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# Introduction:

Welcome to the “US Do It Alone” counterplan (CP) in this year’s evidence set. This file is not for debaters in their first rounds, but if you are attending your third or fourth tournament can be a fun addition to the packet. You’ll find all of the evidence you need to construct a winning argument on the CP against the AI or Cybersecurity affirmatives. This file also includes some affirmative answers to the counterplan.

This is an argument central to the topic. The basic idea behind this argument is that the Affirmative must prove that the United States and NATO should cooperate on the affirmative to be part of this year’s resolution. The negative can therefore agree with part of the idea of the plan (AI/Cybersecurity good) but disagree with another part of the plan (NATO cooperation is good) and win the debate round.

## Negative Introduction & Running the CP

When using this file as the negative there are few things to keep in mind. Counterplans are a strategy that argues that while the affirmative may solve a real problem, it does so in a way that either makes the problem worse and/or causes some other bigger problem. The negative will win if they win that they solve the problems as well as the affirmative while avoiding a bad impact. Like all debate arguments they have some predictable components.

First, counterplans, like plans, need a **text**. This will be the one or two sentence action that the negative will defend. That text will change depending on which affirmative you are debating so make sure you update it before every round.

Second, there is a 1NC shell that includes **solvency**. You must prove that you also solve the problems of the affirmative even though you don’t do the same action.

Finally a counterplan includes a **net benefit**. A net benefit is a disadvantage that the counterplan avoids and the plan calls. It is a reason to prefer the negative’s arguments instead of the affirmative’s arguments.

## Affirmative Introduction & Answering the CP

A CP argues that the affirmative may solve a real problem, but they do so in a way that causes other worse problems. As the affirmative, you should first always try to STOP the CP:

1. Solvency Deficit: Make an argument that the counterplan doesn’t solve as well as the affirmative. This can come from cards in the file. It may also be embedded in cards in your 1AC.
2. Theoretical Objections: Make an argument that there is a reason the counterplan should not exist.
3. Offense (against the net benefit): You will want to answer the net benefit like you would any disadvantage. Attack the link, uniqueness, and impact of the net benefit. For example, if you can win that the affirmative is better for the economy than the CP you will win.

Permutations: This argument means that the plan and the CP could exist at the same time while not triggering the net benefit. Some permutations are simple “Perm do both” others require evidence. For example, in this counterplan the counterplan excludes the NATO part of the plan, so the best permutation is perm do the affirmative and then the CP, which would argue that NATO is necessary to success on AI/Cybersecurity.

## ARGUMENT GLOSSARY

**Global cop (noun)** – an actor, typically a country or international organization, that equips itself with the self-employed task of policing global affairs through economic, diplomatic, or military intervention

**Innovation Economics** (noun) – a relatively new branch of economics that focuses on (rather predictably) innovation, alongside the study of technology, knowledge, and entrepreneurship

**Proton technology** (noun) – A branch of technology that uses radiation energy

**Bureaucrats** (noun) – an official in a government department, in particular one perceived as being concerned with procedural correctness at the expense of people's needs

**Regulatory capture** (noun) – a form of corruption where an entity in power that is supposed to serve the people instead serves a special interest group

**Market-first approach** (noun) – Advancing market image over quantity of sales

**Terabyte** (noun) – A measurement for large amounts of data

**Interoperability** (noun) – ability of a system (such as a weapons system) to work with or use the parts or equipment of another system

**The EU** (noun) – The European Union is a political and economic partnership between 27 countries, created after WWII. The EU promotes a common economic, social, and security leadership between its nations. Examples include a common currency between these nations, and the ability to travel within EU nations without needing to pass through customs again

**Permutation** (noun) – a way things can be arranged

**Private sector** (noun) – economic institutions owned by private groups, not under government control (i.e. companies, businesses, for-profit organizations)

**Disproportionately** (adverb) – in a way that is too large or too small in relation to something else

**Divergences** (noun) – disagreement; differences

**Codify** (verb) – to make something (laws, principles, etc.) into code

# U.S. DO IT ALONE CP

## PLAN TEXT

#### The United States Federal Government should “insert plan text excluding cooperation with NATO”

### 1NC

#### The U.S. alone carries most of the NATO burden

CATO Institute, December 5, 2019, https://www.cato.org/commentary/nato-no-longer-serves-american-interests

