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#### Expand the scope of antitrust refers exclusively to formal law not enforcement.

Sinisa Milosevic et al. 18. Commission for Protection of Competition, The Republic of Serbia. Dejan Trifunovic, Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, The Republic of Serbia. Jelena Popovic Markopoulos, Commission for Protection of Competition, The Republic of Serbia. “The Impact of the Competition Policy on Economic Development in the Case of Developing Countries”. Economic Horizons, May - August 2018, Volume 20, Number 2, 153 – 167. http://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/1450-863X/2018/1450-863X1802157M.pdf

The paper that analyzes the impact of the competition policy on the GDP growth in developing and developed countries in the Solow growth model framework is T. C. Ma’s (2011). The presence and scope of the competition policy is captured by the SCOPE variable that is defined in the paper by K. N. Hylton and F. Deng (2007). The overall effectiveness of the government’s application of policies, not only of the competition policy, is captured by the EFFICIENCY variable that is defined in the paper by D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi (2009). The results show that the SCOPE variable is not significant and the formal existence of the competition law cannot influence economic growth. The interacting variable of SCOPE x EFFICIENCY is named EFFLAW. For poor countries, the coefficient for this variable is 0.04 and is significant, whereas for rich countries the coefficient is 0.064 and is also significant. Therefore, the competition law must be complemented with the effective enforcement of this policy.

#### Prohibition is forbidding an action

People’s Law Dictionary, 2 [Gerald Hill, former Executive Director of the California Governor's Housing Commission, has drafted legislation, taught at Golden Gate University Law School, & Kathleen Hill, former Fellow in Public Affairs with the prestigious Coro Foundation, Law.com, “Prohibition”, https://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1636, accessed 5-30-21, AFB]

prohibition

n. forbidding an act or activity. A court order forbidding an act is a writ of prohibition, an injunction or a writ of mandate (mandamus) if against a public official.

See also: injunction mandate

#### Violation---the aff does not increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by expanding the scope of antitrust law

#### Vote neg

#### Limits---there are hundreds of ways to change enforcement of antitrust law

#### Ground---all DAs and CPs are based on the aff making a business practice illegal per se and strengthening antitrust law

### 1NC---CP

Delegation CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should delegate antitrust rulemaking authority to a new expert agency. The agency should begin notice-and-comment rulemaking to expand the scope of the Sherman Act to give the Department of Justice exclusive authority over antitrust law.

#### Solves the case, engages notice and comment, and avoids courts disads.

Rebecca Haw 11. Climenko Fellow and Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School. J.D., Harvard Law School, 2008; M. Phil, Cambridge University, 2005; B.A., Yale University, 2001."Amicus Briefs and the Sherman Act: Why Antitrust Needs a New Deal." Texas Law Review, vol. 89, no. 6, May 2011, p. 1247-1292. HeinOnline.

Without the informational benefits of expertise and notice-and-comment rulemaking, the Court may be a poor choice to define the broad proscriptions of the Sherman Act. Framed this way, the problem has an obvious solution: give the power to interpret the Act to an expert agency.240 This idea has academic support already, 241 and the case for it is strengthened by this Article's observation that the Court has tried to approximate administrative decision making by relying on amicus briefs. The obvious candidates for reallocation are the two existing antitrust agencies: the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division and the FTC.

A. The Agency Solution

Using agencies to give specific meaning to American antitrust's most important statute means avoiding the problems with the Court's current quasi-administrative process for rulemaking. As adjudicators, agency experts would know what kind of economic evidence is necessary for an efficient solution and would be better able to understand it when it is presented by the parties. Repeat exposure to antitrust cases would only reinforce this advantage, while also giving the administrative judges a broader perspective on what kinds of conflicts commonly arise in competition law, a perspective necessary for efficient policy making in the first instance. A Supreme Court Justice hears about one antitrust case a year, hardly the cross section of controversies necessary to make efficient economic policy writ large.

Agencies could take policy making a step further using notice-and-comment rulemaking. Unlike in adjudication, regulation by rulemaking can be initiated without the formal requirements of a case or controversy and a proper appeal to the Supreme Court. Informal letters of complaint could spark an investigation. A rule-making agency could announce its intention to regulate publicly and provide a convenient venue for, or even solicit, expert opinions on the economic impact of the proposed rule. Not only would it have the benefit of these numerous perspectives, but it would also have the obligation to respond to them in a reasoned manner. Its rule would be subject to judicial review, affording an opportunity to catch mistakes 242 or invalidate rules that do nothing but deliver rents to special interests.

