningly, financial market’s failure to properly imagine and value the world also jeopardizes human and environmental rights, communities and even the future of humanity itself. Functionally, it necessarily places the speculative concerns of a handful of major financial firms over material needs of millions, even billions of people. The financially-driven market’s imagination of the world is a fundamentally skewed one, but its power is such that, increasingly, the world is cut to measure its skewed imagination.

There is another, deeper failure of the imagination inherent to this situation. Financialization depends on most social actors, including notably those with political and economic power, internalizing finance’s imagination of the world and making it their own, the better to compete in a world financialization is creating. Frequently, major political and economic decisions are made based on a sense of inevitability, fatalism or a sense that no other options are possible, representing a profound failure of the imagination.

In sum, to identify finance as capital’s failed imagination of the world is to identify financialization’s reliance on the transformation of the human imagination, but also to contend with it as the means by which the system gains some measure of associative reflexivity. It’s not simply that how capital imagines the world is objectively wrong. That may be the case, but more dangerously still, its power is such that this mismeasured world in then instantiated in reality thanks to finance’s economic, political, social and cultural power.

#### Our political imperative is refusal. It’s try or die to reject capitalist logics. There are communist strategies – that’s certain – but the more relevant question is a study of capital’s encroachment and how we produce it. Once our revolutionary task is complete, we may find creative methods of resistance.

Beller 21 (Jonathan Beller = Professor of Humanities and Media Studies and Critical and Visual Studies at Pratt Institute, “Introduction:  The Social Difference Engine and the World Computer,” in *The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism*, Duke University Press, pp. 183-189 BEH)

