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#### Labor market monopsony collapses the economy---inequality and wage stagnation.

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.

#### Antitrust law permits labor market concentration---that fuels inequality

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 soft power

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.

#### And causes neo-isolationist nativism---undermines global coop

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.”

#### Multilat solves extinction---it’s the pivotal moment to avert breakdown.

Edith M. Lederer 9/11/2021. Associated Press. "UN chief: World is at `pivotal moment' and must avert crises". Washington Post. 6-24-2021. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/un-chief-world-is-at-pivotal-moment-and-must-avert-crises/2021/09/11/ff58806c-1323-11ec-baca-86b144fc8a2d\_story.html

UNITED NATIONS — U.N. Secretary-General Antonio Guterres issued a dire warning that the world is moving in the wrong direction and faces “a pivotal moment” where continuing business as usual could lead to a breakdown of global order and a future of perpetual crisis. Changing course could signal a breakthrough to a greener and safer future, he said.

The U.N. chief said the world’s nations and people must reverse today’s dangerous trends and choose “the breakthrough scenario.”

The world is under “enormous stress” on almost every front, he said, and the COVID-19 pandemic was a wake-up call demonstrating the failure of nations to come together and take joint decisions to help all people in the face of a global life-threatening emergency.

Guterres said this “paralysis” extends far beyond COVID-19 to the failures to tackle the climate crisis and “our suicidal war on nature and the collapse of biodiversity,” the “unchecked inequality” undermining the cohesion of societies, and technology’s advances “without guard rails to protect us from its unforeseen consequences.”

In other signs of a more chaotic and insecure world, he pointed to rising poverty, hunger and gender inequality after decades of decline, the extreme risk to human life and the planet from nuclear war and a climate breakdown, and the inequality, discrimination and injustice bringing people into the streets to protest “while conspiracy theories and lies fuel deep divisions within societies.”

In a horizon-scanning report presented to the General Assembly and at a press conference Friday, Guterres said his vision for the “breakthrough scenario” to a greener and safer world is driven by “the principle of working together, recognizing that we are bound to each other and that no community or country, however powerful, can solve its challenges alone.”

The report -- “Our Common Agenda” -- is a response to last year’s declaration by world leaders on the 75th anniversary of the United Nations and the request from the assembly’s 193 member nations for the U.N. chief to make recommendations to address the challenges for global governance.

In today’s world, Guterres said, “Global decision-making is fixed on immediate gain, ignoring the long-term consequences of decisions -- or indecision.”

He said multilateral institutions have proven to be “too weak and fragmented for today’s global challenges and risks.”

What’s needed, Guterres said, is not new multilateral bureaucracies but more effective multilateral institutions including a United Nations “2.0” more relevant to the 21st century.

“And we need multilateralism with teeth,” he said.

In the report outlining his vision “to fix” the world, Guterres said immediate action is needed to protect the planet’s “most precious” assets from oceans to outer space, to ensure it is livable, and to deliver on the aspirations of people everywhere for peace and good health.

He called for an immediate global vaccination plan implemented by an emergency task force, saying “investing $50 billion in vaccinations now could add an estimated $9 trillion to the global economy in the next four years.”

The report proposes that a global Summit of the Future take place in 2023 that would not only look at all these issues but go beyond traditional security threats “to strengthen global governance of digital technology and outer space, and to manage future risks and crises,” he said.

It would also consider a New Agenda for Peace including measures to reduce strategic risks from nuclear weapons, cyber warfare and lethal autonomous weapons, which Guterres called one of humanity’s most destabilizing inventions.

#### Soft power and international coop solve extinction.

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.

#### Prioritizing worker welfare solves inequality

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

In this Note, I show that the union exemption should be read to encompass a broader concern for the welfare of workers. In other words, antitrust law should be seen not merely as protecting consumers from producers, but also labor from capital. My primary justification is drawn from welfare economics and the “theory of the second best,” which suggests that when a certain market distortion cannot be removed, it may be economically optimal (i.e., the next best option) to introduce a countervailing distortion.21 An ideal competitive labor market would have no market power on either the supply side or demand side, but some degree of rent-extracting market power on the demand side (i.e., firms) is inevitable due to the limited resources of enforcement agencies and labor-market frictions. If concentration is inevitable among employers, permitting concentration among workers is the next best way to (1) counteract abuse and rent-extractive behavior from employers and (2) move income from capitalists to workers, who by virtue of their relatively low income may receive higher marginal utility from income.22 Further justification can be found in the legislative history of the major antitrust statutes. During congressional debate over the antitrust laws, key legislators expressed their intent not only to preserve the organizing power of labor, but also to support affirmatively the accumulation of labor power to contest concentrations of capital.23 Thus, legislative intent provides justification for worker welfare beyond a strictly economic reading of the antitrust laws. Even when labor organizing may not be the most “efficient” economic choice,24 it may still comport with the drafters’ goal of protecting individuals from the economic power of corporations.

### 1AC---modelling adv

#### Global competition standards use 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 prevents global fascism.

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 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.

#### Extinction

Alex de Waal 16. Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School at Tufts University. 12-5-2016. “Garrison America and the Threat of Global War.” http://bostonreview.net/war-security-politics-global-justice/alex-de-waal-garrison-america-and-threat-global-war

Trump’s promises have been so vague that it will be hard for him to disappoint. Nonetheless, many of his supporters will wake up to the fact that they have been duped, or realize the futility of voting for a wrecker out of a sense of alienated desperation. The progressives’ silver lining to the 2016 election is that, had Clinton won, the Trump constituency would have been back in four years’ time, probably with a more ruthless and ideological candidate. Better for plutocratic populism to fail early. But the damage inflicted in the interim could be terrible—even irredeemable if it were to include swinging a wrecking ball at the Paris Climate Agreement out of simple ignorant malice.

Polanyi recounts how economic and financial crisis led to global calamity. Something similar could happen today. In fact we are already in a steady unpicking of the liberal peace that glowed at the turn of the millennium. Since approximately 2008, the historic decline in the number and lethality of wars appears to have been reversed. Today’s wars are not like World War I, with formal declarations of war, clear war zones, rules of engagement, and definite endings. But they are wars nonetheless.

What does a world in global, generalized war look like? We have an unwinnable “war on terror” that is metastasizing with every escalation, and which has blurred the boundaries between war and everything else. We have deep states—built on a new oligarchy of generals, spies, and private-sector suppliers—that are strangling liberalism. We have emboldened middle powers (such as Saudi Arabia) and revanchist powers (such as Russia) rearming and taking unilateral military action across borders (Ukraine and Syria). We have massive profiteering from conflicts by the arms industry, as well as through the corruption and organized crime that follow in their wake (Afghanistan). We have impoverishment and starvation through economic warfare, the worst case being Yemen. We have “peacekeeping” forces fighting wars (Somalia). We have regional rivals threatening one another, some with nuclear weapons (India and Pakistan) and others with possibilities of acquiring them (Saudi Arabia and Iran).

Above all, today’s generalized war is a conflict of destabilization, with big powers intervening in the domestic politics of others, buying influence in their security establishments, bribing their way to big commercial contracts and thereby corroding respect for government, and manipulating public opinion through the media. Washington, D.C., and Moscow each does this in its own way. Put the pieces together and a global political market of rival plutocracies comes into view. Add virulent reactionary populism to the mix and it resembles a war on democracy.

What more might we see? Economic liberalism is a creed of optimism and abundance; reactionary protectionism feeds on pessimistic scarcity. If we see punitive trade wars and national leaders taking preemptive action to secure strategic resources within the walls of their garrison states, then old-fashioned territorial disputes along with accelerated state-commercial grabbing of land and minerals are in prospect. We could see mobilization against immigrants and minorities as a way of enflaming and rewarding a constituency that can police borders, enforce the new political rightness, and even become electoral vigilantes.

Liberal multilateralism is a system of seeking common wins through peaceful negotiation; case-by-case power dealing is a zero-sum calculus. We may see regional arms races, nuclear proliferation, and opportunistic power coalitions to exploit the weak. In such a global political marketplace, we would see middle-ranking and junior states rewarded for the toughness of their bargaining, and foreign policy and security strategy delegated to the CEOs of oil companies, defense contractors, bankers, and real estate magnates.

The United Nations system appeals to leaders to live up to the highest standards. The fact that they so often conceal their transgressions is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. A cabal of plutocratic populists would revel in the opposite: applauding one another’s readiness to tear up cosmopolitan liberalism and pursue a latter-day mercantilist naked self-interest. Garrison America could opportunistically collude with similarly constituted political-military business regimes in Russia, China, Turkey, and elsewhere for a new realpolitik global concert, redolent of the early nineteenth-century era of the Congress of Vienna, bringing a façade of stability for as long as they collude—and war when they fall out.

And there is a danger that, in response to a terrorist outrage or an international political crisis, President Trump will do something stupid, just as Europe’s leaders so unthinkingly strolled into World War I. The multilateral security system is in poor health and may not be able to cope.

Underpinning this is a simple truth: the plutocratic populist order is a future that does not work. If illustration were needed of the logic of hiding under the blanket rather than facing difficult realities, look no further than Trump’s readiness to deny climate change.

We have been here before, more or less, and from history we can gather important lessons about what we must do now. The importance of defending civility with democratic deliberation, respecting human rights and values, and maintaining a commitment to public goods and the global commons—including the future of the planet—remain evergreen. We need to find our way to a new 1945—and the global political settlement for a tamed and humane capitalism—without having to suffer the catastrophic traumas of trying everything else first.

#### Specifically, the Philippines mirrors the US consumer welfare standard

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.

#### Antitrust is key to combat weakened growth and rising income inequality

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.