Another advantage of rulemaking, an option for agencies but not for the Court, since it only operates through adjudication, is that rulemaking regulates behavior ex ante, while resolution of economic policy through cases is necessarily ex post. Antitrust courts worry obsessively about "chill"--deterring procompetitive behavior with overly broad rules for liability.2 43 In fact, the overruling of Dr. Miles in Leegin implies that the entire twentieth century was a period of inefficient business practices and stunted innovation in distribution because of an early misunderstanding of RPM. Only after a long and expensive period of litigation was Leegin redeemed for breaking the law by effecting a change in the law, and only after Leegin was issued were similar firms, perhaps walking the Colgate line better than Leegin, redeemed for wanting some control over their product's ultimate retail price.24 4 The problem of ex post rulemaking is made worse by the treble damages afforded successful plaintiffs suing under the Sherman Act.2 4 5 To create a new form of liability, the Court has to punish a firm threefold for complying with standing antitrust norms. Thus Supreme Court lawmaking in antitrust is a kind of one-way ratchet.246

The result of the current ex post scheme is that "antitrust law leaves considerable gaps between what is permissible and what is optimal." 2 47 With judges making the rules one case at a time, this gap is justifiable. As discussed above, when judges are not economically sophisticated enough to know where "optimal" lies, 24 8 laissez-faire is a very inexpensive regulatory regime for courts to follow, and raising the level of regulation would effect a kind of taking of property from firms operating under the status quo. So if the Court is making antitrust policy, laissez-faire may be the only sensible approach. But that is not to say that it is the most sensible approach. An agency could provide firms with the necessary clarity-ex ante-that they need when conducting business in a world where competitive behavior so closely resembles anticompetitive conduct. The current state of affairs is that much more is illegal on the books than antitrust lawyers think is actually likely to be struck down in a court.24 9 Lawyers thrive in such a legally uncertain world, but firm efficiency suffers.

#### Key to democracy and court acquiescence---notice and comment engages participants and creates deference.

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

Redressing antitrust’s democracy deficit on the procedural side can be done with the tools of administrative law. Administrative law is the body of law that controls the procedures of governmental decision making.151 It allows interested persons to participate in decisions that affect their interests. Normally, it requires appropriate notice, the right to be heard, fair procedures, protection of fundamental rights, and judicial review of the resulting decision. These basic features are present in the administrative laws of most foreign legal systems and are part of a growing international consensus.152 The tradeoff is that the decisions of administrative agencies that properly follow these strictures normally are granted a degree of deference as to the interpretation of the laws they enforce.153 Frequently, but not inevitably, private parties also have the right to proceed with actions for damages against private parties who violate their regulatory obligations and even against the government itself when it acts unlawfully, either substantively or procedurally. These tools of administrative law are available to make antitrust enforcement decisions more transparent and more responsive to the interests that the antitrust laws were meant to serve, thereby promoting both better decision making and greater democratic legitimacy.

CONCLUSION

Free markets and free people cannot be assured by the efforts of technocrats. Ultimately, both come about through the workings of democratic institutions, respectful of the legislature’s goals and constrained from engaging in arbitrary action. Antitrust has moved too far from democratic institutions and toward technocratic control, in service to a laissez-faire approach to antitrust enforcement. We need to move the needle back. Doing so will strengthen the institutions of antitrust, the market economy, and the democratic branches of government themselves.

#### Democracy solves war

Christopher Kutz 16. PhD UC Berkeley, JD Yale, Professor, Boalt Hall School of Law @ UC Berkeley, Visiting Professor at Columbia and Stanford law schools, as well as at Sciences Po University. “Introduction: War, Politics, Democracy,” in On War and Democracy, 1.

Despite Churchill’s famous quip—“Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time”2—democracy is seen as a source of both domestic and international flourishing. Democracy, understood roughly for now as a political system with wide suffrage in which power is allocated to officials by popular election, can solve or help solve a host of problems with stunning success. It can solve the problem of revolutionary violence that condemns autocratic regimes, because mass politics can work at the ballot box rather than the streets. It can help solve the problem of famine, because the systems of free public communication and discussion that are essential to democratic politics are the backbone of the markets that have made democratic societies far richer than their competitors. It can help solve the problem of environmental despoliation, which occurs when those operating polluting factories (whether private citizens or the state) do not need to answer for harms visited upon a broad public. And democracy has been famously thought to help solve the problem of war, in the guise of the idea of the “peace amongst democratic nations”—an idea emerging with Immanuel Kant in the Age of Enlightenment and given new energy with the wave of democratization at the end of the twentieth century.

