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#### Antitrust is a psyop used to pacify the working class and map competition onto subjectivity

Lebow 19 [David Lebow – Lecturer on Social Studies at Harvard University and lawyer, “Trumpism and the Dialectic of Neoliberal Reason,” Perspectives on Politics 18(2):380-398, doi:10.1017/S1537592719000434]

I. Neoliberal Reason

As Michel Foucault and others have argued, neoliberalism entails far more than an economic doctrine favoring deregulated markets.4 It is a novel form of governmentality—a rationality linked to technologies of power that govern conduct, not just through direct state action but through liberty itself.5 Not isolated to the traditionally demarcated sphere of economics, neoliberal society entails a whole economic-juridical order.

The central program of neoliberal governmentality is the absolute generalization of competition as a universal behavioral norm. Whereas in liberal thought, the root principle of capitalism was exchange of equivalents, for neoliberal reason it is competition entailing inequality. The key result of market processes goes from specialization to selection. The competitive market is the exclusive site of rationality. It processes information, indicated by price, and is the only mechanism of producing knowledge, defined as what is profitably utilizable. Because consumers are free to refuse inferior goods or services, the price mechanism of the market system ensures optimal solutions and maximal satisfaction of preferences.

Liberal capitalism, as Karl Polanyi argued, required the construction of “fictitious” commodities like land and labor.6 These abstract, exchangeable factors of production had to be disembedded from concrete non-market social relations, norms, and values. Instead of merely disembedding commodities, neoliberalism intervenes to make competitive mechanisms regulate every moment and point in society. It strives to build an empire of market choice that invades every domain of life, and deposes all other social, political and solidaristic institutions and values.

Neoliberalism does not allege that markets are natural; competition must be constructed. Rather than endorsing laissez-faire overseen by a night watchman, it stipulates a strong state engaged in permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention to maintain artificial competition. It must not plan outcomes, which would upset the market’s innate rationality, and must be insulated from political disturbances. Economic interventionism leads down the road to serfdom; fascism and unlimited state power are its necessary results. A “minimum of economic interventionism” on the “mechanisms of the market” must be accompanied by “maximum legal interventionism” on the “conditions of the market.”7 Fixed, formal rules make up an economic constitution that inhibits planning, repulses political disruptions, and impartially safeguards competition. The state is the executor of the market and growth is the basis of public legitimacy. Governance depoliticizes public power, promotes ostensibly post-ideological technical problem-solving by experts, and relies on “best-practices” that dissolve the distinction between public and private organization.8

Unlimited generalization of competition yields an enterprise society in which calculations of supply/demand and cost/benefit become the model of all social relations. Neoliberal reason renders homo economicus, based on this model of the enterprise, the exhaustive figuration of human subjectivity. The center of economic thought shifts from labor and processes of production, exchange, and consumption to human capital and rational decision-making under conditions of scarcity. Capital is everything that can generate future income; wages are reconceived as income from capital. Labor is no longer comprehended as a commodity exchanged for a wage, but as a combination of human capital (the worker’s education and abilities) and the income stream it generates. This neoliberal subject is an aggregate of human capital who invests in his own income-generating abilities.

Neoliberalism replaces the invariant identity of the moral person as a rights-bearing citizen with a formally empty receptacle filled up through enterprising choices. It brushes aside models of freedom as self-rule achieved through moral autonomy or popular sovereignty.9 In the neoliberal “democracy of consumers,” individual consumers together constitute the sovereign that monopolizes the issuance of legitimate commands.10 Sovereign will is expressed not through political channels, but by choices in the “plebiscite of prices.”11 Whereas producers have particular interests like protectionism, consumers have a consensual and common interest; all favor the impartial functioning of market processes. In the neoliberal free society, consumers exercise their right to choose in complete independence.

II. From Keynesian State Capitalism to Neoliberal Deregulation

Situating the 2008 crisis in a historical account of American political and economic development clarifies its broader significance. The early twentieth-century Progressives were disdainful of what they took to be the chaos and waste of fin de siècle laissez-faire society. They strove to build a new American state that would replace the structural and rights-based formalisms of the nineteenth century with direct democracy and expert administration. It took the Great Depression and New Deal to bring into full bloom the Progressive commitment to pragmatic rationality. Thereafter, the “policy state” was authorized to pursue designated social goals and develop the means to accomplish them.12 The slew of New Deal innovations included state oversight of labor negotiations, invigorated antitrust, Keynesian countercyclical deficits to stimulate demand and increase purchasing power, an expansive public sector sheltered from the business cycle, aggressive banking regulation, and social insurance. Regulation and redistribution ensured the conditions necessary for an economic system based on capital accumulation, private property, and corporate profit to endure.

To many, the differences between the New Deal and Nazi political economies appeared less significant than their common response to monopoly capitalism. Both erased boundaries between state and society by politicizing the private sphere and authorizing public bureaucracies to rationalize crisis-prone economies. Frankfurt School member Friedrich Pollock suggested that this common “state capitalism” had solved the contradiction between the forces and relations of production, and thus overcome the economy’s crisis tendencies. It seemed to him that management had become merely technical and “nothing essential” had been “left to the laws of the market.”13 Worries abounded that the private law sphere of property and contract was necessary for individual freedom. Despite salient differences between Nazi and New Deal state capitalism, many feared that intervention into society was a waystation to domination. Unease about the specter of American despotism motivated development of mechanisms to ensure that interventionism did not devolve into arbitrary rule.14 Expertise was one justification and limitation of the policy state. Authority could be safely delegated to a new corps of public-spirited administrators because their scientific knowledge would not only make them effective, but also counsel restraint. Enduring misgivings led later to new laws of administrative process. The procedural state was legitimated by its defenders as being a substantively value-neutral and instrumentally rational machine serving goals set by society. Regulatory decision-making was shunted into the abstruse procedures of courtrooms and bureaucracies. Defenders of the state emphasized that its processes of allocating authority were neutral, impartial, and open to all. The balanced accommodation of all interest groups seeking to exercise influence would yield an equilibrium corresponding to the public interest.15

The intermeshing of state and society through interest groups, agencies, and professionalized parties marginalized the public. The sovereign public opinion that Progressives had hoped would rationalize government gave way to the rationality supposedly inherent in processes of public law, public-private negotiation, and regulated markets. The state was endowed with a diffuse legitimacy in exchange for a growing economy, broad distribution, and ongoing household capacity to consume.16 The Keynesian welfare settlement pacified the working class, protecting the market economy from more radical political pressures. Newly available, mass-produced commodities encouraged leveled-down notions of citizenship as welfare clientelism and privatistic consumption. As the state expanded and routinized, the initial politicization of private property relations through public intervention developed into depoliticized economic management by lawyers and social scientists organized by administrative and judicial processes.

#### Capitalism causes extinction via endless climate and environmental crisis---“tech fixes” only make it worse

Jeremy Lent 21. Award-winning author. "Solving the Climate Crisis Requires the End of Capitalism". Resilience. 10-13-2021. https://www.resilience.org/stories/2021-10-13/solving-the-climate-crisis-requires-the-end-of-capitalism/

The global conversation regarding climate change has, for the most part, ignored the elephant in the room. That’s strange, because this particular elephant is so large, obvious, and all-encompassing that politicians and executives must contort themselves to avoid naming it publicly. That elephant is called capitalism, and it is high time to face the fact that, as long as capitalism remains the dominant economic system of our globalized world, the climate crisis won’t be resolved.

As the crucial UN climate talks known as COP26 approach in early November, the public is becoming increasingly aware that the stakes have never been higher. What were once ominous warnings of future climate shocks wrought by wildfires, floods, and droughts have now become a staple of the daily news. Yet governments are failing to meet their own emissions pledges from the Paris agreement six years ago, which were themselves acknowledged to be inadequate. Increasingly, respected Earth scientists are warning, not just about the devastating effects of climate breakdown on our daily lives, but about the potential collapse of civilization itself unless we drastically change direction.

The elephant in the room

And yet, even as humanity faces perhaps the greatest existential crisis in its species’ history, the public debate on climate barely mentions the underlying economic system that brought us to this point and which continues to drive us toward the precipice. Ever since its emergence in the seventeenth century, with the creation of the first limited liability shareholder-owned corporations, capitalism has been premised on viewing the planet as a resource to exploit — its overriding objective to maximize profits from that exploitation as rapidly and extensively as possible. Current mainstream strategies to resolve our twin crises of climate breakdown and ecological overshoot without changing the underlying system of growth-based global capitalism are structurally inadequate.

The idea of “green growth” is promulgated by many development consultants, and is even incorporated in the UN’s official plan for “sustainable development,” but has been shown to be an illusion. Ecomodernists, and others who stand to profit from growth in the short-term, frequently make the argument that, through technological innovation, aggregate global economic output can become “absolutely decoupled” from resource use and carbon emissions — permitting limitless growth on a finite planet. Careful rigorous analysis, though, shows that this hasn’t happened so far, and even the most wildly aggressive assumptions for greater efficiency would still lead to unsustainable consumption of global resources.

The primary reason for this derives ultimately from the nature of capitalism itself. Under capitalism — which has now become the default global economic context for virtually all human enterprise — efficiency improvements intended to reduce resource usage inevitably become launchpads for further exploitation, leading paradoxically to an increase, rather than decrease, in consumption.

This dynamic, known as the Jevons paradox, was first recognized back in the nineteenth century by economist William Stanley Jevons, who demonstrated how James Watts’ steam engine, which greatly improved the efficiency of coal-powered engines, paradoxically caused a dramatic increase in coal consumption even while it decreased the amount of coal required for any particular application. The Jevons paradox has since been shown to be true in an endless variety of domains, from the invention in the nineteenth century of the cotton gin which led to an increase rather than decrease in the practice of slavery in the American South, to improved automobile fuel efficiency which encourages people to drive longer distances.

When the Jevons paradox is generalized to the global marketplace, we begin to see that it’s not really a paradox at all, but rather an inbuilt defining characteristic of capitalism. Shareholder-owned corporations, as the primary agents of global capitalism, are legally structured by the overarching imperative to maximize shareholder returns above all else. Although they are given the legal rights of “personhood” in many jurisdictions, if they were actually humans they would be diagnosed as psychopaths, ruthlessly pursuing their goal without regard to any collateral damage they might cause. Of the hundred largest economies today, sixty-nine are transnational corporations, which collectively represent a relentless force with one overriding objective: to turn humanity and the rest of life into fodder for endlessly increasing profit at the fastest possible rate.

Under global capitalism, this dynamic holds true even without the involvement of transnational corporations. Take bitcoin as an example. Originally designed after the global financial meltdown of 2008 to wrest monetary power from the domination of central banks, it relies on building trust through “mining,” a process that allows anyone to verify a transaction by solving increasingly complex mathematical equations and earn new bitcoins as compensation. A great idea — in theory. In practice, the unfettered marketplace for bitcoin mining has led to frenzied competition to solve ever more complex equations, with vast warehouses holding “rigs” of advanced computers consuming massive amounts of electricity, with the result that the carbon emissions from bitcoin processing are now equivalent to that of a mid-size country such as Sweden or Argentina.

An economy based on perpetual growth

The relentless pursuit of profit growth above all other considerations is reflected in the world’s stock markets, where corporations are valued not by their benefit to society, but by investors’ expectations of their growth in future earnings. Similarly, when aggregated to national accounts, the main proxy used to measure the performance of politicians is growth in Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Although it is commonly assumed that GDP correlates with social welfare, this is not the case once basic material requirements have been met. GDP merely measures the rate at which society transforms nature and human activity into the monetary economy, regardless of the ensuing quality of life. Anything that causes economic activity of any kind, whether good or bad, adds to GDP. When researchers developed a benchmark called the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), which incorporates qualitative components of well-being, they discovered a dramatic divergence between the two measures. GPI peaked in 1978 and has been steadily falling ever since, even while GDP continues to accelerate.

Since 1978, Genuine Progress has been falling even while GDP continues to increase. Credit: Kubiszewski et al., Beyond GDP: Measuring and achieving global genuine progress

In spite of this, the possibility of shifting our economy away from perpetual growth is barely even considered in mainstream discourse. In preparation for COP26, the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) modeled five scenarios exploring potential pathways that would lead to different global heating outcomes this century, ranging from an optimistic 1.5°C pathway to a likely catastrophic 4.5°C track. One of their most critical variables is the amount of carbon reduction accomplished through negative emissions, relying on massive implementation of unproven technologies. According to the IPCC, staying under 2°C of global heating — consistent with the minimum target set by the 2015 Paris agreement — involves a heroic assumption that we will suck 730 billion metric tonnes of carbon out of the atmosphere this century. This stupendous amount is equivalent to roughly twenty times the total current annual emissions from all fossil fuel usage. Such an assumption is closer to science fiction than any rigorous analysis worthy of a model on which our civilization is basing its entire future. Yet, even as the IPCC appears willing to model humanity’s fate on a pipe dream, not one of their scenarios explores what is possible from a graduated annual reduction in global GDP. Such a scenario was considered by the IPCC community to be too implausible to consider.

This represents a serious lapse on the part of the IPCC. Climate scientists who have modeled planned reductions in GDP show that keeping global heating below 1.5°C this century is potentially within reach under this scenario, with greatly reduced reliance on speculative carbon reduction technologies. Prominent economists have shown that a carefully managed “post-growth” plan could lead to enhanced quality of life, reduced inequality, and a healthier environment. It would, however, undermine the foundational activity of capitalism — the pursuit of endless growth that has led to our current state of obscene inequality, impending ecological collapse, and climate breakdown.

