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# CyberSecurity NEG

The goal of the negative is simple: Negate the plan of action presented by the affirmative, explain why the affirmative is a bad idea, and present new arguments which serve as reasons why the affirmative will make the status quo WORSE. If the judge believes the plan will not work or make the status quo worse, then neg wins

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Speech Time | (Minutes) |
| 1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC) | 8 |
| 2nd Negative Speaker Questions 1st Affirmative Speaker | 3 |
| 1st Negative Constructive (1NC) | 8 |
| 1st Affirmative Speaker Questions 1stNegative Speaker | 3 |
| 2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC) | 8 |
| 1st Negative Speaker Questions 2nd Affirmative Speaker | 3 |
| 2nd Negative Constructive (2NC) | 8 |
| 2nd Affirmative Speaker Questions 2nd Negative Speaker | 3 |
| 1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR) | 5 |
| 1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) | 5 |
| 2nd Negative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2NR) | 5 |
| 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2AR) | 5 |

**Speaking Roles on the Negative:**

* **1st Negative Speaker:** Your job is to introduce a range of negative arguments in the 1NC, and to definitively win at least one of those arguments in the 1NR.
* **2nd Negative Speaker:** Your job is to expand upon one or two arguments made in the 1NC, then to choose the best argument made by the negative team and show why the negative should win the debate in the 2NR. You are in charge of choosing negative strategy, since you’ll have to explain it in the 2NR

**Phases of a Debate:**

1. **1NC:** Outline a few different reasons why the affirmative is a bad idea, without going into too much detail on any one of them.
2. **2NC/1NR:** Think of these as a single speech, given by different people. Each debater should choose one or two (different) arguments from the 1NC and go into greater detail, explaining and adding evidence when needed.
3. **2NR:** The second negative speaker should give a closing argument all about the strongest negative position (after hearing the affirmative speak in the 1AR). Tell the judge why the negative team should win.

Each negative case will have four main parts. You’ll have to win each piece in order to win a debate as the negative.

* **Solvency:** How will the plan work? Will the affirmative solve what it is they are attempting to solve with their advantages? Will there be a different consequence if the affirmative is passed? In the context of the Cybersecurity negative file, will cooperation with NATO truly solve diplomatic issues with Russia, low voter turnout, and social media misinformation? Will this trigger conflict with other nations?
* **Case impacts/defense:** These are arguments saying the impacts the affirmative claims to solve are not correct.
* **Case turns:** These arguments are negative consequences if the affirmative were to pass. In this instance, will US cooperation with NATO, in turn, somehow worsen international relations with Russia war?
* **Impact Framing:** These arguments answer the moral obligation claims the affirmative makes. How long will it take for the affirmative impacts to be solved? How many people does the affirmative claim to aid? How probable are the affirmative impacts?

You and your partner will have a chance to support your arguments and read more evidence in the block (13-minute stretch of neg speeches, i.e. 2NC + 1NR).

**Topic Introduction:**

The cybersecurity affirmative offers that we increase cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in cybersecurity. Currently the United States is a member of NATO, but has not made any efforts to include them in U.S. cybersecurity efforts or tried to join theirs. The United States is one of the strongest nations in cyber space but is not the most protected. With the growing cyber-attacks from Russia, growing distrust in US political processes, and spread of misinformation on social media platforms, the U.S. needs to increase their security methods via cooperation with NATO. NATO is working on a new program for cyber protection and the U.S. should incorporate that in their own defenses.

The Biden Administration has made cybersecurity one of their top goals for the United States, and the AFF argues that working with NATO would fulfill that goal. This file contains the arguments to negate these claims.

## Argument Glossary

**Cooperative security** (noun) - States working together to solve common problems

**NATO Industry Cyber Partnership** (noun)- A partnership between NATO alliance members to defend against cyber-attacks.

**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.

**Espionage** (noun)- Spying as a political or military strategy

**Traditional Military Deterrence** (noun)- A military strategy where one entity threatens the other with retalitation should they attack.

**International law** (noun)- International law consists of rules and principles governing the relations and dealings of nations with each other, as well as the relations between states and individuals, and relations between international organizations.

**NATO Strategic Concept document** (noun)- The Strategic Concept is a key document for the Alliance. It reaffirms NATO’s values and purpose, and provides a collective assessment of the security environment. It also drives NATO’s strategic adaptation and guides its future political and military development.

**Hypersonic Weapons** (noun)- Fast and low-flying missiles and projectiles which are too advanced to be detected by traditional missile defense systems.

**Quantum Computing** (noun)- An advanced emerging technology which would essentially make impossible problems solvable with data set algorithms, which would enable drastic progression in many fields.

**Voter intimidation** (noun)- Harassment at voting polls in attempt to scare individuals away from voting, usually towards POC or non-English speakers.

**Article 5** (noun)- This is what causes allyship between NATO members; when article 5 is invoked, if a member of NATO is victim of an, every other member will side with the victim and assist them.

**U.S. National Strategy for Global Supply Chain Security** (noun)- A strategy enacted by the Department of Homeland Security with the goals of efficient and secure moment of goods, and fostering a global supply chain system that is resilient against disruptions.

**Digital Colonialism** (noun)- Using technology for political, economic, or social domination of a targeted nation.

**CCDCOE** (noun)- The NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Centre of Excellence is a research center meant to aid NATO alliance members in cyber defense, technology, operations, strategy, and law.

**ICT** (noun)- Information and Communications Technology

## Strategic Overview

The negative version of this file has a few different avenues to take, pending the way the affirmative is constructed in the round. Every advantage is formulated so you can read every card in that section. A lot of the evidence is centered around the lack of consequences left by cyberattacks, the ongoing efforts by private companies to strengthen cybersecurity in the status quo, and alternative causes to impacts the affirmative claims to solve. Breakdown below:

#### COVID-19 Advantage

* 1. This is a very short advantage with a defensive response. The affirmative claims the “work-from-home” culture has increased since the start of the pandemic and, thus, exacerbates the need for stronger cybersecurity.
  2. The negative argues that hackers have cost private companies millions of dollars which has already forced their hand to improve their cybersecurity (Tulane University 22)
     1. This is in direct response to the affirmative’s Meiger 22 evidence

#### Russia Advantage

* 1. The affirmative claims having a strong cybersecurity front will prevent escalation to war between the US and Russia
  2. The negative argues that the consequences of cyberattacks are greatly exaggerated and will not trigger an act of war (Blessing 4/25)
     1. This is a direct response to the affirmative’s second Meiger 22 evidence
  3. In addition, the negative presents the argument that if we treat every cyberattack as an act of war, it delegitimizes efforts against acts of violence all over the globe

#### Civic Engagement Advantage

* 1. The affirmative claims hackers and cyber threats have compromised the integrity of democracy and the election process. This results in election mistrust and low voter turnout, particularly for people of color.
  2. The negative makes 2 important arguments on this advantage
     1. First, voter turnout for people of color is actually INCREASING since the 2016 election (Frey 3/9). This is a direct response to the affirmative’s American Bar Association 20 evidence
     2. Second, the negative claims voter turnout is fueled by changing demographics in the US, and not by perception of the election process (Frey 3/9)

#### Social Media Misinformation Advantage

* 1. The affirmative’s story on this advantage is most Americans get their news from social media platforms, most of which are comprised by fake/unreliable news planted by hackers via cyber attacks
  2. The negative argues there is an alternative cause to fake news, and that’s the lack of regulation and fact checking on the social media platforms’ behalf
  3. In addition, the negative claims social media algorithms promote whatever has the most outrage, regardless of reliability/accuracy (Stewart 20)
     1. These arguments will directly clash with the affirmative’s Greenburg 20 evidence by presenting alternative factors which will prevent the affirmative from making any substantial/successful improvement

## 1NC Shell

### Inherency

#### Russian cyberattacks forces US to advance cybersecurity

**Baldor, 18 --** Baldor, L. C. (2018, October 3). *US to offer cyberwar capabilities to NATO allies*. AP NEWS. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://apnews.com/article/north-america-russia-ap-top-news-international-news-asia-pacific-292c4d08912c4e3f8ae29973e0ecfbbc

