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### Inequality---1AC

#### Advantage 1 is Inequality.

#### Labor monopsony causes rising income inequality---revising antitrust doctrine to account for labor market power solves.

Eric A. Posner 8/13/21. Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor at University of Chicago. How Antitrust Failed Workers. Oxford University Press, 2021.

In the United States, and much of the Western world, economic growth has slowed, inequality has risen, and wages have stagnated. Academic research has identified several possible causes, ranging from structural shifts in the economy to public policy failure. One possible cause that has received increasing attention from economists is labor market power, the ability of employers to set wages below workers’ marginal revenue product.1 New evidence suggests that many labor markets around the country are not competitive but instead exhibit considerable market power enjoyed by employers, who use their market power to suppress wages. This phenomenon—the power of employers to suppress wages below the competitive rate—is known among economists as labor monopsony, or simply labor market power. Wage suppression enhances income inequality because it creates a wedge between the incomes of people who work in concentrated and competitive labor markets. Wage suppression also reduces the incomes of workers relative to those of people who live off capital, and the latter are almost uniformly wealthier than the former. Wage suppression also interferes with economic growth since it results in underemployment of labor and, while it may seem to raise the return on capital, actually depresses it, as capital must lie idle to take advantage of monopsony power. With wages artificially suppressed, qualified workers decline to take jobs, and workers may underinvest in skills and schooling. Many workers exit the workforce and rely on government benefits, including disability benefits that have become a hidden welfare system.2 This in turn costs the government both in lost taxes and in greater expenditures. One estimate finds that monopsony power in the U.S. economy reduces overall output and employment by 13% and labor’s share of national output by 22%.3 The claim that labor market power raises inequality and reduces growth mirrors another claim that has received attention lately—that the product market power of firms has contributed to rising inequality and faltering growth.4 A product market is a collection of products defined by frequent consumer substitution. When a small number of sellers or one seller of these products exist, we say that each seller has product market power, which enables it to charge a price higher than marginal cost, or the price that would prevail in a competitive market. When a small number of employers hire from a pool of workers of a certain skill level within the geographic area in which workers commute, the employers have labor market power. One major source of market power in both types of markets is thus concentration, where only a few firms operate in a given market. Imagine, for example, a small town with only a few gas stations. Each gas station sets the price of gas to compete with the prices of the other gas stations. When a gas station lowers its price, it may obtain greater market share from the other gas stations—which increases profits—but it also receives less revenue per sale. If only a single gas station exists, it will maximize profits by charging a high (“monopoly”) price because the gains from buyers willing to pay the price exceed the lost revenue from buyers who stay away. If only a few gas stations exist, they might illegally enter a cartel in which they charge an above-market price and divide the profits, or they might informally coordinate, which is generally not illegal, though the social harm is the same. In contrast, if many gas stations compete, prices will be bargained down to the efficient level—the marginal cost—resulting in low prices for consumers and high aggregate output of gasoline. Labor market concentration creates monopsony (or, if more than one employer, oligopsony, but I use these terms interchangeably) where labor market power is exercised by the buyer rather than (as in the example of gas stations) the seller. Employers are buyers of labor who operate within a labor market. A labor market is a group of jobs (e.g., computer programmers, lawyers, or unskilled workers) within a geographic area where the holders of those jobs could with relative ease switch among the jobs. The geographic area is usually defined by the commuting distance of workers. A labor market is concentrated if only one or a few employers hire from this pool of workers. For example, imagine the gas stations employ specialist maintenance workers who monitor the gas-pumping equipment. If only a few gas stations exist in that area, and no other firms (e.g., oil refineries) hire from this pool of workers, then the labor market is concentrated, and the employers have market power in the labor market. To minimize labor costs, the employers will hold wages down below what the workers would be paid in a competitive labor market—their marginal revenue product. Faced with these low wages, some people qualified to work will refuse to. But the employers gain more from wage savings than they lose in lost output because of the small workforce they employ. Antitrust law does not distinguish monopoly and monopsony (including labor monopsony): firms that achieve monopolies or monopsonies through anticompetitive behavior violate antitrust law. But product market concentration has received a huge amount of attention by courts, researchers, and regulators, while labor market concentration has received hardly any attention at all.5 The Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) Horizontal Merger Guidelines, which are used to screen potential mergers for antitrust violations, provide an elaborate analytic framework for evaluating the product market effects of mergers. Yet, while the Merger Guidelines state that there is no distinction between seller and buyer power,6 they say nothing about the possible adverse labor market effects of mergers. Similarly, while there are thousands of reported cases involving allegations that firms have illegally cartelized product markets, there are few cases involving allegations of illegally cartelized labor markets.7 This historic imbalance between what I will call product market antitrust and labor market antitrust has no basis in economic theory. From an economic standpoint, the dangers to public welfare posed by product market power and labor market power are the same. As Adam Smith recognized, businesses gain in the same way by exploiting product market power and labor market power—enabling them to increase profits by raising prices (in the first case) or by lowering costs (in the second case).8 For that reason, businesses have the same incentive to obtain product market power and labor market power. Hence the need—in both cases—for an antitrust regime to prevent businesses from obtaining product and labor market power except when there are offsetting social gains.

#### Current antitrust law is the largest factor.

Sandeep Vaheesan 18. Legal director at the Open Markets Institute. “How Contemporary Antitrust Robs Workers of Power” LPE Project. 07-19-18. <https://lpeproject.org/blog/how-contemporary-antitrust-robs-workers-of-power/>

The political economist Albert Hirschman developed the idea that members of an organization can exercise power in two ways—through exit and voice. Market activity is associated with exit: consumers unhappy with the price or quality of service of their current wireless carrier can switch to a rival carrier offering lower rates or better service. Elections exemplify voice: voters can replace a corrupt or ineffective incumbent officeholder with a challenger promising to make the government work for ordinary people. For workers, both exit (joining a new employer) and voice (making demands of a current employer) are important. Despite the pro-worker aims of the framers of the Sherman and Clayton Acts, **antitrust law** today is an **enemy of both exit and voice for workers.** For more than a generation, antitrust enforcers have permitted **labor markets to** **become highly concentrated** and have also **interfered with the efforts** of a large segment of workers to build collective power. Through their labor market actions, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission (FTC) reinforce, rather than tame, corporate power. To create a progressive, pro-worker antitrust, legislators and policymakers must adopt a radically different vision for the field. Tens of millions of American workers **wield little or no power** in their place of work. In many parts of the country, workers lack meaningful exit. They **face concentrated local labor markets** in which only a handful of employers compete (at least theoretically) for their services. In some labor markets, employees have only one actual or prospective employer. In other words, many Americans, at least in their capacity as workers, may experience what we often think of as a relic of a bygone era—the company town. As recent studies have shown, employer-side concentration is **associated with significantly lower wages**. And other research has found that concentration at one level of a supply chain can **depress wages further upstream.** In addition to concentrated markets, approximately **30 million workers** are subject to **non-compete clauses**, which prevent them from accepting a new job or starting a business in the same line of work. Non-compete clauses, regardless of whether they are enforced, can signal to workers that their choice is **either stay at their current job or suffer extended unemployment.** Along with possessing few exit options, most workers cannot assert effective voice in the workplace. Big business’s legal and political war on labor’s power has severely weakened unions. In contrast to the 1950s when roughly a third of wage and salary workers were unionized, only a small percentage of workers are members of labor unions today—around one in ten among all workers, and one in sixteen among workers in the private sector. This decline in union density **explains a significant fraction of the forty-year stagnation in wages and increase in income inequality**. Moreover, even if wage gains had kept pace with productivity, the collapse of organized labor means that workers lost say over numerous workplace issues. While employees can speak up as individuals, this type of voice is no substitute for the collective voice that comes from a democratic union. Given that most individual workers are dispensable and replaceable for their employers, a lone voicing of grievance often can easily be ignored or even invite retaliation from an employer. And, beyond the site of employment, unorganized workers are less able to exercise voice in electoral politics and check the dominant influence of corporations. Antitrust enforcers have allowed labor markets to grow more concentrated across the country. Just as labor law has been rewritten to cripple labor organizing, the executive branch and courts have remade antitrust to be much friendlier to capital over the past four decades. Influenced by the writings of Robert Bork, the Supreme Court has held that the **antitrust laws are a “consumer welfare prescription.”** Although the Supreme Court and the antitrust agencies counterintuitively state that consumer welfare accounts for harms to workers and other sellers of services, the DOJ and the FTC focus their enforcement on mergers and practices harmful to consumers. In developing enforcement priorities, the federal antitrust agencies have relied on simplistic economic theory. Instead of directing their economists to study the structure of labor markets, the DOJ and the FTC have adopted an Econ 101 view of the world and assumed that labor markets are generally competitive on the employer side. Embracing this fiction, the agencies have never stopped a merger on labor market grounds. **Due to antitrust inaction** (and other factors), labor market **concentration has increased** since the late 1970s.

#### Inequality undermines US international engagements---it’s the biggest threat.

Kurt M.Campbell 14**.** Chairman and chief executive of the Asia Group investment and consulting firm was assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from 2009 to 2013. “How income inequality undermines U.S. power” The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/how-income-inequality-undermines-us-power/2014/11/28/53fab4e4-74e5-11e4-9d9b-86d397daad27\_story.html?utm\_term=.40bd11b21cf7

Much has been written about the domestic consequences of growing income inequality in the United States — how **inequality depresses growth**, puts downward pressure on the middle class, accentuates wage stagnation and creates added difficulty paying for a college education and buying a home — but much less has been said about how inequality will affect America’s role in the world. How will the social science experiment of allowing wealth to settle so unequally between the top 1 percent and rest of the United States impact the foundations and contours of U.S. foreign policy? In fact, there are likely to be subtle and **direct consequences of growing inequality** both for the United States’ **international standing** and its activism. In most critical respects, the **United States has helped to create and underwrite the global operating system** since the end of World War II. This required a citizen’s sense of external responsibility and belief that the United States had **something unique** and valuable to confer to the world. Americans over these generations have regularly demonstrated in word and deed that they were prepared to bear burdens and advance ideas. Coinciding with this era was a general sense of overarching optimism that reinforced a post-World War II period of unprecedented American activism on the global scene. It is likely that as a **growing segment of the population strains just to get by**, it will increasingly view foreign policy — foreign assistance and military spending alike — as a kind of **luxury ripe for cuts** and a reduction in ambition. It is possible to see early indicators of these sentiments on the right and left, in the form of both tea party isolationism and Occupy Wall Street suspicion that corporate interests drive America’s foreign entanglements. It is also the case that other countries have long emulated aspects of the American Way in designing their own development models. Having access to higher education, **creating conditions that support innovation and allowing for greater upward mobility** have all been deeply attractive qualities to many nations. But it is the construction of a **durable U.S. middle class** that has been perhaps **most compelling** to highly stratified societies across Latin America, Asia and Africa. Now, however, the United States is moving in the other direction, toward an **unstable society divided between astronomically rich elites** and everyone else. This **undermines a critical component of U.S. soft power** and is a model for societal engineering that few would choose to emulate. It is also the case that the most recent era of U.S. exertion on the global stage has involved nearly 15 years of conflict in the Middle East and South Asia. The most important features of these largely military engagements have involved refinements in counterinsurgency technique and adaptations in military technology. A different 1 percent of the U.S. population has been primarily involved in this struggle: the U.S. military and others associated with the defense establishment. Aside from clapping when a uniformed military member greets an emotional family at an airport homecoming, the vast majority of the population has been largely unaffected by these conflicts. They neither paid for nor fought these wars. The next phase of intense global engagement is likely to demand much more from a larger share of the population. The lion’s share of 21st-century history will play out in Asia, with its thriving and **acquisitive middle classes driving innovation, nationalist competitions, military ambitions, struggles over history and identity, and simple pursuit of power.** The United States is in the midst of a **major reorientation** of its foreign policy and commercial priorities that will draw it more closely to Asia in the decades ahead. The competition for power and prestige there rests on comprehensive aspects of national power — as much to our product and service offerings, the strength of our educational system and the health and vitality of our national infrastructure as to the quality of U.S. military capabilities. Each of these efforts require **substantial and sustained longer-term investments**; all face funding shortfalls due to myriad challenges. A corresponding **consequence of growing inequality has been a reduction** in support for these building blocks for comprehensive and sustained **international engagement.** The worrisome dimensions of income inequality on the quality of domestic American life should be enough to cause us to **consider enacting remedies**. However, the potential negative implications on U.S. performance internationally can only add to the case. Ultimately, a sustained and purposeful American internationalism is inextricably linked to the health of our domestic life, to which **gaping inequality is the biggest threat.**

#### Collapsing worker welfare causes neo-isolationist nativism---recovery future-proofs internationalism.

Charles A. Kupchan and Peter L. Trubowitz May/June 21. Charles A. Kupchan is a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Professor of International Affairs in the School of Foreign Service and the Government Department at Georgetown University. Peter L. Trubowitz is Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science and an Associate Fellow at Chatham House. “The Home Front: Why an Internationalist Foreign Policy Needs a Stronger Domestic Foundation”. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-04-20/foreign-policy-home-front

U.S. President Joe Biden has declared that under his leadership, “America is back” and once again “ready to lead the world.” Biden wants to return the country to its traditional role of catalyzing international cooperation and staunchly defending liberal values abroad. His challenge, however, is primarily one of politics, not policy. Despite Biden’s victory in last year’s presidential election, his internationalist vision faces a deeply skeptical American public. The political foundations of U.S. internationalism have collapsed. The domestic consensus that long supported U.S. engagement abroad has come apart in the face of mounting partisan discord and a deepening rift between urban and rural Americans. An inward turn has accompanied these growing divides. President Donald Trump’s unilateralism, neo-isolationism, protectionism, and nativism were anathema to most of the U.S. foreign policy establishment. But Trump’s approach to statecraft tapped into public misgivings about American overreach, contributing to his victory in 2016 and helping him win the backing of 74 million voters in 2020. An “America first” approach to the world sells well when many Americans experience economic insecurity and feel that they have been on the losing end of globalization. A recent survey by the Pew Research Center revealed that roughly half the U.S. public believes that the country should pay less attention to problems overseas and concentrate more on fixing problems at home. Redressing the hardships facing many working Americans is essential to inoculating the country against “America first” and Trump’s illiberal politics of grievance. That task begins with economic renewal. Restoring popular support for the country’s internationalist calling will entail sustained investment in pandemic recovery, health care, infrastructure, green technology and jobs, and other domestic programs. Those steps will require structural political reforms to ease gridlock and ensure that U.S. foreign policy serves the interests of working Americans. What Biden needs is an “inside out” approach that will link imperatives at home to objectives abroad. Much will depend on his willingness and ability to take bold action to rebuild broad popular support for internationalism from the ground up. Success would significantly reduce the chances that the president who follows Biden, even if he or she is a Republican, would return to Trump’s self-defeating foreign policy. Such future-proofing is critical to restoring international confidence in the United States. In light of the dysfunction and polarization plaguing U.S. politics, leaders and people around the world are justifiably questioning whether Biden represents a new normal or just a fleeting reprieve from “America first.”

#### Soft power solves global existential risks.

Joseph S. Nye Jr. 20. Harvard University Distinguished Service Professor, Emeritus. "COVID-19’s Painful Lesson About Strategy and Power". War on the Rocks. 3-26-2020. https://warontherocks.com/2020/03/covid-19s-painful-lesson-about-strategy-and-power/

In 2017, President Donald Trump announced a new National Security Strategy that focused on great-power competition with China and Russia. While the plans also note the role of alliances and cooperation, the implementation has not. Today, COVID-19 shows that the strategy is inadequate. Competition and an “America First” approach is not enough to protect the United States. Close cooperation with both allies and adversaries is also essential for American security. Under the influence of the information revolution and globalization, world politics is changing dramatically. Even if the United States prevails in the traditional great-power competition, it cannot protect its security acting alone. COVID-19 is not the only example. Global financial stability is vital to U.S. prosperity, but Americans need the cooperation of others to ensure it. And while trade wars have set back economic globalization, there is no stopping the environmental globalization represented by pandemics and climate change. In a world where borders are becoming more porous to everything from drugs to infectious diseases to cyber terrorism, the United States must use its soft power of attraction to develop networks and institutions that address these new threats. For example, this administration proposed halving the U.S. contribution to the World Health Organization’s budget — now we need it more than ever. A successful national security strategy should start with the fact that “America First” means America has to lead efforts at cooperation. A classic problem with public goods (like clean air, which all can share and from which none can be excluded) is that if the largest consumer does not take the lead, others will free-ride and the public goods will not be produced. As the technology expert Richard Danzig summarizes the problem: Twenty-first century technologies are global not just in their distribution, but also in their consequences. Pathogens, AI systems, computer viruses, and radiation that others may accidentally release could become as much our problem as theirs. Agreed reporting systems, shared controls, common contingency plans, norms and treaties must be pursued as a means of moderating our numerous mutual risks. Tariffs and border walls cannot solve these problems. While American leadership is essential because of the country’s global influence, success will require the cooperation of others. On transnational issues like COVID-19 and climate change, power becomes a positive-sum game. It is not enough to think of American power over others. We must also think in terms of power to accomplish joint goals, which involves power with others. On many transnational issues, empowering others helps us to accomplish our own goals. The United States benefits if China improves its energy efficiency and emits less carbon dioxide, or improves its public health systems. In this world, institutional networks and connectedness are an important source of information and of national power, and the most connected states are the most powerful. Washington has some sixty treaty allies while China has few. Unfortunately, as Mira Rapp-Hooper recently argued, the United States is squandering that power resource. In the past, the openness of the United States enhanced its capacity to build networks, maintain institutions, and sustain alliances. But will that openness and willingness to engage with the rest of the world prove sustainable in the current populist mood of American domestic politics? Even if the United States possesses more hard military and economic power than any other country, it may fail to convert those resources into effective influence on the global scene. Between the two world wars, America did not and the result was disastrous.

#### A worker welfare standard would protect workers and reduce labor market concentration.

Suresh Naidu et al 18. \*Suresh Naidu is an Associate Professor of International and Public Affairs and Economics, Columbia University. \*\*Eric Posner is a Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School. \*\*\*E. Glen Weyl is a Principal Researcher, Microsoft Research New England and Visiting Senior Research Scholar, Yale University Department of Economics and Law School “**Antitrust Remedies for Labor Market Power**” University of Chicago Law School. 2018. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=13776&context=journal_articles>

Most of the principles naturally carry over, in suitably modified form, to the analysis of merger effects on labor markets, though a few subtle issues arise. Many of the same factors that could act as efficiencies on the product side are also efficiencies on the labor side. By analogy to the “consumer welfare” standard, we believe that **mergers that trigger scrutiny by reducing** **labor market competition** should be subject to a “**worker welfare” standard**.213 The fact that the merger might raise firm profits more than it harms workers **should not be sufficient to excuse the merger**. Instead, the merger would be permitted if the merger sufficiently increases worker productivity (workers’ marginal revenue product) in a way that will not fully be absorbed by lower prices or increased employer profits. Thus, harms from reduced competition are more than fully offset, and **therefore workers’ wages, benefits, or conditions will improve because of the merger.** This is not to say that mergers that harm workers should never be approved. The losses to workers could be offset by gains elsewhere in the economy. Indeed, the merger of two firms that operate in a frictionless labor market should not greatly harm workers even if it does result in significant layoffs, because in a competitive labor market **the laid-off workers can easily find equally good jobs.**214 In contrast, a merger that does create competitive concern should not be excused simply on the basis that it **allows the firm to cut costs by destroying jobs**. In such cases, antitrust doctrine does not allow efficiency gains in other markets to offset losses in one market.215 Thus, typically, **the worker-surplus implications of a merger will indicate its competitive effects**, just as in product markets consumer surplus is a strong but not perfect proxy for competitive effects. In some cases, a merger may **prove overall competitively harmful in labor markets** (thus **reducing worker welfare**) and beneficial in product markets (thus increasing consumer welfare). Such cases should be treated roughly like ones where competitive harm occurs in one product market but there are competitive benefits in another product market. To the extent possible, antitrust authorities should try to find remedies that address the competitive harms while preserving the benefits, such as requiring the spinning off of critical units that would allow an increase in market power. However, **the frequency of such cases should not be exaggerated**; mergers that increase labor market power and thus raise effective costs will not usually bring lower prices to consumers, and mergers increasing product market power and thus reducing sales will not typically create great jobs. As we noted in section I.A.3, enforcers should **not believe** the canard that the monopsonist’s lower labor costs are **passed on to consumers as lower prices**.216 Monopsony power raises the effective marginal cost a firm faces and thus should almost always lead to increased prices. Similar analysis applies to the merger-specificity of the efficiency gains: productivity gains that could be achieved absent the anticompetitive effects of the merger should not play a role in merger analysis.

### Modeling---1AC

#### Advantage 2 is Modeling.

#### Competition standards around the world focus on consumer welfare.

Marianela Lopez-Galdos 17. “Antitrust in 60 Seconds: Is the Consumer Welfare Standard Appropriate?” Disruptive Competition Project. 11-17-17. https://www.project-disco.org/competition/111717-antitrust-in-60-seconds-is-the-consumer-welfare-standard-appropriate/

In the rest of the world, including the European Union, most competition systems were put in place in the post-war periods. As such, the pursuit of pluralistic goals guided by public interest concerns through the competition system was a method by which these toddling democracies sought to boost and defend their nascent democratic process. That being said, competition systems have evolved, and mature ones have **narrowed the antitrust analysis to focus on consumer welfare.** In this context, it is noteworthy that the UN and OECD have **separately concluded** that many competition systems **pursue consumer welfare as the primary competition goal.** In 1995, UNCTAD concluded that “There has in fact been an increasing convergence in the provisions or the application of competition laws over the laws two decades. Competition systems in many countries are now placing relatively greater emphasis upon the protection of competition, as well as **upon efficiency and competitiveness criteria**, rather than upon other public interest goals”.

**Replacing the federal consumer welfare standard solves.**

Ganesh **Sitaraman 18**. the Co-founder and Director of Policy for the Great Democracy Initiative. He is also a professor of law at Vanderbilt University. Sitaraman served as policy director to Senator Elizabeth Warren during her Senate campaign, and then as her senior counsel in the U.S. Senate. “Taking Antitrust Away from the Courts: A Structural Approach to Reversing the Second Age of Monopoly Power”. https://ir.vanderbilt.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1803/9447/Taking%20Antitrust%20Away%20from%20the%20Courts.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

After World War II, the United States engaged in a historic effort to rebuild Europe and Japan through the Marshall Plan. While the story of the Marshall Plan is well known, what is less commonly understood is that the United States exported aggressive antitrust laws to Europe during those post-war years. The Marshall Plan antitrust advisors believed that the **massive consolidation in the German economy facilitated** and sustained **fascism**, and they argued that a **democratic society required a democratic economy**.26 Today, in the context of increasing concentration, rising authoritarianism, and foreign governments commingling state and markets through state-owned enterprises and state capitalism, **promoting economic democracy** abroad should be an **essential foreign policy objective**. And yet, the text of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade agreement designed by the Obama Administration, established the objectives of competition policy as “economic **efficiency and consumer welfare**,” a narrowly drawn and ideological conception of the purposes of **antitrust** law that has no basis in U.S. statutory law.27 Presidents and their administrations should **abandon these cramped views of antitrust** and instead encourage the adoption of more aggressive antitrust laws **abroad**.