Given the sea change in the nature of **languages and images** themselves— their wholesale transposition and transformation from a means of **representation to a means of production**— the difficulty here is both with the substrate of communication (its bits) and with the us- versus- them perspective: we want to ban advertisers, but today we must also confront the disturbing possibility that we are them. Remember, “they” **program** “our” language and “our” imagination, “we” speak **“their” thought**— indeed, that is our work, or rather our labor. What to do with the fact that “we have seen the enemy and he is us?” One could say, one could want to say, “I don’t care who you are: if you live in the first world, if you live in the Global North, then fuck you! You ain’t no victim, even if you’re sick.” But who would be saying that? Probably some other Northerner, writing about how culture or the Venice Biennale, as if it were, could or should be more than a lavish spectacle of global suffering staged for a cosmopolitan elite. As capital’s nations, banks, armies, schools, languages, newspapers, and films did to its colonies and colonial subjects, the current **institutions from states to computer**- media companies do to “us”: they command us to make ourselves over **in capital’s image** for their own profit through networked strategies of **expropriation and dispossession**. “We” do it to ourselves, and our representations of **self and other are designed to sell** a version of ourselves back to ourselves so that we can perform further work on what is now the raw material for the next iteration of images. Therein lies our ontological lack, an ontological lack of solidarity and of even the possibility for solidarity. Therein lies the desire for and indeed necessity **to become a plantation manager** — the word is overseer. Though it is beyond the scope of this essay, this digital neocolonialism that practically commands global Northerners to in one way or another accept Nazism and genocide with their cappuccino could be understood as being on a continuum with the internal colonization of Europe by the German banks— which depends of course on the **distributed production of a kind of neoliberal “realism**” that Mark Fisher (2009) called “**capitalist realism,”** and was only ever a hair’s breadth away from fascism. This fact of our investment in and by advertising, the conversion of the sign to what I call the “advertisign,” poses a genuine problem for theory— indeed an unprecedented one. This problem is particularly evident considering the material conditions (class, nationality, education, race, language, et c.) of the participants in the would-be counterhegemonic theoretical discussions of culture and policy that presuppose the books, computers, schools, and institutions that sustain these. Those within the circuit of these discussions have already passed through a homogenization process which **programs them in compatible systems languages**. **Without submitting ourselves** and our own aspirations to radical critique, without conducting a Gramscian inventory of our ostensibly internal constitutions, we run the risk of merely trying to set up a **competing corporation** with a new business model. The revolution will not **be televised**; decolonization **will not be a brand.** Any would-be anticapitalist “we” runs this risk of coopting and cooptation from the get-go, particularly if it does not think about the materiality of **social production** from top to bottom: class, yes, but also race, nation, gender, sexuality, ability, geolocation, historical stratification. The world’s postmodern poor, the two billion– plus living on two dollars a day, also lab or to survive in the material landscape organized by the post- Fordist social factory its **anti- Blackness, its Islamophobia, its endless and mutating racism** and imperialism. However, from the standpoint of capital, **the role of those at the bottom is to serve as substrate** for image- production and semiosis; not only in factories, cottage- industries, subsistence farming, and informal economies, but also as starving Advertisarial Relationshordes; “irrational,” criminalized or surplused populations; subject- objects for policing, encampment, and bombing; desperate refugees; and even as voids in the idea of the world—as sites of social death. Forgive me, but I’d wager that no one capable of understanding these words can claim full exemption from the indictment they issue regarding structural complicity with the production and reproduction of everyday life. Humans **are troped (via discourse and the screen) to organize military production**, national policy, internment camps and prisons, bourgeois imaginations, museum shows, corporate strategy, and market projections. Let us clearly state here that **any program** that does not admit this excluded **planet into dialogues** **that vitiate** the **monologues imposed by capitalist** informatics and advertisigns is still floating in the realm of the ruling ideas **and therefore participant in murder.** These ruling ideas are the ones whose density and weight, whose material support and very machinery, threaten to further crush the late- capitalist poor out of not just representation but out of existence. This erasure and disposability, imposed by systems of informatic inscription designed to absorbe very output of sense, is the achievement of the advertisarial relations endemic to computational racial capitalism. When information is an advertisement for itself that presupposes the operating system of the world computer as virtual machine, **banning what we recognize as advertising on the internet, even if an excellent beginning,** is just not adequate to address these issues of representation, social justice, planetary and climate racism, and emancipation. To summarize: the forms of sociality which are the conditions of possibility for the online, informatically organized r elations— best characterized as advertisarial — run through e very sector and register of planetary life. The internet, while recognizable as an effect and a cause of the current form of **planetary production and reproduction**, cannot be considered in isolation as a **merely technical platform or set of platforms if its historical role is to be properly understood.** To take the internet as an autonomous technological force results in a species of platform **fetishism that disavows both the histories and material conditions** of its emergence, conditions that are, in short, those of screen culture and racial capitalism; this is to say that it, the internet, is the very means by which the capitalist suppression of global democracy (which is emphatically, economic democracy as well) has been accomplished and continues. If the internet is autonomous, it is because it expresses the autonomization of the value form. As noted previously, **with the hijacking of communications** and **semiotic infrastructures** by racial capitalism, the medium is the message and **the message is murder.** To ban advertising on the internet would be a good start— but what if the whole thing is advertising? **One reading of** what I have said thus far might suggest that, giv**en the expropriation of the cognitive- linguistic, our volition is overtaken by capital logic;** and given our inability to cogitate in any way that is genuinely resistant to capitalist expropriation, coercion, strictly speaking, **is no longer necessary to impose cooperation for capitalist production.** We “want” to cooperate productively, our desire— which, from the dispossession of even language and mind constitutes ourselves as subjects in the media ecology of the capital is t technical image, that is, in and through the organization of digital information—**is itself an iteration of capital, a script of becoming predestined to become capital**. The old language scored by the new image machines and their extractive algorithms locally organizes cooperative subjects who want to cooperate with vectoral capitalization. **We want to provide content in order to derive currency and survive.** Our solidarity on the internet produces more internet. Thus, in a certain way— and particularly since **we no longer properly have any thoughts of our own—we all collaborate in a world organized by images and screens, thereby participating more or less mindlessly in the seamless realization and triumphant apotheosis of the programming business.** However, I am sorry to have to report that the dystopian vision **here is not quite as bucolic as even this** already dreary picture of unwitting and irredeemable pulverization and servitude. While I do see that representation and semiotics have been increasingly flattened à la Orwell and Marcuse by a vast internalization of the apparatuses of oppression ( in which “**thought” is the** [productive] thought **of the [capitalist**] Party and “**repressive desublimation**” is an engine of capitalist- fascist **production)** the “old problems” like the hierarchy of class have not gone away; neither have racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and fascist nationalisms ceased playing their roles to create vectors of privilege for white male– identifying aspiration. Indeed, most thought today, such that it is, is all about maintaining hierarchical society. **The thinking runs thus**: capital is nature, capital is eternal, capital is information is nature. Or, in a more pedestrian mode: **human beings are naturally acquisitive and competitive**, economic growth and technological advancement mean progress, **this tech provides**, **or almost provides,** a color- , gender- , and religion- blind society, and so on— and one must advance one’s place in it by any (crypto- or not- s o- cryptofascist**) means necessary.** Of course, there exists better thinking out there. Mia Mingus: “As organizers, we need to think of access with an understanding of disability justice, moving away from an equality based model of sameness and ‘we are just like you’ to a model of disability that embraces difference, confronts privilege and challenges what is considered ‘normal’ on every front. We don ’t want to simply join the ranks of the privileged; we want to dismantle those ranks and the systems that maintain them” (Mingus 2011, cited in Puar 2017: 16). However, there is **broad- band, ambient programming that facilitates assuming neo- liberal** and full-on **fascist subjective sovereignty**. This programming seeks triumphant brushes with plenitude (communion with the big Other, as distinct from the racial or otherwise other, becomes the ego- ideal) , and this same programming is violent, competitive, hateful, mean- spirited, and alienating when embraced—at the same time that it is also cooperative, simpering, and abject. Servitude, even when automatic and mostly unconscious, is unhappy and, as we can see any day from the daily news, utterly pathological and sick. Of course, this diagnosis represents a huge generalization, but despite its broad-brushing lack of subtlety we may find that such a schizoid oscillation between entitled adjudicator and abject supplicant sums up the contours of your average reality televisions how or comments section on YouTube. It is Bateson’s (2000) and Deleuze and Guattari’s (1977) schizophrenic, caught in the double- bind, who has become the capitalist norm— the one who struggles to negotiate in the form of contradictory signals the aporias of hierarchical society, while reproducing it, and all the while experiencing their own psychic dissolution as an injunction to create. 3 With this schizoid capture in mind, let me then develop my question about the internet— “ What if it is all advertising?”—in the framework of post- Fordist production. The argument is that, in the context of virtuosity and the expropriation of the cognitive- linguistic by computational racial capital, sociality itself has become advertisarial, a ceaseless waging of capitalized exploits designed to garner attention and value for oneself and one’s capitalistic. This situation represents— indeed imposes— a derivative logic, a logic **in which every action** is a hedge, a kind of risk management devoted to maximize a return. In addition to the fractalization of fascism, in which agency is manifest as a profile that has aggregated the attention of others, advertising has worked its way into the sign itself, into the image, and into data visualization, and it has generated the advertising . All signs become points of potential cathexis, derivative positions on the underlier that is social currency and ultimately value. This new type of sign is not simply the brand but also an element of vectoral language (Wark 2007): functionalized words in a production channel, engaging in the micromanagement of desire, the production of new needs, and the capturing of the imagination, all in order to induce linguistic and behavioral shifts in the attention of others while aggregating their attention for oneself— t urning their heads with an interface. This combination of the manipulation of market conditions (that is, everyday life) through techniques of risk management is no longer merely the province of advertising but of so- called tuman interactivity 188 Chapter 4(what was once just communication and before that culture), now become adversarial through and through. From Smythe’s claim in the “Blindspot” essay (1977) that all leisure time has become lab or time, to Virno’s (2004) notion of virtuosity, we have seen aspects of this model for the capitalist overdetermination of apparently unremunerated time before. However, here— with the financialization of expression—we clearly grasp that the financialization of everyday life means also the convergence of semiotics and financial derivatives. Given the thoroughgoing intensification of vectoral, and in fact matrixial, signs, we need to investigate its implications in the context of a discussion of radical media practice. I will make two additional points here before shifting gears and turning at the end of this chapter to what I identify as an aesthetics of survival—an aesthetics that emerges from within the matrix of adversarial, schizoid capture. The final chapter of this volume will endeavor to extend aspects of such socio aesthetic forms, those resistant to computational racial capitalism, to new notions of radical finance and the possibility of platform communism. If, as was already becoming true in the cinematic mode of production, the dominant means of representation have become the dominant means of production, the questions of and models for political agency are radically transformed, and the urgent need to decolonize communication and decolonize finance presents itself. Future communication will require a cybernetic approach, and, as wes hall argue, this cybernetic approach will necessarily be financial, though it will be reaching toward a different order and different mode of production. Like communism, because it will need to be communist, it will see economic transformation of the material relations of production and reproduction as essential to the revolution. It will draw on the repressed and extracted cognitive- linguistic resource of the racialized and other wise marginalized and configure ways to make our voices matter both as meaning and as tools for the reorginzation of the material world and the social relations therein prescribed. Language and images are neither inside nor outside; they are part of the general intellect— currently they are at once media of thought and of capital. We also know that languages and images are not isolable, meaning that they are not and have never been stand- alone entities but rather exist in relation to their media, their platforms, which are again inseparable from society and its institutions. Furthermore, each platform relates to another platform. Paraphrasing McLuhan, we could even say that the “content” of a media platform is another platform. Thusly the general intellect is inseparable from its media platforms and their financials. We see that the general intellect, once largely held in common, is increasingly being privatized; the very media of our thought belong to someone else . This expropriation of the media commons is precisely the precondition of the real subsumption of society 189 Advertisarial Relationsby capital. It is an extension of the ongoing expropriation begun by primitive accumulation and money as capital, and it has been accomplished through the financialization of media as platforms of extraction. The ramification of mediation by computation and information has resulted in its convergence into formats offering derivative exposure to underliers that are the expressive vitality and futurity of our communication. We therefore no longer have any organic relation to the materials for thought itself (sincerity has become a myth, at least in the medium- term of most circles)— t he words, images, and machines we require to think, to express ourselves, to interact, and to know have been ripped from the species and privatized via the longue durée of dissymmetrical exchange. We work on the words and images, but as numbers they belong to someone else. The media themselves have become forms of capital— forms of racial capital— and our usage of these media means that we work to add value that valorizes capital, for the capitalist and within a relation designed as much as possible to guarantee that our creative acts necessarily occur as dissymmetrical exchange with capital. I write this book in a discourse that does not just not belong to me because it is shared, but in a discourse that is increasingly the property of a set of institutions— publishers, journals, universities— that all have their eye on the bottom line. The means by which we most intimately know the world, ourselves, and our desires (our images and words) are themselves vectors of capitalization intent upon converting our very life- process into surplus value (which is to say value for capital). We need strategies that will seize the means of production and create a reverse subsumption of affect, intellect**, knowledge**, **capability, communication, and community.