2. Income Inequality in the Philjopines Philippine economic literature establishes that market concentration, and conversely, weak market competition, **lead to limited growth and productivity.** The interplay of behavioral, regulatory, and structural constraints fosters within numerous industries the rise of an exclusive circle of dominant players.1 47 Antitrust analysis relies on economic indicators such as the price- cost margin ("PCM") and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index ("HHI), a ratio used to determine industrial concentration, to compare the monopolistic price markup and competitive prices. "In the presence of market power, the firms will be able to set prices above those prevailing under competitive conditions, leading to excessive economic profits or 'rents'." 148 These measures **directly affect the distribution of wealth**. A high HHI means that the industry is concentrated; only a few firms deliver the bulk of industry output and reap the profits therein. On the other hand, a high PCM means that firms are effectively denying to consumers what they could have enjoyed under competitive conditions. Using such economic tools in conjunction with industry analysis, one study found that: (i) deliberate government coddling led to concentration in telecommunications, power, manufacturing, textiles, and cement; (ii) cartel-like behavior persists in flour milling, cement, and inter-island shipping; (iii) entry barriers led to comparatively high domestic prices when compared to border prices; and (iv) entry barriers **sustained the operation of inefficient firms and allowed them to generate monopoly rents.** 149 The flipside of the issue is that more inclusive industries lead to lower figures of the HHI and PCM. One of the Philippines' best chronicled "success stories" on the matter relates to the airline industry. Owing to the various trade liberalization measures implemented during the 1990s-among them the deregulation of aviation-PCMs declined from 67% to 48%. The entry of new firms served to depress monopolistic prices and disperse the 150 profits enjoyed by a previous monopoly. The income inequality concern becomes **even more alarming** when one considers the interests of those within the poorest income strata in the Philippines. Latest statistics indicate that poverty incidence 51 **is at 21.6%.** This figure expresses that, as a fraction of the total number of individuals in the Philippines, around one-fifth live below the poverty threshold. The hardest-hit sectors are the farmers, fisher folk, and children, with poverty incidences at 3 4 .3 %, 3 4 .0%, and 3 1. 4 %, respectively. 152 Moreover, total family expenditure is broken down into food at 42.8%; housing, water, 945 electricity, and other fuels at 1 .1%; and education at . %. Such **figures spell destitution, especially considering that basic commodities are prone to cartelization** while electricity and fuels industries are lorded over by oligopolies. Thus, the stage is **set for antitrust and competition policy to step in.** In order to include redistributive justice as among its "final causes," 154 the law's advocates must identify the specific mechanisms through which economic wealth can be equitably distributed.

**That’s key to prevent terrorism**

**Reuters 17**. “Uneven growth could spark extremism, instability in Southeast Asia – Malaysian PM.” Asian Correspondent. April 28. <https://asiancorrespondent.com/2017/04/uneven-growth-spark-extremism-instability-southeast-asia-malaysian-pm/#XXlMKJU7B9ixeQdP.97>

MALAYSIAN Prime Minister Najib Razak on Friday warned that Southeast Asian countries needed to ensure their economic growth was inclusive, or risk marginalised populations turning to violent extremism or even overturning political systems. Speaking at an event for entrepreneurs during the Association of South East Asian Nations (Asean) summit in Manila, Najib said the region was posting strong growth that could see Asean become the world’s fourth-largest economy, but that growth needed to be equitable. “We do not want our citizens to be marginalised in the age of extremism and radicalisation,” he said. “We know that those who see no hope in their own societies are more prone to the siren calls of terrorists who can and exploit their vulnerability and fill them with their lies.” Islamist extremism is expected to be high on the agenda during this week’s meetings, with fears for Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines about piracy and the rising threat of Islamic State. Of particular concern is the ease in which militants can acquire weapons, seek refuge with existing rebel groups and move between the many islands between the three countries.

#### 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.

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

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.

### 1AC---democracy adv

#### Congressional inaction in antitrust 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 SOP

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.

#### 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 unconstitutional. 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.

#### Congressional action key to democracy---alternative cedes power.

Harry First and Spencer Weber Waller 13. Harry First, New York University School of Law. Spencer Weber Waller, Loyola University Chicago School of Law. “Antitrust’s Democracy Deficit”. Fordham Law Review, Volume 81 Issue 5 Article 13. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4890&context=flr

The recommendation that Congress shift its focus to major issues is particularly critical to reinvigorating Congress’s role in antitrust policy. It is simply more important to probe whether merger enforcement has now been virtually limited to mergers to monopoly than to hold hearings into whether a particular merger in a particular industry is a good idea. Similarly, reasonable people can differ over whether a particular antitrust provision should be enforced more vigorously, less vigorously, or simply repealed, but we doubt any Congress since the passage of the Sherman Act would simply say, “We don’t care, do whatever you want.” We may not like the results of what Congress says on any particular issue, but it remains the only directly democratically accountable branch of government and the one most clearly charged with setting the broad parameters of fundamental public policy. It should speak, as it does in most other areas of our complex economy, and not have its silence used as an excuse for self-interested actors to shift power in their favor when the legislature chooses to turn to other pressing issues of the day

#### 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 every impact---it’s 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.

### 1AC---plan

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

### 1AC---solvency

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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

#### 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.

#### Worker welfare can easily be assessed by the Courts.

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.**

## 2AC

### 2AC---inequality adv

#### Big Tech isn’t innovative, it’s replacing innovative startups.

Alexis C. Madrigal 20. a contributing writer at The Atlantic, a co-founder of the COVID Tracking Project. "Silicon Valley Abandons the Culture That Made It the Envy of the World." Atlantic. 1-15-2020. https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2020/01/why-silicon-valley-and-big-tech-dont-innovate-anymore/604969/

But there’s a more troubling possibility. Maybe something has changed about the nature of innovation, at least in software.

The start-up tradition traces back to Hewlett-Packard, the original company-in-a-garage, in 1937, and later to the Fairchildren of the 1960s, a tangle of semiconductor companies that successively spun out of larger companies, one after the other. The go-your-own-way ethos infused later cohorts of entrepreneurs across the spectrum of technologies, all the way up through the 20th century. The best thing you could be in Silicon Valley was a founder, and the best thing a founder could do was supercede those who came before.

The newest generation of companies has not been able to fulfill the latter half of that prophecy. It’s more difficult to dislodge the elder companies, which have grown ever more entrenched and valuable. CB Insights, a research firm, recently added up the (likely inflated) value of all 439 “unicorns”—start-ups that investors have valued at more than $1 billion—in the world. It got roughly $1.3 trillion, or about one Apple’s worth of market value. Remember, that figure accounts for hardly tech companies, such as Juul; so-far dubious technologies, such as augmented-reality headsets from Magic Leap (valued at $6.3 billion on this list); and all the Chinese and Indian players.

For start-ups not on the unicorn list—and even for many that are—the chance that they will have an initial public offering and remain independent is small. That means the only way their investors will get their money out will be via an acquisition by one of the large companies. Google, Facebook, and their ilk “have become enormous by swallowing small companies, so the network is no longer the network but the octopus,” Margaret O’Mara, a historian at the University of Washington, told me.

This could alter the course of technological development, not just corporate structures. Quantitative research suggests that big companies do different kinds of R&D than their more modest counterparts. Instead of coming up with new products, they come up with process improvements. “If the nature of innovation is distorted toward selling to an incumbent, you’re going to get more feature-driven innovation rather than systemic disruption,” Federal Trade Commissioner Rohit Chopra told me. As an example, O’Mara told me a story famous in Silicon Valley about how Xerox had a personal computer in its hands in the 1970s (thanks, Alan Kay!) but declined to commercialize it. “You get to a certain degree of bigness, and you’re making so much darn money on copy machines, why on Earth would you work on a PC and bring it to market?” O’Mara said. Apple, a start-up at the time, would famously popularize PCs instead.

Even though small firms have been responsible for many of the Valley’s most successful products and services, large firms have deep roots there too. As O’Mara points out in her book The Code, Lockheed Missiles and Space (later a unit of Lockheed Martin) was the largest Silicon Valley employer from the 1950s into the 1980s. The government supported the development of computing and networking in myriad ways. During the Cold War, the U.S. government pushed research dollars through a select few major research universities such as Stanford. Local companies directly benefited from this largesse, in terms of both the funding and concentration of talent around Palo Alto. It wasn’t until the 1970s that the military-industrial beginnings of the technology industry gave way to a different understanding of how to make change in the world.

“The story the Valley told about itself has been very much a small-is-beautiful story since the 1970s,” O’Mara told me. “It has a politics—this Vietnam-era rejection of the military-industrial complex, rejection of the mainframe, Big Business, Big Government, big universities.”

This led people to take risks and launch new projects and firms. Entrepreneurs from all over the world migrated to a place where people understood why they wanted to start companies. And the idea even embedded itself right near the heart of the Valley, at Google. The company’s slogan, “Don’t be evil”, had a particular meaning when it was adopted around the millennium. In the classic Valley mind-set, “evil is bigness of all kinds,” O’Mara said.

Now, of course, “the mainframe” has been replaced by the cloud, and companies such as Facebook have openly called for government regulation around key platform issues. The biggest companies moved closer and closer to Washington, D.C., during the Obama era, and despite some teeth-gnashing, stayed close after Donald Trump’s election.

#### 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.

#### Big tech is already under attack---FTC, DOJ, Congress, states, and EU

Margaret Harding Mcgill, 8-30-21. Axios. "Fall antitrust forecast: Biden raises hammer on Big Tech". Axios. 8-30-2021. https://www.axios.com/antitrust-big-tech-apple-google-amazon-facebook-2e619cf6-2fd9-48be-bc72-0e36cb7fdcfb.html