Acting to counter Russia’s aggressive use of cyberattacks across Europe and around the world, the U.S. is expected to announce that, if asked, it will use its formidable cyberwarfare capabilities on NATO’s behalf, according to a senior U.S. official. The announcement is expected in the coming days as U.S. Defense Secretary Jim Mattis attends a meeting of NATO defense ministers on Wednesday and Thursday. Katie Wheelbarger, the principal deputy assistant defense secretary for international security affairs, said the U.S. is committing to use offensive and defensive cyber operations for NATO allies, but America will maintain control over its own personnel and capabilities. The decision comes on the heels of the NATO summit in July, when members agreed to allow the alliance to use cyber capabilities that are provided voluntarily by allies to protect networks and respond to cyberattacks. It reflects growing concerns by the U.S. and its allies over Moscow’s use of cyber operations to influence elections in America and elsewhere. “Russia is constantly pushing its cyber and information operations,” said Wheelbarger, adding that this is a way for the U.S. to show its continued commitment to NATO. NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg told reporters on Wednesday that the inclusion of offensive cyber operations in alliance missions “is just one of many elements in our strengthened NATO cyber defenses.” And he said that it’s important to have cyber capabilities that can be used against the Islamic State group to destroy the networks they use for recruiting, financing and communicating. He said that the British and Denmark have also agreed to make cyber contributions to NATO and he expects other allies will follow. “We have seen an increasing number of cyber-attacks. They are more frequent, they are more sophisticated,” Stoltenberg said. “We see cyber being used to meddle in domestic political processes, attacks against critical infrastructure. Cyber will be an integral part of any future military conflict.” Wheelbarger told reporters traveling to NATO with Mattis that the move is a signal to other nations that NATO is prepared to counter cyberattacks waged against the alliance or its members. Much like America’s nuclear capabilities, the formal declaration of cyber support can help serve as a military deterrent to other nations and adversaries. The U.S. has, for some time, considered cyber as a warfighting domain, much like air, sea, space and ground operations. In recent weeks the Pentagon released a new cybersecurity strategy that maps out a more aggressive use of military cyber capabilities.

#### US already increasing efforts and cooperation with NATO on cybersecurity

**Baldor, 18 --** Baldor, L. C. (2018, October 3). *US to offer cyberwar capabilities to NATO allies*. AP NEWS. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://apnews.com/article/north-america-russia-ap-top-news-international-news-asia-pacific-292c4d08912c4e3f8ae29973e0ecfbbc

And it specifically calls out Russia and China for their use of cyberattacks. China, it said, has been “persistently” stealing data from the public and private sector to gain an economic advantage. And it said Russia has use cyber information operations to “influence our population and challenge our diplomatic processes.” U.S. officials have repeatedly accused Moscow of interfering in the 2016 elections, including through online social media. “**We will conduct cyberspace operations to collect intelligence and prepare military cyber capabilities to be used in the event of a crisis or conflict**,” the new strategy states, adding that the U.S. is prepared to use cyberwarfare along with other military weapons against its enemies when needed, including to counter malicious cyber activities targeting the country. The document adds that the Pentagon will “work to strengthen the capacity” of allies and partners. NATO has moved cautiously on offensive cyber capabilities. At the Warsaw Summit in 2016, allies recognized cyberspace as a warfighting domain. It has said that a computer-based attack on an ally would trigger NATO’s commitment to defend its members. And last year the alliance agreed to create a new cyber operations center. But the focus has always been on defending NATO networks and those of its members, not offensive cyberwar. NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg said on Tuesday that the defense ministers will have a working session this week to address cyber and other risks, and how allies can cooperate to counter such threats. He did not provide details.

## AT: COVID-19

#### Data breaches cost companies millions – they are already expanding cybersecurity and include those who work from home

**Tulane University, 22 --** Tulane University. (2022). *Four Reasons the Cybersecurity Field is Rapidly Growing*. Tulane University: School of Professional Advancement. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://sopa.tulane.edu/blog/four-reasons-cybersecurity-field-rapidly-growing

In recent years, many high-profile data breach cases have made headlines. Companies like Yahoo!, Uber, and Target faced security threats that exposed possibly millions of Americans' private information like usernames, passwords, and credit card numbers. As hackers and cybercriminals develop new ways to access sensitive systems and information, even the largest companies in the world must stay vigilant about security vulnerabilities. Information security analysts, or cybersecurity specialists, are more in demand than ever, and here’s why. Hackers Are Getting Smarter Hackers find new ways to access data every day. The role of an information security analyst is to identify security risks before hackers do. They then develop and implement new preventative security controls for defending against cyberattacks. As hackers’ skills become more sophisticated, a growing number of cybersecurity specialists are needed to develop and implement advanced security solutions. Earn Your Master in Cybersecurity Management<https://sopa.tulane.edu/blog/four-reasons-cybersecurity-field-rapidly-growing> Cybercrime Is Expensive One reason the cybersecurity field is growing is that most businesses simply can’t afford a data breach. According to IBM, data breaches cost businesses an average of $3.62 million—a number that can put many companies out of business. The number of data breaches and the cost of cybercrime worldwide have also rapidly increased: the total cost by 2021 is expected to be double that of 2015. When a company’s future is on the line, it can’t afford to not hire the best information security analysts to defend its information. Everything Is Automated As companies’ processes become automated, more of their infrastructure is rooted in technology. Every automated system is created by code that can be accessed when cybercriminals break in. Thus, the more processes that are done digitally, the more opportunities hackers get to steal private information. This is bad news for businesses, but good news for [Cybersecurity Management](https://sopa.tulane.edu/degrees-programs/masters-degrees/master-professional-studies-cybersecurity-management) graduates who find an increasing demand for their skills. Vulnerabilities Are Everywhere Hackers aren’t just targeting computers, websites, and servers; any technology based in code offers an opportunity in. From airplane systems and car alarms to power grids and security systems, more products and systems than ever before are at risk for takeover by cybercrooks. Businesses need the best online security professionals to identify and mitigate security threats for every technological innovation. Career Outlook for Cybersecurity Professionals These are just a few reasons the cybersecurity field is experiencing such rapid growth. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts a 28% increase in the demand for information security analysts between 2016 and 2026—that's an increase of 28,500 jobs. With demand for cybersecurity professionals at an [all-time high](https://sopa.tulane.edu/blog/cybersecurity-demand-all-time-high/), positions are available in virtually every industry. The pay isn't shabby either: the median salary was over $98,000 in 2018, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

## AT: Russia

#### Cyberattacks are rarely acts of war – considering them as such undermines NATO’s efforts to deal with legitimate acts of violence

**Blessing, 4/25** -- Blessing, J. (2022, April 25). *The Russian cyber threat is here to stay and NATO needs to understand it*. AEI. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://www.aei.org/op-eds/the-russian-cyber-threat-is-here-to-stay-and-nato-needs-to-understand-it/

Since the Russian invasion of [Ukraine](https://www.foxnews.com/category/world/conflicts/ukraine), the Biden administration has escalated warnings about likely Russian cyber-attacks on American infrastructure and business. More worrying still, cyber alarmists like Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Mark Warner, D-Va., have suggested that cyber-attacks from the Kremlin could be acts of war that trigger NATO’s collective defense. This sky-is-falling delusion, particularly from leaders with access to [classified intelligence](https://www.foxnews.com/category/tech/topics/cia), is at best counterproductive and at worst dangerous. Cyber-attacks are rarely acts of war, and treating them as if they are undermines [NATO](https://www.foxnews.com/category/world/world-regions/europe)’s ability to deal with real threats short of cyber war. NATO has only invoked Article 5 – which triggers a collective response – once and that was after the 9/11 attacks. Cyber-attacks are unlikely to destroy buildings and kill thousands in an instant. While collective defense extends to cyberspace, few operations could realistically be a cause for war. This would include cyber-attacks resulting in death or damage like traditional military operations or coordinated assaults that take the power grid or entire economic sectors offline. These scenarios are unlikely though: such attacks require far too much time, funding, manpower, and control. Instead, most attacks temporarily overwhelm servers with traffic, deny network access, hold computers hostage, and steal or delete data. Even if allies wanted to trigger Article 5 over cyber operations, disagreements about the definitions of threats, origins of attacks, and pain thresholds in cyberspace can derail the process. Collective retaliation requires a unanimous vote across NATO; building unity across these points is nearly impossible for most cyber activity. Unlike missile attacks or tanks in the streets, few “red lines” exist to distinguish cybercrime, cyber espionage, and cyber disruption from digital acts of war. Beyond the bureaucratic and logistical limitations of elevating cyber to a casus belli, focusing on cyber-attacks as acts of war distracts from the more likely Russian digital assaults below the level of armed conflict. These include ransomware attacks and supply chain infiltrations that look like criminal activity or espionage. The Kremlin is particularly adept at the latter. In the SolarWinds compromise, Russia hacked one company’s software product to access networks of Fortune 500 companies and U.S. government agencies.