#### Vote neg for anti-capitalist commons---collectives should refuse commitments to the competitive principle

Rose 21 [Nick. PhD in Political Ecology from RMIT University. Executive Director of Sustain: The Australian Food Network. From the Cancer Stage of Capitalism to the Political Principle of the Common: The Social Immune Response of “Food as Commons.” Int J Health Policy Manag 2021. 3-31-21. DOI: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.20 //shree]

Silvia Federici provides a longer historical perspective, noting that ‘commoning is the principle by which human beings have organised their existence for thousands of years;’ and that to ‘speak of the principle of the common’ is to speak ‘not only of small-scale experiments [but] of large-scale social formations that in the past were continent-wide.’87 Hence a commons-based society is neither a utopia or reducible to fringe projects, and the commons have persisted despite the many and continuing enclosures, ‘feeding the radical imagination as well as the bodies of many commoners.’87 Federici acknowledges that commons and practices of commoning are diverse, that many are susceptible to cooptation and many are consistent with the persistence of capitalism; indeed some, such as charities providing social services (including foodbanks) during the years of austerity budgets in the United Kingdom (2010-2015), reinforce and stabilise capitalism.87 What matters to Federici is the character and intentionality of the commons as anti-capitalist, as ‘a means to the creation of an egalitarian and cooperative society…no longer built on a competitive principle, but on the principle of collective solidarity [and commitments] to the creation of collective subjects [and] fostering common interests in every aspect of our lives.’87

Federici’s analysis resonates with the political thought and proposals developed by Dardot and Laval in their 2018 work, ‘On Common: Revolution in the 21st century.’11 For Dardot and Laval, the common is likewise understood as a principle of political struggle, a demand for ‘real democracy’ and a major driving force behind the emerging articulation of a political vision and programme that transcends and overcomes the straitjacket logic of neoliberal ideological hegemony and its ‘policy grammar’ which appears to foreclose all alternatives and lock us forever into a capitalist realism in which ‘it is easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism.’89 Eschewing Bollier’s ‘triarchy’ of a market/state/ commons coexistence, Dardot and Laval argue for a politics of the common based on an engaged citizenry that directly participates and deliberates in all decisions which impact it, and in the process not merely transforms the institutions responsible for the management of services and allocation of resources, but creates new institutions and new ways of being in the world.11

Dardot and Laval describe this form of politics as ‘instituent praxis’: the common, they argue, is ‘not produced but instituted.’11 This acknowledges the conventional understanding of Ostrom, Bollier and others of ‘the commons’ as residing in the rules – the laws – that a community establishes for the collective management and use of shared resources, but extends it much further and in a more radical direction. The essence of the commons, they argue, is not in the goods per se such as land or a forest or a seed bank ‘held in common,’ but rather in the process of their establishment as well as the ongoing negotiation that will surround their use and governance. Hence, Dardot and Laval distinguish the commons from the ‘rights’ tradition of property, arguing that ‘the commons are above all else matters of institution and government…the use of the commons is inseparable from the right of deciding and governing. The practice that institutes the commons is the practice that maintains them and keeps them alive and takes full responsibility for their conflictuality through the coproduction of rules.’90 To ‘institute’ in this context should not be misunderstood as ‘to institutionalise [or] render official;’ rather it is ‘to recreate with, or on the basis of, what already exists.’ 90 This messy, conflictual and evolving process is what Dardot and Laval insist will ultimately bring about a revolution, not in the form of a violent uprising or insurrection, but rather through the ‘reinstitution of society’ via the transformation of politics and economy from its current state of ‘representative oligarchy’ to full participatory and deliberative democracy.11 Such a vision is premised on a mass politicisation of society; in effect a return of mass popular political contestation and a turn away from the postpolitical era of the neoliberal consumer.91-92

### T---1NC

#### The scope of competition law defines it goals---attempts to meet current goals by banning practice are implementation questions.

ESE No Date. Erasmus School of Economics (as per their website, “The Erasmus Center for Economic and Financial Governance is an international multidisciplinary network of leading researchers and societal stakeholders initiated by researchers from Erasmus School of Economics and Erasmus School of Law. ECEFG conducts interdisciplinary research (law, economics and political science) and contributes to current debates in public and in academia on issues relating to European and global economic and financial governance.”). "Competition Policy". <https://www.eur.nl/en/ese/affiliated/ecefg/research/competition-policy>

Competition Policy

Research in this field consists of two broad areas. The first area – Theory and Implementation of Competition Law and Policy – refers to fundamental and applied research into topics that are traditionally seen as the core of competition policy. The second area – Scope of Competition Law and Policy – refers to all research on the effect and desirability of including new considerations in competition law and policy in order to address the challenges of our time, such as the increasing power of big tech firms, or global warming.

Theory and Implementation of Competition Policy

This covers for instance collusion, abuse of dominance, mergers, market regulation and state aid. Some examples of research topics are:

* the practices firms can use to engage in collusion and its welfare consequences;
* the practices firms can use to abuse a dominant position and its welfare consequences;
* which practices can be considered proof of such activities;
* how to regulate access to a market;
* how to properly assess the effects of a particular practice or merger;
* the practices, by which the state and public authorities distort competition such as subisidies and tax measures
* the interpretation and application of EU and national competition law by Competition Authorities and Courts and the extent to which they achieve the goals of competition policy

Scope of Competition Policy

The effectiveness of European competition law and policy in combination with rapid technological changes have raised questions about its proper scope. Which policy objectives can and should be pursued by means of competition law and policy, and which should be delegated to other legal fields and policies? Some examples of specific research questions include:

* Can and should competition law be used to protect the privacy of consumers on the internet?
* Information gathered by firms can be used to increase their own profits. How does this affect consumers, and what does this depend on? Can and should competition law deal with market power derived from information gathering? For instance, should the big five tech giants be forced to divest activities?
* Should competition policy also include considerations of economic inequality or environmental effects?
* Can competition law remain effective if it is used for more than safeguarding fair competition?

#### That means the aff must replace the consumer welfare standard.

Trevor Wagener 21. "The Curse of Tradeoffs: Neo-Brandeisians vs. Consumers". Disruptive Competition Project. 5-21-2021. https://www.project-disco.org/competition/052121-the-curse-of-tradeoffs-neo-brandeisian-antitrust-versus-consumers/

Neo-Brandeisians seek to replace the longstanding objective and principles-based framework of the consumer welfare standard in antitrust enforcement with an amorphous, process-based framework guided by an ethos one Neo-Brandeisian described as: “Big is bad. Just don’t let big firms merge. The end.” A movement dedicated to replacing a consumer welfare-maximizing approach with an assortment of competing goals has proven unable to offer a quantified, systematic cost-benefit analysis justifying such a radical change, instead relying upon anecdotal evidence and moving prose. The many goals of the Neo-Brandeisian approach are often rhetorically appealing, but the rhetoric hides a simple truth: When you target every variable, you effectively target none. Addressing a wide range of goals through antitrust policy requires de-emphasizing consumer welfare, creating fundamental tradeoffs expected to harm consumers relative to the status quo.

The willingness to sacrifice consumer welfare in order to achieve other ends is a defining characteristic of Neo-Brandeisian antitrust. This is illustrated by concrete Neo-Brandeisian critiques, which typically emphasize perceived harms to businesses rather than harms to consumers. For example, the Neo-Brandeisian activist group American Economic Liberties Project (AELP) published a pair of policy briefs on May 3 that criticize online service operators for a litany of purported inconveniences to businesses over a combined 22 pages, but struggle to quantify any harms to ordinary consumers and users. Those few purported harms to consumers that AELP raised are distinctly qualitative rather than quantitative, consistent with the broader reluctance of prominent Neo-Brandeisian thinkers to conduct a rigorous quantitative cost-benefit analysis of their antitrust policy prescriptions relative to the consumer welfare standard.

#### Vote negative for limits and ground---only “change goals” creates key economy and legal disads over what antitrust should consider---the affs topic races to tiny exemptions and technical changes with no core ground.

### DA---1NC

#### China competition bill centered on semiconductors passes through a fragile bipartisan consensus now---but Biden’s push is key.

Brittney Washington 3-18. "Why China Has U.S. Congress Focused On Computer Chips". Washington Post. 3-18-2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/energy/why-china-has-us-congress-focused-on-computer-chips/2022/03/17/94ca635a-a608-11ec-8628-3da4fa8f8714\_story.html

A rare point of bipartisan consensus in Washington is the desire to spend more than $50 billion to bolster U.S. chip production. That’s a key part of bills pending in both houses of Congress intended to increase U.S. competitiveness with China. The bills are similar, but not identical, and differences on auxiliary issues threaten to stall their progress. 1. What does Congress propose to do? Both the Senate bill, passed last June, and the House bill, passed on Feb. 4, provide $52 billion over five years in emergency appropriations to support semiconductor research and development, legacy chip manufacturing, packaging research and microelectronics development. (Legacy chips are frequently used in cars, aircraft and a variety of military hardware.) The vast majority of that money, $50 billion, would be distributed through a new fund overseen by the Commerce Department; the other $2 billion would be overseen by the Defense Department. On top of that, the House version authorizes $45 billion for grants and loans to support supply chain resilience and manufacturing of critical goods in the U.S. Both measures authorize billions more for research and development at the National Science Foundation, the Energy Department and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2. Why is this necessary? While the U.S. is a leader in chip design, roughly 90% of global chip manufacturing capacity is elsewhere -- primarily in Taiwan and South Korea. That puts the U.S. at high risk of supply chain disruptions in the event of trade disputes, military conflicts or, as seen in the past two years, a pandemic. China’s state-led industrial policies, which aim to achieve self-sufficiency in all stages of chip production, also threaten U.S. competitiveness. The Chinese government plans to boost its domestic production using government subsidies and tax preferences. 3. How are the House and Senate bills different? The House bill would authorize $8 billion over two years in contributions to the Green Climate Fund, a United Nations-overseen initiative to help developing countries address climate change. Republicans are opposed; Representative Michael McCaul of Texas said the money would go to an “unaccountable U.N. slush fund.” The two bills also take different approaches to creating a new directorate at the National Science Foundation, the federal agency that funds basic research in science and engineering. The Senate’s version would focus it on technology issues. The House bill would focus it on research and development to address societal issues such as climate change and inequality. 4. In what way are the bills aimed at China? Neither bill explicitly states the U.S. is in a race with China for semiconductor sovereignty, but lawmakers regularly describe the bills that way. The Senate bill “will allow the United States to out-compete countries like China in critical technologies like semiconductors,” Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said last May. Any doubt that China is the real target of the bills is put to rest by the many provisions unrelated to semiconductors. 5. What are those provisions? Both bills include funding to develop alternatives to Chinese 5G telecommunications equipment, which the U.S. worries could be used to carry out cyberattacks or espionage. (China denies that.) Both bills would impose sanctions on China for its treatment of the predominantly Muslim Uighurs in the far-western region of Xinjiang and elevate the rank of U.S. special coordinator for Tibetan issues at the State Department. The Senate bill would require U.S. agencies to treat Taiwan’s elected government as the “legitimate representative of the people of Taiwan” and to stop using China’s preferred term, “Taiwan authorities.” The Senate would also impose additional sanctions on China for cyberattacks and theft of trade secrets. The House bill would allow Hong Kong residents to apply for temporary protected status in the U.S. and extend an export ban on certain crowd control equipment to the Hong Kong police. After the Senate passed its bill last June, Chinese lawmakers said the legislation “smears China’s development path and domestic and foreign policies” and “interferes in China’s internal affairs under the banner of innovation and competition.” 6. What are the prospects? There is broad agreement on the need to support domestic chip production and research, as both bills would do. A bipartisan group of over 140 lawmakers wrote to House and Senate leaders to urge them to make sure the $52 billion for chips is included in whatever final bill emerges from negotiations. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat, said in March that he was hopeful the legislation would be finished in the coming months. The Biden administration stated its support for both chambers to reconcile differences and put a bill on the president’s desk “as soon as possible.”

#### Plan drains PC and trades off.

Peter C. Carstensen 21. Fred W. & Vi Miller Chair in Law Emeritus, University of Wisconsin Law School, February 2021. “The “Ought” And “Is Likely” Of Biden Antitrust,” https://www.concurrences.com/en/review/issues/no-1-2021/on-topic/the-new-us-antitrust-administration-en

14. Similarly, despite bipartisan murmurs about competitive issues, the potential in a closely divided Congress that any major initiatives will survive is limited at best. In part the challenge here is how the Biden administration will rank its commitments. If it were to make reform of competition law a major and primary commitment, it would have to trade off other goals, which might include health care reform or increases in the minimum wage. It is likely in this circumstance the new administration, like the Obama administration’s abandonment of the pro-competitive rules proposed under the PSA, would elect to give up stricter competition rules in order to achieve other legislative priorities. 15. Another key to a robust commitment to workable competition is the choice of cabinet and other key administrative positions. Here as well, the early signs are not entirely encouraging. In selecting Tom Vilsack to return as secretary of agriculture, the president has embraced a friend of the large corporate interests dominating agriculture who has spent the last four years in a highly lucrative position advancing their interests. Given the desperate need for pro-competitive rules to implement the PSA and control exploitation of dairy farmers through milk-market orders, the return of Vilsack is not good news. Who will head the FTC and who will be the attorney general and assistant attorney general for antitrust is still unknown, but if those picks are also centrists with strong links to corporate America the hope for robust enforcement of competition law will further attenuate! 16. In sum, this is a pessimistic prognostication for the likely Biden antitrust enforcement agenda. There is much that ought to be done. But this requires a willingness to take major enforcement risks, to invest significant political capital in the legislative process, and to select leaders who are committed to advancing the public interest in fair, efficient and dynamically competitive markets. The early signs are that the new administration will be no more committed to robust competition policy than the Obama administration. Events may force a more vigorous policy—I will cling to that hope as the Biden administration takes shape.