#### Global use of the consumer welfare standard fuels populism.

Frederic Jenny 19. ESSEC Business School and OECD Competition Committee. “POPULISM, FAIRNESS AND COMPETITION: SHOULD WE CARE AND WHAT COULD WE DO?” The Japanese Economic Review. Vol. 70, No. 3, September 2019. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jere.12232

Other competition legal scholars have called attention to the fact **the socioeconomic social contract is breaking down.** For example, Gal (2019) argues that: A growing number of citizens believe that the promises of the competition based market system, which form an important part of the implicit social contract, are not fulfilled and that capitalistic markets are no longer working in their favour. Indeed, statistics indicate that social mobility is low; that wealth is aggregated disproportionately in the hands of the already well-off; that **wealth inequality keeps rising**; that several large firms dominate the digital economy, thereby blocking at least some of the promises that technological changes were thought to bring about; that technological changes such as robotics create significant disruption effects and have negative implications on the labor market; or that education and social security **do not create viable solutions** for workers in order to ensure that wide geographic areas or demographic groups are not significantly and irreparably harmed. If one recognises the fact that the unfairness of the result of competition may be one of the **sources of populism** and that a **rebalancing of the benefits of the competitive process** is in order to make economic competition tolerable, the question is how to achieve it. Because the redistributive tools we have **do not seem to be adequate**, some of the hotly debated issues are whether we should be more cautious about entering into trade agreements with countries having widely different social and economic environments or rules and, at the domestic level, whether **antitrust** or competition law enforcement should **concern itself with the fairness of the competitive process.** Concerning antitrust or competition law enforcement three main arguments have been put forward against the inclusion of fairness considerations in the enforcement of anti- trust and competition law. First, the concept of fairness is vague; second, taking into consideration fairness would entail a social cost in terms of efficiency; and third, competition authorities are not equipped to trade fairness against efficiency considerations. Trebilcock and Ducci (2017) consider the vagueness of the notion of fairness and the necessity to specify the notions of fairness which could be relevant for competition. They usefully distinguish different notions of fairness that are pertinent to domestic markets: vertical fairness (between producers and consumers); horizontal fairness on the demand side (between consumers); horizontal fairness on the supply side (between producers); and procedural fairness (due process and private enforcement). One can **easily show** that antitrust is congruent with fairness with respect to horizontal fairness among suppliers in the sense that competition or antitrust law enforcement aims at **eliminating the barriers to entry or to development**, which prevent competitors from entering new markets or competing on the merits with established firms. This dimension of competition does not seem particularly problematic from the standpoint of fairness. One can also mention the fact that competition law, to the extent that it aims at eliminating discriminatory practices (as in the European competition law where article 102 prohibits firms with market power from directly or indirectly imposing unfair purchase or selling prices or other unfair trading conditions, or from applying dissimilar conditions to equivalent transactions with other trading parties, thereby placing them at a competitive disadvantage), goes some way toward meeting the horizontal fairness condition for consumers. The question of whether the way in which competition laws are implemented meet vertical fairness criteria is more complex. Some, like Trebilcock and Ducci, argue that **the goal of protecting consumer welfare assigned in most countries** to competition law is a somewhat **clumsy attempt to bring into competition law fairness issues** which are alien to what which competition law should be concerned with. For example, they write: Despite being usually justified by a distributive justice rationale, we believe that the consumer welfare standard **does not vindicate distributional equity concerns for consumers** vis-a-vis producers, and we believe that such choice of welfare standard does not represent an optimal tool for redistributive goals. On the contrary, we view the consumer welfare standard as resulting from a mix of poorly defined distributive concerns and more political economy-oriented explanations. Under the latter perspective, the ascendance of the consumer welfare standard may be interpreted as a political bargain between self-interested groups of producers (primarily large firms defending the efficiency benefits of economies of scale) and consumers (including final consumers, small buyers, farmers), where the concept of ‘consumer welfare’ can be seen as a more acceptable form of welfare standard for non-specialist audiences, which would politically allow the advancement of economic goals in the competition policy domain.

#### Populism causes extinction.

Richard N. Haass and Charles A. Kupchan 21. Richard N. Haass is President of the Council on Foreign Relations, was Director of Policy Planning for the United States Department of State and a close advisor to Secretary of State Colin Powell. Charles A. Kupchan is Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University, a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and was Director for European Affairs on the National Security Council. “The New Concert of Powers”. Foreign Affairs. 3-23-21. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2021-03-23/new-concert-powers

The international system is at a **historical inflection point.** As Asia continues its economic ascent, two centuries of Western domination of the world, first under Pax Britannica and then under Pax Americana, are coming to an end. The West is losing not only its material dominance but also its ideological sway. Around the world, democracies are **falling prey** to illiberalism and **populist dissension** while a rising China, assisted by a pugnacious Russia, seeks to challenge the West’s authority and republican approaches to both domestic and international governance. U.S. President Joe Biden is committed to refurbishing American democracy, restoring U.S. leadership in the world, and taming a pandemic that has had devastating human and economic consequences. But Biden’s victory was a close call;on neither side of the Atlantic will **angry populism or illiberal temptations readily abate**. Moreover, even if Western democracies overcome polarization, beat back illiberalism, and pull off an economic rebound, they will not forestall the arrival of a world that is both multipolar and ideologically diverse. History makes clear that such **periods of tumultuous** **change** come with **great peril**. Indeed, **great-power** **contests** over hierarchy and ideology regularly lead to **major wars**. Averting this outcome requires soberly acknowledging that the Western-led liberal order that emerged after World War II cannot anchor global stability in the twenty-first century. The search is on for a viable and effective way forward. The best vehicle for promoting stability in the twenty-first century is a global concert of major powers. As the history of the nineteenth-century Concert of Europe demonstrated—its members were the United Kingdom, France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria—a steering group of leading countries can curb the geopolitical and ideological competition that usually accompanies multipolarity. Concerts have two characteristics that make them well suited to the emerging global landscape: political inclusivity and procedural informality. A concert’s inclusivity means that it puts at the table the geopolitically influential and powerful states that need to be there, regardless of their regime type. In so doing, it largely separates ideological differences over domestic governance from matters of international cooperation. A concert’s informality means that it eschews binding and enforceable procedures and agreements, clearly distinguishing it from the UN Security Council. The UNSC serves too often as a public forum for grandstanding and is regularly paralyzed by disputes among its veto-wielding permanent members. In contrast, a concert offers a private venue that combines consensus building with cajoling and jockeying—a must since major powers will have both common and competing interests. By providing a vehicle for genuine and sustained strategic dialogue, a global concert can realistically mute and manage inescapable geopolitical and ideological differences. A global concert would be a consultative, not a decision-making, body. It would address emerging crises yet ensure that urgent issues would not crowd out important ones, and it would deliberate on reforms to existing norms and institutions. This steering group would help fashion new rules of the road and build support for collective initiatives but leave operational matters, such as deploying peacekeeping missions, delivering pandemic relief, and concluding new climate deals, to the UN and other existing bodies. The concert would thus tee up decisions that could then be taken and implemented elsewhere. It would sit atop and backstop, not supplant, the current international architecture by maintaining a dialogue that does not now exist. The UN is too big, too bureaucratic, and too formalistic. Fly-in, fly-out G-7 or G-20 summits can be useful but even at their best are woefully inadequate, in part because so much effort goes toward haggling over detailed, but often anodyne, communiqués. Phone calls between heads of state, foreign ministers, and national security advisers are too episodic and often narrow in scope. Fashioning major-power consensus on the international norms that guide statecraft, accepting both liberal and illiberal governments as legitimate and authoritative, advancing shared approaches to crises—the Concert of Europe relied on these important innovations to preserve peace in a multipolar world. By drawing on lessons from its nineteenth-century forebearer, a twenty-first-century global concert can do the same. Concerts do lack the certitude, predictability, and enforceability of alliances and other formalized pacts. But in designing mechanisms to preserve peace amid geopolitical flux, policymakers should strive for the workable and the attainable, not the desirable but impossible. A GLOBAL CONCERT FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY A global concert would have six members: China, the European Union, India, Japan, Russia, and the United States. Democracies and nondemocracies would have equal standing, and inclusion would be a function of power and influence, not values or regime type. The concert’s members would collectively represent roughly 70 percent of both global GDP and global military spending. Including these six heavyweights in the concert’s ranks would give it geopolitical clout while preventing it from becoming an unwieldy talk shop. Members would send permanent representatives of the highest diplomatic rank to the global concert’s standing headquarters. Although they would not be formal members of the concert, four regional organizations—the African Union, Arab League, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and Organization of American States (OAS)—would maintain permanent delegations at the concert’s headquarters. These organizations would provide their regions with representation and the ability to help shape the concert’s agenda. When discussing issues affecting these regions, concert members would invite delegates from these bodies as well as select member states to join meetings. For example, were concert members to address a dispute in the Middle East, they could request the participation of the Arab League, its relevant members, and other involved parties, such as Iran, Israel, and Turkey. A global concert would shun codified rules, instead relying on dialogue to build consensus. Like the Concert of Europe, it would privilege the territorial status quo and a view of sovereignty that precludes, except in the case of international consensus, using military force or other coercive tools to alter existing borders or topple regimes. This relatively conservative baseline would encourage buy-in from all members. At the same time, the concert would provide an ideal venue for discussing globalization’s impact on sovereignty and the potential need to deny sovereign immunity to nations that engage in certain egregious activities. Those activities might include committing genocide, harboring or sponsoring terrorists, or severely exacerbating climate change by destroying rainforests. Policymakers should strive for the workable and the attainable, not the desirable but impossible. A global concert would thus put a premium on dialogue and consensus. The steering group would also acknowledge, however, that great powers in a multipolar world will be driven by realist concerns about hierarchy, security, and regime continuity, making discord inescapable. Members would reserve the right to take unilateral action, alone or through coalitions, when they deem their vital interests to be at stake. Direct strategic dialogue would, though, make surprise moves less common and, ideally, unilateral action less frequent. Regular and open consultation between Moscow and Washington, for example, might have produced less friction over NATO enlargement. China and the United States are better off directly communicating with each other over Taiwan than sidestepping the issue and risking a military mishap in the Taiwan Strait or provocations that could escalate tensions. A global concert could also make unilateral moves less disruptive. Conflicts of interest would hardly disappear, but a new vehicle devoted exclusively to great-power diplomacy would help make those conflicts more manageable. Although members would, in principle, endorse a norm-governed international order, they would also embrace realistic expectations about the limits of cooperation and compartmentalize their differences. During the nineteenth-century concert, its members frequently confronted stubborn disagreements over, for instance, how to respond to liberal revolts in Greece, Naples, and Spain. But they kept their differences at bay through dialogue and compromise, returning to the battlefield in the Crimean War in 1853 only after the revolutions of 1848 spawned destabilizing currents of nationalism. A global concert would give its members wide leeway when it comes to domestic governance. They would effectively agree to disagree on questions of democracy and political rights, ensuring that such differences do not hinder international cooperation. The United States and its democratic allies would not cease criticizing illiberalism in China, Russia, or anywhere else, and neither would they abandon their effort to spread democratic values and practices. On the contrary, they would continue to raise their voices and wield their influence to defend universal political and human rights. At the same time, China and Russia would be free to criticize the domestic policies of the concert’s democratic members and publicly promote their own vision of governance. But the concert would also work toward a shared understanding of what constitutes unacceptable interference in other countries’ domestic affairs and, as a result, are to be avoided. OUR BEST HOPE Establishing a global concert would admittedly constitute a setback to the liberalizing project launched by the world’s democracies after World War II. The proposed steering group’s aspirations set a modest bar compared with the West’s long-standing aim of spreading republican governance and globalizing a liberal international order. Nonetheless, this scaling back of expectations is unavoidable given the twenty-first century’s geopolitical realities. The international system, for one, will exhibit characteristics of both bipolarity and multipolarity. There will be two peer competitors—the United States and China. Unlike during the Cold War, however, ideological and geopolitical competition between them will not encompass the world. On the contrary, the EU, Russia, and India, as well as other large states such as Brazil, Indonesia, Nigeria, Turkey, and South Africa, will likely play the two superpowers off each other and seek to preserve a significant measure of autonomy. Both China and the United States will also likely limit their involvement in unstable zones of less strategic interest, leaving it to others—or no one—to manage potential conflicts. China has long been smart enough to keep its political distance from far-off conflict zones, while the United States, which is currently pulling back from the Middle East and Africa, has learned that the hard way. The international system of the twenty-first century will therefore resemble that of nineteenth-century Europe, which had two major powers—the United Kingdom and Russia—and three powers of lesser rank—France, Prussia, and Austria. The Concert of Europe’s primary objective was to preserve peace among its members through a mutual commitment to upholding the territorial settlement reached at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The pact rested on good faith and a shared sense of obligation, not contractual agreement. Any actions required to enforce their mutual commitments, according to a British memorandum, “have been deliberately left to arise out of the circumstances of the time and of the case.” Concert members recognized their competing interests, especially when it came to Europe’s periphery, but sought to manage their differences and prevent them from jeopardizing group solidarity. The United Kingdom, for example, opposed Austria’s proposed intervention to reverse a liberal revolt that took place in Naples in 1820. Nonetheless, British Foreign Secretary Lord Castlereagh eventually assented to Austria’s plans provided that “they were ready to give every reasonable assurance that their views were not directed to purposes of aggrandizement subversive of the Territorial System of Europe.” A global concert would give its members wide leeway when it comes to domestic governance. A global concert, like the Concert of Europe, is well suited to promoting stability amid multipolarity. Concerts limit their membership to a manageable size. Their informality allows them to adapt to changing circumstances and prevents them from scaring off powers averse to binding commitments. Under conditions of rising populism and nationalism, widespread during the nineteenth century and again today, powerful countries prefer looser groupings and diplomatic flexibility to fixed formats and obligations. It is no accident that major states have already been turning to concert-like groupings or so-called contact groups to tackle tough challenges; examples include the six-party talks that addressed North Korea’s nuclear program, the P5+1 coalition that negotiated the 2015 Iran nuclear deal, and the Normandy grouping that has been seeking a diplomatic resolution to the conflict in eastern Ukraine. The concert can be understood as a standing contact group with a global purview. Separately, the twenty-first century will be politically and ideologically diverse. Depending on the trajectory of the populist revolts afflicting the West, liberal democracies may well be able to hold their own. But so too will illiberal regimes. Moscow and Beijing are tightening their grip at home, not opening up. Stable democracy is **hard to find** in the Middle East and Africa. Indeed, **democracy is receding,** not advancing, worldwide—a trend that could well continue. The international order that comes next must make room for ideological diversity. A concert has the necessary informality and flexibility to do so; it separates issues of domestic rule from those of international teamwork. During the nineteenth century, it was precisely this hands-off approach to regime type that enabled two liberalizing powers—the United Kingdom and France—to work with Russia, Prussia, and Austria, three countries determined to defend absolute monarchy. Finally, the inadequacies of the current international architecture underscore the need for a global concert. The rivalry between the United States and China is heating up fast, the **world is suffering** through a devastating pandemic, climate change is advancing, and the evolution of cyberspace poses new threats. These and other challenges mean that clinging to the status quo and banking on existing international norms and institutions would be dangerously naive. The Concert of Europe was formed in 1815 owing to the years of devastation wrought by the Napoleonic Wars. But the lack of great-power war today should not be cause for complacency. And even though the world has passed through previous eras of multipolarity, the advance of globalization increases the demand for and importance of new approaches to global governance. Globalization unfolded during Pax Britannica, with London overseeing it until World War I. After a dark interwar hiatus, the United States took up the mantle of global leadership from World War II into the twenty-first century. But Pax Americana is now running on fumes. The United States and its traditional democratic partners have neither the capability nor the will to anchor an interdependent international system and universalize the liberal order that they erected after World War II. The absence of U.S. leadership during the COVID-19 crisis was striking; each country was on its own. President Biden is guiding the United States back to being a team player, but the nation’s pressing domestic priorities and the onset of multipolarity will deny Washington the outsize influence it once enjoyed. Allowing the world to slide toward regional blocs or a two-bloc structure similar to that of the Cold War is a nonstarter. The United States, China, and the rest of the globe cannot fully uncouple when national economies, financial markets, and supply chains are irreversibly tethered together. A great-power steering group is the best option for managing an integrated world no longer overseen by a hegemon. A global concert fits the bill.

#### Specifically, the Philippines mirrors the consumer welfare standard after US law, but it must consider the AFF’s standard to promote development.

Jose Maria L. Marella 18. J.D., University of the Philippines (UP) College of Law. “ADMINISTRATIVE WILL TO POWER: ARTICULATING THE GOALS OF ANTITRUST AND PROPOSING THEREFOR A REGULATORY FRAMEWORK” Philippine Law Journal. Vol. 91. 2018.

The complexities of modern government have often led Congress- whether by actual or perceived necessity-to legislate broad policy goals and general statutory standards, leaving the specific policy options to the discretion of an administrative body. 2 In this regard, the Philippine Competition Commission ("PCC")-the administrative body mandated to implement the Philippine Competition Act -has taken great strides in **advancing the policy objectives of economic efficiency and consumer welfare**. That the two policy objectives figure greatly in the exercise of the PCC's mandate is evident from its regulatory issuances and participation in relevant proceedings. A. Regulatory Issuances In its Implementing Rules and Regulations ("IRR"), the PCC adopts the "substantial lessening of competition" ("SLC") test,4 a Jurisprudential standard crafted and **developed by foreign jurisdictions to weigh the anticompetitive effects of certain transactions.** By assessing market indicators such as firm rivalry, prices, quality, and availability of goods and services, the SLC test filters out agreements that reduce competitive pressure among firms and disincentivize them from becoming more efficient and innovative.5 The IRR also allows the PCC to forbear-or desist from applying the provisions of the PCA-when, among other considerations, forbearance is consistent with the benefit and welfare of the consumers. 6 Economic efficiency and **consumer welfare also take center stage** in the PCC's Rules on Enforcement Procedure ("Enforcement Rules"), the rules and regulations governing hearings, investigation, and other proceedings on anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominant market position, and other violations of the PCA.7 Preliminary inquiries-the PCC proceedings that parallel the prosecutor's preliminary investigation in criminal cases-are to be conducted with due regard to consumer welfare.8 Interim measures may be issued against entities when their acts would result in a material and adverse effect on consumers or competition in the market.9 Upon termination of enforcement proceedings, the PCC will determine the propriety of imposing conclusive remedies with the aim of maintaining, enhancing, or restoring competition in the market.10 Similar to the IRR, the PCC's Rules on Merger Procedure ("Merger Rules") employs the SLC test in determining whether a proposed merger or acquisition will, post-transaction, **reduce economic efficiency or impair consumer welfare**; in determining the appropriateness of imposing interim measures; 12 or in considering whether, before clearing a merger or acquisition, the parties must abide by certain conditions to remedy, prevent, or mitigate competitive harm. 13 In addition, pursuant to its market surveillance function, the PCC is empowered to motu proprio conduct a review of mergers that are reasonably foreseen to breach the SLC test. 14 Intervening by way of an amicus curiae brief, the PCC apprised the Supreme Court of the competition issue intertwined with the legal question in a pending case that assailed, as an ultra vires expansion of statutory language, the regulation issued by the Philippine Contractors Accreditation Board that created a nationality restriction that was unsupported by the governing statutory text.15 The PCC supported striking down the regulation, arguing that, on the basis of economic literature and empirical data, the nationality restriction constituted a regulatory barrier to entry that unduly favored domestic contractors to the detriment of foreign contractors. In its argument that the regulation inordinately restricts market competition, the PCC enunciated the following principles: Consumer welfare, which in this case refers to the welfare of both households and other businesses, is maximized when competition allows consumers to access and choose the most efficient producers, regardless of the service provider's nationality. Indeed, it is a settled principle in economics that if there are many players in the market, healthy competition will ensue. The competitors will try to outdo each other in terms of quality and price in order to survive and profit. Competition therefore results in better quality products and competitive prices, which redound to the benefit of the public.16 In its recent bid to take its legal scuffle with Globe and PLDT17 to the Supreme Court,18 the PCC donned its mantle "to level the playing field across all markets; to review the competitive implications of large transactions; and to actively investigate, prosecute, and sanction cases of cartelistic behaviors that prevent, restrict, or lessen market competition." 19 These mandates would be carried out to "[encourage] innovation among market players, [reward] their efficient and productive use of resources, and ultimately [redound] to the benefit of consumers by lowering prices and enhancing their right of choice over goods and services offered in the market. 20 Significantly, the general public has acquiesced to the perception that the PCC champions economic efficiency and consumer welfare. News reports have consistently adverted to the PCA as a landmark piece of legislation that will enhance and promote these two policy objectives. Even lawmakers have acknowledged the PCC's critical role in improving market competition. Senator Juan Miguel Zubiri, addressing PCC's representative, Commissioner Johannes Bernabe, in a legislative hearing concerning the telecommunications sector, stated: "I'm really one with you [...] So you guys have to help us out [...] We are fighting giants. But as I said, the least that can happen is [that they] shape up and give us better service[,] or the best is that more players can come in and give us the best service[.]"21 But are such policy objectives all there is to the PCA? Or does the statutory text, alone or in conjunction with related legal materials, admit of other governing principles? Addressing such questions is crucial as the PCA may also cover other goals that have not been explicitly recognized. The law, after all, admits of different interpretations. 22 This then requires stakeholders and other government bodies to defer to the "sound discretion of the government agency entrusted with the regulation of activities coming under [its] special and technical training and knowledge[.]" 23 In such case, the PCC might be **undercutting its own potential to make even greater strides in other aspects of national development.** Recognizing these **other objectives** will greatly influence the PCC's exercise of its mandate and, more importantly, could **translate to better gains in national development.** By no means does this Note claim that the PCC is severely limiting the exercise of its functions-whether consciously or subconsciously. Rather, it simply articulates other equally **important antitrust considerations** which can be construed from the statutory text-considerations which the PCC **must also devote attention** to, and which the public, considering the incipient but technical field of competition law, 24 must appreciate.

#### The current standard results in economic injury.

Jose Maria L. Marella 18. J.D., University of the Philippines (UP) College of Law. “ADMINISTRATIVE WILL TO POWER: ARTICULATING THE GOALS OF ANTITRUST AND PROPOSING THEREFOR A REGULATORY FRAMEWORK” Philippine Law Journal. Vol. 91. 2018.