#### Cyberattacks will not warrant and Article 5 response – NATO must build cyber resilience rather than preparing for “cyber doomsday”

**Blessing, 4/25** -- Blessing, J. (2022, April 25). *The Russian cyber threat is here to stay and NATO needs to understand it*. AEI. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://www.aei.org/op-eds/the-russian-cyber-threat-is-here-to-stay-and-nato-needs-to-understand-it/

Spillover from operations in Ukraine poses an additional risk. The Russians have already deployed several digital tools to destroy computer data, resulting in corrupted computers for Ukrainian companies with government support roles. The same malicious software has also affected several Latvian and Lithuanian businesses. The danger is another situation like NotPetya in 2017, where malware self-replicated, spread past Ukrainian targets to cripple networks in over 150 countries, and created $10 billion in damages. Each of these scenarios are much more likely than a “cyber doomsday” that would justify an Article 5 response from NATO members. To be fair, policymakers’ fears of cyber war have led to some positive developments for the alliance. For instance, over the last several years, NATO has developed its own framework for combining cyber and conventional military capabilities in warfighting. But allies remain unprepared to deal with “death by 1000 cuts” in cyberspace. Concentrating only on acts of war comes at the expense of addressing the cumulative costs of low-level cyber threats over time. It leads to an overreliance on cyber deterrence or defensive whack-a-mole strategies, neither of which are sustainable. Threats of retaliation simply don’t deter most cyber-attacks, and it is unrealistic for defensive measures to stop every hacker. Policymakers across NATO must acknowledge that security failures are the norm in cyberspace, and that the compounding costs of failure over time are every bit as dangerous as the threat of cyber war. Building cyber resilience is an important step forward. It acknowledges that, in many cases, the Russians will get the best of us in cyberspace. The focus is on controlling failures to limit damage and quickly get networks back online. Moving from buzzword to actual strategy requires addressing several questions. Which digital assets are most significant? Where is the alliance most exposed to Russian cyber-attacks? Where should NATO reduce operating risks, and in what areas can it assume more? How can allies track long-term trends and adapt to new technologies? The Russian cyber threat is here to stay. Collective defense is – and should remain – the cornerstone of NATO. But time is running out for the alliance to protect itself from scenarios that aren’t all-out cyber war.

## AT: Civic Engagement

#### POC voter turnout increasing now, 2020 election proves

**Frey, 3/9 --** Frey, W. H. (2022, March 9). *Turnout in 2020 election spiked among both Democratic and Republican voting groups, New Census Data shows*. Brookings. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://www.brookings.edu/research/turnout-in-2020-spiked-among-both-democratic-and-republican-voting-groups-new-census-data-shows/

Voter turnout in the 2020 election was exceptionally high, with [66.8% of eligible voters](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/04/record-high-turnout-in-2020-general-election.html) casting ballots, resulting in a victory for Joe Biden. In response, some Republican-controlled state legislatures have enacted measures that would have the effect of [restricting voting](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2021/04/19/georgias-voter-suppression-bill-is-an-assault-on-our-democracy/) in future elections among groups that often vote Democratic. However, recently released results from the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey [voting supplement](https://www.census.gov/topics/public-sector/voting/data/tables.html) indicate that 2020’s **voting spike occurred across both Democratic-leaning demographic groups and Republican-leaning ones**. In particular, there was a noticeable increase in voting among white adults who did not graduate from college (the so-called “non-college white” group). The results from the Census Bureau survey provide information that was not available earlier: estimates of voter turnout for key demographic groups, both nationally and for states. The analysis below reveals how different groups’ voter turnout shifted in 2020 from 2016 and earlier elections, and what that might mean for shifts in the demographic makeup of the voter population. The Census Bureau’s estimates confirm the general perception that 2020 voter turnout was very high, at 66.8%. This was the biggest turnout in a presidential election since 1992 (67.7%) and more than 5 points higher than the 2016 election. Turnout showed distinct increases from 2016 among **Asian American, Latino or Hispanic**, and non-college white voters. Each displayed 2016-to-2020 turnout increases that exceeded 6 points or greater. The non-college white rise in turnout is especially significant, as this group is linked to voting Republican in presidential elections, including in [2020](https://www.census.gov/topics/public-sector/voting/data/tables.html). This group’s 2020 turnout rate of 64% was its highest since at least 2000, and served to close the gap between their turnout and the traditionally higher turnout of their less Republican-leaning college graduate counterparts (which rose by just 3 points, from 79% to 82%). This rise occurred among both non-college white men and women (Download Table A). The non-college white turnout spike helped to increase the overall white turnout in 2020 (from 65% to 71%), elevating the overall white turnout level, which continues to exceed other race and ethnic groups. Yet increased turnout was also evident for Asian American voters (a 10-point increase) and Latino and Hispanic voters (a 6-point increase). Black voters also showed a turnout spurt from their [dip in the 2016 election](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2017/05/18/census-shows-pervasive-decline-in-2016-minority-voter-turnout/). While 2020’s Black turnout—at 63%—still exceeded that of Latino or Hispanic or Asian American voters, it remains below the rate of the two elections won by Barack Obama in 2008 and 2012 ([Download Table A](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210504_Metro_2020-Turnout-Table-A.xlsx)). Consistent with much of the recent past, older adults voted at higher rates in 2020 than their younger counterparts. However, younger age groups showed the greatest turnout increase in that election, rising by 8 points for those aged 18 to 29. In total, over half of these young adults turned out to vote. Even more remarkable is the rise in turnout of the youngest of this group: those aged 18 to 24, who are now mostly members of “Gen Z.” This group was especially notable in 2020, as they comprised a large part of the summer’s political and racial justice protests, leading analysts to [speculate](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2020/07/30/now-more-than-half-of-americans-are-millennials-or-younger/) if this activism would translate into voter turnout. The answer to this question, based on the new census statistics, is a resounding “yes.”

#### Racial makeup of the population fuels voter turnout, not mistrust

**Frey, 3/9 --** Frey, W. H. (2022, March 9). *Turnout in 2020 election spiked among both Democratic and Republican voting groups, New Census Data shows*. Brookings. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://www.brookings.edu/research/turnout-in-2020-spiked-among-both-democratic-and-republican-voting-groups-new-census-data-shows/