#### Semiconductors key to EV rollout

David Ferris 21. E&E News. "Chip Shortage Threatens Biden’s Electric Vehicle Plans, Commerce Secretary Says". Scientific American. 11-30-2021. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/chip-shortage-threatens-bidens-electric-vehicle-plans-commerce-secretary-says/>

Building support for a congressional bill to take on China, Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo said yesterday that automakers’ grand electric vehicle plans are imperiled by the ongoing shortage of computer semiconductors. “The average electric vehicle has about 2,000 chips, roughly double the average number of chips in a non-electric car,” Raimondo said in prepared remarks to the Detroit Economic Club, a nonprofit business group located in Michigan’s automotive hub. “As companies like Ford and GM compete to grab a foothold in the electric vehicle market, we know that innovation in the American battery market will be stifled if we aren’t also investing in domestic semiconductor innovation at the same time,” Raimondo said. Prior to the speech, Raimondo also told reporters that Biden’s plans for half of new vehicles to be electric by 2030 depends on the U.S. investing in semiconductor production. “That’s necessary for our American economic competitiveness, it’s necessary if we’re going to meet our climate change goals, and it’s necessary to create jobs,” she told The Detroit News. The secretary’s Michigan visit was intended to drum up support for a $52 billion legislative package to revitalize the U.S. semiconductor industry. The “Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors (CHIPS) for America Act,” or “CHIPS for America Act” in short, was passed by the Senate in June as part of a bigger bill but hasn’t received a vote in the House of Representatives. The globe’s semiconductors are mainly made in Asia, especially China and Taiwan. As pandemic lockdowns eased and the economy coughed back to life, automakers have been frustrated in their efforts to meet pent-up demand for cars. Semiconductor companies prioritized electronics companies, not automakers, for their limited supplies. As a result, nearly every automaker has experienced chip-related slowdowns and shutdowns. The shortages have already tapped the brakes on several high-profile EVs. In August, Ford Motor Co. told customers that a lack of chips would put off delivery of its flagship EV, the Mustang Mach-E, for several weeks, and General Motors Co. temporarily shut the Detroit factory where it makes the Bolt EV. Also this summer, Rivian Automotive Inc., the electric truck-maker, cited semiconductors as the reason for a delay, and its output remains very slow. A spokesperson for the Commerce Department said that the figure Raimondo cited—that an EV has twice the chips a traditional car has—came from discussions with automakers. “We believe it’s a reasonable average,” the spokesperson said. A recent study by IDTechEx, a consultancy based in the United Kingdom, estimated that an EV requires more than twice as many semiconductors as its internal-combustion-engine counterpart, mainly because the EV demands much more use of power electronics. An analyst said that Raimondo is correct that EVs require more semiconductors but didn’t necessarily agree that it means electric vehicles are uniquely vulnerable to shortages of them. “EVs, particularly those designed on EV-only platforms, generally have more electronic content, and thus require more chips,” said Alan Baum, an automotive forecaster based in Michigan who studies electric vehicles. However, he added, “design of EVs matter and ... a clean sheet approach, like Tesla, or even new platforms from GM, Ford and VW allow for greater capability and more efficient use of chips.” Tesla Inc., the electric automaker, has faced fewer chip-related production problems. Baum said that Tesla’s design requires less chips because it “has centralized computing in a single spot in the car, rather than computing spread through the various vehicle systems.” Tesla’s rivals have taken action on chip shortages by incorporating themselves into the supply chain. Earlier this month, Ford struck an agreement with maker GlobalFoundries to make chips, and GM said it would work with Qualcomm Inc. and NXP Semiconductors NV in a similar arrangement.

#### Solves climate change

Carolyn Gramling 21. Earth and Climate Writer, Ph.D. in marine geochemistry from MIT and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, ; "How electric vehicles offered hope as climate challenges grew". Science News. 9-11-2021. https://www.sciencenews.org/article/electric-vehicles-cars-climate-change-challenges-2021

This was another year of bleak climate news. Record heat waves baked the Pacific Northwest. Wildfires raged in California, Oregon, Washington and neighboring states. Tropical cyclones rapidly intensified in the Pacific Ocean. And devastating flash floods inundated Western Europe and China. Human-caused climate change is sending the world hurtling down a road to more extreme weather events, and we’re running out of time to pump the brakes, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned in August (SN: 9/11/21, p. 8). The world needs to dramatically reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, and fast, if there’s any hope of preventing worse and more frequent extreme weather events. That means shifting to renewable sources of energy — and, importantly, decarbonizing transportation, a sector that is now responsible for about a quarter of the world’s carbon dioxide emissions. But the path to that cleaner future is daunting, clogged with political and societal roadblocks, as well as scientific obstacles. Perhaps that’s one reason why the electric vehicle — already on the road, already navigating many of these roadblocks — swerved so dramatically into the climate solutions spotlight in 2021. Just a few years ago, many automakers thought electric vehicles, or EVs, might be a passing fad, says Gil Tal, director of the Plug-in Hybrid & Electric Vehicle Research Center at the University of California, Davis. “It’s now clear to everyone that [EVs are] here to stay.” Globally, EV sales surged in the first half of 2021, increasing by 160 percent compared with the previous year. Even in 2020 — when most car sales were down due to the COVID-19 pandemic — EV sales were up 46 percent relative to 2019. Meanwhile, automakers from General Motors to Volkswagen to Nissan have outlined plans to launch new EV models over the next decade: GM pledged to go all-electric by 2035, Honda by 2040. Ford introduced electric versions of its iconic Mustang and F-150 pickup truck. Consumer demand for EVs isn’t actually driving the surge in sales, Tal says. The real engine is a change in supply due to government policies pushing automakers to boost their EV production. The European Union’s toughened CO2 emissions laws for the auto industry went into effect in 2021, and automakers have already bumped up new EV production in the region. China mandated in 2020 that EVs make up 40 percent of new car sales by 2030. Costa Rica has set official phase-out targets for internal combustion engines. In the United States, where transportation has officially supplanted power generation as the top greenhouse gas–emitting sector, President Joe Biden’s administration set a goal this year of having 50 percent of new U.S. vehicle sales be electric — both plug-in hybrid and all-electric — by 2030. That’s a steep rise over EVs’ roughly 2.5 percent share of new cars sold in the United States today. In September, California announced that by 2035 all new cars and passenger trucks sold in the state must be zero-emission. There are concrete signs that automakers are truly committing to EVs. In September, Ford announced plans to build two new complexes in Tennessee and Kentucky to produce electric trucks and batteries. Climate change–related energy crises, such as the February failure of Texas’ power system, may also boost interest in EVs, Ford CEO Jim Farley said September 28 on the podcast Columbia Energy Exchange. “We’re seeing more extreme weather events with global warming, and so people are looking at these vehicles not just for propulsion but for … other benefits,” Farley said. “One of the most popular features of the F-150 Lightning is the fact that you can power your house for three days” with the truck’s battery. More to navigate Although the EV market is growing fast, it’s still not fast enough to meet the Paris Agreement goals, the International Energy Agency reported this year. For the world to reach net-zero emissions by 2050 — when carbon emissions added to the atmosphere are balanced by carbon removal — EVs would need to climb from the current 5 percent of global car sales to 60 percent by 2030, the agency found. As for the United States, even if the Biden administration’s plan for EVs comes to fruition, the country’s transportation sector will still fall short of its emissions targets, researchers reported in 2020 in Nature Climate Change. To hit those targets, electric cars would need to make up 90 percent of new U.S. car sales by 2050 — or people would need to drive a lot less. And to truly supplant fossil fuel vehicles, electric options need to meet several benchmarks. Prices for new and used EVs must come down. Charging stations must be available and affordable to all, including people who don’t live in homes where they can plug in. And battery ranges must be extended. Average ranges have been improving. Just five or so years ago, cars needed a recharge after about 100 miles; today the average is about 250 miles, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C., to New York City. But limited ranges and too few charging stations remain a sticking point. Today’s batteries also require metals that are scarce, difficult to access or produced in mining operations rife with serious human rights issues. Although there, too, solutions may be on the horizon, including finding ways to recycle batteries to alleviate materials shortages (SN: 12/4/21, p. 4). EVs on their own are nowhere near enough to forestall the worst effects of climate change. But it won’t be possible to slow global warming without them. And in a year with a lot of grim climate news — both devastating extreme events and maddeningly stalled political action — EVs offered one glimmer of hope. “We have the technology. It’s not dependent on some technology that’s not developed yet,” Tal says. “The hope is that now we are way more willing to [transition to EVs] than at any time before.”

#### Extinction

Bill McKibben 19. Schumann Distinguished Scholar at Middlebury College; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; holds honorary degrees from 18 colleges and universities; Foreign Policy named him to their inaugural list of the world’s 100 most important global thinkers. "This Is How Human Extinction Could Play Out." Rolling Stone. 4-9-2019. https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/bill-mckibben-falter-climate-change-817310/

Oh, it could get very bad.

In 2015, a study in the Journal of Mathematical Biology pointed out that if the world’s oceans kept warming, by 2100 they might become hot enough to “stop oxygen production by phyto-plankton by disrupting the process of photosynthesis.” Given that two-thirds of the Earth’s oxygen comes from phytoplankton, that would “likely result in the mass mortality of animals and humans.”

A year later, above the Arctic Circle, in Siberia, a heat wave thawed a reindeer carcass that had been trapped in the permafrost. The exposed body released anthrax into nearby water and soil, infecting two thousand reindeer grazing nearby, and they in turn infected some humans; a twelve-year-old boy died. As it turns out, permafrost is a “very good preserver of microbes and viruses, because it is cold, there is no oxygen, and it is dark” — scientists have managed to revive an eight-million-year-old bacterium they found beneath the surface of a glacier. Researchers believe there are fragments of the Spanish flu virus, smallpox, and bubonic plague buried in Siberia and Alaska.

Or consider this: as ice sheets melt, they take weight off land, and that can trigger earthquakes — seismic activity is already increasing in Greenland and Alaska. Meanwhile, the added weight of the new seawater starts to bend the Earth’s crust. “That will give you a massive increase in volcanic activity. It’ll activate faults to create earthquakes, submarine landslides, tsunamis, the whole lot,” explained the director of University College London’s Hazard Centre. Such a landslide happened in Scandinavia about eight thousand years ago, as the last Ice Age retreated and a Kentucky-size section of Norway’s continental shelf gave way, “plummeting down to the abyssal plain and creating a series of titanic waves that roared forth with a vengeance,” wiping all signs of life from coastal Norway to Greenland and “drowning the Wales-sized landmass that once connected Britain to the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany.” When the waves hit the Shetlands, they were sixty-five feet high.

There’s even this: if we keep raising carbon dioxide levels, we may not be able to think straight anymore. At a thousand parts per million (which is within the realm of possibility for 2100), human cognitive ability falls 21 percent. “The largest effects were seen for Crisis Response, Information Usage, and Strategy,” a Harvard study reported, which is too bad, as those skills are what we seem to need most.

I could, in other words, do my best to scare you silly. I’m not opposed on principle — changing something as fundamental as the composition of the atmosphere, and hence the heat balance of the planet, is certain to trigger all manner of horror, and we shouldn’t shy away from it. The dramatic uncertainty that lies ahead may be the most frightening development of all; the physical world is going from backdrop to foreground. (It’s like the contrast between politics in the old days, when you could forget about Washington for weeks at a time, and politics in the Trump era, when the president is always jumping out from behind a tree to yell at you.)

But let’s try to occupy ourselves with the most likely scenarios, because they are more than disturbing enough. Long before we get to tidal waves or smallpox, long before we choke to death or stop thinking clearly, we will need to concentrate on the most mundane and basic facts: everyone needs to eat every day, and an awful lot of us live near the ocean.

FOOD SUPPLY first. We’ve had an amazing run since the end of World War II, with crop yields growing fast enough to keep ahead of a fast-rising population. It’s come at great human cost — displaced peasant farmers fill many of the planet’s vast slums — but in terms of sheer volume, the Green Revolution’s fertilizers, pesticides, and machinery managed to push output sharply upward. That climb, however, now seems to be running into the brute facts of heat and drought. There are studies to demonstrate the dire effects of warming on coffee, cacao, chickpeas, and champagne, but it is cereals that we really need to worry about, given that they supply most of the planet’s calories: corn, wheat, and rice all evolved as crops in the climate of the last ten thousand years, and though plant breeders can change them, there are limits to those changes. You can move a person from Hanoi to Edmonton, and she might decide to open a Vietnamese restaurant. But if you move a rice plant, it will die.

A 2017 study in Australia, home to some of the world’s highest-tech farming, found that “wheat productivity has flatlined as a direct result of climate change.” After tripling between 1900 and 1990, wheat yields had stagnated since, as temperatures increased a degree and rainfall declined by nearly a third. “The chance of that just being variable climate without the underlying factor [of climate change] is less than one in a hundred billion,” the researchers said, and it meant that despite all the expensive new technology farmers kept introducing, “they have succeeded only in standing still, not in moving forward.” Assuming the same trends continued, yields would actually start to decline inside of two decades, they reported. In June 2018, researchers found that a two-degree Celsius rise in temperature — which, recall, is what the Paris accords are now aiming for — could cut U.S. corn yields by 18 percent. A four-degree increase — which is where our current trajectory will take us — would cut the crop almost in half. The United States is the world’s largest producer of corn, which in turn is the planet’s most widely grown crop.

Corn is vulnerable because even a week of high temperatures at the key moment can keep it from fertilizing. (“You only get one chance to pollinate a quadrillion kernels of corn,” the head of a commodity consulting firm explained.) But even the hardiest crops are susceptible. Sorghum, for instance, which is a staple for half a billion humans, is particularly hardy in dry conditions because it has big, fibrous roots that reach far down into the earth. Even it has limits, though, and they are being reached. Thirty years of data from the American Midwest show that heat waves affect the “vapor pressure deficit,” the difference between the water vapor in the sorghum leaf’s interior and that in the surrounding air. Hotter weather means the sorghum releases more moisture into the atmosphere. Warm the planet’s temperature by two degrees Celsius — which is, again, now the world’s goal — and sorghum yields drop 17 percent. Warm it five degrees Celsius (nine degrees Fahrenheit), and yields drop almost 60 percent.

It’s hard to imagine a topic duller than sorghum yields. It’s the precise opposite of clickbait. But people have to eat; in the human game, the single most important question is probably “What’s for dinner?” And when the answer is “Not much,” things deteriorate fast. In 2010 a severe heat wave hit Russia, and it wrecked the grain harvest, which led the Kremlin to ban exports. The global price of wheat spiked, and that helped trigger the Arab Spring — Egypt at the time was the largest wheat importer on the planet. That experience set academics and insurers to work gaming out what the next food shock might look like. In 2017 one team imagined a vigorous El Niño, with the attendant floods and droughts — for a season, in their scenario, corn and soy yields declined by 10 percent, and wheat and rice by 7 percent. The result was chaos: “quadrupled commodity prices, civil unrest, significant negative humanitarian consequences . . . Food riots break out in urban areas across the Middle East, North Africa, and Latin America. The euro weakens and the main European stock markets lose ten percent.”

At about the same time, a team of British researchers released a study demonstrating that even if you can grow plenty of food, the transportation system that distributes it runs through just fourteen major choke-points, and those are vulnerable to — you guessed it — massive disruption from climate change. For instance, U.S. rivers and canals carry a third of the world’s corn and soy, and they’ve been frequently shut down or crimped by flooding and drought in recent years. Brazil accounts for 17 percent of the world’s grain exports, but heavy rainfall in 2017 stranded three thousand trucks. “It’s the glide path to a perfect storm,” said one of the report’s authors.

