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**The world is structured by the World Computer, an apparatus of racial capitalism that uses algorithmic techniques to commodify life. Information is produced through real abstraction that codify race, gender, and sexuality – that information structures productive thought to create value for capitalism.**

**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

#### ICT development is dependent on anti-Black labor practices, material extraction, and environmental destruction.

Noble 16, assistant professor in the Department of Information Studies in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at UCLA. (Safiya Umoja, 2016, “A Future for Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies”, *Socialist & Feminist Online*, Issue 13.3-14.1, <https://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/>, accessed 8/26/2021)
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The New Scramble for Africa: An Intersectional Analysis of the IT Sector

In the new scramble for Africa’s resources, transnational information and communication industries are racing to control the minerals and land needed for their aggressive expansion and growth—an echo of earlier colonial pursuits by European nations looking to open new markets for cotton and revitalize depressed Western economies.[20] Neocolonial processes remain intact, particularly in places like the Democratic Republic of Congo. That nation’s history of Western plunder began a century and a half earlier, under the rule of King Leopold II of Belgium, when its rubber and ivory resources were extracted for the manufacture of tires and condoms destined for the sprawling automobile and leisure culture of the United States.[21]

Efforts to reclaim autonomy over the Congo and its natural-resource riches were led in part by the pan-Africanist Patrice Lumumba, whose opposition to Belgian and US control of the Congo resulted in his assassination in 1961. This was but one of many efforts to subdue and effectively put down Black liberation movements on the continent of Africa. The foreclosing of African anti-colonial movements by Western state powers was mirrored in the US government’s simultaneously enacted Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO), which systematically assassinated and jailed Black feminist and Black Power liberation and civil rights movement activists in the US from the 1960s to the 1980s. Many of these same strategies are being re-enacted in this historical moment under the USA Patriot Act. The North American activists targeted by COINTELPRO were seeking liberation from interlocking oppressions, and developed relationships of solidarity and mutual aid with many pan-Africanist movements. Since the 1940s, pan-Africanists had been actively engaging in conferences and knowledge production designed to unify the interests of oppressed peoples directly affected by imperialist projects around the globe. This is an important intellectual lineage from which intersectional feminist critiques and activism emerged, their origins evident in the statement issued in 1945 from the Fifth Pan-African Conference:

We condemn the monopoly of capital and the rule of private wealth and industry for profit alone. We welcome economic democracy as the only real democracy. Therefore we shall complain, appeal and we will make the world listen to the facts of our condition. We will fight every way we can for freedom, democracy and social betterment.[22]

These intellectual linkages of critique and resistance demonstrate the connection between colonial projects of the past to the neocolonial, transnational, and neoliberal projects of the contemporary moment. Indeed, the neocolonial projects that fuel extraction industries (and their concomitant environmental and human catastrophes) in places like the Congo today persist in a historical trajectory of global capital’s thirst for expansion at the expense of Black life. Pádraig Carmody details the colonial quest for rubber and ivory in the Congo that led to the slaughter of more than ten million people; Carmody estimates that another three to five million were killed from 1983 to 2003 in wars over minerals and the control of coltan.[23] Coltan, short for columbite-tantalite, is a mineral, more potent than steel which is needed for computers and electronics to release electrical charges in small capacitors.[24] Contemporary global communications infrastructure, including the internet and the billions of devices, appliances, electronics, and “things” connected to it, could not exist without cheap access to coltan. Nevertheless, the bloody “conflict mineral” wars over its control—the rape, violence, and loss of human life involved—are largely invisible byproducts to digital tech users in the West.

In the networked economy of resources needed for global communications infrastructure, Black lives are engaged in some of the most treacherous labor essential to the growth and proliferation of the internet. Capital’s organization in multi-tiered global supply chains[25] obfuscates the direct relationships between Black labor, child labor, civil war, rape, and a smartphone, laptop, or iPad. Electronics companies such as Google, Apple, Dell, Intel, Sony, Nokia, and Ericsson are heavily invested in the computer and electronics hardware manufacturing industries and need raw minerals such as coltan to produce components such as tantalum capacitors for microprocessor chips. But this labor is outsourced, and thus conveniently out of sight and out of mind, going to low-bidders who provide the cheapest labor under favorable neoliberal economic policies. These practices are consistent with other forms of racialized and outsourced internet labor, such as commercial content moderation for large internet companies.[26]

In a transnational and neoliberal context, such practices are not limited to sites located geographically outside the West. David Pellow and Lisa Sun-Hee Park have written a comprehensive study of the underside of Silicon Valley—touted as a panacea of innovation, wealth, and opportunity, when this is the reality only for a choice few.[27] Just as in other areas of the globe, the technology and communications industries headquartered in Silicon Valley achieve their capital accumulation at the expense of overuse and abuse of the environment, gross poverty, and health degradation as they rely on an invisible labor force of immigrants and others living in the transnational, racialized margins:

Power, privilege and wealth are relational, which often means that one person’s riches and leisure time are derived from another’s impoverishment and hard labor; one’s socioeconomic or racial/ethnic group’s access to safe, high-salary jobs and clean neighborhoods is frequently linked to another group’s relegation to dangerous, low-wage occupations and environmentally contaminated communities. This is the essence of environmental racism and environmental injustice: ecological policies and practices are characterized by unfair treatment, discrimination, and oppression.[28]

Intersectional analysis makes these relational elements visible and allows us to trace the connections forged by inequities of wealth and power that bind local communities to others around the globe. Taking an intersectional approach to the internet and its infrastructure bridges the African diaspora, to help us see where and how oppressions are operationalized in similar ways and in the service of shared agents or shared motivations. The internet and its infrastructure are implicated in cases such as the recent public health crisis in Flint, Michigan, where state and corporate abuses, in the interest of multinational companies heavily invested in the technology sector, resulted in poisoned water supplies. The web is functioning as a site of online hyper-surveillance and trolling of Black activists engaged in the #BlackLivesMatter movement in the US and beyond. It is fundamental to Wall Street, where, through the mortgage crisis and Great Recession of 2008, information technology and the gamification of financial markets led to the largest decimation of Black wealth in the history of the United States. It is central to the oppressive working conditions facing Congolese laborers engaged in mineral extraction, in mineral wars, and in creating the greatest site of sexual violence in the world, according to the United Nations. It is evident in the toxic waste sites on the west coast of Africa, in Ghana, where e-waste is shipped in from the West and dumped, poisoning land, water, people, and environments.

These connections need to be made in order to understand the tradeoffs and true costs that come with the overemphasis, financially and in policy, on digital technologies and internet infrastructures. Communications scholar Robert Mejia has critiqued the multiple ways in which electronics and communications devices and infrastructures have material consequences with potent environmental impacts. He notes:

it is imperative that media and cultural studies scholars offer an account of how the 3.7 million gallons of water used per day by Intel in Hillsboro, Oregon, and the millions more used elsewhere, contribute to an ecology hospitable to infectious disease and its natural reservoirs… Knowing that an estimated 632,000 pounds of mercury were disposed of in United States’ landfills between 1997 and 2007, from just discarded personal computers alone, and that about 130 million cellphones are thrown away each year.[29]

The consequences of these ecological disasters are not equitably applied to everyone. The study of the materiality of the internet includes thinking through the specific contexts of who is affected by the social, environmental, economic, and policy arrangements of the digital.[30]

Intellectual investments in thinking of the internet and the digital as disembodied and ephemeral—as if they have no materiality—come at a great cost of erasure and denial. Jean-François Blanchette has written one of the most detailed critical accounts of the development of computing—including the ways in which information is processed, networks are developed and managed, and fiber infrastructure is built and maintained—in order to dislodge the idea that the internet and computing are immaterial or abstract.[31] An intersectional examination of the global information infrastructure underscores that it is predicated upon a complex, globalized, and fundamentally material economy of resource extraction and human labor, from Congolese labor to extract minerals, to Chinese labor working for poverty wages at Foxconn to make Apple’s iPhones, to the exclusion of African American labor from high-wage IT jobs in the United States, to Ghanaians sifting through electronic trash and toxic waste.

#### Risk management induces volatility upon billions to produce stability for the security state and capitalism. That ensures extinction by warming.

Beller 21, Professor of Humanities and Media Studies and Critical and Visual Studies, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn NY. (Jonathan, February 2021, *The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism*, 46-47 Duke University Press)

Innovation organized by entrepreneurs of the self, of the cyberself, creates possibilities for arbitrage on those super-sets of labor-time, attention and life-time; and all the while, everyday risk management is underpinned and indeed anchored by the calculus of genocide. From the binary of the A-bomb to IBM’s punch-carding of the Nazi Holocaust, from the calculus of sovereign debt to that of social media, the lives of people (in Nagasaki, in Auschwitz, in Furguson), become the substrate that registers the meaning of the compute—at least the meaning as far as they may have been concerned. So many are posited as but renewable pawns in an endless game, and the game goes on. Dispossession and genocide, and the capacity to wreak these, guarantee the liquidity of the financial system by guaranteeing that there will always be some billions willing or forced to do anything for its money and the access to information, to informed matter and therefore to life that it provides. In our era, we see clearly that, under capital, the “stability” imposed by systemic integrations and its programs of finance, surveillance, security, mediation, and so on produces ever greater volatility, and we see that this volatility risk can be bought and sold; it can be cut up, bundled, bought, and resold, priced as content-indifferent numbers based upon volatility indices. Meanwhile the markets roil, dispossession rages, and the planet boils.

As history could confirm, by the mid-twentieth century, the complexity of the techniques for the management of societies, from markets to warfare, from media to cybernetics, and now from social media to the derivatives created by synthetic finance, all required discrete state machines to store and manage the pertinent inventories, schedules, and programs--their valuable information. Though usually thought of as properly belonging to the history of science, communication, mathematics, or computation, the socioeconomic endeavors composing the history of the discrete state machine and its ever more supple functionality are to be thought as part of the increasing complexity of capitalist abstraction and thus the abstraction of social relations. They are the elaboration of real abstraction, the expansive formalization of the field of exchange taking place “behind the backs” of living people. These socioeconomic endeavors such as Google, Facebook, the security state, are the effective occupation of the space and time at all scales by the logistics of exchange and its expanding field of production.

Datalogical representation is already risk management. Management, efficiency, optimization; Foucault’s entrepreneur of the self; and even Brian Massumi and Erin Manning’s “more than human of the human” all recognize a technological paradigm of control operating in and through (and as) the individual (Massumi 2018). We may also observe that the techno-logic of capitalism built upon efficiency—the maximum exploitation of the laboring substrate to meet the demands of the falling rate of profit—prevails across all organizational scales, from the individual to the laboratory to the university to the jail, the township, the state, and the nation-state. In “cultural” spaces, representative agents (a.k.a. subjects) manage and aggregate resources, offering themselves as profiles or brands that are themselves not only marketable, but marketable as derivative exposure to their underliers: their audiences, networks, assets, and currencies. I “friend” you to add you to me, to gain exposure to your network, to add you to my portfolio I am an “influencer.” “Culture,” too, understood as a semi-autonomous domain separable from materiality and technology, can today only be a fetish—another case of platform fetishism—because the generalization of computing means that culture as the connective, communicative tissue of the sociosemiotic is ever more subject to the granularization and grammartization of commodification on the “object’ side (and, its other aspect, the fractalization of fascism on the “subject” side) in what, from a global standpoint, is a racial capitalist sociocybernetic bio-techné. Such is “culture” today—an expression of an overall informationalization of social relations subject to historically imposed computability. Cultural form, computable because inseparable from computation, heretofore always a way of connecting to (or disconnecting from) a multiplicity of networks, is now itself a derivative—a social derivative. Its derivative condition explains what was known as “the postmodern condition,” and is instituted by the universal expansion of the factory code toward the total colonization of space, time, representation, and mind: sociality itself in the largest sense.

