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## Econ DA

#### Inequality reduces growth.

OECD 18. “HOW CAN COMPETITION CONTRIBUTE TO FAIRER SOCIETIES?” Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. 11-29-18. https://one.oecd.org/document/DAF/COMP/GF(2018)13/en/pdf

35. Growing **inequality reduces economic growth**. Financial hardship and credit market imperfections combine to **reduce people's ability to invest** in education and training, to change jobs, to learn new skills or start new businesses. Inequality harms the morale and the work effort of those who are left behind. It also leads to an **inefficient provision of public goods** that benefit the non-wealthy, like transportation and education even if they would foster overall economic growth. Growing inequality tilts public policy to favour the interests of the wealthy, which potentially creates a **vicious public policy cycle that could perpetuate inequality** and market power and threaten democracy. Inequality undermines the legitimacy of the social order, it lessens the sense that everyone has a fair opportunity and an equal voice, and finally many people would say inequality is objectionable morally. Put in utility terms, the marginal dollar may be more valuable socially if it is given to a struggling family to spend than to a wealthy one. There is a wealth transfer from the victims of market power to the firms exercising it. There are allocative efficiency losses and there is wasteful rent seeking as firms invest to create, obtain or preserve market power. Within the markets that are affected by market power, **innovation and productivity improvements slow.**

#### Investor fears high now---heightened enforcement and China---and COVID thumps.

Reuters 8-9-21. "Biden's antitrust crackdown fuels anxiety of merger investors". INQUIRER.net. https://usa.inquirer.net/79749/bidens-antitrust-crackdown-fuels-anxiety-of-merger-investors

U.S. President Joe Biden’s tougher regulatory stance on big corporate mergers has fueled a rise in investor bets on some deals not being completed, threatening to push the brakes on a record-setting dealmaking boom. Spreads between deal prices and the share prices of acquisition targets widened this week after the U.S. Federal Trade Commission said on Tuesday that a surge in mergers and acquisitions (M&A) would delay antitrust reviews, and that companies that did not wait for their outcome completed their deals at their own risk. On Wednesday, the Information reported that the U.S. Department of Justice was weighing a lawsuit to block UnitedHealth Group’s nearly $8 billion deal to acquire health care analytics and technology vendor Change Healthcare. Such a move would follow its lawsuit to block Aon’s $30 billion acquisition of Willis Towers Watson, which resulted in the insurance brokerages abandoning their deal last month. “The fact that spreads have widened is the understatement of the year,” said Roy Behren, managing member of Westchester Capital Management, which currently has $5.1 billion of assets under management, 85% of which is invested in merger arbitrage. The White House did not immediately respond to a request for a comment. Widened spreads include the proposed $33.6 billion deal between railroad operators Canadian National Railway and Kansas City Southern, as both companies await approval from the Surface Transportation Board. Shares of Kansas City are currently trading at $262 apiece, well below the agreed cash-and-stock deal of $325 per share. Other deals where spreads have increased include Zoom Video Communications’ nearly $15 billion all-stock deal for cloud-based call center operator Five9 Inc and medical device maker Thermo Fisher’s $17.4 billion buyout of contract researcher PPD Inc. Adding to the anxiety of merger investors are the escalating geopolitical tensions between China and the United States. China can thwart mergers of U.S. companies if they have a significant present in the country. The spread on semiconductor designer Advanced Micro Devices Inc’s $35 billion acquisition of Xilinx Inc has widened in recent days for that reason, investors said. “The climate of fear surrounding transactions that require Chinese approval is as difficult as I’ve seen in many, many years,” said Behren. It is not uncommon for M&A spreads to widen in times of uncertainty. They blew up dramatically in March 2020, when Wall Street fretted over the financial fallout of the coronavirus outbreak.

#### Wage increases benefit investment and growth.

James Manyika et al 18. James Manyika Jaana Remes, and Jan Mischke. “The U.S. Economy Is Suffering from Low Demand. Higher Wages Would Help” Harvard Business Review. 02-21-18. https://hbr.org/2018/02/the-u-s-economy-is-suffering-from-low-demand-higher-wages-would-help

To put it simply, when consumers have more to spend, they buy more sophisticated things. That’s good not just for consumers and producers, but **for the overall economy**, because making more sophisticated, higher-value things **makes everyone involve more productive**, and therefore helps **increase overall standards of living.** In addition, we found two other ways weak demand hurt productivity growth in the aftermath of the financial crisis: a reduction in economies of scale and weak investment. First, the economies of scale effect. In finance, productivity growth declined particularly in the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain due to contractions in lending volumes that banks were unable to fully offset with staff cuts due to the need for fixed labor (for example to support branch networks and IT infrastructure or to deal with existing loans and bad debt). The utilities sector, which has seen flattening demand growth due to both energy efficiency policies as well as a decline in economic activity during the crisis, was similarly not able to downsize labor due to the need for labor to support electricity distribution and the grid infrastructure, and here, too, productivity growth fell. Second, the effect of weak investment. We have found from our global surveys of businesses that almost half of companies that are increasing their investment budgets are doing so because of an increase in demand. **Demand is the single most important factor** driving corporate investment decisions. Investment, in turn, is critical for productivity growth, as it equips workers with more – and with more recent and innovative – equipment, software, and structures. But we have seen capital intensity growth fall to the lowest levels in post-WWII history. Weaker demand leads to weaker investment and creates a vicious cycle for productivity and income growth. Of course, the financial crisis is long since over, and the economy has recovered, at least by some measures. So what’s to worry about? Won’t demand return to pre-recession levels, and thereby increase productivity? Unfortunately, there is reason to believe that some of the drags on demand for goods and services may be **more structural than crises-related**. Slowing population growth means less rapid expansion of the pool of consumers. And **rising income inequality** is shifting purchasing power from those most likely to spend to those more likely to save. This is reflected in **slowing growth expectations in many markets**. For example, across our sectors and countries studied, in the decade from 1995 to 2004, growth in demand for goods and services averaged 4.6%, slowed to 2.3% in 2010 to 2014, and is forecast to slightly increase to 2.8% in 2014 to 2020. Today, there is concern about where the next wave of growth will come from. Some prominent economists worry that we may be stuck in a **vicious cycle of economic underperformance** for some time. Our analyses strongly suggest that **supporting sustained demand growth needs to be part of the answer**. Demand may deserve attention to help boost productivity growth not only during the recovery from the financial crisis but also in terms of longer-term structural leakages and their impact on productivity. Suitable tools for this longer-term situation include: focusing on productive investment as a fiscal priority, **growing the purchasing power of low-income consumers** with the highest propensity to consume, unlocking private business and residential investment, and supporting worker training and transition programs to ensure that periods of transition do not disrupt incomes.

#### Democratic backsliding turns business confidence.

Rebecca Henderson 21. The John and Natty McArthur University Professor at Harvard University, where she has a joint appointment at Harvard Business School in the general management and strategy units, and the author of the book. “Business Can’t Take Democracy for Granted” Harvard Business Review. 01-08-21. <https://hbr.org/2021/01/business-cant-take-democracy-for-granted>

For years, American business has **taken American institutions for granted**. It has assumed that someone else would ensure that democracy, the rule of law, and the kind of robust, respectful discourse that keeps societies healthy would simply survive — and that the role of business was to keep its head down and maximize profits in the meantime. But this week’s events have demonstrated that **we cannot take our democracy for granted**. Early polls suggest that as many as 45% of Republicans approve of the assault on the U.S. Capitol. If this result holds up, it would imply that millions of Americans see nothing wrong with attempting to overturn the results of an election by force. Democracy Is in Trouble. Business Must Help Fix It. Strengthening democracy is the only way to **ensure the survival of free-market capitalism.** Let’s be clear: This belief is a fundamental threat to the long-term health of our economy and to the strength of American business. As I’ve argued in the past, **American business needs American democracy.** Free markets cannot survive without the support of the kind of capable, accountable government that can set the rules of the game that keep markets genuinely free and fair. And only democracy can **ensure that governments are held accountable**, that they are viewed as legitimate, and that they don’t devolve into the rule of the many by the few and the kind of crony capitalism that we see emerging in so many parts of the world. No businessperson I know is a huge fan of government. I don’t care much for paying taxes myself. But as the pandemic has made **clear, strong government** — democratically accountable government, balanced by a free media and a thriving private sector — is the price we pay for **strong societies**. Without them, there’s far too little investment in public goods like public health, clean air and sensible anti-trust rules. Without them, the rich and the powerful end up in control of both the economy and the state, throttling the entrepreneurial energy and the innovation and experimentation that has made the American economy the envy of the world. We must not become Russia. Strengthening democracy is the only way to ensure the **widespread survival of free-market capitalism**, and with it the prosperity and opportunity that has changed the lives of billions of people. It’s also the only way to tackle the world’s biggest threats, from global warming to increasing inequality. And business has to play a leading role — now.