** When all media have converged as economic media, it is **economic media that must be re- engineered**. When all media have converged as economic media, it is economic media that must be re- engineered. Again, I think this subsumption of cognitive and affective capacity, the quasi-automating (scripting) of productive labor for capital, is what Stiegler means by the proletarianization of the nervous system—which would include the proletarianization of the pathways of feeling and thought. Our affective capacities are put to alienated and alienating work in the social factory, and their product too is alienated, producing ever-intensifying and ever-accumulating dispossession and disempowerment as the dialectical antithesis of its simultaneous production of unprecedented wealth and power for the cyborg avatars of the great media conglomerates. Intellect and emotional intelligence, the product of thousands of years of species- becoming, is being strip-mined so that extraction machines may continue their furious innovation to further discount people. I write this book aware of the pressure to think it just right, to at once extend thinking in order to command attention and produce new needs, but also to delimit it, to control myself, and to put the reins on whatever counterpower may rage within my body, because academia can tolerate only so much “bullshit” and no more. Yes sir, I’ll be careful not to cross that line, but a word to the woke: the bullshit is the best part. From a historical perspective, this encroachment on the means of representation—that Banksy and I and a billion others join the silenced majority in opposing—indicates that the individual subjective agent, itself a platform for sociality that developed with the rise of capitalism (as the subject who relates to other subjects in the market, the bearer of the commodity and thus its thought), is nearly **defunct.** As has been noted previously, in a world where life processes are stripped, ripped apart, rebundled, and sold as derivative exposures, the individual subject is an outmoded technology despite the fact that it still appears as a skeuomorph in certain updated technosocial apparatuses—like the latest forms of films, games, influencers, and versions of national politics that proffer invitations to momentary individualistic identification for the dividual purpose of providing a sense of familiarity and orientation. While palliative for some in small doses, such individuality is no longer a viable (which is to say, sustainable) fantasy. The real thought is that of the infrastructure, of the AI that codes our meat and scripts our sheets. Sure I take up the mantle for a few moments each day to appear as the agent of this text, suiting up as the operator of an intellect that might be adequate to the informatic shit-storm of racist, capitalist, imperialist, patriarchal, for-profit assaults, but then I drop off into an ocean of petty concerns, food shopping, and home repairs. And even when I say “I,” to perform as the nexus of all this insight, I also know that it’s hardly me talking. I’m just curating at the gates of shit that needs to be said, and hopefully titrating to let the right stuff through. That’s part of my politics though Dog knows that I could create a more lucrative named-professor type profile with just a little more discipline, a bit more self-interested adherence to the protocols of the academy’s factory code. Instead, there is the effort to overturn, to be or at least to live something beyond being the scribe of the world computer, to at once witness the drama of the emergence of the intelligence of commodification, testify to its outrage, and intimate the possibility of its overthrow. Such would be the art of this text, practiced at the limits of disciplinarity and of subjectivity, guaranteed by nothing and no one. The expiration of the subject form, imminent since the subject’s first intimation of mortality—and made structurally mandatory by Freud and especially, with the full-blown rise of the sign at the moment of it radical marginalization by visuality, by Lacan—is not necessarily a cause for lament, despite the increasingly intense fading of its incalculable beauty, its sad reduction to cliché. From a political perspective, it means that within each concrete individual body the presumed continuity of the individual is riddled with contradictory and indeed unassimilable indicators; it means also that there exists in differing quantities and qualities capitalist and noncapitalist striations or sectors. Hallways of emptiness, but also hallways of love. Like bundled assets, the mind-body is tranched by executable logics organized by a calculus of risk available to investors. There are, to be a bit simplistic, **aspects of desire that are** programmed (indeed farmed) to produce practices that function in perfect accord with capitalist accumulation strategies (individualizing or schizoid) and aspects of **desire that are atavistic or collectivist**, utopian, communist, or maybe even just plain lonely, and, in short, subprime. In reality, of course, desire is more singular than even such formalizations might indicate. Insert your favorite snippet of poetry here. Hortense Spillers in “All the Things You Could Be by Now If Sigmund Freud’s Wife Was Your Mother” (1997) invokes “the Dozens” and the music of and like that of Charles Mingus (152–3), to make present an “interior intersubjectivity”(140) testifying to the rich unaudited psychic life of what might today be called Blackness. There are vast resources beyond the easy resolution of hegemonic hermeneutics whether deployed by institutionally validated psychoanalysis or compressed by current systems of informatic extraction. In agreeing with Freud that consciousness makes up a small part of mental life when compared to the preconscious, the unconscious, dreams, and so on, but in rejecting the normative assumptions and disavowals (including his own Jewishness) that situate Freud and the psychoanalytic discourse that will become part of European and U.S. bourgeois society, Spillers recognizes a vast store of mental life and the possibility of listening anew. However, when speaking of politics now, we therefore necessarily speak of the abstract forms available for the conceptualization and deployment of concrete emergences whether referring to haecceities that are innumerable or collective forms of existence and psychic life actively mediating between “the one” and “the ‘masses’ ” (141). Let us listen anew. Acknowledging that we ultimately and if possible immediately want to “marry our thought” (Wynter 1994b: 65) to the wealth of subaltern forms of life and the care of the bios, allow me then to put the situation of the post- Fordist subject thusly: in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin (1939) showed how imperialist dividends complicated class issues in England, since many people, otherwise part of the working class, got a share of the dividends of imperialism by clipping the coupons of their investments in racist, exploitative British enterprises across the globe. Today this race-based class fractionalization is fully internalized in the Global North; on our iPads built by Chinese slaves from blood metals extracted from the Congo, we may momentarily feel like biomorphically unmarked nobles in the global cosmopolis; while on the job market or when simply seen in our raced and gendered embodiments, we are abjects. Materially and intellectually we are nodal points on a global network. The signal oscillates between narcissistic megalomania and utter abjection and can be affected by a billion parameters taking us from melancholia to outrage. **Thus, even the concrete individual is composed of class fractions, race fractions, gender fractions.** In the form of signs, we clip coupons that validate our investments. The language of object-identification, we observe here, cannot really keep up with the fluctuations resulting from the throughput of code as we work to identify and disidentify our agency. Can we audit a different mode of emergence, a different futurity than one inexorably overcoded by capital? Of course this is still somewhat simplistic and also class-specific, as many (billions even) never get to participate as an enfranchised global citizen in any aspect or moment of life, even if the lived experience of these same billions is radically overdetermined by the class(es) from which they are excluded.4 The gilded poverty of the enfranchised, as opposed to the mere poverty of the rest, is now a measure of connectivity. A more complete view is that we are the product of the world system and thus everything we are has been produced vis-à-vis globalization, and therefore everything bears the trace of the system in its entirety (again, in varying proportions). This conceptualization of concrete individuals (bodies) as global communitarian products forced to varying degrees into templates of individualized risk by capitalist states, is not to erase class; however, it suggests that, just as Fanon saw the great European metropoles as the product of third world labor, we are all products of the worst conditions prevailing in the Global South and around the planet. Global inequality is internal to **our being**. It is us. How then does one (such a one who is relatively enfranchised by the derivative language of texts such as this one) inventory those relations and produce them as formations of solidarity rather than as disavowed residuum? Is there another data-sphere, a communist one? Can we build communist interfaces, networks, **and finance?** How would **we register,** track, amplify, and render actionable the communitarian affinities, **solidarities, obligations, and debts**, the resources in the wake of too many genocides to count, that in actual practice **underpin the official economy,** collective life, and whatever authentic hope is left to our species? Perhaps we have arrived at a question worthy of theory: Is there, could there be communist algorithms? Communist derivatives? Derivative communism? We are looking for that path. To add to my point about the shifting, distributed character of political actors—that goes so far as to suggest that we can no longer think only of actors but rather must think of vectors and fields in addition to thinking of the resources developed in cultures of survival—I will make a second observation. **A political intervention** in the advertisarial relations that have this planet heading toward environmental doomsday requires not only revolutionary policy but revolutionary culture. (I defer further discussion of a third requirement, revolutionary finance, to the final chapter.) This culture must take into account that, for many on this planet, Armageddon is not the future but an **ongoing constant**. My call here (which should not be entirely unfamiliar, as it gives petit bourgeois intellectuals something important to do) is to (re)politicize semiotic and affective structures and practices, including and perhaps especially those we might control, for example our own utterances—our expression. Of course, to call them “our own” seems to contradict what I’ve said about the expropriation of the cognitive- linguistic and the intensification of aphanisis by visual, verbal, and digital media derivatives, but it is here precisely that we confront one of the significant material contradictions of our time: who or what speaks in us? This question, which I shorthand using the phrase the politics of the utterance and which you can experience palpably right now (as you endeavor to think), seems to me to insist that **our idea-making** must actively produce its solidarity with the dispossessed. We must struggle for the **radical constellation.** The question concerning the politics of the utterance, asked here in a strange passage of this text through a beyond-academic terrain, a moonless forest the traversal of which may or may not at this point lead us back to the plot, also raises the question of becoming, as well as the questions of agency and of action within the capitalist image— programmable images, racializing and racist images that, in the terms we have set out, are functionally omnipresent. Continuous media throughput has generated a capitalist imaginary structuring both language function and imaging processes, coordinated at scales and by calculative logics that exceed individual comprehension. Though the occasion is upon us, **we must struggle for space and time to think. We must** open a spread on which to bet against the dominant order. We glimpse, and we feel, that to insist upon the unremitting relevance of both culture-making and of cross-cultural transnational solidarity helps **to avoid platform fetishism** because it sees the internet and its machines not as a set or collection of autonomous technologies but as a historically emergent system of value-expropriative communication and organization, built directly upon older but nonetheless contemporaneous forms of inequality, including but not limited to historically emergent techniques of gendering, racialization, and imperialism, and embedded in the living flesh of the world. All of this calculative interconnectivity and networked agency implies, contradictorily, in fact, that the internet is not all advertising—but neither is advertising all advertising. It is also murder and struggle. Banksy knows that. The advertisarial relation is the programmatic relation encrypted in the apparatuses of capital: the war of each against all, taken all the way from finance, computation, and surveillance to the speech act and the imagination in accord with the autopoietic algorithm of the distributed Leviathan. Marx himself saw capitalism as vampiric, and today’s processes of **capitalization are even more totalitarian**, more widely distributed, and more blood-, life-, and indeed soul-sucking than even in prior eras—though such comparisons **don’t do those killed by past iterations of capitalism any good.** Despite the disavowals to the contrary, we recognize that capital needs labor, needs metabolic time more desperately and more voraciously than ever before (what else is biopolitics?) and, furthermore, that it wages war on life-time on all fronts, in order to secure labor power, its product and basis, at a discount. The pyramids of inequality become internal fractals, and even as the base broadens, the tip with the all-seeing eye (that is not a subject) ascends ever higher. **We do not** yet **know what can be destroyed** or indeed built with the massive appropriation of Banksy’s rocks, but we do know that at present **there is** total war against our using them to build anticapitalist, nonhierarchical, horizontal, solidary sociality. The refusal or détournement **of capital’s encroachment** **is** itself a creative act. Perhaps we have only **begun to glimpse what** a total **refusal might achieve.**