That the principles of the ordination of matter, being, time, and value by number (or of publics by statistics, and/or of opinions by likes) were perceived to be universal, that is, generally applicable to all phenomena, was more than convenient. It was, as we have said, colonial. It was racializing and gendering. It was capacitating and maiming (Puar 2017). The math, though famously “content-indifferent,” was never value free. Nor were the devices, from desktops to mainframes, from bombers to smartphones, that it spawned. As Diane Nelson (2015: 56) writes in *Who Counts?*, her astonishing ethnography of Mayan number systems and genocide and, also and as importantly, her scathing ethnography of western mathematics and genocide, “Double-entry bookkeeping is also an ‘ethnomathematics,’ but one with an army.” Double-entry bookkeeping was also a proprietary technique; its truth claims, in the form of accounts, implied pathways of control and functionality that served as conduits for capitalization and colonization. It was a system of representation that repressed noise (context) to clearly resolve the value signal called price in a calculus of profit and loss. In our own period, where we see very clearly (simply by looking at the business pages or, for that matter, the culture pages in any newspaper) that contemporary global capitalism is in lockstep with computation, we might expect that the politico-economic meaning of computation as an emergent order of proprietary organization is becoming clear. As new and powerful terms such as *platform sovereignty* (Bratton 2016), *algorithmic governance,* and *the society of metadata* or “*metadata society*” (Pasquinelli 2018) indicate, it appears that it is the information itself that has (or indeed is) value. But the argument here is that it is only valuable within the framework of computation, and indeed within the framework of computational racial capital—at least thus far. Information is the result of that framework; it is an ethno-graphic (not just anthropocentric) instantiation composed from, in, and on states of matter. The framework, a computational infrastructure that is also primarily fixed capital, emerges in conjunction with the myriad phenomena that are now treated informatically; the apparatus is the other side of the supposedly raw material of information. Information is and can only be a relation. The clear implication of this argument is that, just as a DVD presupposes a technical world that can record it and make it play, the very presence of “information” implies the background armature of computation as a mechanism of perception and organization that is fundamentally social and historical. This background armature of perception and organization further indicates the background armature of racial capital as the primordial condition—the meta-machine architecture—of the present system of accounts. We note, and not only in passing, that this way of narrating the epic poem of AI puts anti-Blackness, slavery, settler colonialism, indentured servitude, imperialism, sexism, proletarianization, racial capitalism, and the active organization of oppression for profit at the epistemic center of a computer that could be called world history. It is computation that perceives information, and it is capital expansion that requires the perceptual-instrumental process endemic to quantification, digitization, and computation. The entire system has its conditions of possibility and derives both its significance and its character from the history of capital accumulation, that is itself theft and only theft, and which is, to defer again to the chorus: colonialism, slavery, white heteropatriarchy, imperialism, globalization, financialization, and genocide.

**You should reject the affirmative in favor of a cognitive strike. This refuses the internalization of relations that structures the racial capital of the world computer and disrupts the functioning of capitalism by engendering futilities that creates noise.**

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.**

#### The lineage of capitalism from maritime insurance in the Middle Passage to modern financialization is marked by false inventions that revise market logics and ensure views of knowledge are rigid – that codifies racism and ensures failures of capitalism are always displaced.

**Munn 20**, Luke Munn is a media studies scholar based in Tāmaki Makaurau, Aotearoa New Zealand. His research investigates the sociocultural impacts of digital cultures and their broader intersections with race, politics, and the environment. (Luke, From the Black Atlantic to Black-Scholes: Precursors of Spatial Capitalization. Cultural Politics 1 March 2020; 16 (1): 92–110. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1215/17432197-8017284> Accessed 8/28/21)

Conclusion

Driven by the potentials of capitalization, both the maritime insurance of the black Atlantic and the financial formula of Black-Scholes attempted to develop logical models of space. As Henri Lefebvre (2010: 188) asserted, “One uses space just as one uses machines.” To operationalize space, it is necessary to know it—to define its boundaries, grid its geographies, and mark its points of potential. While risk in the form of bodily danger or financial exposure was key to both moments, **risk could be understood as a failure to fully apprehend space—to adequately internalize the unforeseen event into a spatial system.**

What do we gain by examining both these moments together? What does this somewhat experimental approach offer? First, the “computation” that drives spatial capitalization can be productively historicized. The ability to ring-fence space, to carve it up into zones, to index its flows and apprehend its dynamics—in short, to fold all of its variables into a total informational system—this imperative did not suddenly emerge in the last half of the twentieth century with von Neumann architectures **but is embedded in a far longer lineage, one tightly coupled to the historical development of capital.** Such techniques are not particular to computers, but to computation (Bratton 2016: 79): a more general set of mechanisms for making discrete, for rendering people and things calculable. As Beller argues (2018: 1), “The rise of information itself is an extension of the ongoing quantification and instrumentalization of the life-world imposed by early capitalism.” Informational logics did not appear with the birth of the mainframe or the microchip but were instead anticipated far earlier through a slow buildup of socio-technical developments **striving to know, to map, and to manage.**

This historicization provides a way of contextualizing the imperatives and operations of our contemporary technologies. Such a framing runs counter to the common assumption that these technologies, and the conditions they usher in, are unprecedented. Proclamations of a “new age” or a “digital revolution” abound in business and popular literature (Brynjolfson and McAfee 2014; Sidhu 2016; Skinner 2018). Yet even for a far more sophisticated theorist like Byung-Chul Han (2017: 1), the novelty of digital media presents a crisis of understanding: “This new medium is reprogramming us, yet we fail to grasp the radical paradigm shift that is underway.” Such historical amnesia has allowed **every development to be treated as unprecedented.**

 We are suddenly jolted from In the Age of the Smart Machine (Zuboff 1989) to The Age of Surveillance Capitalism (Zuboff 2019). Framed as entirely novel, each situation seems to demand that **we forget what has come before**, tossing outdated assumptions and developing a whole new set of theories.

Of course, it is true that contemporary **conditions are not identical** to those of the eighteenth or even the twentieth century. New technologies do alter formations of labor and capital, they do exert force at global and local levels, they do reshape ways of being and doing. Yet the historical moments sketched above stress that these **technical affordances are extrapolations rather than inventions**, and that the imperatives that drive them have been seen before—they are evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Granted, this evolution is uneven rather than linear, composed of stops and starts, accelerations and brakings. Nevertheless its birth can be located in the past and its developments traced through history, a formalization and intensification over time.

Taking up this approach would allow future researchers to draw richer connections between seemingly disparate objects and events. After all, a multitude of different instruments, media, and **structures** have been historically employed to recalculate space and **rationalize knowledge**, to optimize tasks and organize labor. Such moments are linked not by their outward form but by their operative logics—by calculation, not representation. This framing opens up a theoretical perspective that is not locked within a particular medium of mass communication or ring-fenced by a particular time period. Instead, this approach speculates that **the means constantly shape-shift** in order to achieve the ends. What is the composition of this power—the capacities that survive and thrive, the politically effective devices and strategies that jump species into the next medial form? By exploring the substantive force exerted by technical formations across time, **chronologies might be productively reorganized,** connecting “the factory floor, the slave ship’s manifest, the spread sheet, the stock exchange” (Beller 2018: 21). Such connections would require a theory with the same kind of flexibility, a somewhat agnostic approach that acknowledges the specificity of things, forms, and tools, while always stressing the operational over the optical.

This historicization also foregrounds the social inequalities of calculative logics, highlighting how they often leverage racial, sexual, and cultural distinctions. Building on Gregory Bateson’s (1972: 459) famous line that information is the “difference that makes a difference,” Beller (2018: 12) stresses that this informational difference is always a social difference, one that recapitulates “historical forms of racialized and gendered violence” by putting the world “in-formation.” Thus while this precursor concept was evident in earlier work (Munn 2014), Beller’s work productively extends it and stresses in particular its racial substrate. Of course Beller is also building on the work of others, from the race-as-technology of Wendy Chun (2009) to the feminist formations of Donna Haraway (2015), Diane Nelson’s quantification of life (2015), and, most explicitly, the racial capitalism of Cedric Robinson (2000). Here Jodi Melamed’s (2015) compelling work on racial capitalism should also not be overlooked. In an article of the same name, she draws on Marx to show how processes of capitalization construct and reinforce social distinctions. “Processes of differentiation and dominant comparative logics create ‘certainties’ of discreteness, distinctness, and discontinuity,” she argues (79**). Capitalism codifies difference, integrating formerly untapped relations into a formalized calculus. Indeed, such inequalities are integral to the production of value.**Accumulation, Melamed concludes, requires “loss, disposability, and the unequal differentiation of human value, and racism enshrines the inequalities that capitalism requires” (77).

The two moments examined here foregrounded this racialization of information. If the slave trade was the cutting edge of maritime insurance, then the key financial instruments that emerged from it are the direct product of its logic of racial difference. In striving to render the Atlantic calculable, insurance policies’ acceptable loss of 10 percent on the “goods” of slaves codified a violent distinction. The force of the policy bore down on captains, captains bore down on sailors, and sailors on slaves. Given a potential insurrection, punishments or executions were enacted on those individuals deemed to pose the most risk, an acceptable “sacrifice” legitimated through maritime law and necessary to ensure the capitalization of the total at the end of the voyage. In the cold logic of capital, the sociocultural ancestry of the individual was stripped away, replaced instead by a disposable, interchangeable integer: a slave-unit. Epidermal difference, formalized and financialized, ensured that some perished while others prospered. Indeed, for Ta-Nehisi Coates (2017: 370), this is the real material difference that underpins the productive fiction of race—there are those who plunder and those who are plundered.

The racialized dimension of calculation appears again at the end of the Black-Scholes narrative. The development of an option pricing formula using a handful of inputs seemed to tame the terrain of financial risk, shifting trades from subjective hunch to empirical objectivity. Based on the formula, strategies like dynamic hedging fueled an explosive new market in derivatives and their variations. Yet the 2008 financial crash dramatically exposed the constraints of this calculative power. There was a general awareness that **it was Main Street, rather than Wall Street, that had paid for this miscalculation**, that “systemic **economic risks and calculable damages have been transformed into elemental dangers for the dependent majority who are powerless to make decisions**” (Vogl 2014: 298). Yet more specifically, the crash was triggered by the precarious base of “toxic assets” that underlay its highly leveraged positions—credit default swaps made of bundled home mortgages obtained from predatory lending practices. This meant that the crash’s material fallout of devaluation and foreclosures fell most heavily on black buyers, black houses, and black neighborhoods. Profits and losses, possession and dispossession, bailouts and evictions—these were divided not just along class lines, but along racialized lines.