### 1NC---K

#### Anti-trust is a capitalist psy op to pacify the working class, buy time to mystify unsustainable accumulation, and map competition onto subjectivity – homo economicus devalues life.

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.

The terms of the social contract preserving the coexistence of capitalism and democracy had been set. In exchange for a pacified citizenry and depoliticized regulatory authority, the policy state promised to deploy instrumental reason to sustain both capital accumulation and widely distributed capacity to consume (supported, always, by the exclusion of African Americans). During the decades of postwar growth, these twin responsibilities seemed attainable and compatible. Capitalism functioned smoothly enough and potentially delegitimating inequality was clipped by inflation, tax-based welfare, and collectively negotiated wages. But in the late 1960s and early 1970s, weakening growth, stagflation, trade deficits, and the collapse of Bretton Woods revealed that state capitalism had not solved the problems of economics. As the Great Depression had enabled construction of the instrumentally rational policy state, economic disturbances in the 1970s opened the breach into which neoliberal reason entered to reconfigure the political economy. Rather than shielding rational policy-making from political pressure and assuring broadly distributed welfare, neoliberalism promised growth driven by depoliticized markets freed from regulation and downwards redistribution. Believing in the optimal rationality of competitive markets, neoliberals sought to reinvigorate capital accumulation through deregulation, lowered taxes, financialization, privatization, and market expansion.

Liberating accumulation from the restrictions and obligations incurred under state capitalism might have imperiled capitalism’s peace treaty with democracy. For deregulation to proceed without impairing the system’s legitimacy, the quid pro quo—depoliticization for consumption—had to continue. Over the ensuing decades, as Wolfgang Streeck explains, the state “bought time” by finding new ways to generate illusions of widely distributed prosperity that prolonged the capacity of the lower and middle classes to consume.17 Each successive attempt exhausted itself, leading to new and escalating disturbances. In the 1970s, inflation safeguarded social peace by compensating workers for inadequate growth until stagflation ended this mode of buying time. A subsequent reliance on public debt enabled the government to pacify conflict with borrowed money. Rising debt and balking creditors delimited this phase, which was brought to a definitive close with the Clinton administration’s social spending cuts and balanced budgets. In a final stage that dawned in the 1980s but grew increasingly paramount over time, debt-based support of purchasing power was privatized. Household spending was financed through mortgages, student loans, and credit cards. This “privatized Keynesianism” buoyed consumption up through 2008, despite cuts to social spending, falling wages, and tightening employment markets.18

Each device for upholding spending maintained the legitimacy of the depoliticized political economy, even as liberalization continued to strip the wage-dependent population of regulatory and redistributive safeguards. The end of the inflation era brought structural unemployment and weakened trade unions. The passing of the public debt regime meant cuts to social rights, privatization of social services, and a trimmed public sector. Growing private debt enabled people to hold on despite lost savings, and rising under- and unemployment. At every step, the neoliberal project was “dressed up” as a consumption project.19 Continuing consumption ensured legitimacy long enough to enact total transformation of the political economy.

The state could not buy time indefinitely. The 1970s had already witnessed the beginning of the transition from a manufacturing, production-oriented economy that exported surpluses to an import-based, finance and services economy focused on consumption. As the United States went from creditor to debtor, a system of “balanced disequilibrium” took hold.20 With impunity granted as the world’s reserve currency, the United States ran mounting budget and trade deficits. To finance them, it absorbed surplus capital from abroad, much of which wended its way to Wall Street. Banks used these profits to extend credit to the working- and middle- classes. Household debt funded consumption of imported goods, returning the surplus capital abroad, and completing the circuit of global trade. This system depended on the unsustainable condition of ever-increasing debt-based consumption. Consumption was notoriously reinforced by secondary markets in what was essentially private money (securitized derivatives and collateralized debt obligation) that was much riskier than assumed. Because increasingly irresponsible lending was integral to continuing the consumption that stabilized the macroeconomic system, it became a sort of vicious collective good that progressively magnified the scale of the inevitable crash.21 When in 2008 the debt finally proved unserviceable and the housing bubble burst, the private money disappeared and the disequilibrated global economic system fell into crisis.

Consumption based on private debt had provided an unstable bridge over the yawning inequality brought about by deregulation, financialization, globalization, and the diminished welfare state. When the 2008 crisis dried up credit, it revealed a divided “dual economy.”22 On one side is the primary sector of elite, highly-educated professionals who are collected in coastal urban centers and tied in to corporate management, technological innovation and oversight of global capital flows. On the other is the secondary sector of low-skilled workers primarily fixed in the heartland, for whom deregulated competition has brought under- or unemployment, job instability, depressed wages, exploding debt, and diminished prospects.