Enjoyment of the foregoing advantages should not, however, serve as vices that hinder the PCC from pursuing other policy objectives **beyond economic efficiency and consumer welfare.** The two virtues are, after all, **not without their shortcomings**-a strong admonition against the PCC from exclusively limiting its mandate to said virtues. Moreover, "with the growing complexity of modern life, the multiplication of the subjects of governmental regulations, and the increased difficulty of administering the laws," Congress has **vested "a larger amount of discretion in administrative and executive officials**, not only in the execution of the laws, but also in the promulgation of certain rules and regulations calculated to promote public interest." 9 0 To begin with, economics may not be as impartial a science as one might paint it to be, while economic efficiency and consumer welfare may not be as dispassionate. Economics, after all, is a tool that can be harnessed to suit any end. As incisively expressed in one article: Despite the laborious techniques and scientific pretention, most brands of economics are covertly ideological. Marxian economics, with its labor theory of value, assumes the inevitability of class conflict, and hence, the necessity of class struggle. Keynesianism, with its conviction that industrial capitalism is systematically unstable, offers an equally "scientific" rationale for government intervention. Neoclassical economics, with its reliance on the efficiency of markets, is a lavishly 9 Although legal analysis can now be expressed in terms of graphs, functions, equations and charts, this does not mean that competition agencies automatically possess the "cold neutrality of an impartial judge[.]" 92 **Antitrust and competition policy**, no different from the application of any other law, is **not an autarchic field** but is instead responsive to the warp and woof of other civil, political, and social dimensions. More alarmingly, employing the standards of economic efficiency and consumer welfare-more so when done to the **exclusion** of other goals-have, in some instances, **perversely led to economic injury.** Efficiency or welfare analysis has been criticized as ascribing to distinct goods and services the same social utility. Such a one-dimensional take fails to account for the harm certain goods-for instance, tobacco and guns- inflict on society. Since efficiency and welfare are primarily concerned with delivering the most competitive prices to consumers, **regulators end up making harmful goods more accessible to the consuming public.** 93 Furthermore, in a regime that adopts efficiency and/or welfare to the exclusion of other standards, "conduct that did not impair efficiency would be permitted, **regardless of the effects competitors, or the political economy at large**." 4 From a broader perspective, efficiency and consumer welfare are but two aspirations in the entire universe of objectives that antitrust may pursue. The United States case of Brown Shoe v. United States95 is instructive on this matter: Congress provided no definite quantitative or qualitative tests by which enforcement agencies were to gauge the effects of a given merger, but rather that Congress intended that a variety of economic and other factors be considered in determining whether the merger was consistent with maintaining competition in the industry in which the merging 96 The PCC shall inevitably encounter cases that will entail the application of other considerations since going by the economic efficiency or consumer welfare approach alone would be a dereliction of the duties to address various issues and promote other equally important values. As more complex variables factor into the agency's calculus, the PCC would risk undercutting its mandate if it were to limit its goals. In such case, **the ultimate loser would be society.**

#### Equitable growth in the Philippines prevents piracy.

Kenneth Yeo Yaoren et al 21. Kenneth Yeo Yaoren is a Research Analyst with the International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research (ICPVTR) of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at the Nanyang Technological University. Rueben Ananthan Santhana Dass is a Research Analyst with ICPVTR. Jasminder Singh is a Senior Analyst with ICPVTR. “Maritime Malice in Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines: The Asymmetric Maritime Threat at the Tri-Border Area”. International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague. April 2021. https://icct.nl/app/uploads/2021/04/maritime-terrorism-southeast-asia-policy-brief.pdf

The Sulu-Celebes Sea is one of the major shipping routes of Southeast Asia.64 Annually, US$40 billion worth of goods pass through the Sulu-Celebes Sea, creating great economic opportunities for inhabitants of the region in logistics management, ship maintenance, and other complementary sectors.65 Moreover, its marine biodiversity66 generates economic opportunities for eco-tourism67, fish farming, and reef-sourced biomedical products.68 However, the threats arising from crime, piracy and terrorism have significantly impacted investors’ confidence in that region. Notwithstanding these opportunities, the labour force participation rate of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) is only 62.3 percent for individuals who are above 15 years old, signalling a high unemployment figure despite the reported 3.8 percent unemployment rate. 69 More critically, low levels of formal education in the BARMM have led to limits on workforce development.70 Non-Governmental Organisations have identified coastal **poverty71** **and relative economic depression72** as the **key factors** that may induce grievances and lead to a sense of relative deprivation and injustice for which affected individuals feel the need to rebel against. This then drives **individuals into engaging in illicit activities and political violence.**73 While comprehensive data on the youth unemployment rates in the region is unavailable, the high intensity of conflict and low formal education attainment reduces economic opportunities among youth. Based on the youth bulge theory, spaces with high youth population and high youth unemployment are more prone to civil conflict.74 The poor economic outlook, coupled with existing political grievances, facilitates the continuous recruitment of disgruntled youth **into militancy**.75 The coasts of the Sulu-Celebes Seas has observed high proportion of youth participating in Abu Sayyaf activities. This includes the infamous Ajang Ajang unit, which comprised sons of deceased Abu Sayyaf members. Much of the Abu Sayyaf militant strength is derived from its youth. Notable leaders like Isnilon Hapilon (49 years old when killed), leader of the Islamic State’s East Asian Wilayah, participated in militancy since he was 17.76 Amin Baco (35 years old when killed), who was touted to succeed Hapilon, participated in Islamist insurgencies since he was 16.77 Nonetheless, more research onto this topic is required to investigate the relationship between the high youth recruitment and economic deprivation at the region. The COVID-19 pandemic has decimated the economies of the TCA member states. Youth unemployment for the Philippines, Indonesia, and Malaysia has risen significantly as a result of measures to curtail the spread of the virus.78 This trend **worsens the existing socio-political grievances** of the population, thereby **increasing** youth **participation in regional militancy**.79 Ultimately, governments must adopt both hard and soft power to build lasting peace in the region.

#### Goes nuclear---terrorist-piracy nexus guarantees escalation.

Abhijit Singh 18. A former naval officer, Senior Fellow, heads the Maritime Policy Initiative at ORF. A maritime professional with specialist and command experience in front-line Indian naval ships, he has been involved the writing of India's maritime strategy (2007). “Maritime terrorism in Asia: An assessment” https://www.orfonline.org/research/maritime-terrorism-in-asia-an-assessment-56581/

The terrorism-piracy nexus and port security In assessing the nature of maritime terrorist activity in Asia, it is important to study the terrorism-piracy nexus – not least because pirates have in the past financed terrorist activity.[59]Evidence of a linkage between the terrorists and pirates first emerged in May 2003, when the M/V Pen rider, a Malaysian-registered oil tanker, was attacked off the coast of Malaysia, and three crew members were taken hostage.[60] After ship owners paid $100,000 to free the crew, it emerged that the attackers were associated with the Free Aceh Movement, an insurgent group operating in Indonesia. The receipt of a ransom of $1.2 million by the Somali pirates to free a Spanish fishing vessel and 26 hostages in 2008 provided more proof of a possible link between terrorists and pirates; reportedly, the Al-Shabaab had received a five-percent cut. A year later, when the terror group hired pirates to smuggle in members of Al Qaeda to Somalia, the terror-piracy linkage seemed virtually certain.[61] In recent years, terrorists and pirates have appeared to draw closer, even if the exact nature of their collaboration is not clear. Somali pirates and terrorists are said to have worked together in arms trafficking, and Al-Shabaab is said to have even have trained pirates for ‘duties’ at sea.[62]An investigation by the United Nations (UN) in 2017 found evidence of collusion between pirates and the Al Shabaab, including the possibility that pirates helped the latter smuggle weapons and ammunition into Somalia.[63] As discussed earlier, in Southeast Asia, the Abu Sayaff’s turn to piracy has resulted in millions earned via ransom payments.[64] Its cadres have used the revenue earned for pirate activity to expand the radical organisation’s presence in Southeast Asia. The terror-piracy linkage is important because it highlights the causal mechanism behind rising violence at sea. The task of maritime security agencies becomes harder, however, when the lines between terrorism and piracy begin blurring, particularly in Southeast Asia, where the Abu Sayyaf has alternated between piracy and terrorism. Today’s pirates are trained fighters onboard speedboats, armed not only with automatic weapons, hand-held missiles and grenades but also and global positioning systems; professional mercenaries that loop effortlessly between rent-seeking and violent acts. Their objectives are as much ideological, as they are material. ISPS code and littoral security While most discussions around maritime terrorism presume a threat to sea-borne assets, port security constitutes the bigger challenge. Terrorists have long had seaports on their crosshairs, because of the latter’s role in trade and economic development. In recent years, there has been a significant increase in freight traffic, with key ports in Asia transformed into global trading hubs. In keeping with the growing importance of port-enabled trade, regional governments have taken better measures to protect ships and onshore facilities. In many ports, authorities have increased guards, gates, and security cameras, even introducing identification card programs to screen those with access to critical port infrastructure. The installation of radiation detectors has been particularly helpful in screening critical cargo and identifying suspicious shipments. Yet, not even the best ports in Asia are able to track and monitor large containers comprehensively. With a rising quantum of cargo to be handled every day, port authorities find it impractical to scan each and every container being offloaded from cargo ships.[65]Container scanning in many ports is in fact a largely random exercise, with authorities insisting that shippers provide manifests of what is contained in cargo bins.[66] The lack of effective checks on ports brings up the possibility of the use of containers as weapons to smuggle in arms, explosive materials or the terrorists themselves. While terrorists would not possibly target cargo ships directly, the latter could be used to transport weapons or to sabotage commercial operations. A dirty-bomb in an illicit cargo container of a cargo ship could cause a port shutdown and huge commercial disruption.[67] Even a failed attempt to smuggle a device into a major transshipment hub would significantly impact port operations. After the 9/11 incident in the United States, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) had established the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code—a set of maritime regulations designed to help detect and deter threats to international shipping. The code subjects ships to a system of survey, verification, certification and control to ensure that the security measures prescribed by the IMO are implemented by member countries. It also provides a standardised, consistent framework for evaluating risk and gauging vulnerabilities of ships and ports facilities, laying down principles and guidelines for governments, port authorities and shipping companies, making compliance mandatory.[68] The code, however, has not been effective in a way originally intended.[69]Firstly, the code is based on the experience of 9/11 and early piracy activity off Somalia. No amendments or revisions have been made with regard to new types of security threats encountered in recent years. The exclusion of vessels less than 500 tonnes, and all fishing vessels regardless of their size, is a further impediment in the code’s implementation, as terrorists have sought to use smaller boats to smuggle weapons and ammunition rarely subject to regulation.[70] Another shortcoming is that the code does not include official monitoring procedures for security matters. Unlike the International Safety Management Code (ISM) that prescribes office audits by internal and external sources, the ISPS enumerates general guidelines and precautions—a standardised template for evaluating risks on many different types, sizes and categories of vessels and facilities.[71] The code also does not specify ways to strengthen capability to protect against new forms of terrorism, such as drone attacks.[72] With no legal obligation to implement regulations, port authorities are unwilling to make necessary investments in security measures. The lack of national legislation/guidelines is another hurdle in the code’s implementation. Regional governments have neither enacted necessary domestic legislation to fight terrorists nor allotted resources to implement security measures.[73] In India, for instance, there is no comprehensive maritime security policy for protection of the commercial maritime infrastructure and supply chains.[74]A new Merchant Shipping Bill[75] in 2016 improved transparency and effective delivery of services, but has failed to address security concerns. Given the complicated mix of variables contributing to port security, a study of security measures adopted by the civil aviation industry might offer some useful pointers. The latter’s efforts to prevent hijackings of commercial aircraft over the past four decades has been widely hailed as a success. Developed in the late 1960s, the international legal regime governing civilian flight operations was significantly upgraded after the attacks of 11 September 2001. The United States’ efforts to bring in legislation to regulate foreign airlines and flights from foreign airports have been particularly helpful. In concert with other international conventions drafted by the UN International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the regulatory regime has deterred terrorists and criminals from targeting aircraft.[76] This may hold important lessons for port security; in particular, approaches used in the international legal regime governing civil aviation to eliminate safe havens for pirates and terrorists by ensuring legal accountability. A study of security in the aviation sector could offer important tips on how port security systems could be mobilised to encourage best management practices; the importance of freezing assets of those who fund piracy enterprises; and the utility of enhancing communication and coordination among the various stakeholders relevant to the fight against piracy and terrorism.[77] A next terrorist attack: Gauging the odds To design policies that help combat maritime terrorism it is important to assess the likely nature of future attacks and their probable targets. Future terrorist attacks could be directed against four kinds of targets: warships, supertankers, passenger ships and port facilities. The most vulnerable and attractive targets remain tankers out at sea. The recent attacks on tankers in the Persian Gulf revealed that the threat is evolving and could now include unmanned vehicles.[78] More damaging would be the seizure and sinking of an oil-carrying tanker in a congested space, crippling the flow of maritime traffic. To get a sense of the extent of damage such an attack would cause, the Limburg incident in 2002 caused a massive spillage of oil (almost 90,000 tonnes) that took many weeks to clear.[79] Another kind of attack could be on cruise ships out at sea. Big cruise ships are a lucrative target since they are lightly defended and relatively easily accessible.[80]An enquiry into the Achille Lauro incident in October 1984 highlighted fundamental deficiencies in safety procedures. Apparently, checks on passengers in the run-up to that fateful incident had not been foolproof. Despite acting nervously and even displaying anti-social behaviour, the Palestinian hijackers did not arouse the suspicions of passengers and crew.[81] While safety procedures have since improved, security procedures at ports and aboard cruise ships (with certain exceptions) are far from immaculate. During the Super Ferry incident in the Philippines in 2004, Abu Sayyaf operatives disguised as tourists smuggled 20 sticks of explosives that were stored inside an emptied out TV set.[82] There is some evidence that cruise shipping companies in Asia and Africa continue with the same lax approach that enabled that devastating attack. The most likely venue of a future terrorist strike, however, might be inside a port facility, and it could possibly involve a ‘lone wolf’ with a loose affiliation to a bigger terrorist group. Ports are an attractive target because many of the tactical problems that terrorists face in orchestrating attacks on ships in the high seas do not apply to harbors, ports, or shore-based maritime facilities. Terrorists realise that the containerised supply chain is complex, and creates many opportunities for isolated acts of terrorism. An ineffective point of check, for instance, could allow a jihadi inside a container to detonate a vast quantity of explosives or a low-grade nuclear device; inadequate surveillance in a vessel could lead a jihadi diver to plant an explosives improvised explosive device (IED). While many ports have installed radiation detectors to combat the threat of IED, the pace of installation has been slow, and smaller ports remain vulnerable.

#### Extinction---retal.

Matthew Bunn & Nickolas Roth 17. \*Professor of practice at the Harvard Kennedy School. \*\*Research associate at the Belfer Center’s Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University and research fellow at the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland. “The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb.” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, http://thebulletin.org/effects-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb11150

The escalating threats between North Korea and the United States make it easy to forget the “nuclear nightmare,” as former US Secretary of Defense William J. Perry put it, that could result even from the use of just a single terrorist nuclear bomb in the heart of a major city. At the risk of repeating the vast literature on the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—and the substantial literature surrounding nuclear tests and simulations since then—we attempt to spell out here the likely consequences of the explosion of a single terrorist nuclear bomb on a major city, and its subsequent ripple effects on the rest of the planet. Depending on where and when it was detonated, the blast, fire, initial radiation, and long-term radioactive fallout from such a bomb could leave the heart of a major city a smoldering radioactive ruin, killing tens or hundreds of thousands of people and wounding hundreds of thousands more. Vast areas would have to be evacuated and might be uninhabitable for years. Economic, political, and social aftershocks would ripple throughout the world. A single terrorist nuclear bomb would change history. The country attacked—and the world—would never be the same. The idea of terrorists accomplishing such a thing is, unfortunately, not out of the question; it is far easier to make a crude, unsafe, unreliable nuclear explosive that might fit in the back of a truck than it is to make a safe, reliable weapon of known yield that can be delivered by missile or combat aircraft. Numerous government studies have concluded that it is plausible that a sophisticated terrorist group could make a crude bomb if they got the needed nuclear material. And in the last quarter century, there have been some 20 seizures of stolen, weapons-usable nuclear material, and at least two terrorist groups have made significant efforts to acquire nuclear bombs. Terrorist use of an actual nuclear bomb is a low-probability event—but the immensity of the consequences means that even a small chance is enough to justify an intensive effort to reduce the risk. Fortunately, since the early 1990s, countries around the world have significantly reduced the danger—but it remains very real, and there is more to do to ensure this nightmare never becomes reality. Brighter than a thousand suns. Imagine a crude terrorist nuclear bomb—containing a chunk of highly enriched uranium just under the size of a regulation bowling ball, or a much smaller chunk of plutonium—suddenly detonating inside a delivery van parked in the heart of a major city. Such a terrorist bomb would release as much as 10 kilotons of explosive energy, or the equivalent of 10,000 tons of conventional explosives, a volume of explosives large enough to fill all the cars of a mile-long train. In a millionth of a second, all of that energy would be released inside that small ball of nuclear material, creating temperatures and pressures as high as those at the center of the sun. That furious energy would explode outward, releasing its energy in three main ways: a powerful blast wave; intense heat; and deadly radiation. The ball would expand almost instantly into a fireball the width of four football fields, incinerating essentially everything and everyone within. The heated fireball would rise, sucking in air from below and expanding above, creating the mushroom cloud that has become the symbol of the terror of the nuclear age. The ionized plasma in the fireball would create a localized electromagnetic pulse more powerful than lightning, shorting out communications and electronics nearby—though most would be destroyed by the bomb’s other effects in any case. (Estimates of heat, blast, and radiation effects in this article are drawn primarily from Alex Wellerstein’s “Nukemap,” which itself comes from declassified US government data, such as the 660-page government textbook The Effects of Nuclear Weapons.) At the instant of its detonation, the bomb would also release an intense burst of gamma and neutron radiation which would be lethal for nearly everyone directly exposed within about two-thirds of a mile from the center of the blast. (Those who happened to be shielded by being inside, or having buildings between them and the bomb, would be partly protected—in some cases, reducing their doses by ten times or more.) The nuclear flash from the heat of the fireball would radiate in both visible light and the infrared; it would be “brighter than a thousand suns,” in the words of the title of a book describing the development of nuclear weapons—adapting a phrase from the Hindu epic the Bhagavad-Gita. Anyone who looked directly at the blast would be blinded. The heat from the fireball would ignite fires and horribly burn everyone exposed outside at distances of nearly a mile away. (In the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum, visitors gaze in horror at the bones of a human hand embedded in glass melted by the bomb.) No one has burned a city on that scale in the decades since World War II, so it is difficult to predict the full extent of the fire damage that would occur from the explosion of a nuclear bomb in one of today’s cities. Modern glass, steel, and concrete buildings would presumably be less flammable than the wood-and-rice-paper housing of Hiroshima or Nagasaki in the 1940s—but many questions remain, including exactly how thousands of broken gas lines might contribute to fire damage (as they did in Dresden during World War II). On 9/11, the buildings of the World Trade Center proved to be much more vulnerable to fire damage than had been expected. Ultimately, even a crude terrorist nuclear bomb would carry the possibility that the countless fires touched off by the explosion would coalesce into a devastating firestorm, as occurred at Hiroshima. In a firestorm, the rising column of hot air from the massive fire sucks in the air from all around, creating hurricane-force winds; everything flammable and everything alive within the firestorm would be consumed. The fires and the dust from the blast would make it extremely difficult for either rescuers or survivors to see. The explosion would create a powerful blast wave rushing out in every direction. For more than a quarter-mile all around the blast, the pulse of pressure would be over 20 pounds per square inch above atmospheric pressure (known as “overpressure”), destroying or severely damaging even sturdy buildings. The combination of blast, heat, and radiation would kill virtually everyone in this zone. The blast would be accompanied by winds of many hundreds of miles per hour. The damage from the explosion would extend far beyond this inner zone of almost total death. Out to more than half a mile, the blast would be strong enough to collapse most residential buildings and create a serious danger that office buildings would topple over, killing those inside and those in the path of the rubble. (On the other hand, the office towers of a modern city would tend to block the blast wave in some areas, providing partial protection from the blast, as well as from the heat and radiation.) In that zone, almost anything made of wood would be destroyed: Roofs would cave in, windows would shatter, gas lines would rupture. Telephone poles, street lamps, and utility lines would be severely damaged. Many roads would be blocked by mountains of wreckage. In this zone, many people would be killed or injured in building collapses, or trapped under the rubble; many more would be burned, blinded, or injured by flying debris. In many cases, their charred skin would become ragged and fall off in sheets. The effects of the detonation would act in deadly synergy. The smashed materials of buildings broken by the blast would be far easier for the fires to ignite than intact structures. The effects of radiation would make it far more difficult for burned and injured people to recover. The combination of burns, radiation, and physical injuries would cause far more death and suffering than any one of them would alone. The silent killer. The bomb’s immediate effects would be followed by a slow, lingering killer: radioactive fallout. A bomb detonated at ground level would dig a huge crater, hurling tons of earth and debris thousands of feet into the sky. Sucked into the rising fireball, these particles would mix with the radioactive remainders of the bomb, and over the next few hours or days, the debris would rain down for miles downwind. Depending on weather and wind patterns, the fallout could actually be deadlier and make a far larger area unusable than the blast itself. Acute radiation sickness from the initial radiation pulse and the fallout would likely affect tens of thousands of people. Depending on the dose, they might suffer from vomiting, watery diarrhea, fever, sores, loss of hair, and bone marrow depletion. Some would survive; some would die within days; some would take months to die. Cancer rates among the survivors would rise. Women would be more vulnerable than men—children and infants especially so. Much of the radiation from a nuclear blast is short-lived; radiation levels even a few days after the blast would be far below those in the first hours. For those not killed or terribly wounded by the initial explosion, the best advice would be to take shelter in a basement for at least several days. But many would be too terrified to stay. Thousands of panic-stricken people might receive deadly doses of radiation as they fled from their homes. Some of the radiation will be longer-lived; areas most severely affected would have to be abandoned for many years after the attack. The combination of radioactive fallout and the devastation of nearly all life-sustaining infrastructure over a vast area would mean that hundreds of thousands of people would have to evacuate. Ambulances to nowhere. The explosion would also destroy much of the city’s ability to respond. Hospitals would be leveled, doctors and nurses killed and wounded, ambulances destroyed. (In Hiroshima, 42 of 45 hospitals were destroyed or severely damaged, and 270 of 300 doctors were killed.) Resources that survived outside the zone of destruction would be utterly overwhelmed. Hospitals have no ability to cope with tens or hundreds of thousands of terribly burned and injured people all at once; the United States, for example, has 1,760 burn beds in hospitals nationwide, of which a third are available on any given day. And the problem would not be limited to hospitals; firefighters, for example, would have little ability to cope with thousands of fires raging out of control at once. Fire stations and equipment would be destroyed in the affected area, and firemen killed, along with police and other emergency responders. Some of the first responders may become casualties themselves, from radioactive fallout, fire, and collapsing buildings. Over much of the affected area, communications would be destroyed, by both the physical effects and the electromagnetic pulse from the explosion. Better preparation for such a disaster could save thousands of lives—but ultimately, there is no way any city can genuinely be prepared for a catastrophe on such a historic scale, occurring in a flash, with zero warning. Rescue and recovery attempts would be impeded by the destruction of most of the needed personnel and equipment, and by fire, debris, radiation, fear, lack of communications, and the immense scale of the disaster. The US military and the national guard could provide critically important capabilities—but federal plans assume that “no significant federal response” would be available for 24-to-72 hours. Many of those burned and injured would wait in vain for help, food, or water, perhaps for days. The scale of death and suffering. How many would die in such an event, and how many would be terribly wounded, would depend on where and when the bomb was detonated, what the weather conditions were at the time, how successful the response was in helping the wounded survivors, and more. Many estimates of casualties are based on census data, which reflect where people sleep at night; if the attack occurred in the middle of a workday, the numbers of people crowded into the office towers at the heart of many modern cities would be far higher. The daytime population of Manhattan, for example, is roughly twice its nighttime population; in Midtown on a typical workday, there are an estimated 980,000 people per square mile. A 10-kiloton weapon detonated there might well kill half a million people—not counting those who might die of radiation sickness from the fallout. (These effects were analyzed in great detail in the Rand Corporation’s Considering the Effects of a Catastrophic Terrorist Attack and the British Medical Journal’s “Nuclear terrorism.”) On a typical day, the wind would blow the fallout north, seriously contaminating virtually all of Manhattan above Gramercy Park; people living as far away as Stamford, Connecticut would likely have to evacuate. Seriously injured survivors would greatly outnumber the dead, their suffering magnified by the complete inadequacy of available help. The psychological and social effects—overwhelming sadness, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, myriad forms of anxiety—would be profound and long-lasting. The scenario we have been describing is a groundburst. An airburst—such as might occur, for example, if terrorists put their bomb in a small aircraft they had purchased or rented—would extend the blast and fire effects over a wider area, killing and injuring even larger numbers of people immediately. But an airburst would not have the same lingering effects from fallout as a groundburst, because the rock and dirt would not be sucked up into the fireball and contaminated. The 10-kiloton blast we have been discussing is likely toward the high end of what terrorists could plausibly achieve with a crude, improvised bomb, but even a 1-kiloton blast would be a catastrophic event, having a deadly radius between one-third and one-half that of a 10-kiloton blast. These hundreds of thousands of people would not be mere statistics, but countless individual stories of loss—parents, children, entire families; all religions; rich and poor alike—killed or horribly mutilated. Human suffering and tragedy on this scale does not have to be imagined; it can be remembered through the stories of the survivors of the US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the only times in history when nuclear weapons have been used intentionally against human beings. The pain and suffering caused by those bombings are almost beyond human comprehension; the eloquent testimony of the Hibakusha—the survivors who passed through the atomic fire—should stand as an eternal reminder of the need to prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used in anger again. Global economic disaster. The economic impact of such an attack would be enormous. The effects would reverberate for so far and so long that they are difficult to estimate in all their complexity. Hundreds of thousands of people would be too injured or sick to work for weeks or months. Hundreds of thousands more would evacuate to locations far from their jobs. Many places of employment would have to be abandoned because of the radioactive fallout. Insurance companies would reel under the losses; but at the same time, many insurance policies exclude the effects of nuclear attacks—an item insurers considered beyond their ability to cover—so the owners of thousands of buildings would not have the insurance payments needed to cover the cost of fixing them, thousands of companies would go bankrupt, and banks would be left holding an immense number of mortgages that would never be repaid. Consumer and investor confidence would likely be dramatically affected, as worried people slowed their spending. Enormous new homeland security and military investments would be very likely. If the bomb had come in a shipping container, the targeted country—and possibly others—might stop all containers from entering until it could devise a system for ensuring they could never again be used for such a purpose, throwing a wrench into the gears of global trade for an extended period. (And this might well occur even if a shipping container had not been the means of delivery.) Even the far smaller 9/11 attacks are estimated to have caused economic aftershocks costing almost $1 trillion even excluding the multi-trillion-dollar costs of the wars that ensued. The cost of a terrorist nuclear attack in a major city would likely be many times higher. The most severe effects would be local, but the effects of trade disruptions, reduced economic activity, and more would reverberate around the world. Consequently, while some countries may feel that nuclear terrorism is only a concern for the countries most likely to be targeted—such as the United States—in reality it is a threat to everyone, everywhere. In 2005, then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that these global effects would push “tens of millions of people into dire poverty,” creating “a second death toll throughout the developing world.” One recent estimate suggested that a nuclear attack in an urban area would cause a global recession, cutting global Gross Domestic Product by some two percent, and pushing an additional 30 million people in the developing world into extreme poverty. Desperate dilemmas. In short, an act of nuclear terrorism could rip the heart out of a major city, and cause ripple effects throughout the world. The government of the country attacked would face desperate decisions: How to help the city attacked? How to prevent further attacks? How to respond or retaliate? Terrorists—either those who committed the attack or others—would probably claim they had more bombs already hidden in other cities (whether they did or not), and threaten to detonate them unless their demands were met. The fear that this might be true could lead people to flee major cities in a large-scale, uncontrolled evacuation. There is very little ability to support the population of major cities in the surrounding countryside. The potential for widespread havoc and economic chaos is very real. If the detonation took place in the capital of the nation attacked, much of the government might be destroyed. A bomb in Washington, D.C., for example, might kill the President, the Vice President, and many of the members of Congress and the Supreme Court. (Having some plausible national leader survive is a key reason why one cabinet member is always elsewhere on the night of the State of the Union address.) Elaborate, classified plans for “continuity of government” have already been drawn up in a number of countries, but the potential for chaos and confusion—if almost all of a country’s top leaders were killed—would still be enormous. Who, for example, could address the public on what the government would do, and what the public should do, to respond? Could anyone honestly assure the public there would be no further attacks? If they did, who would believe them? In the United States, given the practical impossibility of passing major legislation with Congress in ruins and most of its members dead or seriously injured, some have argued for passing legislation in advance giving the government emergency powers to act—and creating procedures, for example, for legitimately replacing most of the House of Representatives. But to date, no such legislative preparations have been made. In what would inevitably be a desperate effort to prevent further attacks, traditional standards of civil liberties might be jettisoned, at least for a time—particularly when people realized that the fuel for the bomb that had done such damage would easily have fit in a suitcase. Old rules limiting search and surveillance could be among the first to go. The government might well impose martial law as it sought to control the situation, hunt for the perpetrators, and find any additional weapons or nuclear materials they might have. Even the far smaller attacks of 9/11 saw the US government authorizing torture of prisoners and mass electronic surveillance. And what standards of international order and law would still hold sway? The country attacked might well lash out militarily at whatever countries it thought might bear a portion of responsibility. (A terrifying description of the kinds of discussions that might occur appeared in Brian Jenkins’ book, Will Terrorists Go Nuclear?) With the nuclear threshold already crossed in this scenario—at least by terrorists—it is conceivable that some of the resulting conflicts might escalate to nuclear use. International politics could become more brutish and violent, with powerful states taking unilateral action, by force if necessary, in an effort to ensure their security. After 9/11, the United States led the invasions of two sovereign nations, in wars that have since cost hundreds of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, while plunging a region into chaos. Would the reaction after a far more devastating nuclear attack be any less?