## Europe

**1NC AT: Solves War**

#### 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.

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

### 1NC---Trade---Environment

#### Trade causes existential warming — increases emissions and deters policy solutions.

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.

#### Warming leads to extinction.

Kareiva 18, Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al. (Peter, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” *Futures*, 102)

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops
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. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

# 2nc – K

### 2NC---O/V

#### B---Scope

McDonald 19, writer and geography PhD student at University of Oxford studying the intersection of grassroots movements and energy transition. (Samuel Miller, 1-4-2019, “Deathly Salvation”, *The Trouble*, https://www.the-trouble.com/content/2019/1/4/deathly-salvation)

A devastating fact of climate collapse is that there may be a silver lining to the mushroom cloud. First, it should be noted that a nuclear exchange does not inevitably result in apocalyptic loss of life. Nuclear winter—the idea that firestorms would make the earth uninhabitable—is based on shaky science. There’s no reliable model that can determine how many megatons would decimate agriculture or make humans extinct. Nations have already detonated 2,476 nuclear devices. An exchange that shuts down the global economy but stops short of human extinction may be the only blade realistically likely to cut the carbon knot we’re trapped within. It would decimate existing infrastructures, providing an opportunity to build new energy infrastructure and intervene in the current investments and subsidies keeping fossil fuels alive. In the near term, emissions would almost certainly rise as militaries are some of the world’s largest emitters. Given what we know of human history, though, conflict may be the only way to build the mass social cohesion necessary for undertaking the kind of huge, collective action needed for global sequestration and energy transition. Like the 20th century’s world wars, a nuclear exchange could serve as an economic leveler. It could provide justification for nationalizing energy industries with the interest of shuttering fossil fuel plants and transitioning to renewables and, uh, nuclear energy. It could shock us into reimagining a less ~~suicidal~~ civilization, one that dethrones the death-cult zealots who are currently in power. And it may toss particulates into the atmosphere sufficient to block out some of the solar heat helping to drive global warming. Or it may have the opposite effects. Who knows? What we do know is that humans can survive and recover from war, probably even a nuclear one. Humans cannot recover from runaway climate change. Nuclear war is not an inevitable extinction event; six degrees of warming is.

### 2NC---Framework 220

#### 3---FEIGNED NEUTRALITY DA---Debating reactionary arguments as if they are truth claims is complicit in systemic and structural inequality. It’s better for us to move on.

Moufawad-Paul 21, professor of philosophy at York University, Maoist (Joshua, “Liberal Academia and Free Speech Absolutism in the Shadow of Imperialism”, May 24th 2021, M-L-M Mayhem!, <http://moufawad-paul.blogspot.com/2021/05/liberal-academia-and-free-speech.html> accessed 3/1/22)--js

The liberal claim to diversity of opinion was always a myth. It emerged in a world where the colonized and slaves were not imagined to be part of this diversity since they were not considered properly human. In this world of liberty and the “rights of man” and John Locke, the larger question of human equality did not matter because the only community of “equals” capable of expressing their liberty were individuals who were in general agreement about maintaining the colonial capitalist order. Such was the vaunted diversity of liberalism: a marketplace of ideas where only a limited sampling of humanity could participate. When the question of abolition was posed in these spaces––which was a rare occurrence because that marketplace of ideas was structured to keep all but a few abolitionists out––it was treated as an idea equivalent to the ideas of the advocates of slavery, with liberty for all invited to this table trumping the demand for equality. The larger question of settler-colonialism, and the legitimacy of nation-states to engage in colonial conquest and establish plantation orders in the first place, was never broached in these classic liberal spaces. Indeed, liberal progressives such as J.S. Mill (whose work represented the synthesis and apotheosis of classical liberal philosophy) could be sympathetic with abolition and suffrage to some extent, but was completely opposed to challenging the foundation of settler-colonialism. Indeed, Mill supported the abolition of slavery, just as he supported certain forms of suffrage, but in a manner that preserved the roots of Empire: he believed that British colonialism was just and necessary, that colonial tyranny of non-white populations was good for humanity as a whole, and thus was incapable of grasping that it was this very same colonialism that generated slavery in the first place. The patronizing attitude of liberal dialogue persists to this day; its vaunted “diversity” seeks to preserve the systemic and structural roots of inequality while arguing that it is providing the basis of social evolution.

But what about the possibility of a diversity that functions outside of the liberal myth of diversity? An explosion of new ideas and debates that can and should happen once we pass the threshold policed by liberalism? Can it not be the case that, once we break with old ideas and in fact suppress and reject these ideas as erroneous, we can have a diversity of thought that is grounded in truth rather than reactionary opinion?

It is in fact an uncritical commitment to liberalism, even amongst supposed anti-capitalists, that prevents these questions from even being asked. According to liberal thought, there can only be a narrow diversity of opinions within a liberal framework. The fact that such a diversity is already curated, that it is already bound within the rules of capitalist society, and functions according to the marketplace of ideas analogy is rarely questioned. Committed liberals work according to the fiction that “illiberal society” is monstrous because liberalism permits an “open society” of debate––that liberalism is essentially self-critical and open to all perspectives. Leaving aside the point, discussed above, that if we are to make a distinction between “truth” and “opinion” then being “open to all perspectives” is akin to treating a high school debate club as the model for a good society, such a commitment to liberalism betrays a willful ignorance regarding the very tradition of liberalism.

Liberal philosophy developed at the same time as settler-colonialism and slavery; its classical proponents developed their concepts of liberty while uncritically supporting this underbelly of modernity. Saidiya Hartman has demonstrated that the core conception of the liberal subject was constructed on the acceptance of natural slavery. Dominco Losurdo’s work on liberalism charts the ways in which liberal philosophy was consciously complicit in the colonial order. These are not whacky revisionist histories of liberalism. You only need to read what the original liberal philosophers write about colonialism, slavery, and race––and how they conceptualize their philosophy in this relationship, a conceptualization that is foundational to contemporary liberal theory––to realize there is something fundamentally flawed in the tradition. Take, for example, J.S. Mill’s treatment of colonialism. Although Mill was writing in a period later than Locke, and thus did not support African slavery as Locke did, his more “advanced” liberal theory was still based on an imperialist apprehension of the world. Mill defends British imperialism by likening the civilizations it has colonized to infants and barbarians in need of guidance of an advanced civilization. Far from being an aberration of his philosophy, this is precisely a core concept of classical liberalism: in On Liberty, Mill argues that European civilization at one point in time required tyranny to reign in an excess of liberty (i.e. Hobbes’ fictional state of nature) but that, since then, it has “grown up” and now can pursue a liberal society due to its maturity. By the same token, there are civilizations that are infantile and require illiberal control: the liberal conception of social evolution, rather than a conception of revolution and antagonism between the oppressed and the oppressor, is essential to liberal thought just as it is essential to justifications of colonialism.

Liberalism’s foundational relationship with capitalism and imperialism continues right up to the present order. Right up to liberal philosophers complaining that it is wrong to punch Nazis while, at the same time, associating “cancel culture” with the very fascism it refuses to confront. Right up to liberal philosophers refusing to say anything worthwhile regarding the obvious ethnic cleansing in Palestine. Hence, the notion that we should treat liberalism as a meaningful part of a revolutionary ethos should be treated with suspicion. While we can indeed say that aspects of liberalism should be examined seriously by revolutionary thought (i.e. some form of free discourse, some form of individual autonomy), we can also say that this does not mean the adoption of liberal categories of thinking any more than the borrowing from Aristotle and Plato by liberal philosophers means the adoption of Ancient Greek categories of thinking. That is, whatever insights can be gleaned from liberalism by anti-capitalist progressives are immediately transformed by a thinking that transcends liberalism. And this thinking does not speak the same language as liberalism: it speaks the language of revolution and, by speaking this language, necessarily rejects the marketplace of ideas, the harm principle, and the notion that free speech and expression can exist outside of class struggle without reifying the ideas of the dominant class.

#### 4---DATAFICATION DA---Resisting neoliberal valuations about the importance of our research is good.

Jackson 20, Professor, Department of International Education @ Education University of Hong Kong (Liz, “‘But Is It Really Research?’ Mentoring Students as Theorists in the Era of Cybernetic Capitalism.” Educational Philosophy & Theory, vol. 52, no. 1, Jan. 2020, pp. 17–21. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1080/00131857.2019.1591150.)

As Michael Peters notes (2017, 2018), in this age of 'cybernetic capitalism', the global knowledge infrastructure is dominated by trillion-dollar multinationals. These forces are reshaping what counts as valuable knowledge, interpreting academic significance in terms of the capacity of research to directly lead to neoliberal market-oriented economic growth. An outgrowth of the rise of the age of cybernetic capitalism is the increased valuation and appreciation of big data over other kinds of evidence and bases for knowledge. As Kenneth Neil Cukier and Viktor Mayer-Schoenberger (2013) have noted, the subsequent rise of big data as the most valued currency can be characterised by 'the ability to render into data many aspects of the world that have never been quantified before'. To neoliberal institutions and nation-states, which provide public and private information infrastructure, such data is of tremendous use and power. Ordinary academics in this environment have tended to conform to capitalistic frameworks of value in this case, working to gather and analyse data in ways that benefit dominant social institutions and political economic actors. Some may assume there is a mutual benefit, as more funding will be granted, and greater significance ascribed, to researchers gathering data that is of more value under neoliberal growth models and agendas.