The alliance continued to add members. Most recently it accepted Montenegro, with North Macedonia awaiting treaty approval by the 29 current members. Next up, the Duchy of Grand Fenwick, featured in the novel The Mouse that Roared! The latest out‐​of‐​area wars have been distant, unconventional conflicts: Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria, of which the latter triggered French President Emmanuel Macron’s complaint about a lack of allied coordination. Some NATO fans call the organization a “global alliance,” presumably ready to act as global cop. In every case, of course, the heavy lifting inevitably falls on Washington. Every recent president criticized Europeans for failing to make sufficient contributions for the common defense. Defense Secretary Robert Gates suggested that the alliance itself was at risk, since “there will be dwindling appetite and patience in the U.S. Congress, and in the American body politic writ large, to expend increasingly precious funds on behalf of nations that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources … in their own defense.” President Trump expressed similar sentiments, though more crudely.

#### 2) The EU has high tech regulations- co-op with NATO would necessitate co-op with GDPR

Proton Technologies AG, 2022, https://gdpr.eu/what-is-gdpr/

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is the toughest privacy and security law in the world. Though it was drafted and passed by the European Union (EU), it imposes obligations onto organizations anywhere, so long as they target or collect data related to people in the EU. The regulation was put into effect on May 25, 2018. The GDPR will levy harsh fines against those who violate its privacy and security standards, with penalties reaching into the tens of millions of euros. With the GDPR, Europe is signaling its firm stance on data privacy and security at a time when more people are entrusting their personal data with cloud services and breaches are a daily occurrence. The regulation itself is large, far-reaching, and fairly light on specifics, making GDPR compliance a daunting prospect, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

#### 3) tech innovation help, broader economy

Brookings, October 19, 2011, https://www.brookings.edu/research/technology-and-the-innovation-economy/

Innovation and entrepreneurship are crucial for long-term economic development. Over the years, America’s well-being has been furthered by science and technology. Fears set off by the Soviet Union’s 1957 launch of its Sputnik satellite initiated a wave of U.S. investment in science, engineering, aerospace, and technology. Both public and private sector investment created jobs, built industries, fueled innovation, and propelled the U.S. to leadership in a number of different fields. In this paper, I focus on ways technology enables innovation and creates economic prosperity. I review the range of new advances in education, health care, and communications, and make policy recommendations designed to encourage an innovation economy. By adopting policies such as a permanent research and development tax credit, more effective university knowledge commercialization, improving STEM worker training, reasonable immigration reform, and regional economic clusters, we can build an innovation economy and sustain our long-term prosperity. Researchers have found a link between technology innovation and national economic prosperity. For example, a study of 120 nations between 1980 and 2006 undertaken by Christine Qiang estimated that each 10 percentage point increase in broadband penetration adds 1.3 percent to a high income country’s gross domestic product and 1.21 percent for low to middle-income nations.[i]

#### 4) Tech innovation is needed to stop econ collapse

Brenda Schmidt, September 16, 2020, Schmidt is the CEO of Coplex, a corporate startup studio that partners with entrepreneurs, industry experts, and corporate innovators to establish high-growth tech companies. She previously founded Solera Health and has spent her career educating, speaking, advising, and leading in the name of creating social impact. https://innovationmanagement.se/2020/09/16/how-the-next-wave-of-innovators-can-rebuild-the-economy-after-a-crisis/

During the last economic expansion, lean startups tapped into the potential of the internet for social networking and transformed the cell phone into a platform for apps that we now consider essential to our lives. Teenagers in dorm rooms and former corporate executives in startup incubators figured out how to move faster and build better than corporations with thousands of employees and seemingly endless resources. The companies they launched are now some of the world’s most powerful organizations. Will tomorrow’s disruptors follow the same formula? Don’t bet on it. Today, established corporations have more advantages over ventures — even if fundraising does pick up. The surge in stocks while small businesses floundered and VCs took a breather illustrates an important point about today’s economy: The resource inequality between America’s largest companies and potential disruptors is bigger than ever. Prior to the pandemic, leading organizations in nearly every industry raced to adopt digital infrastructures and new technologies. As a result, many have adapted quickly to the new normal — and some have even thrived. Throughout the summer, major tech companies have continued to hire, and only recently has employment in the sector begun to show signs of slowing. If you’re leading a company through the current crisis, now is the time to become more innovative and creative than ever. Regardless of how big your company or industry might be, winning in the next normal will require you to think bigger and move faster.

