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#### The 1AC invests in a form of neoliberal governmentality necessary to sustain global capitalism

Lebow ‘19 [David; Lecturer on Social Studies at Harvard University and lawyer; “Trumpism and the Dialectic of Neoliberal Reason,” Perspectives on Politics 18(2):380-398, doi:10.1017/S1537592719000434.]

I. Neoliberal Reason

As Michel Foucault and others have argued, neoliberalism entails far more than an economic doctrine favoring deregulated markets.4 It is a novel form of governmentality—a rationality linked to technologies of power that govern conduct, not just through direct state action but through liberty itself.5 Not isolated to the traditionally demarcated sphere of economics, neoliberal society entails a whole economic-juridical order.

The central program of neoliberal governmentality is the absolute generalization of competition as a universal behavioral norm. Whereas in liberal thought, the root principle of capitalism was exchange of equivalents, for neoliberal reason it is competition entailing inequality. The key result of market processes goes from specialization to selection. The competitive market is the exclusive site of rationality. It processes information, indicated by price, and is the only mechanism of producing knowledge, defined as what is profitably utilizable. Because consumers are free to refuse inferior goods or services, the price mechanism of the market system ensures optimal solutions and maximal satisfaction of preferences.

Liberal capitalism, as Karl Polanyi argued, required the construction of “fictitious” commodities like land and labor.6 These abstract, exchangeable factors of production had to be disembedded from concrete non-market social relations, norms, and values. Instead of merely disembedding commodities, neoliberalism intervenes to make competitive mechanisms regulate every moment and point in society. It strives to build an empire of market choice that invades every domain of life, and deposes all other social, political and solidaristic institutions and values.

Neoliberalism does not allege that markets are natural; competition must be constructed. Rather than endorsing laissez-faire overseen by a night watchman, it stipulates a strong state engaged in permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention to maintain artificial competition. It must not plan outcomes, which would upset the market’s innate rationality, and must be insulated from political disturbances. Economic interventionism leads down the road to serfdom; fascism and unlimited state power are its necessary results. A “minimum of economic interventionism” on the “mechanisms of the market” must be accompanied by “maximum legal interventionism” on the “conditions of the market.”7 Fixed, formal rules make up an economic constitution that inhibits planning, repulses political disruptions, and impartially safeguards competition. The state is the executor of the market and growth is the basis of public legitimacy. Governance depoliticizes public power, promotes ostensibly post-ideological technical problem-solving by experts, and relies on “best-practices” that dissolve the distinction between public and private organization.8

Unlimited generalization of competition yields an enterprise society in which calculations of supply/demand and cost/benefit become the model of all social relations. Neoliberal reason renders homo economicus, based on this model of the enterprise, the exhaustive figuration of human subjectivity. The center of economic thought shifts from labor and processes of production, exchange, and consumption to human capital and rational decision-making under conditions of scarcity. Capital is everything that can generate future income; wages are reconceived as income from capital. Labor is no longer comprehended as a commodity exchanged for a wage, but as a combination of human capital (the worker’s education and abilities) and the income stream it generates. This neoliberal subject is an aggregate of human capital who invests in his own income-generating abilities.

Neoliberalism replaces the invariant identity of the moral person as a rights-bearing citizen with a formally empty receptacle filled up through enterprising choices. It brushes aside models of freedom as self-rule achieved through moral autonomy or popular sovereignty.9 In the neoliberal “democracy of consumers,” individual consumers together constitute the sovereign that monopolizes the issuance of legitimate commands.10 Sovereign will is expressed not through political channels, but by choices in the “plebiscite of prices.”11 Whereas producers have particular interests like protectionism, consumers have a consensual and common interest; all favor the impartial functioning of market processes. In the neoliberal free society, consumers exercise their right to choose in complete independence.

II. From Keynesian State Capitalism to Neoliberal Deregulation

Situating the 2008 crisis in a historical account of American political and economic development clarifies its broader significance. The early twentieth-century Progressives were disdainful of what they took to be the chaos and waste of fin de siècle laissez-faire society. They strove to build a new American state that would replace the structural and rights-based formalisms of the nineteenth century with direct democracy and expert administration. It took the Great Depression and New Deal to bring into full bloom the Progressive commitment to pragmatic rationality. Thereafter, the “policy state” was authorized to pursue designated social goals and develop the means to accomplish them.12 The slew of New Deal innovations included state oversight of labor negotiations, invigorated antitrust, Keynesian countercyclical deficits to stimulate demand and increase purchasing power, an expansive public sector sheltered from the business cycle, aggressive banking regulation, and social insurance. Regulation and redistribution ensured the conditions necessary for an economic system based on capital accumulation, private property, and corporate profit to endure.

To many, the differences between the New Deal and Nazi political economies appeared less significant than their common response to monopoly capitalism. Both erased boundaries between state and society by politicizing the private sphere and authorizing public bureaucracies to rationalize crisis-prone economies. Frankfurt School member Friedrich Pollock suggested that this common “state capitalism” had solved the contradiction between the forces and relations of production, and thus overcome the economy’s crisis tendencies. It seemed to him that management had become merely technical and “nothing essential” had been “left to the laws of the market.”13 Worries abounded that the private law sphere of property and contract was necessary for individual freedom. Despite salient differences between Nazi and New Deal state capitalism, many feared that intervention into society was a waystation to domination. Unease about the specter of American despotism motivated development of mechanisms to ensure that interventionism did not devolve into arbitrary rule.14 Expertise was one justification and limitation of the policy state. Authority could be safely delegated to a new corps of public-spirited administrators because their scientific knowledge would not only make them effective, but also counsel restraint. Enduring misgivings led later to new laws of administrative process. The procedural state was legitimated by its defenders as being a substantively value-neutral and instrumentally rational machine serving goals set by society. Regulatory decision-making was shunted into the abstruse procedures of courtrooms and bureaucracies. Defenders of the state emphasized that its processes of allocating authority were neutral, impartial, and open to all. The balanced accommodation of all interest groups seeking to exercise influence would yield an equilibrium corresponding to the public interest.15

The intermeshing of state and society through interest groups, agencies, and professionalized parties marginalized the public. The sovereign public opinion that Progressives had hoped would rationalize government gave way to the rationality supposedly inherent in processes of public law, public-private negotiation, and regulated markets. The state was endowed with a diffuse legitimacy in exchange for a growing economy, broad distribution, and ongoing household capacity to consume.16 The Keynesian welfare settlement pacified the working class, protecting the market economy from more radical political pressures. Newly available, mass-produced commodities encouraged leveled-down notions of citizenship as welfare clientelism and privatistic consumption. As the state expanded and routinized, the initial politicization of private property relations through public intervention developed into depoliticized economic management by lawyers and social scientists organized by administrative and judicial processes.

The terms of the social contract preserving the coexistence of capitalism and democracy had been set. In exchange for a pacified citizenry and depoliticized regulatory authority, the policy state promised to deploy instrumental reason to sustain both capital accumulation and widely distributed capacity to consume (supported, always, by the exclusion of African Americans). During the decades of postwar growth, these twin responsibilities seemed attainable and compatible. Capitalism functioned smoothly enough and potentially delegitimating inequality was clipped by inflation, tax-based welfare, and collectively negotiated wages. But in the late 1960s and early 1970s, weakening growth, stagflation, trade deficits, and the collapse of Bretton Woods revealed that state capitalism had not solved the problems of economics. As the Great Depression had enabled construction of the instrumentally rational policy state, economic disturbances in the 1970s opened the breach into which neoliberal reason entered to reconfigure the political economy. Rather than shielding rational policy-making from political pressure and assuring broadly distributed welfare, neoliberalism promised growth driven by depoliticized markets freed from regulation and downwards redistribution. Believing in the optimal rationality of competitive markets, neoliberals sought to reinvigorate capital accumulation through deregulation, lowered taxes, financialization, privatization, and market expansion.