Educational researchers are far from immune to these pressures and these seductions. Major associations for educational research such as the American Educational Research Association celebrate their connections with government funders such as the National Science Foundation, which specifically funds 'scientific' research that aims to have an impact. By 'impact', it is implied that the research must agree broadly with the goals of institutions and the value of forwarding them, without major critique or investigation. By 'scientific', there is an emphasis on data. While one might say, following Peter Roberts ([ 7]), that all research is informed by data, as it is 'generated through human experience', in competitive environments in the age of cybernetic capitalism 'more data' is regarded as better data. Quantitative data becomes better than qualitative data, and so on.

There is perhaps no more vital task of educational theorists in this age than to understand and examine how economic growth models are shaping knowledge production agendas, as well as economic and information distribution, normally to benefit the visions of leading players in the age of cybernetic capitalism (Peters, [ 3]). Yet in this context, it would appear that academics researchers are more constrained than ever before by these political-economic forces when it comes to producing research, to be accountable to higher educational institutions and other funding bodies which follow the lead of multinational giants. Rather than setting agendas, most are complying, seeing little recourse and indeed lacking tools that have become devalued by, or may even now be regarded as inherently threatening to, the architects of neoliberal structures that frame information production agendas today.

In the context of ordinary higher education and research institutions, with the ability to gather more data has come greater possibilities for quantitative research. In education, as in other fields, quantitative research has retained a favoured status over qualitative and philosophical approaches for decades. Maths and sciences are still seen as the 'hard' and 'tough' sciences and fields, over the 'softer' arts. That this is senseless binary, particularly in education, has been argued by many philosophers of education (Pring, [ 5]). Qualitative researchers are not immune to the significance of numbers, and quantitative researchers should not be looking at numbers to the neglect of everything else. Yet today, one can see that this binary clearly does have a logic: to divide and differentiate research according to its value
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within the orientation to the world undergirding cybernetic capitalism. In this framing, educational theory, with its focus on ideas, is even more of a loser than qualitative research, not even deemed as research by some due to its lack of big data—and lack of neoliberal priorities.

This is just the latest challenge educational theorists have faced in defending their position in the academy, given the way their work does not tend to fit perfectly with traditional conceptions of educational research, or of applied philosophy (Roberts, [ 7]). Philosophers of education have expressed for a long time a sense of a minority status in teacher education institutions as well, which are normally focused mostly on educational practice, and on training students in qualitative and quantitative research methods. Philosophers and theorists may be feel further crunched today, in education and other fields, as the datafication era aligns with the push for competitive large-scale grants in higher education, which also makes empirical and quantitative research appeal more than ever before.

In this context, educational theorists can do more than simply try to conform, in vain. Instead, they can take responsibility to question neoliberal assumptions about value and significance, interrogate contemporary political-economic influences on academic research and social life, and provide alternative accounts of what is good, significant, and 'productive'. As Roberts ([ 7]) writes, they can also resist 'some of the demands of a performance-driven world', for instance by taking time to pay attention to what is happening in their institutions and in the field today: not to be pragmatic or 'relevant' for the sake of developing neoliberal 'impact', but to reconsider the way their values and ideas do and do not align with the processes and value orientations experienced in the world around them. Additionally, they can train fellow researchers to focus on these issues to a greater extent than they had been focused on in the past. This can also entail cultivating communities which are dialogic and supportive of alternative visions in research and social life.

### 2nc extinction

### 2NC---Link

#### The impact is ecological waste.

Halpern ’18, Associate Professor in Sociology and Anthropology at Concordia University (Orit, “Golden Futures”, Limn Issue 10 https://limn.it/articles/golden-futures/)

Facing limits to planetary resources and maybe even life, we have turned to ubiquitous computing, geo-sensing, and algorithmic trading. To avoid these terminal thresholds of resources and toxins, the mine must conquer the limits of space by deriving value from the future. Enter derivatives. Derivatives are financial instruments that allow a certain amount of something (mortgages, minerals, oil, gold, etc.) to be traded at some point in the future at an agreed-upon price. One also can bet on the cancellation of an order or some other event changing the future price of the underlying commodity or security. The result is that the size of the derivatives markets far overshadows the actual world’s gross domestic product, by now exceeding the world’s GDP by 20 times. These markets have grown exponentially, by 25 percent per year over the last 25 years (Martin 2014).

Futures derivative markets make a double move. They bet change in value of some entity (you can even bet on the weather) between the present to some future point against another change in value of some other entity. But what makes the market interesting is that you can sell your bet before the event happens. In doing so, one “hedges” the future. Gold is the long-standing hedge bet. You can pull out when you make money irrespective of what the future might hold (Cooper 2010). Time no longer equals money but rather money derives from time=time, from bets on relations between times. One can swap the debt, for example, on a package of mortgages or of entire countries for gold futures without the homes being sold or the nations paying or defaulting on their loans. You are betting on temporalities of two different markets, looking to bet on fluctuations in price between the two markets. The forms of time here are speculative, not predictive. One does not need to calculate the final risk of the action of investment; only manage the time of the action. Risk, which is calculable, now has become just raw uncertainty to be managed through algorithmic financial logics that mirror the big-data infrastructures of the extraction industries themselves.

Such understandings of time, of course, demand that we ask: what is the relationship between derivation and extraction? This logic is based in a discourse of reclamation, optimization, and “sustainability” that now dominates mining and energy industries. The value of the mine is being transformed constantly through changes in the mines’ functions and extractions of value from what used to be waste. We are constantly panning our destruction of the environment in search of increments of changing future values to bet on. What is true of gold is also true of most other extraction industries, especially oil markets, which had become the second largest futures market and one of the largest derivatives markets by 2002 (EIA 2002). Our planet is now a hedged bet, where finitude in life is converted to surplus information for future speculation.

#### Digital labor is physical labor---interdependence still links.

Fuchs 16, Professor and Director of the Communication and Media Research Institute at the University of Westminster (Christian, “Digital Labor and Imperialism”, *Monthly Review*, Vol. 67, Iss. 8, retrieved from KU Libraries) strikethrough modifies gendered language

The International Division of Digital Labor

Global communications, in the form of the telegraph and international news agencies, already played a role in imperialism by the time of the First World War, helping to organize and coordinate trade, investment, accumulation, exploitation, and war. A hundred years later, qualitatively different means of information and communication such as supercomputers, the Internet, laptops, tablets, mobile phones, and social media have emerged. But just like the labor of workers in the periphery during earlier stages of imperialism, the production of information and information technology is part of an international division of labor, one that continues to shape modes of production, distribution, and consumption.

Critical scholars introduced the notion of the new international division of labor (NIDL) in the 1980s in order to stress that developing countries had become cheap sources of manufacturing labor and to track the rise of multinational corporations.25 In their book The Endless Crisis, John Bellamy Foster and Robert W. McChesney situate the rise of multinationals in capital's attempt to overcome long-term economic stagnation and attain global monopoly profits.26 Multinationals aim to drive down the wage share globally and increase their profits by installing a system of global competition among workers. The consequence is a worldwide increase in the rate of exploitation that Foster and McChesney, drawing on Stephen Hymer's work, call a "strategy of divide and rule."27

Table 1 shows comparative data for the world's 2,000 largest multinational corporations in the years 2004 and 2014. These companies' revenues accounted for more than 50% of worldwide GDP, showing that multinationals compete for monopoly status at the global level. In both years, almost three-quarters of the capital assets of these companies were located in the FIRE sector-finance, insurance, real estate-which confirms Foster and McChesney's assertion that we can accurately speak of a system of global monopoly-finance capitalism.28 However, these assets also include significant shares in mobility industries (transportation infrastructure, oil and gas, vehicles), manufacturing, and information (from telecommunications hardware, software, and semiconductors to advertising, the Internet, publishing, and broadcasting). All of this indicates that to varying degrees, global capitalism means not only monopoly-finance capitalism, but also monopoly-mobility capitalism, monopolyhyperindustrial capitalism, and monopoly-information capitalism.29

A significant change between 2004 and 2014 was the rise of Chinese multinationals, whose shares of assets, revenues, and profits dramatically increased. European and North American multinational corporations now no longer control around three-quarters, but instead two-thirds of global capital, which means that they nevertheless continue to be dominant. That Chinese multinationals play a more important role does not signify a fundamental break, but rather shows that China imitates Western-style capitalism, so that a "capitalism with Chinese characteristics" has emerged.

The N1DL is at the heart of the information and digital economy that produces information and communication technologies (ICT) and information itself. Various forms of physical work produce information technologies that are then used by workers in the media and cultural industries to create digital content, such as music, movies, data, statistics, multimedia, images, videos, animations, texts, and articles. Technology and content are thus dialectically interconnected, so that the information economy is at once physical and non-physical. The information economy is neither a superstructure nor immaterial, but rather a specific form of the organization of productive forces that cuts across the basesuperstructure divide.