The antitrust scrutiny of tech giants that began during the Trump era will only intensify this fall as Big Tech critics Lina Khan, Tim Wu and Jonathan Kanter take the lead on competition policy and enforcement in the Biden administration. Why it matters: Facebook, Google, Amazon and Apple face threats from federal regulators, Congress, state attorneys general and European Union authorities. The big picture: That's four companies each being challenged from four directions: No wonder the antitrust arena can feel like three-dimensional chess. As the fall season looms, here's what the game board looks like: Facebook The Federal Trade Commission, now led by Khan, [renewed its legal effort](https://www.axios.com/ftc-accuses-facebook-of-buy-or-bury-scheme-in-new-antitrust-complaint-465b1a63-6d78-444d-9863-d34249604f48.html) challenging Facebook's acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp in August. The FTC accuses Facebook of buying rivals or using anticompetitive tactics to stymie them in order to squelch competition. What to watch: Facebook has until Oct. 4 to respond. The European Commission launched [an antitrust investigation](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_21_2848) of Facebook Marketplace in June over concerns that Facebook's collection of data from advertisers gives it an unfair advantage. What to watch: The United Kingdom announced a similar investigation in June that also focuses on Facebook's online dating service. In Congress, the House Judiciary Committee [narrowly approved](https://www.axios.com/house-committee-tech-competition-bills-pass-34dbc5fc-3075-4a89-beb6-2f59f6ea4915.html) a slate of tech antitrust bills, including one that would force more interoperability and another that would bar big companies from snapping up rivals through acquisitions. What to watch: Bipartisan companion legislation in the Senate would give these bills some momentum. Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) said in July he intends to introduce a bill that would curb mergers among big tech companies. Amazon The FTC has been investigating Amazon's business practices since the Trump administration and [is also digging](https://www.wsj.com/articles/amazons-planned-purchase-of-mgm-to-be-reviewed-by-ftc-11624379614) into the e-commerce giant's plan to buy Hollywood studio MGM. What to watch: Amazon wants Khan [to recuse herself](https://www.axios.com/amazon-ftc-chief-recusal-antitrust-ecb53fe6-8cc9-476f-813c-00b7b1346cfb.html) from FTC's Amazon cases, given her previous advocacy of action against the company. The European Commission accused Amazon last November of [violating antitrust rules](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_2077) by harnessing data it collects from third-party sellers to shape the products it offers that compete with those merchants. What to watch: The commission also opened a separate investigation into how Amazon selects which products get the coveted "Buy Box" label. But a Financial Times story in March suggested that case has been an [uphill climb](https://www.ft.com/content/d5bb5ebb-87ef-4968-8ff5-76b3a215eefc). In Congress, Amazon faces the potential for drastic changes to its business model through the House antitrust bills that would bar it from both operating its online marketplaces and selling goods on them. What to watch: Amazon is [warning sellers](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/08/20/amazon-launches-website-to-warn-sellers-about-antitrust-bills.html) that they could bear the brunt of the cost if such legislation is enacted — and hoping those sellers will call their representatives. Google The Justice Department and several state attorneys general filed multiple antitrust lawsuits against Google last year, with the DOJ [accusing Google](https://www.axios.com/justice-department-sues-google-over-alleged-search-monopoly-e885ac43-b7a6-4dac-afe3-b5ca8402c833.html) of an illegal monopoly in online search and search advertising. What to watch: The judge in DOJ's case indicated it likely won't go to trial until 2023. President Joe Biden nominated Jonathan Kanter, an antitrust attorney who has battled Google on behalf of its tech foes, to lead the antitrust division of the DOJ, though he has not yet been confirmed by the Senate. In Congress, Google faces multiple legislative threats, from the House antitrust bills as well as legislation in both the House and the Senate that would [curb its power](https://www.axios.com/app-stores-bipartisan-senate-bill-google-apple-081c9949-ba90-4996-ad9f-fecc16029f9e.html) over its Google Play Store. What to watch: State attorneys general [also sued](https://www.axios.com/google-state-antitrust-lawsuit-b20ff43c-e0d5-4b5a-b064-5b091519d7cf.html) Google over how it operates its app store. The European Commission opened its [own investigation](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_3143) in June into Google's power in the online advertising ecosystem. What to watch: Previous European antitrust investigations into Google have led to billions of dollars in fines. Apple In Congress, Apple is facing proposed laws in both House and Senate that would limit its control over how it runs its App Store. What to watch: Apple recently offered [some concessions](https://www.axios.com/apple-settles-developer-class-action-c13bb308-daf3-4231-a399-ffd48b6b2c52.html) on its App Store policies to settle a class-action lawsuit — but not enough to satisfy those who back these bills. The European Commission, acting on a complaint by Spotify, accused Apple in April of [violating antitrust laws](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_2061) by requiring rival music streamers to use its in-app payment system and follow other rules. What to watch: The commission opened [a separate investigation](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_1073) in June to more broadly review Apple's rules for app developers. The Justice Department is [reportedly also investigating](https://www.politico.com/news/2020/06/24/justice-department-anti-trust-apple-337120) Apple for anticompetitive practices, although that probe has led to no charges so far.

#### No link and big-tech companies aren’t key.

Ganesh Sitaraman 20. Professor. “The National Security Case for Breaking Up Big Tech” Vanderbilt University Law School. 2020. <https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=663088101094067111125109085097113006019074041037048078090069008097017004119004010122107117023039103016043127077017079016077008031015032054022020121019008102008007010086011000024110101003093009026125020004074123005019020029106079113089098073024122005&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE>

Some might argue that robotics, AI, and quantum computing are so resource-intensive that an ecosystem of smaller companies engaged in fierce competition would mean that no company would have the resources available to invest in those next-generation technologies. There are a few responses to this argument. First, it is not clear that breaking up and regulating big tech would **prevent those firms from having the considerable resources** to develop the technologies of the future. Facebook would still have billions of users, even without Instagram and WhatsApp, for example. Amazon’s platform would still have enormous market power. Second, and more importantly, part of the answer is that the decision to break up and regulate tech companies should be accompanied by public investment in R&D. One of the primary arguments for the national champions view is that monopolists have the resources to be able to invest in innovation because they do not face competitive pressures.65 But any system of innovation operates against a backdrop of laws and public policy.66 The ability to capture the gains of innovation depends on intellectual property law. The possibility of winning government contracts for frontier projects that require innovation is determined by procurement policies. And, of course, an alternative to monopolist investment in R&D is public investment in R&D. These policy choices all shape the innovation ecosystem, and it is not at all obvious why society has to accept national champions instead of thinking about revising these laws and policies more broadly. Given the emphasis that proponents of national champions place on research and development, it is worth noting that historically, as Mariana Mazzucato has argued, **government** has been a significant driver of innovation through its research and development efforts.67 Today, one could easily imagine the **government spending considerable sums of money on R&D in artificial intelligence**, robotics, quantum computing, augmented and virtual reality, and other technological research. Public investment in research has a **variety of benefits**. First, because it is not tied to the profit motive and business model of a single company, it **covers a wider range of subjects**, leading potentially to innovations that would otherwise go undiscovered. Public investment extends to basic research that does not have immediate or foreseeable commercial appli- cations. It could also include research into areas that might challenge the incumbency and business models of existing companies. Second, and relatedly, public investment into research is less likely to be geared toward improving surveillance capacity. As long as the **biggest companies have surveillance, personalized targeting, and behavioral response at the heart of their business models,** research and innovation within those companies will likely **be geared, in no trivial part, toward improving those activities**. A digital authoritarian country might see that as a valuable public goal, but it is not at all clear why a free and democratic society should. Public-sponsored research might instead be directed toward a variety of socially beneficial uses other than continual improvement of individual monitoring and behavioral reactions. Nota- bly, as there are more opportunities in research outside of the big tech companies, many talented people might choose to work on a wider range of problems. Third, public investment in R&D has the potential to spread the bene- fits of technology, innovation, and industry throughout the country. At present, much of the country’s technological and intellectual prowess is concentrated in a few regions, the most prominent being northern Cali- fornia, Seattle, and Boston. **Geographic inequality has a variety of negative consequences**—economic, social, and political.68 But, as economists Jonathan Gruber and Simon Johnson show in their book Jump-Starting America, there is no reason that public investment couldn’t spur suc- cessful economies in dozens of mid-sized cities all over the country, with spillover benefits for their regions.69 Unlike government action, technol- ogy companies have no reason to develop the capacities of all regions of the country. Amazon’s so-called competition for its second headquarters is a good example. After much public attention, the company settled on New York City and a suburb of Washington, D.C., two superstar cities. Artificial intelligence, of course, requires considerable data in order to improve precision and accuracy. One of the arguments for big tech is that such companies alone are able to collect this data and use it. But there is **no reason why this has to be the case either**. Consider two alternate possibilities. First, the United States could create a **public data commons** that would be highly regulated to protect privacy. The public data commons would include publicly available data from a variety of govern- ment sources, and qualifying businesses, local governments, or nonprof- its could train their machines using this data. Any new data they collect from users could then be fed back into the data commons (de-identified), so that the data commons improves in quality and quantity of data over time.70 Second, we could imagine requiring big tech companies to make their data available in interoperable formats. If these companies effectively have a monopoly power over data, then they could be regulated as monopolies—and one condition of their continued protection as monopolies could be **enabling access to the datasets**. Again, there is no legal or regulatory reason why these kinds of policy options are impossible. And in either case, they would **enable a larger number of players to innovate than does the status-quo**, stand-pat approach to protecting big tech from competition.

#### 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>

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 in 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.

#### 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.

### 2AC---modelling adv

### 2AC---democracy adv

### 2AC---T-prohibit

#### w/m---the plan prohibits activity.

Leon B. Greenfield, et al. 20. Perry A. Lange & Nicole Callan, Antitrust Populism and theConsumer Welfare Standard: What Are We Actually Debating?, 83 Antitrust L.J. 393(2020).

1. Public Interest Considerations in Merger Review

Under a "public interest" standard, mergers could be prohibited for reasons going beyond competitive harm, such as reduced wages, job cuts, or harm to small business. Critics of a public interest test argue that it would unconstructively inject social and political concerns into enforcement. For example, Di-ana Moss of the American Antitrust Institute (which generally advocates for aggressive antitrust enforcement) has warned that a public interest standard would introduce uncertainty into the antitrust laws and "could include every-thing that is affected by a merger or abusive conduct: employment, health and safety, and even environmental concerns."168

#### the aff is an antitrust prohibition of anticompetitive practices.

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

Antitrust law helps workers and increases output by penalizing firms that use anticompetitive methods—above all, firms that concentrate labor markets by merging and firms that collude with each other by entering no-poaching agreements and the like. The law thus raises residual supply elasticity—or, in other words, competition—which forces employers to bid up wages toward the competitive level. Antitrust law does not directly regulate wages, of course; wages increase as a result of the penalizing of anticompetitive behavior. Nor does antitrust law offset the distortions introduced into labor markets by labor monopsony—in the way that certain fiscal and related policies can, as we will see. Let us now turn to other policy tools that can be used to counter labor monopsony.

#### c/i---Prohibitions are any proscribed conduct in antitrust.

Margaret V. Sachs 01. Robert Cotten Alston Professor of Law, University of Georgia School of Law. A.B. 1973, Harvard University; J.D. 1977, Harvard Law School. “Harmonizing Civil and Criminal Enforcement of Federal Regulatory Statutes: The Case of The Securities Exchange Act Of 1934”. https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2001/06/Sachs.pdf

Many federal regulatory statutes are hybrid statutes—their prohibitions1 are enforceable in criminal actions as well as in private or govern- mental civil actions (or both).2 Leading examples include the Sherman Antitrust Act,3 the Clean Water Act,4 the Truth in Lending Act,5 the False Claims Act,6 the Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations Act,7 the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act,8 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.9 Hybrid statutes present an important question that has divided courts but received virtually no attention from legal scholars—can the same prohibition mean different things in different enforcement contexts?10

---FOOTNOTE 1 STARTS---

1. For purposes of this article, the term “prohibition” refers to the part of the statute that identifies proscribed conduct. The plaintiff must prove that the defendant engaged in this conduct in order to establish a prima facie case.

---FOOTNOTE 1 ENDS---

### 2AC---T-anticompetitive

#### w/m---the aff is an antitrust prohibition of anticompetitive practices.

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

Antitrust law helps workers and increases output by penalizing firms that use anticompetitive methods—above all, firms that concentrate labor markets by merging and firms that collude with each other by entering no-poaching agreements and the like. The law thus raises residual supply elasticity—or, in other words, competition—which forces employers to bid up wages toward the competitive level. Antitrust law does not directly regulate wages, of course; wages increase as a result of the penalizing of anticompetitive behavior. Nor does antitrust law offset the distortions introduced into labor markets by labor monopsony—in the way that certain fiscal and related policies can, as we will see. Let us now turn to other policy tools that can be used to counter labor monopsony.