This article has drawn together the black Atlantic and Black-Scholes to suggest an alternative approach, one that undermines the blinkered presentism and bright optimism that tends to dominate technological rhetoric. Far from being unprecedented, contemporary technologies are simply the most sophisticated instances of a long-standing dream: if space could be more comprehensively captured and coded, it could be more intensively capitalized. At the same time, this technically driven capitalization is often predicated on social difference, leveraging racial distinctions, among others, to amplify a space’s ability to accumulate capital. If these calculative logics have a long lineage, it is also a dark lineage, based on inequality and dispossession.

### 1NC---T

#### Next off is T private sector

#### The means the entire group.

Merriam-Websters 8 Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### Private sector means all non-governmental persons or entities, including non-profits

Senate Report 95 (Senate Report. 104-1, “UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995,” <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-report/104th-congress/senate-report/1> , date accessed 9/10/21)

"Private sector" is defined to cover all persons or entities in the United States except for State, local or tribal governments. It includes individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, and educational and nonprofit institutions.

#### A topical aff could change a universally-applied standard, like the CWS [Consumer Welfare Standard]

Phillips 18, commissioner on the Federal Trade Commission. (Noah J. November 1, 2018, Before the Federal Trade Commission, “Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century,” <https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_events/1415284/ftc_hearings_session_5_transcript_11-1-18_0.pdf>)

Our second topic today is the consumer welfare standard. And I think most folks even out in the public know, this is the standard that we use across the board, mergers and conduct in courts and at agencies, to judge anticompetitive conduct. It is not only a standard that we in the U.S. apply, it is a standard that is used by competition agencies around the world. It is an economically-grounded standard, and it requires that there be harm to consumers for conduct to be condemned. Mere harm to competitors is considered insufficient. So let me repeat that again. There has to be harm to consumers, not just competitors. The reason that is so, the reason harm to competitors is considered insufficient is because sometimes a less-efficient firm losing sales or market share to a cheaper, more innovative or efficient rival, can be and often is consistent with vibrant competition and with outcomes that benefit consumers. Courts and agencies have embraced this standard for decades. Today, there are two very important discussions going on about the consumer welfare standard, and they are happening simultaneously. And I think it is important that we understand that there are two conversations going on. One is a continuing discussion about how we apply the standard, regarding whether enforcement is at the appropriate level, whether it is properly targeted. This is an introspective question on some level, in which scholars, economists, practitioners, and enforcers all ask ourselves, are we bringing the right kinds of cases? Are we using the right kinds of evidence? Should we be doing more or less in certain places? The antitrust bar, the business community, and others benefit from this ongoing and active analysis. The second discussion happening now, and the one on which today’s consumer welfare standard panels will focus, is whether the standard is itself the right metric we ought to use in antitrust enforcement and in antitrust law; some argue that enforcement under the consumer welfare standard has failed because of the law, and accordingly, that we should reform the law.

#### Violation: the aff applies exclusively to conduct in a specific segment of the private sector.

#### Vote neg:

#### FIRST---limits and ground---the number of potential subsets is infinite---any industry, product, single companies, individuals---undermines clash. Only big affs have link uniqueness.

#### SECOND----precision---our interp has intent to define, exclude and is in legislative context.

## Solvency

### 1NC---Blocking Statutes

#### China blocks---nukes solvency

Kava 19, JD/MBA Candidate @ JU (Samuel, “The Extraterritorial Application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act in the Age of Globalization,” *15 J. Bus. & Tech. L. 135*, Lexis)

Before the FTAIA was enacted, in 1982, many of the United States’ closest allies were disgruntled by the U.S. courts’ expansive extraterritorial application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.152 These nations confided in the territorial principle, and believed it “axiomatic that in anti-trust matters the policy of one state may be to defend what it is the policy of another state to attack.”153 The United Kingdom, one of the most outspoken allies against the United States’ “attempt[] to impose [its] domestic laws on persons and corporations who are not U.S. nationals and who are acting outside the territory of the United States,” viewed the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act as ironic given the fact “the United States was founded by those who took exception to little matters of taxation being imposed extraterritorially.”154 Thus, in an attempt to “protect their nationals from criminal [and civil] proceedings in foreign courts where the claims to jurisdiction [were] excessive and constitute[d] an invasion of sovereignty,” foreign nations enacted blocking statutes to resist the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act.155 The blocking statutes of each nation varied, but all served to “block the discovery of documents located in their countries and bar the enforcement of foreign judgements.”156 The United Kingdom achieved these goals with the Protection of Trading Interests Act, France with the French Blocking Law, Canada with the Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act, and Australia with the Foreign Proceedings Act.157 The conflicting laws between the United States and its foreign counterparts created tremendous uncertainty regarding what nation’s laws would be applied in the event of a cross-border dispute. According to Nuno Limáo and Giovanni Maggi, economists from the University of Maryland and Yale University, “as the world becomes more integrated, the gains from decreasing trade-policy uncertainty should tend to become more important relative to the gains from reducing the levels of trade barriers.”158

#### China nullifies U.S. restrictions

Baruzzi, 21 is an Editorial Research Assistant with Dezan Shira & Associates, an AmCham China Corporate Partner Program member. (Sofia Baruzzi “China Promulgates New Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Measures” accessed online 9/17/2021 https://www.china-briefing.com/news/china-promulgates-new-extraterritorial-jurisdiction-measures/)

On January 9, 2021, the Ministry of Commerce (“MOFCOM”) released the Measures for Blocking Improper Extraterritorial Application of Foreign Laws and Measures (“Measures”), with immediate effect. The Measures state that Chinese citizens, legal entities, and organizations (hereafter collectively referred to as “PRC persons”) must report to the competent authority in China, any inappropriate application of foreign measures or laws that are designed to bar economic, trade, and related activities between China and other countries. The competent authority has the power to issue an injunction allowing the reporter not to recognize, implement, or comply with the said foreign norms, as well as to file a lawsuit in China claiming for losses’ compensation. What is the reason behind the adoption of the Measures? As further explained below, the Measures provide a retaliation clause remarking that China is ready to take the necessary countermeasures against any improper extraterritorial application of foreign laws and measures. In this way, China is sending a message to the entire world, warning foreign countries to stop unjustly prohibiting or restricting Chinese people or companies from doing business. With the decision to promulgate such type of measures, China reasserts that, if Chinese businesses are not treated equally and allowed to carry out their business in a lawful and regular manner, then the Chinese government is ready to intervene. It is worth noting that while the Measures do not mention any specific foreign country, they will likely serve as countermeasures to the US restrictions and bans – for instance, the ban against Tik Tok and WeChat, the measures adopted against Huawei’s chips, or the exclusion of China Unicom, China Telecom, and China Mobile from the stock exchange – that heavily impact doing business with Chinese companies and individuals. Considering the recent change in US administration, China’s move might be interpreted as an attempt to change the direction of US-China relations, in the hope that such Measures will deter President Joe Biden’s administration from maintaining (or exacerbating) the regulations implemented during Trump’s administration. Hence, how China will relate itself with the US – and consequently how global companies will be impacted by the Measures – really depends on the Biden administration’s approach. (In a recent interview, Biden said that his administration would be ready for “extreme competition” with China but based within the scope of international rules.) The same type of logic shall apply to any other foreign country, in other words, if it wants to maintain a good and smooth relationship with China – it will have to evaluate whether to modify (or remove) the policies and regulations that prevent or restrict PRC persons from performing economic, trade, and related activities.

### 1NC---Private Sector

#### Cross-apply T---private sector means “non-governmental economic operations.”

#### Chinese Corporations are State Owned

Gatuzade 19 Amir Guluzade Chief Operating Officer, Private Wealth Institute, Ahmadoff & Co, 07 May 2019, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/05/why-chinas-state-owned-companies-still-have-a-key-role-to-play/>

China is home to 109 corporations listed on the Fortune Global 500 - but only 15% of those are privately owned. China’s SOEs are enormously bulky and therefore lack flexibility when responding to market demands.

#### China would circumvent by making any companies covered by the plan State Owned Enterprises—they want to nationalize big company’s

Gatuzade 19 Amir Guluzade Chief Operating Officer, Private Wealth Institute, Ahmadoff & Co, 07 May 2019, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/05/why-chinas-state-owned-companies-still-have-a-key-role-to-play/>

Despite the above-mentioned factors, the Chinese government is still keen on supporting SOEs and is committed to making them bigger, stronger and more efficient. This is particularly relevant to certain strategic sectors where government oversight is essential - specifically in defense, energy, telecom, aviation and railway systems. Conversely the state is encouraged to divest from other industries by decreasing its ownership. The State-owned Asset Supervision and Administration Commission (SASAC) is making great strides in implementing the government’s ‘zhuada fangxiao’ (grasp the big, release the small) policy, which has greatly reduced the number of SOEs through privatisation, asset sales, and mergers and acquisitions. The Commission, which was established in 2003, is currently concentrating on restructuring the remaining SOEs into modern profit-oriented corporations. Practically all of the entities overseen by SASAC are structured as corporations and are legally separate from the government with their own boards of directors, effectively delegating more authority to the executives. There is also substantial work being done to improve SOEs through reorganisation, restructuring and enhancing their internal governance standards. The government went as far as introducing mixed ownership in telecoms company China Unicom, by selling shares worth around $11 billion to 14 private investors. This was done as a step towards making China Unicom more accountable and more focused on generating returns on equity, while retaining state control. These efforts to make SOEs competitive while holding absolute control over their final decision-making reasserts the Chinese government’s commitment to consolidating state control while simultaneously allowing the market to be the ultimate resource allocator. In other words, the government wants to keep a close eye on market forces while reserving the ‘intervention option’ in critical situations. China’s legal and regulatory systems are going through crucial transformations with regards to investment and intellectual property - but they are not yet prepared to regulate giant, strategically significant corporations, which is why the government has chosen to retain the option of direct control over its SOEs. Besides, once the property rights framework is brought to a certain level, the government could profit far more by privatising competitive enterprises rather than selling off distressed assets in the current legal environment.

## Advantage 1

### 1NC---Relations

#### Their relations UQ is just alt causes + “China hates the U.S. aggressing against its companies.”

1AC Zhang 21 [KU=yellow] – Angela Huyue Zhang is an associate professor at the Faculty of Law at the University of Hong Kong. An expert in Chinese law, Angela has written extensively on Chinese regulatory issues. Angela is a four-time recipient of the Concurrence Antitrust Writing Award, which selects the best articles published globally in the field of antitrust law each year. Angela frequently speaks at prestigious antitrust conferences in the United States, Europe, and Asia. And she regularly contributes commentaries to popular press including Project Syndicate, Nikkei Asia Review and Bloomberg. Angela has broad research interests in the areas of law and economics, particularly in transnational legal issues bearing on businesses. She is currently working on a few projects pertaining to platform governance and regulation, trade and investment, as well as the Chinese political economy. Angela also serves as the Director of the Centre for Chinese Law at the University of Hong Kong, which promotes legal scholarship with the aim to develop a deeper understanding of China and facilitate dialogue between East and West. Before joining the University of Hong Kong, Angela taught at King’s College London and practiced law for six years in the United States, Europe, and Asia. She worked as a bankruptcy lawyer at Debevoise & Plimpton in New York and as an antitrust attorney at Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton in Brussels. Angela was admitted to the New York Bar in 2009. ​Angela received her LLB from Peking University, and her LLM, JD and JSD from the University of Chicago Law School. She wrote her doctoral dissertation under the supervision of former Judge Richard A. Posner. Chinese Antitrust Exceptionalism: How The Rise of China Challenges Global Regulation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198826569.001.0001.