Liberating accumulation from the restrictions and obligations incurred under state capitalism might have imperiled capitalism’s peace treaty with democracy. For deregulation to proceed without impairing the system’s legitimacy, the quid pro quo—depoliticization for consumption—had to continue. Over the ensuing decades, as Wolfgang Streeck explains, the state “bought time” by finding new ways to generate illusions of widely distributed prosperity that prolonged the capacity of the lower and middle classes to consume.17 Each successive attempt exhausted itself, leading to new and escalating disturbances. In the 1970s, inflation safeguarded social peace by compensating workers for inadequate growth until stagflation ended this mode of buying time. A subsequent reliance on public debt enabled the government to pacify conflict with borrowed money. Rising debt and balking creditors delimited this phase, which was brought to a definitive close with the Clinton administration’s social spending cuts and balanced budgets. In a final stage that dawned in the 1980s but grew increasingly paramount over time, debt-based support of purchasing power was privatized. Household spending was financed through mortgages, student loans, and credit cards. This “privatized Keynesianism” buoyed consumption up through 2008, despite cuts to social spending, falling wages, and tightening employment markets.18

#### Capitalism structurally necessitates militarism, ecocide and technological dystopia---each causes extinction

Foster ‘19 [John; Sociology Professor @ Oregon; February 1; “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?” *The Monthly Review*, Volume 70, Issue 9, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>]

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological “death spiral.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war.

To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3

Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7

The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13

Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15

In the United States and other high-income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18

At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21

More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet.

Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23

The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers.

Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27

War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29

Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30

More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35

The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38

If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40

Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity.

#### Collapse is inevitable – conventional economic models have already failed – capitalist markets and governments have no answers for impending crises.

Ahmed '18 [Nafeez; 8/27/18; Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development, MA in Contemporary War & Peace Studies and PhD in International Relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University; "Scientists Warn the UN of Capitalism's Imminent Demise," <https://www.vice.com/en/article/43pek3/scientists-warn-the-un-of-capitalisms-imminent-demise/>]

Capitalism as we know it is over. So suggests a new report commissioned by a group of scientists appointed by the UN Secretary-General. The main reason? We’re transitioning rapidly to a radically different global economy, due to our increasingly unsustainable exploitation of the planet’s environmental resources.

Climate change and species extinctions are accelerating even as societies are experiencing rising inequality, unemployment, slow economic growth, rising debt levels, and impotent governments. Contrary to the way policymakers usually think about these problems, the new report says that these are not really separate crises at all.

Rather, these crises are part of the same fundamental transition to a new era characterized by inefficient fossil fuel production and the escalating costs of climate change. Conventional capitalist economic thinking can no longer explain, predict, or solve the workings of the global economy in this new age, the paper says.

Energy shift

Those are the stark implications of a new scientific background paper prepared by a team of Finnish biophysicists. The team from the BIOS Research Unit in Finland were asked to provide research that would feed into the drafting of the UN Global Sustainable Development Report (GSDR), which will be released in 2019.

For the “first time in human history,” the paper says, capitalist economies are “shifting to energy sources that are less energy efficient.” This applies to all forms of energy. Producing usable energy (“exergy”) to keep powering “both basic and non-basic human activities” in industrial civilisation “will require more, not less, effort.”

The amount of energy we can extract, compared to the energy we are using to extract it, is decreasing “across the spectrum—unconventional oils, nuclear and renewables return less energy in generation than conventional oils, whose production has peaked—and societies need to abandon fossil fuels because of their impact on the climate,” the paper states.

The shift to renewables might help solve the climate challenge, but for the foreseeable future will not generate the same levels of energy as cheap, conventional oil.

In the meantime, our hunger for energy is driving what the paper refers to as “sink costs.” The greater our energy and material use, the more waste we generate, and so the greater the environmental costs. Though they can be ignored for a while, eventually those environmental costs translate directly into economic costs as it becomes more difficult to ignore their impacts on our societies.

And the biggest “sink cost,” of course, is climate change:

“Sink costs are also rising; economies have used up the capacity of planetary ecosystems to handle the waste generated by energy and material use. Climate change is the most pronounced sink cost,” the paper states.

The paper’s lead author, Dr. Paavo Järvensivu, is a “biophysical economist”—an emerging type of economist exploring the role of energy and materials in fuelling economic activity.

The BIOS paper suggests that much of the political and economic volatility we have seen in recent years has a root cause in ecological crisis. As the ecological and economic costs of industrial overconsumption continue to rise, the constant economic growth we have become accustomed to is now in jeopardy. That, in turn, has exerted massive strain on our politics.

But the underlying issues are still unacknowledged and unrecognised by most policymakers.

“We live in an era of turmoil and profound change in the energetic and material underpinnings of economies. The era of cheap energy is coming to an end,” the paper says.

Conventional economic models, the Finnish scientists note, “almost completely disregard the energetic and material dimensions of the economy.”

“More expensive energy doesn’t necessarily lead to economic collapse,” Järvensivu told me. “Of course, people won’t have the same consumption opportunities, there’s not enough cheap energy available for that, but they are not automatically led to unemployment and misery either.”

The scientists refer to the pioneering work of systems ecologist Professor Charles Hall of the State University of New York with economist Professor Kent Klitgaard from Wells College. Earlier this year, Hall and Klitgaard released an updated edition of their seminal book, Energy and the Wealth of Nations: An Introduction to BioPhysical Economics.

Hall and Klitgaard are highly critical of mainstream capitalist economic theory, which they say has become divorced from some of the most fundamental principles of science. They refer to the concept of ‘Energy Return on Investment’ (EROI) as a key indicator of the shift into a new age of difficult energy. EROI is a simple ratio that measures how much energy we use to extract more energy.

“For the last century, all we had to do was to pump more and more oil out of the ground,” say Hall and Klitgaard. Decades ago, fossil fuels had very high EROI values—a little bit of energy allowed us to extract large amounts of oil, gas and coal.

But as I’ve previously reported for Motherboard, this is no longer the case. Now we’re using more and more energy to extract smaller quantities of fossil fuels. Which means higher production costs to produce what we need to keep the economy rolling. The stuff is still there in the ground—billions of barrels worth to be sure, easily enough to fry the climate several times over.

But it’s harder and more expensive to get out. And the environmental costs of doing so are rising dramatically, as we’ve caught a glimpse of with this summer’s global heatwave.

These costs are not recognised by capitalist markets. They literally cannot be seen by prevailing economic models.

Earlier in August, billionaire investor Jeremy Grantham—who has a track record of consistently calling financial bubbles—released an update to his April 2013 analysis, ‘The Race of Our Lives.’

The new paper, ‘The Race of Our Lives Revisited,’ provides a bruising indictment of contemporary capitalism’s complicity in the ecological crisis. Grantham’s verdict is that “capitalism and mainstream economics simply cannot deal with these problems,” namely, the systematic depletion of planetary ecosystems and environmental resources:

“The replacement cost of the copper, phosphate, oil, and soil—and so on—that we use is not even considered. If it were, it’s likely that the last 10 or 20 years (for the developed world, anyway) has seen no true profit at all, no increase in income, but the reverse,” he wrote.

Efforts to account for these so-called ‘externalities’ by calculating their actual costs have been well-meaning, but have had negligible impact on the actual operation of capitalist markets.

In short, according to Grantham, “we face a form of capitalism that has hardened its focus to short-term profit maximization with little or no apparent interest in social good.”

Yet for all his prescience and critical insights, Grantham misses the most fundamental factor in the great unravelling in which we now find ourselves: the transition to a low EROI future in which we simply cannot extract the same levels of energy and material surplus that we did decades ago.

Many experts believe we’re moving past capitalism, but they disagree on what the ultimate outcome will be. In his book Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future, British economics journalist Paul Mason theorises that information technology is paving the way for the emancipation of labour by reducing the costs of knowledge production—and potentially other kinds of production that will be transformed by AI, blockchain, and so on—to zero. Thus, he says, will emerge a utopian ‘postcapitalist’ age of mass abundance, beyond the price system and rules of capitalism.