These young adult voters cast ballots at higher rates in 2020 than in any election so far this century, with turnout at more than half for Gen Z Asian American and white voters, nearly half for Gen Z Black voters, and more than two-fifths for Gen Z Latino or Hispanic voters. The impact of this voting bloc—which [leaned heavily Democratic](https://www.cnn.com/election/2020/exit-polls/president/national-results) in the most recent election—was influential in many close 2020 swing states. The voter population for presidential elections continues to change in its demographic makeup. This relates both to turnout and to the changing shifts in the nation’s overall population. Because of the [rising growth rates](https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-census-data-shows-the-nation-is-diversifying-even-faster-than-predicted/) of nonwhite race and ethnic groups nationally and the [increased educational attainment](https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2020/demo/educational-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html) of younger voters, the share of all voters identifying as “non-college white” continues to shrink. Thus, for the first time in a presidential election, white voters without college degrees comprised less than two-fifths of the voter population.These changes look quite different from 2004, when non-college white voters comprised more than half of the voter population and nonwhite minorities comprised only one-fifth. Since then, the former’s share dropped to 39.7%; the share of white college-educated voters increased modestly, from 27.7% to 31.3%.; and the share of nonwhite voters rose to 29%, almost equaling that of white college graduates. The shift in the race-ethnic makeup of the population—especially the younger population—is evident when looking at voters in the past five presidential elections. During this period, younger generations of voting-age citizens have become more racially diverse. In 2020, for the first time, at least 10% of the total voter population identified as Latino or Hispanic, as did 15% of voters below age 40. The white share of the under-age-40 voter population declined by 10 points from 2004 to 2020, to 64% ([Download Table B](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210504_Metro_2020-Turnout-Table-B.xlsx)). National turnout shifts between 2016 and 2020 were broadly evident across individual states. Turnout rose in 44 states as well as Washington, D.C. ([Download Table C](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210504_Metro_2020-Turnout-Table-C.xlsx)). Among the states with double-digit turnout gains was the swing state of Arizona, where turnout rose from 60% to 72%. New Jersey increased turnout from 61% to 78%, giving it the highest 2020 turnout rate of all states. Similarly, all but nine states showed turnout gains for their 18- to 29-year-old populations Most notable are turnout shifts among white non-college and white college graduate populations. Only six states registered 2016-to-2020 turnout drops for non-college white voters, whereas 15 states showed such drops for white college graduates. In all but 11 states, turnout gains were greater for non-college white voters than for college-educated white voters. And particularly relevant for the 2020 election, both Michigan and Wisconsin registered turnout gains for non-college white voters and declines for college-educated white voters. Given the importance of the state outcomes in the Electoral College, it is useful to study turnout patterns in swing or near-swing states from the 2020 presidential election ([Download Table D](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210504_Metro_2020-Turnout-Table-D.xlsx)). Three such states in the rapidly growth South and West regions are Georgia, Arizona, and Texas. The former two gave Biden a razor-thin win over Donald Trump; the latter, which Trump won, showed a smaller Republican margin than in recent elections. In all three states, turnout was highest for white college graduates, and lowest for nonwhite voters.

#### The turnout trend for young voters, particularly people of color has been increasing since the 2016 election

**Frey, 3/9 --** Frey, W. H. (2022, March 9). *Turnout in 2020 election spiked among both Democratic and Republican voting groups, New Census Data shows*. Brookings. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://www.brookings.edu/research/turnout-in-2020-spiked-among-both-democratic-and-republican-voting-groups-new-census-data-shows/

Yet in each case, 2016-to-2020 turnout increases were greater for non-college white voters than for white college graduates. Each state also exhibited sizeable gains in their nonwhite turnout rates, which countered the Republican-leaning impact of the non-college white turnout increase. This was especially the case for the large Latino or Hispanic populations in Arizona and Texas, and modestly for the Black population in Georgia. It is the case that the white non-college bloc voted [somewhat less Republican](https://www.brookings.edu/research/2020-exit-polls-show-a-scrambling-of-democrats-and-republicans-traditional-bases/) in each of these states in 2020 than in 2016. However, it appears that the rise in white non-college turnout helped to make the races in Georgia and Arizona close, and in Texas, kept the Republican margins from shrinking further. Among northern states in 2020, the three closest presidential vote totals were in Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin—each of which went for Trump in 2016 and Biden in 2020. These generally “whiter” states show similar shifts in turnout between 2016 and 2020. Of the three, Pennsylvania exhibited the greatest overall rise in turnout, but it was most accentuated for the state’s non-college white voters. As mentioned earlier, both Michigan and Wisconsin showed turnout declines for their college-educated white populations, although each registered turnout gains among their nonwhite populations. The rise in turnout among non-college white voters in these states were perhaps even more instrumental in keeping their 2020 elections close than in the more racially diverse states discussed earlier. Of course, these rises were countered by the rising turnout of strongly Democratic-leaning Black populations, especially in Pennsylvania and Michigan. Despite the rise in turnout among generally Republican-leaning white non-college voters, it is important to note this group’s decreasing share of all voters in both Sun Belt and Snow Belt battlegrounds. This is evident in the highly diverse states of Georgia, Arizona, and Texas, where the nonwhite share of voters rose considerably between 2004 and 2020. In Arizona, especially, white non-college adults dipped from over half of all voters in 2004 to 36% in 2020. While the three northern swing states—Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin—are less racially diverse, the impact of their white college graduate and nonwhite populations will rise over time. And for all states, the rise in diversity was even more accentuated for the under-age-40 voter group, which people of color now comprise roughly half of in Georgia, Arizona, and Texas ([Download Table E](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/20210504_Metro_2020-Turnout-Table-E.xlsx)). VOTER TURNOUT IN 2020 AND BEYOND The new census data makes plain that the 2020 election was record-breaking in terms of the magnitude of its voter turnout. Yet there are two aspects of this turnout which need to be emphasized. One is the sharp rise in the turnout among white non-college voters—a group that has strongly favored Republicans. The other is the accentuated turnout among young people and people of color—representing the increasing influence of voters who heavily lean toward Democratic presidential candidates. Both of these groups exerted countervailing forces on the results of the 2020 election, leading to close popular vote totals in a handful of states. However, the underlying demographics of the nation’s voter population show that Democratic-leaning voter populations are on the rise in both fast-growing and slow-growing parts of the country. This raises the question as to whether even greater turnout among white non-college voter groups—or Republican efforts to alter voting requirements in their favor—will be enough to counter the influence of young voters and voters of color in future presidential elections.

## AT: Social Media Misinformation

#### Social media companies rarely fact check or regulate news on their platforms. This is the largest cause for increasing fake news

**Stewart, 20 --** Stewart, E. (2020, December 22). *America's growing fake news problem, in one chart*. Vox. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2020/12/22/22195488/fake-news-social-media-2020

America’s [fake news](https://www.vox.com/21430923/fake-news-disinformation-misinformation-conspiracy-theory-coronavirus) problem is getting worse, not better. According to an analysis released by [NewsGuard](https://www.newsguardtech.com/special-report-2020-engagement-analysis/) and first reported by [Axios’](https://www.axios.com/unreliable-news-sources-social-media-engagement-297bf046-c1b0-4e69-9875-05443b1dca73.html)s Sara Fischer on Tuesday, websites that provide “unreliable news” increased their share of social media interactions this year. In 2019, 8 percent of engagement with the 100 top-performing news sources on social media was dubious. In 2020, that number more than doubled to 17 percent. NewsGuard, which rates news websites according to reliability, found that people are engaging in a lot more news this year than they were last year. Engagement with the top 100 US news sources (meaning likes, shares, and comments on Facebook and Twitter) went from 8.6 billion reactions to 16.3 billion reactions between 2019 and 2020. That makes sense given, well, everything that has happened in 2020. There has been a lot of news, and due to pandemic-related factors such as unemployment and lockdowns, people have a lot of time on their hands to read stuff online. But an increasing amount of the news people are seeing **is problematic, inaccurate, or suspicious**. And that’s something to worry about. The analysis found that the Daily Wire, the outlet founded by right-wing commentator Ben Shapiro, saw 2.5 times more interactions this year than last. The blossoming of false and unreliable news on the internet is a cultural, political, and technological phenomenon that’s hard to get your head around, let alone tackle. Conspiracy theories, misinformation, and disinformation run rampant on the internet, and it’s often difficult for people to tell what is true and what’s not. Social media companies are not exactly doing a bang-up job of addressing the problem, either. Right-wing content, in particular, thrives on platforms such as Facebook. But just because someone sees certain content doesn’t necessarily mean they are particularly influenced by it, and figuring out just how powerful certain messages are can be complicated. Over the summer, Kevin Roose at [the New York Times](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/27/technology/what-if-facebook-is-the-real-silent-majority.html) reported on what he described as a “parallel media universe” of super-conservative content on Facebook, noting that right-leaning pages and posts on the platform consistently get more interactions and shares than more liberal and mainstream ones. (Though just because someone likes a news post doesn’t mean they actually read it.)