#### They’re worse for innovation.

Ganesh Sitaraman, 20. Chancellor Faculty Fellow and Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School and Director of its Program in Law and Government. "The National Security Case for Breaking Up Big Tech". Knight First Amendment Institute at Columbia University. 1-30-20. https://knightcolumbia.org/content/the-national-security-case-for-breaking-up-big-tech

Big Tech and the Foundations of American Power American power is also critical in a time of great power competition. Here too, the case for protecting big tech and restricting competition in the tech sector is weak. Under conventional market theory—and economic practice—competition sparks innovation. If the United States wants to continue to be at the forefront of technological innovation, then more competition is desirable, not less. Breaking up and regulating big tech will thus improve innovation, not reduce it. America’s position in a great power rivalry also depends on its defense industrial base—the resilience and capacity of its defense sector. But a concentrated defense sector means less innovation in defense, higher prices for taxpayers to procure defense systems, and a functional redistribution of taxpayer funds from R&D or other kinds of spending to profits for defense contractors. As technology becomes more integrated with defense, the same dangers of a concentrated defense industrial base could emerge with respect to the defense technological base. Breaking up and regulating big tech, combined with R&D funding, would likely instead create a more competitive defense sector and a more innovative, more resilient, and cheaper one too. Big Tech, Competitiveness, and Innovation One of the central arguments against breaking up and regulating big tech on national security grounds is that big tech companies are essential for innovation in the tech sector and thus for American competitiveness and ultimately for national security. Historically, however, innovation has come from a mix of competition and public funding of research and development. Breaking up and regulating tech companies thus doesn’t mean ceding ground to the Chinese on technological innovation—it means creating a competitive marketplace with great innovative capacity. Whether or not they say it explicitly, those who want to protect big tech from antitrust and regulation support a national champions model. The national champions approach suggests that innovation takes place within big companies that are protected from competition and therefore have resources to spend on research and development. Some associate this approach with Joseph Schumpeter, who suggested that firms in competitive markets might be less innovative than monopolists.58 In this vein, commentators celebrate how Bell Labs was able to innovate for generations and see Google X, Facebook, and other tech companies as similarly investing in frontier research that will ultimately lead to innovative breakthroughs.59 While innovation can take place under a national champions model, innovation does not require national champions—and there are strong arguments that the national champions approach is limited and even counterproductive. First, as Tim Wu has noted, “[B]oth history and basic economics suggest we do much better trusting that fierce competition at home yields stronger industries overall.”60 This response, of course, has been commonplace in basic economics for decades and in debates on competition is linked to the views of Kenneth Arrow.61 Market competition is good for innovation because competitors have to find ways to differentiate themselves in order to survive and expand. In contrast, large protected firms get lethargic, are slow to innovate, and rest on their laurels. Wu points out that we also have evidence—not just theory—to show that protecting national champions is inferior to encouraging competition. In the 1980s, Wu argues, Japan took the approach of protecting its national champions in the electronics industry. Powerhouses like NEC, Panasonic, and Toshiba had direct government support. In contrast, the United States took the opposite tack with IBM. The computer firm was brought under antitrust scrutiny, and the legal battle went on for more than a decade, along the way chilling Big Blue from engaging in any conduct that could even potentially run afoul of the antitrust laws. The result, Wu notes, was to create the space for a variety of hardware and software companies, Microsoft, Lotus, and Apple among them. Competition led to innovation and the creation of some of the most forward-looking companies of the era.62 Second, national champions can actually limit innovation because they have an incentive to avoid research and innovations that might jeopardize their business model or undermine their dominant position. Bell Labs, for example, has long been celebrated for its role as an “ideas factory.”63 But Bell and AT&T also suppressed innovations when they threatened its business model. Bell inventors, for example, developed recording devices in the 1930s that could have been used for answering machines. But AT&T’s management blocked their emergence for fear that they would jeopardize use of the telephone.64 An alternative approach to innovation is one that relies less on protectionism for national champions and more on market competition and on public investment in research and innovation. Competition, as noted already, can be a powerful motivator for innovation. When big tech incumbents face little competition, society forgoes the innovation benefits that come from competition. Who knows if Instagram or WhatsApp could have dethroned Facebook’s primacy and developed even more new and innovative products? Facebook’s moves to acquire those firms prevented us from ever finding out. What small businesses might emerge if they didn’t have to compete with Amazon Basics on Amazon’s Marketplace? Unwinding mergers and separating platforms from companies that do business on the platform would help spur competition and lead to innovation.

#### COVID destroyed the US economy

Dana Kennedy 20. “Coronavirus may destroy 40% of the US economy, officials say” The New York Post. 04-25-2020. <https://nypost.com/2020/04/25/coronavirus-may-destroy-40-of-the-us-economy-officials-say/>

The coronavirus pandemic could **wipe out 40%** of the U.S. economy, **quadruple** the federal deficit to **$3.7 trillion** and push the **national debt to nearly $27 trillion**, the Congressional Budget Office reports. Fiscal 2020 debt and deficit figures are on track to be the **highest since World War II** after Congress passed four massive coronavirus response bills; President Trump signed the measures. Lawmakers will be ultimately be forced to tackle the government’s **chronic financial woes** given the **looming insolvency** of Social Security and Medicare, according to the Daily Mail. But when they do, almost **none of them will have any experience in successfully doing so.** Congress has not passed a major attack on the deficit since a 1997 law that capped a decade’s worth of politically costly but effective reduction

#### No econ decline impact.

**Walt 20** [Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, May 13th, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/]

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).”

Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself.

The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success.

Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then.

The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

## Politics

#### Won’t pass- Dems factions are miles apart

Heather Caygle, 10-12-2021, "Dem tension keeps spiking ahead of make-or-break 3 weeks," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/12/democrats-reconciliation-agenda-515837

Top Democrats are continuing to talk past each other as they openly spar over the scope of President Joe Biden’s social agenda ahead of a critical three-week stretch in the negotiations.

Speaker Nancy Pelosi and other Democrats have indicated they hope to reach a deal on the massive social safety net bill by the end of the month. But if the dueling messages Tuesday are any indication, Democrats remain miles apart on an agreement to address everything from child care and paid family leave to a massive health care expansion to climate change, as the party grapples with which priorities in the bill should stay, which should go and which should be trimmed.

“We have some important decisions to make in the next few days so that we can proceed,” Pelosi told reporters in a press conference Tuesday. “At $3.5 trillion we were doing everything well. … We’re still talking about a couple of trillion dollars but it’s much less.”

Pelosi indicated Tuesday that Democrats are eyeing a double-barrel approach: trimming both the number of priorities in their social spending package as well as cutting back on the length certain programs would be funded. Democratic leaders hope the two-prong plan can dramatically cut the package from its initial price tag of $3.5 trillion to a spending target Senate moderates are comfortable supporting.

But top progressives didn’t hide their exasperation, both with the pace of the talks and what little they have heard from two key negotiators — Sens. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.).

“We are prepared to negotiate, we are prepared to compromise, but we’re not going to negotiate with ourselves,” Senate Budget Chair Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) told reporters in a press call Tuesday.s

Democrats are increasingly anxious about the enormous obstacles to completing the package in the coming weeks, with pressure building to deliver a key Biden priority amid his lagging approval ratings. Privately, some Democrats fear that the sprawling bill could spill over into the December of hell, when the party will also need to pass a trillion-dollar government spending bill and avoid a debt crisis.

#### No deal or PC not key

Jeff Stein, 10-9-2021, "Biden faces shrinking timetable to salvage his agenda," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2021/10/09/biden-faces-shrinking-timetable-salvage-his-agenda/

As they battle over the size of the legislation, Democrats are also debating how to structure the benefit programs so they fit under the final cap.

Manchin argues forcefully that Democrats should impose income limits on programs like the child tax credit, so that wealthier households do not receive benefits they may not need. But if the child tax credit is adjusted that way, it could violate Biden’s pledge not to raise taxes on households earning less than $400,000 per year, while adding administrative complications to a program still in its infancy.

Some liberal lawmakers, in turn, have floated the idea of funding some new programs only for a set number of years, which in theory would lower their costs. The liberals hope, however, that the programs will prove so popular that Congress would be forced to extend them later. But some centrist lawmakers are balking at that accounting strategy.

Biden’s challenge is that both wings of the Democratic Party believe they have already been forced to yield too much. Centrists complain that the president has taken the liberals’ side by tying the infrastructure package to the far more liberal safety net bill.

“If Biden thinks he’s adopted a middle course that should leave people equally happy, he has misjudged the situation,” said Bill Galston, a former domestic policy official in President Bill Clinton’s administration. “The prevailing view of the centrists is the president has tilted decisively in the other direction. There’s not a lot of joy in Mudville.”

Liberals are rankled that, after they agreed to cut the size of the safety net package significantly, to $3.5 trillion, they are now being told they must reduce it much more.

“There is nothing superfluous in the agenda. Every dollar is needed to deliver millions of good-paying jobs, affordable child care and health care, and a clean energy future,” said Lindsay Owens, executive director of Groundwork Collaborative, a left-leaning group.

If Biden has one weapon in his arsenal, it’s the recognition by many Democrats that if his agenda collapses, it could be devastating for the party in the 2022 midterm elections and beyond.