It sounds peachy, but Mason completely ignores the colossal, exponentially increasing physical infrastructure for the ‘internet-of-things.’ His digital uprising is projected to consume evermore vast quantities of energy (as much as one-fifth of global electricity by 2025), producing 14 percent of global carbon emissions by 2040.

Toward a new economic operating system

Most observers, then, have no idea of the biophysical realities pointed out in the background paper commissioned by the UN Secretary-General’s IGS—that the driving force of the transition to postcapitalism is the decline of what made ‘endless growth capitalism’ possible in the first place: abundant, cheap energy.

The UN’s Global Sustainable Development Report is being drafted by an independent group of scientists (IGS) appointed by the UN Secretary-General. The IGS is supported by a range of UN agencies including the UN Secretariat, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the UN Environment Programme, the UN Development Programme, the UN Conference on Trade and Development and the World Bank.

The paper, co-authored by Dr Järvensivu with the rest of the BIOS team, was commissioned by the UN’s IGS specifically to feed into the chapter on ‘Transformation: the Economy.’ Invited background documents are used as the basis of the GSDR, but what ends up in the final report will not be known until the final report is released next year.

Overall, the paper claims that we have moved into a new, unpredictable and unprecedented space in which the conventional economic toolbox has no answers. As slow economic growth simmers along, central banks have resorted to negative interest rates and buying up huge quantities of public debt to keep our economies rolling. But what happens after these measures are exhausted? Governments and bankers are running out of options.

“It can be safely said that no widely applicable economic models have been developed specifically for the upcoming era,” write the Finnish scientists.

Having identified the gap, they lay out the opportunities for transition.

In this low EROI future, we simply have to accept the hard fact that we will not be able to sustain current levels of economic growth. “Meeting current or growing levels of energy need in the next few decades with low-carbon solutions will be extremely difficult, if not impossible,” the paper finds. The economic transition must involve efforts “to lower total energy use.”

Key areas to achieve this include transport, food, and construction. City planning needs to adapt to the promotion of walking and biking, a shift toward public transport, as well as the electrification of transport. Homes and workplaces will become more connected and localised. Meanwhile, international freight transport and aviation cannot continue to grow at current rates.

As with transport, the global food system will need to be overhauled. Climate change and oil-intensive agriculture have unearthed the dangers of countries becoming dependent on food imports from a few main production areas. A shift toward food self-sufficiency across both poorer and richer countries will be essential. And ultimately, dairy and meat should make way for largely plant-based diets.

The construction industry’s focus on energy-intensive manufacturing, dominated by concrete and steel, should be replaced by alternative materials. The BIOS paper recommends a return to the use of long-lasting wood buildings, which can help to store carbon, but other options such as biochar might be effective too.

But capitalist markets will not be capable of facilitating the required changes – governments will need to step up, and institutions will need to actively shape markets to fit the goals of human survival. Right now, the prospects for this look slim. But the new paper argues that either way, change is coming.

#### The alternative is radical democratic organizing around the collective goal of the abolition of capitalism---that necessitates rejecting neoliberal rhetoric in pedagogical spaces like debate

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

As educators, it is crucial for us to examine how we talk, teach, and write about inequality as an object of critique in an age of precarity, uncertainty and the current pandemic crisis. This is especially true at a time when a growing number of authoritarian regimes around the globe substitute replace thoughtful dialogue and critical engagement with the suppression of dissent and a culture of forgetting r. How do we situate our analysis of education as part of a broader discourse and mode of analysis that interrogates the promises, ideals, and claims of a substantive democracy? How do we fight against iniquitous relations of power and wealth that empty power of its emancipatory possibilities, and as Hannah Arendt has argued, “makes most people superfluous as human beings”? How might we understand how neoliberal ideology, with its appropriation of market-based values, regressive notions of freedom and agency, uses language to infiltrate daily life? How does a pandemic pedagogy in the service of neoliberalism produce identities defined by market values, and normalize a notion of responsibility and individuality that convinces people that whatever problem they face they have no one to blame but themselves? Repeated endlessly on right-wing media platforms, the underlying conditions that disproportionately produce chronic illness among poor people of color disappear among a public distracted, if not persuaded, by a pandemic pedagogy that celebrates unchecked self-interest, disdains social responsibility, and turns away from the reality of a society with deep-seated institutional rot and unravelling of social connections and the social contract.

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

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

Depoliticization and the Authoritarian Turn

Neoliberalism is not only an economic system, it is also an ideological apparatus that relentlessly attempts to structure consciousness, values, desires, and modes of identification in ways that align individuals with its governing structures. Central to this pedagogical project is the attempt to prevent individuals from translating private issues and troubles into broader systemic considerations. By doing this, it becomes difficult for individuals to grasp the historical, social, economic, and political forces at work in shaping a social order as a human activity deeply immersed in specific relations of power. Neoliberalism’s attempt to erase or rewrite historical and social forces makes it difficult for individuals to imagine alternative notions of society, with themselves as collective actors, or view their problems as more than the limitations of faulty character, moral failure, or a problem of personal responsibility. Reducing individuals to isolated, discrete, hermetically-sealed human beings whose lives are shaped only by notions of self-reliance and self-sufficiency is a pedagogical strategy that utterly depoliticizes people, leading them to believe that however a society is shaped, it is part of a natural order. President Trump echoed this “no alternative” narrative when asked about celebrities and rich people having special access to being tested for the coronavirus while few others had access. He replied, “Perhaps that’s been the story of life.”

This individualization of the social with its mounting privatization, gated communities, and social atomization undermines collective action, any viable notion of solidarity, and weakens the notion of global connectivity. The philosopher Byung-Chul Han has rightly argued that contemporary neoliberal society is shaped by a dysfunctional notion of solitude and hermitically-sealed notions of agency, all of which undermine the values and social connections vital to a democracy. He writes:

“Those subject to the neoliberal economy do not constitute a we that is capable of collective action. The mounting egoization and atomization of society is making the space for collective action shrink… The general collapse of the collective and the communal has engulfed it. Solidarity is vanishing. Privatization now reaches into the depths of the soul itself. The erosion of the communal is making all collective efforts more and more unlikely.”

This panoptical nature of hyper-individualism is more aligned with shared fears than shared responsibilities. Under such circumstances, trust and the notion that all life is related become difficult to grasp as the myopic language of private self-interest inures individuals to wider social problems such as extreme inequality. There is no understanding in this discourse of the damage fanatical entrepreneurialism does to our embodied collectivity. Nor is there any value attributed to the important responsibilities, social values, and notion of the common good that exceeds who we are as individuals, or how we have been shaped by diverse social forces in particular ways.

It should be clear that questions of economic and social justice cannot be addressed by a neoliberal pedagogy that enshrines self-interest and privatization while converting every social problem into individualized market solutions or regressive matters of personal responsibility. Under neoliberalism’s disimagination machine, individual responsibility is coupled with an ethos of greed, avarice, and personal gain. One consequence is the tearing up of social solidarities, public values, and an almost pathological disdain for democracy. This radical form of privatization is also a powerful force for the rise of fascist politics because it depoliticizes individuals, immerses them in the logic of social Darwinism, and makes them susceptible to the dehumanization of those considered a threat or disposable.

Just as the spread of the pandemic virus in the United States was not an innocent act of nature, neither is the rise and pervasive grip of inequality. What is clear is that neoliberal support for unbridled individualism has weakened democratic pressures and eroded democracy and equality as governing principles. Moreover, as a mode of public pedagogy, it has undercut social provisions, the social contract, and support for public goods such as education, public health, essential infrastructure, public transportation, and the most basic elements of the welfare state. As a form of pedagogical practice, neoliberalism has morphed into a form of pandemic pedagogy that sacrifices social needs and human life in the name of an economic rationality that values reviving economic growth over human rights. As a lived system of meaning and values, self-reliance and rugged individualism are the only categories available for shaping how individuals view themselves, and their relationship to others and to the planet. The individualization of everyone and the reduction of social problems to private troubles is paralleled by sanctioning a world marked by borders, walls, racism, hate, and a rejection of government intervention in the interest of the common good. Most importantly, neoliberal individualization personalizes power, creating a depoliticized subject whose only obligation as a citizen is defined by consuming and living in a world free from ethical and social responsibilities. In many ways, it does not just empty politics of any substance, it destroys its emancipatory prospects.