#### Algorithms which run social media newsfeed preferences are biased towards outrage and views, thus promoting news regardless of its accuracy or reliability

**Stewart, 20 --** Stewart, E. (2020, December 22). *America's growing fake news problem, in one chart*. Vox. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2020/12/22/22195488/fake-news-social-media-2020

There’s now [a running debate](https://www.theverge.com/interface/2020/7/22/21332774/facebook-crowdtangle-kevin-roose-nyt-tweets-interactions-reach-engagement) among academics, analytics experts, and observers like Roose around what we know about what’s happening on Facebook and why. Dartmouth political scientist Brendan Nyhan recently [argued](https://twitter.com/BrendanNyhan/status/1299166780913602560) that “likes,” comments, and shares are just a small part of what people actually see on Facebook, and that it’s difficult to draw conclusions from these interactions alone or to know what they might mean for an election. Still, the trend is concerning. [Social media is making political polarization worse in America](https://www.vox.com/recode/21534345/polarization-election-social-media-filter-bubble), and it’s often the case that people no longer agree on even basic facts. What people consume shapes what they see — basically, someone clicks on a certain article and algorithms start to predict what else they might like in alignment with that. And the further down the rabbit hole they go, the more they begin to seek out that media, often winding up in an information bubble. For people who complain so much about supposed social media censorship, they are not really being censored Republicans have spent years complaining that social media companies are biased against them and that their content is being censored and removed. President Donald Trump [has often lashed out](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/5/28/21273878/trump-executive-order-twitter-social-media-section-230-free-speech-implications) against tech companies with unfounded claims of bias. He and his administration [have also attempted to undercut and scrap Section 230](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/6/18/21294331/section-230-bill-barr-josh-hawley-trump-internet-free-speech), a law that basically says social media companies are allowed to police their platforms however they want and aren’t liable for the content third parties post on them. ([Recode’s Sara Morrison has a full explainer on Section 230](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/5/28/21273241/section-230-explained-trump-social-media-twitter-facebook). Rather than bias toward a certain political leaning, social media algorithms are often biased toward outrage — they push content that people have an emotional reaction to and are likely to engage with. The NewsGuard data and other research shows that **people are increasingly being drawn to unreliable content** — and often, unreliable content that has a conservative bent. And that content can influence all sorts of attitudes and cause confusion on even basic facts. [The New York Times](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/22/technology/georgia-senate-runoff-misinformation.html) recently took a look at Georgia and how misinformation and unreliable news is playing a role in the [US Senate runoffs](https://www.vox.com/21571755/georgia-senate-runoffs-9-questions) there. A conservative local news network called Star News Group announced it would launch the Georgia Star in November, and NewsGuard’s analysis found that the website has published misleading information about the presidential election and the Senate races. One story making false claims about Georgia’s presidential election results reached up to 650,000 people on Facebook. Combating fake and misleading news would require efforts from multiple stakeholders. Yet Facebook [recently rolled back changes](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/16/technology/facebook-reverses-postelection-algorithm-changes-that-boosted-news-from-authoritative-sources.html) to its algorithm that would promote news from reliable sources. **Given the pace at which the problem is growing, the matter is likely to worsen without intervention.**

## AT: Solvency

#### NATO policy on cyberattacks too ambiguous, raises concerns for USFG action

**Alemany et al, 3/9** -- Alemany, J., Meyer, T., & Raji, T. (2022, March 9). *Analysis | lawmakers wonder whether NATO is ready to robustly defend against a cyberattack against one of its own*. The Washington Post. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/08/lawmakers-wonder-whether-nato-is-ready-robustly-defend-cyber-attack-against-one-if-its-own/

The other battlefield: It isn't only Russia's military might that has some U.S. lawmakers and experts concerned about what's next in the conflict with Ukraine. They're also worried about a stealthy but possibly just as damaging enemy: cyber warfare. They believe that as Russian President Vladimir Putin is pressed on the battlefield and continues to be squeezed by the sharp bite of U.S. and European sanctions, NATO's newly evolved cyber policy might not be prepared to respond. Over the past decade, NATO — like most organizations and entities — has modernized its cyber defensive posture and practices, prompting NATO to say last year that it would “weigh ‘on a case-by-case basis’ whether a cyberattack would trigger its Article 5 collective defense principle, which establishes that an attack against one ally is an attack against all allies,” our colleagues [Cat Zakrzewski and Joseph Menn reported last month.](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/02/24/russia-cyberattacks-global/?itid=lk_inline_manual_9) “We will not speculate on how serious a cyberattack would have to be in order to trigger a collective response,” a NATO official [told reporters month](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/cyberattack-nato-could-trigger-collective-defence-clause-official-2022-02-28/). “Any response could include diplomatic and economic sanctions, cyber measures, or even conventional forces, depending on the nature of the attack,” the official added. The updated policy, according to former U.S. ambassadors to NATO and experts who work closely with the organization, has come a long way since Russian-based attackers launched [massive cyberattacks on Estonia](https://www.bbc.com/news/39655415) over the removal of a Soviet war memorial in the small Baltic country in 2007. As it currently stands, NATO leaders were deliberately ambiguous in defining what would qualify as an Article 5 attack when revising the group's cyber policy, “so as not to create a clear-cut threshold beneath which an opponent could operate freely,” said Douglas Lute, a former U.S. ambassador to NATO. But there is some concern the ambiguity might muddle a potential response to a cyberattack. Key quote: “If you have a catastrophic cyberattack that shuts down your [power] grids or shuts down your ability to keep your people warm in the winter or fed or what have you, we've got to figure that out. I think NATO needs to get together and have those very difficult [discussions] because it is a component of war, as I said before, and I think it needs to be viewed as such,” Rep. John Katko (R-N.Y.), the top Republican on the House Homeland Security panel, told The Washington Post in [an interview last week](https://www.washingtonpost.com/washington-post-live/2022/03/01/117th-congress-rep-john-katko-r-ny/?itid=lk_inline_manual_16). “I think it's evolving. Do they have more to go? Absolutely,” Katko added of NATO.

#### NATO is weak now and lacks consensus on cybersecurity policy. This consensus model means there is a delay in execution of the aff

**Alemany et al, 3/9** -- Alemany, J., Meyer, T., & Raji, T. (2022, March 9). *Analysis | lawmakers wonder whether NATO is ready to robustly defend against a cyberattack against one of its own*. The Washington Post. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/08/lawmakers-wonder-whether-nato-is-ready-robustly-defend-cyber-attack-against-one-if-its-own/

Article 5 James Andrew Lewis, the director of the strategic technologies program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, said NATO has “actually done a pretty good job of figuring out what their response would be to a significant cyber attack,” Lewis said, adding that “there would have to be some equivalence with a physical attack” in order to trigger Article 5. “But NATO might not have the political consensus,” Lewis added, referring to the need for the consent of all 28 members in order for any invocation of the collective defense clause. At least one NATO member, for example, “has taken a broad view suggesting a cyber operation would be an armed attack 'if it caused substantial loss of life or considerable physical or economic damage,'" Michael Schmitt, a distinguished scholar at West Point, wrote [in Just Security](https://www.justsecurity.org/80347/expert-backgrounder-nato-response-options-to-potential-russia-cyber-attacks/) last month. But: “The prevailing view is that … an armed attack is the ‘most grave form’ of a use of force. Thus, the scale and effects of any Russian cyber operations would have to be especially severe before triggering the right of individual or collective self-defense,” Schmitt writes. Ivo Daalder, U.S. ambassador to NATO from 2009 to 2013, added that updates to Article 5 are irrelevant if the overall system “**to act collectively in defense of NATO territory has eroded.”** “Although NATO has done what it needs to do in order to maintain some significant capability of defense, the system as a whole really hasn't lived with the prospect of a military or cyber attack on its territory in a credible way,” Daalder said. Ukraine was admitted to NATO's Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence (CCDCOE) last week, [Cyberscoop's Suzanne Smalley reports](https://www.cyberscoop.com/ukraine-admitted-nato-ccdcoe/) of the NATO-accredited military research institution. NATO Sec. Gen. Jens Stoltenberg said in January that CCDCOE's cyber experts “had been exchanging information with their Ukrainian counterparts 'on the current malicious cyber activities' that Ukraine was experiencing in the lead-up to Russia’s invasion,” per Smalley. But another potential setback for NATO is that it has not taken steps to acquire offensive cyber capabilities and is dependent on member states that boast them. “We need to add into our plans the way we fight offensive cyber capability because you better believe Russia is going to use it on us … But what NATO is good at is being a defensive alliance, and sometimes they're slow to pick up on we have to also be capable of offensive action,” retired former NATO supreme commander and retired U.S. Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove told The Early.