It saddens me to see how Sino-US relations are heading towards divorce as tensions continue to escalate on a host of issues ranging from the trade imbalance between the two countries to passing the buck on the COVID-19 pandemic and the passage of the Hong Kong National Security Law. As an avid reader of both US and Chinese newspapers, I find their polar opposite stances quite unsettling. Neither side is listening to the other, and neither side is being heard.

Is it possible to salvage what is left of the Sino-US marriage? I firmly believe so, if the two sides are willing to gain a deeper appreciation of their differences and commonalities. As elaborated in this book, the sources of Chinese exceptionalism are deep-seated in the distinctness of Chinese institutions, which often reflect the weaknesses and inherent contradictions of the Chinese regime. Although Chinese institutions have been moving in the right direction towards more openness and transparency, changes occur very slowly. The institutional inertia that surfaced after the series of reform has largely contributed to discontent and anxiety over the way China regulates and is regulated. Yet these institutional problems have little to do with Chinese communist ideology. It is thus a serious mistake to perceive China as an existential threat that wants to overtake the West and completely subvert their existing governance framework. Above all, the current Sino-US strategic rivalry fundamentally lacks aspects of a pervading ideological conflict analogous to the Cold War.3 Moreover, given how deeply China is embedded in the global supply chain, any attempt to completely disentangle the US economy from China would seem unimaginable. It may also backfire. As I have repeatedly emphasized here, the Chinese state is hardly monolithic, and policy-making is often a pluralistic process involving government departments with overlapping and divergent missions. Furthermore, growing US hostilities against China and Chinese companies are stirring nationalistic fever, giving hardline officials an upper hand, as evident in China’s increasingly aggressive ‘wolf warrior’ foreign policy.4 This will have the unintended consequences of undermining efforts of the more progressive bureaucratic departments and unwinding some of China’s promising institutional reforms. Indubitably, the rising Sino-US geopolitical tensions have resulted in profound mistrust between the two countries. But I remain hopeful that future cooperation remains possible, as long as China and the United States stay patient and far-sighted and continue to maintain significant leverage against each other. The Sino-US marriage does not necessarily need to have a tragic ending.

#### Plan’s especially bad for tensions

Murray 17, J.D., 2017, and Stein Scholar, Fordham University School of Law; B.A., 2010, Vassar College (Sean, “With a Little Help from my Friends: How a US Judicial International Comity Balancing Test Can Foster Global Antitrust Redress,” <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2690&context=ilj>)

With nowhere else to go, private litigants have naturally flocked to the United States for remedial assistance, creating an issue for developing antitrust regimes.12 Several implications attend foreign plaintiffs seeking recovery in the United States. American courts have recognized the importance of allowing foreign plaintiffs to bring claims in the United States under the Sherman Act.13 Before 2004, there was a significant chance that parties injured abroad by global cartels that directly harmed the United States would be able to sue in US courts to recover their losses.14 But, as illustrated above, private litigants applying US antitrust law for redressing harm that occurred abroad create tensions over sovereignty with other countries.

Start FN 15

15. See, e.g., Joseph P. Griffin, Extraterritoriality in U.S. and EU Antitrust Enforcement, 67 ANTITRUST L.J. 159, 160-61 (1999) (discussing that aggressive extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act brought “considerable backlash from foreign governments”); Mark S. Popofsky, Extraterritoriality in U.S. Jurisprudence, in 3 ISSUES IN COMPETITION LAW AND POLICY 2417, 2423 (2008) (describing the controversy associated with US antitrust law extraterritoriality with US trading partners). See also infra § III

End FN 15

### 1NC---!D---China War

#### **No US-China war.**

Lei 20, PhD and MA in International Politics, associate research fellow with the China Institute of International Studies. (Cui, 7-24-2020, "Despite heated talk, risk of a US-China hot war is small", *South China Morning Post*, https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3094121/why-risk-us-china-hot-war-small-despite-heated-talk)

Many observers are pessimistic about deteriorating US-China relations and believe the two countries are heading towards a cold war. Even worse, some argue that the situation might be more dangerous than the US-Soviet Union Cold War, and that a hot war might break out between the two. This argument is unconvincing. First of all, deterrents to a flare-up are much stronger in US-China relations than in US-Soviet relations. Although economic and people-to-people ties between China and the US are declining, they are still close compared to US-Soviet ties. It is hard to decouple two closely intertwined economies and societies. Take two examples. China is expected to become the world's largest consumer market, a temptation hard to resist for exporters, including those from the US. And in education, more than 300,000 Chinese students study in the US, bringing in huge revenues for the US education industry. Many universities go to great lengths to woo international students. Recently Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology even sued the government over its new visa restrictions, now aborted, on international students. Second, even if there is decoupling, the pain would not be too great and can be kept out of the national security sphere if properly handled. In fact, for national security reasons, a modest degree of isolation will make both sides more secure and comfortable. For instance, if China’s information technology equipment cannot capture Western markets, the US will be more relaxed. If China cannot get advanced technologies from the US and its technological progress slows down, the US will be less anxious. In the same vein, China feels assured knowing that if the Trump administration does impose a travel ban on Communist Party members, it would be abandoning one of the tools available to the US to promote “peaceful evolution” in China. Economic decoupling is undeniably more painful for China than for the US. But unlike Japan during WWII, which was hit hard by the US oil embargo because of its lack of natural resources, China has no such problems. Given its large domestic market, losing the US as a major customer is not a disaster for China, and can be compensated through more dynamic economic activities at home. China can also make up for being freezed out of technological exchanges by turning to indigenous innovation. As for the US, it can import goods from other developing countries, albeit less cheaply. The relative loss is acceptable when weighed against the heightened perception of economic independence and security. Third, the ideological confrontation between China and the US is less intense than that during the Cold War. Unlike the obsession with ideology in those days, the line between capitalism and socialism is blurred today. The market economy has become universally recognised as the best way to promote economic growth and, politically, many countries have embraced democracy. Even North Korea calls itself the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Although ideological hawks in the US still long for the day when the beacon of freedom will light up the world, after many years of fighting bloody wars overseas, most American people are not interested in promoting democracy abroad. Meanwhile, China just wants to preserve its political system and has no interest in exporting it to other countries, as the Soviet Union did. Thus, ideological antagonism in China-US relations can easily be eased by calculations of realistic interests, which create conditions for compromise and cooperation. Fourth, both China and the US have many options other than war to achieve their policy goals. While they have no allies to serve as a buffer, given the nature of the potential conflict in the South China Sea or Taiwan Strait, both countries are adept at operating in grey zones and fighting psychological, public opinion or diplomatic warfare below the threshold of war. The forced closure of the Chinese consulate in Houston by the US government is just the latest act of brinkmanship. In addition, given China’s huge economic and financial interests in the US, the latter can wield the stick of sanctions when use of force is highly risky or not worth it. When both sides have many tools and options, why would they rush to war to achieve their goals? Last but not least, the imbalance of power will act as a deterrent. Some say the US and Soviet Union did not fight a hot war because they were evenly matched. It was not the case, actually. At the beginning of the Cold War, the Soviet Union was at a relative military disadvantage. Moreover, a country needs the will to fight before going to war, even if it is stronger militarily than its adversary. Having fought years of meaningless wars, the US is weary of war. China, too, abhors war. Having a clear understanding of US strength, especially when its own economy is slowing down and it is facing various domestic challenges, China would not wish to recklessly start a war with the US. In summary, the possibility of a hot war between China and the US is very small. The greatest danger for China is not a cold or hot confrontation with the US, but policymakers’ interpretation of the momentary hostility towards Beijing of a portion of the American population and the larger world. An erroneous interpretation could end China’s march to further opening up, and see it turn instead towards self-isolation.

## Advantage 2

### 1NC---AT 5G

#### 5G race is media hype.

Smith 20 (Rick, editor and co-founder of WRAL TechWire, “Is 5G sky falling? Here’s the truth about China, US in battle for wireless future,” 1 December 2020, <https://www.wraltechwire.com/2020/12/01/is-5g-sky-falling-heres-the-truth-about-china-us-in-battle-for-wireless-future/>, DOA: 1-5-2021) //Snowball

WASHINGTON, D.C. – 5G is expected to provide the connective tissue for many emerging technologies critical to productivity, innovation, and national competitiveness. Some commentators have panicked over the so-called “race” for 5G, pointing in fear at China’s hundreds of thousands of new base stations, and projections of hundreds of millions of 5G subscribers this year alone.

But if we are going to base policy decisions on this race (and it is questionable that we should), understanding how infrastructure and subscription numbers are actually counted matters. A closer look reveals that China’s wireless infrastructure and subscriber numbers are not as impressive as they may first appear: By counting anyone on a 5G plan—even if they only have a 4G device connecting to 4G infrastructure—as a 5G subscriber, and measuring individual base stations instead of cell sites, China’s 5G stats can paint a misleading picture. This misleading picture leads to the interpretation that the sky is falling.