#### The plan solves---US antitrust law is modeled---the stakes are huge.

David J. Gerber 13. Teaches antitrust law, comparative law and more specialized seminars such as international and comparative competition law. He has been a member of the Chicago-Kent faculty since 1982. After graduating from the University of Chicago Law School, Professor Gerber practiced law in New York City and then spent several years working in a German law firm and in several universities in Europe. “U.S. ANTITRUST: FROM SHOT IN THE DARK TO GLOBAL LEADERSHIP” Then & Now: Stories of Law and Progress. 2013.

The “shot in the dark” that was the **U.S. antitrust law system** is today no longer solely a domestic field of law. It is now also a **critically important component of global economic policy!** The system that U.S. judges had evolved to deal with purely domestic problems and that relied on little more than confidence in the capacity of courts to develop reasonable responses to conflicts has been transformed into the central player in efforts to respond effectively to economic and other forms of globalization. It is now a U.S. export product, and the **stakes are enormous.** What directions and forms will the **rules of competition** take? Treatment of these issues will be a **factor in the future of many countries**, including the U.S., and for more than two decades Chicago-Kent has brought transnational competition law to our students, and Chicago-Kent faculty have contributed to the international discussion of these issues. A. Foreign Interactions and Perceptions **U.S. antitrust now plays on a global stage**, and much will depend on how foreign experts, lawyers, government officials and business leaders **see U.S. antitrust**. They will make **decisions about what to do in their own countries** and on the international level. This means that their perspectives on the U.S. system are critical to its roles both at home and abroad, and foreign images of U.S. antitrust have changed radically. Prior to the Second World War, those in Europe who knew anything about U.S. antitrust law (and they were few) generally considered it a mistake. They tended to see it as a failure that actually created more harm than good by forcing companies to merge rather than cooperate. This view predominated in large measure until after the Second World War. The Europeans were developing a different concept of competition law that emphasized administrative control of dominant firms. This conception of competition was spreading rapidly in Europe in the 1920s, but depression and war led to its virtual abandonment. After that war ended, however, U.S. antitrust law became associated with U.S. economic dominance in the “free world.” The real and imagined connections between economic concentration and military expansion in both Germany and Japan convinced many that **U.S.-style antitrust law should be used** to combat such concentrations. U.S. occupation forces in Germany and Japan imposed U.S. antitrust ideas during the occupation period, and the U.S. insisted that both countries either enact or maintain competition law after the occupation. This increased awareness of these ideas abroad. Perhaps more important, however, was the **perception that antitrust was a source of strength for the U.S. economy** and thus a potential spur to growth that other countries could employ. U.S.-style antitrust did not, however, always fit well with European legal traditions and institutions, and in most European countries skepticism toward the U.S. model limited progress in protecting competition. In Germany, however, a separate set of ideas about how to protect competition developed in the 1930s and 1940s in the underground, and after the war it became the basis for German antitrust law. From here it spread to the European level and became part of the process of Euro- pean integration. The basic idea of U.S. antitrust law—i.e., protecting the competitive process from restraints—was part of this model of competition law, but the model itself was conceptually and institutionally quite distinct. European scholars and officials in these areas often looked to U.S. antitrust for comparisons and insights into problems, but there was relatively little interaction between U.S. and European forms of competition law until the 1990s. In the 1990s these relationships became far closer and more important for both the U.S. and Europeans. Moreover, the fall of the Soviet Union precipitated widespread interest in market-based approaches around the world and revived the messianic tenor of the U.S. antitrust law community. Many countries that had socialist or other command-based approaches to the organization of economic activity now introduced antitrust laws or significantly increased their investment in the enforcement of such laws. Often they looked to U.S. antitrust officials, lawyers and scholars for help in implementing or evaluating their new activities.

### Democracy---1AC

#### Advantage 3 is Democracy.

#### Congressional inaction shifts power to less democratic institutions.

Spencer Weber Waller 19. John Paul Stevens Chair in Competition Law and Director, Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies, Loyola University Chicago School of Law. "Antitrust and Democracy " Florida State University Law Review. 2019. https://lawecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1658&context=facpubs

It is disappointing that the U.S. Congress has more often focused on the minutiae of competition law and policy or conducted hearings on high profile mergers that, by design, cannot affect the eventual enforcement actions of the agencies. 160 There have been no major amendments of the antitrust laws since the 1970s. 16 1 Criminal penalties have been increased, but the private treble damage remedies as a whole have been largely left unchanged. 162 Exemptions and immunities have been expanded and contracted at the margins. 16 3 Budgets have been increased and lowered depending on the era and the overall political zeitgeist.

Unfortunately, much of Congressional attention to competition law has involved minor issues and outright petty matters. For example, Congress effectively killed a proposal that would have rationalized cooperation between the Antitrust Division and the FTC because it affected which Congressional committee had "jurisdiction" over the work of these agencies. 164 Even more petty was the unsuccessful effort of one Congressman to force the FTC to vacate its headquarters for an expansion of the national art museum.165

The opportunity costs for each hearing on such marginal issues, for example, whether professional baseball should continue to enjoy a partial exemption from the antitrust laws or grandstanding for constituents over the fate of a particular merger with a pronounced local effect, is high. Congress sacrifices time, money, and attention better used to study more important, broader issues of competition law and policy. Stated enforcement policy over unilateral conduct and merger policy have changed substantially between administrations and over time. Important guidelines and stated enforcement priorities have changed as well with little substantive Congressional involvement. 16 6 Critical decisions by the United States Supreme Court have changed the law in dramatic and subtle ways without significant Congressional input either before or after the decisions. 167

Perhaps Congress simply does not care about, or actually approves of, the continued evolution of United States antitrust law and policy in all its complexity. However, this silence or indifference has important consequences. It shifts power from the most democratic elected institutions to the more distant, less democratic institutions of agencies and courts to craft fundamental economic policy free from all but the most macro-level interventions or corrections.

#### That collapses court legitimacy and constitutional separation of powers.

David P. Ramsey 10. Associate Professor of Government at the University of West Florida. “The Role of the Supreme Court in Antitrust Enforcement”. May 2010. https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/7960/david\_ramsey\_phd.pdf?sequence=3

White’s announcement of the rule of reason was not without its critics on the Court. Justice John Marshall Harlan, author of the Court’s opinion in the Northern Securities case, delivered a passionate dissent which, in the period immediately following announcement of the Court’s ruling in the Standard Oil case, was more widely covered in the press than White’s majority opinion. For Harlan, the real issue of the case was whether or not the Court would resist the temptation to amend the Sherman Act by a process of judicial legislation.28 Harlan places the decision in the context of the failed arguments of defendants in the Trans-Missouri and Joint Traffic arguments, who twice attempted to persuade the Court to amend or interpret the text of Sherman §1 prohibition of all agreements in restraint of trade to read all agreements ‘in unreasonable restraint of trade,’ and twice failed to do so.29 Given such precedents, Harlan found White’s decision now to incorporate the standard of reasonableness into the Court’s interpretation of the statute troubling not only because this would seem to **raise constitutional concerns** about judicial legislation, but also because it seemed to show such **blatant disregard** for stare decisis, and would thus help to **weaken** an important source of **institutional power** for the judiciary over time. 30 Finally, Harlan explained that he was worried that White’s adoption of a rule of reason would have **profound constitutional implications in future generations**, particularly the danger of judicial encroachment on the legislative power, and the danger that the Court, by something so small as inserting the word ‘reasonable’ into the Sherman Act’s prohibition of restraints of trade, might eventually come to **erect itself into a superlegislature**, just as Brutus and the Anti-Federalists had feared. Emphasizing the three “separate, equal and coordinate departments” erected by the Constitution, Harlan stresses the danger posed to our institutions should any one branch of the federal government begin to usurp the powers of another, and that this danger was all the more **prevalent and pernicious** in cases involving attempts to transcend constitutional powers in the name of the common good. Harlan closes with a passionate exhortation to resist this temptation to pursue the public good or further the legislative intent of Congress by surpassing the powers granted the Court in Article III. After many years of public service at the National Capital, and after a somewhat close observation of the conduct of public affairs, I am impelled to say that there is abroad in our land a most harmful tendency to bring about the amending of constitutions and legislative enactments by means alone of judicial construction. As a public policy has been declared by the legislative department in respect of interstate commerce, over which Congress has entire control, under the Constitution, all concerned must patiently submit to what has been lawfully done until the People of the United States—the source of all National power—shall, in their own time, upon reflection and through the legislative department of the Government, require a change of that policy.31 Though Harlan’s warning tends to be lightly dismissed by later critics, it must be remembered that at the time, federal involvement in regulation of the economy was minimal, and therefore the Court tended to defer to the political branches. Harlan’s reluctance to accept a court-made rule of reason was in part, then, an attempt to protect the Court from the political backlash that would likely result from being positioned at the vanguard of Progressive reforms. The Sherman Act was controversial enough as a statement of national economic policy without the Court adding to it an additional layer of discretionary power for the judiciary.

#### Rule of law is essential to stave off societal collapse.

Stephen Breyer 18. An associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. “AMERICA’S COURTS CAN’T IGNORE THE WORLD” The Atlantic. October 2018. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/10/stephen-breyer-supreme-court-world/568360/>

Third, and finally, my legal examples suggest the importance of looking to approaches and solutions that themselves **embody a rule of law**. To achieve and maintain a rule of law is more difficult than many people believe. The effort is ancient, stretching back to King John and the Magna Carta, and still earlier. And the effort does not always succeed. I often describe to judges from other countries how, in the 1830s, a president of the United States, Andrew Jackson, when faced with a Supreme Court decision holding that northern Georgia (where gold had been found) belonged to the Cherokee Nation, is said to have remarked, “John Marshall [the chief justice] has made his decision, now let him enforce it.” Jackson sent troops to Georgia, but not to enforce the law. Instead they evicted the tribe members, sending them along the Trail of Tears to Oklahoma, where their descendants live to this day. Not for more than a century, a period that included the Civil War and decades of racial segregation, would the Supreme Court hold, in Brown v. Board of Education, in 1954, that racial segregation violated the Constitution. Yet the country did not abolish segregation the next year or the year after that. When, in 1957, a judge in Little Rock, Arkansas, ordered Central High School desegregated, the local White Citizens’ Council, supported by the governor, rallied in front of the school, letting no black child enter. It took more than judicial decisions to end segregation. It took a president’s decision to send 1,000 paratroopers to Arkansas. It took Martin Luther King Jr., and the Freedom Riders, and the words and deeds of countless Americans who were not lawyers or judges. Today the public has come to accept the rule of law. When the Court decided Bush v. Gore, a case that was unpopular among many, and was (as I wrote in dissent) wrongly decided, the nation accepted the decision without rioting in the streets. That is a major asset for a nation with a highly diverse population of 320 million citizens. We do not have to convince judges or lawyers that maintaining the rule of law is necessary—they are already convinced. Instead we must convince ordinary citizens, those who are not lawyers or judges, that they sometimes must accept decisions that affect them adversely, and that may well be wrong. If they are willing to do so, the rule of law has a chance. And as soon as one considers the alternatives, the need to work within the rule of law is obvious. The **rule of law** is the opposite of the arbitrary, which, as the dictionary specifies, includes the **unreasonable, the capricious, the authoritarian, the despotic, and the tyrannical.** Turn on the television and look at what happens in nations that use other means to resolve their citizens’ differences. For my generation, the need for law in its many forms was perhaps best described by Albert Camus in The Plague. He writes of a disease that strikes Oran, Algeria, which is his parable for the Nazis who occupied France and for the evil that inhabits some part of every man and woman. He writes of the behavior of those who lived there, some good, some bad. He writes of the doctors who help others without relying upon a moral theory—who simply act. At the end of the book, Camus writes that the germ of the plague never dies nor does it ever disappear. It waits patiently in our bedrooms, our cellars, our suitcases, our handkerchiefs, our file cabinets. And one day, perhaps, to the misfortune or for the education of men, the plague germ will reemerge, reawaken the rats, and send them forth to die in a once-happy city. The struggle against that germ continues. And the rule of law is one **weapon that civilization has used to fight it.** **The rule of law is the** **keystone of the effort to build a civilized, humane, and just society.** At a time when facing facts, understanding the local and global challenges that they offer, and working to meet those challenges cooperatively is **particularly urgent**, we must continue to construct such a society—a **society of laws**—together.

#### Judicial activism collapses democracy.

James Muffett 14. Founder & President of Student Statesmanship Institute and President of Citizens for Traditional Values. “The Danger Of Judicial Activism”. Michigan All Rise. 9-8-14. <https://michiganallrise.org/resources/the-danger-of-judicial-activism/>

There is a battle in our nation between those who believe that judges should follow the law as intended by the legislature, and those who think judges have latitude to interpret the law according to their view of what the law ought to be. The latter are referred to as, “activist judges.” When judges insert their own personal bias, they usurp the role of the legislators whom the citizens elect to represent them in deciding disputed, difficult policy issues. Thus, judicial activism **undermines the very basis of our representative democracy.** It can be argued that activist judges have done more damage to traditional, Judeo-Christian values than the other branches of government combined. The areas of greatest damage include free enterprise, human life, marriage, personal freedoms, property rights and religious liberty. Judges who usurp the authority of the people are **not merely incorrect; they are themselves unconstitutiona**l. And they are unjust. In fact, Justice White in his Roe v. Wade dissent opinion, wrote that the court had acted “**not in constitutional interpretation**, but in the unrestrained imposition of its own, **extra-constitutional value preferences**.” In addition to short-circuiting the democratic process, this judicial approach creates an environment of unpredictability which ultimately leads to **destabilization and more litigation.** When judges exercising the power of judicial review are guided by the text, logic, structure, and original understanding of the Constitution and the law, they deserve our respect and gratitude. By operating with this type of judicial oversight, they are playing their part to make constitutional republican government a reality. But where judges usurp democratic legislative authority by imposing on the people their moral and political preferences, under the guise of fairness or empathy, they should be severely criticized and resolutely opposed. It is time for all citizens to wake up to this **crisis** and work to elect “Rule of Law” judges who exercise constitutional authority only to enforce the law as written and ensure that laws apply to everyone equally.

#### Antitrust is key to democratic legitimacy---sets a precedent.

Daniel A. Crane 21. Frederick Paul Furth, Sr. Professor of Law, University of Michigan. "Antitrust Antitextualism " Notre Dame Law Review. 1-28-2021. https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4952&context=ndlr

3. Implications for Interpretation

The phenomenon of antitrust antitextualism is important for understanding the U.S. antitrust system, its history, and the possibilities for its reform, but it also has significance for more general understandings of how statutes are written and how their interpretation functions or should function. Scholars have argued that Congress sometimes means statutory language to be purely expressive, indeed that it means for the courts not to give that language legal effect.262 But the story of antitrust antitextualism goes far beyond judicial excision of stray words or phrases from the antitrust statutes. In important instances, particularly with respect to the FTC and Robinson-Patman Acts, the courts have entirely rewritten the textual meaning and legislative purpose of the statute.263 Through a chronic cycle of legislative enactment, judicial disregard, and implicit legislative acquiescence, Congress and the courts have constituted the common-law system that judges and scholars across the political spectrum now consider normalized and perhaps even inevitable.

This pattern of judicial/legislative engagement (with the executive playing an enabling role) raises both analytical and normative questions for the jurisprudence of statutory interpretation. Analytically and descriptively, is antitrust law sui generis, or do other statutory domains exhibit a similar, but perhaps unrecognized, dynamic? Do the antitrust laws idiosyncratically operate in a space of equipoise between Jeffersonian idealism and Hamiltonian pragmatism, with Congress implicitly assigning itself the role of idealist orator while acquiescing as the courts provide pragmatic counterbalance? Or is this yin and yang phenomenon, disguised in the interpretive rhetoric of broad delegations and common-law method, a more general one, in maybe unappreciated ways? Once a pattern is observed in one legal domain, it tends to be observed soon in others as well. Finding a recurrence of the antitrust pattern elsewhere could provide new insights on statutory interpretation, separation of powers, and the de facto institutional roles of the legislative and judicial branches.

Normatively, there is much to question about the democratic legitimacy of the implicit system of legislative declaration and judicial reformation described in this Article. There seems little in it that either a committed textualist or a committed purposivist could defend, since the system entails the courts honoring neither what Congress wrote nor what it meant. To rehabilitate the system’s democratic legitimacy, a subtle purposivist might say that what Congress actually meant—in a deep sense—must be gathered from the norms of the system itself rather than from conventional evidence such as floor statements by members of Congress, committee reports, or other contemporaneous sources of public meaning. Perhaps members of Congress legislate against a backdrop of expectation that the courts will continue to read down new statutes to accommodate pragmatic efficiency interests, and consenting to this implicit system, the members feel liberated to express more in the statute than they actually mean as prescriptive. But if that is wholesome democratic practice, that case is yet to be made.

#### Democratic backsliding in the US spills over.

Larry Diamond 21. Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies at Stanford University. "A World Without American Democracy?". Foreign Affairs. 7-2-2021. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/americas/2021-07-02/world-without-american-democracy?utm\_medium=referral&utm\_source=www-foreignaffairs-com.cdn.ampproject.org&utm\_campaign=amp\_kickers

Aprolonged global democratic recession has, in recent years, morphed into something even more troubling: the **“third reverse wave” of democratic breakdowns** that the political scientist Samuel Huntington warned could follow the remarkable burst of “third wave” democratic progress in the 1980s and the 1990s. Every year for the past 15 years, according to Freedom House, significantly more countries have seen declines in political rights and civil liberties than have seen gains. But since 2015, that already ominous trend has turned sharply worse: 2015–19 was the first five-year period since the beginning of the third wave in 1974 when more countries **abandoned democracy**—twelve—than transitioned to it—seven. And **the trend continues.** Illiberal populist leaders are **degrading democracy** in countries including Brazil, India, Mexico, and Poland, and **creeping authoritarianism** has already moved Hungary, the Philippines, Turkey, and Venezuela out of the category of democracies altogether. In Georgia, the dominance of the Georgian Dream Party has led to the steady decline of electoral processes and a breakdown in the rule of law. In Myanmar, the military overthrew the elected government of Aung San Suu Kyi, ending an experiment in partial democracy. In El Salvador, president Nayib Bukele staged an executive coup by removing the attorney general and Supreme Court justices who were obstacles to his consolidation of power. In Peru, democracy hangs from a thread as the right-wing autocrat Keiko Fujimori advances vague claims of election fraud in a bid to overturn her narrow electoral defeat to left-wing opponent Pedro Castillo. What is especially striking about this last case is that Fujimori’s gambit bears a grim resemblance to the lie perpetuated by former U.S. President Donald Trump and his followers about the 2020 presidential election. This is no coincidence. As the journalist and historian Anne Applebaum has observed, fictitious claims of fraud and “stop the steal” tactics are becoming a common means by which autocratic populists try to obstruct democracy. Such tactics have long been a source of instability in countries struggling to develop democracy. But the fact that the most recent iteration of the antidemocrat’s playbook draws heavily on precedents in the **world’s most important and powerful democracy** marks the start of a **dangerous new era.** Today, the United States confronts a **growing antidemocratic movement**, not just from the ranks of fringe extremists but also from a substantial group of officeholders—a movement that is challenging the very foundations of electoral democracy. Should this effort succeed, the United States could become the first ever advanced industrial democracy to fail—that is, to no longer meet the minimum conditions for free and fair elections as political scientists and other scholars of democracy define them. The **failure of American democracy would be catastrophic** not only for the United States; it would also have **profound global consequences** at a time when freedom and democracy are already **under siege**. As Huntington noted, the diffusion of democratic movements and ideas from one country to another has helped drive positive democratic change. Antidemocratic norms and practices can **spread in a similar fashion**—especially when they emanate from powerful countries. That is why the acceleration of a democratic recession into a democratic depression happened largely on Trump’s watch. And it is why no development would **more gravely damage the global democratic cause** than the democratic backsliding of its **most important champion.**

#### Democracy solves great power war.

Larry Diamond 19. PhD in Sociology, professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University. “Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition and American Complacency,” Kindle Edition

In such a near future, my fellow experts would no longer talk of “democratic erosion.” We would be spiraling downward into a time of democratic despair, recalling Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s grim observation from the 1970s that liberal democracy “is where the world was, not where it is going.” 5 The world pulled out of that downward spiral—but it took new, more purposeful American leadership. The planet was not so lucky in the 1930s, when the global implosion of democracy led to a catastrophic world war, between a rising axis of emboldened dictatorships and a shaken and economically depressed collection of selfdoubting democracies. These are the stakes. Expanding democracy—with its liberal norms and constitutional commitments—is a crucial foundation for world peace and security. Knock that away, and our most basic hopes and assumptions will be imperiled. The problem is not just that the ground is slipping. It is that we are perched on a global precipice. That ledge has been gradually giving way for a decade. If the erosion continues, we may well reach a tipping point where democracy goes bankrupt suddenly—plunging the world into depths of oppression and aggression that we have not seen since the end of World War II. As a political scientist, I know that our theories and tools are not nearly good enough to tell us just how close we are getting to that point—until it happens.