# 2NC

## AT: “Russia/US war”

#### Russia/US war will not happen – Russia just pushing nuclear rhetoric

**Ellyat, 4/29 –** Ellyatt, H. (2022, April 29). *Could there be war between Russia and the west? strategists predict what could happen next*. CNBC. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/29/russia-ukraine-war-should-the-west-prepare-for-war-with-putin.html

The saber-rattling and rhetoric between Moscow and the West have become notably more aggressive this week, prompting concerns that a direct confrontation between the two power blocs could be more likely. In the last few days alone, for example, Russia stopped gas supplies to two European countries and has warned the West several times that the risk of a nuclear war is very “real.” In addition, [Russian President Vladimir Putin](https://www.cnbc.com/vladimir-putin/) has said that any foreign intervention in Ukraine would provoke what he called a “lightning fast” response from Moscow, while his Foreign Ministry warned NATO not to test its patience. For their part, Western officials have dismissed Russia’s “bravado” and “dangerous” nuclear war rhetoric, with the U.K. calling on Western allies to “double down” on their support for Ukraine. CNBC asked strategists about the likelihood of a direct confrontation between Russia and the West. Here’s what they said. Nuclear attack? At the start of the week, Russia’s foreign minister warned that the threat of a nuclear war “cannot be underestimated” and said NATO’s supply of weapons to Ukraine was tantamount to the military alliance engaging in a proxy war with Russia. Putin doubled down on the bellicose rhetoric Wednesday, threatening a “lightning fast” retaliation against any country intervening in [the Ukraine war](https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/29/russia-ukraine-live-updates.html) and creating what he called “strategic threats for Russia.” He then appeared to allude to Russia’s arsenal of intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons when he warned that Russia has the “tools” for a retaliatory response “that no one else can boast of having now ... we will use them if necessary.” But strategists told CNBC that Putin is playing on risk aversion in the West and that the chances of a nuclear war are **remote**. “I think it’s outside the realm of possibility right now that there’s going to be a nuclear war or World War III that really spills over that far beyond Ukraine’s borders,” Samuel Ramani, a geopolitical analyst and associate fellow at the Royal United Services Institute, told CNBC. “If there’s a border spillover right now, we’re still probably most likely looking at something like Moldova being vulnerable to an invasion,” he said. A U.S. infantryman at a combined arms live fire exercise at Al-Ghalail Range in Qatar, on Nov. 14, 2018. He noted that Russia has a long history of using “nuclear brinkmanship” as a way of preventing the West from pursuing security policies that it doesn’t like, with the escalation in hostile rhetoric aimed at deterring NATO members from making heavy arms deliveries to Ukraine. Moment of danger Nonetheless, Ramani noted the threat posed by Russia could become more acute if it felt humiliated on the battlefield. In particular, military setbacks in Ukraine around May 9 could pose some danger. That’s Russia’s “Victory Day” — the anniversary of Nazi Germany’s defeat by the Soviet Union in World War II. “Putin has had a history of escalating unpredictability if he feels that Russia is being humiliated in some way ... and if there are major setbacks, especially on around the 9th [of May] then there’s a risk of unbreakable action,” he said. “But also there’s a logic of mutually assured destruction that hopefully will rein everybody in.”

#### Nuclear war threats from Russia are just scare tactics – even if they escalate, they cannot handle NATO’s defense capabilities

**Ellyat, 4/29 –** Ellyatt, H. (2022, April 29). *Could there be war between Russia and the west? strategists predict what could happen next*. CNBC. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/29/russia-ukraine-war-should-the-west-prepare-for-war-with-putin.html

Threatening nuclear attacks is part of Putin’s “playbook,” said William Alberque, director of strategy, technology and arms control at the International Institute for Strategic Studies think tank. “Putin enjoys using risks and he thinks he has a much more appetite for risk than the West does,” he told CNBC on Thursday. “He’s trying to use the old playbook of ‘if I terrify you enough, you’ll back down’,” he said. “Ultimately, if he uses nuclear weapons, even a demonstration strike, this would turn Russia into a global pariah,” Alberque said. He advised Western leaders, “We just need to be able to manage our risk and keep our nerve and not panic when he does something that we might not expect.” There’s no indication that there will be a direct confrontation, Liviu Horovitz, a nuclear policy researcher at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, told CNBC. “Both the United States and Western European governments have repeatedly said that they have no interest in escalating this conflict beyond Ukraine, and I don’t see anything suggesting that NATO troops will be fighting in Ukraine anytime soon.” How NATO is defending Eastern Europe Still, if a wider war did break out, “NATO’s overall conventional capabilities outmatch Russia’s,” he noted. What’s important now is that “all sides should avoid any steps that could create misunderstandings,” he said — steps that could lead to an accidental and potentially catastrophic war. Economic war While NATO has shied away from providing any aid to Ukraine that could be misconstrued as a direct attack on Russia, Western allies continue to pile on the pressure on Moscow. Indeed, the economic punishment on Russia has been increasing by the day, in the form of more sanctions on its businesses, key sectors and officials close to or within Putin’s regime. Russia’s own Economy Ministry expects the economy to contract as a result, by 8.8% in 2022 in its base-case scenario, or by 12.4% in a more conservative scenario, [Reuters reported.](https://www.reuters.com/business/russias-gdp-decline-could-hit-124-this-year-economy-ministry-document-shows-2022-04-27/) Russian forces patrol in Mariupol, Ukraine, where the Russian Army has taken control, on April 22, 2022. “There is no end in sight to Russia’s war in Ukraine, and relations with the West will likely continue to deteriorate,” one analyst said. For its part, Russia has sought to inflict its own pain on European countries that are, awkwardly, heavily reliant on Russian natural gas imports. This week [it suspended supplies to Poland and Bulgaria because they refused to pay for the gas in rubles](https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/27/russias-gas-supplies-to-poland-bulgaria-uncertain-as-tensions-rise.html). Russia’s move was branded as “blackmail” by the EU but defended by Moscow. While a direct confrontation between Russia and the West remains unlikely, one close Russia watcher said Western governments need to imbue their populations with a “war mentality” to prepare them for the hardships they could face as the economic fallout from the war continues. Those include rising energy costs and disrupted supply chains and goods from Russia and Ukraine, among the world’s biggest “bread baskets.”