#### c/i---Any competition distortion---includes per se or rule of reason.

Charlotte Wezi Mesikano-Malonda 16. Executive director. "Global Competition Review". No Publication. 7-22-2016. https://globalcompetitionreview.com/review/the-european-middle-eastern-and-african-antitrust-review/the-european-middle-eastern-and-african-antitrust-review-2017/article/malawi-competition-and-fair-trading-commission

Anticompetitive business practices are generally defined as the category of agreements, decisions and concerted practices that result in the prevention, restriction or distortion of either actual or potential competition. Abuse of dominance and market power is an example of anticompetitive business practices and hence falls within the purview of the CFTA.3 Anticompetitive business practices are either illegal per se or illegal by rule of reason. A conduct is illegal per se if, regardless of its objective and effect or any justifications of the conduct, there is a presumption of harm on competition.

#### aff ground---everything that’s anticompetitive is already illegal. Any aff that meets their standard is non-inherent.

Ivy Wigmore 19. Content Editor. "What is anti-competitive practice?". WhatIs. xx-xx-xxxx. https://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/anti-competitive-practice

An anti-competitive practice is an action conducted by one or more businesses to make it difficult or impossible for other companies to enter or succeed in their market. The market distortion resulting from anti-competitive practices can result in higher prices, poorer service and a stifling of innovation, among other effects. As such, anti-competitive practices are illegal in most countries and are prohibited under antitrust law in the United States.

### 2AC---T-practices

#### c/i---Any competition distortion---includes per se or rule of reason.

Charlotte Wezi Mesikano-Malonda 16. Executive director. "Global Competition Review". No Publication. 7-22-2016. https://globalcompetitionreview.com/review/the-european-middle-eastern-and-african-antitrust-review/the-european-middle-eastern-and-african-antitrust-review-2017/article/malawi-competition-and-fair-trading-commission

Anticompetitive business practices are generally defined as the category of agreements, decisions and concerted practices that result in the prevention, restriction or distortion of either actual or potential competition. Abuse of dominance and market power is an example of anticompetitive business practices and hence falls within the purview of the CFTA.3 Anticompetitive business practices are either illegal per se or illegal by rule of reason. A conduct is illegal per se if, regardless of its objective and effect or any justifications of the conduct, there is a presumption of harm on competition.

### 2AC---adv cp

#### Regulations can’t adapt to market conditions.

Howard Shelanski 21. Professor of Law, Georgetown University; Partner, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP. “Antitrust and Deregulation.” *Yale Law Journal* (127): 1951-1953. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/Shelanski_kcn6n4k3.pdf>.

A longstanding debate examines the comparative advantages of antitrust and regulation. The late Cornell economist Alfred Kahn, the architect of airline deregulation in the Carter Administration, wrote that “society’s choices are always between or among imperfect systems, but that, wherever it seems likely to be effective, even very imperfect competition is preferable to regulation.”117 Kahn does not address antitrust in that quotation, but it suggests that he would find antitrust law’s more targeted, case-by-case approach to governing competition to be preferable to regulation. Indeed, Kahn elsewhere wrote, while expressing his “belief in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws,” that “the antitrust laws are not just another form of regulation but an alternative to it—indeed, its very opposite.”118 Then-Judge Stephen Breyer has similarly stated that “antitrust is not another form of regulation. Antitrust is an alternative to regulation and, where feasible, a better alternative.”119

The comparisons that Breyer and Kahn made were, in context, mostly between antitrust and rate regulation, where the agency was trying to protect consumers from monopoly pricing.120 But some of these criticisms, including “high cost; ineffectiveness and waste; procedural unfairness, complexity, and delay; unresponsiveness to democratic control; and the inherent unpredictability of the end result,” apply to most kinds of regulation.121 Regulation might well be worthwhile despite those potential drawbacks, but certain attributes—ex post and case-by-case enforcement, judicial oversight with the government bearing the burden of proof—make antitrust enforcement less vulnerable to those critiques.

Regulation can also be comparatively slow to adapt to new market conditions, and that delay can affect an entire regulated industry.122 Antitrust authorities also might fail to foresee relevant market changes, but their actions typically affect only one discrete case and they generally have flexibility, as conditions change, to modify relevant consent decrees and decline to pursue similar investigations or sanctions.123 It is harder for government agencies to make changes to established regulatory programs,124 making regulation more likely than antitrust to outlast the problems it was implemented to solve. Regulation’s delayed adaptation to changing conditions can be costly,125 especially as markets transition to more competitive structures.126 As Michael Boudin, a former DOJ antitrust official (and later federal judge) put it, “regulation almost always will be very difficult to dislodge, even if it proves mistaken. Almost any regulatory regime will develop a constituency, armed with congressmen and self-interested bureaucrats . . . [and] become[] the foundation on which private arrangements are constructed, arrangements that cannot easily be discarded.”127

#### Antitrust is key to legitimacy

Sanjukta Paul 20. Assistant professor of law at Wayne State University and a fellow of the Thurman Arnold Project at Yale, and she studies both antitrust and labor law. Her book project on the development of antitrust law from working people’s perspective, Solidarity in the Shadow of Antitrust, is under contract with Cambridge University Press. Parts of this testimony draw upon that project. "Antitrust Law’s Current Stance Toward Workers Violates Its Original Purpose to Balance Power With Powerful Firms". ProMarket. 2-13-2020. https://promarket.org/2020/02/13/antitrust-laws-current-stance-toward-workers-violates-its-original-purpose-to-balance-power-with-powerful-firms/

While labor law reform is also necessary, this is not a problem that antitrust law can afford to outsource or ignore. Indeed, antitrust law’s current bias against democratic cooperation—including coordination among workers—and in favor of top-down corporate control has contributed more broadly to the institutional weakness and perceived illegitimacy of workers’ collective action rights, even when those rights are grounded in labor law.

Given the original purposes of antitrust law, its current stance toward workers is perverse. It should do more to restrain the control exerted by powerful firms, from franchisors to ride-share platforms to trucking companies, over workers and small players. At the same time, it should not impose obstacles upon workers’ attempts to engage in collective bargaining or other collective action in order to better their conditions, by balancing the bargaining power of more powerful contracting parties. And in navigating these and all other issues arising under antitrust law, decision-makers should not justify harms to workers by means of often-speculative benefits to consumers.

### 2AC---states cp

#### State labor actions 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/>

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

#### The DOJ and FTC undermine states.

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

#### FTC is key to modelling.

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

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

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

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

### 2AC---infrastructure da

#### no link---plan is popular.

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

**Left and right seem to be converging** here. **Progressives** are concerned that corporate power **threatens equality**, **conservatives** are concerned that it **threatens individual liberty**, and both are concerned that it threatens innovation. A **populist critique** of corporate power run amok may also **be good politics**. Political culture in the United States has never abandoned the Jeffersonian ideal of the yeoman farmer or independent artisan, nor has it abandoned its characteristic distrust of major institutions. There is now a Congressional Antitrust Caucus, and numerous foundations are sponsoring research into the causes and consequence of market concentration. This is all part of a renewed and **essential focus on structural inequality** and generally for the good.

#### Manchin and House progressives fighting over reconciliation- blocks infrastructure

Andrew Solender, 9-12-2021, "Tensions Erupt As Manchin Slams AOC, Warns ‘America Will Recoil’ At Progressives’ Infrastructure Threats," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewsolender/2021/09/12/tensions-erupt-as-manchin-slams-aoc-warns-america-will-recoil-at-progressives-infrastructure-threats/?sh=1692bd83b7fb

Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) on Sunday tore into progressives amid an ongoing conflict over various spending bills, warning of political backlash against House progressives if they sink a bipartisan infrastructure bill and labeling allegations from Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) about his ties with oil lobbyists as “totally false.”

Manchin warned in a CNN interview that if progressives kill the $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill, they will have to tell constituents, “I don’t care about the roads and bridges, you don’t need it,” adding, “If they play politics with the needs of America… America will recoil.”

The moderate West Virginia senator repeatedly said in the interview he opposes $3.5 trillion in social spending as part of Democrats’ budget reconciliation bill, a key demand of progressives in the House who say they are willing to vote down the infrastructure bill.

Manchin refused to give an alternative figure, but floated $1 trillion or $1.5 trillion as possible viable alternatives, figures that would be unlikely to satiate the dozens of progressives demanding “robust” reconciliation spending.

#### Compromises mean their impact may be eliminated, underfunded to ineffectiveness, or delayed for years

David Dayen, 9-14-2021, executive editor, "Infrastructure Summer: The Sophie’s Choice of the Reconciliation Bill," American Prospect, https://prospect.org/infrastructure/building-back-america/infrastructure-summer-sophies-choice-of-the-reconciliation-bill/

THIS HOBSON’S CHOICE, figuring out whether to live with less on every policy in the Build Back Better Act, or to jettison some and make sure the policies remaining actually work and are politically potent, is agonizing for advocates and members of Congress. In a better world, this choice wouldn’t exist; the policies reflect critical human needs, and deciding to punt on them yet again should be unacceptable. But the axis of Sens. Joe Manchin (D-WV) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-AZ) has decided that they must have a cap on both spending and revenues, which is forcing these difficult conversations.

Adding to the frustration is the sheer number of policies in the legislation. When you put all your priorities as a party into one bill, you draw in every member who’s been fighting for one part or another for years. But when the overall toplines get cut, nobody wants to take out their pet project. The only other option is to cut everything across the board, which can lead to a slew of ineffective half measures.

We’re seeing this play out in several ways. Some programs, like HCBS, are just being cut. Others, like the dental benefit in Medicare, are being delayed for several years. This makes it look cheaper within the ten-year budget window.

#### Debt ceiling thumps

BURGESS EVERETT and HEATHER CAYGLE, 9-12-2021, "Dems hurtle toward a new fiscal cliff," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/12/dems-toil-to-avoid-default-shutdown-in-pivotal-fall-511158

Democrats’ internal wrangling over a massive new social spending plan will soon be eclipsed by much more urgent problems: avoiding an economic collapse and a government shutdown.

There is growing worry among some rank-and-file Democrats that their tunnel-vision mentality on a $3.5 trillion budget reconciliation bill could provoke economic blowback if Republicans hold the line and tank efforts to lift the debt ceiling. And Democrats' threadbare majorities in Congress are leaving the party with little time to wriggle out of a dangerous economic morass that could overwhelm their other priorities, from voting rights to tax increases on the wealthy to a sweeping expansion of the social safety net.

#### Nothing will pass, tons of thumpers, and Biden’s PC is sapped

Anita Kumar and Christopher Cadelago, 9-7-2021, Senior Editor, Standards & Ethics for POLITICO; White House correspondent. "Abortion fight adds to Biden’s growing policy backlog," POLITICO, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/07/abortion-fight-biden-policy-510003>

Biden and his fellow Democrats are currently trying to come up with a $ 3.5 trillion reconciliation program that would fund paid time off, child care and education, as well as climate change initiatives. They are also pushing a $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill to fix crumbling roads, bridges and sewers. The hope is that if Democrats push through these reforms, they can build momentum for other agenda items and the midterms beyond.

“When you look at what has been accomplished so far and what is almost inevitably going to happen in reconciliation, it’s a huge accomplishment,” said Democratic strategist Adrienne Elrod, who worked on Biden’s campaign. “Once we get past reconciliation, then I think some of the other top priorities that the president has consistently talked about from the election campaign until now… will come to the fore.”