Five weeks after that, another report raised an even deeper question. What if you can figure out how to grow plenty of food, and you can figure out how to guarantee its distribution, but the food itself has lost much of its value? The paper, in the journal Environmental Research, said that rising carbon dioxide levels, by speeding plant growth, seem to have reduced the amount of protein in basic staple crops, a finding so startling that, for many years, agronomists had overlooked hints that it was happening. But it seems to be true: when researchers grow grain at the carbon dioxide levels we expect for later this century, they find that minerals such as calcium and iron drop by 8 percent, and protein by about the same amount. In the developing world, where people rely on plants for their protein, that means huge reductions in nutrition: India alone could lose 5 percent of the protein in its total diet, putting 53 million people at new risk for protein deficiency. The loss of zinc, essential for maternal and infant health, could endanger 138 million people around the world. In 2018, rice researchers found “significantly less protein” when they grew eighteen varieties of rice in high–carbon dioxide test plots. “The idea that food became less nutritious was a surprise,” said one researcher. “It’s not intuitive. But I think we should continue to expect surprises. We are completely altering the biophysical conditions that underpin our food system.” And not just ours. People don’t depend on goldenrod, for instance, but bees do. When scientists looked at samples of goldenrod in the Smithsonian that dated back to 1842, they found that the protein content of its pollen had “declined by a third since the industrial revolution — and the change closely tracks with the rise in carbon dioxide.”

Bees help crops, obviously, so that’s scary news. But in August 2018, a massive new study found something just as frightening: crop pests were thriving in the new heat. “It gets better and better for them,” said one University of Colorado researcher. Even if we hit the UN target of limiting temperature rise to two degrees Celsius, pests should cut wheat yields by 46 percent, corn by 31 percent, and rice by 19 percent. “Warmer temperatures accelerate the metabolism of insect pests like aphids and corn borers at a predictable rate,” the researchers found. “That makes them hungrier[,] and warmer temperatures also speed up their reproduction.” Even fossilized plants from fifty million years ago make the point: “Plant damage from insects correlated with rising and falling temperatures, reaching a maximum during the warmest periods.”

### CP---1NC

#### The United States federal government should:

#### Impose structural regulations on domestic, private sector financial institutions amassing liabilities greater than five percent of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's Deposit Insurance Fund including but not limited to requirements for

#### Aggregate ownership caps

#### Voting limits

#### Governance restrictions

#### Clearinghouses

#### Increase its funding for startup companies in the United States

#### Increase its spending on research and development

#### Substantially increase funding allocated to social insurance programs, increase investment in green infrastructure and public universities, and increase the minimum wage

#### Create and invest in an artificial intelligence-based counter-disinformation framework

#### Solves and avoids legislation

Daniel A. Hanley 22. Senior Legal Analyst at the Open Markets Institute. “Administrative Antimonopoly”. Open Markets Institute. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e449c8c3ef68d752f3e70dc/t/6218f6611faaa208ec1c7c9c/1645803106323/HanleyDaniel+-+Administrative+Antimonopoly+-+FINAL.pdf

V. Conclusion

America is facing an invigorated resurgence in antimonopoly enforcement. While Congress considers new antitrust legislation, the president can use administrative agencies to enact a progressive and vigorous antimonopoly agenda. The agencies detailed in this report have exceptionally broad and latent statutory powers that in many cases have been woefully underutilized for decades. These powers can and must be used to create a fairer marketplace for consumers, workers, and small businesses.

### DA---1NC

#### DOJ’s focused on its Google lawsuit now.

NICO GRANT et al. 6/28/21. Technology Reporter at Bloomberg, with MARK BERGEN, NAOMI NIX, AND BLOOMBERG, “Google’s ad business faces heat as DOJ extends Trump-era probe.” https://fortune.com/2021/06/28/googles-ad-business-antitrust-probe/

Antitrust investigators at the U.S. Justice Department have stepped up scrutiny of Google’s digital ad market practices in recent months, according to people familiar with the matter, showing that the Biden administration is actively pursuing a probe that started under former President Donald Trump.

Staffers from the antitrust office have interviewed multiple Google competitors about its practices in the advertising technology market, putting a target on the company’s second-most important business, according to people familiar with the action, who asked not to be identified discussing the early stage probe.

The Justice Department already sued Google last year, saying the Alphabet Inc.-owned company was abusing its dominance in internet search, its biggest business. Any additional legal action, including whether to bring a second suit, will likely depend on whoever is chosen as the assistant attorney general of the antitrust division by U.S. President Joe Biden. It will be up to that person to decide whether to proceed, and it’s possible the government will bring no action against the company.

The government is also gathering evidence from existing lawsuits and probes in other jurisdictions, focusing on Google’s business that places ads on others’ websites, one of the people said. The Justice Department declined to comment.

“Our advertising technologies help websites and apps fund their content and enable small businesses to reach customers around the world,” Julie Tarallo McAlister, a Google spokeswoman, said in a statement. “The enormous competition in online advertising has made online ads more relevant,reduced ad-tech fees, and expanded options for publishers and advertisers.”

Google, which for many serves as the home page of the internet, has been under intense antitrust scrutiny from regulators around the world, who have opened a flurry of investigations into the company’s business practices. The antitrust division’s continued information-gathering on Google’s display business raises the specter of additional regulatory enforcement against the internet giant in the U.S., its largest market and home turf.

The news comes soon after the confirmation of tech critic Lina Khan as the new chair of the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, as well as the European Union’s announcement of a formal investigation into whether Google has abused its leading position in the ad tech market. The company this month made concessions to the French government to make its digital auctions fairer.

Google already faces three antitrust lawsuits at home, one led by the Justice Department and two brought by coalitions of U.S. state attorneys general.

The Mountain View, California-based company owns major pieces of the online ad market. It runs an ad-buying service for marketers and an ad-selling one for publishers, as well as a trading exchange where both sides complete transactions in lightning-fast auctions.

These exchanges operate like online stock-trading platforms with an automated bidding process. Competitors and publishers have complained that Google leverages parts of this vast network, like its ad exchange, to benefit other areas and kneecap rivals. Overall, these ad tech products generated $23 billion in gross revenue for the internet giant last year. Google has argued that it pays out much of these ad-tech sales to web publishers.

The Justice Department cast a wide net when it began investigating Google under Attorney General William Barr, speaking with longtime foes of the tech giant including News Corp., Oracle Corp., and Yelp Inc. on their varied concerns about Google, including claims related to ad tech. In October, the department sued Google on other grounds, alleging the company had taken anti-competitive steps to extend its search engine monopoly. Two months later, a group of U.S. states led by Texas sued Google, claiming it had rigged the digital ads market, at which point it was unclear if the Justice Department maintained an interest in investigating Google’s ad tech business.

#### **DOJ resources are finite---the plan forces tradeoffs.**

Brian Blais 21. Partner in the litigation and enforcement practice group @ Ropes & Gray LLP and a former federal prosecutor, 3/26/21. “Podcast: 2021 DOJ Enforcement Priorities Under U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland.” Interview with Lisa Bebchick. https://www.ropesgray.com/en/newsroom/podcasts/2021/March/Podcast-2021-DOJ-Enforcement-Priorities-Under-US-Attorney-General-Merrick-Garland

Brian Blais: Well, as I referenced earlier, I think one real challenge for the Garland DOJ will be the many competing demands on the resources available to DOJ leadership. In addition to the many corporate-related priorities I just discussed, there are a large number of Biden administration priorities that implicate the DOJ, many of which represent a sharp break from the priorities of the Trump Department of Justice—so those include things like environmental justice and the prosecution of environmental cases; civil rights and voting act cases; the ongoing fight against domestic terrorism, including as we talked about earlier, the January 6th Capitol attack; immigration reform and potential shifts in immigration prosecution priorities; potentially heightened antitrust enforcement; and criminal justice reform writ large, just to name a few. And putting aside even all these priorities, there’s a huge backlog of cases in the Department more broadly due to pandemic-related shutdowns, including a substantial trial backlog. So there will be a significant amount of prosecutorial time and effort in the near-term devoted to resolving these already charged matters, as well as moving along already opened investigations, so that leaves reduced prosecutorial bandwidth to advance any new enforcement priorities. So all of that’s to say, one big question for the Garland DOJ is: Can it do it all, or will these various competing demands lead to a natural prioritization of certain enforcement priorities over others? We’ll certainly have a better sense in the coming weeks and months as the remaining DOJ leadership is confirmed, as priorities get communicated, and as the first round of investigations under the new leadership start to launch.

#### **The case against Google will be the first to go.**

CHRISTOPHER KOOPMAN 21. Executive director at the Center for Growth and Opportunity at Utah State University, with Caden Rosenbaum, 3/11/21. “Why Merrick Garland needs to rethink the Google antitrust case.” https://fortune.com/2021/03/11/merrick-garland-google-antitrust-lawsuit-big-tech-breakup/

During the first day of Merrick Garland’s Senate hearing last month, President Biden’s nominee for attorney general outlined what his priorities would be at the Department of Justice. From investigating the insurrection to immigration enforcement, Garland has promised to bring a change in direction from the last Justice Department. To accomplish this will require reassessing where the DOJ focuses its time, resources, and leadership. The first step is withdrawing from several initiatives that are dubious at best, politically motivated at worst.

In particular, now that he has been confirmed as attorney general, Garland should begin by closely scrutinizing the DOJ’s current lawsuit against Google. That case is an example of what happens when political pressures and intergenerational misunderstandings shape cases, rather than the law. In short, Attorney General William Barr’s decision to bring this case in the way he did was a literal embodiment of the “Old Man Yells at Cloud” meme.

#### **Breaking up Big Tech key to privacy.**

Praharsha Anand 21. business and technology writer based in Bangalore, India 3/5/21. “Pros and cons of breaking up big tech.” https://www.itpro.com/data-insights/big-data/358795/pros-and-cons-of-breaking-up-big-tech

Pros of breaking up Big Tech

1. More opportunities for small businesses

Google answers 92% of the world’s search queries, and Amazon sells nearly everything a consumer may seek, leaving small business owners with little or no market space. Plus, buying smaller rivals is another trade practice Big Tech firms exercise to protect their dominance. For instance, Google has acquired over 270 companies since 2001. Over the last decade, Facebook acquired numerous rivals, including WhatsApp and Instagram, to kill the competition.

One way to ensure fair trade across industries is to bar Big Tech from entering adjacent markets. This will also prevent Big Tech from getting bigger.

2. Reduced data privacy concerns

When Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg testified and publicly apologized for a massive data breach in 2018, users worldwide questioned the platform’s ability to keep their information safe. Many believe Big Tech is increasingly seeking to monitor and dictate what consumers see and buy online. Targeted ads from Google have summoned similar reactions.

Once again, healthy competition can help end users’ privacy dilemmas. The more players looking to offer secure platforms, the greater the pressure on Big Tech to increase users’ data privacy.

#### Privacy outweighs everything else.

Goold, 10. Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia Faculty of Law and a Research Associate at the Oxford University Centre for Criminology, (Benjamin, “How Much Surveillance is Too Much? Some Thoughts on Surveillance, Democracy, and the Political Value of Privacy”, OVERVÅKNING I EN RETTSSTAT - SURVEILLANCE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, 2010, PDF, page 45-47)

This all of course leads us back to the question at the beginning of this chapter, namely: how much state surveillance is too much? Perhaps the first and most obvious response to this question is that the state should at all times be sensitive to the fact that privacy is a basic human right, and that it is essential to personal development, individual dignity, and the ability of citizens to engage in meaningful social relationships. We have, in the words of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, a right to “respect for private and family life” because without such privacy we can never truly flourish. Going further, however, the state must also recognize that privacy has an important role to play in the promotion of democracy and the meaningful exercise of a number of other fundamental rights, such as the right tofreedom of expression and freedom of association. As a consequence, all state surveillance activities – regardless of whether the justification for such measures is the prevention of crime, the promotion of security, or even the efficient delivery of public services – must be evaluated in terms of the potential cost to political freedom and the maintenance of democratic values. This is particularly important given that, as Bennett and Raab rightly point out, the social value of privacy can be easily forgotten in our efforts to protect individuals from the personal effects of overzealous state surveillance: The social value [of privacy] is underpowered and survives precariously unless it can be specifically reinforced by a change in the privacy culture, for it is powerfully challenged by the legacy of the conventional paradigm and by forces that tend to the protection of privacy seen as an individual value, if a value at all.62 Put simply, there is little point in the state seeking to create a society free from crime and secure against terrorist threats if the overall cost is a severe loss of personal freedom and the introduction of Orwellian, authoritarian government. Put more simply, we know that there is too much surveillance when citizens begin to fear the surveillance activities of the state, and no longer feel free to exercise their lawful rights for fear of unwanted scrutiny and possible censure. Finally, given that a democratic state can only be legitimate and thrive in an atmosphere of mutual trust between government and governed, it follows that any surveillance measure that threatens to erode or destroy that trust must be resisted, or at the very least its potential costs and benefits carefully considered. As anyone who has lived in a state where the rule of law is not taken for granted – and where there is little in the way of institutional trust – will be able to tell you, confidence in the institutions of government is hard won and easily lost.63 For this reason, the presumption should be that any surveillance measure which is directed at the public at large – and which treats all citizens as potential threats or management challenges – has prima facie gone a step too far, and demands an extra-ordinary justification. According to this view, mass state surveillance should always be the exception and never the rule. In short, we will know when there is too much state surveillance when political rights and democratic participation are threatened, and it is at this point that the citizenry should demand that the state pulls back and accepts that there are times when it is better for the government to know less rather than more. Of course, some will say that we have already passed this point, that the current surveillance infrastructure already poses a serious threat to democracy and the rule of law. If this is true, then there is an even more pressing need for us to demand a halt to any further expansion in the surveillance apparatus of the state, and a fundamental reappraisal of the state’s use of technologies like public area CCTV.

### CP---1NC

#### The United States federal government should:

#### substantially increase prohibitions on interstate and foreign anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by establishing unified Banking Merger Guidelines that consider larger geographical markets, minimum efficient scale, and non-traditional competition

#### Determine that applications of federal antitrust law to intrastate anticompetitive practices violates the Commerce Clause.