THE SKY IS FALLING: CLAIMS THAT CHINA IS BEATING THE UNITED STATES AT 5G

One can barely scan a technology news site without reading that the United States is losing to China in 5G, and that this will mean economic catastrophe. Headlines such as “China’s Dominance Of 5G Networks Puts U.S. Economic Future At Stake” and “China’s growing 5G dominance is a disaster for US security” keep policymakers on edge when considering how the United States should move forward with the next generation of wireless.1 The fear is that the first country to build 5G networks will have a head start in developing the emerging technologies that depend on 5G’s low-latency, high-throughput wireless connectivity. As Attorney General William Barr put it, “China’s success in 5G infrastructure is also translating into advantages in a range of new technologies associated with 5G.”2 He claimed, “Within the next five years, 5G global territory and application dominance will be determined,” and “the stakes for the United States could not be higher.”3

#### Dowd’s a Christian hack.

1AC Dowd 15 [KU=yellow] – Alan Dowd, Senior Fellow at the Sagamore Institute for Policy Research, Contributing Editor for the American Legion Magazine, “Shield & Sword: The Case for Military Deterrence”, Providence Magazine, Fall, https://providencemag.com/2015/12/shield-sword-the-case-for-military-deterrence/

It’s a paradoxical truth that military readiness can keep the peace. The Romans had a phrase for it: Si vis pacem, para bellum. “If you wish for peace, prepare for war.” President George Washington put it more genteelly: “There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet an enemy.” Or, in the same way, “We infinitely desire peace,” President Theodore Roosevelt declared. “And the surest way of obtaining it is to show that we are not afraid of war.” After the West gambled civilization’s very existence in the 1920s and 1930s on hopes that war could somehow be outlawed, the men who crafted the blueprint for waging the Cold War returned to peace through strength. Winston Churchill proposed “defense through deterrents.” President Harry Truman called NATO “an integrated international force whose object is to maintain peace through strength…we devoutly pray that our present course of action will succeed and maintain peace without war.”[iii] President Dwight Eisenhower explained, “Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk its own destruction.” President John Kennedy vowed to “strengthen our military power to the point where no aggressor will dare attack.” And President Ronald Reagan steered the Cold War to a peaceful end by noting, “None of the four wars in my lifetime came about because we were too strong.” Reagan also argued, “Our military strength is a prerequisite for peace.”[iv]

Even so, arms alone aren’t enough to deter war. After all, the great powers were armed to the teeth in 1914. But since they weren’t clear about their intentions and treaty commitments, a small crisis on the fringes of Europe mushroomed into a global war. Neither is clarity alone enough to deter war. After all, President Woodrow Wilson’s admonitions to the Kaiser were clear, but America lacked the military strength at the onset of war to make those words matter and thus deter German aggression. In other words, America was unable to deter. “The purpose of a deterrence force is to create a set of conditions that would cause an adversary to conclude that the cost of any particular act against the United States of America or her allies is far higher than the potential benefit of that act,” explains Gen. Kevin Chilton, former commander of U.S. Strategic Command. It is a “cost-benefit calculus.”[v] So, given the anemic state of America’s military before 1917, the Kaiser calculated that the benefits of attacking U.S. ships and trying to lure Mexico into an alliance outweighed the costs. That proved to be a grave miscalculation.

In order for the adversary not to miscalculate, a few factors must hold.

First, consequences must be clear, which was not the case on the eve of World War I. Critics of deterrence often cite World War I to argue that arms races trigger wars. But if it were that simple, then a) there wouldn’t have been a World War II, since the Allies allowed their arsenals to atrophy after 1918, and b) there would have been a World War III, since Washington and Moscow engaged in an unprecedented arms race. The reality is that miscalculation lit the fuse of World War I. The antidote, as alluded to above, is strength plus clarity.

A second important factor to avoid miscalculation: The adversary must be rational, which means it can grasp and fear consequences. Fear is an essential ingredient of deterrence. It pays to recall that deterrence comes from the Latin dēterreō: “to frighten off.”[vi] Of course, as Churchill conceded, “The deterrent does not cover the case of lunatics.”[vii] Mass-murderers masquerading as holy men and death-wish dictators may be immune from deterrence. (The secondary benefit of the peace-through-strength model is that it equips those who embrace it with the capacity to defeat these sorts of enemies rapidly and return to the status quo ante.)

Third, the consequences of military confrontation must be credible and tangible, which was the case during most of the Cold War. Not only did Washington and Moscow construct vast military arsenals to deter one another; they were clear about their treaty commitments and about the consequences of any threat to those commitments. Recall how Eisenhower answered Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev’s boast about the Red Army’s overwhelming conventional advantage in Germany: “If you attack us in Germany,” the steely American commander-in-chief fired back, “there will be nothing conventional about our response.”[viii] Eisenhower’s words were unambiguously clear, and unlike Wilson, he wielded the military strength to give them credibility.

Discussing military deterrence in the context of Christianity may seem incongruent to some readers. But for a pair of reasons it is not.

First, deterrence is not just a matter of GDPs and geopolitics. In fact, scripture often uses the language of deterrence and preparedness. For example, in the first chapter of Numbers the Lord directs Moses and Aaron to count “all the men in Israel who are twenty years old or more and able to serve in the army.” This ancient selective-service system is a form of military readiness. Similarly, I Chronicles 27 provides detail about the Israelites’ massive standing army: twelve divisions of 24,000 men each. II Chronicles 17 explains the military preparations made by King Jehoshaphat of Judah, a king highly revered for his piety, who built forts, maintained armories in strategically located cities “with large supplies” and fielded an army of more than a million men “armed for battle.” Not surprisingly, “the fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands surrounding Judah, so that they did not go to war against Jehoshaphat.” In the New Testament, Paul writes in Romans 13 that “Rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong…Rulers do not bear the sword for no reason.” Again, this is the language of deterrence. Those who follow the law within a country and who respect codes of conduct between countries have nothing to fear. Those who don’t have much to fear. Likewise, to explain the importance of calculating the costs of following Him, Jesus asks in Luke 14, “What king would go to war against another king without first sitting down to consider whether his 10,000 soldiers could go up against the 20,000 coming against him? And if he didn’t think he could win, he would send a representative to discuss terms of peace while his enemy was still a long way off.” In a sense, both kings are wise—one because he recognizes that he’s outnumbered; the other because he makes sure that he’s not. Put another way, both kings subscribe to peace through strength. Again, as with the Centurion earlier, Jesus could have rebuked the martial character of these kings, but he did not. This is not just description but commendation. We ignore their example at our peril.

Secondly, it is not incongruent if we understand military deterrence as a means to prevent great-power war—the kind that kills by the millions, the kind humanity has not endured for seven decades. We know we will not experience the biblical notion of peace—of shalom, peace with harmony and justice—until Christ returns to make all things new. In the interim, in a broken world, the alternatives to peace through strength leave much to be desired: peace through hope, peace through violence, or peace through submission. But these options are inadequate.

The sheer destructiveness and totality of great-power war testify that crossing our fingers and hoping for peace is not a Christian option. Wishful thinking, romanticizing reality, is the surest way to invite what Churchill called “temptations to a trial of strength.”

Moreover, the likelihood that the next great-power war would involve multiple nuclear-weapons states means that it could end civilization. Therefore, a posture that leaves peer adversaries doubting the West’s capabilities and resolve—thus inviting miscalculation—is not only unsound, but immoral and inhumane—unchristian. “Deterrence of war is more humanitarian than anything,” Gen. Park Yong Ok, a longtime South Korean military official, argues. “If we fail to deter war, a tremendous number of civilians will be killed.”[ix]

Peace through violence has been tried throughout history. Pharaoh, Caesar and Genghis Khan, Lenin, Hitler, Stalin and Mao, all attained a kind of peace by employing brutal forms of violence. However, this is not the kind of “peace” under which God’s crowning creation can flourish; neither would the world long tolerate such a scorched-earth “peace.” This option, too, the Christian rejects.

Finally, the civilized world could bring about peace simply by not resisting the enemies of civilization—by not blunting the Islamic State’s blitzkrieg of Iraq; by not defending the 38th Parallel; by not standing up to Beijing’s land-grab in the South China Sea or Moscow’s bullying of the Baltics or al-Qaeda’s death creed; by not having armies or, for that matter, police. As Reagan said, “There’s only one guaranteed way you can have peace—and you can have it in the next second—surrender.”[x]

The world has tried these alternatives to peace through strength, and the outcomes have been disastrous.

After World War I, Western powers disarmed and convinced themselves they had waged the war to end all wars. By 1938, as Churchill concluded after Munich, the Allies had been “reduced…from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it.”[xi] Like predators in the wilderness, the Axis powers sensed weakness and attacked.

In October 1945—not three months after the Missouri steamed into Tokyo Bay—Gen. George Marshall decried the “disintegration not only of the Armed Forces, but apparently…all conception of world responsibility,” warily asking, “Are we already, at this early date, inviting that same international disrespect that prevailed before this war?”[xii] Stalin answered Marshall’s question by gobbling up half of Europe, blockading Berlin, and arming Kim Il-Sung in patient preparation for the invasion of South Korea.[xiii] The U.S. military had taken up positions in Korea in 1945, but withdrew all combat forces in 1949.[xiv] Then, in 1950, Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced that Japan, Alaska and the Philippines fell within America’s “defensive perimeter.”[xv] Korea didn’t. Stalin noticed. Without a U.S. deterrent in place, Stalin gave Kim a green light to invade. Washington then reversed course and rushed American forces back into Korea, and the Korean peninsula plunged into one of the most ferocious wars in history. The cost of miscalculation in Washington and Moscow: 38,000 Americans, 103,250 South Korean troops, 316,000 North Korean troops, 422,000 Chinese troops and 2 million civilian casualties.[xvi] The North Korean tyranny— now under command of Kim’s grandson—still dreams of conquering South Korea. The difference between 2015 and 1950 is that tens of thousands of battle-ready U.S. and ROK troops are stationed on the border. They’ve been there every day since 1953.

The lesson of history is that waging war is far more costly than maintaining a military capable of deterring war. As Washington observed, “Timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it.” Just compare military allocations, as a percentage of GDP, during times of war and times of peace:

In the eight years before entering World War I, the United States devoted an average of 0.7 percent of GDP to defense; during the war, U.S. defense spending spiked to 16.1 percent of GDP. In the decade before entering World War II, the United States spent an average of 1.1 percent of GDP on defense; during the war, the U.S. diverted an average of 27 percent of GDP to the military annually.

During the Cold War, Washington spent an average of 7 percent of GDP on defense to deter Moscow; it worked.

Yet it seems we have forgotten those hard-learned lessons. In his book The World America Made, Robert Kagan explains how “America’s most important role has been to dampen and deter the normal tendencies of other great powers to compete and jostle with one another in ways that historically have led to war.” This role has depended on America’s military might. “There is no better recipe for great-power peace,” Kagan concludes, “than certainty about who holds the upper hand.”[xvii]

## Advantage 3

### 1NC---AT Oversight

#### Unrestricted executive is inevitable---yesterday the U.S. drone struck civilians in Afghanistan---no way the plan would have stopped that through oVeRSiGhT.

#### No risk they cause Congress to assert leadership---tons of incentives for Congressional passivity

Moore 15 - Professor of Law, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School.