### CYBER SECURITY SOLVENCY

#### The U.S. should improve cyber security alone

MIT Technology Review, March 18, 2022, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/03/18/1047395/inside-the-plan-to-fix-americas-never-ending-cybersecurity-failures/>

The change in tack comes just as the war in Ukraine, and the heightened threat of new cyberattacks from Russia, is forcing the White House to rethink how it keeps the nation safe. “We're at an inflection point,” Chris Inglis, the White House’s national cyber director and Biden’s top advisor on cybersecurity, tells MIT Technology Review in his first interview since Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. “When critical functions that serve the needs of society are at issue, some things are just not discretionary.” The White House’s new cybersecurity strategy consists of stronger government oversight, rules mandating that organizations meet minimum cybersecurity standards, closer partnerships with the private sector, a move away from the current market-first approach, and enforcement to make sure any new rules are followed. It will take its cue from some of the nation’s most famous regulatory landmarks, such as the Clean Air Act or the formation of the Food and Drug Administration. With looming threats from Russian hackers, the FCC is planning for the prospect of Russians hijacking internet traffic, a tactic they’ve seen Moscow employ in the past. A new FCC initiative, announced March 11, aims to investigate if US telecom companies are doing enough to be secure against the threat. However, it’s a real test for the agency because it doesn't have the power to force companies to comply. They are relying on the possibility of a national security crisis to get them to toe the line. For many officials, this almost total reliance on the goodwill of the market to keep citizens safe cannot continue. "The purely voluntary approach [to cybersecurity] simply has not gotten us to where we need to be, despite decades of effort,” says Suzanne Spaulding, previously a senior Obama administration cybersecurity official. “Externalities have long justified regulation and mandates such as with pollution and highway safety." Crucially, the White House’s top officials concur. “I’m a strong fan of what Suzanne says and I agree with her,” says Inglis. Without a dramatic change, advocates argue, history will repeat itself.

#### High tech regulations are bad for innovation

Harvard Business Review, February 9, 2019, https://hbr.org/2018/02/how-more-regulation-for-u-s-tech-could-backfire

The best regulator of technology, it seems, is simply more technology. And despite fears that channels are blocked, markets are locked up, and gatekeepers have closed networks that the next generation of entrepreneurs need to reach their audience, somehow they do it anyway — often embarrassingly fast, whether the presumed tyrant being deposed is a long-time incumbent or last year’s startup darling. That, in any case, is the theory on which U.S. policymakers across the political spectrum have nurtured technology-based innovation since the founding of the Republic. Taking the long view, it’s clearly been a winning strategy, especially when compared to the more invasive, command-and-control approach taken by the European Union, which continues to lag on every measure of the Internet economy. (Europe’s strategy now seems to be little more than to hobble U.S. tech companies and hope for the best.) Or compared to China, which has built tech giants of its own, but only by limiting outside access to its singularly enormous local market. And always with the risk that too much success by Chinese entrepreneurs may one day crash headfirst into a political culture that is deeply uncomfortable with the internet’s openness. That solution — to stay the course, to continue leaving tech largely to its own correctives — is cold comfort to those who believe tomorrow’s problems, coming up fast in the rear-view mirror, are both unprecedented and catastrophic.

#### Government regulation of tech is bad

Forbes, March 26, 2018, https://www.forbes.com/sites/simonconstable/2018/03/26/no-we-really-dont-need-government-regulation-of-the-tech-industry/?sh=227500f6eb8d

In any event, in the case of tech, without doubt, the private sector will be far ahead of the bureaucrats. Expert regulators get hired by the regulated. If the regulators themselves were any good at what they do, then it is more than likely that they'd end up working for one of the regulated companies. Why? This happens because the private sector can and does pay far more than does the government for such expertise. The hiring companies can afford to pay fat salaries because the knowledge the former regulators bring allows the companies to run circles around the rules. Investopedia dubs the situation one of "gamekeeper turned poacher." The only caveat is that the poacher manages to give the gamekeeper the runaround while remaining within the rules of the law. In short, it makes the regulations impotent. It is part of a problem known as regulatory capture whereby the regulators listen far more to the companies/industry they are supposed to oversee rather than anyone else. For a more detailed outline of the matter see Investopedia. Regulatory capture, without doubt, can occur in the tech business just as much as it has elsewhere. Regulations help the largest companies the most. By no means least important, is the fact that government rules help to entrench the dominant companies more than they would be otherwise. Regulations, whether they be simple form-filling or more extensive, are costly to administer by the companies regulated. These costs tend to disproportionately fall on smaller firms which don't have the economies of scale associated with being a large corporation.