#### The fifty states and all relevant territories should uniformly increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by the banking sector by establishing unified Banking Merger Guidelines that consider larger geographical markets, minimum efficient scale, and non-traditional competition.

#### It competes---the counterplan retracts the scope of antitrust law AND PICs out of intra-state anticompetitive practices.

Alan J. Meese 20. Ball Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for the Study of Law and Markets, William and Mary Law School. Antitrust Regulation and the Federal-State Balance: Restoring the Original Design, 70 AM. U. L. REV. 75 (2020).

Abandoning the substantial effects test and retracting the scope of the Sherman Act would reboot competitive federalism in the antitrust field. States would again be free to adopt unique antitrust doctrine applicable to restraints that occur within their borders and produce no external harm. States would reap the benefits of doctrinal innovations, with no prospect that federal courts applying the Sherman Act will undermine state-specific policies. 556 The resulting competition between the states acting as "laboratories of democracy"557 would presumably generate a wider variety of possible solutions-both substantive and institutional-to various antitrust problems, as states vie for producers and consumers by offering rival packages of antitrust doctrine and enforcement institutions. 558 This decentralized process of articulating antitrust doctrine and policy would generate both experience and data about the impact of various rules and institutions, thereby informing lawmakers and state courts considering possible reforms. Federal courts, too, could learn from these results, drawing upon the "accumulated experience" of various states when fashioning Sherman Act doctrine. 559

Retraction of the scope of the Sherman Act would also radically alter the prominence and role of the state action doctrine, first articulated in 1943 in Parker v. Brown.560 As noted earlier, the vast majority of cases where parties raise the state action defense involve police power regulations restraining local commerce without producing any interstate harm.51 No doubt the resulting framing of the legal question as a clash between the Sherman Act and historic police power regulation has deterred the Court from invoking the Act as a source of general authority to evaluate the "reasonableness" of garden variety state regulations, especially during the 1940s, when faith in the motives and capacity of regulators was at its apogee.5 2 Indeed, scholars and jurists have attributed Parker to just such an anti-Lochnerian impulse. 563

Restoration of the pre-1948 direct/indirect standard would place such local regulations beyond the reach of the Sherman Act altogether, eliminating the need for any state action analysis with respect to such restraints.564 The Supreme Court's state action docket would shrink accordingly. Moreover, state action cases that did reach the Court would differ significantly from those that have thus far informed the Court's treatment of state-imposed restraints. Instead of state regulations of local billboards, dentistry, and intrastate lawyer advertising, such cases would, like Parker, involve state restraints imposing substantial harm on out-of-state consumers. 565 This new framing could force the current Court, less friendly to regulation than the Parker Court, to reconsider its hands-off approach to state-approved restraints. Reducing the scope of the Sherman Act could ironically result in more robust preemption of state-approved restraints than ever accomplished under the post1948 regime.

#### Solves the case and restores competitive government---the plan and perm unduly expand the Commerce Clause.

Bruce Johnson and Moin A. Yahya 04. D. Bruce Johnsen, Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law. J.D., Emory University, 1985; Ph.D., University of Washington, 1987. Moin A. Yahya, Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, University of Alberta School of Law. J.D., George Mason University School of Law, 2003. Ph.D., University of Toronto, 2000. The Evolution of Sherman Act Jurisdiction: A Roadmap for Competitive Federalism, 7 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 403 (2004). https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jcl/vol7/iss2/2

Scholars and jurists increasingly acknowledge that the U.S. Supreme Court's Commerce Clause jurisprudence desperately needs a new direction. Even Laurence Tribe, widely regarded as a liberal commentator, concedes that until very recently the Court's decisions in this area came dangerously close to foreclosing it from imposing any kind of principled constitutional limitation on the scope of Commerce Clause jurisdiction.3 Chief Justice Rehnquist has openly admitted that much of the case law in this area is less than a model of clarity.4 In what has been heralded by some as the Rehnquist Court's "celebrated project to re-establish structural constitutional principles on federalism,' ' and by others more prosaically as "the new federalism, ''6 recent Supreme Court cases have imposed Tenth Amendment constraints on federal commerce power,7 limited the local application of federal regulatory statutes to Congress's unmistakable intent," and most importantly found that local non-economic activities lie outside the constitutional scope of Commerce Clause jurisdiction.9 Yet, in spite of indications the Rehnquist Court is inclined to seek a new direction, it remains to be seen how it might do so in a way that minimizes troublesome conflicts with the existing body of constitutional precedent. This Article shows that the Court can look to the evolution of Sherman Acto jurisdiction to realign its approach to Commerce Clause jurisdiction to restore the balance of dual sovereignty while posing little immediate threat to constitutional precedent.

The first of two steps is for the Court to fully embrace competitive federalism as the long-run framework within which to gradually narrow the evolving contours of Commerce Clause jurisdiction." Competitive federalism has experienced growing appreciation among political scientists, economists, and constitutional scholars, 2 with some even suggesting it has been the driving force of sustained economic development in modern times.1 3 There is no doubt the U.S. Constitution establishes a federal system, but this says nothing about what determines the proper balance of dual sovereignty. Under competitive federalism, state and federal governments compete with one another to provide regulation to a mobile citizenry. State regulation under local "police powers" is justified when economic markets fail to allocate resources efficiently due to economic spillovers-so-called "externalities"-that separate the parties who benefit from those who bear costs of an activity. When confined to a single state, competition from other states ensures that the state's regulators have sufficient incentive to address economic spillovers. In the face of interstate spillovers, however, individual states will misallocate political resources by engaging in too little regulation of their internal economic markets. Federal regulation of economic markets under the Commerce Clause is justified only when competition between states leads to a political market failure.

This approach has been criticized as a prescription for how the Court should determine the limits of federal commerce power because those seeking regulation can always make a plausible claim that the activity in question generates an interstate economic spillover, while in fact they are motivated by private rent seeking. 4 Through out this Article we remain agnostic on this issue. Whether a federal regulation is driven by public interest or rent seeking, our sole concern is with how the Court can gradually identify and screen out applications of antitrust regulations that do not plausibly involve interstate economic spillovers. The Court can thereby move toward the proper balance of dual sovereignty, and political competition should increasingly limit the sum of economic rents the respective sovereigns are able to extract.15

Competitive federalism has clear implications for the evolution of Sherman Act jurisdiction. This evolution provides a useful roadmap to help the Court find the appropriate jurisdictional balance for its general Commerce Clause jurisprudence. It is both fitting and instructive that case law under one of the nation's first pieces of Commerce Clause legislation would provide such a roadmap,"6 for this is where judicial understanding of the relevant market failure can be expected to have evolved furthest to reduce legal uncertainty raised by the statutory shock. Passed in response to fears that the great trusts were beyond • • the power \* of 17 any state to effectively regulate owing to a political market failure, the Sherman Act prohibits only restraints of trade or commerce "among the several States."'8 For more than eighty years following passage of the Act, the Court struggled to identify the nature of the market failure resulting from various business practices alleged to restrain. This led to a patchwork of conflicting decisions, judicial confusion over the proper objective of the Act, and condemnation of business activities now widely recognized as pro-competitive. As economic theory progressed it gave the Court increasing insight into the nature and effect of various trade restraints. Driven largely by the Chicago School of economics,' 9 antitrust scholars began to develop and test hypotheses regarding a host of business practices that were argued to restrain trade.2 0 This process eventually generated a body of scientific knowledge sufficiently reliable to support expert testimony on the nature of the market failure associated with trade restraints, now widely regarded as the defendants' exercise of market power. The problem with market power is not that it allows firms to suppress competition or earn monopoly profits, but that it may lead them to misallocate resources by reducing output and raising prices to consumers. Courts and commentators now largely agree that the exclusive substantive objective of the Sherman Act is to promote consumer welfare.

Case law under the Sherman Act has since evolved toward a body of clear, workable substantive rules. But relying uncritically on the substantial effects test from its decisions on general Commerce Clause jurisdiction, the Court has routinely upheld applications of the Sherman Act to restraints that harm consumers only locally, if at all. The Court's most recent jurisdictional decision under the Act indicates that it has yet to recognize the consumer welfare standard's profound jurisdictional implications. In Summit Health, Ltd. v. Pin- 23 has, a narrow majority of the Court found that an alleged conspiracy by a chain of hospitals to exclude a single doctor from the Los Angeles market for eye surgery had a sufficient nexus to interstate commerce to support jurisdiction under the Act. The Court reasoned that the defendants' alleged restraint on the practice of ophthalmological services should be measured by its impact on other market participants not just by its impact on the respondent.24 Joined in dissent by three members of the Court, Justice Scalia noted that the majority's "analysis tells us nothing about the substantiality of the impact on interstate commerce generated by the particular conduct at issue here."25 He also argued that the Sherman Act does not "prohibit all conspiracies that have sufficient constitutional 'nexus' to interstate commerce to be regulated. It prohibits only those conspiracies that are 'in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States.' This language commands a judicial inquiry into the nature and potential effect of each particular restraint."26

Following Summit, federal courts have regularly entertained cases in which the interstate exercise of market power is so unlikely that the defendants' restraint should be presumed as a matter of law to be purely intrastate. 7 In the spirit of Justice Scalia's dissent, the second step the Court should take to realign its approach to Commerce Clause jurisdiction is to overturn Summit by formally recognizing the jurisdictional implications of the consumer welfare standard. If the market failure justifying federal regulation of trade restraints is the exercise of market power, and if the problem with market power is that it injures consumers by raising prices, then, according to competitive federalism, trade restraints that do not plausibly increase prices to consumers outside the home state should lie beyond federal reach.

#### Extinction---concentrated power makes prolif, terrorism, warming, and inequality inevitable.

Nasos Mihalakas 19. Global Professor of Practice in Law at the University of Arizona College of Law, and a Visiting Research Associate at the Athens Institute for Education & Research (ATINER). "The Need for Governance Reform – Symptoms vs. Cause". Federalism Project. 5-21-2019. https://the-federalism-project.org/2019/05/21/the-need-for-governance-reform-symptoms-vs-cause/

There is no doubt that we live in “challenging” times. We face ‘social challenges,’ from racial discrimination to gender inequality, women’s rights (reproductive or otherwise) that will have to be addressed, LGBTQ issues (recognition of gay marriage), a gun violence epidemic due to both inadequate gun control laws but also excessive violence in our society, etc. We also face ‘economic challenges,’ like stagnant salaries and low wages, job insecurity (due to automation or outsourcing), taxes that are too high for some and not high enough for others, mounting student debt, and yes massive income inequality. And, of course, we do face ‘external challenges’, from nuclear proliferation in the Korean peninsula, to ISIS and religiously motivated global terrorism, to global warming and climate change!

Yet, most of these issues are but symptoms of a greater cause. Their existence, or our inability to overcome them, is being caused by a much greater problem in our society that unless we address soon we risk permanent societal failures within the next 20 to 30 years.

This greater cause is our very own failing system of governance!!!

Though brilliant in its original construction by the founding fathers, our Federal system of governance (separation of powers, check and balances, separate Federal and State governments) is grossly off track and highly unbalanced. During the past 200 years, we witnessed a steady transfer of power away from the States and into the Federal government, and within the Federal government we saw a similar steady concentration of power in the hands of the Executive (the singular President), and to a certain extend the Supreme Court (due to Congressional acquiescence).

This did not happen due to some conspiracy by the ‘powerful elite’ or through interference by foreign powers. It happened gradually (almost naturally), as a response to major failures at the State level: in dealing with slavery and racial discrimination (see Civil War and Jim Crow laws in the south), in dealing with market failures and the need to regulate business and provide a safety net (see Great Depression, The New Deal and the Great Society), in fighting a Cold War with the Soviet Union (see expansion of military and intelligence services to advance US foreign policy).

Today, power and authority to deal with issues and solve problems is highly concentrated at the Federal level, away from ordinary people and their ability to monitor let alone influence elected politicians.

There is so much power concentrated at the Federal level, and in particular in the hands of one person (the President) that it makes Washington politicians constant targets of special interests and lobbying organizations, makes negotiations for compromise impossible because there is so much at stake, and it has created a highly unbalanced system (where “checks and balances” are not fully implemented and more often can’t work effectively).

Washington gridlock, dysfunction, polarization, and partisanship have led to the inability to pass a budget (balanced or otherwise), or address the need for immigration reform, or provide for adequate healthcare coverage and affordable prescription drugs, or even implement proper tax reform. Therefore, unless we address these ‘systemic’ failures of our system of governance, unless we implement institutional changes and fix the process, we will never get lasting solutions to our current and future societal challenges.

Unfortunately, there is no one thing we can do, no ‘magic bullet’ that can fix the dysfunction of our Federal system of governance (because it’s not just ‘the Federal government’ that needs reform, but also/primarily Congress and the Judiciary). Rather, there are several things (from specific process changes through laws/regulations to Constitutional amendments) that we will have to changes now, in order to see improvement in the function of our system of governance in the next 20 to 30 years.

There is a parallel example to this system of governance failures, and it’s that of ‘global warming.’ Global temperatures have been rising, due to greenhouse gases (caused by human activity – burning fossil fuels like coal and oil), presenting an existential threat to our planet and our way of life. However, fossil fuels are not inherently evil, used by certain people bent on the destruction of humanity! Energy from fossil fuels was instrumental in facilitating the industrial revolution, which brought progress and technological innovations during the past 150 years, that helped the whole world to advance, prosper, and better connect. It was not until recently that we realized that the constantly expanding use of fossil fuels by humans is contributing to rising temperatures, and if we don’t do something now to ‘bent the curve’, then in 20 to 30 years from now temperatures will rise to levels that can be devastating to the planets ecosystem, and by extension us humans.

Concentration of power at the Federal level, over the past 200 years, though not inherently evil (downright necessary and proper during some critical periods), has reached a point of pure dysfunction. The proof of the unsustainable nature of our current system (like rising temperatures are a proof of global warming) is income inequality. During the past 50 years, we have witnessed a steady concentration of wealth at the hands of the top 10% (and primarily the top 1%).