David H., Taking Cues from Congress: Judicial Review, Congressional Authorization, and the Expansion of Presidential Power, Notre Dame L. Rev. 1019 (2015). Available at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr/vol90/iss3/2>

Several of the reasons for Congress’s failure to defend against presidential encroachment can also explain Congress’s affirmative authorization of the expansion of presidential power.79 Members of Congress care about reelection, which they face every two to six years.80 Reelection concerns may lead them to focus on immediate gains that improve their political standing rather than the long-term institutional interests of Congress.81 Foreign policy questions generally do not promise immediate political gains. As Professors Epstein and O’Halloran assert, it is hard to channel benefits to constituents in the foreign policy arena, while “the risks of [making] illinformed policy [are] great.”82 Perhaps for the same reasons, voters tend not to focus on foreign policy in electing members of Congress. “[F]oreign policy is persistently a major factor in presidential elections,” but “not as large a factor in congressional elections.”83 As one member of Congress said, “I have no constituency in foreign policy.”84 In this environment, congressional delegation of authority to a copartisan President can secure desirable foreign policy outcomes and allow members of Congress to benefit both from their copartisan President’s successes and from the opportunity to concentrate on matters of greater concern to their voting constituents.85 Moreover, the resulting harm to Congress’s interests is divided among members of Congress and felt fully only in the future, rendering institutional harm a less weighty concern.86 Congressional focus on reelection by constituents who, like members of Congress, may care more about immediate policy than long-term congressional victories may explain the massive expansion in the use of congressional-executive agreements. The United States enters international agreements of four types: Article II treaties (which require supermajority Senate approval); executive agreements pursuant to these Article II treaties; congressional-executive agreements (which involve congressional approval by simple majority in each house); and sole executive agreements (which are made by the President independent of Congress).87 The congressional–executive agreement is by far the most common. Between 1980 and 2000, for example, the United States entered approximately 375 Article II treaties and roughly 3,000 congressional-executive agreements.88 The vast majority of congressional-executive agreements were negotiated and concluded by the President based on an ex ante authorization from Congress.89 Professor Hathaway asserts that the growth in ex ante delegations of authority for the President to enter executive agreements resulted in part from incremental delegations to Presidents of the same party that freed members to focus on more pressing constituent interests.90 Of course, such delegations harmed Congress institutionally, but the harm from any particular delegation was spread among members and the aggregate felt fully only by future Congresses.91 B. Functionalist Theory Functionalist reasoning may also induce Congress to empower the President to take actions in foreign affairs. The demands of foreign relations are great. As indicated, between 1980 and 2000, the United States entered thousands of international agreements,92 and entering agreements is only a portion of what is required by foreign affairs. It would be demanding for Congress to participate enthusiastically in all these activities. Moreover, foreign affairs are generally perceived as complex and unpredictable.93 The President is arguably better suited to handle these extensive and shifting demands.94 As has been recognized since the Founding, the President, in comparison to Congress, is better able to act quickly, uniformly, with secrecy, and based on information gathered from far-flung diplomatic and military agents.95 The functional advantages of executive leadership in foreign affairs, especially in times of crisis,96 have led members of Congress97 to delegate foreign affairs authority to the President.98 These delegations have often included significant discretion in light of the unpredictability of foreign relations.99 Indeed, as Professors Epstein and O’Halloran found, foreign policy statutes rank among the statutes authorizing the highest levels of executive discretion.100 Epstein and O’Halloran likewise found support for the functionalist explanation for these authorizations. The two hypothesized “that the more informationally intense a [congressional] committee’s issue area, the more discretionary authority is delegated to the executive in bills emerging from that committee.”101 Measuring the complexity of issues handled by a committee by reference to “the average number of hearings” the committee holds as well as “the average number of oversight hearings,” “the average percent of oversight hearings,” and “the scope of [the] committee’s issue domain,”102 Epstein and O’Halloran found that issue complexity correlates with the level of delegation to the executive.103 At the same time, committees conduct oversight of delegated authority.104 As a result, members of Congress do not appear merely to be avoiding complex issues (as continuing oversight requires the development of some expertise) or responsibility for adverse consequences in policy areas under their jurisdiction (which might motivate delegation without oversight).105 Legislators are arguably taking advantage of the executive’s relative competence to deal with complex issues of the sort common in foreign affairs, which may make sense from a functionalist, but not checks and balances, perspective.106 C. Collective Action Theory Collective action problems may also motivate congressional authorizations of presidential power. As previously noted, Congress faces a collective action problem in defending its institutional prerogatives from presidential encroachment.107 Individual members receive only a fraction of the benefit from defensive efforts, with much of the benefit accruing in the future, and therefore lack incentive to protect the institution.108 Collective action problems likewise lead to affirmative transfers of authority to the President. For example, in situations in which each member of Congress has an incentive to secure a particular benefit for her state or district, Congress might engage in political logrolling to the detriment of the United States as a whole.109 To avoid this result, Congress might delegate to the President discretion to distribute benefits.110 The President, whose constituency is national, will then make decisions that leave the nation and perhaps members of Congress, but not Congress’s institutional power share, better off than under the logrolling scenario.111 Trade policy illustrates.112 Assuming that the nation as a whole benefits from liberal trade, individual members of Congress may be motivated to secure the benefits of liberal trade generally but to protect industries located in their states or districts by way of exception.113 Pursuit of these motivations might result in logrolling that yields a protectionist policy detrimental to the whole.114 Authorizing the President to draw the boundaries of protection subverts these fragmented motivations and produces a policy that is more beneficial nationally.115 Upon delegation, members of Congress and/or their constituents might still lobby the President for protection while enjoying the benefits of free trade in products produced in other states or districts.116 And members of Congress, through the delegation, may both escape interest group pressure and avoid blame for distributional decisions adverse to constituents.117 The collective action theory may explain the difference in the nature of the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (RTAA).118 The Smoot-Hawley Act was a product of congressional logrolling; it “revised tariffs on 3,221 items” and produced “the highest tariff rates of the twentieth century.”119 By contrast, the RTAA secured more liberal trade by authorizing “the president to unilaterally cut tariff levels by up to 50 percent in bilateral negotiations with other countries.”120 Of course, presidential decisionmaking will not necessarily be superior; Congress might yet produce the better policy outcome.121 Furthermore, the Constitution may assign the particular question to Congress. The Constitution, for example, explicitly grants Congress the power “[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.”122 The Supreme Court has described this power as “plenary,” “complete,” “exclusive and absolute,”123 and has recognized congressional supremacy over the executive in foreign commerce.124 Congressional authorization of presidential action in foreign commerce alters this hierarchy as a practical matter, elevating the President arguably because the interests of members of Congress do not align with those of their institution as contemplated by checks and balances. D. Societal Conflict Theory Not only might Congress, on the theories developed above, shift power to the President by statute, but Congress may attempt to alter constitutional understanding to the President’s advantage. The notion that Congress would not intentionally shift constitutional power relies on the assumption that partisan actors ultimately lack the incentive or ability to undermine checks and balances to their benefit.125 This assumption has traction when it comes to the distribution of constitutional powers generally. It is widely believed that politicians cannot predict how shifts in the distribution of constitutional power will affect long-term political outcomes and that they therefore refrain from trying to adjust the distribution.126 Whatever the merits of this belief generally, Jide Nzelibe has recently argued that the distribution of foreign affairs powers can be, and is, manipulated by politicians representing societal interest groups.127 The Constitution’s foreign affairs powers are more susceptible to partisan manipulation than other constitutional powers for two reasons.128 First, judicial doctrine governing foreign affairs powers is relatively sparse and indeterminate, leaving room for interpretation.129 Relatedly, courts are sometimes reluctant to adjudicate foreign affairs disputes, reducing the threat that the judiciary will upend any particular partisan interpretation.130 Second, foreign affairs powers and processes tend to be more discrete and therefore can be manipulated to achieve specific policy ends.131 When the same constitutional power or process is used to address a wide range of policy issues, it is difficult to manipulate the power or process to partisan advantage.132 For example, the legislative process is used to address such diverse issues as gun control, welfare benefits, drug trafficking, and immigration.133 It is unclear how the process could be altered in a way that would increase the probability of liberal or conservative outcomes across these issue areas.134 In the foreign affairs context, these hurdles are reduced. The power and process of making war, for example, are distinct in many ways from the power and process of making treaties.135 And manipulation of these powers and processes can secure more consistently liberal or conservative outcomes.136 Increased executive power over war making, for example, is likely to produce more hawkish, or (nowadays)137 conservative, military outcomes.138 A presumption in favor of treaty self-execution—rendering more treaties immediately enforceable in U.S. courts—would promote U.S. compliance with international law, including left-leaning international human rights.139 The result is that societal conflicts over foreign policy may incentivize the political branches to adopt particular visions of the distribution of constitutional foreign affairs powers. Or, to state it another way, partisan politics incentivize the alteration of constitutional checks and balances in the area of foreign affairs. As a result, judicial reliance on congressional authorization, or Congress’s constitutional perspective, to find presidential power raises serious checks and balances concerns.

# 2NC

## K

### 2NC—Framework

#### The China threat is constructed by an echo chamber of think tank operatives and US allies – it’s a self-fulfilling prophecy that increases militarization and trades off with response to climate change.

Stimpson and Zhang 20, \*Cassandra Stimpson is a research project director with the Foreign Influence Transparency Initiative at the Center for International Policy. \*\*Holly Zhang is a researcher with the Foreign Influence Transparency Initiative at the Center for International Policy. (Cassandra and Holly, 11-20-2020, "Want to Know Who Influences US Foreign Policy? Follow the Money.", The Nation, https://www.thenation.com/article/world/biden-contractors-foreign-policy/)

War: What is it good for? Apparently, in Washington’s world of think tanks, the answer is: the bottom line.

In fact, as the Biden presidency approaches, an era of great-power competition between the United States and China is already taken for granted inside the Washington Beltway. Much less well known are the financial incentives that lurk behind so many of the voices clamoring for an ever-more-militarized response to China in the Pacific. We’re talking about groups that carefully avoid the problems such an approach will provoke when it comes to the real security of the United States or the planet. A new cold war is likely to be dangerous and costly in an America gripped by a pandemic, its infrastructure weakened, and so many of its citizens in dire economic straits. Still, for foreign lobbyists, Pentagon contractors, and Washington’s many influential think tanks, a “rising China” means only one thing: rising profits.

Defense contractors and foreign governments are spending millions of dollars annually funding establishment think tanks (sometimes in secret) in ways that will help set the foreign-policy agenda in the Biden years. In doing so, they gain a distinctly unfair advantage when it comes to influencing that policy, especially which future tools of war this country should invest in and how it should use them.

Not surprisingly, many of the top think tank recipients of foreign funding are also top recipients of funding from this country’s major weapons makers. The result: an ecosystem in which those giant outfits and some of the countries that will use their weaponry now play major roles in bankrolling the creation of the very rationales for those future sales. It’s a remarkably closed system that works like a dream if you happen to be a giant weapons firm or a major think tank. Right now, that system is helping accelerate the further militarization of the whole Indo-Pacific region.

In the Pacific, Japan finds itself facing an increasingly tough set of choices when it comes to its most significant military alliance (with the United States) and its most important economic partnership (with China). A growing US presence in the region aimed at counterbalancing China will allow Japan to remain officially neutral, even as it reaps the benefits of both partnerships.

To walk that tightrope (along with the defense contractors that will benefit financially from the further militarization of the region), Japan spends heavily to influence thinking in Washington. Recent reports from the Center for International Policy’s Foreign Influence Initiative (FITI), where the authors of this piece work, reveal just how countries like Japan and giant arms firms like Lockheed Martin and Boeing functionally purchase an inside track on a think tank market that’s hard at work creating future foreign-policy options for this country’s elite.

HOW TO MAKE A THINK TANK THINK

Take the prominent think tank the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), which houses programs focused on the “China threat” and East Asian “security.” Its Asia Maritime Transparency Initiative, which gets funding from the governments of Japan and the Philippines, welcomes contributions “from all governments in Asia, as well as corporate and foundation support.”

Unsurprisingly, the program also paints a picture of Japan as central “to preserving the liberal international order” in the face of the dangers of an “increasingly assertive China.” It highlights that country’s role as Washington’s maritime security partner in the region. There’s no question that Japan is indeed an important ally of Washington. Still, positioning its government as a linchpin in the international peace (or war) process seems a dubious proposition at best.