The neoliberal strategists use education not only to mask their abuses and the effects of their criminogenic policies, they also – in a time of crisis, when dissatisfaction of the masses might lead to chaos, revolts, and dangerous levels of resistance – move dangerously close to creating the conditions for a fascist politics. The noted theologian Frei Betto is right in stating that under such conditions, “…they cover up the causes of social ills and cover up their effects with ideologies that, by obscuring causes, fuel mood in the face of the effects. That’s why neoliberalism is now showing its authoritarian face – building walls that divide countries and ethnic groups, executive power over legislature and judiciary, disinformation about digital networks, the cult of the homeland, the brazen offensive against human rights.”

Neoliberalism and its regressive notion of individualism and individual responsibility has undermined the belief that human beings both make the world and can change it. The pandemic has ushered in a crisis that undermines that belief and opens the door for rethinking what kind of society and notion of politics will be faithful to the creation of a socialist democracy that speaks to the core values of justice, equality and solidarity. Under such circumstances, private resistance must give way to collective resistance, and personal and political rights must include economic rights. If inequality is to be defeated, the social state must replace the corporate state and social rights must be guaranteed for all. There can be no adequate struggle for economic justice and social equality unless economic inequality on a global level is addressed along with a movement for climate justice, the elimination of systemic racism and a halt to the spiraling militarism that has resulted in endless wars. This can only take place if the anti-democratic ideology of neoliberalism, with its collapse of the public into the private and its institutional structures of domination, are fully addressed and discredited. Étienne Balibar is right in stating that the triumph of neoliberalism has resulted in the “death zones of humanity.” Following Balibar, what must be made clear is that neoliberal capitalism is itself a pandemic and a dangerous harbinger of an updated fascist politics.

Overcoming Pandemic Pedagogy

The kind of societies that will emerge after the pandemic is up for grabs. In some cases, the crisis will give way to authoritarian regimes such as Chile, Hungary and Turkey, all of which have used the urgency of COVID-19 as an excuse to impose more state control and surveillance, squelch dissent, eliminate civil liberties and concentrate power in the hands of an authoritarian political class. As is well documented, history in a time of crisis also has the potential to change dominant ideologies, rethink the meaning of governance, and enlarge the sphere of justice and equality through a vision that fights for a more generous and inclusive politics. It is crucial to rethink the project of politics in order to imagine forms of resistance that are collective, inclusive and global, capable of producing new democratic arrangements for social life, more radical values and a “global economy which will no longer be at the mercy of market mechanisms.” This is a politics that must move beyond siloed identities and fractured political factions in order to build transnational solidarities in the service of an alternative radically democratic society. Making the pedagogical more political means challenging those forms of pandemic pedagogy that turn politics into theater, a favorite tactic of Trump. In this case, the performance works to suspend disbelief, hold power accountable and unravel one’s sense of critical agency. Pandemic pedagogy does more than undermine critical thinking and informed judgments, it dissolves the line between the truth and lies, fantasy and reality, and in doing so, destroys the foundation for understanding, engaging and promoting that social and economic justice. The endgame under the rubric of a pandemic pedagogy is not simply the destruction of the truth, but the elimination of democracy itself.

Central to developing an alternative democratic vision is development of a language that refuses to look away and be commodified. Such a language should be able to break through the continuity and consensus of common sense and appeals to the natural order of things. At stake here is the need to reclaim both critical and redemptive elements of a radical democracy in order to address the full spectrum of violence that structures institutions and everyday life in the United States. This is a language connected to the acquisition of civic literacy, and it demands a different regime of desires and identifications to enable us to move from “shock and stunned silence toward a coherent visceral speech, one as strong as the force that is charging at us.”

Of course, there is more at stake here than a struggle over meaning; there is also the struggle over power, over the need to create a formative culture that will produce informed critical agents who will fight for and contribute to a broad social movement that will translate meaning into a fierce struggle for economic, political and social justice. Agency in this sense must be connected to a notion of possibility and education in the service of radical change. Reimagining the future only becomes meaningful when it is rooted in a fierce struggle against the horrors and totalitarian practices of a pandemic pedagogy that falsely claims that it exists outside of history.

Václav Havel, the late Czech political dissident-turned-politician, once argued that politics follows culture, by which he meant that changing consciousness is the first step toward building mass movements of resistance. What is crucial here in the age of multiple crises is a thorough grasp of the notion that critical and engaged forms of agency are a product of emancipatory education. Moreover, at the heart of any viable notion of politics is the recognition that politics begins with attempts to change the way people think, act and feel with respect to both how they view themselves and their relations to others. There is more to agency than the neoliberal emphasis on the “empire of the self,” with its unchecked belief in the virtues of a form of self-interest that despises the bonds of sociality, solidarity and community.

The U.S. is in the midst of a political and pedagogical crisis. This is a crisis defined not only by a brutalizing racism and massive inequality, but also a constitutional crisis produced by a growing authoritarianism that has been in the making for some time. The recent attacks by the police on journalists, peaceful protesters and even elderly people marching for racial justice echoes the violence of the Brownshirts in the 1930s. Let’s stop the futile debate about whether or not the U.S. is in the midst of a fascist state and shift the register to the more serious question of how to resist it and restore a semblance of real democracy.

Under such circumstances, education should be viewed as central to politics, and it plays a crucial role in producing informed judgments, actions, morality and social responsibility at the forefront not only of agency, but politics itself. In this scenario, truth and politics mutually inform each other to erupt in a pedagogical awakening at the moment when the rules are broken. Taking risks becomes a necessity, self-reflection narrates its capacity for critically engaged agency and thinking the impossible is not an option, but a necessity. Without an informed and educated citizenry, democracy can lead to tyranny, even fascism.

Trump represents the malignant presence of a fascism that never dies and is ready to remerge at different times in different context in sometimes not-so-recognizable forms. The COVID-19 crisis and the pandemic of inequality and racism have revealed elements of a fascist politics that are more than abstractions. The struggle against a fascist politics is now visible in the rebellions taking place across the United States. While there are no political guarantees for a victory, there is a new sense that the future can be changed in the image of a just and sustainable society. There is a new energy for reform taking place in the aftermath of the killing of George Floyd. Massive protests for racial, economic and social justice are emerging all over the globe. As I have argued in The Terror of the Unforeseen, at stake here is the need for these protests to transition from a pedagogical moment and collective outburst of moral anger to a progressive international movement that is well organized and unified. Such a movement must build solidarity among different groups, imagine new forms of social life, make the impossible possible, and produce a revolutionary project in defense of equality, social justice and popular sovereignty. The racial, class, ecological and public health crisis facing the globe can only be understood as part of a comprehensive crisis of the totality. Immediate solutions such as defunding the police and improving community services are important, but they do not deal with the larger issue of eliminating a neoliberal system structured in massive racial and economic inequalities. David Harvey is right in arguing that the “immediate task is nothing more nor less than the self-conscious construction of a new political framework for approaching the question of inequality, through a deep and profound critique of our economic and social system.” This is a crisis in which different threads of oppression must be understood as part of the general crisis of capitalism. The various protests now evolving internationally at the popular level offer the promise of new global anti-fascist and anti-capitalist movements. In the current moment, democracy may be under a severe threat and appear frighteningly vulnerable, but with young people and others rising up across the globe — inspired, energized and marching in the streets — the future of a radical democracy is waiting to breathe again.

### 1NC – CP

#### The 50 states, Washington, D.C., and all relevant territories should increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices conducted against wholly owned foreign subsidiaries of United States based parent companies.

### 1NC – CP

#### The United States federal government should regulate business practices conducted against wholly owned foreign subsidiaries of United States based parent companies.