#### 5) Innovation key to cyber security

Nasdaq, October 2021, https://indexes.nasdaq.com/docs/Cybersecurity%20Innovation.pdf

As the world becomes more digitally connected, cybersecurity’s role in business, technology, and society has become mission critical. Simply put, the modern world is built on cybersecurity. Without it, capital cannot flow freely, information cannot be stored safely, and businesses, governments and critical infrastructure cannot operate securely. One major challenge in securing a world that relies on data and connectivity is that the rapid pace of technological change has created more vulnerabilities and opportunities for cyber threat actors, e.g.: nation states, groups, or cybercriminals, to exploit. As a result of these rapid technological advancements across several different technologies, businesses, organizations, and cybersecurity companies have been forced to embrace new, innovative technologies to make the world more secure. Since the world has become more digital, cybersecurity has also become a key element in the way businesses make decisions and innovate. For example, in a KPMG article, they stated that businesses and organizations have shifted from a paradigm of asking, “How do I mitigate and manage risk?” to “How do I leverage cyber security to give my business a competitive advantage?” 1 Said another way, cybersecurity is a key component of unlocking innovation.

#### 6) Innovation in Cybersecurity is imperative

Nasdaq, October 2021, https://indexes.nasdaq.com/docs/Cybersecurity%20Innovation.pdf

Today, innovation within the cybersecurity theme is just as critical as the cybersecurity itself. This is due in part to the rampant technological change taking place across both sides of the cybersecurity aisle – the businesses and organizations deploying cybersecurity to protect their data, networks, etc. and the threat actors who are looking to steal, destroy, and wreak havoc on those systems being protected. What’s happening though is that the threat actors are beginning to use more advanced methods and technologies, making it paramount for cybersecurity firms and cybersecurity technology to keep up with this change. How? Through innovation. According to the World Economic Forum in The Global Risk Report 2021, “Business, government, and household cybersecurity infrastructure and/or measures are outstripped or rendered obsolete by increasingly sophisticated and frequent cyber-crimes, resulting in economic disruption, financial loss, geopolitical tensions and/or social instability.” 8 Cybersecurity must innovate to keep up with the sophistication and frequency of cybercrimes.

### AI SOLVENCY

#### NATO can only set AI regulations IF all countries agree

Politico, Marc 29, 2021, https://www.politico.eu/article/nato-ai-artificial-intelligence-standards-priorities/

The problem is that NATO's members are at very different stages when it comes to thinking about AI in the military context.The U.S., the world's biggest military spender, has prioritized the use of AI in the defense realm. But in Europe, most countries — France and the Netherlands excepting — barely mention the technology’s defense and military implications in their national AI strategies. “It’s absolutely no surprise that the U.S. had a military AI strategy before it has a national AI strategy," but the Europeans "did it exactly the other way around," said Ulrike Franke, a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, said: That echoes familiar transatlantic differences — and previous U.S. President Donald Trump's complaints — over defense spending, but also highlights the different approaches to AI regulation more broadly.The EU's AI strategy takes a cautious line, touting itself as "human-centric," focused on taming corporate excesses and keeping citizens' data safe. The U.S., which tends to be light on regulation and keen on defense, sees things differently. There are also divergences over what technologies the alliance ought to develop, including lethal autonomous weapons systems — often dubbed “killer robots” — programmed to identify and destroy targets without human control. Powerful NATO members including France, the U.K., and the U.S. have developed these technologies and oppose a treaty on these weapons, while others like Belgium and Germany have expressed serious concerns about the technology.