And although one can look at our society today statically and say: “things are still ok: there are rich people and poor people, and we are still the most powerful and wealthy nation in the world – so what’s the problem?”… the trend keeps going upwards: currently over 70% of our national wealth is concentrated at the hands for the top 10%. When do we need to do something to stop this trend? When it gets to 80%, or 90%?

Democrats and Republicans (now thanks to Donald Trump) both agree on the existence of a ‘powerful elite, in cahoots with the political establishment, bent on exploiting the middle class’… yet both party’s solution is the same: win political power and cut or raise taxes, regulate more or less, appoint some type of judges… in essence, deal with the symptoms and not the underlying cause!

If we want to address the underlying cause of income inequality (and outsourcing of jobs, health-care failures, racial tensions, education funding, women’s rights, public housing, etc.), then we need to reform our system of governance, before we can consider specific policy priorities. By fixing the legislative process, restoring proper checks, correcting the imbalance within the government branches and returning powers back to the States… we can get on a path where we see real results within the next 20 to 30 years.

Otherwise, gridlock and dysfunction at the Federal level will only get worse!

## Rural development

### Turn---1NC

#### Heg decline inevitable---attempts to sustain it guarantee conflicts like Ukraine

Haluk Dogan 2/22/22. PhD candidate in Strategy and Security within the Department of Politics at the University of Exeter, where he also completed his MA in International Relations. “The US provoked the Russian invasion to maintain its global primacy.” https://www.trtworld.com/opinion/the-us-provoked-the-russian-invasion-to-maintain-its-global-primacy-55000

In a moot effort to cling to its hegemony and keep NATO relevant, Washington has, in turn, allowed the invasion to happen.

Following a long period of escalation, Russian President Vladimir Putin has ordered troops into Eastern Ukraine’s two breakaway regions, prompting immediate Western condemnation and an emergency UN Security Council meeting. While Moscow stands accused by the West of increasing acts of aggression on the Ukrainian border, the invasion was not a one-sided event.

For months, the Anglo-American bloc has been unwilling to de-escalate the crisis. Washington and London have aimed to resuscitate the case for the NATO alliance, to invalidate arguments for a separate European Union-wide security arrangement, and to weaken Russia in seeking to prevent the emergence of rival blocs in Eurasia and the Asia-Pacific regions.

However, to put it bluntly, this strategy will not reverse the decline of American hegemony.

Is the ‘transatlantic alliance’ back?

A couple of days before the invasion, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy expressed his disappointment at the failure of his Western “friends” to support Ukraine vis-a-vis Russian aggression. This perception is consistent with Ukrainian officials’ previous accusation that US President Joe Biden gave Moscow a “green light” to invade.

Kiev’s disappointment is completely understandable.

Giving Moscow the green light is as much about transatlantic relations as it is about West-Russia or Ukraine-Russia relations. The US’ post-World War II hegemony is predicated on its domination in continental Europe, with NATO acting as the principal mechanism for achieving American primacy.

The Anglo-American strategy now focuses on preventing European states from acting independently. The Russian threat is thought to serve that aim, pushing Europe to be in need of American and British power.

The Anglo-American bloc has never been happy with France’s attempts to establish an alternative European security mechanism, or with Germany’s relations with Russia – especially in terms of cooperation on the Nord Stream gas pipeline. The growing economic ties between the European Union and China are also causes of concern for the Anglo-American alliance.

In this context, it is not surprising Biden pointed out at the 2021 Virtual Munich Security Conference: “America is back. The transatlantic alliance is back…The partnership between Europe and the United States, in my view, is and must remain the cornerstone of all that we hope to accomplish in the 21st Century, just as we did in the 20th Century.”

Eliminating Russia in the ‘Great Game’?

Neither NATO nor Western states will go to war with Russia over the invasion of Ukraine. The invasion justifies their efforts to undermine Russia economically and politically.

However, the strategy of weakening Russia is not only about its military activities in Eastern Europe. The Kremlin has long embraced an approach that emphasises Russia’s great power status in a multipolar world, in direct opposition to the US’ vision of a unipolar world in which it reigns supreme.

Therefore, the Anglo-American goal is not only to weaken Russia via economic sanctions, or harm Moscow’s economic interests in Europe, but also to divert its attention and energy away from the Indo and Asia-Pacific in particular, with the aim of hindering Russia’s partnerships with India and China.

India has decades-long ties with Russia, and New Delhi recently started receiving Russian S-400 defence systems. But India is also a member of Quad – an alliance involving the US, Japan, and Australia, which aims to counter China’s growing assertiveness. Both the US and Britain have long been pushing India to cooperate with them in dealing with China.

At the last Quad meeting, the US requested that India stand by its side in the face of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Another important topic for discussion was the growing economic and diplomatic relationships between Russia and China.

The Anglo-American bloc hopes that the Ukraine invasion will severely wound Russia, preventing it from being an important rival actor in their confrontation with China.

The question of American decline

Anglo-American domination will push Europe into submission to some extent, and Russia will be wounded. But will this reverse the unravelling of American hegemony in the long term?

As Russian President Vladimir Putin made clear in his televised speech just before the invasion, sanctions imposed by the West will not dissuade Russia from attempting to preserve its standing on the world stage.

NATO has already lost prestige and power, and the invasion of Ukraine will only worsen this situation. Increasing the Anglo-American bloc’s weight in Europe due to the conflict in Eastern Europe will also have a negative impact on their ability to contain China in Asia.

As it follows Russia’s annexation of Crimea, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine will not cause France to abandon its call for strategic autonomy for the EU entirely, nor will it change the interdependence of Europe and Russia on gas.

The Anglo-American coalition’s gas diversification efforts in favour of Europe will affect the strategic dynamics in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Yet it is not likely to obstruct the Nord Stream 2 project, despite Washington wanting to see this. Due to the steady erosion of the US’ hegemonic position in the world economy, it appears that China will continue to be the EU’s biggest trading partner.

India has already signalled that it will remain neutral on the Ukraine crisis, which implies that Russia’s invasion of Ukraine will have little impact on the close ties between Moscow and New Delhi.

More crucially, this situation appears to have given Moscow and Beijing further reasons to act together and get closer, despite their conflicting interests in Asia. They share a common desire to challenge the Western-dominated international system. Should Russia be wounded by Western sanctions, it will rely on China in economic terms to some extent, while their collective security actions will hasten the demise of US hegemony.

In the case of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, there is no absolute winner. Indeed, nothing will change in terms of the ongoing and gradual unravelling of global American hegemony.

#### Ukraine escalation causes extinction

Ira Helfand 22. MD, Immediate Past President of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, recipient of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize, and cofounder and past president of Physicians for Social Responsibility, 2/8/22. “Ukraine and the Threat of Nuclear War.” https://www.thenation.com/article/world/ukraine-russia-nuclear-threat/

These figures are based on the assumption that only conventional weapons are used. However, if the conflict spread beyond Ukraine’s borders and NATO became involved in the fighting, this would become a major war between nuclear-armed forces with the very real danger that nuclear weapons would be used—and the public debate about this crisis is utterly lacking in discussion of this terrible threat.

Both sides in such a conflict would, of course, begin fighting with non-nuclear conventional weapons. But as a result of advances in technology and firepower over recent decades, these weapons possess much greater range and destructiveness than earlier models, enabling them to strike high-value targets—airbases, radar stations, command centers, logistical hubs, and so on—far behind the front lines. As the losses mounted up on both sides—and if one or the other faced imminent defeat—its leaders could feel driven to employ their tactical nuclear weapons to avert such an outcome. Both US and Russian military doctrines allow for the use of tactical nuclear weapons under such circumstances.

Despite reductions in nuclear forces over the last several decades, Russia still has 1,900 tactical nuclear weapons and 1,600 deployed strategic nuclear weapons. On the NATO side, France has 280 deployed nuclear weapons and the UK, 120. In addition, the United States has 100 B-61 tactical bombs deployed at NATO bases in Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey, and an additional 1,650 deployed strategic warheads.

If even a single 100-kiloton nuclear weapon exploded over the Kremlin, it could kill a quarter of a million people and injure a million more, completely overwhelming the disaster-response capability of the Russian capital. A single 100-kiloton bomb detonated over the US Capitol would kill over 170,000 people and injure nearly 400,000.

But it is unlikely that an escalating nuclear conflict between the United States and Russia would involve single warheads over their respective capitals. Rather, it is more likely that there would be many weapons directed against many cities and that many of these weapons would be substantially larger than 100 kiloton. For example, Russia’s 460 SS-18 M6 Satan warheads have a yield of 500 to 800 kilotons. The W88 warhead deployed on US Trident submarines has a yield of 455 kilotons.

A 2002 report showed that if just 300 of Russia’s 1,600 deployed strategic warheads were detonated over US urban centers, 78 million people would die in the first half hour. In addition, the nation’s entire economic infrastructure would be destroyed—the electric grid, Internet, food distribution system, transportation network, and the public health system. All of the things necessary to sustain life would be gone, and in the months following this attack the vast majority of the US population would succumb to starvation, radiation sickness, exposure, and epidemic disease. A US attack on Russia would produce comparable devastation there. And if NATO were involved, most of Canada and Europe would suffer a similar fate.

Still, these are just the direct effects of the widespread use of nuclear weapons between NATO and Russia. The global climate effects would be even more catastrophic. Recent studies have confirmed the predictions, first advanced in the 1980s, that large-scale use of nuclear weapons would cause abrupt, catastrophic global cooling. A war involving the full deployed arsenals of the US and Russia could loft up to 150 teragrams (150 million metric tons) of soot into the upper atmosphere, dropping average temperatures around the world as much as 18 degrees Fahrenheit. In the interior regions of North America and Eurasia temperatures would drop 45 to 50 degrees, to levels not seen since the last ice age, producing a disastrous decline in food production and a global famine that might kill the majority of humanity. Even a more limited war involving just 250 warheads in the 100 kiloton range could drop average global temperatures by 10 degrees, enough to trigger a famine unprecedented in human history, which would almost certainly bring the end of modern civilization.

The enormity of the risk inherent in the current game of nuclear chicken between the US and Russia demands a fundamental change in their relation to each other, and in the equally fraught relation between the US and China. The great powers can no longer pursue a zero-sum game to see who will come out on top. It is possible that one of them will emerge on top of the heap—but the heap may well be a global ash pile.

#### Heg provokes blowback aggression due to status insecurity and dooms global governance---decline spurs a great power concert that solves extinction

Stephen Pampinella 19. Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the State University of New York (SUNY) at New Paltz, 1/23/19. “The Internationalist Disposition and US Grand Strategy.” https://thedisorderofthings.com/2019/01/23/the-internationalist-disposition-and-us-grand-strategy/

But in recent weeks, establishment voices have sought to reassert their control over foreign policy debates by arguing for the necessity of US hegemony and classic liberal internationalist forms of cooperation. Colás’ methodological internationalism illustrates why traditional US foreign policy approaches will fail to provide actual security for ordinary Americans. It also suggests (somewhat counterintuitively) what kinds of grand strategies could do so. A great power concert strategy, in which the United States pursues a balance of power among its rivals while committing to more democratic forms of international cooperation, can best resolve the non-state threats to US democracy generated by its own liberal order.

The New Internationalism of the American Left

Colás describes methodological internationalism as a focus on macrostructural processes like capitalism or difference-based hierarchies which transcend state borders and generate worldwide categorical inequalities. We can contrast this perspective with methodological nationalism, the idea that the main units of analysis in world politics are nation-states. But rather than assume that international relations (IR) is about neatly bounded sovereigns pursuing their interests as autonomous actors, methodological internationalism privileges networks of social relations that constitute subjectivities in world politics. It refuses to accept that actors are constituted prior to their interactions with others and recognizes that the boundaries separating inside/outside are social constructs. What we see in domestic politics, including various struggles against economic exploitation and in defense of the environment and marginalized peoples, are really foreign policy problems that simply manifest themselves in a particular social context. This radical version of internationalism suggests that resolving our societies’ problems will require establishing democratic control over global processes on the basis of solidarity and respect for difference.

The emerging discussion around progressive internationalism builds upon this disposition. For example, Bernie Sanders and Yanis Varoufakis call for a global movement to revive democracy and oppose growing authoritarianism in the United States and Europe. Daniel Nexon argues that progressive multilateralists and anti-hegemony leftists can form a new foreign policy coalition that aims to lessen inequality through the deconcentration of economic power. Heather Hurlburt demonstrates that the United States can no longer pursue trade openness for the benefit of capital at the expense of workers as a means of extending its influence across the globe. All these ideas are consistent with methodological internationalism. Given the scale of transnational threats like inequalities produced by global capitalism and catastrophic climate change, a true progressive internationalism would prioritize intensive cooperation with other state and non-state actors to collectively regulate these global processes. The purpose of national security policy, then, would be to de-escalate great power competition as a means of enabling economic and ecological security.

Why Liberal Internationalism Will Fail (Again)

But in recent weeks, mainstream US foreign policy experts have provided their own spin in progressive internationalism. Advocates and practitioners of a traditional hegemonic foreign policy have sought to co-opt progressive internationalism in a series of essays which argue for the necessity of American power and global influence. These writers embody the post-Cold War centrist foreign policy coalition of liberal internationalists and neoconservatives. For them, that the greatest threat to the democratic “free” world created by the United States remains the autocratic governance model of Russia and China. While Washington should pursue cooperation on transnational governance issues where possible, they argue it cannot do so at the expense of making security concessions which would reward revisionist behavior by great power rivals. As in the past, American exceptionalism remains the identity narrative justifying a return to US hegemony, with Anglo-American norms serving as the basis for hegemonic socialization and cooperation.

The internationalist disposition is a reminder of why a mere social democratic twist on US hegemony will fail to provide actual security for the United States and its allies. Establishment voices continue to rely on state-centric assumptions about IR and ignore how state identities and interests are a function of their relationship with each other. Or, as Jennifer Mitzen and Michelle Murray might argue, the revisionist intentions of Russia and China are a product of their ontological insecurity. A hegemonic United States defending an Anglo-American order denies them recognition of their own great power identities and their right to participate in all deliberations about global order. From this perspective, we should challenge the implicit assumption made by Anthony Blinken and Robert Kagan that Russia is revisionist by nature. An internationalist perspective suggests that Russia has adopted those intentions in relation to a Wilsonian United States which seeks domination over Moscow and the transformation of its political system. The same is true for China, which rejects being cast as a “responsible stakeholder” by Washington which would eventually accept democracy following its internal transformation by global capitalism. In other words, the very terms of US relations with these states over the past 25 years is the source of their revisionist intentions, and not some essentialized feature of their domestic politics.