Unable to buy more time, the state’s breach of the postwar social contract has been exposed. The neoliberal system of capital accumulation was entrenched at the expense of broad and sustainable consumption. The results have been the politicization of defrauded citizens and a political economy plunged into legitimation crisis. Time has belied the premature conclusion that contradiction and crisis potential had been overcome by state capitalism. Contradiction was relocated into cross-cutting imperatives for the state to enable capital accumulation and distribute consumption. In hindsight, we find only a window of stabilization of an enduring crisis potential built into capitalist political economy. As Nancy Fraser puts it “on the one hand, legitimate, efficacious public power is a condition of possibility for sustained capital accumulation; on the other hand, capitalism’s drive to endless accumulations tends to destabilize the very public power on which it relies.”23 The political fallout from the 2008 crisis marks the end of the postwar social contract that had established conditions ensuring the continued coexistence of capitalism and democracy.

#### Competitive markets produce monopolization---antitrust replicates the problem.

Richard Wolff 19. Professor Emeritus of Economics at University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Transcript from YouTube video: “Economic Update: Competition and Monopoly in Capitalism.” Democracy @ Work. December 9th, 2019. https://www.democracyatwork.info/eu\_competition\_monopoly\_in\_capitalism.

Today I'm going to devote the program to something many of you have asked me to present, to talk about, to analyze, and that is the question of monopoly. It has to do with the assertions we hear often these days that somehow our capitalist system, here in the United States and beyond, is being negatively affected because monopolies have replaced or displaced competition. The idea here is if only we can get competition back, recreate a competitive capitalism, why then the problems we face will go away. Today's program is a design to show you how and why that is not the case, to think about these things in a different way from this nice story that capitalism is basically fine; it's just the monopoly form we have to get rid of so we get back to the competition which we're all supposed to believe is wonderful and presents us with no problems to solve. So let's go, and let's do it in a systematic way. First, it is of course easier, faced with a declining capitalism, a capitalism that's all around us with its extreme inequalities, with its instabilities – here we are, trying to cope with the effects of the Great Crash of 2008, even while we anticipate the next downturn coming down the road soon – an economic system that has shown (that is, capitalism) that it is not respectful of the natural environment; it is not, as the words now go, sustainable in a reasonable way. Yeah, we're surrounded by problems of capitalism. So it's comforting in that situation to get the idea from somewhere that this really isn't a problem of capitalism as a system but rather the problem brought in somehow from the outside – monopoly – a situation in which competition among many companies gives way in some way we're not quite sure about to a domination by one or a small handful of companies. And so the argument goes, we don't have to be critical of capitalism; we don't have to think about an alternative system. No, no, we just have to deal with this little detail, the monopoly problem. And if we can deal with that, well, we'll get back to a competition, to a competitive capitalism that is good. There are three big mistakes involved in this way of thinking, which is nonetheless very widespread and very popular, more so now than in quite some years. First mistake: Capitalism has been wrestling with the problem of monopoly from day one. We have had repeated periods of monopoly. They have eventually led to movements, often of many people, to destroy or remove monopoly. We used to call that in America trust-busting, or antitrust. We even have a department within the Department of Justice in Washington devoted to antitrust activities. Yeah, we've been waging battles against monopoly over and over again, and you know why? Because we keep having monopolies over and over again. Google is a monopoly. Amazon is a monopoly. They're all around us: companies that have effectively no real competition. This is a problem that capitalism has always displayed. And that ought to lead you to wonder whether thinking about it as something we can do away with isn't maybe the best possible example of wishful thinking. The second big mistake is to imagine that competition is some unmixed blessing. It never was, and it isn't today. A competitive market is a human institution. Like every other human institution, it has strengths, and flaws, and weaknesses. To think of competition as some magical perfection is a silly abnegation of your own rational capability to evaluate something. It's sort of advertising thinking. By that, I mean the advertiser tells you what's good about the product they've been told to advertise; they don't tell you what's bad about it. If you want to evaluate it, you don't talk to an advertiser because they only give you one side. The people who promote competition use advertising logic. We're not going to do that here. Competition is no unmixed blessing. And finally, I'm going to show you that competition is itself the major cause of monopoly. So that even if we ever got back to a competitive capitalism, all that would mean is we're back in the process that produces monopoly – as it always has. All right, so let's begin. I'm going to start with explaining how competition has all kinds of consequences that most of you, like me, don't like, don't want. It's a discussion, if you like, of competition's other side: you know, the part that the advertiser doesn't tell you about. The used-car