CSIS is anything but alone when it comes to the moneyed interests pushing Washington to invest ever more in what now passes for “security” in the Pacific region. A FITI report on Japanese operations in the United States, for instance, reveals at least 3,209 lobbying activities in 2019 alone, as various lobbyists hired by that country and registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act targeted both Congress and think tanks like CSIS on behalf of the Japanese government. Such firms, in fact, raked in more than $30 million from that government last year alone. From 2014 to 2019, Japan was also the largest East Asian donor to the top 50 most influential US think tanks. The results of such investments have been obvious when it comes to both the products of those think tanks and congressional policies.

Think-tank recipients of Japanese funding are numerous and, because that country is such a staunch ally of Washington, its government can be more open about its activities than is typical. Projects like the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace’s “China Risk and China Opportunity for the U.S.-Japan Alliance,” funded by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, are now the norm inside the Beltway. You won’t be surprised to learn that the think tank scholars working on such projects almost inevitably end up highlighting Japan’s integral role in countering “the China threat” in the influential studies they produce. That threat itself, of course, is rarely questioned. Instead, its dangers and the need to confront them are invariably reinforced.

Another Carnegie Endowment study, “Bolstering the Alliance Amid China’s Military Resurgence,” is typical in that regard. It’s filled with warnings about China’s growing military power—never mind that, in 2019, the United States spent nearly triple what China did on its military, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. Like so many similarly funded projects inside the Beltway, this one recommended further growth in military cooperation between the United States and Japan. Important as well, it claimed, was developing “the capability to wage combined multidomain joint operations” which “would require accelerating operational response times to enhance firepower.”

The Carnegie project lists its funding and, as it turns out, that foundation has taken in at least $825,000 from Japan and approximately the same amount from defense contractors and US government sources over the past six years. And Carnegie’s recommendations recently came to fruition when the Trump administration announced the second-largest sale of US weaponry to Japan, worth more than $23 billion worth.

If the Japanese government has a stake in funding such think tanks to get what it wants, so does the defense industry. The top 50 think tanks have received more than $1 billion from the US government and defense contractors over those same six years. Such contractors alone lobby Congress to the tune of more than $20 million each election cycle. Combine such sums with Japanese funding (not to speak of the money spent by other governments that desire policy influence in Washington) and you have a confluence of interests that propels US military expenditures and the sale of weapons globally on a mind-boggling scale.

A DEFENSE BUILD-UP IS THE ORDER OF THE DAY

An April 2020 report on the “Future of US-Japan Defense Collaboration” by the Atlantic Council’s Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security offers a typical example of how such pro-militarization interests are promoted. That report, produced in partnership with the Japanese embassy, begins with the premise that “the United States and Japan must accelerate and intensify their long-standing military and defense-focused coordination and collaboration.”

Specifically, it urges the United States to “take measures to incentivize Japan to work with Lockheed Martin on the F-2 replacement program,” known as the F-3. (The F-2 Support Fighter is the jet Lockheed developed and produced in partnership with Mitsubishi Heavy Industries for the Japanese Defense Forces.) While the report does acknowledge its partnership with the embassy of Japan, it fails to acknowledge that Lockheed donated three quarters of a million dollars to the influential Atlantic Council between 2014 and 2019 and that Japan generally prefers to produce its own military equipment domestically.

The Atlantic Council report continues to recommend the F-3 as the proper replacement for the F-2, “despite political challenges, technology-transfer concerns,” and “frustration from all parties” involved. This recommendation comes at a time when Japan has increasingly sought to develop its own defense industry. Generally speaking, no matter the Japanese embassy’s support for the Atlantic Council, that country’s military is eager to develop a new stealth fighter of its own without the help of either Lockheed Martin or Boeing. While both companies wish to stay involved in the behemoth project, the Atlantic Council specifically advocates only for Lockheed, which just happens to have contributed more than three times what Boeing did to that think tank’s coffers.

A 2019 report by the Hudson Institute on the Japan-US alliance echoed similar sentiments, outlining a security context in which Japan and the United States should focus continually on deterring “aggression by China.” To do so, the report suggested, American-made ground-launched missiles (GCLMs) were one of several potential weapons Japan would need in order to prepare a robust “defense” strategy against China. Notably, the first American GCLM test since the United States withdrew from the Cold War era Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty in 2019 used a Lockheed Martin Mark 41 Launch System and Raytheon’s Tomahawk Land Attack Cruise Missile. The Hudson Institute had not only received at least $270,000 from Japan between 2014 and 2018, but also a minimum of $100,000 from Lockheed Martin.

In 2020, CSIS organized an unofficial working group for industry professionals and government officials that it called the CSIS Alliance Interoperability Series to discuss the development of the future F-3 fighter jet. While Japanese and American defense contractors fight for the revenue that will come from its production, the think tank claims that American, Japanese, and Australian industry representatives and officials will “consider the political-military and technical issues that the F-3 debate raises.” Such working groups are far from rare and offer think tanks incredible access to key decision-makers who often happen to be their benefactors as well.

All told, between 2014 and 2019, CSIS received at least $5 million from the US government and Pentagon contractors, including at least $400,000 from Lockheed Martin and more than $200,000 from Boeing. In this fashion, a privileged think-tank elite has cajoled its way into the inner circles of policy formation (and it matters little whether we’re talking about the Trump administration or the future Biden one). Think about it for a moment: Possibly the most crucial relationship on the planet between what looks like a rising and a falling great power (in a world that desperately needs their cooperation) is being significantly influenced by experts and officials invested in the industry guaranteed to militarize that very relationship and create a 21st century version of the Cold War.

Any administration, in other words, lives in something like an echo chamber that continually affirms the need for a yet greater defense build-up led by those who would gain most from it.

PROFITING FROM GREAT POWER COMPETITION

Japan is singled out in this analysis because the Center for International Policy’s Foreign Influence Transparency Initiative, where we work, had striking access to its influence data. There are, however, many other nations with defense agendas in the Indo-Pacific region who act similarly. As a Norwegian think tank document put it, “Funding powerful think tanks is one way to gain such access, and some think tanks in Washington are openly conveying that they can service only those foreign governments that provide funding.” A Japanese official publicly noted that such funding of US think tanks “is an investment.” You can’t put it much more bluntly or accurately than that.

Foreign governments and the defense industry debate the nitty-gritty of how best to arm a region whose continued militarization is accepted as a given. The need to stand up to the Chinese “aggressor” is a foregone conclusion of most thought leaders in Washington. They ought, of course, to be weighing and debating the entire security picture, including the potential future devastation of climate change, rather than simply piling yet more weaponry atop the outdated tools of war.

To be sure, think tanks don’t make US foreign policy, nor do foreign lobbyists and defense contractors. But their money, distributed in copious amounts, does buy them crucial seats at that policymaking table, while dissenters are generally left out in the cold.

What’s the solution? For starters, a little transparency in Washington foreign-policy-making circles would be useful so that the public can be made more aware of the conflicts of interest that rule the roost when it comes to China policy. All think tanks should be required to publicly disclose their donors and funders. At least the Atlantic Council and CSIS report their funders by levels of donations and note certain sponsors of events or reports (a basic level of transparency that makes a piece like this possible). Such a standard of transparency should minimally be practiced by all think tanks, including prominent organizations like the American Enterprise Institute and the Earth Institute, neither of which releases any information about its funders, to highlight potential conflicts of interests.

Without transparency, the defense contractors and foreign governments that donate to think tanks help create foreign-policy thinking in which this world is, above all, in constant need of more weapons systems. This only increases military tensions globally, while helping to perpetuate the interests and profits of a defense industry that is, in truth, antithetical to the interests of most Americans, so many of whom would prefer diplomatic, peaceful, and coordinated solutions to the challenges of a rising China.

Unfortunately, as foreign policy is now made, a rising China is also guaranteed to lift all boats (submarines, aircraft carriers, and surface ships) as well as fighter planes aiding the military-industrial complex on a planet increasingly at war with itself.

### 2NC—AT: Cap Inev

#### “No alternative” is an elite fallacy---grassroots activists are laying the seeds for the end of capitalism, but global commitment is key.

Grubačić et al. '20 [Andrej; 9/24/20; Professor and Department Chair of Social and Cultural Anthropology at California Institute of Integral Studies; Brett Wilkins, Bridget Meehan, Cynthia Peters, Don Rojas, Elena Herrada, Mark Evans, Medea Benjamin, Michael Albert, Noam Chomsky, Oscar Chacon, Paul Ortiz, Peter Bohmer, Savvina Chowdhury and Vincent Emanuel; "Greenwashing Capitalism Won’t Heal the Planet," https://truthout.org/articles/greenwashing-capitalism-wont-heal-the-planet/]

Our Future Must Be One Without Economic Growth

So focused on serving the needs of the wealthy elites, most governments, political leaders and policy-makers are stuck in the certainty that “there is no alternative” and their plans lie at the core of that belief. The proposals support “business as usual” with a coat of greenwash and a nip and tuck here and there. They fail to recognize that economic growth is in direct conflict with decarbonization, slowing down global warming or redistributing wealth, and that we must eliminate or vastly reduce certain activities altogether.

It is time to expose the extreme fallacy behind mainstream policy positions regarding the climate crisis. Decarbonization that will slow global warming is going to require more than a few tweaks to the system and nods to green investment. It will demand that we jettison our current economic paradigm altogether and replace it with a more socialist, participatory and democratic paradigm that puts social and environmental needs at its center and massively redistributes wealth. We are only kidding ourselves if we think it can happen any other way.

Many millions of us have already come to this realization. Recent polls conducted in Britain, for example, showed that just 6 percent wanted to go back to the economy as it was before the COVID-19 pandemic and 82 percent wanted to prioritize health and well-being over economic growth. Grassroots activists and movements are busy creating and implementing the alternatives to the status quo. “Ordinary” people are light-years ahead of the governments and political leaders in taking these courageous steps.

Despite the heroic efforts of everyday people working at localized levels, there are three hard truths we must face. The first is that our governments and political leaders are a major barrier. They may be pathetic but they hold the levers of power, albeit on behalf of the elites. The second hard truth is that efforts at localized levels are insufficient. Solving the climate crisis will necessitate the end of capitalism and that necessitates action on a global scale through global coordination, planning and regulation. Both of these truths, therefore, make it critical for our governments and leaders to catch up and start working for and with us.

### 2NC—AT: Getting Better

#### Data denies environmental progress.

Hickel 20, Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Visiting Senior Fellow at the International Inequalities Institute at the London School of Economics, and Senior Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London. He serves on the Statistical Advisory Panel for the UN Human Development Report 2020, the advisory board of the Green New Deal for Europe, and on the Harvard-Lancet Commission on Reparations and Redistributive Justice. (Dr. Jason Hickel, 10-27-2020, "Degrowth: A response to Branko Milanovic", *Jason Hickel*, <https://www.jasonhickel.org/blog/2017/11/19/why-branko-milanovic-is-wrong-about-de-growth>) \*Note: the url has a different date/title than the article---that’s not a cite mistake, just a website quirk

6. Green growth is not a thing

Milanovic believes that technology will come to our rescue, and make growth “green”. Unfortunately there is a strong consensus against this assumption. We have reviewed the relevant empirical evidence here (“Is green growth possible?”), examining both CO2 emissions and resource use.