Democrats, above all else, are trying desperately to avoid what happened with President Donald Trump’s pledge to repeal the Affordable Care Act in 2017. That effort bogged down the congressional Republican majority for months, and when then-Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) finally brought a repeal provision to the floor for a vote, it was defeated in a major embarrassment.

#### Biden’s PC wrecked now

Scott Wong & Mike Lillis, 10-11. Scott Wong is a Senior Reporter at The Hill. Mike Lillis is a Senior reporter at The Hill. “Bleak midterm outlook shadows bitter Democratic battle.” 10/11/21. https://thehill.com/homenews/house/575993-bleak-midterm-outlook-shadows-bitter-democratic-battle

It’s numbers like that that are making Republicans very confident about their chances of winning back the House next year. “Pretty remarkable given it was THAT much money, ostensibly needed for an 'emergency,' and at the height of Biden’s political capital… and just a few months later it’s underwater,” a GOP aide said in an email. A Daily Kos-Civiqs survey in August offered a similar warning to Democrats, finding that 57 percent of voters say the Biden administration has done nothing to benefit them personally. “If a large infrastructure bill passes, there's no guarantee his approval will recover,” said Wasserman. “But if it fails, it could get worse — and that's what Democrats have to fear." Kyle Kondik, managing editor of Sabato's Crystal Ball, an election handicapper based at the University of Virginia, provided a similar analysis, noting that Biden's agenda, while popular in some districts, could be a liability in others where Republicans will attack the safety net expansion as government overreach. “Having some success to point to always seems preferable to failure,” Kondik said. “But let’s say the Democrats pass the bipartisan bill and a reconciliation package — maybe it helps them, or maybe it gives Republicans something to point to as they argue for checks and balances next year.”

#### Biden can’t and won’t use PC to move Sinema or Manchin

Alexander Bolton 10/15/21. The Hill "Biden's soft touch with Manchin, Sinema frustrates Democrats". TheHill. 10-15-2021. https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/576861-bidens-soft-touch-with-manchin-sinema-frustrates-democrats

A growing number of Senate Democrats are getting impatient with President Biden’s kid-glove approach to negotiating with Sens. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.).

Biden’s approach has involved a lot of facetime and personal attention, but little in the way of public concessions or discernible movement.

After talks on the scale and scope of the Democrats’ $3.5 trillion reconciliation spending bill stalled in September, Democratic senators expressed hope that Biden’s personal involvement would yield a breakthrough.

Yet after several one-on-one meetings between the president, Manchin and Sinema, Democrats don’t seem any closer to agreeing on a framework than a month ago.

This is fueling frustration among senators who see this Congress as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to pass bold reforms as the House and possibly the Senate are in danger of flipping to Republicans in the 2022 midterm election.

“Both of them have left the president hanging,” grumbled one Democratic senator who requested anonymity to vent about the lack of progress since Biden reached out personally to Manchin and Sinema.

Biden met one-on-one with Sinema on the morning of Sept. 15 and then with Manchin later that day. He also held separate meetings with the two senators on Sept. 28.

Little news came out of any of the meetings other than a report that Sinema issued an ultimatum to Biden, warning him she wouldn’t back the reconciliation bill if the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill was delayed or failed in the House.

“If [Biden] had been able to walk away and say, 'I have a commitment to $2 trillion from both [senators] and now we’re working on the details,' it would have been like a sense of momentum. ‘The president’s magic of the Oval Office comes in once again.’ But instead it was like, ‘There’s no magic in the Oval Office right now,’” the senator who spoke to The Hill said of the meetings.

Some Democratic senators think Biden’s deference to Manchin and Sinema has only emboldened them to dig in their heels even more.

#### PC is fake.

Roberts 20 [David Roberts, writer about energy and climate change @ Vox. 12-1-2020, "Joe Biden should do everything at once," Vox, accessed 7-12-2021, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/21724758/biden-transition-trump-polarized-climate-change-health-immigration] //BY \*\*\*edited for gendered language

Two-party partisan politics really is a zero-sum game

The theme of these stories is that Democrats relied on clever sequencing over and over again, imagining some amount of political capital (“credibility”) that they could ~~husband~~ [gather] and spend strategically to get assistance across the aisle, at every juncture underestimating the ferocity and unanimity of Republican opposition. They kept behaving as though they would find good-faith negotiating partners, as though they were still in the postwar American era of relatively low (or at least manageable) polarization.

What too few of them realized was that they were already in a new era of near-total polarization, with the population sorted into like-minded enclaves, a bifurcated media ecosystem nurturing stacked (and diametrically opposed) “mega-identities,” and voters motivated primarily by “negative partisanship,” which is to say, hatred of the other side.

A fully polarized two-party system really is a zero-sum game. Any victories or gains by one side come at the other side’s expense, even if the victory secures shared goals. The rational course for the party out of power is to fight with full intensity against everything, always, and that’s what Republicans did under Obama. With scarcely any exceptions, from 2010 through 2020, they pushed in every case for maximal partisan advantage, no matter the stakes or possible cost.

#### Haitian migrants, Afghanistan, declining polls thump PC

Alex Seitz-Wald, 9-27-2021, "Biden in a bind on border: 'The coalition that elected him will collapse'," NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/joe-biden/biden-bind-border-politics-finally-got-better-their-policy-n1280044>

“President Biden needs to show moral clarity in this moment,” said Julián Castro, the former Obama Cabinet member and 2020 Democratic presidential candidate. “If he doesn’t, the coalition that elected him will collapse.”

There were no snakes and alligators, as Trump reportedly wanted on the U.S.-Mexico border. But the images of Border Patrol agents on horseback chasing Haitian asylum-seekers attempting to cross the Rio Grande has many of Biden’s allies comparing him to his predecessor and questioning his commitment to the larger reform project.

The administration has attempted to distance itself from actions taking place under its oversight.

Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas called the images “horrible and horrific,” and the White House said horses will no longer be used in the area.

Vice President Kamala Harris, who has been tasked with dealing with some border issues, released an eyebrow-raising readout of a call she held with Mayorkas speaking to her nominal subordinate the way she might to a hostile a foreign leader.

But none of it seems to have helped much.

The administration’s top envoy to Haiti resigned in protest of the "inhumane, counterproductive decision" to deport Haitian refugees back to a country seemingly everyone agrees is unsafe as it grapples with political unrest and the aftermath of a hurricane and earthquake.

And Republicans are still insisting Biden is promoting “uncontrolled illegal immigration into the country,” as Missouri Sen. Josh Hawley said during a hearing with Mayorkas.

For some, like Frank Sharry, the longtime head of the immigration advocacy group America's Voice, it’s all too familiar to see a Democrat have their dreams — and backbone — crushed by a media firestorm over an immigration flashpoint.

“I’ve been in this debate for 40 years, and it feels like groundhog,” Sharry said, noting every president for decades has dealt with surges of Haitian and Central American migrants.

Back in March, when a different surge of migrants was in the news, many of the questions at Biden’s first news conference were about the border. The new president stood by his plan for a regional approach to stem the flow of migrants, fix the asylum system and “undo the moral and national shame of the previous administration.”

But since then, Biden has faced one challenge after another, from the pandemic to the pullout of Afghanistan, with his poll numbers declining along with the prospects for his domestic legislative agenda on Capitol Hill, leaving little political capital left for a fight on one of the most divisive issues in the country.

“The politics finally got the better of their policy vision,” Sharry said. “In my view, they held their nerve. And in the last week, they choked.”

#### Self-inflicted wounds sapped Biden’s PC

Don Purdum, 9-26-2021, political analyst "Independents Erode Biden’s Political Capital," No Publication, https://www.unitedvoice.com/independents-erode-bidens-political-capital/

Biden’s problem spot isn’t the GOP; it’s independents. Biden’s highest approval among them was 61%. Independents now approve of the president’s job performance at an abysmal 37% among this critical group of voters. Gallup added that two-thirds of the slide occurred in the past three months.

Unfortunately, the poll didn’t get into the specifics of why the president is losing faith with independents. At this point, it’s probably not just the Afghanistan issue giving Biden fits among voters. The administration largely moved away from the fiasco three weeks ago as it pivoted to trying to pass Biden’s signature two-track infrastructure plan, which at the moment may fall apart soon if the far-Left and Center don’t start compromising. That’s unlikely.

As Biden’s self-inflicted failures continue to grow into gaping wounds, the president’s political capital may be fading into the sunset. A president’s approval rating often correlates to upcoming midterm elections. If this trend holds, the chances of the Democrats successfully defending their razor-thin margins aren’t good.

#### Won’t pass or will be ineffective

Tony Romm, 9-8-2021, "Democrats confront numerous hurdles as they work to advance $3.5 trillion economic package," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2021/09/08/democrats-september-debt-ceiling-reconciliation/

The primary battle concerns the package’s price tag, as Manchin and other moderates raise fears that as much as $3.5 trillion in spending could worsen the deficit and contribute to inflation. Democrats say they intend to cover the costs of their measure in full, but Manchin has maintained privately that the number still may be too high.