#### Tensions will not escalate beyond economic or sovereign conflicts – Russia will not want backlash from NATO

**Ellyat, 4/29 –** Ellyatt, H. (2022, April 29). *Could there be war between Russia and the west? strategists predict what could happen next*. CNBC. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/29/russia-ukraine-war-should-the-west-prepare-for-war-with-putin.html

[From soaring food prices to social unrest, the fallout from the Russia-Ukraine war could be immense](https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/21/from-food-to-inflation-the-russia-ukraine-war-has-a-global-impact.html) “We’re likely to see a further escalation of the economic war, because in some ways, that’s a rational and logical move from both sides that have a very difficult time fighting one another in a direct way because of the nuclear escalation risks,” Maximilian Hess, a fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute, told CNBC on Thursday. “Russia will cut off gas to more countries, it will increase its ruble demands, because it wants to ensure the ruble convertibility remains open, and the West needs to be preparing for this with a full war mentality, making the Western populations understand that this is going to have real economic costs and real impacts on the cost of goods, the cost of living and inflation over the coming years.” “If we don’t take this war mentality and apply it to the economic war, then it becomes a lot easier for Putin to win and have successes there,” Hess said. Other flashpoints to watch After more than two months of war, Russia has expanded its control of territories in eastern and southern Ukraine, trying to create a land bridge from Russia via the Donbas region to its annexed territory of Crimea. But it has also sustained large losses in terms of manpower and arms. In the meantime, [the West continues to pledge more and more support for Ukraine](https://www.cnbc.com/2022/04/28/russia-ukraine-live-updates.html), and the country’s forces are mounting a strong resistance to Russian troops, signaling a protracted and bloody conflict ahead. NATO’s chief, Jens Stoltenberg, warned Thursday that the war in Ukraine could last for years. Ukraine war has been a ‘trigger’ for Sweden, Finland to seek NATO membership Andrius Tursa, Central and Eastern Europe advisor at Teneo Intelligence, said that against this backdrop, “there is no end in sight to Russia’s war in Ukraine, and relations with the West will likely continue to deteriorate.” “The rhetoric in Russia is already shifting from statements of fighting the ‘nationalists’ in Ukraine to an alleged (proxy) war with NATO. Multiple flashpoints could further escalate the tensions with the West,” he said. Those include recent explosions in the breakaway Moldovan region of Transnistria (which could serve as a pretext for an increased Russian presence in the region) which could bring the conflict “dangerously close to NATO’s borders,” Tursa said in a note Wednesday. “Moscow could also step up threats to NATO over weapons supplies to Ukraine, especially after multiple military and energy facilities in Russia have been allegedly hit by Ukraine. Finally, decisions by Finland and Sweden to join NATO would be perceived by Moscow as another security threat to Russia and could increase military tensions in the Baltic region.

## AT: “Hackers plant fake news in social media”

#### Social media misinformation comes from all platforms, independent of cyber attacks

**Burns, 2/9 --** Burns, G. (2022, February 9). *Journalists give thumbs down to social media*. Local News Initiative. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://localnewsinitiative.northwestern.edu/posts/2022/02/09/medill-social-media-survey/

Journalists say social-media platforms have hurt their industry, contributing to inaccurate and one-sided news accounts by exerting too much control over the mix of news that people see, according to a recent survey. More than nine of every 10 survey respondents said social-media companies deliver a “worse mix of news” to their users, according to the online survey of journalists by Northwestern University’s Medill school of Journalism, Media, Integrated Marketing Communications. The survey also found that nearly eight of 10 said harassment of journalists on social media is a “very big” or “moderately big” problem. The second-ever Medill Media Industry Survey was conducted at the end of 2021 by Associate Professor Stephanie Edgerly of Medill, and Danielle K. Brown, the Cowles Professor of Journalism, Diversity and Equality at the University of Minnesota. More than 1,500 members of the U.S. news media completed the questionnaire. Medill used Cision, a media listings database, to obtain email contact information from individuals who had at least one of the following keywords in their profile: columnist, correspondent, director, editor, producer, reporter, writer, then sorted the list for news organizations exceeding a minimal audience size. Exactly 25,000 people were invited to participate in the survey, which was open between Nov. 30 and Dec. 31. Among the findings, 90.7 percent of respondents said the role social media companies play in delivering the news results is a worse mix of news, while 86.5 percent said social media companies have too much control over the mix of news people see. Some 79.3 percent said social media has a mostly negative impact on the journalism industry, and an overwhelming 94.3 percent of respondents blamed social media for spreading **inaccurate news**. The survey was the subject of a discussion at a Medill Centennial panel on Feb. 3, featuring newsroom leaders of ABC News, The Wall Street Journal, Vox Media and the Los Angeles Times. “There’s certainly a lot of frustration,” observed Kevin Merida, Executive Editor at the Times. But Merida also said social-media platforms are an important gateway to the work of journalists, who must learn to operate on them. “We’re not putting the genie back in the bottle,” he said. “Within the platforms, we have the ability to also hop in and define our relationship, how we’re going to access them and how we’re going to communicate through them.” ABC News President Kimberly Godwin said journalists need to help people become smarter consumers of news on social platforms. “They keep sending you misinformation,” she said. “We have to find ways to break through the clutter so that they get at the truth.”

#### Journalists and news reporters already fighting to improve accuracy, reliability, and quality of news information on social media platforms

**Burns, 2/9 --** Burns, G. (2022, February 9). *Journalists give thumbs down to social media*. Local News Initiative. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://localnewsinitiative.northwestern.edu/posts/2022/02/09/medill-social-media-survey/

Social media challenges journalists to understand its strengths and weaknesses so they can interest an audience and deliver strong, accurate messages, said Melissa Bell, publisher of Vox Media. “It is important for us to recognize how much of an impact social media has had on our reporting,” she said. “There are strengths in it. There are ways to reach people that you couldn’t reach before.” Journal Editor in Chief Matt Murray warned that journalists should not mistake dialogue on social media for the “richer, fuller, more varied and dramatic” stories that reporters can uncover in “real life.” “Social media is a tool, from a journalist’s perspective, to be used,” he said. “It’s a tool to get news out there,” Murray said. The survey indicates that journalists are more critical of social media than are U.S. adults at large. The percentage of U.S. adults saying the companies have too much control over the mix of news they see was 62 percent in a Pew Research Center survey from July 2019. That response was nearly 25 percentage points lower than that of journalists in the 2021 Medill survey. Similarly, the percentage of U.S. adults who said social-media companies provide a worse mix of news was 55 percent in the Pew survey, far less than the 90.7-percent response from journalists surveyed by Medill. Edgerly, who oversaw the survey, said its results suggest that social media is not living up to its potential to make vital news stories more visible. “A clear majority of journalists are seeing the potential gains are not matching the realities,” she said. “The survey suggests that we’re not seeing quality information reaching a broader audience. That is not the reality of how social media functions.” The University of Minnesota’s Brown, who partnered with Edgerly, said she’s not surprised that journalists’ view of social media is more negative than the population’s at large, as measured in other surveys. “We asked journalists to think about: social-media companies and their control; loss of autonomy; and how the work they create is used by other people,” she said. “It doesn’t surprise me that they don’t like the way social-media companies control the news that people have access to. It doesn’t surprise me at all.”

## AT: “Democracy weak”

#### Democracy strong now – Global leaders pushing for international alliance. Efforts on COVID-19 and economic issues prove

**Heath, 2/19 --** Heath, R. (2022, February 2). *'democracy must prevail': Biden goes all-in on Trans-Atlantic Alliance*. POLITICO. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from https://www.politico.com/news/2021/02/19/biden-democracy-security-conference-470190

President Joe Biden delivered an emphatic message to democratic allies and rivals alike at the Munich Security Conference Friday morning, pledging to work with Europe and stop at nothing to ensure democratic values prevail around the world. “I believe with every ounce of my being that democracy must prevail,” Biden said. Appearing on-screen in a display of trans-Atlantic unity with German Chancellor Angela Merkel and French President Emmanuel Macron, Biden said democracy is under assault around the world and called on Western allies to “demonstrate that democracy functions and works and together there’s nothing we can’t do.” Aware that [many European countries came to doubt America’s commitment to collective NATO defense](https://www.politico.eu/article/trump-threatens-to-pull-out-of-nato/) under former President Donald Trump, Biden insisted: “Let me erase any lingering doubt: The United States will work closely with our European Union partners and capitals across the continent.” The president added that America’s commitment to NATO is “guaranteed” and that “an attack on one is an attack on all,” a sharp break from Trump, whose [rhetoric on the trans-Atlantic alliance](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/07/12/trump-nato-spending-714976) was dominated by [haranguing member states about their relatively low levels of defense spending](https://www.politico.eu/article/trump-threatens-to-pull-out-of-nato/). German Chancellor Angela Merkel speaks to the media following her participation in a virtual meeting of G-7 leaders on Feb. 19, 2021, in Berlin, Germany. Biden reserved his toughest words for China and Russia. Biden accused Beijing of perpetuating abuses that “undercut the foundations of the international economic system,” and insisted that “Chinese companies should be held to the same standards” of governance and transparency as Western companies. Urging a strong NATO and EU, Biden insisted that only trans-Atlantic unity could contain Russia. “It’s so much easier for the Kremlin to bully and threaten individual states than a strong and united trans-Atlantic community,” Biden said. Speaking after Biden, Angela Merkel said that “the prospects of democracy are better “thanks to Biden’s trans-Atlantic commitments and promised her full support — with a subtle warning: “In Germany we say words are not enough, you have to do them, and that is true in trans-Atlantic cooperation.” Merkel said that Germany and U.S. interests would “not always converge” but that trans-Atlantic values are fundamentally the same. Emmanuel Macron offered assurances that the [EU’s push for “strategic autonomy”](https://www.politico.eu/article/europe-trade-wants-strategic-autonomy-decide-what-means/) is not an effort to distance itself from the U.S., but to show that Europe can be a “reliable and responsible and credible partner,” instead of a continent dependent on the U.S. for security. Macron called for western allies to immediately deliver 13 million Covid-19 vaccine doses to African nations to protect the continent’s health workers, before China and Russia fill the void. At an earlier meeting of G-7 leaders, Biden agreed with counterparts “to work together to beat Covid-19 and build back better,” mirroring his own domestic messaging. On economic issues, the G-7 committed to “cut emissions and create good jobs on a path to net zero no later than 2050,” to reform the World Trade Organization, and to agree a global taxation framework by mid-2021.