Briefly, about CO2, the question is not whether GDP can be decoupled from emissions (we know that it can be), the question is whether this can be done fast enough to stay within safe carbon budgets while growing GDP at the same time. And the answer to this is no. More growth entails more energy use, and more energy use makes it all the more difficult to cover that demand with renewables. The only scenarios that succeed in reducing emissions fast enough to keep us under 1.5 or 2C involve a reduction in resource and energy use (in other words, degrowth). I discuss this in more depth here. This 2020 review examines 835 empirical studies and finds that decoupling alone is not adequate to achieve climate goals; it requires what the authors themselves refer to as “degrowth” scenarios. This paper in Nature Sustainability comes to similar conclusions.

As for resources: resource use continues to rise along with GDP (despite significant efficiency improvements, and a significant shift to services and knowledge as share of GDP), and indeed all existing models indicate that absolute decoupling is unlikely to happen, even under strong policy conditions. See here and here for more.

Ward et al (2016) find that even the most optimistic projections of efficiency improvements yield no absolute decoupling in the medium and long term. The authors state: “this result is a robust rebuttal to the claim of absolute decoupling”; “decoupling of GDP growth from resource use, whether relative or absolute, is at best only temporary. Permanent decoupling (absolute or relative) is impossible… because the efficiency gains are ultimately governed by physical limits.” Schandl et al (2016) find the same thing. Even in their best-case scenario projection, global material consumption still grows steadily. The authors conclude: “Our research shows that while some relative decoupling can be achieved in some scenarios, none would lead to an absolute reduction in energy or materials footprint.”

Our review was published in 2019, and the literature on this has grown since: i.e., here and here… the latter paper reviews 179 studies on decoupling published since 1990 and finds “no evidence of economy-wide, national or international absolute resource decoupling, and no evidence of the kind of decoupling needed for ecological sustainability.” Here is a 2020 meta-analysis of all available data on GDP and resource use, which comes to the same conclusion.

# 1NR

## Solvency

### Private Sector

#### Xi will take over private businesses

McGregor 19 Richard McGregor reporter for The Guardian, How the state runs business in China, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/25/china-business-xi-jinping-communist-party-state-private-enterprise-huawei>

When Xi Jinping took power in 2012, he extolled the importance of the state economy at every turn, while all around him watched as China’s high-speed economy was driven by private entrepreneurs. Since then, Xi has engineered an unmistakable shift in policy. At the time he took office, private firms were responsible for about 50% of all investment in China and about 75% of economic output. But as Nicholas Lardy, a US economist who has long studied the Chinese economy, concluded in a recent study, “Since 2012, private, market-driven growth has given way to a resurgence of the role of the state.”

## T

### 1NR---O/V

#### A-- Legally --

#### Other parts of the US code concur

US Code 96 (United States Code, 2 U.S. Code § 658 – Definitions, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/2/658#9> , Section effective Jan. 1, 1996, date accessed 9/10/21)

(9) Private sector

The term ``private sector'' means all persons or entities in the United States, including individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, and educational and nonprofit institutions, but shall not include State, local, or tribal governments.

#### AND, policy analysts

Adler 99 – Senior Director of Environmental Policy, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C. (Jonathan, “WETLANDS, WATERFOWL, AND THE MENACE OF MR. WILSON: COMMERCECLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE AND THE LIMITS OF FEDERAL WETLAND REGULATION,” 29 Envtl. L. 1)

In discussions of environmental policy, it is traditional to equate environmental protection with environmental regulation. This connection is unfounded, however. Direct government regulation is only one means of addressing environmental problems. Other approaches include the use of fiscal instruments (for example, subsidies and taxes), direct government provision or purchase of public goods, and the creation or recognition of property rights in environmental resources. 404Link to the text of the note Fiscal instruments are typically used to modify behavior in the marketplace by changing the incentives faced by individuals and corporations. For example, providing a financial incentive to maintain habitat for endangered species will induce more landowners to protect species habitat than if the government had not provided an added incentive. Similarly, taxing certain activities, such as the emission or particular substances, will reduce those activities on the margin. 405Link to the text of the note In circumstances in which federal policymakers believe that the private sector will underprovide a public good, the federal government can provide the good directly. 406Link to the text of the note Federal agencies can, and do, purchase ecologically sensitive lands from private landowners and groups to ensure [55] their protection. 407Link to the text of the note In those cases where landowners are unwilling to sell, the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution allows the federal government to take land for public use so long as compensation is provided. 408Link to the text of the note Thus, the federal government can use the spending power to advance environmental goals where its regulatory powers are limited. Governments need not take direct action to facilitate conservation efforts. The creation of property interests empowers owners to act as stewards of environmental resources and facilitates conservation efforts in the private sector.

\*\*\*start 409\*\*\*

It should be noted that here the phrase "private sector" is used to encompass all nongovernmental institutions and undertakings, and not just for-profit corporations and profit- seeking individuals.

\*\*\*end 409\*\*\*

Thus, the recognition of conservation easements empowers conservation groups to purchase development rights from a given parcel of land and protect the present ecological values. 410Link to the text of the note Similarly, when states recognize property interests in instream water flows, a local environmental group can purchase instream flows to improve salmon habitat. 411Link to the text of the note Internationally, allowing the commercial utilization and quasi- ownership of elephants in Zimbabwe has led to larger herds and the devotion of greater acreage for wildlife habitat. 412Link to the text of the note In New Zealand the creation of fishing rights known as "individual transferable quotas" (ITQs) reduced overfishing and encouraged fishermen to support sustainable harvesting. 413Link to the text of the note The expansion of property rights in these areas further enhances the already substantial private conservation efforts going on today. 414Link to the text of the note

#### AND, international law

Avis 16 (Dr William Robert Avis-International Development Department Research Fellow @ University of Birmingham. “Private sector engagement in fragile and conflict-affected settings”, GSDRC Applied Knowledge Services Helpdesk Research Report , 13.01.2016 <http://unprmeb4p.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Private-sector-engagement-in-fragile-and-conflict-affected-settings.pdf> , date accessed 7/19/21).

NOTE: \*DFAT is short for Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the department of the Australian federal government responsible for foreign policy and relations, international aid, consular services and trade and investment.

Whilst PSD is considered to have an important role to play in the field of economic development, there is much debate over what constitutes ‘best practice’ in PSD and what the term private sector encompasses. The private sector1 [[BEGIN FOOTNOTE 1]] DFAT use the term ‘private sector’ to refer to all commercial enterprises (businesses) and includes individual farmers and street traders, small and medium enterprises, large locally-owned firms and multinational corporations.[[END FOOTNOTE 1]] can include local formal, informal and illegal actors, diaspora communities and regional and multinational players (Peschka, 2010). This review adopts DFATs definition of private sector engagement which is characterised as a tool to achieve better development outcomes in private sector development and human development.

#### This is the most common usage

Your Dictionary No Date(“Private-sector” , <https://www.yourdictionary.com/private-sector> , date accessed 9/10/21)

Private-sector meaning

The part of the economy that is controlled by individuals or private organizations and is not funded by the government.

noun

(business) All organizations in an economy or jurisdiction that are not controlled by government, including privately owned businesses and not-for-profit organizations.

*After spending two decades at various government agencies, he returned to the private sector and took a job as a business consultant.*

Of or pertaining to the private sector.

Adjective

### 1NR---AT Chandrasekhar

#### The Chandrasekhar ev says that gov stimulates private sector---doesn’t say they’re the same thing.

2AC Chandrasekhar 17 [KU=yellow] – C. P. Chandrasekhar is currently Professor at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He has published widely in academic journals. August 2017, “How Large is China’s Private Sector?” https://www.networkideas.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/China\_Private\_Sector.pdf

It is a truism that economic reform in China has meant a substantial expansion in the role of private initiative in economic activity. The dismantling of communes and collectives, the encouragement of foreign investment, the recognition of the private sector initially as a “supplement to the state-owned economy” and subsequently as an “important component of the socialist market economy”, the closure, restructuring and disinvestment of shares of enterprises in the state-owned sector, the opening of Communist Party of China (CPC) membership to entrepreneurs and businesspersons, the sale of equity in leading state-owned banks and most recently the decision to make all state-held shares in the1,300 listed companies publicly traded, have all contributed to a substantial expansion in the role of the private sector, and continue to do so.

### 1NR---AT Emmerich

#### Emmerich just poses the dichotomy---you can either assume a clean division OR you can apply a muddled concept to topicality which lets the affirmative regulate government entities---they’re extra-T at the least.

2AC Emmerich 17 [KU=yellow] – Brandon Emmerich is a Data Analyst at Suvretta Capital Management. Brandon writes for Financial Times, Seeking Alpha, and Global Finance about Chinese business practices, 2-17-2017, "Parsing State Ownership In China More private companies compete with China’s state-owned enterprises, but government influence continues to run deep," Global Finance Magazine, <https://www.gfmag.com/topics/blogs/identifying-soes>

\*graphs omitted\*

How does China define company registration? For the government, the identity of the controlling shareholder—that is, the legal entity with the power to appoint and remove board members—sufficiently designates a company as either state or private sector. In the case of private sector companies, the controlling shareholder is a person, or often a family. SOEs, on the other hand, are controlled by either a cabinet-level ministry or a state holding company responsible for preserving and managing state-owned assets, called a SASAC. Although the official taxonomy is quite straightforward, there are two reasons why this first-order approximation needs significant refinement if we are to truly understand the reach of the state. In fact, not only is the state more involved in the economy than China’s company registration statistics imply, the state vs private sector distinction poorly describes the relationship of any given company to the state. Mixed ownership, in particular, muddies China’s company registration taxonomy. Of the 1,600 private sector listed companies in China, 23% count either Huijin or the CSF as one of their top shareholders. Note, Huijin is owned by China Investment Corporation, which is owned by the ministry of Finance, which reports to the State Council. The CSF is owned collectively by China’s stock, commodities and futures exchanges, which are all regulated by the CSRC, which is a cabinet-level ministry directly under, you guessed it, the State Council. Whew. In other words, minority owners of nearly a quarter of Chinese private sector listed companies report at least indirectly to the State Council—that is, President Xi. Mixed ownership permeates the state sector as well. In fact, nearly 60% of China’s 980 listed SOEs count an individual as one of their top 10 shareholders. Additionally, while ownership presents a convenient methodology for classifying companies into either the state or private sector, it has very little to do with the functional definition of state control. In a paper on Chinese state capitalism, Beyond Ownership, Curtis Milhaupt of the Columbia Law School and Wentong Zheng of the University of Florida explain: Functionally, SOEs and large POEs in China share many similarities in the areas commonly thought to distinguish state-owned firms from privately owned firms: market access, receipt of state subsidies, proximity to state power, and execution of the government’s policy objectives. Which is to say, the ownership of state-owned or private sector companies fails to define sufficiently the scope of state involvement. To understand the blurred lines between China’s state and private sectors, let’s consider three dimensions of state intervention: management control, financial control and extra-legal control.