Instead, the West Virginia Democrat in recent days has told peers he might support only as much as $1.5 trillion package, according to a person familiar with the matter who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe his thinking. Axios first reported on the senator’s views.

Slashing Democrats’ spending — perhaps by as much as half — would force party lawmakers to scale back some of their policy aspirations. The issue has been top of mind for lawmakers including Rep. Robert C. “Bobby” Scott (D-Va.), leader of the House Education and Labor Committee, one of the panels set to convene Thursday to begin its work on reconciliation. Entering the session, Scott’s panel has put forward a roughly $450 billion plan meant to improve the country’s child care programs, along with policies that would grant millions of Americans access to paid leave and improve aging schools.

“In this package, you are limited by the top line,” he said in a recent interview.

Privately, some Democrats have acknowledged this week they may have no choice but to whittle down their spending as they try to assuage moderates’ concerns. But aides to liberal-leaning lawmakers, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe their bosses’ thinking, stressed that a package as low as $1.5 trillion is essentially a nonstarter — a pledge that dooms any bill at that size.

Appearing at a news conference Thursday, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) appeared to acknowledge both of her party’s factions. “I don’t know what the final number will be,” she said. “But we have to talk about what does that take? Where would you cut child care, family medical leave paid for, universal pre-K, home health care?”

#### Best climate measures will be cut- ineffective and hurts international perception

Coral Davenport, 10-15-2021, "Key to Biden’s Climate Agenda Likely to Be Cut Because of Manchin Opposition," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/15/climate/biden-clean-energy-manchin.html

The most powerful part of President Biden’s climate agenda — a program to rapidly replace the nation’s coal- and gas-fired power plants with wind, solar and nuclear energy — will likely be dropped from the massive budget bill pending in Congress, according to congressional staffers and lobbyists familiar with the matter.

Senator Joe Manchin III, the Democrat from coal-rich West Virginia whose vote is crucial to passage of the bill, has told the White House that he strongly opposes the clean electricity program, according to three of those people. As a result, White House staffers are now rewriting the legislation without that climate provision, and are trying to cobble together a mix of other policies that could also cut emissions.

A White House spokesman, Vedant Patel, declined to comment on the specifics of the bill, saying, “the White House is laser focused on advancing the president’s climate goals and positioning the United States to meet its emission targets in a way that grows domestic industries and good jobs.”

A spokeswoman for Mr. Manchin, Sam Runyon, wrote in an email, “Senator Manchin has clearly expressed his concerns about using taxpayer dollars to pay private companies to do things they’re already doing. He continues to support efforts to combat climate change while protecting American energy independence and ensuring our energy reliability.”

West Virginia’s other senator, Republican Shelley Moore Capito, said she was “vehemently opposed” to the clean electricity program because it is “designed to ultimately eliminate coal and natural gas from our electricity mix, and would be absolutely devastating for my state.”

The $150 billion clean electricity program was the muscle behind Mr. Biden’s ambitious climate agenda. It would reward utilities that switched from burning fossil fuels to renewable energy sources, and penalize those that do not.

Experts have said that the policy over the next decade would drastically reduce the greenhouse gases that are heating the planet and that it would be the strongest climate change policy ever enacted by the United States.

“This is absolutely the most important climate policy in the package,” said Leah Stokes, an expert on climate policy, who has been advising Senate Democrats on how to craft the program. “We fundamentally need it to meet our climate goals. That’s just the reality. And now we can’t. So this is pretty sad.”

The setback also means that President Biden will have a weakened hand when he travels to Glasgow in two weeks for a major United Nations climate change summit. He had hoped to point to the clean electricity program as evidence that the United States, which is historically the largest emitter of planet-warming pollution, was serious about changing course and leading a global effort to fight climate change. Mr. Biden has vowed that the United States will cut its emissions 50 percent from 2005 levels by 2030.

The rest of the world remains deeply wary of the country’s commitment to tackling global warming after four years in which former President Donald J. Trump openly mocked the science of climate change and enacted policies that encouraged more drilling and burning of fossil fuels.

“This will create a huge problem for the White House in Glasgow,” said David G. Victor, co-director of the Deep Decarbonization Initiative at the University of California, San Diego. “If you see the president coming in and saying all the right things with all the right aspirations, and then one of the earliest tests of whether he can deliver falls apart, it creates the question of whether you can believe him.”

## T

#### Prohibit can mean ‘severely hinder’---doesn’t necessitate a ban.

Washington Court of Appeals 19 (KORSMO-judge. Opinion in State v. Kimball, No. 35441-5-III (Wash. Ct. App. Apr. 2, 2019). Google scholar caselaw. Date accessed 7/13/21).

His argument runs counter to the meaning of the word "prohibit." It means "1. To forbid by law. 2. To prevent, preclude, or severely hinder." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 1405 (10th ed. 2014). As "severely hinder" suggests, a "prohibition" need not be an all or nothing proposition.

#### Prohibition includes per se and rule of reason.

Anu Bradford and Adam S. Chilton 18. Anu Bradford Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia Law School. Adam S. Chilton. Assistant Professor of Law and Walter Mander Research Scholar.

Before discussing our data and the coding of the CLI, it is important to recognize that there are limitations to any index that attempts to quantify competition regulation. This is because it is difficult to produce a single metric that tells the comprehensive story of country’s competition regime. For example, if a specific type of conduct is prohibited, is it prohibited always (per se) or sometimes (rule of reason)? This seems like a relevant distinction to code, but it turns out to be difficult to capture systematically in many jurisdictions. For instance, Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) seems to regulate anticompetitive agreements under the rule of reason standard in the European Union, but, in practice, cartels are per se prohibited. This highlights the challenge of coding even just the law in books, let alone accounting for all the nuances of a country’s competition policies.20

#### 4. Grammar---“by” means expanding antitrust is the way in which we prohibit---making it illegal under antitrust should be sufficient.

Crown Academy of English 18, (Andrew, Fully qualified English teacher with TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) qualification. “Preposition BY – Meaning and use”, https://www.crownacademyenglish.com/preposition-by-meaning-use/)

by + ING form of verb

This describes how to do something. It describes the method for achieving a a particular result.

## States CP

### Pre-emption

#### State labor actions get pre-empted under the NLRA---thousands of empirics.

Moshe Marvit 17. attorney and fellow at the Century Foundation, and co-author with Richard D. Kahlenberg of Why Labor Organizing Should Be a Civil Right: Rebuilding a Middle-Class Democracy by Enhancing Worker Voice. “The Way Forward for Labor Is Through the States.” The American Prospect. 9/1/2017. <https://prospect.org/labor/way-forward-labor-states/>