## ALT Causes to “Democracy Collapse”

#### Even if you buy that democracy is failing, there are alt causes to this decline

**Miller-Idriss, 21** -- Miller-Idriss, C. (2021, November 25). *America's democracy is failing - and the World Knows it*. MSNBC. Retrieved June 20, 2022, from https://www.msnbc.com/opinion/america-s-democracy-failing-world-knows-it-n1284597

A number of non-governmental organizations that have long worked to rebuild communities in countries beset by violent and [intractable conflicts](https://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/us-peace-justice-democracy-webinar-series) — places that have collapsed under the weight of mass atrocities, political assassinations, authoritarian take overs, and widespread citizen violence — have shifted focus to a new subject: The United States. For a country that has long thought of itself as a beacon of democracy, this is a wake-up call. At this moment, our country is in great need of [lessons](https://www.sfcg.org/common-ground-usa/) on what it takes to restore crumbling political systems. This week, the United States was added to a [list](https://www.idea.int/gsod/sites/default/files/2021-11/the-global-state-of-democracy-2021_0.pdf) of “[backsliding](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/nov/22/us-list-backsliding-democracies-civil-liberties-international)” democracies in an [annual report](https://www.idea.int/gsod/) on the global state of democracy, marking a serious decline in international observers’ assessments of our political stability. In naming the U.S. to the list for the first time, the report’s authors — Sweden’s International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) — pointed to the “visible deterioration of democracy” in the United States on several criteria, including unwillingness to accept credible election results, voter participation suppression efforts, increasing polarization, and declines in civil liberties. For a country that has long thought of itself as a beacon of democracy, this is a wake-up call. There are a lot of different ways that [democracies can fail](https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/562246/how-democracies-die-by-steven-levitsky-and-daniel-ziblatt/). Some collapse under the weight of political leaders who assume authoritarian control, arrest opponents, or refuse to allow new elections to take place. Others suffer at the hands of citizens who support political violence, dehumanize other political parties as “evil,” or call for civil war. Still others [struggle](https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/ten-warning-signs-that-democracies-are-under-siege/) with voter suppression and intimidation efforts, weakened trust in institutions, and falling political participation. **The U.S. is facing all these problems, and more**. We are witnessing challenges to the [integrity](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/aug/13/osce-election-monitors-us-integrity-november) of elections, rooted in [disinformation](https://freedomhouse.org/country/united-states/freedom-net/2021) spread by our own elected officials and in widespread conspiracies that circulate online. A [third](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/one-three-us-election-officials-feels-unsafe-survey-2021-06-16/) of election poll workers reported feeling [unsafe](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/policy-solutions/election-officials-under-attack) this year, after an “[unprecedented](https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-rise-of-political-violence-in-the-united-states/)” number of them received threats. The violent insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6 came at the hands of thousands of ordinary citizens who aimed to disrupt the democratic certification of the presidential election and prevent President Joe Biden from taking office. There is a particular urgency in the U.S. warning signs, not least because we are a nation of citizens who are now armed at previously unimaginable levels. We also face rising harassment and violence from extremist groups, citizen vigilantes, and unlawful [militias](https://www.law.georgetown.edu/icap/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2021/05/2021.05.26-McCord-CRCL-Subcommittee-Hearing.pdf) who threaten minority groups, disrupt our freedom of assembly and [demonstration](https://bridgingdivides.princeton.edu/trends-and-risk-analysis) with shows of violent force, and violate civil rights like the right to “[public accommodations](https://www.lawyerscommittee.org/dumpson-vs-ade/),” as recent court rulings have shown. We have seen repeated [violent attacks](https://fortune.com/2021/09/29/health-care-workers-face-threats-covid-19-pandemic/), harassment, and even death threats directed at front-line workers and public officials, including school board members, health care workers, teachers, flight attendants, and restaurant hostesses. The U.S. isn’t the only democracy that is eroding. Democratic [stability](https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2021/02/02/global-democracy-has-a-very-bad-year) is backsliding across the globe, as nations suffer from compromised elections, dismantled checks on government, challenges to a free media, and reductions of minority protections. But there is a particular urgency in the U.S. warning signs, not least because we are a nation of citizens who are now armed at previously unimaginable levels. This year is on track to be the second-highest year of firearm sales in history, following a “[record shattering](https://abcnews4.com/news/nation-world/gun-sales-skyrocketing-to-near-record-numbers-this-year)” year in 2020, in which 21 million background checks for firearms sales took place — far above the average of about 8.6 million annual checks.

#### The aff can’t solve the demise of democracy – Sustained educational, national, and community investments are key

**Miller-Idriss, 21** -- Miller-Idriss, C. (2021, November 25). *America's democracy is failing - and the World Knows it*. MSNBC. Retrieved June 20, 2022, from https://www.msnbc.com/opinion/america-s-democracy-failing-world-knows-it-n1284597

Luckily, just because a democracy is in crisis does not mean it will collapse. On average, **it takes** [**about a decade**](https://web.archive.org/web/20210328045720/https:/www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/chapters/conditions-and-consequences-of-populism-and-democratic-backsliding.pdf)from the onset of democratic backsliding to end in either democratic breakdown or recovery. But we are long overdue for a course correction. Aside from international NGOs focusing on fixing America’s democracy, we can learn from the experiences of foreign governments throughout history, too. Germany’s post-World War II efforts to strengthen democracy include a wide variety of investments that simultaneously tackle right-wing extremism, racism, and antisemitism. South Africa built a national Truth and Reconciliation Commission to address the atrocities of apartheid and provide a path to restorative justice and healing. These cases demonstrate that it is possible — with sustained educational, national, and community investments — to create more informed citizens, restore trust across dividing lines, energize youth engagement, and reduce political violence. Doing so requires significant educational and [media literacy](https://www.npr.org/2019/03/22/705809811/students-in-ukraine-learn-how-to-spot-fake-stories-propaganda-and-hate-speech) programming. It requires engagement across sectors, through partnerships with civil society, the tech and media sector, local governments, and faith communities. Ultimately, restoring democracy requires creating a nation in which every citizen and resident feels part of a shared community in which they have a voice and a path to a common future. We are a long way from that kind of shared community. And in the end, saving our own democracy will require more than the efforts of a few committed citizens. The kind of effort we need to turn our backsliding democracy around cannot be done if the federal government doesn’t lead the charge with serious resource investments. At its heart, this work is about resilience, rooted in an understanding that democracies must be nurtured through education and not just defended with force. After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the U.S. made unprecedented investments in our security infrastructure. We created an entire new agency — the U.S. Department of Homeland Security — whose mission is to “[secure the nation from the many threats we face](https://www.dhs.gov/about-dhs).” But now, the call is coming from inside the house: the biggest threats to our nation are ones we’ve created ourselves.