#### It’s an impact filter---democracies are comparatively more stable than autocracies.

Kroenig 20 Matt. 4/3. Professor of government and foreign service at Georgetown University – you know who he is. “Why the U.S. Will Outcompete China” <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/04/why-china-ill-equipped-great-power-rivalry/609364/>) 1/20/2021

National-security analysts see China as one of the greatest threats facing the United States and its allies. According to an emerging conventional wisdom, China has the leg up on the U.S. in part because its authoritarian government can strategically plan for the long term, unencumbered by competing branches of government, regular elections, and public opinion. Yet this faith in autocratic ascendance and democratic decline is contrary to historical fact. China may be able to put forth big, bold plans—the kinds of projects that analysts think of as long term—but the visionary projects of autocrats don’t usually pan out. Watch White Noise, the inside story of the alt-right The Atlantic’s first feature documentary ventures into the underbelly of the far-right movement to explore the seductive power of extremism. Stream Now Yes, democratic governments are obligated to answer to their citizens on regular intervals and are sensitive to public opinion—that’s actually democracies’ greatest source of strength. Democratic leaders have a harder time advancing big, bold agendas, but the upside of that difficulty is that the plans that do make it through the system have been carefully considered and enjoy domestic support. Historically speaking, once a democracy comes up with a successful strategy, it sticks with the plan, even through a succession of leadership. Washington has arguably followed the same basic, three-step geopolitical plan since 1945. First, the United States built the current, rules-based international system by providing security in important geopolitical regions, constructing international institutions, and promoting free markets and democratic politics within its sphere of influence. Second, it welcomed into the club any country that played by the rules, even former adversaries, like Germany and Japan. And, third, the U.S. worked with its allies to defend the system from those countries or groups that would challenge it, including competitors such as Russia and China, rogue states such as Iran and North Korea, and terrorist networks. America can pursue long-term strategy in part because it enjoys domestic political stability. While new politicians seek to improve on their predecessor’s policies, the United States is unlikely to see the drastic shifts in strategy that come from the fall of one political system and the rise of another. Democratic elections may be messy, but they’re not as messy as coups or civil wars. Daniel Blumenthal: The Unpredictable Rise of China Open societies have many other advantages as well. They facilitate innovation, trust in financial markets, and economic growth. Because democracies tend to be more reliable partners, they are typically skillful alliance builders, and they can accumulate resources without frightening their neighbors. They tend to make thoughtful, informed decisions on matters of war and peace, and to focus their security forces on external enemies, not their own populations. Autocratic systems simply cannot match this impressive array of economic, diplomatic, and military attributes. David Leonhardt recently wrote in The New York Times, “Chinese leaders stretching back to Deng Xiaoping have often thought in terms of decades.” Commonly cited examples of that long-term thinking include the Belt and Road Initiative, a program that invests in infrastructure overseas; Made in China 2025, an effort to subsidize China’s giant tech companies to become world leaders in 21st-century technologies, such as artificial intelligence; and Beijing’s promise to be a global superpower by 2049. Since putting in place sound economic reforms in the 1970s, China has seen its economy expand at eye-popping rates, to become the world’s second largest. Many economists predict that China could even surpass the United States within the decade, and some have suggested that China’s model of state-led capitalism will prove more successful, in terms of economic growth, than the U.S. template of free markets and open politics. I doubt these predictions. Because autocratic leaders are unconstrained and do not have to contend with a legislature or courts, they have an easier time taking their countries in new and radically different directions. Then, when the dictator changes his mind, he can do it again. Mao’s autocratic China ricocheted from one failed policy to another: the Great Leap Forward, then the Hundred Flowers Campaign, then the Cultural Revolution. Mao aligned with the Soviet Union in 1950 only to nearly fight a nuclear war with Moscow in the next decade. Beginning in the time of Deng Xiaoping, China pursued a fairly constant strategy of liberalizing its economy at home and “hiding its capabilities and biding its time” abroad. But President Xi Jinping abandoned these dictums when he took over. As the most powerful leader since Mao—he has changed China’s constitution to set himself up as dictator for life—he could once again jerk China in several new directions, according to his whims, and back again. According to the Asia Society, he has stalled or reversed course on eight of 10 categories of economic reform promised by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) itself. Moreover, Xi is baring China’s teeth militarily, taking contested territory from neighbors in the South China Sea and conducting military exercises with Russia in Europe. The problem for Beijing is that stalled reforms will stymie its economic potential and its confrontational policies are provoking an international coalition to contain them. The 2017 U.S. National Security Strategy declared great-power competition with China the foremost security threat to the U.S.; the European Union labeled China a “systemic rival”; and Japan, Australia, India, and the United States have formed a new “quad” of powers to balance China in the Pacific. Furthermore, the plans often cited as evidence of China’s farsighted vision, the Belt and Road Initiative and Made in China 2025, were announced by Xi only in 2013 and 2015, respectively. Both are way too recent to be celebrated as brilliant examples of successful, long-term strategic planning. A certain level of domestic political stability is a prerequisite for charting a steady strategic course in foreign and domestic affairs. But autocratic regimes are notoriously brittle. While institutionalized political successions in democracies typically lead to changes of policy, political successions in autocracies are likely to result in regime collapse and war. China’s “5,000 years of history” were pockmarked by rebellion, revolution, and new dynasties. Fearing internal threats to domestic political stability—consider the protests this year in Hong Kong and Xinjiang—the CCP spends more on domestic security than on its national defense. If you follow the money, the CCP is demonstrating that the government is more afraid of its own people than of the Pentagon. This domestic fragility will frustrate China’s efforts to design and execute farsighted plans. If threats to Chinese domestic stability were to materialize and the CCP were to collapse tomorrow, for example, Chinese grand strategy could undergo another seismic shift, including possibly opting out of competition with the United States altogether. Shadi Hamid: China Is Avoiding Blame by Trolling the World Autocracies have other vulnerabilities as well. State-led planning has never produced high rates of economic growth over the long term. Autocrats are poor alliance builders who fight with their supposed allies more than with their enemies. And the highest priority of autocratic security forces is repressing their own people, not defending the country. The world has undergone drastic changes in just the past few years, but these enduring patterns of international affairs have not. Some fear that Trump’s nationalist tendencies will erode the U.S. position, but the momentum of America’s successful grand strategy has kept the country on a fairly steady course. Despite Trump’s criticism of NATO, for example, two new countries have joined the alliance on his watch, including North Macedonia this week. The coronavirus has upended a sense of security in the U.S., leading many people into the familiar trap of lauding autocratic China’s firm response in contrast to the halting and patchwork measures in the United States. But there is good reason to believe that this assessment will be updated in America’s favor with the benefit of hindsight. Already we are seeing evidence that conditions are much worse in China than CCP officials are letting on and that China’s attempts at international “disaster diplomacy” are backfiring. It has been revealed that the CCP has continually misrepresented the numbers of COVID-19 infections and deaths in China, and European nations have rejected and returned faulty Chinese coronavirus testing kits.

#### The plan is key to reverse erroneous court judgement that distorted the purpose of antitrust law.

Daniel Hanley 21. A policy analyst at the Open Markets Institute. "Slate - How Antitrust Lost Its Bite" Open Markets Institute. 4-21-2021. https://www.openmarketsinstitute.org/publications/slate-how-antitrust-lost-its-bite

Antitrust is about determining and allocating the rights, privileges, and duties of all economic actors. When Congress originally enacted the Sherman Act, the law was intended to protect consumers, workers, and democracy from excessive concentrations of corporate power. Because of this reality, it is an inherently political area of law. The shift toward rooting it in economics, and making its application substantially more obscure than a bright-line rule, is effectively a means by the judiciary to strip the historical foundations of antitrust from the record and instead substitute its own judgment on what the priorities are for the economy and how it should be structured.

When combined with the rule of reason, the judiciary’s consumer welfare framework effectively erases Congress’ intent for the antitrust laws to operate as a “comprehensive charter of economic liberty” that “does not confine its protection to consumers, or to purchasers, or to competitors, or to sellers.” Such values are best determined by members of the elected legislature rather than unelected judges, a point ironically acknowledged by the Supreme Court in 1972.

Lower federal courts today continue to push the consumer welfare standard even further by, in violation of controlling Supreme Court precedent, weighing the competitive harms of a dominant firm’s conduct against one group to the benefits provided to another group. In ongoing litigation against the NCAA that was heard by the Supreme Court last week, the district court judge ruled that the NCAA’s compact with universities to set a ceiling on the amount of compensation that student-athletes can receive is legal because of the reputed benefit consumers derive from watching athletes knowing there is a cap on their compensation. The court employed the rule of reason to arrive at this result. In an alternative enforcement regime, the NCAA would be a per se illegal employer cartel that is suppressing workers’ wages.

Comprehensive empirical analysis has revealed that the rule of reason has been a rubber stamp for even the most egregious antitrust conduct. A 2009 analysis revealed that 97 percent of cases analyzed under the rule of reason result in victories for defendants. That means corporations are effectively shielded from most antitrust violations.

Part of the reason for such a skewed result in favor of antitrust defendants is that dominant firms have access to high-salaried economists that are able to manipulate analyses to mask the corporation’s conduct to look like it is operationally efficient instead of engaging in predatory practices. Such a situation also deters antitrust litigation because a plaintiff will also have to incur the cost of an economist—which can cost several thousand dollars and, in some cases, several hundred thousand dollars. Thus, the battle over the legality of a business tactic under a consumer welfare framework and rule of reason legal analysis depends on access to immense financial capital and judicial appeasement of policies that favor corporate integration rather than common notions of fairness, equity, and deconcentrated markets—which was the original purpose of the antitrust laws.

Despite controlling Supreme Court precedent prohibiting the use of economics in certain antitrust violations, courts now routinely use it to justify corporate consolidation. For example, in the context of merger analysis, the economization of antitrust has led courts to believe and depend on theoretical assumptions on how mergers are beneficial for society and consumers. In the case of AT&T and its pursuit of acquiring Time Warner in 2018, the corporation stated its merger would produce efficiencies and save customers money. District Court Judge Richard Leon was persuaded by AT&T’s statements holding that vertical integration is able to shrink its costs and will “lead to lower prices for consumers.” But such assumptions have been categorically repudiated by researchers. In one example, the economist John Kwoka found that 80 percent of studied mergers led to high prices and even reduced output. Other studies have found equivalent results. In the context of AT&T, subsequent evidence showed that AT&T did raise prices on consumers.

As Congress considers enacting new legislation, it must start by reclaiming control over antitrust by enacting laws with clear rules that could deter exclusionary conduct and greatly simplify the litigation process for plaintiffs. Moreover, instead of just restoring many of the historical bright-line rules that the judiciary has eroded over the last 60 years, new laws should go further to ensure that markets remain deconcentrated and to promote economic fairness. For example, Congress could enact strict prohibitions on firms entering certain lines of business, such as AT&T being prohibited from entering the computer industry in 1956, or ban the use of specific competitive practices outright, such as noncompetes that restrict the mobility of workers. Rules like these ensure the markets are structured by publicly accountable institutions to incentivize socially beneficial corporate conduct, such as investments in research and development and product quality.

Importantly, rules-based laws would also ensure the judiciary is adhering to Congress’ directive to keep markets deconcentrated and acknowledge that the judiciary is not a reliable safeguard for smaller independent firms and workers who often do not have access to significant amounts of capital to litigate an antitrust lawsuit. In fact, in commonly applied rules for how judges interpret Congress’ laws, the judiciary views ambiguity as an opportunity to fill any legal gaps with its interpretation and ideology.

History has consistently shown that only bright-line rules will lead to an effective and vigorous enforcement environment, as they do in other areas of law, and prevent the judiciary from favoring dominant economic enterprises and distorting the antitrust laws to preference increased concentration. The Supreme Court’s original development of the rule of reason and its subsequent gutting of the enforcement of the Clayton Act in the 1930s is particularly illustrative of why bright-line rules are necessary.

### Plan---1AC

#### The United States Federal Government should prohibit private sector business practices that violate an antitrust worker welfare standard.

### Solvency---1AC

#### Contention 4 is Solvency.

#### Replacing consumer welfare with worker considerations lets labor win---alternatives legalize exploitation and ban collective bargaining.

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

Introduction

This paper offers a critical investigation of the law and economics of competition law enforcement in conflicts between workers and employers in the European Union (hereinafter EU) and the US. In such cases competition law comes into direct conflict with the principle of worker solidarity: according to the principle of market competition individuals are expected to take independent economic decisions and actions, whereas workers need to take collective economic actions and decisions to protect their interests. This conflict is particularly obvious in the context of the so-called gig economy,1 in which employers keep casualised workers at legal arms’ length to reduce labour and regulatory costs.2 If gig workers take collective action against their working conditions, they might face attack from competition law, because legally they might be considered independent service providers, rather than workers.3

The legal conundrum facing gig workers has become an increasingly popular subject in the law and economics literature.4 Nevertheless, the more fundamental question of how the enforcement of competition rules affects the overall position of workers beyond the limited case of the gig economy remains largely unexplored. This paper aims to investigate this broader and more fundamental question. In order to provide a sufficiently global answer, the paper focuses on the legal positions of the EU and US, as the leading competition law jurisdictions and primary competition policy exporters.5 The EU–US comparison shows that despite the slightly different legal tests applied in these polities, competition rules constitute nearly equally disciplining mechanisms against collective worker action on either side of the Atlantic.

This paper also makes an original contribution to the emerging debate on whether and how competition law can contribute to wealth equality between citizens in the post-2008 crisis economy. The existing debate on the competition law–equality relationship takes the ‘consumer welfare’ standard as its main reference point: it focuses exclusively on the distribution of wealth between consumers and producers; as a result, it overlooks the production process that takes place before consumers meet products and services, and the position of workers within it.6 This is a natural result of competition law's reliance on a limited area of neoclassical economics called ‘equilibrium economics’ that understands efficiency exclusively as a market mechanism in which the price manifests itself where supply meets demand.7 Departing from the mainstream competition law and economics methodology, this paper builds its investigation on a holistic theoretical foundation, looking beyond equilibrium economics at labour exploitation theory as established in neoclassical as well as Marxian models. This analysis shows that despite standing at opposing ends of the political spectrum and whilst having some fundamental differences, Marxist and neoclassical models agree that collective worker action is economically beneficial and socially necessary. As a result, a critical analysis of the current legal situation on both sides of the Atlantic in light of this holistic framework illustrates how competition law's hostility towards collective worker action is not only unjust but also economically unsound.

This paper demonstrates that the key problem in competition law's treatment of labour stems from the application of the consumer welfare standard in cases involving the competition–solidarity conflict without paying any attention to the idiosyncratic qualities of labour that render it naturally open to exploitation. Similarly, the consumer welfare standard overlooks the fact that consumers and workers are essentially the same group of people and one's welfare cannot be increased or decreased without affecting the other's.8 Even if worker exploitation could result in reduced labour costs and decreased prices, this cannot be deemed efficient as it reduces the workers’ welfare and results in broader negative socio-economic effects. Similarly, collective worker action resulting in higher labour costs and potentially higher prices cannot automatically be deemed inefficient, because although this might increase the prices consumers pay, they benefit from higher wages and better working conditions in their position as workers. As a result of this critical analysis, the paper proposes an original and more inclusive ‘citizen welfare’ standard that takes into account the economic effects of anti-competitive behaviour on workers as well as consumers. The citizen welfare standard could also potentially be applied in other contexts to solve long-standing conflicts between competition and other policy objectives, such as industrial, environmental and social policy objectives,9 although this paper primarily focuses on the application of citizen welfare to the competition–solidarity conflict.

The structure of the paper is as follows: the next section provides an opening discussion of competition law, consumer welfare and equality. This is followed by a discussion of the economic theory of labour exploitation. Then, the paper investigates how competition law approaches the competition–solidarity conflict in the EU and the US. The fourth section critically discusses the EU and US legal positions in light of economic theory. This section also develops the citizen welfare approach as an alternative to consumer welfare for the resolution of the competition–solidarity conflict. This is finally followed with conclusions. Regarding terminology, this paper uses the term ‘worker’ (rather than employee) as a non-legal, generic term encompassing all individuals who make a living by providing labour power as a production factor in the production process of goods and services. Similarly, the term ‘labour’ is used to refer to the contribution of the workers to the production process as an abstract human factor. However, if the courts or authorities in question use a different term (such as employee) in a specific case, the paper uses the same term in the discussion of that specific case.

#### Antitrust law must prioritize worker welfare---workers suffer a greater loss than consumers.

Clayton J. Masterman 16. 2019 graduate of the Vanderbilt University Ph.D. Program in Law & Economics. “The Customer Is Not Always Right: Balancing Worker and Customer Welfare in Antitrust Law” Vol. Vanderbilt Law Review. 69:5:1387. 2016. <https://law.vanderbilt.edu/phd/students/The-Customer-Is-Not-Always-Right-Balancing-Worker-and-Customer-Welfare-in-Antitrust-Law.pdf>

As this Note has already stated, the purpose of antitrust law is to protect competition, but the **meaning of competition is nebulous**.136 Regardless of whether total welfare or the consumer welfare standard is the appropriate measure of net competitive effect,137 a body of law that protects competition should **not allow firms to engage in conduct that restricts trade severely** in one part of the supply chain merely because it prioritizes end customer benefits.138 As a class of consumers, **workers also deserve protection from anticompetitive employer agreements.** Congressional intent **supports prioritizing the interests of workers** over customers when analyzing anticompetitive restraints in labor markets. Unions are inherently anticompetitive; a union is a combination of workers jointly setting wages and other work conditions, just as a cartel is a combination of firms setting prices together.139 As a result, the existence of unions increases the wages that firms pay their workers, which in turn results in price increases for customers.140 Nonetheless, labor law staunchly defends the ability of workers to create unions. When antitrust restrictions would deter union conduct, Congress has decided that **labor law carries more weight.**141 Thus, the labor exceptions to antitrust law142 demonstrate a congressional decision that the welfare gains to workers from increased wages and other improved terms of employment outweigh the costs to customers in the output market from the resulting increased prices. Given that Congress protects workers in one class of anticompetitive conduct, it is reasonable to **structure antitrust law to protect workers from conduct with parallel effects**. Restraints of trade in labor markets are the converse of unions, trading lower wages for lower prices. However, it is possible that Congressional intent extends only to weighing the interests of workers over customers in the special case of union activity. Even though unions engage in political activies, the aims of unions are primarily economic.143 Thus, Congress supports the economic mission of unions (advancing the welfare of workers despite the potential economic effects on firms and customers) by favoring them in antitrust law. Unions are only special in antitrust because Congress has expressed a legislative preference for workers over other economic actors. It is thus **appropriate for courts to weigh workers over other actors** when firms engage in conduct that affects workers at the expense of other groups. Further, the welfare economics of restricting competition in employment markets supports worker protection. Economists generally agree that individuals exhibit diminishing marginal utilities of wealth—that is, each additional dollar an individual receives makes them a little less well off than the previous dollar did.144 **Diminishing marginal utility of wealth** thus implies that when two individuals lose equivalent amounts of money, the individual for whom the loss was a greater portion of his or her wealth **suffers a greater loss**.145 Generally, the wages that workers lose as a result of anticompetitive conduct will be larger than the price cuts for customers.146 Where the monopsonist also has market power in the output market, the price decrease passed on to customers will be even smaller than in a competitive output market.147 Because wages likely represent a larger portion of workers’ wealth than the additional wealth consumers gain from lower prices, workers lose more welfare than customers gain. Moreover, behavioral economics suggest that the losses to workers from wage reductions will **hurt workers more** than the gains that customers will receive from lower prices.148 Behavioral economists have recognized that individual utility is relative to a reference point like the status quo; losses relative to that reference point **cause a welfare loss about twice the size of the welfare gain** from an equivalent gain.149 Put simply, losses hurt more than equivalent gains feel good. Because monopsonistic conduct results in losses for workers and gains for customers relative to the competitive equilibrium, the **total net effect on welfare that consumers experience is even more likely to be negative.** To be sure, behavioral economics has not been universally welcomed in antitrust law.150 But courts have entertained behavioral economics arguments in antitrust before, generally in cases where neoclassical economic analysis would sharply diverge from what the court believes a “real” customer would do.151 Here, it is unlikely that customers weigh price decreases in the same way that workers weigh wage increases because wages are the primary source of most workers’ incomes; as a result, equivalent economic losses to workers likely outweigh the gain.152

#### Worker welfare can easily be assessed.

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

Just as consumer welfare can be measured through economic factors like price, output, quality, and innovation, **courts and economic experts can assess worker welfare through a set of analogous factors:** wages and benefits, hours, working conditions,65 and training. One major tension between these two standards is that workers benefit from higher wages while consumers benefit from lower prices, but these factors capture **similar characteristics of equilibria in both markets**.66 Wages and hours are the labor-market analogs of price and quantity, and benefits can be considered along with wages as a type of compensation. **Working conditions reflect heterogeneity within a single type of employment**, just as quality reflects heterogeneity within a single type of product. And training reflects how labor markets can be dynamic, just as innovation reflects how product markets can be dynamic: that is, labor productivity can improve over time, just as firm productivity can improve over time. As in product-market analysis, courts and economic experts can assess how a contested activity (e.g., a merger) **affects these factors and estimate the net effect on worker welfare.** A worker welfare standard would be similar to a consumer welfare standard in that much of its application would fall on economic experts, whose work would be assessed and weighed by courts. Of course, some cases will be clearer and may be amenable to per se analysis, like an agreement between firms to fix wages. But, as in product markets, other cases will be subtle, and economics will have a role to play. **Just as economic models are used to forecast** the effects of certain market events on price and quantity, and aggregate those effects to estimate net effects on consumer welfare,67 economics will also be instrumental in forecasting the effects of market events on wages and hours, and aggregating those effects to estimate net effects on worker welfare. Antitrust analysis is highly technical in the status quo,68 and **a worker welfare standard would not be any different in its reliance on economics**. The main difference is that a worker welfare standard **focuses attention on the interests of workers, who are often neglected** despite their vulnerability to rent-extractive firm behavior, and recognizes that advancing the interests of workers may **require more than advancing the interests of consumers.**

#### The plan’s codification is key to certainty.

Eric A. Posner 8/13/21. Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor at University of Chicago. How Antitrust Failed Workers. Oxford University Press, 2021.

Anticompetitive behavior. Plaintiffs would be able to base their case on any of the following anticompetitive acts: mergers in highly concentrated markets; use of noncompete and related clauses; restrictions on employees’ freedom to disclose wage and benefit information; unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act;38 misclassification of employees as independent contractors; no-poaching, wage-fixing, and related agreements that are also presumptively illegal under Section 1; and prohibitions on class actions. Of course, current law gives employees the theoretical right to allege these types of anticompetitive behavior, but the cases show a pattern of judicial skepticism, as noted earlier. Codification would help employees by compelling courts to take these claims seriously. Employers would be allowed to rebut a prima facie case of anticompetitive behavior by showing that the act in question would likely lead to an increase in wages. This reform would strengthen and extend Section 2 actions against labor monopsonists by standardizing a list of anticompetitive acts. While not all of these acts are invariably anticompetitive, the employer would be able to defend itself by citing a business justification. For example, a noncompete could be justified because it protects an employer’s investment in training. If so, an employer could avoid antitrust liability by showing that its use of noncompetes benefits workers, who obtain higher wages as a result of their training.39 These reforms would strengthen Section 2 claims against labor monopsonies but would also preserve the doctrinal structure of Section 2. They would not generate significant legal uncertainty or require a revision in the way that we think about antitrust law.