#### The United States can manage AI alone

Brookings, May 17, 2022, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2022/05/17/the-u-s-can-improve-its-ai-governance-strategy-by-addressing-online-biases/

The United States has been working to codify the National Artificial Intelligence (AI) Initiative that focuses on six strategic pillars: improving AI innovation, advancing trustworthy AI, creating new education and training opportunities through AI, improving existing infrastructure through new technologies, facilitating federal and private sector utilization of AI to improve existing systems, and promoting an international environment that supports further advances in AI. In April 2022, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the National Institute on Standards (NIST) announced members of the inaugural National Artificial Intelligence Advisory Committee (NAIAC), which will be tasked with advising the Biden administration on how to proceed with national AI governance efforts. At their first meeting on May 4, 2022, the NAIAC discussed the use of AI pertaining to U.S. competitiveness, issues related to workforce, and whether there is adequate national oversight of AI systems. Taken together, the objectives of the national AI initiative and the creation of the NAIAC will ensure strategic and timely approaches to the design and deployment of autonomous systems, as well as further establish national norms.

#### 3) NATO is ill-equipped to handle AI development

Defense News, February 15, 2018, https://www.defensenews.com/smr/munich-security-forum/2018/02/16/ai-warfare-is-coming-and-some-global-leaders-say-nato-isnt-ready/

The future of warfare will involve artificial intelligence systems acting as lethal weapons, and much like cyber a decade ago, NATO allies are ill-equipped to manage the potential threat, said current and former European leaders speaking at the Munich Security Conference. Kersti Kaljulaid, president of Estonia, estimated a 50 percent chance that by the middle of this century we will have an AI system capable of launching a lethal attack. And yet, just as the world was not prepared for a cyberattack when Russia first launched a cyberattack against Estonia in 2007 — bombarding websites of Estonian parliament, banks, ministries, and news outlets — there is no strategy or international law to deter such tactics of warfare. First, “we need to understand the risks — what we’re afraid of,” said Kaljulaid,, pointing to three: someone using AI disruptively; intelligence going widespread; and AI depleting energy.

#### 4) Innovation key to AI

Science Direct, December 2021, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162521005138

Artificial intelligence (AI) is radically changing the process and outcomes of digital innovation owing to its specific nature and ontology (Benbya et al., 2021; Haefner et al., 2021; Kohli and Melville, 2019; Nambisan et al., 2019, 2017; Yoo et al., 2012). The nature of the changes triggered by AI is fundamentally different from those triggered by other traditional information technologies as it is developing new ways to collect and process vast amounts of information (Balasubramanian et al., 2020; Haefner et al., 2021). The increasing fluidity and complexity between digital innovation processes and outcomes leads to a significant new way of value creation and differentiation by the competitors (Nambisan et al., 2017; Yoo et al., 2012). This encourages a rethinking of how actors, organisations, AI, and action possibilities may pursue innovative endeavours. Prior studies suggest that AI can support and speed up labour-intensive information processes in Human Resource Management (HRM) (Leicht-Deobald et al., 2019), evaluate candidates with the same criteria consistently (Metcalf et al., 2019), make fairer and less biased decisions compared to human intuition (Cowgill, 2019), and promote diversity in organisations (Daugherty et al., 2019).

### PERM ANSWER

#### 1) A permutation would just be the AFF, and cause war

Michael Schmitt, February 24, 2022, Schmitt is Professor of International Law at the University of Reading in the United Kingdom; G. Norman Lieber Distinguished Scholar at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point; Strauss Center Distinguished Scholar and Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Texas; professor emeritus at the U.S. Naval War College; and Director of Legal Affairs for Cyber Law International. He serves on the Department of State’s Advisory Committee on International Law, is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, and is General Editor of The Lieber Studies (OUP). https://www.justsecurity.org/80347/expert-backgrounder-nato-response-options-to-potential-russia-cyber-attacks/

Over recent weeks, concern has been expressed that Russia might launch hostile cyber operations against the United States and other NATO members in parallel with a military campaign against Ukraine. That military campaign is now fully underway. This article examines how the feared Russian cyber operations would be characterized under international law and outlines the response options open to States targeted by them. The analysis is, among other things, a cautionary note to those who would too readily jump to describing such Russian operations as an “attack” that triggers the alliance’s collective self-defense mechanism. It is important to sort through the more likely scenarios of Russian-led activity below that threshold, as well as if that threshold is crossed. And it’s important to comprehend how the legal framework applies to Russian use of non-state actors to carry out such operations. All this and more in the analysis that follows.