While reforms to federal law have been blocked by Congress, states and cities have faced a different hurdle: the courts. Starting in 1959, **the Supreme Court has written into the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) a continually expanding preemption doctrine that prevents states and cities from passing laws that touch upon anything related to labor**, involve the interpretation of a collective bargaining agreement, or even involve issues that the courts believe Congress intended to leave to the free play of market forces. Congress can, and often does, expressly preempt states from passing laws that fall within a defined scope. Neither the NLRA nor its extensive legislative history, however, contains any mention of preemption: Congress did not expressly preempt states from acting. **In instances where Congress has not expressly preempted states from acting, state laws that actually conflict with federal laws are still preempted**. However, neither the NLRA nor its legislative history show any consensus that Congress meant to push states and cities from making laws that advanced, and do not conflict with, the pro-collective-bargaining policies of the NLRA. And yet, as Harvard Law Professor Ben Sachs has pointed out, the Supreme Court has not employed the typical typologies of preemption at all when dealing with labor law. Rather, it has created a preemption doctrine [that] is among the broadest and most robust in federal law. In most other areas of worker protection, from minimum wage to antidiscrimination laws, the federal government has set the floor under which states and cities may not go, but they can and often do raise the ceiling by increasing state or local minimum wage or including additional protected categories such as sexual orientation to existing protections. Indeed, the evolution of many of the nation's employment and civil rights protections began at the state level and trickled up to the federal government. It is only in the area of workers' labor rights that states and cities are powerless to act and that, solely as the result of judicial decisions. The Supreme Court's preemption doctrine started with the 1959 case, San Diego Building Trades v. Garmon, where the employer got a state court injunction against the union for picketing. The Supreme Court should have held that the picketing that the union was engaged in was a protected right under federal labor law, and therefore the state could not pass a law that conflicts with that right. Instead, the Court went further and held that Congress gave the National Labor Relations Board primary agency jurisdiction, and so when something is arguably protected or prohibited by the NLRA, then only the Board can act. Furthermore, only the Board can answer the initial question of whether conduct is arguably under the Board’s jurisdiction. The Supreme Court then doubled down on its preemption doctrine in the 1976 case, Machinists v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission. In the Machinist case, an employer brought an unfair labor practice charge against union workers who engaged in concerted refusal to work overtime during contract negotiations. The NLRB dismissed the charge because it held that the work refusal was not prohibited under the NLRA, so the employer brought a state court action against the union. In response, the Supreme Court expanded its earlier Garmon preemption to hold that Congress intended that certain conduct be left unregulated and left to be controlled by the free play of economic forces. Though the union in the Machinists case benefitted from the Court’s expansion of federal preemption, the decision has led to states and cities being almost absolutely prohibited from passing laws that promote unionization and collective bargaining. These Court decisions, and **thousands of lower court decisions that have followed the precedent in overturning state and local laws,** rely on three types of specious and archaic reasons that deserve challenge and reconsideration. First, the Court has repeatedly shown a strong reliance on the state of the economy and labor force during the time when these decisions were issued. In the Machinists case, the Court described how it experimented with various types of preemption before settling on the broad form begun by Garmon, stating, as it was, in short, experience, not pure logic, which initially taught that each of these methods sacrificed important federal interests in a uniform law of labor relations. The experience the Court referred to was that of the late 1940s and 1950s, when union membership was at its peak. Whatever balance between labor and management that may have existed then has since eroded. Second, the Court has long interpreted the statute to require a uniform labor law across the country, and yet, labor law has become in many ways a crazy quilt, varying from region to region, from state to state, and from one president to the next. The NLRB has become a highly politicized agency, with its decisions swinging wildly every time a new president appoints new members and a general counsel. Cases that proceed through the National Labor Relations Board are often appealed to federal courts, and different federal circuits often come to opposite conclusions, meaning that the laws in different states effectively differ though it is the courts, not state or local governments, that create those differences. Further, the expansion of state right to work laws, as well as a variety of state public sector labor laws have also undermined any goal of national uniformity in labor law. Lastly, the Court's determination that Congress intended to leave a wide variety of conduct to the free play of economic forces has, in the words of NYU Law Professor Cynthia Estlund, done what Congress did not do in the NLRA, or even with the Taft-Hartley Act: It has granted to employers a federal right to use their economic power against unions. The Congress that passed the NLRA may have intended to ensure a balance between employer and union power, but there is no indication that it intended employers to be able to use the Act to evade any regulation in broad areas through a laissez faire argument. The result of this judicially created broad preemption has been to limit state and local experimentation in line with what Justice Brandeis described as laboratories of democracy with labor laws that advance the stated purpose of federal labor law. However, since states and cities cannot act in the field of labor law, all discussions of federal labor law reform are purely theoretical and lack any empirical basis for their possible effects. Numerous labor law scholars have written critically over the years of the rationale for such broad preemption, as well as the effects it has had on workers' ability to organize. Recently, Lewis & Clark Law Professor Henry Drummonds came up with a list of ten potential reforms that would advance the pro-collective bargaining mission of the NLRA if states could be able to pass such reforms under normal preemption rules. These include allowing states to: increase damages for violating workers' labor rights so the penalties are in line with those for other forms of workplace discrimination; experiment with restrictions on permanent replacement of striking workers and on the use of employer lockouts; experiment with â€œcard checkâ€ recognition of the union; provide equal access to union advocates as well as employers during a campaign for unions; and require arbitration if an impasse arises in the bargaining over a first contract. **The one and only major state labor reform since** the **1935** enactment of the NLRA has had a profound effect on the division of wealth and power in the United States. That, of course, **was the provision of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act enabling states to pass right to work laws.** Allowing states and cities to create local rules that promote unionization and collective bargaining that are tailored to local needs and local industries could prove just as significant in the opposite direction.

#### Can’t solve international coop---the DOJ and FTC are key to American antitrust’s global solvency.

Garza et. al. 07. Chair of the Antitrust Modernization Commission, a bi-partisan blue ribbon commission created by Congress to advise Congress and the President on the state of U.S. Antitrust law enforcement and former DOJ Antitrust Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Regulatory Affairs. “Antitrust Modernization Commission: Report and Recommendations: Chapter 2,” p. 216-217. Antitrust Modernization Commission. 2/4/2007. https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/amc/report\_recommendation/chapter2.pdf

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) have made extensive efforts to improve cooperation between the United States and other nations’ antitrust enforcers.26 Both U.S. antitrust agencies “enjoy [a] strong cooperative relationship[] with a large and increasing number of foreign enforcement agencies, enabling close cooperation on cases, coordination on international antitrust policy, and provision of technical assistance to new agencies around the world.”27 Whereas U.S. requests for cooperation previously took up to a year to be processed,28 today antitrust agencies worldwide have a “pick up the phone” approach toward sharing information and assisting each other in their antitrust enforcement efforts.29 This high degree of cooperation has facilitated convergence of both procedural and substantive aspects of antitrust law.

The efforts of the U.S. antitrust agencies have been advanced in part through their participation in two organizations, the OECD and the ICN.30 The OECD was created in 1961 to expand free trade and improve development in member countries.31 As part of these efforts, it created a Competition Law and Policy Committee that provides a variety of means for countries to share their best practices regarding antitrust and competition policy.32 The ICN, in comparison, is relatively new, but has a more broad-based membership. It was created after ICPAC called for the creation of a “Global Competition Initiative” to address antitrust enforcement in a growing globalized economy.33 Membership in the ICN has increased from fourteen jurisdictions when it began in 200134 to ninety-seven members from eighty-five jurisdictions in 2007.35

The ICN and OECD have promulgated “best practices” on merger reviews and cartel investigations and continue to work on convergence of substantive and procedural law.36 For example, the ICN is currently undertaking a study of unilateral conduct standards with the goal of developing a consensus on the objectives and legal and economic bases of enforcement regarding unilateral conduct.37 The ICN in the past has developed principles of best practices regarding merger notification regimes, with the objective of highlighting the importance of transparency and clarity in each jurisdiction’s rules regarding filing requirements and review.38 Overall, through their efforts, these institutions have had a meaningful influence in “promoting convergence in antitrust enforcement”39 and have contributed to the “significant recent progress in reducing conflicts by increasing cooperation, information sharing, and networking.”40 Indeed, their successes are reflected at least in part by the fact that the vast majority of international investigations are conducted without incident.41

#### Coercive process collapses democratic legitimacy impacted out by advantage 3

Peter M. Shane 03. Joseph S. Platt-Porter, Wright, Morris and Arthur Professor of Law, Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University and Distinguished Service Professor Adjunct of Law and Public Policy, H. J. Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University. "When Inter-Branch Norms Break Down: Of Arms-for-Hostages, Orderly Shutdowns, Presidential Impeachments, and Judicial Coups," Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy: Vol. 12: Iss. 3, Article 3. Available at: http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cjlpp/vol12/iss3/3

The reason this matters is complex. We have a national system of government whose orderly and effective operation depends to an exceptional degree upon certain norms of cooperation among its competing branches. The strength of those norms is essential to securing the primary political asset that our government design was intended to help realize: an especially robust form of democratic legitimacy. If recent norm-bending initiatives constitute a trend, rather than a series of coincidental, but unlinked episodes, then the capacity of our government to manifest this particular form of legitimacy may be endangered. Such a development should not proceed unnoticed.

## Advantage CP

#### The plan’s legal standard is key to collective worker action.

Firat Cengiz 20. School of Law and Social Justice, University of Liverpool. "The conflict between market competition and worker solidarity: moving from consumer to a citizen welfare standard in competition law". Cambridge Core. 10-8-2020. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-studies/article/conflict-between-market-competition-and-worker-solidarity-moving-from-consumer-to-a-citizen-welfare-standard-in-competition-law/6E783D1FC4BAB5605DFABCD17FBE3F35

4. The competition-solidarity conflict in light of labour exploitation theory: moving from consumer to citizen welfare

Economic models from opposing ends of the political spectrum perceive labour as a special and different production factor with idiosyncratic qualities, which makes it particularly open to exploitation. Labour's particular likelihood for exploitation is all the more worrying because labour power is attached to and cannot be separated from the worker. Additionally in the case of labour, unlike other production factors, there is not a zero-sum dynamic between the value attached to the production factor and consumer welfare. This is because, as exemplified in Marx's labour fetish theory, most consumers are also workers. As a result, when wages increase this benefits consumers in their economic role as workers even though they might have to pay a higher price for products and services.

As a result, economic theory suggests that, unlike commodities and other production factors, conflicts involving labour cannot be solved using simple economic cost–benefit analyses without any substantial adjustment. Similarly, worker solidarity and collective action need protection as common goods when they come into conflict with the principle of competition not only because this would be socially just but also because it would be economically sound.

As the analysis in the previous section illustrates, competition rules in the EU and the US are applied with a strict consumer welfare standard in mind, which overlooks the idiosyncratic characteristics of labour, and as a result, competition rules become a disciplining mechanism against collective worker action. Consequently, when dealing with the competition–solidarity conflict, courts and competition authorities need to follow a more inclusive legal standard that better reflects the characteristics of labour as a production factor. For this purpose, this paper suggests a citizen (rather than consumer) welfare standard that takes into consideration the economic effects of anti-competitive behaviour on consumers as well as workers. The citizen welfare standard could also be applied in other cases where competition rules and principles come into conflict with public interest or other policy objectives, such as cases involving industrial policy, environmental policy or other social objectives in which competition authorities and courts are yet to produce a consistent approach.102 As a result, in these cases, competition authorities and courts would be able to look at how the specific behaviour in question affects citizens in their entirety as a holistic group, rather than focusing on the interests of the narrow category of consumers.