## 2ac

### CP --- NRLB

#### 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.

#### Funding doesn’t solve.

Frederic Jenny 19. ESSEC Business School and OECD Competition Committee. “POPULISM, FAIRNESS AND COMPETITION: SHOULD WE CARE AND WHAT COULD WE DO?” The Japanese Economic Review. Vol. 70, No. 3, September 2019. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jere.12232

Competition economists and competition authorities are aware of the plight of workers displaced through competition and the fact that **reallocation of resources does not work.** However, they consistently hold that competition brings net overall benefits to consumers and that, therefore, through redistribution the losers of the competition game can be compensated by the winners, while adding that redistribution is not and should not be the goal of competition law itself but should be the goal of dedicated agencies. However, **to the extent that it is effective**, redistribution is **only a temporary solution and does not solve the long-term problem** faced by displaced workers. Furthermore, as noted by Baker and Salop (2015), “existing (redistributive) programs do not appear to have offset the growing inequality in our economy”.

#### 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](about:blank)

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.

### CP --- con con

#### 2---Perm do the plan when the CP’s amendment is ratified---delay avoids the link to politics.

Chism 5 [Chism, National Archives education specialist, 2005, The constitutional amendment process.(teaching content). Kahlil Social Education 69.7 (Nov-Dec 2005): p373(9)]

Even though the steps can be described briefly, actual ratification can take much longer. Some amendments, such as the 27th (Congressional pay increases), took many years to complete the ratification process. It was proposed by James Madison in 1789, but not ratified until 203 years later. This amendment required that any change in the salary of members of Congress only take effect after the next general election (so lawmakers were not voting to increase their own salaries). Congress ratified other amendments in short order, such as the 18th (Prohibition), which took little more than a year. The length of time depends upon the gravity of the issue the amendment is intended to address, the intensity of public sentiment concerning the issue, and whether or not a time limit for ratification was written into the amendment during the proposal stage.

#### 7---Counterplan causes a runaway convention---collapses democracy

Riestenberg 18 Jay Riestenberg, Deputy Communications Director @ Common Cause U.S. Constitution Threatened as Article V Convention Movement Nears Success https://www.commoncause.org/resource/u-s-constitution-threatened-as-article-v-convention-movement-nears-success/

A well-funded, highly coordinated national effort is underway to call a constitutional convention, under Article V of the U.S. Constitution, for the first time in history. The result of such a convention could be a complete overhaul of the Constitution and supporters of the convention are dangerously close to succeeding. With special interest groups gaining more momentum, conservative advocates are just six states short of reaching the constitutionally-required 34-state goal. They are targeting Republican-controlled legislatures in 2018 and are within striking distance. The unknowns surrounding a constitutional convention pose an unacceptable risk, particularly in the current polarized political climate. Given how close calling a new convention is, it’s time to spotlight that risk and sound an alarm for the preservation of our Constitution. Too few Americans are even aware that a constitutional convention can be called, let alone that there would be no checks on its scope and further that the process to call one is well underway and being underwritten by some of the nation’s richest individuals. Calls for a convention are coming from right and left, with more money, a stronger campaign structure, and national coordination on the right. A number of major conservative organizations and donors, including Mercer family and Koch-funded groups such as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), have renewed and intensified efforts to thrust this issue into the spotlight after years of inactivity. This memo that outlines the different campaigns calling for an Article V convention and why it is just a dangerous idea. These calls for a constitutional convention represent the most serious threat to our democracy flying almost completely under the radar.

#### 8---The process will make the outcome illegitimate.

Almond 74- Practicing Lawyer in North Carolina[MCHAEL A. ALMOND (JD from University of North Carolina), “Amendment by Convention: Our Next Constitutional Crisis?,” NORTH CAROLINA LAW REVIEW, 53 N.C. L. Rev. 491, 1974]

In retrospect, perhaps the most striking feature of the above discussion is the sharp disagreement among legal scholars regarding the distribution and scope of the amendment power, particularly with respect to the convention procedure. Indeed, **on the subject of con**stitutional **con**ventions, **the Constitution is either textually ambiguous or provocatively mum**. In truth, then, no one really knows how to amend the Constitution by convention, and among - those who claim to know, there are general differences of opinion on even - the most fundamental propositions. Accordingly, the debate and discussion concerning article V has resolved nothing, but has instead merely isolated the major points of controversy. In a word, the alternative amendment procedure is "imperfect"; and as such it is repugnant to the first of the three essential prerequisites for amendment discussed earlier. 202 Our present "imperfect" understanding of the convention procedure could **forever cloud the legitimacy of any amendment proposed and ratified under this process**. The underlying political environment, if cankered by **extreme partisanship** on some issue of basic concern, could ***poison the*** ***amendment process***; ***and*** should any sizable portion of the people become convinced that a constitutional amendment was wrongfully adopted or rejected, ***respect for the authority of the Constitution*** generally ***would be undermined***. Pg. 526-527

#### Con con fails---special interests and issue linkage---and, it links to politics.

Kelleigh Nelson 14. Citing Stanford Law Professor Gerald Gunther. Nelson is an investigative researcher since 1975, secretary for Rocky Top Freedom Campaign, a strong freedom advocate group, 2-28-2014, "Convention of States: Violent Partisans Will Destroy the Constitution," Freedom Outpost, http://freedomoutpost.com/2014/02/convention-states-violent-partisans-will-destroy-constitution/

Previous Battles In the late 1970s and early 1980s, we fought a call for a con-con via a Balanced Budget Amendment (the same thing they're using today), and we educated the people enough that 10 of the states who put out a call for a con-con, recalled that call. It was very close. The enemy succeeded in getting 32 of the necessary 34 states to call for a convention. With God's help and the hard work of many patriots across the country, we succeeded in saving our Constitution. That was more than 30 years ago, and our electorate was far more educated then than it is today. Unfortunately, today our fellow citizens listen to the neo-con talking heads like Michael Levin, Tom Coburn, Michael Farris, Lou Marin, The Goldwater Institute, Mark Meckler - formerly of Tea Party Patriots, American Legislative Exchange Council, Judge Roy Moore (who thinks he'll get an amendment ban on homosexual "marriage" with a con-con), David Barton, Glenn Beck, Occupy Wall Street, talk show host Neal Boortz, former presidential candidate Herman Cain, (both Boortz and Cain are Fair Tax promoters which calls for a con-con to get rid of the 16th amendment although we didn't need a con-con to get rid of the 18th amendment). Not one of these people are old-right conservatives. We must ask, who is funding the new push for a con-con? The Money Behind Article V There is no telling what some of the delegates will bring to the table no matter what "commission" they have instructing them (see Move to Amend below). One thing is certain, the LEFT, the progressives, the socialists, the Internationalists, the hardcore communists in our country, won't sit on the sidelines of such a Convention. They'll be in the convention and lobbying for their communist agenda. There are hundreds and hundreds of Left-leaning organizations that want the Article V Convention so they can get "their man" in as a delegate to urge their amendments and Constitutional changes upon the deliberations of the Convention. These organizations have organized into a coalition called "Move to Amend." Here's the list of their member organizations. It would shock most conservatives to know who pays the bills at the online purveyor of progressive ideology. In fact, George Soros funds nearly every major left-wing media source in the US. Forty-five of those are financed through his support of the Media Consortium. Yes, the financier of global fascism is pumping millions of dollars into the same Article V campaign that is being promoted by Levin, Limbaugh, Hannity, Beck, Farris, Meckler, Barton, and the rest of the neo-con Trotskyite right. One would think this would be enough alone to convince all true Constitutional conservatives and friends of freedom and liberty to run headlong away from the ranks of the Article V con-con army, regardless of how popular their purveyors may be. Link If Soros and the left want it, why would any conservative back this? Are they duped? Or, as suspected, are they part of the agenda as they were in the early 80s when we fought this? Precedents and Legal Conclusions Legal experts have long concluded that if a convention is ever called under Article V of the Constitution, it would have the power to propose anything it wanted — a rewrite of the Bill of Rights, the abolition of the Supreme Court — anything. I've written about this extensively (Link), as has Publius Huldah, John Birch Society, Phyllis Schlafly of Eagle Forum and others. Under that never-used Article V, a convention would be mandatory upon the call of at least two-thirds (34) of the states. Pushed by tea-party groups and the so-called conservative American Legislative Exchange Council, as well as all the above listed right and left organization, similar resolutions are moving or have already passed in Virginia, Wisconsin, Indiana, Alabama and a number of other states We don't see any George Washington's or James Madison's today, and we don't want to put our fate in the hands of men who think they can improve on the work of either of these men or the other delegates at the 1787 Convention. Stanford Law School Professor Gerald Gunther also wrote "The fear that a Constitutional convention could become a 'runaway' convention and propose wholesale changes in our Constitution is by no means unfounded. Rather, this broad view of the authority of a convention reflects the consensus of most constitutional scholars who have commented on the issue." As well, Professor Gunther, whose case-book is used in the majority of U.S. law schools, said that, "even if Congress tried to limit the Convention to one subject, the delegates could decide for themselves that the Convention "is entitled to set its own agenda." Chief Justice Warren Burger, wrote: "I have been asked questions about this topic many times during my news conferences and at college meetings since I became Chairman of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, and I have repeatedly replied that such a convention would be a grand waste of time. I have also repeatedly given my opinion that **there is no** effective **way to limit** or muzzle **the actions of a** Constitutional **Convention**. The Convention could make its own rules and set its own agenda. After a Convention is convened, it will be too late to stop the Convention if we don't like its agenda. With George Washington as chairman, the [original constitutional convention] deliberated in total secrecy, with no press coverage and no leaks. A Constitutional Convention today would be a free-for-all for special interest groups, television coverage, and press speculation." We have far too many uneducated fools in our electorate today...and this, as the elite have planned, will be our downfall if we allow the left and the neo-con right to succeed in pushing a Balanced Budget Amendment, Article V, or Convention of States, etc. The fact is, under the vague language of Article V, a Constitutional Convention cannot be limited. It would be wide open, and able to consider ANY change in the Constitution that was proposed, even eliminating everything after "We The People." This means that, even if supporters of a "Con-Con" claim that the convention would only cover one issue -- whether it's a Balanced Budget Amendment or removing the requirement that to be eligible to serve as President, one must be a "natural born citizen," or anything else -- there is NO WAY to stop the Convention from changing EVERYTHING that we hold dear in America!

### CP --- states

#### 2---States get pre-empted.

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/](about:blank)

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 r

eliance 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.

#### 4---The DOJ and FTC undermine.

The Open Markets Institute and Service Employees International Union 19. “How the Antitrust Agencies Can Help—Instead of Hurt—Workers”. https://www.justice.gov/atr/page/file/1217856/download

The DOJ and the FTC have largely failed American workers today by allowing a concentration crisis in scores of industries to weaken competition for labor. Instead of actively policing mergers for harms to workers, they have let employer-side concentration reach very high levels. Troublingly, when the FTC and DOJ have acted against practices in labor markets, the two agencies often have used antitrust laws to either undermine efforts by employees and states to challenge abusive behavior by employers or actually targeted efforts by workers or professional to work together. The FTC, for instance, has filed numerous complaints against workers for engaging in collective bargaining and other joint action. Furthermore, the FTC has campaigned against state and local occupational licensing rules that can enhance the bargaining power and earnings of workers, professionals, and independent entrepreneurs. The DOJ meanwhile has endorsed legal standards that would empower franchisees to collude against workers. The DOJ’s and FTC’s general inactivity against employers and activity against workers reinforce and deepen inequality between the individual and the corporation. The agencies should reorient their enforcement priorities and focus on protecting workers from employers rather than on interfering with the basic rights of workers, professionals, and independent entrepreneurs to organize.2

#### 8---states lack enforcement mechanisms and administrative infrastructures.

Bourree Lam 17. former staff writer at The Atlantic. She was previously the editor of Freakonomics.com. “Will States Take Up the Mantle of Worker Protection?” The Atlantic. 1/17/2017. [https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2017/01/worker-protection-schneiderman/513182/](about:blank)

But it’s not as though states took a backseat during the Obama administration. Some states took on an increased role in handling wage and labor practices, with a growing number of have passed their own minimum wage and paid-leave laws. Seven states—California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Vermont, and most recently Arizona and Washington—now have laws requiring paid sick leave. Minimum wage went up in 21 states and 22 cities at the start of this year. For labor advocates, the concern about this approach is what happens to people in states that are less adamant about enforcement. While workers in states that have been active on these issues in the past—such as California, Connecticut, Illinois, and Massachusetts to name a few—will likely continue to be protected by their state agencies, states without established resources in place will **have a harder time stepping up in the same way**. In Georgia, for example, there is no state-level enforcement process, and wage claims are **filed directly to the Department of Labor**. “It’s far from ideal, if this ends up happening,” says Tsedeye Gebreselassie, an attorney at the National Employment Law Project. “The way that this should be done is that the federal Department of Labor remains an effective recourse for workers whose rights have been violated, not just on minimum wage but all the federal laws that the Department of Labor enforces. But then you also have states there too as another avenue through which workers can recover their unpaid wages.” Additionally, though states can play a key role on some employment issues, there are workplace issues that **require federal enforcement**. "States can play a tremendously important role in combating wage theft, but in other critical areas, like workplace safety and health or workers' right to organize, states may have a harder time filling in the gap because they are often preempted by federal law from directly enforcing these laws," says Gerstein. “To me, there’s no question that it’s federalism from below,” says Janice Fine, an associate professor and labor expert at Rutgers University’s School of Management and Labor Relations. Fine has been studying how states and localities think about enforcement, and while she’s concerned about states with less enforcement, she’s found that there can be see creative solutions. She cites the example of the Fair Food Standards Council in Florida, a labor group which won over companies on fair work conditions and now acts as a private enforcement agency to protect farmers on health, safety and wage issues, as well as the work of the Workers Defense Project in Texas, which has notably pushed through a bill that makes it easier for police departments across Texas to arrest employers engaging in wage theft. A state-by-state approach means that worker protection becomes less an American project, and more a feature of the particular place one lives. And for workers who don’t live in the states that will fill in where the federal government leaves off, that could mean many American workers not getting paid what they’re owed.

### DA --- CWS

#### Increasing worker welfare strengthens innovation.

Yu Wei et al. 20. School of Finance, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Kunming, China. \*Haoxi Nan School of Economics and Management, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China. \*Guiwu Wei School of Business, Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu, China. "The impact of employee welfare on innovation performance: Evidence from China's manufacturing corporations." Science Direct. October 2020. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925527320301389

As innovation requires the active participation of every employee in the corporation (Dougherty, 1992; Van de Ven, 1986), it is important to increase employee participation in innovation activities. Implementing a series of employee-friendly policies, such as improving employee compensation (Mas, 2006), providing employees with a more comfortable working environment (Faleye and Trahan, 2011), and offering work-family benefits (Meyer et al., 2001), can alleviate employees’ worries, improve their recognition by the corporation, reduce the employee turnover rate and help retain outstanding talents. Therefore, employee welfare may enhance corporate innovation by helping the corporation to retain outstanding talents.

Taylor (1911) points out that if employees are regarded as unskilled labor without special status, then employee welfare is a wasteful expenditure. However, with the development of technology and the corporations, the role of employees has also undergone tremendous changes. Highly competitive business environment and human capital-intensive corporation form force corporations to pay more attention to innovation capability (Edmans, 2011). At the same time, technological progress has also increased the demand for highly motivated and well-educated labors to meet the requirements of new technologies. Therefore, it is becoming more and more important to rely on a series of employee welfare policies, such as improving the working environment and enhancing employee treatment, to retain employees and stimulate their enthusiasm and creativity. As we all know, innovation is characterized by long-term and high risks (Holmstrom, 1989), which requires the long-term and stable participation of talented employees. The corporations can increase employee loyalty and productivity by improving employee benefits, such as generous salary, comfortable and safe working environment, good employee care and protection, and attractive retirement protection (Bloom et al., 2011), so as to retain talents for the corporation and attract excellent employees to join (Chen et al., 2016a). At the same time, employees who have solved their worries can increase their risk tolerance and be more willing to improve efficiency (Tian and Wang, 2011; Chen et al., 2016b). Therefore, employee welfare may enhance corporate innovation by improving the inventor efficiency.

Innovation requires not only the long-term investment of corporates and the active participation of employees, but also a good external ecological environment. The attention and active publicity of news media will also have a significant impact on the innovation investment of corporates. Corporates with good employee welfare often enjoy good social reputation, which can attract more and better talents to join in and promote innovation efficiency. At the same time, they can also get more positive reports from the media (Ben-Nasr and Ghouma, 2018), creating a relaxed and harmonious external environment for corporates, leading to the improvement of corporates innovation level.

#### Gaps in the CW enforcement reduce innovation.

Kevin Caves & Hal Singer 18. \*Director of Econ One. \*Managing Director of Econ One and an Adjunct Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University. "WHEN THE ECONOMETRICIAN SHRUGGED: IDENTIFYING AND PLUGGING GAPS IN THE CONSUMER-WELFARE STANDARD" George Mason Law Review. Fall 2018. https://heinonline-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/gmlr26&div=16&id=&page=&collection=journals

Michael Luca and Timothy Wu show how a vertically integrated platform can decrease an edge rival's usage, a potential proxy for harm to edge innovation. 29 In a paper funded by Yelp and coauthored with Yelp's data scientists, the authors demonstrated that Google deviated from its organic search results to favor its own local web properties in a search for caf6s in Louisville." The European Union has advanced a similar theory, accusing Google in 2015 of diverting traffic from competitive rivals toward its own comparison-shopping site.' When Google was induced to revert back to its organic search results, the rankings of competing independent properties were elevated in Google's search, and users were 40% more likely to engage with the search results, as measured by click activity.3 2 To the extent that fewer clicks means fewer matches between buyers and sellers on the internet, and fewer consummated transactions, Google's favoritism of its own local web properties is consistent with an output reduction. And antitrust generally condemns conduct of a firm with market power that restricts output or leads to higher prices without any efficiency justification.

Another piece of evidence linking platform power to innovation comes via a study of the mobile app market by Professors Wen Wen and Feng Zhu.3 3 The authors find that after Google's entry threat into a specific app space increases, developers susceptible to Google's entry threat reduce innovation (as measured by software updates) and raise the prices for the affected apps.3 4 The authors measure both the innovation effects and price effects relative to apps in the same category that are unaffected by Google's entry threat.15 After Google's entry, software updates are further reduced, and prices further increased.36 Specifically, prior to Google's entry, the "affected developer reduces his updates on an affected app by 5 percent" and "increase[s] the prices of affected apps by 1.8 percent when the entry threat increases."" Once Google enters, the affected developer "reduces updates on the affected app by 8 percent" and "increase[s] the prices of affected apps ... by 3.6 percent," consistent with entry accommodation. 38

The authors conclude that, when app developers are "threatened by the platform owner, they do not stop investing and innovating; rather, they shift innovation effort from affected markets to unaffected markets."39 They further conclude that "Google's entry threats and actual entry [can] discourage further investment

in developing duplicative features [yet] encourage app developers to introduce more new apps in other markets" by creating incentives to design around the platform owner. 40 The study therefore illustrates the potential for the CW standard's focus on price effects to generate false positives: seizing on higher app prices might miss the potential for increases in innovation and variety. Even the short-run price effects that the authors observe may be endogenous, assuming that Google's entry is a signal for app quality and that app prices are correlated with their quality. Their findings also highlight the potential for the CW standard, through its focus on output effects, to generate false negatives: if independents are merely displaced into new app spaces by discriminatory treatment such that total short-run output is unfazed, intervention is unwarranted under the CW standard even though a platform provider has altered the trajectory of innovation, potentially dampening the incentives for future edge innovation. Traditional antitrust enforcement, at least under the CW standard, could not do this balancing; Congress would need to make a balancing decision and set the rules.

#### no link---consumers are still considered.

Clayton J. Masterman 16. 2019 graduate of the Vanderbilt University Ph.D. Program in Law & Economics. “The Customer Is Not Always Right: Balancing Worker and Customer Welfare in Antitrust Law” Vol. Vanderbilt Law Review. 69:5:1387. 2016. [https://law.vanderbilt.edu/phd/students/The-Customer-Is-Not-Always-Right-Balancing-Worker-and-Customer-Welfare-in-Antitrust-Law.pdf](about:blank)

Monopsony continues to **challenge antitrust law** despite Weyerhauser. Given that anticompetitive agreements among employers benefit one group of consumers (customers) while hurting another consumer group (workers), antitrust law forces courts to weigh the interests of these two groups of consumers against one another. Weighing the interests of two groups of consumers is complex and requires courts to choose whose economic welfare matters more. Currently, courts are **improperly allowing monopsonists to engage in anticompetitive conduct** merely because it results in lower prices.167 Currently, courts directly weigh the welfare of both customers and workers against each other. Because antitrust law traditionally focuses on customers and anticompetitive conduct in labor markets causes lower prices, direct comparison of the welfare is insufficient. Extending the antitrust history of partial equilibrium analysis, I propose that courts consider the welfare of workers first, then **customers’ welfare only if workers experience a de minimis harm**. This proposal **appropriately weighs the interests of workers against customers** who receive a price cut from monopsonistic conduct. Further, this proposal **sits well with antitrust law’s long history** of providing different treatment to anticompetitive conduct in labor. This rule does not solve every problem that a mirror treatment of monopoly and monopsony creates. Yet, this solution both operates within the established Weyerhauser framework to apply current antitrust standards in new ways and pursues antitrust law’s goal of protecting competitive markets.

#### U.S. tech leadership is high and resilient.

Gad Levanon 20. Forbes manufacturing contributor. “Reports Of US Decline Are Greatly Exaggerated.” 08/27/20. [https://www.forbes.com/sites/gadlevanon/2020/08/27/reports-of-us-decline-are-greatly-exaggerated/?sh=6253227b26f8](about:blank)

Despite what many suspect is an eroding US global standing, 2020 may be remembered as the year when the US became even more globally dominant economically.

Why? The tech sector’s share of the US economy is much larger than in most countries. And the pandemic-driven recession has greatly accelerated the shift to online activity and digital transformation by businesses and consumers, which would otherwise have taken years. That lead to faster growth in the global demand for technology. In addition, the US is especially dominant in the tech industries that are likely to grow the fastest i

n the coming years.

Stock prices certainly support this story. The S&P 500 is already above pre-pandemic highs despite the deepest recession in 80 years, and most of the stock prices’ strength comes from tech sector. The companies that have seen the strongest gains since the pandemic focus on online shopping and payments, cloud computing services, cyber security, business related software, social media, online advertisement, and on-demand entertainment content.

Stock prices are volatile and so are a treacherous guide for predicting the future, but there is a plausible explanation for the large tech gains – and why they might last.

[Chart omitted]

There are several objective and subjective reasons for why the US is so successful in technology compared with other countries. It has:

1The best universities, which attract many of the best students from all over the world – most of whom tend to stay in the US after completing their studies

2A large inflow of experienced talent from other countries

3 Unrivaled access to venture capital

4 Fluency in English, the global language in both business-dealing and content

5 An economy big enough to make achieving scale relatively easy

6 Silicon Valley, the home and heart of the tech revolution

7 A culture that welcomes innovation and disruption and strongly encourages entrepreneurial behavior

Given these factors, US tech leadership should continue.

What about the competition? One factor helping the US stand out is the weakness of the European tech sector. The market cap of the largest European tech company, SAP SAP -0.3%, is about one-tenth of Apple AAPL +1.6%’s. In other sophisticated industries like pharmaceuticals, motor vehicles and aircraft, European companies are strong competitors to their US counterparts. Europe’s relative technology weakness is perhaps as unusual as the US strength in the sector, and is only reinforced by the fact that US technology companies are already big players in European economies.

Most of the top tech companies from East Asia – places like Japan, Taiwan and South Korea – are in hardware and semiconductors manufacturing. They are serious competitors in these areas, but these technology sectors are not growing as quickly.

No discussion of the future of technology is complete without China. The Chinese internet companies are huge and growing rapidly, but their ability to expand beyond China and its periphery is questionable. In almost all sophisticated industries, Chinese companies are not yet major players in Western economies. Also, recent events suggest that Western countries will be more cautious in dealing with China, perhaps limiting its expansion. The latest developments with Huawei and TikTok are good examples. In addition, US companies are slowly moving their supply chain elsewhere, further weakening China.