#### 2)A “permutation” is the key next step to another world war

European Leadership Network, May 16, 2022, https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/collective-cyber-defence-and-attack-natos-article-5-after-the-ukraine-conflict/

Recent state activities demonstrate how cyberoperations can have physical consequences. In the summer of 2020, Iranian hacking of Israeli water treatment facilities came close to over-chloritizing the water, changing faucets into poison dispensers. More recently, in February 2022, in an attempt to cut communications within Ukraine, Russian cyberattacks on Viasat satellite networks disrupted German windmill electricity generation and distribution. Additionally, Russia has in the past—and continues in the current war as recently as April 2022—to target electrical power generation and distribution systems with cyber effects and to harm Ukrainian civilian and military infrastructure. As the above examples show, cyber attacks are not limited to online locations but their impact can be felt in the physical world. As a result, NATO must prepare for these activities to grow and expand. Following the shortcomings of the 2015 United Nations Group of Governmental Experts report on information and telecommunications in the context of national security, a lack of consensus continues to exist on the severity of cyberspace operations targeting critical infrastructure requiring collective and even national responses. Individual nations constructed individual criteria and response actions, utilising diplomacy, information, military, or economic action. They largely did so alone or in combination with other states. NATO, however, did not formulate a coherent analogous response and as a result, lacks publicly acknowledged policy addressing cyberspace activities that would constitute a necessary collective response under Article 5. In order for NATO to maintain its relevance in the present moment and sustain it through the coming years, this paradigm must change.

\**Currently, NATO does not have the group cooperation to in-act Article 5, but the AFF’s proposed solution would increase cooperation and finally help define the article and start a war.*

## AFF ANSWERS

### Solvency Deficit – Cyber Security Aff

#### 1) The United States needs NATO

Atlantic Council, July 5, 2018, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/here-s-why-the-united-states-needs-nato/

NATO is a force multiplier that gives the United States access to military tools in greater numbers than it can achieve by itself. Non-US NATO members have 1,857,000 active duty service members and 1,232,290 reservists. The seven largest non-US NATO member armies have the same number of active duty troops as the United States (1.3 million). Non-US NATO members can deploy 6,983 battle tanks, 34,000 armored vehicles, 2,600 combat aircraft, 382 attack helicopters, 252 major naval craft (including submarines), and 1,582 patrol and surface combatants. France and the United Kingdom alone provide 30 percent of the Alliance’s ballistic-missile-submarine fleet. NATO’s European members are beginning to host the first stages of the Alliance’s new ballistic-missile-defense system aimed at preventing long-range attacks by rogue states on the United States and Europe. NATO members frequently share intelligence across the Alliance, aiding US operations and intelligence-gathering. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany alone add 40,000 intelligence personnel to the Alliance’s intelligence capabilities. Non-US NATO members host twenty-eight US main operating bases in Europe, which cut down on the time needed for the United States to respond to a crisis and are critical for US missions in the Middle East and North Africa. In 2009, for example, Germany contributed $800 million to offset and improve its US bases.

#### 2) The US promised to work with NATO on cyber security

Council on Foreign Relations, October 10, 2018, https://www.cfr.org/blog/sharing-caring-united-states-new-cyber-commitment-nato

Given the recent blockbuster headlines about alleged Chinese snooping on server hardware sold to major technology companies and the latest joint-denunciation of Russian cyber operations, you could be forgiven for having missed an important NATO-related development. The Associated Press reports that the U.S. Defense Department will announce a new commitment to use offensive and defensive cybersecurity capabilities on behalf of NATO allies. The new commitment is notable given how cybersecurity has long been treated as an exceptional domain of operations, and cyber capabilities reserved as strategic national assets to be shared with only the closest of allies. With this announcement, the Pentagon is suggesting that cyber capabilities might be used alongside conventional weapons with allies and indeed, equal weight appears to be given to offensive and defensive operations. Perhaps most significantly, the announcement moves NATO partners closer to what has been a tight coterie of U.S.-favored signals intelligence partners such as the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, and Canada. The DoD announcement is a sign of the continued, if nascent, normalization of cybersecurity under the current administration and in Europe. Even where offensive cyber operations may not rise to the level of war, they provide decision-makers with options to influence the geopolitical environment. This aligns with recent trends in the U.S. military to integrate cyber capabilities into maneuver units and large exercises, and reflects the shift towards more risk acceptant and offensive measures to counter cyberattacks found in the 2018 DoD Cyber Strategy.