#### The counterplan PICs out of anti-trust legislation and the FTC and DOJ as enforcers---other agencies’ regulations solve

Lawrence Fullerton et al. 08. Joel M Mitnick, William V Reiss, George C Karamanos and Owen H Smith. Sidley Austin LLP. Vertical Agreements The regulation of distribution practices in 34 jurisdictions worldwide. “United States.” https://www.sidley.com/-/media/files/publications/2008/03/getting-the-deal-through--vertical-agreements-2008/files/view-united-states-chapter/fileattachment/united-states-21.pdf

5 What entity or agency is responsible for enforcing prohibitions on anticompetitive vertical restraints? Do governments or ministers have a role?

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (DoJ) are the two federal agencies responsible for the enforcement of federal antitrust laws. The FTC and the DoJ have jurisdiction to investigate many of the same types of conduct, and therefore have adopted a clearance procedure pursuant to which matters are handled by whichever agency has the most expertise in a particular area.

Additionally, other agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and Federal Communications Commission, maintain oversight authority over regulated industries pursuant to various federal statutes, and therefore may review vertical restraints for anti-competitive effects.

### 1NC – DA

DA FTC Tradeoff

#### FTC’s increasing enforcement in privacy now – it’s focused on algorithmic bias.

James V. Fazio 21. Special counsel in the Intellectual Property Practice Group at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP, with Liisa M. Thomas, 3/11. “What Is FTC’s Course Under Biden?” https://www.natlawreview.com/article/what-ftc-s-course-under-biden

The new acting FTC chair, Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, recently signaled that the FTC may increase enforcement and penalties in the privacy and data security realm. Slaughter pointed to several areas of focus for the FTC this year, which companies will want to keep in mind: Notifying Consumers About FTC Allegations: Slaughter referred favorably to two recent cases: (1) the Everalbum biometric settlement from earlier this year (which we wrote about at the time); and (2) the Flo Health settlement over alleged deceptive data sharing practices (which we also wrote about at the time). In drawing on these two cases, Slaughter indicated that in future cases the FTC intends to include as part of any settlement a requirement to notify customers of any FTC allegations. This, she said, would allow consumers to “vote with their feet” and help them decide whether to recommend their services to others. FTC Intent to Plead All Relevant Violations: According to Slaughter, another lesson the FTC is taking from the Flo case is to include in the cases it brings all potentially applicable violations of all relevant privacy-related laws. In the Flo case, Slaughter said the FTC should have pleaded a violation of the Health Breach Notification Rule, which requires that vendors of personal health records notify consumers of data breaches. Focus on Ed Tech and COPPA: Given the explosive growth of education technology during COVID-19, the FTC is conducting an industry sweep of the industry. Related to this, the FTC is reviewing its Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act Rule. This goes beyond the refresh the agency did of their FAQs earlier in the pandemic (which we wrote about at the time). For now, Slaughter reminds companies that parental consent is needed before collecting information online from children under the age of 13. Examination of Health Apps: The FTC will take a closer look at health apps, including telehealth and contact tracing apps, as more and more consumers are relying on such apps to manage their health during the pandemic. Overlap Between Competition and Privacy: Slaughter also indicated that it is worth looking at situations where there may be not only privacy concerns, but antitrust as well. Because the FTC has a dual mission (consumer protection and competition) she notes that it has a “structural advantage” over other regulators in that it can look at these issues, especially since -she states – “many of the largest players in digital markets are as powerful as they are because of the breadth of their access to and control over consumer data.” Racial Equality and AI/Biometrics/Geotracking: Slaughter noted that COVID-19 is exacerbating racial inequities. She pointed to the unequal access to technology, as well as algorithmic discrimination (the idea that discrimination offline becomes embedded into algorithmic system logic). The FTC intends to focus on algorithmic discrimination, as well as on the discrimination potentially embedded into facial recognition technologies. (This mirrors concerns that gave rise to the recent Portland facial recognition law, which we recently wrote about). Finally, Slaughter commented on the use of location data to identify characteristics of Black Lives Matter protesters, and said she is concerned about the misuse of location data to track Americans engaged in constitutionally protected speech. Putting it Into Practice: Companies that operate health apps, that are in the education technology space, or that use algorithms or facial recognition tools will want to keep in mind that these are areas of focus for the FTC. And for everyone, keep in mind that the FTC has indicated it will beef up privacy law penalties and will ask for more notification to injured consumers.

#### Antitrust enforcement saps up FTC resources and personnel, which are finite.

Tara L. Reinhart, et al. 21. \*\*Head of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*Steven C. Sunshine, Co-head of Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*David P. Whales, antitrust lawyer with over 25 years of experience in both private and public sectors. \*\*Julia Y. York, partner at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP. \*\*Bre Jordan, associate at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP focusing on antitrust law. “Lina Khan’s Appointment as FTC Chair Reflects Biden Administration’s Aggressive Stance on Antitrust Enforcement.” 6/18/21. https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2021/06/lina-khans-appointment-as-ftc-chair

Second, like all antitrust enforcers, Ms. Khan and the FTC will face resource constraints. Bringing antitrust litigation is an expensive and laborious process, often requiring millions of dollars for expert fees and a large army of FTC staff attorneys and taking many months or even years to accomplish. Typically, the FTC can only litigate a handful of antitrust matters at a time. It seems likely that Congress will provide more funding to the FTC in the current environment, but even with these extra resources, the FTC will still have to pick its cases carefully and cannot challenge every deal or every instance of alleged unlawful conduct.

#### That trades off with the necessary resources for privacy enforcement.

John O. McGinnis\* and Linda Sun\*\* 20. \*George C. Dix Professor, Northwestern University, and Associate-Designate, Wilmer Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP. “Unifying Antitrust Enforcement for the Digital Age.” Northwestern Public Law Research Paper No. 20-20. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3669087

The FTC needs more resources to adequately address the nation’s growing privacy concerns. Currently, the FTC oversees both consumer protection—encompassing privacy—and antitrust,249 making the FTC the chief federal agency on privacy policy and enforcement250 and the nation’s de-facto privacy agency.251 The agency has long-standing experience in enforcing privacy statutes252 and also has special privacy assets, such as an internet lab capable of high-quality tech forensics to track invasions of privacy.253 The FTC, however, has failed to keep pace with the massive growth of privacy concerns—a phenomenon also driven by modern technology. Very few Americans feel conﬁdent in the privacy of their information in the digital age.254 According to a 2019 study, over 80% of Americans feel that they have little to no control over the data collected on them by companies and the government.255 To adequately address privacy concerns, the FTC needs more resources.256 The agency has been explicit that it needs more manpower to police tech companies. In requesting increased funding from Congress, FTC Director Joseph Simons said the money would allow the agency to hire additional staff and bring more privacy cases.257 A former director of the FTC’s Bureau of Consumer Protection, which houses the privacy unit, has called the FTC “woefully understaffed.”258 As of the spring of 2019, the FTC had only forty employees dedicated to privacy and data security, compared to 500 and 110 employees at comparable agencies in the UK. and Ireland, respectively.259 Without more lawyers, investigators, and technologists, the FTC will be forced to conduct privacy investigations less thoroughly, and in some cases, forgo them altogether.260 Currently, the FT C’s resources are spread thin across multiple missions, to the detriment of its privacy efforts. Removing the agency’s antitrust responsibilities would reallocate resources from the antitrust department to its privacy unit and other areas of consumer protection. Further, it would free up the scarce time of the commissioners to oversee this essential effort.261

#### Unchecked algorithmic bias risks massive inequality and extinction.

Mike Thomas 20. Quoting AI experts including MIT Physics Professors, Senior Features Writer for BuiltIn. THE FUTURE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: 7 ways AI can change the world for better ... or worse, Updated: April 20, 2020, <https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/artificial-intelligence-future>