But whatever momentum there was for reconciliation and infrastructure bills, it has been dashed in recent weeks. Biden faces the lowest approval ratings of his presidency so far, following the botched troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. The calendar also plays against the party. Congress is already engrossed in passing Biden’s two main spending bills and will soon have to grapple with efforts to maintain government funding and increase the federal borrowing limit. And by the end of the year, members of Congress will turn their attention to the campaign – first the midterms, then the next presidential race.

With the closing of legislative windows, the angst in many corners of the progressive ecosystem has grown stronger.

#### Biden’s green infrastructure is *too weak* to solve warming and *increases emissions*

Aronoff, 21 (Kate Aronoff is a staff writer at The New Republic, She is the co-author of A Planet To Win: Why We Need A Green New Deal, a fellow at the Type Media Center and a contributing writer to the Intercept, January 26 2021 “The Fossil Fuel Industry Thinks It Will Have a Good Year Under Biden” The New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/161048/fossil-fuel-oil-biden-stimulus>) MULCH

But the business press and industry analysts have presented a rather different story. Oilfield services companies are cautiously optimistic, after a rash of bankruptcies last year. The combined prospects of an economic stimulus and infrastructure package—both of which will boost fossil fuel demand—spell a more prosperous 2021 and 2022 for the world’s biggest polluters. Even Biden’s aspirations to “Build Back Better” with green jobs, Oslo-based energy consultancy Rystad Energy predicted last week, may well be welcome news to oil and gas producers. “Any ‘green’ focus of the infrastructure bill,” a company press release read, “will be mostly additive to overall short-term oil products demand due to construction activity, with risks mostly limited to medium-term oil demand, depending on the scope and success of the projects.” Stimulus measures, in other words, will increase energy demand in general. At least for now, that means more demand for fossil fuels. They call it the “Biden boost,” predicting an extra 350,000 barrels per day (bpd) for 2021 and 900,000 bpd for 2022, should he follow through on his promises. They do also note that new environmental rules, if carried out, could cause oil demand to start to fall toward the end of the 2020s. This may seem counterintuitive given Biden’s campaign promises. The mechanism isn’t complicated, though: There’s a stubborn link between growth in gross domestic product and greenhouse gas emissions. Even the greenest of recoveries is likely to boost both growth and emissions in the near term by putting people back to work and boosting consumer spending. Unless economic recovery policy includes sweeping, rapid changes to electrify and decarbonize the country and actively curtail fossil fuel production, even a stimulus that’s green on many other fronts could help emissions climb for years to come. Savvy U.S. polluters, of course, could still flourish even with new regulations. Federal lands—on which Biden has issued his two-month pause on new drilling leases and permits, allowing a select few Department of Interior officials to approve exceptions—are now home to just 14 percent of active land rigs. A recently released analysis by Morgan Stanley expects that large, diversified companies can simply reallocate all of their new drilling and planned investment to nonfederal land. While the bank predicts political pressure will put any permanent ban on leasing off the table, it projects tighter rules on everything from methane emissions to environmental reviews going forward. For many companies, that wouldn’t be a bad thing. “In effect,” Oil & Gas Journal writes of the bank’s findings, a Biden administration placing more climate-focused policy constraints on the industry “is constructive for the oil and gas macro—constraining supply and putting upward pressure on the marginal cost of shale production without impacting short-term demand.” Smaller firms that do a lot of business on federal land face big risks, of course. Yet larger and more integrated U.S. oil majors like Chevron are well insulated against even sweeping restrictions and “could benefit to the extent President Biden’s policies tighten the supply/demand balance for global oil & gas markets.”
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#### Inequality

Orsetta Causa 17. \*Senior economist, Ireland/Portugal desk, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). \*Mikkel Hermansen, economist, Bulgaria/Denmark desk, OECD. \*Nicolas Ruiz, senior economist, Estonia/Poland desk, OECD. "Does growth lead to inequality? It depends." OECD. 1-10-2017. https://oecdecoscope.blog/2017/01/10/does-growth-lead-to-inequality-it-depends/

Using a novel empirical framework, Hermansen et al. (2016) shed new light on the old growth and inequality nexus by assessing the impact of growth on household incomes across the distribution, that is, progressively encompassing poor, middle class and rich households. Their conclusion is that that there is no single answer to the growth and inequality question. Labour productivity growth is found to have contributed to rising market income inequality, while this was partly mitigated through government redistribution, on average across OECD countries over the past three decades (Chart 1, Panel A). By contrast, employment growth is found to have had an equalising impact, benefiting mostly and importantly households in the lower part of the income distribution (Chart 1, Panel B). Overall, these two forces have tended to offset each other and resulted in a broadly distribution-neutral impact of GDP per capita growth, on average across OECD countries over the last three decades. So, with reducing inequality remaining a defining challenge of the post-crisis era, promoting job creation is a key policy goal, in particular where employment rates still fall short of pre-crisis levels. But, perhaps more importantly, in looking for ways to revive productivity growth, governments need comprehensive policy strategies to ensure that the gains are more broadly shared across the population.

#### the tech labor market is competitive

Brittany Meiling, 7-31-21. San Diego Union-Tribune. "Employers bow to tech workers in hottest job market since the dot-com era". Los Angeles Times. 7-31-2021. https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2021-07-31/employers-bow-down-to-tech-workers-in-hottest-job-market

There’s an air of desperation among tech employers this summer. Software talent, it seems, is in such high demand that companies are morphing how they hire. And workers are the ones with the power. Good and experienced tech workers are being treated like celebrities — hounded by recruiters, courted by managers, and bestowed a bevy of options before choosing their next boss. “It makes you feel like you’re amazing, when really ... you’re just another software engineer that’s looking for a job,” said Henry Chesnutt, who just moved back to San Diego from San Francisco to work at the rapidly growing tech startup Flock Freight. The job outlook for workers like Chesnutt has been good for much of the last decade. But now, a multitude of factors are driving competition for talent to a level not seen in nearly 20 years, some recruiters say. “This is the most competitive market I can remember in my professional career, with many people comparing it to the dot-com market of the late ‘90s,” said Jim Bartolomea, vice president of global talent at tech titan ServiceNow, which employs a huge chunk of the software talent in San Diego. Last month, employers posted more than 365,000 job openings for IT workers, the highest monthly total since September 2019, according to IT trade group CompTIA. The positions highest in demand include software developers, IT support specialists, systems engineers and architects. [There’s no labor shortage — just not enough good jobs](https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2021-07-02/labor-shortage-is-workers-crisis-as-covid-economy-recovers) Employers in California and the U.S. are scrambling to fill jobs as the dust from the pandemic begins to settle. Just don’t call it a labor shortage. The demand has been attributed to all sorts of things. During the pandemic, businesses that had been slow to adopt enterprise software began rapidly catching up. A tidal wave of productivity software, conferencing and collaboration tools, and e-commerce tech flooded the world. The same was true for consumer tech, with video game development, entertainment tech and social platforms booming. Many of these jobs are going unfilled, as competition for new hires ramps up. Simultaneously, remote work became the status quo in the tech industry. Suddenly, software talent could pick and choose from a massive pool of job opportunities. All while existing talent is beginning to stray. Roughly a third of more than 2,800 IT professionals said they plan to look for a new job in the next few months, according to a recent Robert Half International survey. Aaron Bartholomew, a lead backend developer at tech company Trust & Will, just went through a two-month job search in which he held the power in the employer-worker exchange. “I realized pretty quick that I was the one with the upper hand,” Bartholomew said. “All these companies were moving incredibly fast to try and close on me.” Software interviews have a reputation for being slow, painful processes that involve tests of logic, design and computer science knowledge. Years ago, Chesnutt was tested for five straight hours on algorithms during an interview with YouTube. But now, these technical interviews are often being waived, said Chesnutt and Bartholomew, who both experienced this step dropped for the sake of urgency. Recruiters are increasingly using what Chesnutt sees as pressure tactics, such as “exploding offers,” which are job offers that self-detonate at a set date and time if engineers don’t accept them soon enough. “They’ll try to rush you through the process as soon as possible, and get you to sign that day while they’re on the phone with you,” Chesnutt said. Brett Wayne, a tech recruiter and managing director at Cypress, said the competitive pressure is unlike anything he’s seen in his 13-year career in recruiting. He likened it to what’s happening in the real estate market. Just like a hot property with multiple bids, Chesnutt ended his job hunt with four employment offers. To win a bid on a quality engineer, companies are offering things such as flexible hours, sign-on bonuses and permanent remote work, the last of which has become a requirement for much of the workforce. Dice, a website and staffing firm that focuses on tech talent, published [a report in June](https://www.dice.com/media/dice-press-releases/6-15-21-dice-report-shows-technologists-desire-flexible-structure-over-full-time-remote-work.html) that found only 17% of technologists wanted to work in an office full time, while 59% wanted remote and hybrid approaches. [‘Work from anywhere’ is here to stay. How will it change our workplaces?](https://www.latimes.com/business/technology/story/2020-11-12/companies-will-allow-employees-to-work-wherever-they-want) Working from home will become the norm for many employees even after the pandemic ends. But prepare for a pay cut. Wayne said he’s observed companies shoot themselves in the foot by not offering remote options, making an already slim candidate pool even slimmer. “If it was hard to hire talent 18 months ago — and now you cut the group you’re going for in half — it’s going to be really tough for you,” Wayne said. Bartholomew said he’s watched a great migration of developers out of urban areas, riding remote work out of San Diego or other cities. “Literally about 50% of my peer group has moved,” Bartholomew said. “Companies that adapt will get the majority of the talent pool.” It’s not strict remote work, however, that seems to be appealing to the majority of engineers, according to the Dice report. It’s more about flexibility to choose. “While many technologists would still prefer to work 100% remotely, there is an equal desire for a hybrid approach, and we’ve actually seen fewer remote days per week become more desirable over the past year,” Art Zeile, CEO chief executive of Dice, said in a statement. “The companies who succeed in attracting and retaining top talent will be those who take the time to build an agile approach that gives technologists flexibility and control over their work environment.” U.S. tech salaries are also on the rise. A recent [Dice report](https://techhub.dice.com/Dice-2021-Tech-Salary-Report.html) found tech jobs saw an average salary increase of 3.6% between late 2019 and late 2020. That might not sound like much, but it’s a significant jump compared with 2017, 2018 and 2019, when annual increases were less than 1%. U.S. employers across all industries — not just tech — reported their strongest hiring outlook since 2000, according to an [employment outlook survey](https://www2.staffingindustry.com/site/Editorial/Daily-News/US-hiring-plans-in-Q3-highest-since-2000-ManpowerGroup-57966) published by staffing giant ManpowerGroup in June. “It’s a worker’s market, and employees are acting like consumers in how they are consuming work — seeking flexibility, competitive pay and fast decisions,” Becky Frankiewicz, ManpowerGroup president for North America, said in a statement. “Now is the time for employers to get creative to attract talent — and to hold onto the workers they have with both hands.”