Another significant advantage of following this approach is that this would not require a change in the law but only a change in the approach and the legal tests employed by courts and competition authorities when they deal with the competition–solidarity conflict.

In light of the citizen welfare standard, collective worker action would be shielded from competition law attack under labour exemption, because even though collective worker action could result in increased prices in the product market due to higher labour costs and decreased consumer welfare, it would also increase the welfare of workers, who will benefit from increased wages and better working conditions. An exemption standard that is based on an inclusive welfare approach will also save courts and competition authorities from disentangling who qualifies as an undertaking (in the EU) and whether or not worker organisations acted jointly with third parties (in the US), both of which result in imprecise and limited judicial exemptions that do not provide a secure harbour for collective worker action and render it particularly precarious for workers in casualised flexible arrangements to take collective action against their working conditions.

Similarly, in light of the citizen welfare standard, even if the effect of collusive employer behaviour on prices in the product market cannot be proven, a reduction in the welfare of workers in the production process, such as reduced wages, will be considered sufficient for the collusion in question to qualify as anti-competitive. Collusion between employers suppressing wages and other working conditions does not necessarily affect consumer welfare. Suppression of wages might even result in reduced prices and increased consumer welfare due to reduced labour costs in the short run but this comes at the cost of a negative effect on worker welfare.

This does not mean that courts should engage in a balancing analysis between consumer and worker welfare and investigate whether the effect on consumer or worker welfare is larger. In the light of the labour fetish theory, consumers and workers belong to the same group of people and an increase/decrease in consumer welfare with the resulting decrease/increase in worker welfare is most likely to be a transfer. Under the citizen welfare standard, an increase in worker welfare would be considered sufficient for the labour exemption to protect collective worker action from antitrust attack and a decrease in worker welfare would be considered sufficient for the employer collusion in question to be considered anti-competitive.

#### The aff solves inequality best.

Ike Brannon 20. senior fellow at the Jack Kemp Foundation. “A Wealth Tax Is Not A Solution For Income Inequality” Forbes. 09-29-20. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ikebrannon/2020/09/29/a-wealth-tax-is-not-a-solution-for-income-inequality/?sh=6353462b7f5b>

A **permanent increase in pay in the occupations of low-income households is infinitely preferable than any commensurate increase in transfer payments.** Successive governments abetted this increase beneficial development by quickly acting to ameliorate the effect of the financial crisis and then making economic growth writ large a priority across both Democratic and Republican Administrations. And after the economic expansion reached 7 years, **wages at the bottom started to increase. This also describes our success at reducing inequality** in the 1990s.

#### Antitrust law failure harms workers.

Brishen Rogers 18. An Associate Professor at Temple University's Beasley School of Law, and a Fellow at the Roosevelt Institute. “The Limits of Antitrust Enforcement” Boston Review. 04-30-18. http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality/brishen-rogers-limits-antitrust-enforcement

Just a few years ago, the mainstream economic and legal opinions held that labor markets basically tended to “clear,” and that employers’ market power did not have a significant impact on wages or other terms of employment. Today, however, the issue of economic power, especially in the labor market, has made a startling reversal. A number of economists and legal scholars have recently argued that **declining antitrust enforcement has harmed not just consumers, but also workers.** Employers’ use of non-compete agreements and compulsory arbitration have also come under public scrutiny: non-competes because they **limit workers’ ability to leave their employment**, and arbitration because it **prevents workers from protesting unfair treatment** and enforcing their own legal rights. Unchecked corporate power is cancerous. **The workplace, too often, is authoritarian**. The remedy lies in democratic control.

## Modeling CP

# 1AR vs Minnesota AP

## Adv CP

### Plank 1

#### Minimum wage doesn’t solve inequality.

Christos Makridis 16. Ph.D. Candidate in Macroeconomics and Public Finance at Stanford University. “Raising the Minimum Wage Won’t Reduce Inequality” The New Republic. 02-05-16. <https://newrepublic.com/article/129286/raising-minimum-wage-wont-reduce-inequality>

How minimum wages affect inequality, however, remains controversial. Detecting it with **standard statistical methods is very challenging** because their full effects are constantly changing and require data on both individuals and companies. Back in 1999, Princeton economist David Lee used the Consumer Population Survey (CPS) from 1979 to 1989 to argue that the declining purchasing power of the minimum wage largely explains why inequality surged in the 1980s. Other new research, however, has put that conclusion in doubt. Perhaps the **most conclusive reassessment** comes from economists David Autor, Alan Manning, and Christopher Smith earlier this year. Using many more **years of microdata from the CPS**, as well as a different statistical approach, they found that the minimum wage explains **at most 30 percent** to 40 percent of the rise in wage inequality among the lowest earners. Since economists had thought that changes in the minimum wage could explain as much as 90 percent of the shift in inequality, these **new estimates are important.** How wages affect worker behavior While the extent is still uncertain, it’s clear that the minimum wage and other wage-setting forces such as tax rates and union bargaining power do in fact affect inequality and the labor market. My own ongoing research, which focuses on the link between such wage-setting mechanisms and company behavior, suggests labor-market distortions like raising the minimum wage can have other **negative effects on workers, businesses and inequality** beyond the overall impact on employment. The first adverse effect concerns how much people work. If, for example, worker wages rise due to a government mandate, the employer may reduce the number of hours staff work, leading to lower paychecks even after the raise. That’s part of the reason why we’ve seen companies like McDonald’s increasingly try to automate tasks that were once held by people. In addition, my research suggests one of the major ways people acquire new skills is by spending more time at work. Thus policies that lead to fewer hours could lower employees’ ability to improve their long-run earnings potential. The second is an indirect effect on the way businesses invest in workers and design compensation and organizational policies. When companies are forced to pay higher wages, they may offset the cost by reducing how much they invest in workers. There is **evidence that minimum wage laws have this effect.** This can result in weaker compensation contracts (e.g., purely salary-based), which provide employees with fewer incentives to accumulate skills. As a result, workers paid fixed wages suffer greater long-run earnings volatility than those receiving performance-based pay. Put simply, if a recession comes and an individual loses his or her job, having more skills makes it easier to find a new position and return to the previous income level. Minimal impact on inequality Even setting aside all the plausible economic arguments against the minimum wage, under the best case scenario, what does it really achieve? If the average full-time employee works 1,700 hours per year, then moving from $7.25 an hour to $9 an hour produces **only about $2,975 in additional annual earnings**. While some may argue that something is better than nothing, this would be **at best a marginal solution to inequality.** Taking a look at the most recent 2015 Current Population Survey data and restrict the sample to full-time earners with over $10,000 earnings per year, Americans at the 90th income percentile (they earn more than 90 percent of their compatriots, or $80,000 a year) make 5.6 times as much, on average, as those at the 10th percentile ($14,200). Increasing the minimum wage to $9 an hour would put the ratio around 4.65. In other words, **even in the best of worlds**—where the minimum wage has no unintended side effects—it appears to only **marginally reduce inequality.**

## Econ DA

#### Enhancing worker welfare is necessary even if there are negative effects on consumers.

Eugene K. Kim 20. J.D. 2020; Yale College, B.A. 2016. “Labor’s Antitrust Problem: A Case for Worker Welfare” The Yale Law Journal. 2020. https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/130.2Kim\_q1s8bt8t.pdf

Even if workers’ organizations have ambiguous or negative effects on **consumers**, the **fact that they enhance worker welfare is an independent reason to enable them**, in light of both the exploitation that many workers face due to con- centration in capital, as well as the **concern for labor expressed through statutory text and legislative history.** Although worker organization can have marginally negative effects on employment, **studies** have shown that unionization can have significant positive effects on wages and working conditions for union and non- union workers alike, leading to a **net positive effect on worker welfare**.146

#### Other factors weaken business confidence.

Eric Rosenbaum 21. Senior Editor. “Politics, inflation pinch as small business confidence rises slower than markets and economy” CNBC. 05-03-21. <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/03/politics-inflation-pinch-as-small-business-confidence-trails-economy.html>