salesman who wants you to buy that junk doesn't tell you about what happened last week in the car crash that that was part of, etc., etc. All right, let's begin. One of the major reasons that American corporations shut down their operations in the United States and moved them to China, among other places, is because of – you guessed it – competition. They wanted to make more money than they had been before. They were afraid of other companies beating them in the competitive game, so they said wow, let's go to China, because there you can pay workers a lot less. There you don't have the same rules to obey. There they don't care that much about pollution as they do here. So we can save on all kinds of costs, and that will allow us to undercut our competitors. Yeah, one of the consequences of competition was the exodus of American companies to other parts of the world, and the enormous unemployment that resulted from it. Yeah, that was a result, among other things, of competition. Here's another one: Capitalists, employers, seeking to compete with one another, often engage in what we call automation. They bring in machines that are cheaper to use than human laborers, and that gets them a step ahead of their competitors. Okay, if we replace people with machines, we throw those people out of work. That has an impact on them, their self-esteem, their relationship to their spouse, their relationship to their children, their relationship to alcohol – should I continue? What are the social costs of automation? They're huge. They've been documented over and over again. Competition provokes and produces automation. Let me give you another example: Companies are competing, say, in the food business – you know, trying to get a customer like you or me to buy this kind of cereal rather than another. So they get their labs to go to work, and they discover we can replace wheat, which we used to put in our little flakes, with – Lord help us – some chemical that is cheaper than wheat. We're not going to worry about what that chemical does to your chemistry in your body because we can now lower the price of our cereal, because we're saving on wheat, and undercut the competitor. The human beings who eat this stuff will suffer, now and in the future, but competition left our producer of cereal no choice. And in case you think I'm making some up, let me give you some concrete ones. The Boeing Corporation, the major producer of airplanes in this country, is in a crisis as a corporation. You know why? Because the 737 Max crashed a couple of times, killing hundreds of people. And you know why? It turns out they economized on safety measures, and training measures. And you know why they did that? Because they're in a very tight competition with European and other airplane manufacturers, and that leads them – as it usually does – to look to cut corners: that race for, quote, "efficiency." Yeah, it was competition that contributed to those deaths and to that problem. That's competition too. You can't whitewash this story; they're real. One of the ways Amazon beats its competition is it speeds up the work process. It has figured out ways to make people work much more intensely, using up their brains, their muscles, their nerves, in ways that cause real long-term physical damage to working people. That, too, is a result of the competitive effort. And you know, it wasn't so long ago that children were part of the labor force. That's right, kids as young as five and six years of age. We were told they have little fingers, you see. They can be more productive than people who are adults with big fat fingers, you know – that doesn't work. And by the way, you should be grateful because poor kids are the ones we hire, and that gives their poor families more income than they would otherwise have. We heard those arguments. Competition, the companies said, required them to use the more productive, and the lower-wage, children rather than adults. So child labor was also a result of competition. It was so ugly and so troubling to so many people that finally there were movements in the United States and many other countries simply to outlaw child labor. So it became a crime for any employer to use a worker who was under 16 or 18 years of age. That was a way in which people said we are not going to allow competition among capitalists to destroy our children. They were recognizing that competition has an awful effect in what it does to children. Well, it has many awful effects. So let's be clear: In the history of capitalism, the monopoly problem (which we're going to get to in the second half of today's program) is no worse, it's just different, from the competition problems. Capitalism goes through phases of competition and monopoly, going from one to the other, as I will explain. But we shouldn't bemoan the one in favor of the other, any more than vice-versa. These are neither of them solutions; they are both phases of the problem. And the problem is capitalism, which does its number on us both in the period when it's competitive and in the period when it's monopoly. People who want us to engage one more time in an anti-monopoly crusade are doing something that in the end evades the problem, which is the system – capitalism – not this or that form of that system, such as competition and monopoly. We've come to the end of the first half of today's Economic Update. This gives me an opportunity to remind you, please, to sign up if you haven't already, to subscribe to our YouTube channel. It's a way easily for you to support us, doesn't cost any money, and it is a big help to us in terms of our reputation and what we can accomplish. Likewise, please make use of our websites. They are there for your communication with us. They are there for you to be able to, with a click of a mouse, to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. And finally, a special thanks goes, as always, to our Patreon community for their ongoing