### Solvency Deficit- AI AFF

#### 1) The United States needs NATO in AI

NATO Review, October 25, 2021, <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/10/25/an-artificial-intelligence-strategy-for-nato/index.html>

With the formal adoption of the NATO AI Strategy, Allies have committed to the necessary cooperation and collaboration to meet these very challenges in both defence and security, naming NATO as the primary transatlantic forum. The aim of NATO’s AI Strategy is to accelerate AI adoption by enhancing key AI enablers and adapting policy, including by adopting Principles of Responsible Use for AI and by safeguarding against threats from malicious use of AI by state and non-state actors. By acting collectively through NATO, Allied governments also ensure a continued focus on interoperability and the development of common standards. Overall, with innovation ecosystems implicating different actors and faster technology lifecycles than typically included in traditional capability development systems, the NATO AI Strategy is also a recognition that exploitation of AI will require new efforts to foster and leverage the Alliance’s innovation potential, including through new partnerships and mechanisms. Taken together, these efforts will in turn strengthen the Alliance’s ability to pursue cooperative security efforts and to engage with international partners and other international organisations on matters of international security.

#### 2) The United States is in an AI race with China

James Ryseff, October 9, 2020, He leverages his prior experience as a software engineer at Microsoft, Google, and other companies in the private sector to apply his technical skills to public policy problems. His work focuses how technologies and practices such as Artificial Intelligence, Cloud Computing, cybersecurity, agile software methodologies, and large-scale data analysis impact policy problems. https://warontherocks.com/2020/10/the-united-states-can-only-achieve-ai-dominance-with-its-allies/

As the United States races with China to apply artificial intelligence for military purposes, many experts worry that it may be hampered by a shift in the nature of AI. The conventional wisdom has been that, until now, American technologists could depend on elite researchers and faster computers to outperform their Chinese rivals. However, these advantages are no longer the keys to harnessing AI most effectively. Data is. Chinese AI experts believe that China’s larger population and lax privacy controls give China a durable advantage in collecting the best data sets to teach AI algorithms how to optimize their performance. Kai-Fu Lee, China’s most prominent AI researcher, has dubbed China the “Saudi Arabia of data” and argues that China’s data advantage is expanding by the day. The Center for Data Innovation, an American think tank, agrees, calculating that the Chinese population generates terabytes more information than Americans do.

#### 3) The United States can only dominate AI with NATO

James Ryseff, October 9, 2020, He leverages his prior experience as a software engineer at Microsoft, Google, and other companies in the private sector to apply his technical skills to public policy problems. His work focuses how technologies and practices such as Artificial Intelligence, Cloud Computing, cybersecurity, agile software methodologies, and large-scale data analysis impact policy problems. https://warontherocks.com/2020/10/the-united-states-can-only-achieve-ai-dominance-with-its-allies/

The success of American technology companies illustrates the most promising path for the U.S. military to pursue at the dawn of its own AI age. That does not mean that the Department of Defense should simply copy Silicon Valley’s strategy mindlessly. While data from the commercial sector — such as an individual’s social connections, current employer, or personal finances — will continue to be a gold mine for global intelligence agencies, data relevant to the future battlefield will primarily concern soldiers, vehicles, training exercises, and the like. No organization will have more relevant data for these use cases than the military itself. Fortunately, the Defense Department has positioned itself well to become the globally dominant platform for military data, just as American technology companies dominate the global marketplace in their realms. The United States counts most industrialized nations as military allies and equipment manufactured by the United States or its NATO allies is driven and flown around the world. However, the Defense Department has yet to capitalize on this potential. NATO weapons and vehicles were originally designed to be interoperable in an industrial-age sense, shooting the same bullets or refueling from the same connectors. Unfortunately, NATO has not yet upgraded for the information age. The data generated by U.S. Army tanks cannot easily be accessed or aggregated with data generated by Marine Corps tanks, let alone British ones. Just as the Goldwater-Nichols Act once pushed America’s separate armed services to break out of their isolated battlefield domains, military data must now discover how to operate jointly as well. Three initiatives could be critical to accomplishing this.