Klabjan also puts little stock in extreme scenarios — the type involving, say, murderous cyborgs that turn the earth into a smoldering hellscape. He’s much more concerned with machines — war robots, for instance — being fed faulty “incentives” by nefarious humans. As MIT physics professors and leading AI researcher Max Tegmark put it in a 2018 TED Talk, “The real threat from AI isn’t malice, like in silly Hollywood movies, but competence — AI accomplishing goals that just aren’t aligned with ours.” That’s Laird’s take, too. “I definitely don’t see the scenario where something wakes up and decides it wants to take over the world,” he says. “I think that’s science fiction and not the way it’s going to play out.” What Laird worries most about isn’t evil AI, per se, but “evil humans using AI as a sort of false force multiplier” for things like bank robbery and credit card fraud, among many other crimes. And so, while he’s often frustrated with the pace of progress, AI’s slow burn may actually be a blessing. “Time to understand what we’re creating and how we’re going to incorporate it into society,” Laird says, “might be exactly what we need.” But no one knows for sure. “There are several major breakthroughs that have to occur, and those could come very quickly,” Russell said during his Westminster talk. Referencing the rapid transformational effect of nuclear fission (atom splitting) by British physicist Ernest Rutherford in 1917, he added, “It’s very, very hard to predict when these conceptual breakthroughs are going to happen.” But whenever they do, if they do, he emphasized the importance of preparation. That means starting or continuing discussions about the ethical use of A.G.I. and whether it should be regulated. That means working to eliminate data bias, which has a corrupting effect on algorithms and is currently a fat fly in the AI ointment. That means working to invent and augment security measures capable of keeping the technology in check. And it means having the humility to realize that just because we can doesn’t mean we should. “Our situation with technology is complicated, but the big picture is rather simple,” Tegmark said during his TED Talk. “Most AGI researchers expect AGI within decades, and if we just bumble into this unprepared, it will probably be the biggest mistake in human history. It could enable brutal global dictatorship with unprecedented inequality, surveillance, suffering and maybe even human extinction. But if we steer carefully, we could end up in a fantastic future where everybody’s better off—the poor are richer, the rich are richer, everybody’s healthy and free to live out their dreams.”

### 1NC – T

T Per Se

#### ‘Prohibiting’ a practice requires per se illegality.

Lee Mendelsohn 6, Director at Edward Nathan, “KIPA Conduct Amounts to Price Fixing”, Business Day (South Africa), 6/12/2006, Lexis

The first step in any competition law analysis is to define the relevant market. There are two components to an analysis of the relevant market, namely the relevant product market and the geographic market.

The relevant product market consists of those products and services that operate as a competitive constraint on the behaviour of the suppliers of those products and/or services.

The relevant product market is determined by ascertaining whether a small but significant non-transient increase in pricing of the product in question would cause buyers to substitute the product with another product or would cause suppliers of other products to begin producing the product in question.

The relevant geographic market is determined by ascertaining whether a small but significant non-transient increase in pricing of the product in question would cause buyers to purchase the product from other geographic areas, alternatively suppliers of the product in other geographic areas to supply those products into the area in question.

For the purposes of this case study, we are instructed to accept that each medical speciality constitutes a relevant product market and that the relevant geographic market for each of them is Kleindorpie.

The Competition Act provides that "an agreement between, or concerted practice by, firms, or a decision by an association of firms, is prohibited if it is between parties in a horizontal relationship and if … it involves … directly or indirectly fixing a purchase or selling price or any other trading condition".

An "agreement" is defined as including a contract, arrangement or understanding, whether or not legally enforceable. The term agreement is very widely defined. A "horizontal relationship" is defined as a "relationship between competitors".

The prohibition on the fixing of a purchase or selling price or any other trading condition is one of the so-called "per se" prohibitions which are included in our Competition Act. The prohibition is automatic and absolute and the fixing of prices or other trading condition cannot be justified on the basis of any technological, efficiency or other procompetitive gains that could outweigh the potential anticompetitive effect of the fixing of the price or trading condition. If the capitation plan of KIPA falls within the restrictive horizontal practice prohibiting price fixing and the fixing of other trading conditions, such practice will be a contravention of the act.

Limits---many standards, requiring distinct answers, make the topic unmanageable.

Ground---fringe standards dodge links and allow bidirectional permissiveness.

## Supply Chains Adv

### Grid/ cyber --- 1NC

#### No blackouts

**Larson 18** Selena Larson, Cyber threat intelligence analyst at Dragos, Inc. [Threats to Electric Grid are Real; Widespread Blackouts are Not, 8-6-2018, https://dragos.com/blog/industry-news/threats-to-electric-grid-are-real-widespread-blackouts-are-not/]//BPS

The US electric grid is not about to go down. Though it’s understandable if someone believed that. Over the last few weeks, numerous media reports suggest state-backed hackers have infiltrated the US electric grid and are capable of manipulating the flow of electricity on a grand scale and cause chaos. Threats against industrial sectors including electric utilities, oil and gas, and manufacturing are growing, and it’s reasonable for people to be concerned. But to say hackers have invaded the US electric grid and are prepared to cause blackouts is false. The initial reporting stemmed from a public Department of Homeland Security (DHS) presentation in July on Russian hacking activity targeting US electric utilities. This presentation contained previously-reported information on a group known as Dragonfly by Symantec and which Dragos associates to activity labeled DYMALLOY and ALLANITE. These groups focus on information gathering from industrial control system (ICS) networks and have not demonstrated disruptive or damaging capabilities. While some news reports cite 2015 and 2016 blackouts in Ukraine as evidence of hackers’ disruptive capabilities, DYMALLOY nor ALLANITE were involved in those incidents and it is inaccurate to suggest the DHS’s public presentation and those destructive behaviors are linked. Adversaries have not placed “cyber implants” into the electric grid to cause blackouts; but they are infiltrating business networks – and in some cases, ICS networks – in an effort to steal information and intelligence to potentially gain access to operational systems. Overall, the activity is concerning and represents the prerequisites towards a potential future disruptive event – but evidence to date does not support the claim that such an attack is imminent. The US electric grid is resilient and segmented, and although it makes an interesting plot to an action movie, one or two strains of malware targeting operational networks would not cause widespread blackouts. A destructive incident at one site would require highly-tailored tools and operations and would not effectively scale. Essentially, localized impacts are possible, and asset owners and operators should work to defend their networks from intrusions such as those described by DHS. But scaling up from isolated events to widespread impacts is highly unlikely.

### Taiwan war --- 1NC

#### No China-Taiwan war

**Hutchins 18** (Reid Hutchins completed a Master of Strategic Studies at the Australian National University and is currently a Ministerial Liaison Officer at the ACT Government, “High Stakes Strategy in Taiwan,” 1-1, <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/taiwan-arms-sales/>)