enthusiastic support. It means the world to us. My final, very final for this first half, is about a new book that we have just produced and released. It's a follow-up to an earlier volume I have spoken to you about that was called Understanding Marxism. For the same reason, we have now produced a brand-new book, just out, called Understanding Socialism. It is a response, as this program is, to issues, questions, comments you have sent to us in large numbers. It's an attempt to give an overview of the different interpretations of what socialism means, of what happened in countries like Russia and China that tried to create this – the strengths, the weaknesses, the lessons to be learned, what to do, and what not to do. Please, if you're interested and want to follow up, check us out, check the book out: lulu.com is how you find both books. And I will be right back; stay with us. Welcome back, friends, to the second half of today's Economic Update. This program, as I explained, is devoted to the analysis of competition and monopoly as two interactive, sequential phases of capitalism as a system. The first part of the program was devoted mostly to competition, so let's turn now to monopoly. What is the basic definition and criticism of monopoly? Strictly speaking, monopoly is defined simply as a situation in which the producers of a particular commodity – shoes, software programs, haircuts, it doesn't matter – have been reduced to only one. Literally one seller – a monopolist. But in general language, it includes also situations where many producers who once competed with one another have been reduced to only a handful. The strict term for only a handful is "oligopoly," but we don't have to split hairs about this. "Monopoly" will be the word we use for either one or a very small number. For example, there were once dozens of automobile companies, but very quickly their competition reduced them to basically three for much of the post-World War II period, and you know their names: Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. And likewise there were once many cigarette producers, there were once many television-set producers, and they became very few, whose names, therefore, we all know. What's the criticism of a monopoly or oligopoly situation? Again, very simple: The idea is, if there's only one seller of something, that seller can jack up the price way above what he might have otherwise because he doesn't have any competitor. If he had a competitor, if he raised the price, the competitor would get all the business because we'd all go to the competitor who hadn't raised the price rather than buy it at a higher price from the monopolist. So we don't like monopolies, because they can jack up their prices and their profits because they don't have a competitor. And if it's a few, a handful, well then we talk about things like cartels: arrangements when a few get together over dinner, or out on the golf course, and tell us what the price is. If you ever wondered why the prices of different cars, different cigarettes, and so on, are so close to one another – mm-hmm – that's because there are few sellers, and somehow they worked it all out. But the basic criticism is that a monopoly is a situation in which the seller of something jacks the price up way beyond what they could otherwise get because there are no more competitors. So let's talk about this monopoly problem and where the monopolies come from. Well, the first and most important lesson is this: Competition produces monopoly. It's not something external, imposed on competition. It has nothing to do with human greed or anything else. Are people greedy? You betcha – some more, some less – but that's really a separate matter. It's competition that produces monopoly, and let me show you how that works. In competition, we have, by definition, a whole bunch of producers. They all produce the same thing. They compete with one another, hoping we, the consumer, will buy from one rather than the other. They compete in the quality of what they produce and in the price of what they produce. And we are supposed, as consumers, to go look for the best quality at the lowest price, and to patronize that one who offers that to us better than the others that we could buy from but choose not to. Okay, that's a fair definition. Now let's follow the logic. Company A produces – however it manages it – a better quality and/or a lower price than Company B. So we all go to Company A. Company B can't find any buyers because it's not competitive. Or to say the same thing in other words, Company A outcompetes Company B. Here's what happens: Company B collapses. Because it can't sell its goods, we're all going to Company A. So Company B sooner or later declares bankruptcy. It can't continue. It lays off its employees, it stops buying inputs, because it can't compete. Good. Now what happens in Company A? Company A says hey, there's a whole bunch of workers that have just lost their job at Company B; they're trained in producing what we produce; let's go hire some of them. And likewise, Company A says, they're not using their computers, or their trucks, or their other inputs. They're going to have to sell them on the secondhand market. We can get some important inputs we need at a lower price than we would have to pay if we bought them new. So what begins to happen is, where before there were two companies, A and B, there's now one larger A, and B has disappeared. Or to say the same thing in simple English, A – the winner in the competitive struggle – eats, absorbs into itself, what's left of Company B. And this process is repeated over and over, until 30, or 300, companies have become one, or two, or three. That's the result of competition. That's how competition is supposed to work. That's how competition does work. It's important to understand: Monopoly is where competition leads. And as if that weren't enough, let me make sure you understand this from the business