Further, a liberal exceptionalist narrative that contrasts “Eastern autocracy” with “Western freedom” masks how the United States has perpetuated its own systems of illiberal dominance throughout its history. Those same structures of oppression are the greatest threat to contemporary US democracy and also serve as glaring evidence of US hypocrisy. In his defense of American exceptionalism, Jake Sullivan represents institutional racism as a bug rather than a feature of the American political system by emphasizing the liberal ideals of the Founders and casting Donald Trump’s white ethnonationalism as an aberration. But this telling of the American story whitewashes the long history of an exclusive, white ethnic US identity dating back to the early 19th Century and its role in generating the modern United States. Scholars of American political development and US history have long demonstrated that institutions of slavery and land conquest constituted US society and made possible its economic prosperity rather than some kind of intrinsic tendency toward freedom.

Fast-forward to the present: liberal exceptionalism further denies how economic globalization made possible the rise of authoritarianism. Nils Gilman and David Klion rightly argue that the kleptocratic alliance between autocrats and oligarchs is the true threat to democracy and rule of law. Their ability to concentrate political and economic power has been enabled by the emergence of an integrated global market that privileges the freedom of capital over the needs of ordinary people, one created by the United States when liberal internationalism went global after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Finally, attempts to revive US hegemony will doom transnational efforts to deal with existential non-state threats. Hegemonists like Thomas Wright argue that Russia and China are the greatest threat to the United States, and that Washington should never make concessions to either power as a means of ensuring cooperation on issues of global governance. However, “ring-fencing” global capitalism and climate change as separate issues will fail to achieve the necessary level of cooperation to cope with these threats. National security policymakers cannot recognize that the greatest dangers faced by US citizens are non-state economic and ecological global processes that shape domestic politics from the inside-out, and not rival sovereigns. Economic destitution to the point of embracing fascist dictators coupled with environmental collapse are near-certain non-state threats which transcend our boundaries – in fact, as a global power, the United States has been complicit in creating them.

The internationalist disposition would suggest that the priorities of US foreign policy must change. Regulating global processes should be the primary objective, and it requires that the United States pursue intense macro-levels of cooperation with all other states, including its rivals, to achieve them. Yet it will be unlikely to do so if it remains wedded to liberal hegemony and consumed by great power competition. Short-term incentives to accumulate resources and power will override the long-term need for global governance. The result will be a world whose people live in precarity, ravaged by climate change, and constantly on the verge of great power war.

From “Disposition” to “Grand Strategy”

The internationalist disposition clearly illustrates why old US strategies are incompatible with the progressive internationalism of the US left. However, contra Colás, progressives should not avoid developing of a positive vision for foreign policy due to the diverse range of radical perspectives. To do so would cede pro-restraint arguments to structural realist and libertarian advocates of offshore balancing who offer no template for global engagement or institutional cooperation. What progressives must do is articulate a grand strategy, or a plan that mobilizes all elements of national power and influence, grounded in a relationalist ontology that combines restraint with internationalism. This strategy must be post-hegemonic (a term even Ikenberry has flirted with), post-statist, and supportive of intense international cooperation based on the diversity of identities and values otherwise ignored by the universalist pretenses of Anglo-American liberalism. If our very existence is mutually dependent on others, then we need a foreign policy based on solidarity in response to collectively experienced threats.

I think there is a strategy consistent with the international disposition: great power concert. A concert strategy requires that all great powers pursue mutual accommodation and recognize each other’s interests as part of a larger commitment to maintain international stability. Patrick Porter and Amitav Acharya argue that a great power concert strategy is the best suited to adapt to the transfer of wealth and power to Asia along with the “multiplex” nature of world politics (not to mention a global perspective on international relations). The emergence of a diverse range of state and non-state actors bound together by extreme interdependence makes it impossible for any one actor, such as the United States, to establish rules for global governance which can mobilize all others. On this basis, a concert strategy would lead the United States to collaborate with others on the basis of mutual co-existence and embrace joint decision-making at the global level for coping with macrostructural processes that threaten all peoples around the world. In this way, a concert strategy is firmly grounded the international disposition and can serve as the realization of progressive internationalism.

Security and The Balance of Power

A concert strategy can do what establishment foreign policy cannot, namely de-escalate great power competition by giving up US hegemony. If adopted, the United States would treat other great powers, like Russia, China, and Iran, as equal partners in the maintenance of global stability and incorporate their interests into regional security agreements. The United States would give up its self-assumed role as an unrivaled global hegemon and seek a balance of power based on mutual respect with other great powers as partners rather than enemies. This kind of international posture would result in a more horizontal great power system, one that Stacie Goddard as identified as being productive of status quo rather than revisionist intentions. It would be compatible with recognition of the great power identities of other states and provide them with ontological security.

#### Global governance solves emerging tech, pandemics, and war---extinction

Robert Bailey 18. professional technologist and strategic manager who has led initiatives to improve the delivery of civic services in major North American cities, Master of Science Degree in Computer science, 9/5/18. “Why do we need global governance?” https://www.visionofearth.org/social-change/global-governance/

Global governance is necessary because humanity increasingly faces both problems and opportunities that are global in scale. Today, transnational problems such as violence and pandemics routinely reach across borders, affecting us all. At the same time, the increasingly integrated global system has also laid the necessary foundations for peace and spectacular prosperity. Effective global governance will allow us to end armed conflict, deal with new and emerging problems such as technological risks and automation, and to achieve levels of prosperity and progress never before seen.1

The most important challenge for humanity to overcome is that of existential risks. One way to look at the danger of an existential risk is to quantify the level of global coordination needed to deal with it. While best-shot risks, at one end of the spectrum only require that a single nation, organization or even individual (i.e., superhero) has the means and the will to save everyone, weakest-link risks, at the other end of the spectrum, are dangers that might require literally every country to take appropriate action to prevent catastrophe, with no room for failure.2 3

We’ve always been at risk of natural disaster, but with advances in our level of technology the risk we pose to ourselves as a species becomes ever greater. Nuclear weapons are a well-known risk that we still live with to this day. The progress of technological research exposes us to new dangers such as bioengineered superbugs, nanotechnological menaces, and the risk of an out-of-control artificial intelligence with ill-intent. Increased levels of global coordination are needed to combat many of these risks, as described in our article on the cooperation possibilities frontier.

There are other problems that don’t necessarily threaten the species or even civilization as we know it, but which are holding back the development of prosperity and progress. Armed conflict, around since the dawn of history, still haunts us today. Even though wars between great powers appear to be a thing of the past, regional conflicts still account for tremendous human suffering and loss of life in parts of the world without stable governance.4

Other problems have emerged precisely because of our successes in the past. The unprecedented advancement of human wellbeing and prosperity over the past century has been based in large part on the use of fossil fuels, thus exposing us to climate change. Widespread automation, already a stressor on society, will put increased pressure on the social and economic fabric of our societies over the next few decades. Global governance can help alleviate these issues in various ways – we refer the interested reader to the very detailed work in Ruling Ourselves.

Finally, global governance will increasingly be judged not only by the extent to which it prevents harm, but also by its demonstrated ability to improve human wellbeing.5 Progress has let us set our sights higher as a species, both for what we consider to be the right trajectory for humanity and for our own conduct.6 Major advances in human wellbeing can be accomplished with existing technology and modest improvements in global coordination.

Effective global governance is global governance that tackles these issues better than the regional governments of the world can independently. Global governance is key to solving global problems. Without it, we may not be able to avoid weakest-link existential risks or regulate new and dangerous technologies. With it, we may be able to prosper as we never have before. The next step is to determine how effective global governance can be achieved.

#### No offense---heg isn’t key to global stability

Christopher J. Fettweis 17. Associate professor of political science, Tulane. “Unipolarity, Hegemony, and the New Peace.” Security Studies, 26:3, 423-451.