**Confidence** among small business owners has barely risen as fears about **inflation, hiring costs, tax hikes and partisan politics** weigh on Main Street as it shows some signs of returning to pre-pandemic levels. According to a CNBC|SurveyMonkey Small Business Survey conducted last month, **64% of entrepreneurs say their business can survive** more than a year under current business conditions as the wave of shutdowns and bankruptcies that crushed many Main Street enterprises eases and the country emerges from Covid-19. That’s up from 55% in the first quarter. The survey also found that 34% of business owners think current business conditions are good. The survey’s Small Business Confidence Index ticked higher to 45 in the current quarter from a record low of 43 in the first quarter. To be sure, that’s still a negative sentiment reading. “In the middle, confidence wise, is appropriate, because there are still lots of unknowns as far as the recovery,” Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council President Karen Kerrigan said. “Many are still digging out ... paying back-rent, getting back to a normal level of revenue.” The percentage of business owners forecasting a revenue decrease over the next year dropped to 18% from 27% last quarter. Less than half, 46%, expect revenue to grow. Biden’s infrastructure plan and Main Street The U.S. economy is staging a sharp recovery as several rounds of stimulus checks have buoyed consumers. President Joe Biden’s infrastructure plan and spending priorities are also expected to provide an economic boost. But **views about the president’s ambitions are mixed on Main Street.** While just over half of small business owners support Biden’s infrastructure legislation, there is a divide on Main Street driven by party affiliation. According to the survey, 97% of small business owners who identify as Democrats and Democratic leaners support The American Jobs Plan. That drops to 55% among independents and to 23% among Republicans and GOP leaners. The tax policy needed to fund the infrastructure plan **divides small business owners**, with 39% of entrepreneurs in favor of paying for the measures by raising the corporate tax rate to 28% from 21%, while **59% disapprove**. The partisan split here is also wide: 85% of Democrats and Democratic leaners approve of a corporate tax hike, along with just 38% of independents and a mere 13% of Republicans and GOP leaners “We view this as a fragile recovery and these proposals certainly infuse a little more uncertainty into that,” said Kevin Kuhlman, vice president of federal government relations at the National Federation of Independent Business. The NFIB’s most-recent survey found small business confidence is back at its historical average after being below that level for nearly a year. Certain industries within the small business community should benefit from infrastructure spending, such as construction and internet services. But Biden’s alignment with labor unions could dampen expectations among small business owners over the plan’s potential benefits. “Most companies are not union companies,” Kerrigan said, though she added most do view infrastructure spending positively. Fears about inflation, hiring As businesses attempt to get back to normal, finding workers and supply chain issues are **still headwinds for operating at full capacity.**

#### Monopsony results in economic losses.

C. Scott Hemphill & Nancy L. Rose 18. \*C. Scott Hemphill is Professor of Law at New York University School of Law. \*Nancy L. Rose is the Charles P. Kindleberger Professor of Applied Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. “Mergers that Harm Sellers” The Yale Law Journal. 2018. <http://economics.mit.edu/files/17752>

Now **consider monopsony**. The firm has market power in an input market, such as the labor it hires to make a product. The firm recognizes that its decisions affect the purchase price of the input. If the firm reduces the price it pays, the quantity available for purchase falls, but not to zero. In the labor context, workers with a low enough reservation wage still accept a job offer; workers with a higher reservation wage drop out. By reducing its wage offer, the firm pays a lower wage for all employees, which can raise its overall profits. Part of the workers’ loss takes the form of wages transferred to the firm as extra profit. Additional **deadweight loss arises** as workers whose greatest productivity is working for the firm are instead pushed to less productive employment or **out of the labor market entirely**.11 The exercise of monopsony power in hiring skilled labor, such as nurses, may **lead to further economic losses over time**, as some workers choose not to invest in skill acquisition **due to the lower wage rate**.12 When the inputs are produced by upstream firms, such as farmers raising beef cattle to be sold to meat processing companies, the further dynamic costs of monopsony may include **reductions in investment** by upstream firms in capacity, innovation, product quality, or other important input attributes.13 While dynamic effects such as these will depend on the particular facts and circumstances of a given market, and likely are difficult to quantify empirically, innovation costs of reduced competition among buyers have the potential to dwarf static or short- run costs.14

## Ptx

#### No credible scientific organization thinks warming causes extinction.

Michael Shellenberger 19. Time Magazine “Hero of the Environment,” Green Book Award Winner, and author of Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All. frequent contributor to The New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Scientific American, and other publications. Cites the IPCC, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, and William Nordhaus, a Nobel-winning Yale economist. "Why Apocalyptic Claims About Climate Change Are Wrong". Forbes. 11-25-2019. https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2019/11/25/why-everything-they-say-about-climate-change-is-wrong/

First, no credible scientific body has ever said climate change threatens the collapse of civilization much less the extinction of the human species. “‘Our children are going to die in the next 10 to 20 years.’ What’s the scientific basis for these claims?” BBC’s Andrew Neil asked a visibly uncomfortable XR spokesperson last month.

“These claims have been disputed, admittedly,” she said. “There are some scientists who are agreeing and some who are saying it’s not true. But the overall issue is that these deaths are going to happen.”

“But most scientists don’t agree with this,” said Neil. “I looked through IPCC reports and see no reference to billions of people going to die, or children in 20 years. How would they die?”

“Mass migration around the world already taking place due to prolonged drought in countries, particularly in South Asia. There are wildfires in Indonesia, the Amazon rainforest, Siberia, the Arctic,” she said.

But in saying so, the XR spokesperson had grossly misrepresented the science. “There is robust evidence of disasters displacing people worldwide,” notes IPCC, “but limited evidence that climate change or sea-level rise is the direct cause”

What about “mass migration”? “The majority of resultant population movements tend to occur within the borders of affected countries," says IPCC.

It’s not like climate doesn’t matter. It’s that climate change is outweighed by other factors. Earlier this year, researchers found that climate “has affected organized armed conflict within countries. However, other drivers, such as low socioeconomic development and low capabilities of the state, are judged to be substantially more influential.”

Last January, after climate scientists criticized Rep. Ocasio-Cortez for saying the world would end in 12 years, her spokesperson said "We can quibble about the phraseology, whether it's existential or cataclysmic.” He added, “We're seeing lots of [climate change-related] problems that are already impacting lives."

That last part may be true, but it’s also true that economic development has made us less vulnerable, which is why there was a 99.7% decline in the death toll from natural disasters since its peak in 1931.

In 1931, 3.7 million people died from natural disasters. In 2018, just 11,000 did. And that decline occurred over a period when the global population quadrupled.

What about sea level rise? IPCC estimates sea level could rise two feet (0.6 meters) by 2100. Does that sound apocalyptic or even “unmanageable”?

Consider that one-third of the Netherlands is below sea level, and some areas are seven meters below sea level. You might object that Netherlands is rich while Bangladesh is poor. But the Netherlands adapted to living below sea level 400 years ago. Technology has improved a bit since then.

What about claims of crop failure, famine, and mass death? That’s science fiction, not science.

Humans today produce enough food for 10 billion people, or 25% more than we need, and scientific bodies predict increases in that share, not declines.

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) forecasts crop yields increasing 30% by 2050. And the poorest parts of the world, like sub-Saharan Africa, are expected to see increases of 80 to 90%.

Nobody is suggesting climate change won’t negatively impact crop yields. It could. But such declines should be put in perspective. Wheat yields increased 100 to 300% around the world since the 1960s, while a study of 30 models found that yields would decline by 6% for every one degree Celsius increase in temperature.

Rates of future yield growth depend far more on whether poor nations get access to tractors, irrigation, and fertilizer than on climate change, says FAO.

All of this helps explain why IPCC anticipates climate change will have a modest impact on economic growth. By 2100, IPCC projects the global economy will be 300 to 500% larger than it is today. Both IPCC and the Nobel-winning Yale economist, William Nordhaus, predict that warming of 2.5°C and 4°C would reduce gross domestic product (GDP) by 2% and 5% over that same period.

Does this mean we shouldn’t worry about climate change? Not at all.

One of the reasons I work on climate change is because I worry about the impact it could have on endangered species. Climate change may threaten one million species globally and half of all mammals, reptiles, and amphibians in diverse places like the Albertine Rift in central Africa, home to the endangered mountain gorilla.

But it’s not the case that “we’re putting our own survival in danger” through extinctions, as Elizabeth Kolbert claimed in her book, Sixth Extinction. As tragic as animal extinctions are, they do not threaten human civilization. If we want to save endangered species, we need to do so because we care about wildlife for spiritual, ethical, or aesthetic reasons, not survival ones.

#### Dems too far apart on key priorities

Heather Caygle & Sarah Ferris, 10-12-2021, "Dem tension keeps spiking ahead of make-or-break 3 weeks," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/12/democrats-reconciliation-agenda-515837

Some Democrats privately said they hoped that since Pelosi was back from an overseas trip, the negotiations with Democratic leaders, liberals, Manchin and Sinema could resume in earnest. But many were still skeptical that the key party members could reach a deal by the desired Oct. 31 deadline.

Pelosi is focusing her negotiations in three main areas: climate change; family issues including child care and paid family leave; and health care — specifically House Democratic leaders desire to strengthen Obamacare and extend Medicaid to red states that have refused to expand the program.

But the party’s two factions still remain far apart on some key areas even within those three buckets.

Manchin has spoken against certain climate provisions while Sinema has rebuffed progressives on efforts to lower prescription drug costs. Sanders, meanwhile, continues to buck House Democratic leaders on health care, saying his push to expand Medicare to cover vision, hearing and dental benefits is a must.

But privately, Democratic negotiators say there’s no way to have both Sanders’ Medicare push — of which the dental expansion in particular is very costly — along with efforts to shore up Obamacare and Medicaid, especially in a bill that will be dramatically lower in cost.