Figure 1 shows a model of the major production processes that are involved in the international division of digital labor. Each production stage involves human subjects (S) using technologies of labor (T) on objects of labor (0), yielding a new product. The very foundation of global digital labor is the agricultural labor cycle by which miners extract minerals. These minerals then become the objects in the next production stage, as they are processed into ICT components, which in turn enter the next labor cycle as objects: assembly workers build digital media technologies using ICT components as inputs. The outcome of all this labor is these digital media technologies, which manage the production, distribution, circulation, and consumption of diverse types of information.

"Digital labor," therefore, does not only denote the production of digital content. It is a category that rather encompasses the whole mode of digital production, a network of agricultural, industrial and informational labor that enables the existence and use of digital media. The subjects (S) involved in the digital mode of production-miners, processors, assemblers, and information workers-stand in specific relations of production. So what is designated as S in figure 1 is actually a relationship, S,-S2, between different subjects or subject groups.

Today most of these digital relations of production are shaped by wage labor, slave labor, unpaid labor, precarious labor, and freelance labor, making the international division of digital labor a vast and complex network of interconnected, global processes of exploitation. These range from the Congolese slave miners who extract minerals for use in ICT components, superexploited wage-workers in Foxconn factories, and lowpaid software engineers in India to highly paid, highly stressed software engineers at Google and other Western corporations, precarious digital freelancers who create and disseminate culture, and e-waste workers who disassemble ICTs, exposing themselves to toxic materials.

Let us look at one example of digital labor. In 2015, according to the Fortune list of the largest transnational corporations, Apple was the world's twelfth largest company.30 Its profits grew from $37 billion in 2013 to $39.5 billion in 2014 and $44.5 billion in 2015.31 That year, iPhones accounted for 56 percent of Apple's net sales, iPads for 17 percent, Macs for 13 percent, and iHines, software, and other services for 10 percent.32 The Chinese labor involved in manufacturing an iPhone made up only 1.8 percent of the iPhone's price, while Apple's profits from iPhone sales were 58.5 percent, and Apple's suppliers, such as the Taiwanese company Foxconn, made a 14.3 percent profit.33 Thus the iPhone 6 Plus does not cost $299 because of labor costs, but rather because for each phone, Apple on average earns $175 in profits and Foxconn makes $43, while the workers assembling the phones in a Foxconn factory receive just $5. The high cost of iPhones and other products are a consequence of a high profit rate and a high rate of exploitation-direct results of the international division of digital labor. China is, as Foster and McChesney write, "the world assembly hub" in a system of "global labor arbitrage and... superexploitation."34

According to the 2015 Fortune Global 500 list, Foxconn is the third-largest corporate employer in the world, with more than a million workers, made up mostly of young migrant workers from the countryside.35 Foxconn assembles the iPad, iMac, iPhone, and the Amazon Kindle, as well as video game consoles by Sony, Nintendo, and Microsoft. When seventeen Foxconn workers tried to commit suicide between January and August 2010, and most of them succeeded, the issue of dismal working conditions in the Chinese ICT assembly industry began to attract wider attention. A number of academic studies have subsequently documented the everyday reality at Foxconn factories, where workers must endure low wages, long hours, and frequent work schedule disruptions: inadequate protective gear; overcrowded, prison-like accommodations: yellow unions managed by company officials and distrusted by workers; prohibitions on talking during work; beatings and harassment by security guards; and disgusting food.36

Yet Apple boasts in its Supplier Responsibility 2014 Progress Report that the company requires its "suppliers to achieve an average of 95 percent compliance with our maximum 60-hour work week."37 The International Labor Organization's Convention C030 on work hours recommends an upper limit of forty-eight hours per work week, and no more than eight hours a day. That Apple prides itself on enforcing a sixty-hour work week for labor in its supply chain shows that contemporary imperialism's international division of digital labor is not just exploitative, but also effectively racist: Apple assumes that for people in China, sixty hours is an appropriate standard.

Apple's 2014 report also claims that the company audited the working conditions of more than a million workers. However, these audits are not conducted independently, nor are their results reported independently. Since Apple doesn't rely on independent corporate watchdog organizations such as Students and Scholars against Corporate Misbehavior (SACOM), its reports must be considered inherently biased: workers being studied by their own employers will certainly not report their complaints, lest they lose their jobs.

As to the numerous labor-rights violations listed above, the report's style and language suggest that the failings of suppliers and local agencies are the problem: "Our suppliers are required to uphold the rigorous standards of Apple's Supplier Code of Conduct, and every year we raise the bar on what we expect....We audit all final assembly suppliers every year." The report could never acknowledge that such behavior is really driven by multinational corporations' own demand to produce cheaply and quickly. Apple's ideological strategy diverts attention from its own responsibility for the exploitation of Chinese workers.

Conclusion: Ideology and Resistance

Apple has marketed the iPhone 5 as being made "for the colorful" and the iPhone 6 as "bigger than big." Such slogans imply that the digital technological revolution has brought about a new and better society that benefits all. Similar ideological promises and claims can be found in the context of social media, cloud computing, big data, crowdsourcing, and related phenomena. Such assertions are forms of technological fetishism that assume that technology inherently fosters a good society without analyzing the social relations in which it is embedded. In technological fetishism, just as Marx wrote of classic commodity fetishism, the "definite social relation between ~~men~~ [people] themselves" assume "the fantastic form of a relation between things."38

Confronting the international division of digital labor with Lenin, Luxemburg and Bukharin's classical concepts of imperialism helps us to unmask this technological fetishism. The example of Apple shows that digital technology and the ideologies that frame it in advertising and politics are obscured by a fascination with the new that necessarily overlooks the continuities of global exploitation.

Apple achieves high profits in the international division of digital labor by outsourcing manufacturing labor to China, where the Western strategy of "exporting capital abroad" achieves high profits because wages are low and the rate of exploitation is high.39 The exploitation of workers at Foxconn, Pegatron and other companies shows that "'[s]weating blood and filth with every pore from head to toe' characterizes not only the birth of capital but also its progress in the world at every step."40 Through it all, Lenin's and Luxemburg's analyses remain as true in the twentyfirst century as they were a hundred years ago.

### 2NC---AT: Link

### 2NC—AT: Cap Good—Warming 56

#### 1—It’s not sustainable – their evidence assumes constant and sustained growth which is impossible under our theory of derivative speculation – even if they are right under traditional economics, those inevitably fail – that’s Halpern

#### 2---Decoupling is a joke – expected growth far outpaces expected decoupling.

Alexander & Rutherford 19, Co-director of the Simplicity Institute, is a lecturer at the Office for Environmental Programs, University of Melbourne, Australia, \*Coordinator of the New International Bookshop and a 'Simpler Way' activist (Samuel & Johnathan, A Critique of Techno-Optimism: Efficiency Without Sufficiency is Lost, *The Handbook of Global Governance*, http://samuelalexander.info/publications/)

The figures are confronting, to say the least. Let’s assume, as with the Ward et al (2016) scenario, that continuous economic growth at a modest 2.41% growth rate leads today’s developed nations (i.e. OECD) to expand their economies eight-fold by 2100. Let us also assume that by this time the world population will have reached 11 billion, in line with median U.N projections (UNDSEA, 2017). Let us finally assume that this population has by the end of the century, caught up to the per capita incomes of the OECD. If this scenario were ever to be achieved, the global economy would end up approximately 28 times larger than it is today!

Needless to say, ecosystems are already trembling under the pressure of one ‘developed world’ at the existing size. Who, then, could seriously think our planet could withstand the equivalent of a 28-fold increase in the size of the global economy? The very suggestion is absurd, and yet this very absurdity defines the vision of the global development agenda. It is the elephant in the room. If we remember that humanity is already in ecological overshoot by 70 per cent, then to achieve long-term sustainability humanity would need to achieve a factor 48 reduction in overall environmental impact (i.e. resource use, carbon emissions) per unit of GDP. Compare this 48-factor reduction with the 5-factor reductions that some techno-optimists think might be achievable via an efficiency revolution which has historically failed to fulfil its promise (Von Weizsacker, 2009; Lovins, 1998). Accordingly, even if these figures are overstated by an order of magnitude, the point would remain that efficiency gains could not possibly be expected to make the projected amount of GDP growth sustainable. The levels of decoupling required would simply be too much (Huesemann and Huesemann, 2011; Trainer, 2012). To think otherwise is not being optimistic but delusional.

#### 3—“Sustainable” capitalism is a new link– waste becomes speculated upon which is Halpern, and renewable development depends on colonial exploitation and resource extraction.

Hickel 19, PhD, Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Senior Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London. (Jason, 5-6-2019, "The Limits of Clean Energy", *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/09/06/the-path-to-clean-energy-will-be-very-dirty-climate-change-renewables/>)

The phrase “clean energy” normally conjures up happy, innocent images of warm sunshine and fresh wind. But while sunshine and wind is obviously clean, the infrastructure we need to capture it is not. Far from it. The transition to renewables is going to require a dramatic increase in the extraction of metals and rare-earth minerals, with real ecological and social costs.