Is change on the cards? As a new US administration seeks to reassure China that its policies remain largely unchanged, the importance of forging strong bilateral relations between the two great powers is paramount. Yet, it is still within US interests to sell arms to Taiwan. The US is caught between honouring its Taiwanese alliance and also quelling rising Chinese anxiety over its territorial claims. As a way of countering China’s own salami, ‘divide-and conquer’ tactics, the suggestion has been made that the US could incrementally sell defensive arms to Taiwan over a period of time. Continually delivering large arms packages has already spurred rapid Chinese military modernisation over a number of years. A meeting of the annual National People’s Congress confirmed this anxiety, when it announced a 7 per cent rise in the military budget. While China, Taiwan and the US have shifted their foreign policy to a varying extent, these shifts have not fundamentally altered the strategic interests of each state vis-à-vis the other. There should never be any certainty that trilateral relations will remain as they are, especially given new reformist US and Taiwanese administrations, but each state has not yet demonstrated any signs of changing their strategic objectives. What are the motivations? China has taken great interest in the domestic politics of Taiwan in recent years, as the island nation has gone through a transitional government. Whilst there is always an element of the unknown, President Tsai Ing-wen’s Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) will look to neutralise hostile territorial claims from China. Given Taiwan’s long record of arms deals with the US, China’s President Xi Jinping would likely have assumed that Trump’s arms deal would go ahead. Xi will now continue a policy of incremental coercion in an effort to influence Taiwan’s political establishment and derail future arms sales in the long term. Whilst China’s primary goal is to politically unify Taiwan with the mainland, Chinese policy-makers are pragmatic and realistic enough to know that the feasibility of this goal can only be achieved in the long term. Taiwan will continue to rely on US extended deterrence for its national security. It will therefore continue to pursue arms sales agreements with the US and do whatever possible to preserve the alliance. Based on previous condemnations, China’s negative response to the new deal was predictable. Tsai knew that beyond strong condemnation, China will not escalate its rhetoric into a significant hostile action. Despite espousing unpredictable foreign policy views, Trump was successfully convinced by Tsai and his advisors to honour an important bilateral arms arrangement, knowing a negative backlash for Sino-US relations would be inevitable. As such, Trump will look to build trust and rapport with Xi—a greater foreign policy priority than arms sales with Taiwan. Tsai will look for any opportunity to reaffirm the necessity of future US arms sales to boost Taiwan’s defensive military capability. Trump has shown an adherence to the ‘One China’ policy in an effort to appease China that it’s business as usual. He has so far maintained the status quo regarding American commitments to Taiwan. Senior military advisors will likely recommend that Trump maintain bilateral military relations as a show of relevance and superiority in the region. However, a US naval presence in Taiwan would be an undue provocation to an already sensitive situation. To avoid alarming China and disrupting Sino-US relations, the salami tactic of incremental arms packages is a viable option that the US could consider. Large US military transfers to Taiwan such as the sale of 150 fighter jets in 1992 drew strong condemnation from China, raising tensions throughout the region. By making smaller but more regular arms sales to Taiwan, the US is honouring its security arrangement and limiting Chinese anxieties. China’s perspective China views US arms sales to Taiwan as a threat to its national and strategic interests. This threat is driven by a deep sense of national humiliation suffered under foreign rulers during its imperial past. This narrative has been espoused by Chinese foreign policy-makers to promote nationalistic sentiment at home. For China, national pride is at stake with regard to Taiwan in its pursuit for national rejuvenation. The US presence in Taiwan threatens the source of this national pride and revives painful historical memories of foreign encroachment and occupation. Given that China believes Taiwan to be indivisible from the PRC, US arms deals to a secessionist Taiwan is viewed by China as hostile anti-Chinese behaviour. Taiwanese prospects Taiwan is at the centre of a great power contest as it struggles to achieve sovereignty from its powerful mainland neighbour, whilst having the freedom to pursue greater relations with the West. As an island nation that has forged a distinct political and social identity from the mainland, Taiwan’s foreign policy towards China has consistently been one of self-determination. In an effort to achieve independence, successive Taiwanese leaders have sought greater defensive military capabilities to deter a potential Chinese assault. In December 2016, President Tsai Ing-wen angered China by calling President Trump to congratulate his win and reaffirm the alliance. With Trump’s recent arms sales approval, Taiwanese defence policy-makers have been appeased after months of uncertainty. Taiwanese efforts to boost its military capability has become a national priority as it looks to counterbalance a more assertive China. Whilst Taiwan does not have the capability to defeat a conventional Chinese assault, it could inflict enough damage for the cost to be too great to warrant attempting. President Tsai is faced with Taiwan’s usual foreign policy dilemma—appeasing China whilst still relying on US security commitments. Through decades of careful diplomatic manoeuvring, Taiwan has been able to strike an uneasy balance between the US and China which Tsai will want to preserve. So far, she has kept satisfactory cross-strait relations by keeping to the status quo. However challenges will always remain for any Taiwanese leader who must play off two competing great powers.

### US-Russia War --- 1NC

#### No Russia war---deterrence solves

Edward **Lucas 15**, senior editor for the Economist, has specialized in Russia and Eastern Europe, “No, We’re Not Facing World War III,” 12/6/15, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/12/06/no-we-re-not-facing-world-war-iii.html

Yet the big point is that deterrence worked, and still works. In fact it works better now than ever. The United States is overwhelmingly dominant in every part of the military spectrum, from space to cyber via conventional and nuclear weapons, just as the Western alliance with its combined GDP of around $40 trillion, and population of 800 million, is overwhelmingly more powerful than Russia (GDP of $1.7 trillion and population of 140 million: both shrinking, incidentally).

Putin is a bully, but he is not insane. He may rattle his nuclear saber, but in any real confrontation with the West, he is the guaranteed loser. He can credibly menace the Baltic states (because in Pentagon war games, the Russians always get to the coast before the allies get to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania). But this ignores the wider context. So long as the West responds to a geographically limited provocation with a much broader response, Putin is powerless. He is only able to intimidate us if he frames the conflict in his terms: “Will you risk World War III to protect Estonia?”

The answer to that is (in most Western capitals) clearly no, but it is an answer to the wrong question. Instead, we should frame the conflict in our terms. The apocalypse which we can wreak on the Putin regime has nothing to do with enriched uranium and missiles. It comes from exploiting Russia’s Achilles Heel—its dependence on Western financial markets and systems. The Putin regime steals tens of billions of dollars every year from the Russian people. But it does not stash those ill-gotten gains in its own rotten realms. It puts them into well-run investment vehicles in the West. Capital flight from Russia is running at $100 billion a year.

This gives the West—if it so chooses—the best possible response to Russian military intimidation. We can freeze and if necessary seize the Kremlin’s assets in the West. We can question and if necessary prosecute the bankers, lawyers, and accountants who have facilitated this huge tide of dirty money that washes through Vienna, Cyprus, London, and Dubai. We can also investigate the curious behavior of Russian participants in setting energy prices in world markets.

This does not mean we should neglect the military countermeasures needed to deter the Putin regime from bullying its neighbors. We need more troops in Poland and the Baltic states, with closer integration of non-NATO Sweden and Finland. We need better intelligence—especially about Russia’s battlefield nuclear weapons—better cyber-defenses, and a resilient economic and political system which can withstand sanctions, propaganda attacks, and the targeted use of corruption. All these are the elements of what in military jargon is known as “hybrid warfare”—the use of a wide range of military and non-military means in pursuit of a political goal. Hybrid warfare was waged in Ukraine, initially to dramatically success effect.

But it has not succeeded. Russia did not stoke an insurrection all across southern and eastern Ukraine. It did not best the Ukrainian army (pitifully led and equipped though it was). It did not succeed in breaking the Ukrainian people’s will, or toppling the elected government. All that happened for lessons which we should bear in mind in our far stronger and richer societies: Ukrainians survived because they were not scared. We are losing because we are. The fear of “World War III” is part of the Kremlin’s psychological arsenal, designed to make us think that resistance is futile or suicidally risky.

It is not. Russia is in objective terms a nuisance, not a menace. It becomes a danger only because we let it. Putin is far more scared of us than we should be of him. After all, we’ve got his money.

### Korea first strike --- 1NC

#### No Korea war ever

**Jackson 15** [Van, Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security and a Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow, researching the intersection of Asian security, strategy, and military trends. He is also a Visiting Scholar and Adjunct Assistant Professor with the Asian Studies Program in Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service. Dr. Jackson has testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and is a frequent commentator in popular media and policy outlets, “Preparing for the Next Korean War”, 8/24/15, <http://thediplomat.com/2015/08/preparing-for-the-next-korean-war/>]