point of view: It is the great dream of every entrepreneur to become the last one standing in the competition, to win the competition, not just because it makes you feel good you outmaneuvered your competitors, but because if you're the last one standing, you're the monopolist. The reward for having outcompeted the others is that you're now in a position to jack up the profits, and the prices, way beyond what you could have done before. So we have a system that produces monopoly, and all the incentives for every entrepreneur in competition to work as hard as possible to become the monopolist. So why is anyone surprised that monopolies keep happening, because they're the whole point and purpose of capitalist competition. If you ever were – and we never have, but if you ever were – able to get rid of all the monopolies and re-establish competition, all you would be doing is setting this same process in motion again for the umpteenth historical time. In other words, fighting against monopoly is pointless as long as you have capitalism, because it is the endless reproducer of this problem – as it always has been. Now, how do monopolies maintain themselves? If you're the only one standing, you're a monopolist. Or you're an oligopoly, you're a few, and you get together and jack up your prices together. The question becomes look, a monopolist makes very high profits – much higher than a competitor can achieve – and isn't that an enormous incentive for other capitalists to get in on that business? Because look at the profits they're earning, because they're the only one. Apple, Amazon, Google – the profits are staggering. Everybody wants to get in. So the way a monopolist has to think is, I've got to create obstacles that block other people from coming in to get a piece of the enormous profits my monopoly allows me to get. We call that in economics "barriers to entry." Monopolists need to create barriers. Let me give you a couple of examples. The major soft drink makers in the United States – basically Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola – they produce a drink that has sugar and coloring in it, and lots and lots of water. Let me assure you, there is nothing difficult or complicated about producing a mixture of sugar, color, and water. It doesn't take a genius; it never did. Pepsi and Coca-Cola make a fortune off of their product, as we know, and they have for decades. They have a virtual monopoly. Now, lots of other people could produce water, sugar, and color close to, if not identical with, whatever they produce, but they can't break through. They can't really get to that status. And you know why? Because Coca-Cola and Pepsi erected a barrier to entry. And the way they did that was with advertising. Every billboard, every magazine cover, every doorway of every institution you've ever been to has a picture of smiling, happy people drinking one or the other. You've learned: that's the drink, that's the drink. Another company might make a perfect substitute, but they can't afford the enormous cost of advertising. The advertising costs more than the water, and the sugar, and the color. What you pay for when you buy Pepsi and Coke is the advertising that got you to buy it. You're paying for being hustled. But it works, because it means other companies know that they can't get in there by cheaply producing an alternative, because you have to produce the advertising that goes with it, or else you can't do it. And so their monopoly is maintained. Here's another way to maintain a monopoly: Get the government to step in. Here the famous example is the milk producers. Some years ago, there was a crisis with milk. There was contamination; people were getting sick. So the clever milk monopolies came in and said, we're going to support the enormously expensive, special equipment to guarantee pasteurization, and so on, of milk. Why did they support it? Because your small farmer, your small dairy producer, can't afford it, so they go out of business. Only the big, rich few that are left can afford the enormous equipment. They used governmental rules to create a barrier to entry. Here's another way: corrupt public officials. President Trump denounces Huawei corporation because it compromises our national security. It denounces European car producers because somehow their shipping cars here compromises our security. Who cares? As long as the president blocks other companies from getting into the business that might compete with an American, a barrier to entry exists. Monopolists have been very creative in coming up with ways to preserve their monopolies. I don't want to lose the basic point. The basic point is: Capitalism oscillates, back and forth between competition and monopoly – first this industry, then that one. For a while, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler were the monopolies – or the oligopoly, if you like – in automobiles. But eventually, Toyota, and Nissan, and Peugeot, and Fiat broke the monopoly. In that case, it was foreigners who did it. And then we had some competition, and that, then, is now shrinking. The French – the last two producers in France – have just agreed to merge. You get the picture. Industry by industry, first this one, then that one, go through one phase or another. The important point is: The phases are not our problem. They merge into, and incentivize, each other. Each provokes movement in the other direction. The point to understand is that the problems of a capitalist system are not about this oscillation of phases. We're not going to solve the problem of monopoly by getting rid of them and re-establishing competition. We've been there; we've done that; it reproduces monopoly; and it doesn't change the basic inequality, unsustainability, instability of capitalism. We need to get beyond that stale, old debate – competition versus monopoly – and face the underlying reality: Capitalism is the problem, and getting beyond it is the solution.