These assessments of conflict are by necessity relative, because there has not been a “high” level of conflict in any region outside the Middle East during the period of the New Peace. Putting aside for the moment that important caveat, some points become clear. The great powers of the world are clustered in the upper right quadrant, where US intervention has been high, but conflict levels low. US intervention is imperfectly correlated with stability, however. Indeed, it is conceivable that the relatively high level of US interest and activity has made the security situation in the Persian Gulf and broader Middle East worse. In recent years, substantial hard power investments (Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq), moderate intervention (Libya), and reliance on diplomacy (Syria) have been equally ineffective in stabilizing states torn by conflict. While it is possible that the region is essentially unpacifiable and no amount of police work would bring peace to its people, it remains hard to make the case that the US presence has improved matters. In this “strong point,” at least, US hegemony has failed to bring peace. In much of the rest of the world, the United States has not been especially eager to enforce any particular rules. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been enough to inspire action. Washington’s intervention choices have at best been erratic; Libya and Kosovo brought about action, but much more blood flowed uninterrupted in Rwanda, Darfur, Congo, Sri Lanka, and Syria. The US record of peacemaking is not exactly a long uninterrupted string of successes. During the turn-of-the-century conventional war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, a highlevel US delegation containing former and future National Security Advisors (Anthony Lake and Susan Rice) made a half-dozen trips to the region, but was unable to prevent either the outbreak or recurrence of the conflict. Lake and his team shuttled back and forth between the capitals with some frequency, and President Clinton made repeated phone calls to the leaders of the respective countries, offering to hold peace talks in the United States, all to no avail.67 The war ended in late 2000 when Ethiopia essentially won, and it controls the disputed territory to this day. The Horn of Africa is hardly the only region where states are free to fight one another today without fear of serious US involvement. Since they are choosing not to do so with increasing frequency, something else is probably affecting their calculations. Stability exists even in those places where the potential for intervention by the sheriff is minimal. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological, of the United States. It seems hard to make the case that the relative peace that has descended on so many regions is primarily due to the kind of heavy hand of the neoconservative leviathan, or its lighter, more liberal cousin. Something else appears to be at work. Conflict and US Military Spending How does one measure polarity? Power is traditionally considered to be some combination of military and economic strength, but despite scores of efforts, no widely accepted formula exists. Perhaps overall military spending might be thought of as a proxy for hard power capabilities; perhaps too the amount of money the United States devotes to hard power is a reflection of the strength of the unipole. When compared to conflict levels, however, there is no obvious correlation, and certainly not the kind of negative relationship between US spending and conflict that many hegemonic stability theorists would expect to see. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on defense by about 25 percent, spending $100 billion less in real terms in 1998 that it did in 1990.68 To those believers in the neoconservative version of hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace,” argued Kristol and Kagan at the time.69 The world grew dramatically more peaceful while the United States cut its forces, however, and stayed just as peaceful while spending rebounded after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the military budget was cut under President Clinton, in other words, and kept declining (though more slowly, since levels were already low) as the Bush administration ramped it back up. Overall US military spending has varied during the period of the New Peace from a low in constant dollars of less than $400 billion to a high of more than $700 billion, but war does not seem to have noticed. The same nonrelationship exists between other potential proxy measurements for hegemony and conflict: there does not seem to be much connection between warfare and fluctuations in US GDP, alliance commitments, and forward military presence. There was very little fighting in Europe when there were 300,000 US troops stationed there, for example, and that has not changed as the number of Americans dwindled by 90 percent. Overall, there does not seem to be much correlation between US actions and systemic stability. Nothing the United States actually does seems to matter to the New Peace. It is possible that absolute military spending might not be as important to explain the phenomenon as relative. Although Washington cut back on spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. The United States has accounted for between 35 and 41 percent of global military spending every year since the collapse of the Soviet Union.70 The perception of relative US power might be the decisive factor in decisions made in other capitals. One cannot rule out the possibility that it is the perception of US power—and its willingness to use it—that keeps the peace. In other words, perhaps it is the grand strategy of the United States, rather than its absolute capability, that is decisive in maintaining stability. It is that to which we now turn. Conflict and US Grand Strategy The perception of US power, and the strength of its hegemony, is to some degree a function of grand strategy. If indeed US strategic choices are responsible for the New Peace, then variation in those choices ought to have consequences for the level of international conflict. A restrained United States is much less likely to play the role of sheriff than one following a more activist approach. Were the unipole to follow such a path, hegemonic-stability theorists warn, disaster would follow. Former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski spoke for many when he warned that “outright chaos” could be expected to follow a loss of hegemony, including a string of quite specific issues, including new or renewed attempts to build regional empires (by China, Turkey, Russia, and Brazil) and the collapse of the US relationship with Mexico, as emboldened nationalists south of the border reassert 150-year-old territorial claims. Overall, without US dominance, today’s relatively peaceful world would turn “violent and bloodthirsty.” 71 Niall Ferguson foresees a post-hegemonic “Dark Age” in which “plunderers and pirates” target the big coastal cities like New York and Rotterdam, terrorists attack cruise liners and aircraft carriers alike, and the “wretchedly poor citizens” of Latin America are unable to resist the Protestantism brought to them by US evangelicals. Following the multiple (regional, fortunately) nuclear wars and plagues, the few remaining airlines would be forced to suspend service to all but the very richest cities.72 These are somewhat extreme versions of a central assumption of all hegemonic-stability theorists: a restrained United States would be accompanied by utter disaster. The “present danger” of which Kristol, Kagan, and their fellow travelers warn is that the United States “will shrink its responsibilities and—in a fit of absentmindedness, or parsimony, or indifference— allow the international order that it created and sustains to collapse.” 73 Liberals fear restraint as well, and also warn that a militarized version of primacy would be counterproductive in the long run. Although they believe that the rule-based order established by United States is more durable than the relatively fragile order discussed by the neoconservatives, liberals argue that Washington can undermine its creation over time through thoughtless unilateral actions that violate those rules. Many predicted that the invasion of Iraq and its general contempt for international institutions and law would call the legitimacy of the order into question. G. John Ikenberry worried that Bush’s “geostrategic wrecking ball” would lead to a more hostile, divided, and dangerous world.74 Thus while all hegemonicstability theorists expect a rise of chaos during a restrained presidency, liberals also have grave concerns regarding primacy. Overall, if either version is correct and global stability is provided by US hegemony, then maintaining that stability through a grand strategy based on either primacy (to neoconservatives) or “deep engagement” (to liberals) is clearly a wise choice.75 If, however, US actions are only tangentially related to the outbreak of the New Peace, or if any of the other proposed explanations are decisive, then the United States can retrench without fear of negative consequences. The grand strategy of the United States is therefore crucial to beliefs in hegemonic stability. Although few observers would agree on the details, most would probably acknowledge that post-Cold War grand strategies of American presidents have differed in some important ways. The four administrations are reasonable representations of the four ideal types outlined by Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross in 1996.76 Under George H. W. Bush, the United States followed the path of “selective engagement,” which is sometimes referred to as “balance-of-power realism”; Bill Clinton’s grand strategy looks a great deal like what Posen and Ross call “cooperative security,” and others call “liberal internationalism”; George W. Bush, especially in his first term, forged a strategy that was as close to “primacy” as any president is likely to get; and Barack Obama, despite some early flirtation with liberalism, has followed a restrained realist path, which Posen and Ross label “neo-isolationism” but its proponents refer to as “strategic restraint.” 77 In no case did the various anticipated disorders materialize. As Table 2 demonstrates, armed conflict levels fell steadily, irrespective of the grand strategic path Washington chose. Neither the primacy of George W. Bush nor the restraint of Barack Obama had much effect on the level of global violence. Despite continued warnings (and the high-profile mess in Syria), the world has not experienced an increase in violence while the United States chose uninvolvement. If the grand strategy of the United States is responsible for the New Peace, it is leaving no trace in the evidence. Perhaps we should not expect a correlation to show up in this kind of analysis. While US behavior might have varied in the margins during this period, nether its relative advantage over its nearest rivals nor its commitments waivered in any important way. However, it is surely worth noting that if trends opposite to those discussed in the previous two sections had unfolded, if other states had reacted differently to fluctuations in either US military spending or grand strategy, then surely hegemonic stability theorists would argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. Many liberals were on the lookout for chaos while George W. Bush was in the White House, just as neoconservatives have been quick to identify apparent worldwide catastrophe under President Obama.78 If increases in violence would have been evidence for the wisdom of hegemonic strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the relationship between US power and international stability suggests that the two are unrelated. The rest of the world appears quite capable and willing to operate effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise have precious little empirical support upon which to build their case. Hegemonic stability is a belief, in other words, rather than an established fact, and as such deserves a different kind of examination. The Political Psychology of Unipolarity Evidence supporting the notion that US power is primarily responsible for the New Peace is slim, but belief in the connection is quite strong, especially in policy circles. The best arena to examine the proposition is therefore not the world of measurable rationality, but rather that of the human mind. Political psychology can shed more light on unipolarity than can any collection of data or evidence. Just because an outcome is primarily psychological does not mean that it is less real; perception quickly becomes reality for both the unipolar state and those in the periphery. If all actors believe that the United States provides security and stability for the system, then behavior can be affected. Beliefs have deep explanatory power in international politics whether they have a firm foundation in empirical reality or not. Like all beliefs, faith in the stability provided by hegemony is rarely subjected to much analysis. In their simplest form, beliefs are ideas that have become internalized and accepted as true, often without much further analysis Although they almost always have some basis in reality, beliefs need not pass rigorous tests to prove that they match it. No amount of evidence has been able to convince some people that vaccines do not cause autism, for example, or that the world is more peaceful than at any time before, or that the climate is changing due to human activity. Ultimately, as Robert Jervis explains, “we often believe as much in the face of evidence as because of it.” When leaders are motivated to act based on unjustified, inaccurate beliefs, folly often follows. The person who decides to take a big risk because of astrological advice in the morning's horoscope can benefit from baseless superstition if the risk pays off. Probability and luck suggest that successful policy choices can sometimes flow from incorrect beliefs. Far more often, however, poor intellectual foundations lead to suboptimal or even disastrous outcomes. It is worthwhile to analyze the foundations of even our most deeply held beliefs to determine which ones are good candidates to inspire poor policy choices in those who hold them. People are wonderful rationalizers. There is much to be said for being the strongest country in the world; their status provides Americans both security and psychological rewards, as well as strong incentives to construct a rationale for preserving the unipolar moment that goes beyond mere selfishness. Since people enjoy being “number one,” they are susceptible to perceiving reality in ways that brings the data in line with their desires. It is no coincidence that most hegemonic stability theorists are American. Of the few hegemonic-stability theorists from elsewhere, most hail from the United Kingdom and counsel the United States to follow the lead of the British Empire. Perhaps the satisfaction that comes with being the unipolar power has inspired Americans to misperceive the positive role that their status plays in the world. Three findings from political psychology can shed light on perceptions of hegemonic stability. They are mutually supportive, and, when taken together, suggest that it is likely that US policymakers overestimate the extent to which their actions are responsible for the choices of others. The belief in the major US contribution to world peace is probably unjustified. The Illusion of Control Could 5 percent of the world’s population hope to enforce rules upon the rest? Would even an internationally hegemonic United States be capable of producing the New Peace? Perhaps, but it also may be true that believers in hegemonic stability may be affected by the very common tendency of people to overestimate their ability to control events. A variety of evidence has accumulated over the past forty years to support Ellen J. Langer’s original observations about the “illusion of control” that routinely distorts perception.82 Even in situations where outcomes are clearly generated by pure chance, people tend to believe that they can exert control over events.83 There is little reason to believe that leaders are somehow less susceptible to such illusions than subjects in controlled experiments. The extensive research on the illusion of control has revealed two further findings that suggest US illusions might be even stronger than average. First, misperceptions of control appear to be correlated with power: individuals with higher socioeconomic status, as well as those who are members of dominant groups, are more likely to overestimate their ability to control events.84 Powerful people tend to be far more confident than others, often overly so, and that confidence leads them to inflate their own importance.85 Leaders of superpowers are thus particularly vulnerable to distorted perceptions regarding their ability to affect the course of events. US observers had a greater structural predisposition than others, for example, to believe that they would have been able to control events in the Persian Gulf following an injection of creative instability in 2003. The skepticism of less powerful allies was easily discounted. Second, there is reason to believe that culture matters as well as power. People from societies that value individualism are more likely to harbor illusions of control than those from collectivist societies, where assumptions of group agency are more common. When compared to people from other parts of the world, Westerners tend to view the world as “highly subject to personal control,” in the words of Richard Nisbett.86 North Americans appear particularly vulnerable in this regard.87 Those who come from relatively powerful countries with individualistic societies are therefore at high risk for misperceiving their ability to influence events. For the United States, the illusion of control extends beyond the water’s edge. An oft-discussed public good supposedly conferred by US hegemony is order in those parts of the world uncontrolled by sovereign states, or the “global commons.” 88 One such common area is the sea, where the United States maintains the only true blue-water navy in the world. That the United States has brought this peace to the high seas is a central belief of hegemonic-stability theorists, one rarely examined in any serious way. Indeed the maritime environment has been unusually peaceful for decades; the biggest naval battles since Okinawa took place during the Falklands conflict in 1982, and they were fairly minor.89 If hegemony is the key variable explaining stability at sea, maritime security would have to be far more chaotic without the US Navy. It is equally if not more plausible to suggest, however, that the reason other states are not building blue-water navies is not because the United States dissuades them from doing so but rather because none feels that trade is imperiled.90 In earlier times, and certainly during the age of mercantilism, zero-sum economics inspired efforts to cut off the trade of opponents on occasion, making control the sea extremely important. Today the free flow of goods is vital to all economies, and it would be in the interest of no state to interrupt it.91 Free trade at sea may no longer need protection, in other words, because it essentially has no enemies; the sheriff may be patrolling a crime-free neighborhood. The threat from the few remaining pirates hardly requires a robust naval presence, and is certainly not what hegemonic-stability advocates mean when they compare the role played by the US Navy in 2016 to that of the Royal Navy in 1816. It is at least possible that shared interest in open, free commons keeps the peace at sea rather than the United States. Oceans unpatrolled by the US Navy may be about as stable as they are with the presence of its carriers. The degree to which 273 active-duty ships exert control over vast common parts is not at all clear. People overestimate the degree to which they control events in their lives. Furthermore, if these observations from political psychology are right about the factors that influence the growth of illusions of power, then US leaders and analysts are particularly susceptible to misperception. They may well be overestimating the degree to which the United States can affect the behavior of others. The rest of the world may be able to get along just fine, on land and at sea, without US attempts to control it.

## Investment

### No I/L---1NC

#### No internal link to the tech impact---Saeed says U.S. innovation is good for competitiveness, Jain says AI development is bad.

### AT: Food production---1NC

#### 2008 price spike empirically denies the impact.

#### Food prices don’t cause conflict–reject their bad studies.

Demarest 15—PhD Researcher at the Centre for Research on Peace and Development [Leila, “Food price rises and political instability: Problematizing a complex relationship,” *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 27, No. 5, p. 650-671, Emory Libraries]

6. Conclusions and Way Forward

While some progress has been made in improving our understanding of the linkages between rising food prices and conflict, several important gaps remain. Firstly, notions of conflict and political instability are often used interchangeably, while these concepts and the relationships between them remain to some extent vague. The ‘food riot’ concept in particular leads to confusion. Although it is popularly seen as a violent rise of the masses, in reality, many peaceful events are gathered under this term, while violence is often committed by the state rather than by hungry consumers. The term also presupposes that food is the central issue at hand, which does not necessarily have to be the case. Many misunderstanding arise from the second gap identified in this paper: the uncritical data gathering based on international news reports. Not only are these remarkably inconsistent, they also make use of classifications which are not scientifically investigated. Finally, causal mechanisms in the relationship between rising food prices and conflict often remain assumptions in the literature and lack empirical foundation. Three crosscutting avenues for improvement therefore exist: better concept definitions, better data gathering, and more focus on contexts.

Clearly defined concepts and categorizations of conflict and instability are a necessary foundation for research on the linkages between rising food prices and conflict. For (food) protests in particular, purposeful categorizations require an enhanced insight in the events that took place on the ground. Local news sources for data gathering can prove to be more reliable than Western (English) media to accomplish this. Event descriptions are also likely to be more detailed in local sources, which allows for a first-hand qualitative analysis of causes and context.

As international food prices are likely to remain high, improving our understanding of the causal mechanisms which can lead to conflict remains crucial. We can draw important lessons from the literature on poverty and conflict, resource scarcity and conflict, and regime transition in Africa. The causal role of economic factors alone has continuously been questioned, and ‘context’ or prevailing political, economic, and social factors play a crucial role in the conflict outcome. The argument that adverse economic shocks seem more of a trigger to conflict rather than an important cause is not particularly remarkable in itself. Yet while many authors acknowledge this, the focus often remains on the trigger. Resource scarcity, climate change, population growth, or food insecurity often remain the starting point of analyses, with researchers consequently tracing the divergent (theoretical) possibilities for conflict. In the end, most admit that these factors do not automatically lead to conflict everywhere, and stress the importance of context. Because the theoretical possibilities for conflict are so large, however, the context factor remains rather understudied with as most agreed upon notions that elements of ‘grievance’ and ‘collective action’ are required.

It is hence important to focus more on the ‘contexts’ that can lead to conflict and, in doing so, to make the distinction between different forms of conflict. This also implies a data collection exercise. Contextual data are currently collected at the aggregate, national level, and only on a yearly basis, which can lead to spurious relations. While the use of these variables is increasingly questioned in civil war studies, we can also doubt their strength in the study of highly localized, one-time events such as riots. I particularly make the case for ‘bringing politics back in’. The policies taken by the government are crucial in the violent escalation of social conflict (e.g. accommodation versus repression), but the only variable currently in use to explain state behaviour seems to be the country-level regime type variable (Polity IV or Freedom House), which is also used with regards to highly localized conflicts. Other ways in which politics matter, can be the strength of the political opposition. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, for example, was probably better organized than other opposition groups to make use of economic unrest.

## Localization

### No I/L---1NC

#### No growth internal link---Akin says that banks are risky in response to recessions, not that risk taking causes recessions---they haven’t read UQ for decline now.

### AT: Growth !---1NC

#### No impact to economic decline – countries respond with cooperation not conflict.

Christopher Clary 15. PhD in Political Science, MIT; Postdoctoral Fellow, Brown’s Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs. “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries.” *MIT Political Science Department*. Research Paper 8: 4.

Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to downplay the seriousness of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to consider threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international economic cooperation. Leaders seek foreign aid, enhanced trade, and increased investment from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as capable of resolving economic difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it much more likely that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this causal logic in greater detail, while also providing historical examples that these mechanisms recur in practice.

### Clarity---1NC

#### Plan nukes regulatory certainty AND creates vagueness that monopolists exploit to dodge enforcement

D. Daniel Sokol 9, Assistant Professor at the University of Florida Levin College of Law, Senior Advisor at White & Case LLP, LLM from the University of Wisconsin Law School, JD from the University of Chicago Law School, MSt in History from Oxford University, AB from Amherst College, “Limiting Anticompetitive Government Interventions That Benefit Special Interests”, George Mason Law Review, 17 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 119, Fall 2009, Lexis

Antitrust litigation produces regulatory uncertainty because different courts may rule inconsistently with the same set of facts. Anecdotal evidence indicates that when courts do not understand complex antitrust issues, they rule based on a highly procedural formalism. 140 These problems of procedural formalism in antitrust decisions create particular concerns in conduct cases or with regard to penalties for conduct, regardless of the origin of the legal system. 141 For example, in New Zealand, telecommunications regulation focused on a general antitrust solution in conjunction with courts rather than with sector regulation. 142 In a case involving interconnection rates within telecommunications between the incumbent provider and a new entrant for access to the local loop, the case took five years to decide, with significant procedural delay. 143 The lack of the New Zealand judicial system's understanding of the complex pricing issues and methodologies for interconnection underlying the case meant that the conflicting court decisions left little certainty-none of the courts came up with a specific interconnection price. This enabled the incumbent Telecom Corporation to maintain its monopoly position, and it left the victims of its anticompetitive behavior without any effective means of redress. 144 A similar problem occurred in Chile, where the Chilean Supreme Court recently overruled the Chilean Competition Tribunal in cases regarding tacit collusion based on procedural rather than substantive grounds, and where it seemed apparent that the Supreme Court did not understand the antitrust issues. 145 [\*148]