We need a rapid transition to renewables, yes—but scientists warn that we can’t keep growing energy use at existing rates. No energy is innocent. The only truly clean energy is less energy.

In 2017, the World Bank released a little-noticed report that offered the first comprehensive look at this question. It models the increase in material extraction that would be required to build enough solar and wind utilities to produce an annual output of about 7 terawatts of electricity by 2050. That’s enough to power roughly half of the global economy. By doubling the World Bank figures, we can estimate what it will take to get all the way to zero emissions—and the results are staggering: 34 million metric tons of copper, 40 million tons of lead, 50 million tons of zinc, 162 million tons of aluminum, and no less than 4.8 billion tons of iron.

In some cases, the transition to renewables will require a massive increase over existing levels of extraction. For neodymium—an essential element in wind turbines—extraction will need to rise by nearly 35 percent over current levels. Higher-end estimates reported by the World Bank suggest it could double.

The same is true of silver, which is critical to solar panels. Silver extraction will go up 38 percent and perhaps as much as 105 percent. Demand for indium, also essential to solar technology, will more than triple and could end up skyrocketing by 920 percent.

And then there are all the batteries we’re going to need for power storage. To keep energy flowing when the sun isn’t shining and the wind isn’t blowing will require enormous batteries at the grid level. This means 40 million tons of lithium—an eye-watering 2,700 percent increase over current levels of extraction.

That’s just for electricity. We also need to think about vehicles. This year, a group of leading British scientists submitted a letter to the U.K. Committee on Climate Change outlining their concerns about the ecological impact of electric cars. They agree, of course, that we need to end the sale and use of combustion engines. But they pointed out that unless consumption habits change, replacing the world’s projected fleet of 2 billion vehicles is going to require an explosive increase in mining: Global annual extraction of neodymium and dysprosium will go up by another 70 percent, annual extraction of copper will need to more than double, and cobalt will need to increase by a factor of almost four—all for the entire period from now to 2050.

The problem here is not that we’re going to run out of key minerals—although that may indeed become a concern. The real issue is that this will exacerbate an already existing crisis of overextraction. Mining has become one of the biggest single drivers of deforestation, ecosystem collapse, and biodiversity loss around the world. Ecologists estimate that even at present rates of global material use, we are overshooting sustainable levels by 82 percent.

Take silver, for instance. Mexico is home to the Peñasquito mine, one of the biggest silver mines in the world. Covering nearly 40 square miles, the operation is staggering in its scale: a sprawling open-pit complex ripped into the mountains, flanked by two waste dumps each a mile long, and a tailings dam full of toxic sludge held back by a wall that’s 7 miles around and as high as a 50-story skyscraper. This mine will produce 11,000 tons of silver in 10 years before its reserves, the biggest in the world, are gone.

To transition the global economy to renewables, we need to commission up to 130 more mines on the scale of Peñasquito. Just for silver.

Lithium is another ecological disaster. It takes 500,000 gallons of water to produce a single ton of lithium. Even at present levels of extraction this is causing problems. In the Andes, where most of the world’s lithium is located, mining companies are burning through the water tables and leaving farmers with nothing to irrigate their crops. Many have had no choice but to abandon their land altogether. Meanwhile, chemical leaks from lithium mines have poisoned rivers from Chile to Argentina, Nevada to Tibet, killing off whole freshwater ecosystems. The lithium boom has barely even started, and it’s already a crisis.

And all of this is just to power the existing global economy. Things become even more extreme when we start accounting for growth. As energy demand continues to rise, material extraction for renewables will become all the more aggressive—and the higher the growth rate, the worse it will get.

It’s important to keep in mind that most of the key materials for the energy transition are located in the global south. Parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia will likely become the target of a new scramble for resources, and some countries may become victims of new forms of colonization. It happened in the 17th and 18th centuries with the hunt for gold and silver from South America. In the 19th century, it was land for cotton and sugar plantations in the Caribbean. In the 20th century, it was diamonds from South Africa, cobalt from Congo, and oil from the Middle East. It’s not difficult to imagine that the scramble for renewables might become similarly violent.

If we don’t take precautions, clean energy firms could become as destructive as fossil fuel companies—buying off politicians, trashing ecosystems, lobbying against environmental regulations, even assassinating community leaders who stand in their way.

### 2NC---Alternative
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# 1nr – T- statutory exemptions, case

## T

### 2NC---Overview

#### Legal definitions are more precise and better for establishing mechanisms and brightlines.

IAMR 20 (IAMR Law College, <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:Ow2tu5fufXQJ:https://iamrlawcollege.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/CRIMINOLOGY-LEC-6.docx+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>)

According to the legal definition, a delinquent juvenile is one who violates criminal law (i.e. commits an offence). Sociologists insist that legal definition is of no help in understanding the true nature of delinquency and in knowing who are juvenile offenders, since the arrest or conviction of a child may depend upon various fortuitous circumstances. Thus, legal definition fails to take' into account the environmental factors. Also, legal definition differ from place to place and time to time. However, legal definitions are preferred because of their precision and specificity, while the sociological definitions are full of diverse individual or group opinions. Also, legal definition specifies machinery and process determining the violations and therefore able to identify offenders, which is not possible when certain conduct branded as delinquent in social terms.

#### That makes statutory exemptions key.

McGinnis 14, JD @ U-M, 2014 (Anne, “Ridding the Law of Outdated Statutory Exemptions to Antitrust Law: A Proposal for Reform,” *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 47.2)

Most of the statutory exemptions enacted over the last one hundred years are still in place today, despite widespread changes in economic theory, market structures, and antitrust law in general. When initially enacted, many statutory exemptions were seen as special-interest legislation harmful to competition, competitors, and society. While others were beneficial when first put into law, even many of those have grown irrelevant over time. Some have even become as harmful as those enacted with the intent of benefitting special interests.

### 2nc – AT counter interp

### 2NC---AT: 2AC [1] We Meet

#### 2---A statute’s scope refers to what is in the statute – expanding the scope means expanding what it applies to.

Dernbach 21, Professor of Law at Widener's Harrisburg campus, teaching administrative law, environmental law, property, international law, international environmental law, sustainability and the law, and climate change (John, A Practical Guide to Legal Writing and Legal Method”, In “Chapter 5: Reading and Understanding Statutes, p. 61)

Understanding the scope of a statute is the second step. A statute’s “scope” defines the persons to whom and the circumstances to which the statute applies. Some statutes, such as criminal statutes, apply to almost everyone with only minor exceptions (e.g., young children). Other statutes, however, apply only to certain classes of people, and/or only when certain factual circumstances exist. If the person or organization that you represent is not subject to the statute’s requirements, then the statute is not applicable to your client. Similarly, if your client’s conduct or desired course of action is not addressed in the statute, the statute is not applicable. Thus, efficient research and effective representation depend on a lawyer’s ability to determine whether and when a given statute applies to a client’s situation.

#### 3---Antitrust exemptions are legislative.

Krattenmaker 4, US Federal Trade Commissioner, (Antitrust Enforcement in Regulated Sectors Working Group , International Competition Network, <https://centrocedec.files.wordpress.com/2015/07/limits-and-constraints-intervening-in-regulated-sectors-2004.pdf>)

Congress’s will prevails. – The national antitrust laws and the national regulatory statutes are creatures of Congress. They mean whatever Congress wants them to mean and conflicts between them must be ironed out according to the will of Congress, as best as that intent can be ascertained. So, if Congress has spoken clearly to the issue, its resolution governs. For example, in United States v. Philadelphia National Bank, 374 U.S. 321 (1963), the Supreme Court was confronted with an antitrust challenge to a bank merger. The banks argued that a recent statute, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 repealed by implication the application of antitrust law to block bank mergers. The Court found that Congress had not intended such a result. But what if Congress has not clearly spoken? Then other principles come into play. B. Full compliance is the norm. – Generally speaking, one must comply with both the dictates of the antitrust laws and the requirements of the regulatory regime. Thus, for example, mergers between telecommunications firms are subject to review under both federal antitrust law and the provisions of the Federal Communications Act. Telecommunications firms, then, may not merge unless they have cleared both antitrust and Federal Communications Commission review. Permission from one does not entail permission from the other. Denial by one is therefore sufficient, but legally does not constitute denial by the other. Of course, if there is a clear conflict – so that one federal statute commands an act that another one forbids and that conflict cannot be resolved by statutory interpretation – then the later expression of Congressional will governs. (See, for example, the case of Gordon v. New York Stock Exchange, discussed below, in which fear of conflict led the Court to imply an antitrust immunity.) Exemptions from the antitrust laws are not lightly inferred. – Sometimes, compliance with antitrust may be possible, but difficult or arguably not consistent with the policies underlying the regulatory scheme. Firms may argue that the regulatory scheme should be understood to act as granting an implied exemption from antitrust. Federal courts rarely accept this argument. The general rule is that, to obtain an exemption from antitrust, one must get it directly and explicitly from the legislature, not from courts. The Philadelphia National Bank case, discussed above, is an example of the Court’s general refusal to find antitrust exemptions without express direction from Congress. Similarly, in an important case establishing the per se rule against price fixing, United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 310 U.S. 150 (1940), the Court gave short shrift to the defendants’ claim that their conduct was “consistent with the general objectives and ends sought to be obtained under the National Industrial Recovery Act,” which was in place when the conduct began. This was because the conduct, illegal under the antitrust laws, “lack[ed] Congressional sanction.” Even though the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has extensive powers over interconnection and interconnection prices, the Court refused to imply an antitrust immunity in a challenge to a refusal to interconnect and provide electricity in Otter Tail Power Co. v. United States, 410 U.S. 366 (1973). On very rare occasions, the Supreme Court will find an implied immunity. In Gordon v. New York Stock Exchange, 422 U.S. 659 (1975) the plaintiffs challenged agreements by which New York Stock Exchange brokers fixed commission charges. These agreements were allowed under New York Stock Exchange rules, but the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission had statutory authority to alter the rules and in fact exercised supervisory authority over them. On these facts, the Court found an immunity necessary to prevent conflicts between instructions from the Commission and from antitrust courts to the Exchange.44