“The truth of the matter is these predictions should have been included in the original Medicare bill, they were not,” Sanders said. "This to me is not negotiable.”

#### Biden is botching it- attempts to use PC fail

SARAH FERRIS et al 10-1-2021, "Infrastructure vote ‘ain’t going to happen’ until agreement on larger plan, Biden says," https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/01/house-democrats-biden-infrastructure-deal-514878

The president told members during the meeting that the infrastructure bill “ain’t going to happen until we reach an agreement on the next piece of legislation.”

“Let’s try to figure out what we are for in reconciliation … and then we can move ahead," Biden said, adding that even a bill smaller than $3.5 trillion "can make historic investments."

Biden’s 40-minute speech in the caucus’s basement meeting room — in which he took no questions — only seemed to sow confusion and rile up frustrated Democrats as the prospects of a large deal remained out of reach.

Biden’s lack of urgency for an infrastructure vote on Friday made it all but certain that the House would not take it up that day, just hours after members declared they were prepared to spend their weekends in the Capitol. Instead, top Democrats decided to pass a 30-day patch for a highways funding program using a fast-track method for noncontroversial bills.

Senior Democrats discussed another vote related to the president's infrastructure and spending packages — a wonky procedural tactic to formally link the bills and show forward momentum on the bill. But moderates shot down the idea, and leadership dropped it by dinnertime Friday.

“We’re going back in and we’re going to vote on the highway patch," House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said, announcing plans for lawmakers to approve the highway extension and then depart the Capitol.

While liberal Democrats acknowledged after Biden’s huddle they would need to narrow their ambition for the size of the broader spending package, many progressives also felt that the White House was acknowledging their position for the first time in months.

"I feel great," said Rep. Chuy García (D-Ill.), one of dozens of progressives who had threatened he wouldn’t back the president’s infrastructure bill without promises on the broader spending plan.

Still, Congressional Progressive Caucus Chair Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) said it would be “tough” to lower their sights for the party’s broader bill.

“We're gonna have to come down on our number and we're gonna have to do that work,” Jayapal said.

But Biden’s lengthy speech — in which he seemed to speak more about the merits of the bills — left several moderates lost in the wilderness after they spent weeks calling for an immediate vote on the president’s own infrastructure bill.

"The president made the call,” said centrist Rep Elissa Slotkin (D-Mich). “And we will wait to see, and hopefully as soon as possible both these bills will come to the floor."

Several Democrats — not all of whom were centrists — said they were stunned at the lack of specifics from Biden’s speech, saying they were left with zero clarity about the next steps for the president’s two biggest priorities.

"It was a shocking failure to meet the moment," said one Democratic moderate, who emerged disappointed that Biden hadn’t delivered a call to action for the caucus, and instead appeared to tick through the major tenets of his plans.

Biden’s huddle with the House Democrats’ caucus was their second all-members gathering of the day as Pelosi, the president and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer work to strike an agreement to establish the broad strokes of the party’s mammoth social spending plan. Without an accord, progressives are vowing to tank Biden’s separate infrastructure bill, which is now set for a vote later Friday after a series of delays this week.

Several Democrats publicly said Biden’s appearance is long overdue, complaining in private that he spent too much time focused on a pair of key Democratic senators— Joe Manchin (W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (Ariz.) — and no one else. Just before Biden arrived at the Capitol, Sinema was on the phone with the White House from Arizona as the key players continued to negotiate a potential framework for the spending bill.

Biden and party leaders have struggled to mollify the restive caucus, which can only lose three votes on the floor, or risk a potentially fatal blow to both bills.

#### Won’t pass- assumes PC

Susan B. Glasser, 10-1-2021, "The Democratic Civil War Has a Winner: Donald Trump," New Yorker, https://www.newyorker.com/news/letter-from-bidens-washington/the-democratic-civil-war-has-a-winner-donald-trump

Then again, not shutting down the government because you managed to pass and sign a bill pushing the problem off until early December is hardly an accomplishment for the ages. President Biden and Speaker Nancy Pelosi have promised—and not yet delivered—a House vote on the bipartisan infrastructure bill that passed the Senate this summer. That vote was blocked by members of their own party, which cannot agree on the size and specifics of the three-and-a-half-trillion-dollar budget-reconciliation-and-everything-else bill that Biden has proposed as the centerpiece of his Presidency. The long-predicted Democratic civil war between progressives and moderates has begun.

The two leaders threw all the political capital they had at reaching a deal by their own self-imposed deadline, and couldn’t get there. Biden personally involved himself in hours of talks with the feuding Democratic factions, and gave extraordinary time to a lone senator, Kyrsten Sinema, of Arizona, who never publicly explained her position. A surprise Presidential visit to the annual Congressional Baseball Game did not close the deal, nor did an absolute insistence on a Thursday vote that never took place. Pelosi, relentless and ever optimistic, was adamant that there would be a vote and that she would win it, until long after even fellow Democratic leaders had given up this line. But, at the end of a long week of the Speaker not getting her way, one Washington axiom still applies: it’s never a good idea to bet against Nancy Pelosi. If and when she closes a deal on the budget-reconciliation measure, whose price tag of three and a half trillion dollars was never going to last, and brings the infrastructure bill to the floor—a roughly trillion-dollar measure that got the votes of nineteen Senate Republicans as well as those of all of that chamber’s Democrats—the week’s many delays will be forgotten.

Harder to forget will be the intensifying divisions revealed by this week’s haggling: the House-Senate divide, the progressive-moderate divide, the everyone-versus-Joe-Manchin-and-Kyrsten-Sinema divide. (“Biden Bets It All on Unlocking the Manchinema Puzzle,” as one headline put it. Punchbowl News prefers “Sinemanchin.”) It’s sure to get nastier before the deal gets done. Representative Steve Cohen, of Tennessee, a Democratic moderate, said, on CNN, that his car was older than some of the progressives holding up the vote on the infrastructure bill. The progressives, meanwhile, were not in an accommodating mood. “We’re pushing back and saying, ‘Hell, no,’ ” Jamaal Bowman, a first-year congressman from New York, said. At the end of it all, Democrats were still negotiating with themselves. Fighting with themselves. Getting mad at one another. It’s as if they never really accepted until this week the idea that a fifty-fifty Senate means that any one Democratic senator—or two, in this case—can have extraordinary power to dictate the outcome of legislation.

#### Will have to weaken climate programs for Manchin

Zach Colman, 10-14-2021, "To woo Manchin, Dems could OK climate funds for coal and gas plants," https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/14/coal-gas-plants-climate-funds-515988

Lawmakers and the White House may soften a major clean energy component of Democrats’ climate change and social spending legislation in a bid to overcome objections from Sen. Joe Manchin, two people familiar with the discussions said on Wednesday.

The changes under consideration could make it easier for coal and natural gas power plants to receive billions of dollars in financial incentives for clean energy, a potential boon for fossil fuel producers in Manchin's home state.

But that shift could bring objections from progressive Democrats who want to see the incentives hasten the nation's transition to greener sources. Under the proposed change, as long as coal and gas plants were equipped with technology to capture their greenhouse gas emissions, they could qualify for a plan that would pay power companies to deploy more renewable power and impose fines on those that don't.

Climate advocates consider that effort, called the Clean Electricity Performance Program, one of the core elements of Democrats' effort to speed the transition toward solar and wind power and slash greenhouse gas emissions. But Manchin (D-W.Va.) has raised issues with the concept both publicly and privately, putting its inclusion in any final compromise reconciliation bill in doubt.

The people familiar with the discussions said lawmakers and the White House could raise the program’s carbon emissions factor, a figure that determines which power plants would qualify as clean energy. Increasing that figure from the level of 0.1 metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent per megawatt-hour that was approved by the House Energy and Commerce Committee could enable natural gas and coal-fired power plants outfitted with carbon capture equipment to qualify for payments, which could help win over Manchin.

“That number is movable,” one of the people said.

The other person said the conversation is linked with a separate discussion that would change eligibility requirements for a tax credit that would offer incentives to carbon capture and storage technology. The person said changes to that tax credit, known as 45Q, would not on their own be enough to convince companies to launch new projects — unless the CEPP was altered to make it easier for coal power plants outfitted with carbon capture to participate.

President Joe Biden has pledged to put the country on a path to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 50 to 52 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. He also wants to reach net-zero emissions on the power grid by 2035.

Biden’s climate platform allowed for the deployment of carbon capture and storage technology, which proponents say would prevent heat-trapping gases from reaching the atmosphere. While that technology is not yet economically viable on its own for the U.S. power sector without subsidies, labor unions connected to the energy industry favor the technology, saying it could provide jobs even as the nation transitions to cleaner fuel sources.

Several of those unions sent a letter on Friday that was obtained by POLITICO to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, calling for the CEPP to better accommodate carbon capture technology.

But some environmental groups dismiss carbon capture as a false solution for fighting climate change, complaining that it would prolong the use of fossil fuels that would still cause local pollution problems from extracting oil, coal and natural gas.