So, the technology sector will perform well in the next several years, benefiting countries that are strong in that area. The US, more than any other country, has a large and successful tech sector that seems to be especially concentrated in the fastest-growing tech industries.

What does this mean for the US economy overall? First, it is important to mention that the boost the US is getting from its tech sector has been larger than what most other advanced economies have gotten for quite a while, and is one of the reasons the US has been growing faster than them in recent years. But now, this trend is likely to accelerate.

Here is some back of the envelope math for the difference between the technology sector’s contribution to GDP growth in the US versus a typical advanced economy: Suppose in the US the tech sector is 12 percent of GDP and is growing at 10 percent a year. In another typical advanced economy the tech sector is 7 percent of GDP and is growing at 5 percent a year. That means that the annual contribution to GDP from the tech sector is 1.2 percent for the US versus 0.35 percent for the other country. That is 0.85 percent faster growth for the US every year. The net effect may be smaller because some of the growth in tech companies come at the expanse of companies from other sectors. But when the average annual GDP growth rate is 1.5-2 percent in advanced economies, even a 0.5 percent a year difference is meaningful.

The gains from the rapid growth in technology would disproportionately go to tech companies’ owners and workers. As most of these are high earners, this trend is likely to increase income inequality. But some of the gains will spread more widely. After all, owners and workers, and the companies themselves, spend a large share of their income in the communities they live and operate in. It will also increase geographic inequalities. Not surprisingly, within the US, areas close to Silicon Valley benefited the most from the technology demand-surge. Between 2013-2018, among the 382 metro areas in the US, San Jose and San Francisco metro areas had the fastest growth in personal income per-capita. During that time, personal income per-capita in the San Jose Metro area rose by 48 percent, more than twice as fast as the national rate (22 percent). The surrounding metro areas, Napa, Santa Rosa-Petaluma, Santa Cruz-Watsonville, Stockton, Vallejo, were all ranked in the top 40. Seattle, another technology Hub, is ranked 13.

All of these data points add up to an enduring strength. Despite concerns about US’s standing in the world, its tech sector may keep it at the forefront of the global economy in the foreseeable future.

### DA --- infra

#### Biden has no PC---Senate is not passing anything on Biden’s agenda---other issues thump.

Sahil Kapur 21 [(Sahil Kapur, ) “Where does Joe Biden's agenda stand in Congress? Here's a rundown,” NBC News, 7-11-2021, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/where-does-joe-biden-s-agenda-stand-congress-here-s-n1273251,] \*AP\*

Biden's agenda is imperiled on policies that are subject to the 60-vote threshold in the Senate, where Democrats have 50 members and continue to struggle to achieve GOP cooperation. Biden's call for a $15-an-hour minimum wage hit a dead end in March, when eight Democratic senators joined all Republicans to vote it down. More recently, equal pay legislation fell to a Republican-led filibuster. And the prospects for beefing up LGBTQ protections don't look good. Prospects for gun control are grim after bipartisan talks to expand background checks for firearm sales broke down. Biden's immigration bill to grant a path to citizenship for millions of people in the U.S. illegally and to link green cards to the economy is going nowhere fast. Republicans roundly reject it, and Democrats are split. An updated Dream Act for young undocumented people passed the House but faces an uphill climb in the Senate. Biden's push to bolster voting rights has hit a brick wall in Congress after Senate Republicans filibustered debate on the House-passed For the People Act to set a minimum standard of voting access in every state and overhaul campaign finance laws. The separate John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act could pass the House, but it is also unlikely to clear the Senate. Most Republicans say that the issue should be left to states and that the federal government needn't weigh in. Conservative have been inflamed by fabricated claims by former President Donald Trump that the 2020 election was stolen from him, which has fueled a push in GOP-led states to tighten voting laws. Negotiations between the parties continue on police reform, but they have repeatedly missed their deadlines, and Democrats worry that a split within the law enforcement community over police accountability measures could derail a deal.

#### PC is fake---especially true with Biden and republicans drag their feet regardless.

Waldman 20 [Paul Waldman is an opinion writer for the Plum Line blog. Before joining The Post, he worked at an advocacy group, edited an online magazine, taught at university and worked on political campaigns. He has authored or co-authored four books on media and politics, and his work has appeared in dozens of newspapers and magazines. He is also a senior writer at the American Prospect. 12-2-2020, "Opinion: Joe Biden has to move fast," Washington Post, accessed 7-13-2021, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/12/02/joe-biden-has-move-fast/] //BY

Slow-walking will absolutely be the Republican strategy, on both appointments and legislation. They won’t come out and say they’re going to stonewall every appointee and refuse to allow any legislation to pass; instead they’ll say that they just want to make sure Biden doesn’t stock his administration with radical leftists and propose far-out socialist laws. Send us the nominees and the bills, and we’ll consider them. It’ll just take some time. Weeks will then stretch into months, and the Biden agenda will languish. They’ve done it before — Obama himself describes how they endlessly dragged out negotiations on the Affordable Care Act by claiming they might support it — and they’ll do it again. That’s the Republican plan. The first step to getting around it is to understand that the public won’t blame gridlock on the ones who are causing it. They’ll just see a bunch of bickering in Washington with nothing getting done, and Biden will be the one who takes the blame. Once you realize that the public is neither aware of nor particularly concerned about process questions, you can stop worrying about whether Republicans will squawk at this appointment or that executive order — because they’ll squawk no matter what you do. If it’s a good idea and you think the results will be good, then just do it. As quickly and comprehensively as possible. As David Roberts of Vox observes: In 2009, Obama and his aides made the mistake of thinking that their major initiatives had to be rolled out one at a time in sequence, because he had a finite store of “political capital” that had to be spent carefully. But political capital is not something that exists apart from any particular issue; it isn’t a special sauce that has to be poured on a policy in order to make it palatable. And with the parties as polarized and unified as they are, political capital has become all but meaningless.

There may have been a time when a popular president possessed so much capital that a senator from the opposition party would feel compelled to support him on part of that president’s agenda, but that time is long gone. There is no account Biden can draw on to turn Republican “no” votes into “yes.” So setting up a series of high-profile policy battles may be the opposite of what Biden should do. The unfortunate fact is that he may not have the opportunity to do much in the way of big legislation on health care or climate change or anything else, and if he has only executive power to work with, it makes it all the more urgent to move quickly. Which means getting staff in place immediately and then unleashing them. The Revolving Door Project argues that Biden should give as much authority as possible to the agencies to let them dismantle their particular corners of the Trump legacy on their own, because the task “simply will not happen if approached sequentially or micromanaged” by a White House staff with limited bandwidth. That means moving on every policy area all at once. There’s nothing to be gained by putting off any part of Biden’s agenda. Whatever he can do given the limits of his power, he should do as soon as possible, in a flood of policymaking. Even if Democrats win both Georgia races and control the Senate, Biden should acknowledge that he likely has two years until the 2022 midterm elections to pass whatever legislation he can. Not only will Democrats probably lose one or both houses in the inevitable backlash (as happens to most presidents in their first midterm), the only possible chance at forestalling that result is to get results, as many as possible, that he can show the voters. Republicans will complain that Biden is being partisan, uncompromising, taking a “my way or the highway” approach. It will be a strategy to convince everyone of the lie that Biden and Democrats might be able to find some way of winning them over, when in fact they’ll be implementing a strategy of total opposition. If Biden follows them on that fruitless quest, he’ll be running in circles while crucial time passes and nothing gets done. The only option for him is to decide not to care about Republican whining and do what he got elected to do with all haste. The alternative is failure.

#### Winners win---stimulus and early presidency proves.

**Kilgore 21** [Ed Kilgore is a political columnist for New York magazine and the managing editor of the Democratic Strategist, an online magazine. Kilgore is a former senior fellow at the centrist Progressive Policy Institute, and a contributor to the Washington Monthly where he wrote the Political Animal blog. He has also written for the New Republic, and served as policy director for the centrist Democratic Leadership Council. 3-15-2021, "Biden Builds Popularity by Focusing on COVID Relief Plan," Intelligencer, accessed 7-13-2021, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2021/03/biden-builds-popularity-by-focusing-on-covid-relief-plan.html] //BY

But even within the narrow parameters set by increased partisanship, there are some interesting variations. Obama’s initial policy salvo was an economic stimulus package that, despite its “bipartisan” character, was less popular than Obama himself, according to a CNN survey at the time. Trump began his presidency with two immigration gestures (announcing initial construction of a southern border wall, and banning travel into the U.S. by citizens of Islamic countries) that were not very popular generally but elicited positive reactions from Trump’s base. Biden has focused almost exclusively on a COVID-19 relief and stimulus package, which is significantly more popular than he is. So **despite perceptions** that Biden is **gambling** political capital by promoting a large and ideologically liberal piece of legislation via the partisan budget reconciliation vehicle, the **better way** to **understand** it is that the 46th president is **building political capital** by so exclusively concentrating on doing something popular.

#### Data shows a tendency toward restraint.

Valeriano & Maness 18 Brandon Valeriano, PhD, Chair of Armed Politics at the Marine Corps University, Cyber Security Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council, & Ryan Maness, an American cybersecurity expert, Defense Analysis Professor at Naval Postgraduate School. [How We Stopped Worrying about Cyber Doom and Started Collecting Data, Politics and Governance, 6(2), Cogitatio Press]//BPS

6. Expanding Cyber Security Data Our team has been coding cyber incident data since 2010 and serves as a unique example of how the process of collecting cyber security data and evidence can be done. Our first peer reviewed published work appeared in 2014 in Journal of Peace Research (Valeriano & Maness, 2014). In this article we note that cyber conflict is much more restrained than generally understood by popular discourse. Threat inflation is ripe in cyber security, and the real use of cyber tools seems to be to enhance the power of strong states. The data that Valeriano and Maness (2014, 2015) have built challenges the cyber revolution perspective and does so with the tools of social science, and is a necessary turn given the general tone of the debate. We first determine that a viable data collection method in light of limited resources was to focus on states that are committed interstate rivals (Diehl & Goertz, 2001). This allows us to focus on those actors with an intense history of recent hostilities that should be the most likely users of cyber technology on the battlefield (Maness & Valeriano, 2018). In our research (Maness & Valeriano, 2016; Maness, Valeriano, & Jensen, 2017; Valeriano & Maness, 2014, 2015), we have been able to marshal a massive amount of evidence that is useful in dissecting the actual trends on the cyber battlefield in a geopolitical context. We demonstrate that while cyber-attacks are increasing in frequency, they are limited in severity, are directly connected to traditional territorial disagreements, and mostly take the shape of espionage and low-level disruptive campaigns rather than outright warfare. Given this data-based perspective, we question the dynamics of the cyber security debate and offer a countering theory where states are restrained from using more malicious cyber actions due to the limited nature of the weapons, the possibly of blowback, the connection between the digital world and civilian infrastructure, and the reality that any cyber weapon launched can be replicated and used right back against the attacker. Given all of these perspectives gleamed from the data, we must moderate our views about the transformation that is offered by cyber strategists who stress a more revolutionist tone (Lango, 2016).

### DA --- midterms

#### 3---Dems win now or too soon to predict

David Lightman & Gillian Brassil, 9-16-2021, "Is Newsom’s big recall win a good sign for Democrats running in 2022? What experts say," Sacramento Bee, https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article254260073.html

Gov. Gavin Newsom’s landslide triumph against the recall made Democrats giddy Wednesday about prospects for winning back Republican House seats as they celebrated the victory as affirmation of their efforts to combat COVID-19.

But whether the Democratic glow will linger and help the party in next year’s pivotal congressional elections is questionable.

Republicans, as well as some analysts, noted that Tuesday’s result guarantees nothing, since a lot can change between now and the November 2022 midterm vote.

#### 5---GOP will also repeal

Paul Blumenthal, 9-17-2021, "The Filibuster’s Fate Is Already Decided. Just Look To The 2022 Democratic Senate Candidates.," HuffPost, <span class="skimlinks-unlinked">https://www.huffpost.com/entry/filibuster-2022-senate-elections\_n\_61439d4ce4b07ad8c8dd38e4</span>

“The filibuster is not going to be here in five years either because Democrats will have expanded their majority with candidates like these or because Republicans take over and end the filibuster themselves,” said Eli Zupnick, spokesman for Fix Our Senate, the main filibuster reform coalition.

#### 6---Will use reforms or carve outs

Ed Kilgore, 9-14-2021, "How a Filibuster Reform for Voting Rights Could Happen," Intelligencer, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2021/09/how-a-filibuster-reform-for-voting-rights-could-happen.html

So there’s plenty of precedent for limiting the filibuster partially; killing it altogether, or keeping it intact has never been the exclusive choice, much as those who hate or love the dilatory tactic might pretend otherwise.

7--- Thumpers

#### A series of six new antitrust bills thump.

Lauren **Feiner 6-22**-21. Lauren Feiner is a News Associate for CNBC. “Google, Amazon accuse lawmakers of harming small businesses as Big Tech antitrust bills move through Congress.” CNBC. 6/22/21. https://www.cnbc.com/2021/06/22/tech-industry-urges-congress-to-slow-down-new-antitrust-bills.html

Tech giants that could be broken up under a series of new antitrust bills are speaking out against the measures as lawmakers are set to debate them on Wednesday. Amazon and Google released statements on Tuesday opposing the bills. Apple and Facebook, which were also targets of the House Judiciary Committee’s investigation into digital markets, have yet to put out their own statements. But industry groups backed by the tech firms have also pushed back on the legislation, arguing it would prevent the companies from operating popular consumer services and ultimately hurt small businesses and entrepreneurs. The six bills set to be considered at Wednesday’s markup, where lawmakers will discuss the proposals and any amendments before deciding whether they should advance, would have a profound impact on the tech industry and possibly beyond it. Amazon and Google called for the Judiciary Committee to pump the breaks on the legislation, which is headed to a full committee markup in an unusually short period of time — less than two weeks since most were introduced. Google VP of government affairs and public policy Mark Isakowitz said in a statement the company isn’t opposed to new regulation, but warned the bills on the table would “break” popular consumer services. “As many groups and companies have observed, the bills would require us to degrade our services and prevent us from offering important features used by hundreds of millions of Americans,” he said. “This would all dramatically undermine US technology leadership, damage the way small businesses connect with consumers, and raise serious privacy and security concerns. We respectfully recommend that these consequences receive more thoughtful consideration before Congress takes action.” Amazon VP of public policy Brian Huseman also warned of “significant negative effects” on Amazon consumers and small- and medium-sized businesses that sell on the platform. Amazon is still reviewing the bills, he added. “More than a half million American small- and medium-sized businesses make a living via Amazon’s marketplace, and without access to Amazon’s customers, it will be much harder for these third-party sellers to create awareness for their business and earn a comparable income,” he said in a statement. “Removing the selection of these sellers from Amazon’s store would also create less price competition for products, and likely end up increasing prices for consumers,” Hseman said.” The Committee is moving unnecessarily fast in pushing these bills forward. We encourage Chairman Cicilline and committee members to slow down, postpone the markup, and thoroughly vet the language in the bills for unintended negative consequences.” “Antitrust laws should promote competition and protect consumers, not punish successful American companies,” a Facebook spokesperson said. “The surest way to address the challenges facing today’s internet is to tackle the areas of greatest concern to people like content moderation, election integrity, and privacy – not attempt to dismantle the products and services people depend on. These bills underestimate the unrelenting competition within the tech sector, including competition from foreign companies such as TikTok, WeChat, and Alibaba. The proposed bills aren’t a solution to the ever-changing challenges of the consumer internet; they are a poison pill for America’s tech industry at a time our economy can least afford it.” Apple did not provide comment on the bills. Two of the bills could require structural changes, or break-ups, at several of the platforms because of their prohibitions on owning and operating business lines that present conflicts of interest and stipulations against discriminatory business practices. Others would give regulators a leg up in antitrust proceedings by shifting the burden of proof in merger cases onto dominant platforms, raising filing fees for mergers and giving state attorneys general more say in the venue of their antitrust cases. Another bill in the package would make it easier for consumers to switch platforms by mandating the services allow users to take their data with them. The bills would specifically apply to platforms with over $600 billion in market cap and 50 million monthly active U.S. users, limiting their application to only the largest of businesses. But industry players argue that their implications will reach far beyond their own walls because of the vast impact of their services on consumers’ lives. Prior to the company statements, industry associations funded by several of the companies have similarly pushed back on the bills and asked for additional time to consider their implications. TechNet, whose members include Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Google, wrote to the Judiciary Committee on Monday requesting the panel hold hearings, “rather than rush the legislation from introduction to markup in just 12 days.” Comcast, which owns CNBC parent company NBCUniversal, is also a member of the group.

#### Merger Guidelines thump.

Joseph Miller 21. Co-chair, Mintz Antitrust Practice. “More Antitrust News, Still None of it Good.” *The National Law Review*. July 10th, 2021. [https://www.natlawreview.com/article/more-antitrust-news-still-none-it-good](about:blank).

In a joint press release, the FTC and Antitrust Division announced they are launching a review of the Merger Guidelines so the agencies "review mergers with the skepticism the law demands" in order to "determine if they are too permissive." Richard Powers, the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust is a criminal lawyer by background and has no significant merger experience so it's fair to assume this initiative is being promoted by FTC Chair Lina Khan. Merger Guidelines are often cited by courts for their persuasive authority but do not carry the force of law. They are influential because they reflect a fair view of current economic learning, reduced to an administrable set of principles to guide agency merger staffs and businesses alike. The current horizontal merger guidelines were published in 2010 so perhaps it is time for an update. What we see in the press release, however, is a strong signal that the agencies will not incorporate the latest economic literature, but rather take a hyper-aggressive enforcement posture based on a literal reading of a very old statute. Merger guidelines will need to be backed by sound law and economics in order to persuade the federal courts. If this initiative reflects nothing more than ideologically driven hostility towards efficient transactions we will see a burst of enforcement activity, followed by legal sophistry about textualism, Brown Shoe, Von's, and other bad but not explicitly overturned precedent, followed by a well-deserved thrashing in the courts of appeal. I guess antitrust lawyers should settle in for the best of times/worst of times period, lots of activity but also hard for counselors and clients to plan transactions if enforcement decisions are untethered to the consumer welfare standard, without which enforcement decisions will necessarily be driven by broader policy goals or raw political calculations. I may be reading too much into a short press release and I hope I'm wrong about how bad this will get in the short term. I'm also grateful that the FTC has staggered terms for commissioners so Christine Wilson and Noah Feldman can continue to articulate sound, traditional enforcement principles, and priorities.

#### 8--- Filibuster prevents anything from passing

Mel Barnes et al, September 2021, staff counsel at Law Forward, with Norman Eisen senior fellow in Governance Studies at Brookings, Jeff Mandell founder, president, and lead counsel of Law Forward, and Norman Ornstein emeritus scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. Filibuster Reform is Coming— Here’s How Seven Ideas for Change, [https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Filibuster-Reform-is-Coming\_Heres-How\_Sept2021.pdf](about:blank)

What is a shocking departure is the level of obstruction the modern Senate has achieved. Even after the end of the talking filibuster and the introduction of the two-track process made delay easier, the usage of the filibuster did not skyrocket until our current era of hyperpartisan polarization.55 The Senate has too often stopped functioning as a great deliberative body—or functioning at all. From January 2001 to the end of 2006, a Democratic minority in the Senate used 201 filibusters to block bills with majority support. In a comparable six-year period, from January 2009 to the end of 2014, Republicans were in the minority, and used the filibuster 504 times—more than twice as often.56

For the half-century between the advent of the cloture rule on the eve of World War I and the twotrack reform in 1970, the Senate averaged fewer than 3 filibusters per two-year Congress (measured by cloture motions filed, the best analogue publicly tracked by the Senate). By the George W. Bush Administration, that average was up to 85 per Congress.57 Everything changed when the filibuster gained its most recent and innovative champion: Senator Mitch McConnell. McConnell served as the minority leader for most of the Obama Administration, and vowed early, clearly, and publicly that his number one goal was ensuring Obama had only one term as president.58 McConnell would fail by that measure but succeed tremendously in delaying and blocking popular legislation supported by Obama, the majority of the Senate, and majorities of the American public. During Obama’s presidency, the average number of filibusters (cloture motions filed) per Congress shot up to 158—nearly double the previously unheard-of record during the term of his immediate predecessor.59 Correspondingly, fewer bills on average were passed as filibuster numbers increased: From 1950–1990, over 1,000 bills were passed by the Senate each Congress; between 2009 and 2018, that average was less than 450.60 The modern drop in Senate productivity is even more dramatic when examining how many bills passed excluding those passed via voice votes (generally indicative of a noncontroversial bill with broad support, such as a bill to rename a post office). Roll call votes accounted for only 52 pieces of legislation passed in the 2017–2018 Senate.61

McConnell’s use of cloture and other procedural rules to stall any business in the Senate from his perch atop the minority did not engender an age of great debate. It did not incentivize negotiation among senators with different views. It merely prevented everything from civil rights advances to the most basic and necessary business of government from moving forward—all in silence and nearly invisible to most voters. Those who say the filibuster promotes legislative compromise are ignoring history. But to the extent that was ever true, it describes a bygone era that has nothing in common with our present politics and the modern Senate.

### DA --- ftc

#### 2---Merger Guidelines thump.

Joseph Miller 21. Co-chair, Mintz Antitrust Practice. “More Antitrust News, Still None of it Good.” *The National Law Review*. July 10th, 2021. [https://www.natlawreview.com/article/more-antitrust-news-still-none-it-good](about:blank).

In a joint press release, the FTC and Antitrust Division announced they are launching a review of the Merger Guidelines so the agencies "review mergers with the skepticism the law demands" in order to "determine if they are too permissive." Richard Powers, the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust is a criminal lawyer by background and has no significant merger experience so it's fair to assume this initiative is being promoted by FTC Chair Lina Khan. Merger Guidelines are often cited by courts for their persuasive authority but do not carry the force of law. They are influential because they reflect a fair view of current economic learning, reduced to an administrable set of principles to guide agency merger staffs and businesses alike. The current horizontal merger guidelines were published in 2010 so perhaps it is time for an update. What we see in the press release, however, is a strong signal that the agencies will not incorporate the latest economic literature, but rather take a hyper-aggressive enforcement posture based on a literal reading of a very old statute. Merger guidelines will need to be backed by sound law and economics in order to persuade the federal courts. If this initiative reflects nothing more than ideologically driven hostility towards efficient transactions we will see a burst of enforcement activity, followed by legal sophistry about textualism, Brown Shoe, Von's, and other bad but not explicitly overturned precedent, followed by a well-deserved thrashing in the courts of appeal. I guess antitrust lawyers should settle in for the best of times/worst of times period, lots of activity but also hard for counselors and clients to plan transactions if enforcement decisions are untethered to the consumer welfare standard, without which enforcement decisions will necessarily be driven by broader policy goals or raw political calculations. I may be reading too much into a short press release and I hope I'm wrong about how bad this will get in the short term. I'm also grateful that the FTC has staggered terms for commissioners so Christine Wilson and Noah Feldman can continue to articulate sound, traditional enforcement principles, and priorities.

#### 3---so does right to repair.

Brian Fung 7/22. technology reporter who covers the intersection of business and policy, graduate of Middlebury College and the London School of Economics. “The FTC vows to 'root out' illegal repair restrictions on phones, fridges, tractors and more.” CNN. 7/22/21. [https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/22/tech/ftc-right-to-repair/index.html](about:blank)

US regulators are vowing to make it easier for consumers and independent service shops to repair commercial products like smartphones without having to rely on those products' manufacturers, effectively backing a principle known as "right to repair." On Wednesday, the Federal Trade Commission led by Chair Lina Khan voted unanimously to condemn restrictions imposed by manufacturers on products that make them more difficult to repair independently. The decision commits the FTC to investigating restrictions that may be illegal under both the nation's antitrust laws as well as a key consumer protection law governing product warranties, the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act. In a statement, **FTC Chair Lina Khan vowed to use the agency's full range of tools to "root out" illegal repair restrictions.**

#### 4---fiat solves – give more funding to enforce the plan.

#### 5---Non-unique---COVID cost-cutting, Facebook case, and record-high cases thump

Leah Nylen 20. Covers antitrust and investigations for POLITICO Pro, spent eight years covering antitrust at MLex. “FTC suffering a cash crunch as it prepares to battle Facebook.” 12/10/20. https://www.politico.com/news/2020/12/10/ftc-cash-facebook-lawsuit-444468

The agency that just launched a landmark antitrust suit to break up Facebook is so strapped for cash that its leaders have discussed shrinking their staff and warned against taking on more cases.