Nobody Wants Nuclear War—Not Even Kim Jong-un Every Korea expert I’ve ever met believes North Korea’s primary goal is regime survival. Yet most of these same experts believe that Kim Jong-un is capable of anything and there’s no telling what he might do. To put it politely, that’s cognitive dissonance. If we know North Korea seeks regime survival, then we know something about what it’s keen to avoid. Even Kim Jong-un must know there are certain actions that would end him and his regime—nuclear attacks, the destruction of Seoul, or a mass invasion of South Korea. Kim Jong-un isn’t a Millenarian or a Jihadi; his goal isn’t ~~suicide~~. So unless we want to shrug our shoulders and say “anything could happen,” we should have some modest confidence that Kim won’t pursue the extreme actions that North Korean media routinely threaten. South of the DMZ, the incentives to avoid a nuclear conflict are just as strong. For starters, 60 years of “restraint” when faced with North Korean violence suggests that, in the United States especially, there is a strong desire to avoid the risks of escalation and conflict in general. Plus, no sitting president—American or South Korean—wants to go down in history as the first president to usher in the era of nuclear warfighting. The cost in lives would be abhorrent, and there’s a high risk that such a situation would rapidly erode the nuclear nonproliferation regime. North Korea Can’t Invade the South In June 1950, North Korea launched a large-scale invasion of a South Korea with only a token ability to resist and no meaningful U.S. military presence. This is the classic scenario that experts and military planners often imagine when they think of another Korean War. Yet there’s now a heavily armed DMZ—replete with a large minefield, no less—separating the North and South, and the South Korean military is better trained and equipped than any force North Korea could muster. North Korea’s air force and navy services are vastly inferior to the technologically advanced South Korean military. And the U.S. military presence in and commitment to South Korea is far more than symbolic. The point is that no military leader would look at the military balance on the Korean Peninsula—especially not a leader in the North Korean People’s Army (KPA)—and think that it makes sense for North Korea to invade South Korea. The former might have cause for conflict, but waged asymmetrically, not as a head-on frontal assault. Invasion of the South is militarily impossible. This North-South military imbalance is worsened by a KPA that lacks the logistics and sustainment capacity required of an invasion; the KPA is numerically large, but regularly diverted from military tasks to perform agricultural and industrial labor functions to support a moribund economy. The KPA isn’t a force that’s capable of a long duration military campaign. Invading North Korea is Long, Slow, and Costly While there are few, if any, reasons to expect a North Korean conquest over the South, the converse is equally unlikely. Any invasion of North Korea would be slow and costly, offering both sides many opportunities to either “pause” and de-escalate conflict, or escalate to total devastation. First, invading North Korea guarantees the mass artillery shelling of Seoul, South Korea’s capital, and North Korea’s use of “battlefield” chemical weapons at scale. If the alliance is invading, there’s no reason for North Korea to refrain from taking these actions. Second, moving large numbers of troops into North Korea requires not only facing down an adversary with home field advantage, but a topography that’s entirely inhospitable to outside invasion—highly mountainous, lots of underground facilities and tunnels, and with very little infrastructure such as roads and bridges to exploit. Third, because North Korea’s local advantages would dramatically slow the progress of a northward march, North Korea would have plenty of time to confirm that its regime is facing extinction, which increases incentives to launch nuclear strikes. North Korea’s Growing Nuclear Confidence, with Authoritarian Characteristics Applied to the Korea situation, two concepts in political science also bear on incentives for limited conflict: audience costs and the stability-instability paradox. Audience costs are the expected punishments or rewards a leader is likely to face based on their behavior. In democracies, domestic audience costs are thought to sometimes encourage restraint in political leaders, and to strengthen the credibility of threats when leaders of democratic polities make them. A politician who fails to live up to their word, for example, will be punished at the ballot box (this is a theory, not a description of reality). In dictatorships though, the audience cost mechanism as a source of either restraint or credibility doesn’t exist in the same way. The only audiences that might punish or reward a leader are elites who implement orders and are capable of threatening a coup. But in North Korea, Kim Jong-un seems to be killing all those guys. So even if dictators face audience costs in general—and many scholars think they don’t—North Korea seems a special case in which audience costs are marginal if they exist at all. So if North Korea ends up in an undesirable conflict, Kim Jong-un and the generals can de-escalate or back down without necessarily losing face. At any rate, North Korea has a history of making threats that it fails to follow through on. The stability-instability paradox was a concept developed during the Cold War to explain how two states can achieve stability at the strategic level through mutually assured destruction but, as a consequence, simultaneously be even freer to pursue small-scale and seemingly low-stakes conflicts like provocations and proxy wars. The odds of a nuclear holocaust were thought to approach zero while low-intensity conflicts became a recurring phenomenon. As North Korea’s nuclear capability improves, the logic of the stability-instability paradox becomes more compelling. Even without delivery vehicles for North Korea’s nuclear capability, some believe that the stability-instability paradox has already reached the Korean Peninsula due to the capacity of both sides to inflict unimaginable atrocities on the other through conventional weapons alone. In short, while there may be incentives for conflict by either side, both sides also have even more compelling incentives to limit the scope of any violence. There are, of course, many chances for miscalculation—especially during a crisis—but there’s no conceivable miscalculation that would reasonably lead to total war without lots of intervening steps and assumptions in between the miscalculation and the nightmare outcome. And if we reason from a place of likelihoods rather than from a place of what’s hypothetically possible, we stand a chance of crafting better policy.

## Global Development Adv

### African Instability --- 1NC

#### African war won’t escalate

**Schear 16** – Dr. James A. Schear, PhD, Global Fellow with the Africa Program at the Woodrow Wilson, “FORGING SECURITY PARTNERSHIPS IN AFRICA: WHAT LIES AHEAD?”, Wilson Quarterly, Winter, http://wilsonquarterly.com/quarterly/the-post-obama-world/forging-security-partnerships-in-africa-what-lies-ahead/

More than a generation later, the tempo of political violence has **greatly subsided** across large areas of southern and eastern Africa and, more recently, in parts of coastal west Africa. Tragically, other venues — most notably central Africa’s Great Lakes region, as well as the Maghreb and Sahel to the north — are still riven by deep-set instabilities. And, yes, colonial-era legacies do still exert some malign influences, state fragility poses perennial relapse risks, and new threats are ever-evolving. Despite these complexities, any geostrategist would have to acknowledge contemporary Africa’s **positive features**. The continent has not seen a war between sovereign states since the late 19**90s**, when Eritrean and Ethiopian forces waged large-scale mechanized warfare along their (still) disputed border. Nor is Africa a venue for aggressively overreaching **hegemons**. None of its largest, strongest countries — Angola, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa and Tanzania — are locked into polarizing rivalries with each other, and **growing economic interdependencies** within and beyond their regions have tended, on balance, **to aid local stability**. This is all good news, but alas, it is only part of the story.

### Food Insecurity---1NC

#### No food wars

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

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

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

### Terrorism ---1NC

#### Terrorism isn’t existential.

**Walt 16** Stephen M. Walt, international relations professor at Harvard University. [My Top 5 Foreign-Policy Unicorns — and Why I Want to Kill Them, 9-8-2016, https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/08/my-top-5-foreign-policy-unicorns-and-why-i-want-to-kill-them/]//BPS

3. The terrorist mastermind. A close cousin to the nuclear rogue is the terrorist mastermind, busily concocting elaborate and highly destructive plots to bring the world to its knees. People like Osama bin Laden and Islamic State leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi have made extravagant and dire threats, but the good news is that they’ve never come close to toppling a foreign government, winning millions of followers, or threatening our way of life. I don’t deny that some terrorist groups have devised and executed successful assaults — of which the 9/11 attacks were by far the most damaging — but a word like “mastermind” conjures up images of Dr. Evil-style villains who will inevitably outwit our feeble efforts to stop them and unleash fearsome destruction on an innocent world. In fact, as John Mueller and others keep reminding us, the vast majority of contemporary terrorists are incompetent misfits, and even the very best of them fall well short of evil genius. They can and do stage small-scale attacks that cause modest amounts of harm, but they have repeatedly shown themselves to be incapable of orchestrating complicated operations that could actually bring a stable country to its knees. There have been serious terrorist attacks in Boston; London; Paris; Brussels; Orlando, Florida; and several other places in recent years, for example — yet in each case, these societies proved resilient, and they are thriving again today. Or just look at New York City, which suffered the worst single attack ever and has since fully recovered. Terrorism is a problem, the lives lost to it are an unfortunate tragedy, and those who employ it are dangerous criminals. A few terrorists are moderately clever; most are not. None rises to the level of a “mastermind,” and none poses an existential threat. Reporters, pundits, and speechwriters should drop this term from their lexicon, because this particular animal doesn’t exist. Fortunately.