#### Innovation is failing.

Josh Hawley 19. A Republican Senator from Missouri. "Big Tech’s ‘Innovations’ That Aren’t" WSJ. 8-28-2019. https://www.wsj.com/articles/big-techs-innovations-that-arent-11567033288

Innovation in physics—the world of real things—has slowed, and America is losing its manufacturing process edge in key industries. Meanwhile, the landscapes of our cities and towns look about the same as they did half a century ago.

There’s no question that Silicon Valley and the three or four corporate behemoths that dominate it have made it easier to share information. But the modern smartphone, the search engine and the digital social network were invented more than a decade ago. What passes for innovation by Big Tech today isn’t fundamentally new products or new services, but ever more sophisticated exploitation of people.

To monetize older innovations, the dominant platforms employ behavioral scientists to develop interface designs that keep users online as much as possible. Big Tech calls it “engagement.” Another word would be addiction.

By getting their users to spend more time on their platforms, the social-media giants turn the customer into a data source to be sucked dry. Here’s how it works: The more attention users give the platform, the more personal information the platform extracts from them, recording every click, view and preference. Big Tech then converts this information into advertisements, all targeted with increasing precision—which produces even more advertising dollars for Big Tech.

What “innovation” remains in this space is innovation to keep the treadmill running, longer and faster, drawing more data from users to bombard us with more ads for more stuff.

But here’s the problem. As we spend more time on that digital treadmill, our real-world relationships atrophy, sometimes to disastrous effect. Teen suicide is up. Twenty-two percent of millennials report that they have no friends. More than a few researchers have noticed a connection.

At the same time, the dominant tech companies’ market concentration is stifling competition that might bring truly new and rewarding innovation. Want to raise money for a venture to challenge Facebook or Google? Good luck. The best pitch for a startup is a pitch for getting purchased by one of the tech giants a few years in. If they won’t buy you, they’ll just copy you.

Americans shouldn’t settle for this stagnation. It’s time we demanded more of Big Tech than it demands of us. That's why I’ve proposed banning the “dark patterns” that feed tech addiction. I’ve introduced legislation to provide consumers a legally enforceable right to browse the internet privately, without data tracking. I’ve advocated stepping up privacy safeguards for children and requiring tech companies to moderate content without political bias as a condition of civil immunity. And I’ve advocated more competition to spur real innovation for real people.

It should be no surprise that the tech companies have fiercely resisted these proposals at every turn, often with hysterical claims about breaking the internet or putting the American economy at a disadvantage to China—as if “autoplay” or “infinite scroll” were powering American productivity. If those are the weapons we’ll marshal in an economic battle with Chinese high-tech manufacturing, the war is already lost.

#### And CWS fails to protect 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

Given Microsoft's prominence in the defense of the CW standard, it is worth quickly revisiting Microsoft on this question: plaintiffs burden for demonstrating anticompetitive effects in a single-firm-conduct case involving a platform monopolist. The D.C. Circuit ruled that "in a case brought by the Government, it must demonstrate that the monopolist's conduct harmed competition, not just a competitor." 0 Summarizing its rationale for why Microsoft's license restrictions with original equipment manufacturers ("OEMs") were deemed anticompetitive, the court noted that "Microsoft reduced rival browsers' usage share not by improving its own product but, rather, by preventing OEMs from taking actions that could increase rivals' share of usage."' The court similarly found Microsoft's integration of its browser and its operating system to be anticompetitive, because "the commingling [of browsing and nonbrowsing code] deters OEMs from preinstalling rival browsers, thereby reducing the rivals' usage share and, hence, developers' interest in rivals' APIs [application programming interfaces] as an alternative to the API set exposed by Microsoft's operating system." 5 2 Even after it expressly stated that harm to "just a competitor" was not sufficient, the court treated evidence of rival browsers' usage (or market) share as a proxy for harm to competition.5 1 Importantly, the court did not require evidence of any price or output effect.5 4 And, on the question of innovation harms, the court seemed more concerned about innovation from Microsoft's perspective-that is, an innovation harm in the platform market from regulation, and not in the edge or app markets." The government won on claims where Microsoft had no efficiency justification; wherever Microsoft offered a justification, on the other hand, the court performed no actual weighing of the harms and benefits and instead deferred to Microsoft.5 6 This failure to weigh suggests that the courts and the CW standard are ill equipped to address the issue of innovation harms.

#### It increases productivity.

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

According to incentive theory, providing employees with better welfare can motivate them to work hard and ultimately create higher corporate value. In modern management theories, employees are considered strategic asset that can provide additional value to the corporation, particularly in knowledge-based industries, such as manufacturing and pharmaceutical corporations. According to these theories, employee welfare is particularly crucial to drive employee engagement which ultimately translates into higher performance and enhanced shareholders’ values. Consistent with this view, Levine (1992) and Wadhwani and Wall (1991) find that high levels of wages lead to enhanced productivity. Moreover, Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) document that family-friendly policies within corporations lead to increasing market share, and larger corporate profits. More recently, Edmans (2011) utilizes a value-weighted portfolio of the “100 Best Corporations to Work for in America” to investigate the relationship between employee satisfaction and long-run stock returns. The results show that this portfolio earned an annual four-factor alpha of 2.1% above industry benchmarks during the period from 1984 to 2009. The author concludes that corporations with high levels of employee satisfaction generate superior long-term stock returns. The author attributes these findings to the failure of the stock markets to incorporate intangible assets (such as employee well-being) fully into stock valuations. Affected by incentive theory, some corporations strive to provide welfare for their employees in all aspects, making them satisfied and happy, as happy employees are often more efficient than unhappy employees (Oswald et al., 2015). Increasing remuneration (Mas, 2006) can increase employees’ enthusiasm for work and create higher corporate value. Other corporations enhance their value creation, profitability and productivity by providing employees with more comfortable working environment (Faleye and Trahan, 2011). Negative incentives, such as layoffs and pay cuts, dampen employee enthusiasm and lead to low productivity and a loss of corporate value (Ghaly et al., 2015).

#### They can’t catch up.

Fred Hu 18, economist and chairman of Primavera Capital Group, 8-22-2018, "The U.S. Is Overly Paranoid About China’S Tech Rise," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/08/22/us-china-3/?utm\_term=.ed8dd0d27f82

But much of the fear over China’s technological rise is unfounded. Fundamentally, China is like most emerging economies around the world: still trying hard to close the enormous technological gap with advanced economies led by America. China has undoubtedly made more progress than many of its developing peers in that race. Its tech industries have grown at a faster pace and achieved a global scale beyond those of most developing countries. In a broad range of manufacturing sectors — notably consumer electronics, steel, ship building, high-speed rail systems and solar panels — China has established itself as the world’s leading producer. In areas such as consumer Internet and financial technology, it has arguably overtaken even the United States and now leads the rest of the world. Yet China hawks such as Robert Lighthizer and Peter Navarro charge that whatever progress China has made on the tech front is due to the country’s blatant theft of U.S. technology. Considering the enormous investments China has made in science and technology over recent decades, such claims do not hold water. China has devoted vast resources to research and development — $409 billion in 2015 (21 percent of the global total), according to the U.S. National Science Foundation. China’s investment in research and development grew over 20 percent annually between 2000 and 2010 and almost 14 percent from 2010-2015. U.S. research and development hovered around 4 percent over the same period. For a country with an average per capita income a mere one-sixth of America’s, China’s research and development investments reflect a real and sustained national commitment. At the same time, China has vastly expanded and improved STEM education and has one of the largest pools of STEM graduates in the world. The devotion of significant resources to research and development and human capital has in turn enabled China to reap some of the early fruits of innovation. China now tops the world in new patent filings. As the first country to receive more than 1 million patent applications in a single year — a record the World Intellectual Property Organization said reflected “extraordinary” levels of innovation — China accounts for almost 40 percent of the global total and more than that of the United States, Japan and South Korea combined. China has also significantly boosted venture capital investment, which supports the commercialization of emerging technologies. While the United States attracts the most investment worldwide (nearly $70 billion), venture capital investment in China rose from approximately $3 billion in 2013 to $34 billion in 2016, climbing from 5 percent to 27 percent of the global share — the fastest increase of any economy. China’s start-up ecosystem is both vast and vibrant; it has successfully incubated more tech unicorns than any other country except the United States. Too often, U.S. critics claim that Chinese industrial policies like Made in China 2025 are behind the country’s ascendancy in tech. In fact, virtually none of China’s leading tech firms, such as Alibaba, Baidu and Tencent, are state-owned or meaningful beneficiaries of state support. They are all founded and led by smart and risk-taking private entrepreneurs, just like their Silicon Valley brethren. Tellingly, many Chinese tech start-ups have received U.S. venture financing. And Chinese technology companies and venture firms have made significant investments in U.S. start-ups. Sadly, the virtuous two-way venture capital flows are now in jeopardy because of Washington’s growing paranoia about China. As impressive as China’s innovation and progress may be, however, it is premature to declare that China has caught up with the U.S. tech industry. Interventionist government bureaucracy, stodgy state-owned enterprises, a rigid school system and — above all — harsh restrictions on individual freedoms continue to stifle independent thinking and creativity and constrain China from realizing its full innovation potential. While China is well positioned to succeed in “strategic” industries such as semiconductors, pharmaceuticals and commercial aircraft due to its vast pool of engineering talent and the size of its domestic market, so far it has remained a laggard. China has failed to develop an indigenous chip industry despite a state-led drive to do so, with tens of billions spent over the past four decades. Despite its status as the “world’s factory,” making everything from cell phones and laptops to numerous other devices, China continues to import 90 percent of its microchips from foreign countries, predominantly from the United States. That is why the U.S. threat to cut off critical chip supply to ZTE, a Chinese telecom equipment firm, has been dubbed the “Sputnik moment” in China: a sober reminder of China’s continued weaknesses in critical technologies. While China has made spectacular progress on the tech front, the United States remains the undisputed global leader in science and technology. The United States holds most of the world’s leading research universities; it deploys the highest amounts of both public and private funding in research and development; attracts the most venture capital; awards the most advanced degrees; provides the most advanced business, financial and information services and is the largest producer in knowledge-intensive, high-tech sectors, from pharmaceuticals to semiconductors. The fear that China will displace the United States as the global tech superpower is grossly exaggerated. Unfortunately, such paranoia dominates the minds of protectionist U.S. politicians and China hawks and has already amplified a destructive trade war between the world’s two largest economies. For China’s part, its soul-searching is overdue. Beijing should resist the prevalent yet ill-justified self-complacency and triumphalism that contributed to the fear in Washington in the first place, and it should make serious efforts to reform and open its domestic economy. Unless Beijing amends its heavy-handed statist approach to economic development, China’s potential as a leading nation in science and technology could be seriously curtailed.