In a series of emails to all Federal Trade Commission staff, obtained by POLITICO, Executive Director David Robbins said the agency would face a period of “belt tightening” to cut costs — and that filing fewer cases and trimming litigation expenses must be on the table.

“[W]e will either need to bring fewer expert intensive cases or significantly decrease our litigation costs (e.g. experts, transcripts, litigation support contractors, etc.),” Robbins said in an Oct. 29 email.

The emails offer an increasingly dire portrait of the money woes facing the FTC, which has launched a record amount of litigation in the past year

even as the pandemic has caused a sharp reduction in the corporate merger filing fees that normally supply about half its budget. The crunch also raises the possibility that the FTC may not have the cash it needs to win its case against Facebook, which is gearing up for an expensive fight, or to take on additional companies like Amazon.

#### 6---FTC overstretch inevitable BUT the plan fiats they legislative backing and court victory---key to legitimacy and funding.

Marianela Lopez-Galdos 7-28-21. Global Competition Counsel at the Computer& Communications Industry Association, previously served as Director of Competition & Regulatory Policy, and is a professor at George Washington University Competition Law Center and at the University of Melbourne Law School. “Policy Decisions of Antitrust Institutions Series: The Future of the FTC and Its Perils”. Disruptive Competition Project. [https://www.project-disco.org/competition/072821-policy-decisions-of-antitrust-institutions-series-the-future-of-the-ftc-and-its-perils/](about:blank)

The FTC’s Enforcement Authority Let’s get started by understanding why the FTC’s antitrust policy rerouting has raised a lot of questions. The FTC is one of the two federal agencies that has authority over competition, and consumer protection matters. Throughout its enforcement, advocacy and regulatory activities, the FTC has endorsed competition policy that has inured to the benefit of consumers in the U.S. economy. As most DisCo readers know, the FTC under a Neo-Brandeisian leader has in a short period of time made drastic changes to the bipartisan consensus that had traditionally governed the FTC’s enforcement decision-making framework. In this respect, the most prominent example is the FTC’s recent decision to rescind the [Statement of Enforcement Principles Regarding “Unfair Methods of Competition” Under Section 5 of the FTC Act](about:blank) (Section 5 Policy Guidelines). In 2015, under the Obama administration, the FTC adopted the Section 5 Policy Guidelines with bipartisan support. These guidelines were the result of a lot of work put forward throughout many years by the antitrust community including academia and FTC staffers. Although the Guidelines were short, and maybe imperfect, they covered the minimum principles to guide the FTC when enforcing Section 5 of the FTC Act relating to ‘unfair methods of competition’ that fell outside the scope of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Moreover, Section 5 Policy Guidelines reaffirmed the FTC’s commitment to carrying out its antitrust mandate under the consumer welfare standard as [noted](about:blank) by the Chairwoman Edith Ramirez: “The promotion of consumer welfare is a cornerstone of the FTC’s antitrust enforcement, and these principles reaffirm the agency’s legal framework in carrying out that important mission.” But most importantly, the Section 5 Policy Guidelines acted as the guardrails to avoid situations where the FTC, in an effort to expand its enforcement authority, would lose many antitrust stand-alone Section 5 cases in court, to the **detriment of the institution itself.** Indeed, the Section 5 Policy Guidelines were the result of lessons learned throughout the history of the FTC and represented a tool to avoid history repeating itself. In this respect, it is important to [recall](about:blank) that back in the 70s, under Chairman Pertschuck, and in the following years, the FTC suffered immensely due to disparities between enforcement promises and implementation capabilities. Much of the **institutional suffering** came from the agency not self-imposing limitations and standards to bring cases under Section 5 of the FTC Act which led to **numerous litigation losses**, **consequential institutional reputational damage, and lack of political suppor**t But the current FTC leadership seems to have overlooked the agency’s history. As such, it has already promised to produce different policy outcomes and noted that the Section 5 Policy Guidelines were shortsighted. As a result, the current FTC has decided, with the support of the other two Democratic Commissioners, to rescind the Policy Guidelines. It is unknown whether the current FTC will try to adopt different guidelines or whether it will start opening more cases under Section 5 of the FTC Act. Furthermore, it is less clear whether the new FTC leadership currently counts with the sufficient and aligned Neo-Brandeisian human talent to bring solid cases that are not based on the consumer welfare standard or to litigate before judges that support the Neo-Brandeisian vision of antitrust. What seems clear is that the new agency’s leader might find it hard to bring all Commissioners to an agreement with respect to what the agency can do with Section 5 of the FTC Act, and this situation, in and of itself, puts the agency in peril. The FTC’s Rulemaking Authority Another important policy change that may be detrimental to the FTC is its expressed willingness to expand the agency’s rulemaking authority under, e.g., Section 18 of the FTC Act. It is well known that in addition to its authority to investigate law violations by individuals and businesses, the FTC also has federal rulemaking authority to issue industry-wide regulations. However, the agency’s rulemaking authority has been self-limited since the 80s in an effort to ensure the institution doesn’t overuse its capacity to adopt industry-wide regulations and raise concerns with those policy makers that are against the legislature deferring its core mandate to an independent agency that doesn’t represent the people. Traditionally the legislature has the constitutional mandate to create laws affecting different sectors of the economy. Whereas it is legally accepted to design independent agencies with constrained mandates to adopt regulations, such powers are not necessarily understood to construe independent agencies as substitutes for the legislature’s powers. It is a basic tenet of administrative law, that agencies are constrained by the enabling statute that gives them authority to promulgate regulations in the first place. Against this background, it seems risky for the new leadership to engage in broad rulemaking endeavors that might raise concerns from an institution legitimacy perspective. In the long term, it is predictable that many policymakers might not be supportive of an agency that implements its rulemaking authority in its broadest sense. As a result, some degree of political backlash against the agency might not help the agency’s lifecycle, especially if the agency is not granted with specific legislative guidance in the form of new legislation. The Future of the FTC One of the most challenging matters to tackle when it comes to leadership of antitrust authorities, or administrative agency for that matter, is legacy and the impact for the future of the agency. To put it simply, while antitrust leaders leave agencies, the side effects of leadership’s successes and failures condition the future of the agencies. Their leadership has consequences and sets precedent which will bind the agency well into the future. Under the current political context, it would not be surprising if the current Neo-Brandeisian FTC enjoyed political support and success with its decision to bring big cases, especially against leading tech companies. In the short term, if the FTC makes headlines for opening cases against “Big Tech”, policymakers pushing for antitrust reforms will surely applaud the new changes as they would reflect a commitment to enhanced enforcement outcomes notwithstanding the strength of the cases. However, in the mid-and long-term, if the FTC loses the big cases, the commitment to policy outcomes won’t be met.

And then, it is unlikely that the question would be whether the antitrust norms are fit for today’s economy, but rather if the agency is capable of executing its mandate effectively. The recent decision in the FTC v. Facebook case is a good example of this paradigm, where the Judge expressed that the FTC had not carried out a sufficiently robust analysis supported by evidence, and therefore dismissed the case. Eventually, the agency’s short-term reputational gains could quickly turn into a debacle for the institution itself with the caveat that by then, most probably, Neo-Brandeisian leadership will be long gone. Unfortunately then, the U.S. antitrust system — which is the only one to keep two federal antitrust agencies, bringing about positive outcomes for consumers — might be at risk. Political support to merge these two institutions could gain even more support, as has happened in the past, to the detriment of consumers.

#### Covid thumps – who cares about needing to repair weapons when we are cancelling military exercises and letting NATO fill in anyway

Cipher Brief, 20. “How Will COVID-19 Impact U.S. Military Readiness?” https://www.thecipherbrief.com/column\_article/how-will-covid-19-impact-u-s-military-readiness

COVID-19 is also sure to impact another key Trump administration objective – NATO playing a larger role in countering the so-called Islamic State (IS) as the United States continues to draw back resources from its counterterrorism mission. In late February, NATO announced an increase in resources for its training mission in Iraq, but remains unclear where such resources will come from. Also, how quickly those plans will be realized are in significant doubt. The impact could be critical as IS continues to reconstitute itself in wake of the power vacuum resulting from a diminished U.S. footprint in the region. Finally, the U.S. military has cancelled numerous other joint exercises. In Africa, where a mosaic of resurgent Salafi-jihadist groups continues to expand operations, the U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) canceled Exercise African Lion 2020, which was to be conducted in Morocco, Tunisia, and Senegal. The AFRICOM maritime exercise, the Phoenix, slated for April, was also cancelled. In the Arctic tundra, Operation Cold Response, involving ten countries, including the United States, was cancelled after it began because a Norwegian soldier tested positive for coronavirus. COVID-19’s disruption of U.S. and NATO military exercises attenuates readiness while providing an opening to state and non-state actors to exploit.

#### Covid thumps – readiness already wrecked in ways right to repair cant solve

Cipher Brief, 20. “How Will COVID-19 Impact U.S. Military Readiness?” https://www.thecipherbrief.com/column\_article/how-will-covid-19-impact-u-s-military-readiness

U.S. military education has also been negatively impacted by COVID-19. The U.S. Military (Army) and Naval academies quickly pivoted to remote learning. The decision to transition to online learning took hold more slowly at the Air Force Academy, where 1,000 cadets, all seniors, were told to remain on campus. While on campus and in social isolation, two Air Force cadets tragically committed suicide in late March. The U.S. military academies are critical to the replenishment of the officer corps in every branch of the military. While graduating seniors can effectively assume the roles they have been groomed to fill within their chosen service, the long-term impact on the academies’ younger generation will be more difficult to gauge, especially because hands-on learning, or tacit knowledge, is indispensable to their future success as officers. If prolonged indefinitely, online learning could lead to a diminishment of key skills and capabilities required of commissioned officers who are expected to lead soldiers into battle. Finally, the influx of new military recruits has been halted as services like the Army have delayed onboarding due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, the U.S. Marine Corps cancelled the arrival of new trainees to its recruitment depot

at Parris Island, South Carolina. COVID-19’s impact on training future officer and non-officer personnel is already impairing military readiness.

#### Right to repair not key to readiness

Jerri-Lynn Scofield, 19. “Lack of Right to Repair Limits Ability of US Military to Maintain its Own Equipment.” November 22, 2019. [https://www.nakedcapitalism.com/2019/11/lack-of-right-to-repair-limits-ability-of-us-military-to-maintain-its-own-equipment.html](about:blank)

What Is to be Done? As I mentioned above, both Sanders and Warren propose a right to repair for farm equipment, and legislation is pending in approximately twenty states, some of which covers consumer electronics. As Gizmodo reports, Lack of Right-to-Repair Protections Is Even Screwing With the U.S. Military: Gay Gordon-Byrne, executive director of the Repair Association, told Gizmodo by email that the problem Ekman raises in her piece “illustrates the pervasiveness of repair monopolies and their very real-world consequences.” “The military cannot possibly function without being able to fix their own stuff—but here we are. Farmers cannot put food on the table if they cannot fix their own stuff—but here we are,” Gordon-Byrne said. “Consumers are waking up to the fact they cannot fix their stuff either—and the legislative solution is in front of us. We don’t need to wait for the federal government to unlock monopolies—we can do it right now by passing right-to-repair legislation in any of multiple states.” Gordon-Byrne noted the many bills that have been proposed in more than 20 states that hoped to secure right-to-repair protections for consumers. Gordon-Byrne said detractors of these proposals have described the bills as “too broad,” but she added that she doesn’t think “that argument is going to hold water going forward.” “If we cannot fix our phones and bulldozers while waging war,” she said, “we’ve really screwed ourselves.” Obviously, general right to repair legislation is not the only way to address the military issue.

**Defense spending is high that’s more important to overall readiness than right to repair**

Gordon **Adams** **18**. Professor of international relations, American University's School of International Service; distinguished fellow, Stimson Center. “The Military’s ‘Readiness’ Scam Worked Again.” Foreign Policy. 2/15/2018. [http://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/15/the-militarys-readiness-scam-worked-again/](about:blank).

For the next two years, at least, the American public should be spared the U.S. Defense Department’s wailing about “readiness.” After seven years of teeth-gnashing and garment-rending, the military is finally getting what it wants: more money than ever. The Donald Trump administration’s defense budget request for fiscal year 2019 is out, less than a week after Congress cut an overall deal on spending levels for 2018 and 2019. Unlike the domestic spending part of the administration’s budget request, the defense numbers aren’t dead on arrival — in fact, the military can count on getting every cent. The congressional deal set new levels for defense, agreeing to $700 billion for national defense in 2018 and $716 billion in 2019. That’s nearly $165 billion more than the military had anticipated prior to this year. The United States is back to defense spending, in constant dollars, that is **higher than the peak spending levels under Ronald Reagan**. Only in 2010, at the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, was defense spending higher. It’s worth thinking about why defense spending is about to explode. It’s **not** because of some revolutionary change in the global security environment — aside from those pesky North Koreans and their nukes, America has **never been so secure**. It’s not because the U.S. military’s effectiveness has declined; it remains the **most powerful force** in the world, **highly capable** and **very ready**. The reason the Pentagon’s budget is now on a long-term upswing is because the military has spent years **loudly lobbying** for such an increase while complaining about an **alleged** “readiness crisis.” Complaining works, at least when the military does it, because politicians in both parties fear the military’s wrath. Partisan gridlock can still impede efforts to bump up the military’s resources, but now that Republicans are in control of Congress and the White House, there are no more hurdles standing in the way. None of this is to suggest, however, that the congressional generosity will buy Americans more security or a better force than the one they have today. Every military leader in history has wanted more resources at his or her disposal. U.S. secretaries of defense have been especially adamant since 2011, when the Budget Control Act first set limits on both defense and domestic spending. The **tears shed** by the Pentagon went beyond complaining about those pesky budget caps. They also touched on declining military readiness, units that weren’t combat ready, Chinese military expansion, and **just about anything else that defense officials thought might put the spending train back on the tracks**. All the Pentagon’s complaints **ignored the reality** that since 2001 the military has been receiving tens, and sometimes even hundreds, of billions of dollars in additional funding — above and beyond the budget caps — thanks to a **special slush fund**, the Overseas Contingency Operations account. That money is supposed to be designated for emergencies, but both the Pentagon and the Congress have routinely used this budget for nonemergency purposes, such as paying, training, and supporting existing troops (all normally in the Pentagon’s base budget) and buying equipment already in the long-term defense plan. Nevertheless, the military has complained that its readiness is in tatters. And after all those years of deployments, military officials testifying to Congress could always come up with a **sad anecdote** about planes being cross-decked to an outgoing carrier, fighters not ready to fly, or missing pilots. U.S. policymakers have **seen this movie many times before**. I experienced it myself in the 1990s, when the brass was displeased with the budget levels set by the Bill Clinton administration and whined about readiness problems to the Office of Management and Budget, where I worked. My follow-up with the Pentagon’s civil servants made it clear that the **measures they were using were rigged** to show low levels of readiness; they set standards that called units “ready” only if they had every capability imaginable to fight a major ground war, and they counted as “unready” units that were back from deployments and had missed a training slot for that big war, one they would soon be scheduled to receive. We knew the Pentagon was using manipulated numbers to bludgeon us with demands for more funding. Nevertheless, we caved: In 1994, we added more than $20 billion to the defense budget, not really to fix readiness but to try to make the issue go away before the midterm elections that year. (It didn’t work, by the way.) Four years later, we did it again, busting previous budget commitments to add billions of dollars more. (For an excellent analysis of that fight, read This War Really Matters: Inside the Fight for Defense Dollars by the late George C. Wilson, once the premier Pentagon correspondent for the Washington Post.) Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose — the more things change, the more they stay the same — as military parade leaders in France might say. Today, once again, the U.S. military stands on the brink of an **alleged** readiness crisis, and more money is needed, pronto. The trail of tears became so deep that it caught up Republicans and Democrats (always eager to portray themselves as “tough on national security”). It caught up in the lachrymose flow virtually all of the **think tank preachers** at the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Center for a New American Security, and large panels of bipartisan heavyweights reviewing the Pentagon’s four-year defense studies. Everyone in Washington seems to have been swept up in the tide; even some of the most careful, independent analysts are on board. As Todd Harrison of the Center for Strategic and International Studies noted, “We are stretched too thin.… We are trying to do too much with the size force that we have all around the world.” All this **hand-wringing** is happening about a ground force that, after nearly two decades of war, is highly experienced and primed — and largely back at home; a Navy that is larger than any other navy in the world and the only one with global reach; an Air Force that is larger and more technologically advanced than any other, flying, bombing, tanking, airlifting globally. America’s is the only military that has global basing, logistics, communications, transportation, and intelligence; nobody else, not the Chinese and certainly not the Russians, comes even close. But this is Washington, where the **policy and analytical sheep gather under one tree to be safe from the storm of political criticism**. The British novelist Lawrence Durrell comes to mind: “How nugatory and how glum / The endomorphs of scholarship / Like hippos on a sinking ship / Stand bum to silly bum.” (Just replace scholarship with politics and the comparison is apt.)
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#### Ext Cervis Evidence

#### Inequality resulted from legal decisions that harm workers---a new standard for antitrust is key.

Marshall Steinbaum and Maurice E. Stucke 20. \*\*Marshall Steinbaum is an Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Utah. \*\*Maurice Stucke is a Douglas A. Blaze Distinguished Professor of Law, University of Tennessee College of Law. The authors would like to thank Peter Carstensen, Bert Foer, Gene Kimmelman, Jack Kirkwood, Ganesh Sitaraman, Sandeep Vaheesan, Spencer Weber Waller, and participants in the April 2018 Roosevelt Institute Twenty-First Century Antitrust Conference for their helpful comments. “The Effective Competition Standard” The University of Chicago Law Review, Vol. 87, No. 2. March 2020. [https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/26892422.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A08eacf5273d0f26c135c4d0caa61682f](about:blank)

As we elaborate elsewhere,20 the consumer welfare standard has **numerous infirmities**, including the following: Under the consumer welfare standard, **competition is diminishing, which harms consumers, workers, and innovation**: The infirmities of the consumer welfare standard would be less alarming if the welfare of consumers **actually increased** over the past forty years. If that were the case, one could quibble that their welfare might have increased a little more under a better antitrust standard, but it would be a question of degree. The sad reality, however, is that competition, under the consumer welfare standard, has diminished significantly in many markets. The consumer welfare standard, it turns out, benefited **neither consumers nor their welfare.** • Difficulty in Reconciling the Consumer Welfare Standard with **Upstream Abuses**: The standard is hard to reconcile with plainly anticompetitive restraints that do not affect consumers and instead affect only upstream sellers and workers, such as no-poaching agreements. • **No Well-Accepted Definition**: The consumer welfare standard has **not** fostered global convergence. It means different things to different competition agencies around the world. • **Rule of Law Concerns**: Given the varying definitions of consumer welfare that exist, it is not surprising that courts have reached inconsistent results based on their own conceptions of consumer welfare. Rather than an objective standard, the consumer welfare standard invites considerable subjectivity—and, more to the point, tolerance of anticompetitive practices. Consequently, the consumer welfare standard provides **little guidance as an antitrust goal.** There remains no consensus on what the term actually means or who the consumers are. Under any of the current definitions, there remains “no easy, non-contestable method for quantifying harm to consumer welfare that will work for all cases.”21 Moreover, under this standard, antitrust has contributed to, rather than prevented, America’s current market power problem. Antitrust is supposed to play a critical role in promoting open and competitive markets. Today’s market power problem matters because society overall pays a stiff price. We end up with a less stable, **less efficient economy that generates less growth**, less public investment, and less opportunity.22 Our **democracy is weakened** with greater voter disillusionment and greater **distrust in our government** as 99 percent of the population are disempowered. The greatest cost imposed on society is “the erosion of our sense of identity in which fair play, equality of opportunity, and a sense of community are so important.”23 Economic policies entail choices, and all economic policies have distributive consequences. Much of America’s **economic inequality** resulted from deliberate legal and enforcement decisions, whereby the government, over the past forty years, failed to protect the 99 percent. Instead, the economically powerful used the government to enrich themselves at society’s expense. Because antitrust policy is a necessary (but not sufficient) tool to redress the market power problem, **it is time for a new antitrust standard**.

### DA – Infra

#### No impact to AI – it’s fear-mongering.

Adam Coates 17. \*\*Director, Baidu Research Silicon Valley AI Lab. \*\*Li Deng, chief AI officer, Citadel. \*\*Gary Bradski, chief technology officer, Arraiy. “Ask the AI experts: Should we be afraid of AI?” McKinsey & Co. [https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/mckinsey-analytics/our-insights/ask-the-ai-experts-should-we-be-afraid-of-ai](about:blank)

Adam Coates, director, Baidu Research Silicon Valley AI Lab: I do think sometimes we get carried away and start to think about sentient machines—machines that are just going to understand everything the way that we do and totally interact with us like a human. I think that stuff is pretty far away. And a lot of the scare mongering around AI taking over the world, AI doing all of these things that are negative aspects of the technology that we don’t control, I think these are a little bit overwrought.

When I think about the power of AI, the thing that we’re really, really good at is that we can take inputs and map them to outputs. This is a prediction problem that we’re unbelievably good at. And within that framework, there are just so many positive things we can do that a lot of this other stuff about sentience feels to me like a distraction.

Li Deng, chief AI officer, Citadel: For the people who actually work on artificial intelligence, we worry about if there are certain kinds of behavior we want to correct, and that it takes so much thinking involved to make that happen. People talk about the danger of AI, if it is going to harm humans—I think that kind of argument is really overhyped. I think it overestimates the technology in terms of the speed of advancement.

Gary Bradski, chief technology officer, Arraiy: Deep nets [deep neural networks, also known as deep learning] are a data-flow architecture. You train them up, you pour something in, you get pattern recognition or large-scale pattern matching coming out the other side. There’s no thought in there. There’s nothing like sentience. These things are pattern recognizers. They’re not something that thinks. They can innovate to an extent, where you feed it one pattern, and then it can put another pattern, or a picture, in the style of another pattern. But that’s built in by its training. The networks don’t wake up and say, “I’m gonna invent a new kind of game,” or whatever. So there’s been very little progress on what you’d call real living intelligence. It’s not clear why you would want it [real living intelligence], except for space exploration and in other dangerous areas—then you do want things to be able to fend for themselves and live autonomously and repair themselves. But mostly you don’t want your washing machine thinking for itself too much.

#### AI decreases the risk of nuke war.

Edward Geist & Andrew J. Lohn 18. \*\*Associate policy researcher at RAND and PhD in Russian history, University of North Carolina. \*\*Engineer at RAND who applies mathematical and machine learning techniques into cyberwarfare, AI, and drone delivery and a PhD in electrical engineering, UC Santa Cruz. “How Might Artificial Intelligence Affect the Risk of Nuclear War?” RAND Corporation. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE296.html](about:blank).

One example discussed in the workshops was an AI that acts as a decision support system. Without being directly connected to the nuclear launchers, an AI could still provide advice to humans on matters of escalation. It seems reasonable that such a capability, at least for some aspects of the decisionmaking process, could be achieved by 2040 given the progress AI is making in increasingly complex and poorly specified tasks. Alarmists might be concerned that such a capability could be incorporated before it is sufficiently robust or without fully understanding its limitations. If an AI adviser were proven effective, however, it could increase stability by reducing the likelihood of human error and by providing radical transparency, which could reduce the risk of miscalculation. But many experts were concerned by the potential for an adversary to subvert even a very capable AI by hacking, poisoning its training data, or manipulating its inputs.

Maintaining strategic stability in the coming decades will require revisiting the foundations of deterrence theory in a multipolar world. Effective deterrence will require us to contend with the rapidly changing set of capabilities being driven by progress in AI. Key considerations include the impact of the actual capabilities, the perceived potential of those capabilities (whether they exist or not), and the premature use or fallibility of those capabilities, especially as a result of adversarial actions. With care and some forward-thinking, these risks can potentially be identified and mitigated.