### 2NC---AT: 2AC [2] arbitrary

### 2nc – Aff flex
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### 2NC---AT: 2AC [X] Overlimits just the consumer welfare

#### 

#### B---Underlimiting is worse. Including anything “antitrust” would overstretch debate

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.

#### A---There are exemptions written into the core laws, and other statutes. Both explicitly limit scope.

ABA 15 (American Bar Association, Handbook on the Scope of Antitrust Law, ABA Section of Antitrust Law, Chicago: ABA)

Next, the language of the federal antitrust laws imposes several scope limits. Each of the major antitrust statutes applies only to "trade or commerce,"39 and that phrase has been held to exclude gratuitous or charitable conduct and other conduct not involving the exchange of goods or services for consideration.40 The Sherman Act likewise applies only to "persons," and while that term is construed broadly under the Sherman Act, it has some exceptions, notably for the federal government and its instrumentalities.41 Stricter limits appear in the Clayton, Robinson-Patman, and Federal Trade Commission Acts (FTC Act), and these limits are quite complex. The Robinson-Patman Act and two of the Clayton Act's substantive provisions, the limit on tying and exclusive dealing arrangements in section 3 and the limit on interlockin§ directorates in section 8, apply only to persons "engaged in comrnerce.',4 The Federal Trade Commission Act is subject to a few special peculiar Scope limits of its own.

Finally, in several distinct ways the language of other federal statutes can limit the scope of the federal antitrust laws. First, approximately three dozen statutes explicitly limit antitrust as it would otherwise apply in particular contexts. Statutory exemptions tend to concern either ( 1) industries that are already regulated by some agency, like insurers excepted by the McCarran-Ferguson Act, by virtue of their being regulated by state insurance commissioners,44 or ocean shipping firms regulated by the Federal Maritime Com.mission,45 or (2) specific kinds of conduct that Congress has chosen from time to time to favor with special freedom to collaborate, like technological research and development, 46 the graduate medical resident program,47 or production joint ventures among competing newspapers.48

#### B---There are at least a dozen legislative exemptions based on subsidiary statutes. Here’s a list, compiled from a variety of sources [inserting it, feel free to google any of them]

Codification of Extraterritorial Scope in FTAIA

Webb-Pomerene Act

The Export Trading Company Act of 1982

Capper-Volstead and the Fishermen’s Collective Marketing Act

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act

The National Cooperative Research and Production Act and the Standards Development Organization Advancement Act

the Curt Flood Act

The Olympic and Amateur Sports Act

Insurance and the McCarran-Ferguson Act

Ocean Shipping

The Natural Gas Policy Act

Health Care Quality Improvement Act

Need-Based Educational Aid Act

Charitable Gift Annuity Antitrust Relief Act

### 2NC---AT: 2AC [6] Reasonability

## Case

### 2NC/1NR No Impact To Decline

#### e. their “empirics” are misapplied and weren’t caused by declines in trade

Fletcher 16

Ian Fletcher (Advisor, Coalition for a Prosperous America). “Free Traders Can’t Name a Single Trade War.” Huffington Post. March 8th, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ian-fletcher/free-traders-cant-name-a\_b\_9409890.html

Failed 2012 presidential candidate Mitt Romney has been claiming that Donald Trump’s (and by logical implication, Bernie Sanders’) proposed rejection of free trade would start a trade war and tip America into recession. Economists Paul Krugman and Howard Richman have both neatly summarized why this simply isn’t how the economics works, even if a trade war does happen, so I won’t repeat their points here. But I have a simpler one: **Trade wars are mythical. They simply do not happen.** If you google “the trade war of,” you won’t find any historical examples. There was no Austro-Korean Trade War of 1638, Panamanian-Brazilian Trade War of 1953 or any others. History is devoid of them. Please don’t respond with that old canard about the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 starting a trade war and causing the Great Depression. It doesn’t stand up, as actual economic historians from Milton Friedman on the right to Paul Krugman on the left have documented. See here, and here, and here. The Depression’s cause was monetary. The Fed allowed the money supply to balloon during the late 1920s, piling up in the stock market as a bubble. It then panicked, miscalculated, and let it collapse by a third by 1933, depriving the economy of the liquidity it needed to breathe. A wave of bank failures in 1930 spread the collapse around the country. Trade had nothing to do with it. As for the charge that Smoot caused the Depression to spread worldwide: it was too small a change to have plausibly so large an effect. For a start, it only applied to about one-third of America’s trade: about 1.3 percent of GDP. Our average tariff on dutiable goods went from 44.6 to 53.2 percent—not a large jump. Tariffs were higher in almost every year from 1821 to 1914. Our tariff went up in 1861, 1864, 1890, and 1922 without producing global depressions, and the recessions of 1873 and 1893 managed to spread worldwide absent tariff increases. Neither does the myth of a spiral of retaliation by foreign nations stand up. According to the official State Department report on this question in 1931: With the exception of discriminations in France, the extent of discrimination against American commerce is very slight...By far the largest number of countries do not discriminate against the commerce of the United States in any way. Trade wars are an invented concept, **a bogeyman invented to push free trade**. The giveaway, of course, is that free traders claim both that a) trade wars are a terrible threat we must constantly worry about, and b) it’s obvious no nation can ever gain anything from having one. Think about that for minute. Now my challenge to free traders (and to my readers) is this: write to me and name a trade war. I promise to publish any results I get.

#### f. other norms prevent conflicts and cooler heads prevail

Ikenson 12

March 5th, Daniel, [Daniel Ikenson](http://www.cato.org/people/daniel-ikenson) is director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war>]

An **emerging narrative** in 2012 is that a proliferation of protectionist, treaty-violating, or otherwise illiberal Chinese policies is to blame for worsening U.S.-China relations. China trade experts from across the ideological and political spectra have lent credibility to that story. Business groups that once counseled against U.S. government actions that might be perceived by the Chinese as provocative have changed their tunes. **The term "trade war" is no longer taboo**.¶ The media have portrayed the United States as a victim of underhanded Chinese practices, including currency manipulation, dumping, subsidization, intellectual property theft, forced technology transfer, discriminatory "indigenous innovation" policies, export restrictions, industrial espionage, and other ad hoc impediments to U.S. investment and exports. ¶ Indeed, it is beyond doubt that certain Chinese policies have been provocative, discriminatory, protectionist, and, in some cases, violative of the agreed rules of international trade. But there is more to the story than that. U.S. policies, politics, and attitudes have contributed to rising tensions, as have rabble-rousing politicians and a confrontation-thirsty media. If the public's passions are going to be inflamed with talk of a trade war, prudence demands that the war's nature be properly characterized and its causes identified and accurately depicted.¶ Those agitating for tough policy actions should put down their battle bugles and consider that **trade wars are never won**. Instead, such wars claim victims indiscriminately and leave significant damage in their wake. Even if one concludes that China's list of offenses is collectively more egregious than that of the United States, the most sensible course of action — for the American public (if not campaigning politicians) — is one that avoids mutually destructive actions and finds measures to reduce frictions with China.¶ Nature of the U.S.-China Trade War¶ It should not be surprising that the increasing number of commercial exchanges between entities in the world's largest and second largest economies produce frictions on occasion. But the U.S.-China economic relationship **has not descended into an existential call to arms.** Rather, both governments have taken protectionist actions that are **legally defensible** or plausibly justifiable within the rules of global trade. That is not to say that those measures have been advisable or that they would withstand closer legal scrutiny, but to make the distinction that, unlike the free-for-all that erupted in the 1930s, these trade "skirmishes" have been prosecuted in a manner that speaks to a mutual recognition of the primacy of — if not respect for — the rules-based system of trade. And that suggests that the **kerfuffle is containable** and **the recent trend reversible**.1
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### Trade Causes Warming — 2NC/1NR

#### 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.