### 1AR---democracy adv

### 1AR---infrastructure da

#### No impact

Koerth 18 – Maggie, senior science writer for FiveThirtyEight, citing Bill Lawrence, vice president and chief security officer at the North American Electric Reliability Corporation and Candace Suh-Lee, who leads a cybersecurity research team at the Electric Power Research Institute, a nonprofit research and development lab, " Hacking The Electric Grid Is Damned Hard", *FiveThirtyEight*, 8/13/2018, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/hacking-the-electric-grid-is-damned-hard/> JHW

The nightmare is easy enough to imagine. Nefarious baddies sit in a dark room, illuminated by the green glow of a computer screen. Meanwhile, technicians watch in horror from somewhere in the Midwest as they lose control of their electrical systems. And, suddenly, hundreds of thousands, even millions of Americans are plunged into darkness. That scene was evoked in recent weeks as federal security experts at the Department of Homeland Security warned that state-sponsored hackers have targeted more than American elections — they’re after the electric grid, too. They’ve gotten “to the point where they could have thrown switches,” a DHS official told The Wall Street Journal. Both DHS and the FBI have linked these attacks to Russia — which was already pinned as the culprit in two attacks that shut down power to hundreds of thousands of people in Ukraine two Decembers in a row, in 2015 and 2016. It’s all very urgent — a high-risk crisis that must be solved immediately. But, surprisingly, some electrical system experts are thinking about it in a different way. Cyberattacks on the grid are a real risk, they told me. But the worst-case scenarios we’re imagining aren’t that likely. Nor is this a short-term crisis, with risks that can be permanently solved. Bringing down the grid is a lot harder than just flicking a switch, but the danger is real — and it may never go away. Representatives from two nonprofit organizations — both of which play large roles in how the electric grid is regulated and maintained — said it is easier to imagine disaster scenarios than create one. “There’ve been some very sensational books out there about the grid going dark because someone’s got their finger ready over a mouse and everything is going to turn off at the same time,” said Bill Lawrence, vice president and chief security officer at the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the regulatory authority that sets and enforces technological standards for utility companies across the continent. “The grid does not work that way.” Our electric infrastructure is chock-full of both redundancies and regional variations — two things that impede widespread sabotage. That’s not to say that the grid isn’t under attack. Lawrence acknowledged that there is interest in “trying to hurt us from a distance.” But he emphasized there have not yet been any successful attacks — meaning hackers haven’t caused any blackouts. The division of Homeland Security that collects reports of cyberattacks on critical infrastructure has not yet published its incident report numbers for 2017. Organizations report incidents on a voluntary basis, so these numbers may not reflect all incidents. They’ve been poking at our critical infrastructure for a long while. Incident reports published by the Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team — a division of Homeland Security that does training and responds to cyberattacks on critical infrastructure — suggest that electricity, oil and natural gas infrastructure have been routinely targeted for years.1 There are dozens of these attacks reported to ICS-CERTS annually. However, it would be difficult for these attacks to lead to wide-scale blackouts, according to Lawrence and Candace Suh-Lee, who leads a cybersecurity research team at the Electric Power Research Institute, a nonprofit research and development lab. And that’s true even if hackers do eventually succeed in taking control of some electric systems. It helps that the North American electric grid is both diverse in its engineering and redundant in its design. For instance, the Ukrainian attacks are often cited as evidence that hundreds of thousands of Americans could suddenly find themselves in the dark because of hackers. But Lawrence considers the Ukrainian grid a lot easier to infiltrate than the North American one. That’s because Ukraine’s infrastructure is more homogeneous, the result of electrification happening under the standardizing eye of the former Soviet Union, he told me. The North American grid, in contrast, began as a patchwork of unconnected electric islands, each designed and built by companies that weren’t coordinating with one another. Even today, he said, the enforceable standards set by NERC don’t tell you exactly what to buy or how to build. “So taking down one utility and going right next door and doing the same thing to that neighboring utility would be an extremely difficult challenge,” he said. Meanwhile, the electric grid already contains a lot of redundancies that are built in to prevent blackouts caused by common problems like broken tree limbs or heat waves — and those redundancies would also help to prevent a successful cyberattack from affecting a large number of people. Suh-Lee pointed to an August 2003 blackout that turned the lights off on 50 million people on the east coast of the U.S. and Canada. “When we analyzed it, there was about 17 different things lined up that went wrong. Then it happened,” she said. Hackers wouldn’t necessarily have control over all the things that would have to go wrong to create a blackout like that. In contrast, Suh-Lee said, scenarios that sound like they should lead to major blackouts … haven’t. Take the 2013 Metcalf incident, where snipers physically attacked 17 electric transformers in Silicon Valley. Surrounding neighborhoods temporarily lost power, but despite huge energy demand in the region, “the big users weren’t even aware Metcalf had happened,” she said. Difficult isn’t the same as impossible, Suh-Lee told me. Depending on where an attack happened and how people responded, you could get the stuff of our nightmares. Lawrence repeatedly invoked the phrase “knock on wood” as he talked about the possibility of infiltrations of electric infrastructure turning into real-world blackouts. That’s why there’s a lot of effort going into research, monitoring and preparation for cyberattacks. Lawrence’s team, for instance, is gearing up for an event that’s held every other year and is sort of like war games for the electric grid. And the Department of Energy is planning a similar event, focused on figuring out what it takes to reboot after a hacker-caused blackout. But that preparation doesn’t mean we’ll eventually solve this problem, either, Suh-Lee said. If the chances of a cinematic disaster are low, the chances of a theatrical hero on a white horse riding in to save the day are even lower. Making the grid stronger and more resilient also means making it more digital — the work that’s being done to improve the infrastructure has also created new opportunities for hackers to break in. And the risk of attack is here to stay. Security improvements are “never going to completely eliminate the risk,” she said. “The risk is out there and people will find a new way to attack.” We’ll be living with cyber threats to the grid for the rest of our lives.

#### Internationally—NDCs are screwed

Sachs '20 [Noah; 5/5/20; Professor of Law and Director of the Law School's Robert R. Merhige, Jr. Center for Environmental Studies at the University of Richmond, JD from Stanford Law School; "The Paris Agreement in the 2020s: Breakdown or Breakup?" Ecology Law Quarterly, Vol. 46, Issue 3, p. 865-910/]

The Agreement requires, as a binding treaty obligation, that each party submit an NDC and report on its progress.27 However, at the insistence of the Obama Administration, which cited the need to avoid Senate ratification, there is no legally binding requirement to actually achieve the goals set forth in an NDC.28 It is up to each party to implement policies to achieve its NDC, and there is no sanction for failing to reach the target. The nonbinding nature of NDCs has several consequences that make the Paris Agreement fragile and prone to defections. States cannot compel other states to submit an ambitious NDC or punish states for falling short. There is nothing in the Agreement, moreover, that requires a party to justify its NDC in relationship to reaching the treaty’s overall two-degree goal. No provision requires a party to show, for example, that its pledge, in coordination with other nations making a similar level of effort, would achieve this temperature goal. The treaty allows governments to set pledges solely on the basis of domestic convenience and capability. Seen in this light, as Anne-Marie Slaughter has noted, the Agreement is mainly a “statement of good intentions.”29 The parties opted for this voluntary approach because a “tougher” agreement with binding targets and enforceable sanctions would not have attracted the participation of major emitters, including the United States.30 Many proponents of the Agreement contend that it was the best that could have been achieved in 2015, after years of fruitless negotiation on legally binding targets and timetables.31 The voluntary structure was also the natural evolution of negotiations since 2009 that centered on a pledge-and-review approach.32 The Agreement’s lack of bindingness has been lauded on the grounds that states’ GHG-reduction pledges are likely to be more ambitious than commitments states would submit under an alternative, legally binding regime with tough sanctions.33 As the IPCC has explained, “states may prefer [that] legally binding agreements . . . embody less ambitious commitments, and [states] may be willing to accept more ambitious commitments when they are less legally binding.”34 Voluntary pledges could be more effective in the long run than mandatory, legally binding commitments of lesser magnitude. The problem with relying on voluntary pledges, however, is that if the aggregate emissions reductions expected under the NDCs are insufficient to keep warming within tolerable levels, there is no stick to force states to commit to greater reductions. We now have a short window of time to slash global GHG emissions, but the Agreement offers no mechanism to force emissions reductions on parties or even to allocate effort among the parties. It rests on the vicissitudes of voluntary action, with each party deciding how much effort it is willing to make. The emissions gap—the shortfall in the sufficiency of the voluntary pledges—was obvious at the Paris conference. Analysts quickly predicted that if all the NDCs submitted under the Agreement in 2015-2016 were fully implemented by 2030 (which is highly unlikely), global temperatures would increase 2.7 to 3.5 degrees Celsius beyond preindustrial levels,35 a catastrophic level of warming. Negotiators knew that the voluntary pledges were nowhere near sufficient to achieve the ultimate goal of the treaty: keeping global warming to “well below” 2 degrees Celsius compared to preindustrial temperatures and “pursuing efforts” to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius.36 The parties took what they could get in 2015, fully aware of this emissions gap, and hoped the Agreement would spur collective progress over time. The long-term success of the Agreement therefore depends on the optimistic vision of what I call an “upward spiral,” where early-stage cooperation at Paris will result in parties making progressively more ambitious commitments in the future. As parties work toward reasonably achievable NDCs and continue to build trust, they may be willing to make deep cuts in emissions, secure in the knowledge that other parties are making similar sacrifices. This vision of an upward spiral in turn depends on two assumptions: first, that the so-called “ratchet mechanism” of the Agreement will operate as intended, and second, that pressure from other parties to aim higher in the ambition of NDCs, which I call the “peer pressure proposition,” will be sustained over several decades. Both of these assumptions are attractive, widely held, and wrong. A. The Paris Agreement’s Ratchet Mechanism The ratchet mechanism refers to the provisions of the Paris Agreement that require parties to submit progressively more “ambitious” NDCs over time. “Ambitious” in this context means NDCs that commit a state to progressively deeper GHG emissions cuts or, for many developing states, NDCs that allow an increase in expected emissions, but at a slower rate than current projections. The ratchet mechanism is crucial to slowing climate disruption. It is the only internationally adopted legal text that encourages parties to reduce their GHG emissions over a multidecade timespan. The ratchet mechanism is not spelled out in any single article of the Agreement. Rather, the “ratchet” results from a collection of scattered provisions, including the following: • Each Party shall “prepare, communicate and maintain successive nationally determined contributions that it intends to achieve.”37 • Each Party’s successive NDCs “will represent a progression beyond the Party’s then current nationally determined contribution and reflect its highest possible ambition . . . .”38 • Each Party shall regularly provide information on national inventories and information “necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving” its NDC.39 • A Party may at any time “adjust” its NDC “with a view to enhancing its level of ambition.”40 • Beginning in 2023 and every five years thereafter, the parties shall “take stock of the implementation of this Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of [the] Agreement and its long-term goals . . . .”41 • Parties will then submit successive NDCs “informed by the outcomes of the global stocktake[s] . . . .”42 These provisions, though skeletal, suggest how the parties expect an upward spiral to unfold. They create a detailed timeline in which the parties will submit NDCs, prepare emissions inventories at least every two years, take stock every five years of progress under the Agreement (2023, 2028, etc.), and submit pledges that “represent a progression beyond the Party’s then current [NDC]” in 2020, 2025, 2030, and so on.43 Some scholars believe that parties will follow the ratchet mechanism quite literally, even if domestic circumstances are unfavorable. Christina Voigt, for example, has argued that even if a party were in a “financial, political or economic crisis,” there would be no grounds for “a decrease in what can be considered its ‘highest possible ambition’ compared to the level contained in the previous NDC.”44 According to Voigt, each submission of an NDC sets a “floor” for the next NDC.45 Every party is required to go above and beyond its previous NDC with each new submittal.46 Voigt suggests that the Agreement somehow locks in an upward spiral of progressively more ambitious commitments. But this optimism is misplaced. The text of the ratchet is not self-executing. Given the lack of penalties for failing to achieve NDCs, parties still face strong incentives to defect or free ride under the Agreement, to pledge only minimal action, or to appear to take action while actually imposing few costs on their domestic interest groups. Many states— especially those in “financial, political, or economic crisis”—will prioritize the needs of their domestic constituencies over their voluntary, nonbinding Agreement pledges. In short, the ratchet mechanism is a necessary but not sufficient condition for a consistent, upward trajectory of NDCs. Parties must somehow be incentivized to stick with it. B. The Peer Pressure Proposition and Its Fallibility According to many scholars, peer pressure will be the glue that holds the Agreement together.47 Under the pledge-and-review system, parties will feel pressure from other parties to submit and achieve progressively more ambitious NDCs. Additionally, the ratchet mechanism could be sustained if parties fear reputational costs for noncooperative behavior, such as failing to achieve their own NDCs. If parties perceive that others are making progress toward their respective NDCs at each review conference, they will be more willing to undertake progressively deeper cuts themselves.48 In this view, the five-year “stocktake” review conferences—a collective “show and tell” on the international stage49—will be the key fora for exercising peer pressure under the Agreement. I refer to these arguments about disclosure, reciprocity, and reputation as the “peer pressure proposition.” The peer pressure proposition holds that positive peer pressure or perceived reputational costs will encourage parties to make and achieve progressively more ambitious commitments under the Agreement.50 There is reason to question whether the peer pressure proposition can consistently work to support the Paris Agreement over several decades, especially through global political and economic upheavals. The peer pressure proposition needs to be critically scrutinized, rather than merely assumed. Below, I challenge some key assumptions of the peer pressure proposition, arguing that skepticism is warranted for three main reasons: states will prioritize domestic interests over international reputation, “naming and shaming” strategies are not likely to be effective, and it is not assured that states will find it easier to make deep emissions cuts in the near future. 1. Domestic interests will likely outweigh perceived international reputational concerns. One reason for skepticism is that the peer pressure proposition excessively emphasizes the role of international reputation. Reputation surely matters in international law. As Ian Johnstone has argued, “states care about collective judgment of their conduct because they have an interest in reciprocal compliance by and future cooperation with others . . . .”51 International reputation is but one consideration for states, however. A more nuanced account would acknowledge that states make a cost-benefit calculus on the stringency of their international climate commitments, and their calculus gives substantial weight to domestic interests. These domestic interests include the immediate pressures of electoral politics, the expected impact of deep emissions cuts on domestic industries, and prioritization of national economic growth over global emissions reductions. In each party’s cost-benefit calculus, powerful domestic economic interests will undoubtedly weigh as much or more than concerns about international reputation, particularly because any reputational “hit” under the Agreement is tied to a nonbinding climate pledge. NDCs are legally unenforceable pledges, so the reputation costs of failing to achieve them are diluted.52 Even if many governments were to perceive that net benefits outweigh net costs in committing to ambitious NDCs, the distribution of costs on powerful domestic actors might act as a drag on national ambition. For example, if veto players in the oil, coal, or palm oil industries retain their political influence with the governments of major emitters (for example, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Indonesia), which seems likely, these governments might perceive international pressure to submit more ambitious NDCs, combined with intense domestic pressure to do less. As a consequence, these important states might continue to submit weak NDCs throughout the 2020s. Russia is emblematic of this group. It is the fourth largest GHG emitter, yet it held off on ratifying the Paris Agreement until 2019, and its NDC is so weak that Russia is already achieving its 2030 target.53

#### Biden’s PC’s resilient

1NR Everett 9-16 (Burgess Everett, staff reporter @ Politico, Dems call in big gun as they face huge Hill tests, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/16/biden-influence-capitol-democrats-511952>, y2k)

Biden appears to be answering the call. The president is getting increasingly involved in Congress’ chaotic fall session as he battles sagging approval ratings, heightened concerns around the pandemic and some internal criticism over his withdrawal from Afghanistan. On Thursday, he'll speak to Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Speaker Nancy Pelosi ahead of a critical week for funding the government and lifting the debt ceiling.

#### Biden passing tough bills expands his political capital

Stankiewicz 1/20/21 (Kevin - associate reporter for *CNBC.com*, “Sen. Chris Coons says Biden has ‘practical’ bent, hopes for cooperation in Congress,” https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/20/biden-inauguration-day-live-updates-stream.html)

Democratic Sen. Chris Coons told CNBC he is hopeful President Joe Biden’s plans to address the Covid-19 crisis could set the tone for bipartisan cooperation in Washington. “I think it’s possible for Joe Biden, by responding to this pandemic in a competent and caring way, to actually build his political capital, to surprise the American people by showing that he and [GOP Sen.] Mitch McConnell, that the leaders in the House and the Senate, can actually work together to solve problems,” said Coons, a close ally to Biden and his fellow Delawarean. In an interview on “Power Lunch,” Coons said most Americans are fed up by inaction and partisan bickering from Congress. “Joe is someone who has never forgotten where he’s from, who has a practical, common-sense bent and who sees the suffering of the American people.” “He’s going to give us a chance to move forward, boldly, together, and I pray that the Congress takes him up on it,” Coons said.

#### Dems will fold inevitably

1NR Sargent 9-7 (Greg Sargent, columnist @ Washington Post, Opinion: How Democrats can make it harder for centrists to downsize Biden’s agenda, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/09/07/manchin-sinema-spending-stock-buybacks/>, y2k)

The key point here is that when proposals like this one start to get debated in earnest, it will be much harder to oppose the reconciliation bill’s spending levels in an abstract way.

#### Midterms

1NR Jaacobson 9-10 (Louiis Jacobson, correspondent @ Politifact, The Democrats’ reconciliation bill: What you need to know, <https://www.politifact.com/article/2021/sep/10/democrats-reconciliation-bill-what-you-need-know/>, y2k)

How serious are the centrists and progressives about derailing the process if they don’t get their way?

Experts said it’s certainly possible that either centrists or progressives would tank the bill if they can’t get everything they want, though such a course would be risky since the Democrats are at risk of losing their slim majorities in the 2022 midterm elections.

#### Dem unity

Robert Kuttner, 8-20-2021, co-founder and co-editor of The American Prospect, and professor at Brandeis University’s Heller School. "How Much Trouble Is Biden In?," American Prospect, https://prospect.org/politics/how-much-trouble-is-biden-in/

I don’t have a crystal ball, but it seems to me that six months from now, as we begin the midterm election year, Biden will be looking pretty good. The internal splits between the progressives and the Gang of Nine will get nastier; and primary season will enflame these tensions. At the same time, neither the left nor the center wants to be responsible for destroying Biden’s core agenda. At the end of the day, even as soon as October, some version of the $3.5 trillion budget reconciliation is likely to pass, minus a few hundred billion to appease Joe Manchin et al.

#### Floor time

Carolyn Bourdeaux, et al, 8-23-2021 with Ed Case, Jim Costa, Henry Cuellar, Jared Golden, Vicente Gonzalez, Josh Gottheimer, Kurt Schrader and Filemon Vela Democratic members of the House. Let’s take the win. Let’s do infrastructure first. Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/08/22/reconciliation-can-wait-lets-do-infrastructure-first/

But we are firmly opposed to holding the president’s infrastructure legislation hostage to reconciliation, risking its passage and the bipartisan support behind it.

We can walk and chew gum, just as the Senate did. We can pass the infrastructure measure now, and then quickly consider reconciliation and the policies from climate to health care to universal pre-K that we believe are critical.

#### Lobbying---Big business lobby tanks the bill OR they aren’t powerful enough to make the difference

Jonathan Weisman, 9-12-2021, congressional correspondent, "In Social Policy Bill, Businesses See a Lot to Like. They Oppose It.," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/12/us/politics/businesses-social-policy.html

The far-reaching social policy bill under construction in Congress has much that corporate America has long sought from Washington.

Federal funding for family leave would ease the burden of businesses that currently pay for it while helping those that cannot afford it compete for workers. Child care tax credits would get women back in the work force. Income supports for young families could ease upward pressure on wages.

But the bill also contains plenty for corporate America to dislike — particularly the tax increases that would pay for it — and in the cold calculus of corporate lobbying, industries are working hard to bring the whole enterprise down.

“It’s not fair to say we like all the spending but don’t want to pay for it. There is some investment that is more valuable than others,” said Neil Bradley, the executive vice president and chief policy officer for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. But, he added, “ultimately we’re making the case that taken as a whole, this is economically devastating for the country and in particular members’ districts and states.”

Businesses have long seen a role for the government in creating and sustaining the kind of trained, healthy work force that can keep them competitive in a global economy.

Access to affordable child care and early childhood education would help parents who stopped working during the coronavirus pandemic return to the labor force. Expanded higher education aid and worker retraining could create a more flexible labor pool, programs that business groups have supported for years. Federally financed family and medical leave would help small businesses that cannot afford it compete for talent with larger businesses providing the benefit.

“What’s holding back growth? Labor force participation, which hasn’t recovered; nonaffordability of child care, which is going to take the biggest leap forward that we’ve ever had; paid leave for illness and family leave,” said Representative Donald S. Beyer Jr., a Virginia Democrat who owned and ran car dealerships before his political career. “On the business side, I think it will make for a better workplace, an easier one with less tension.”

Yet the Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, the National Federation of Independent Business and the National Association of Manufacturers are implacably opposed. Many have made it clear: Taxes trump policy.

“We’re hearing somewhere between $1.8 and $3.5 trillion on job creators in America. That would take us back to where we were before the 2017 tax reforms,” Jay Timmons, the chief executive of the manufacturers’ association, said on CNBC. “We will oppose the bill with any of those factors in there.”