#### Capitalism drives extinction and structural violence

Allinson et al 21 [Jamie Allinson is Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Introduction. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963 //shree]

This is the question that vexed us as we set out to write The Tragedy of the Worker. From the vantage point of the present, the history of capitalist development is, as Marx expected, the history of the development of a global working class, the proletarianisation of the majority of the world’s population. But the very same process of that development has brought us to the precipice of climate disaster. Our position, to recall Trotsky’s rationalisation of War Communism in 1920, is in the highest degree tragic.

It is now clear that we will pass what scientists have long warned will be a tipping point of global warming, accelerating the already catastrophic consequences of capitalist emissions. How do we imagine emancipation on an at best partially habitable planet? Where once communists imagined seizing the means of production, taking the unprecedented capacities of capitalist infrastructures and using them to build a world of plenty, what must we imagine after the apocalypse has befallen us? What does it mean that as capitalism has become truly global, the gravediggers it has created dig not only capitalism’s grave, but also that of much organic life on earth?

Our answers to these questions remain rooted in the politics of revolutionary communism. Our stance is not based on the fantasy of a homeostatic nature that must be defended but on the critique of the capitalist metabolism – the Stoffwechsel- that must be overthrown. Earth scientists are accustomed to speak in terms of ‘cycles’ by which substances circulate in different forms: the water cycle, the rock cycle, the nitrogen cycle, the glacial-interglacial cycle, the carbon cycle, and others. One way of registering the catastrophe of climate change is to see these cycles – most of all, but not solely, the carbon cycle – as disordered, under- or over-accumulating. But this is to ignore the more fundamental circuit of which these now form epicycles, like Ptolemy’s sub-orbits of the heavenly bodies: the circuit of capital accumulation, M-C-M′.

This circuit accumulates profit and produces death. Neither is accidental. It is for this reason that the debates that capitalist ruling classes permit among themselves on ‘adaptation’ versus ‘mitigation’ take place on false premises. What is to be mitigated is the impact of climate change on accumulation, rendered through the ideology of ‘growth’ as something that benefits everyone. What we are to adapt to are the parameters of accumulation, sacrificing just enough islands, eco-systems, indigenous – and non-indigenous – cultures to maintain its imperatives for a period of time until new thresholds must be crossed, and new life sacrificed to the pagan idol of capital. Already, capitalist petro-modernity builds a certain quantum of acceptable death into its predicates: at the very least, the 8.7 million killed by fossil fuels each year according to Harvard University are considered a price worth paying for the stupendous advantages of fossil capital. And the sky can only keep going up, as deforestation, polar melt, ocean acidification, soil de-fertilisation and more intense wildfires and storms tear the web of life into patches. If the necropolitical calculus of the Covid-19 pandemic appears crass, just wait until its premises are applied to climate catastrophe.

#### Vote neg for anti-capitalist commons – collectives should refuse commitments to competitive principle and the straitjacket of what’s “realistic”

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

### 1NC---DA

#### 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 a strong defense industrial base.

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

Big Tech and the Foundations of American Power

American power is also critical in a time of great power competition. Here too, the case for protecting big tech and restricting competition in the tech sector is weak. Under conventional market theory—and economic practice—competition sparks innovation. If the United States wants to continue to be at the forefront of technological innovation, then more competition is desirable, not less. Breaking up and regulating big tech will thus improve innovation, not reduce it. America’s position in a great power rivalry also depends on its defense industrial base—the resilience and capacity of its defense sector. But a concentrated defense sector means less innovation in defense, higher prices for taxpayers to procure defense systems, and a functional redistribution of taxpayer funds from R&D or other kinds of spending to profits for defense contractors. As technology becomes more integrated with defense, the same dangers of a concentrated defense industrial base could emerge with respect to the defense technological base. Breaking up and regulating big tech, combined with R&D funding, would likely instead create a more competitive defense sector and a more innovative, more resilient, and cheaper one too.

#### Strong defense industrial base key to avert war with China and Russia---goes nuclear.

A. Wess Mitchell & Jakub Grygiel 16. Jakub Grygiel is a senior fellow and A. Wess Mitchell is the President of the Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA), Washington, DC; "Predators on the Frontier;" American Interest; https://www.the-american-interest.com/2016/02/12/predators-on-the-frontier/; 02-12-2016

How should the United States respond to these dynamics? As our rivals grow more aggressive and our military edge narrows, we must look to other methods for waging and winning geopolitical competitions in the 21st century.

The most readily available but underutilized tool at our disposal is alliances. America’s frontline allies offer a mechanism by which it can contain rivals—indeed, this was the original purpose for cultivating security linkages with small states in the world’s rimland regions to begin with. In coming years, the value of strategically placed allies near Eurasia’s large land powers will grow as our relative technological or numerical military strength shrinks. The time has come for the United States to develop a grand strategy for containing peer competitors centered on the creative use of frontline allies. It must do so now, before geopolitical competition intensifies.

Predatory Peers

Probing has been the strategy of choice for America’s modern rivals to challenge the existing order. Over the past few years, Russia, China, and, to a degree, Iran have sensed that the United States is retreating in their respective regions—whether out of choice, fatigue, weakness, or all three combined. But they are unsure of how much remaining strength the United States has, or of the solidity of its commitments to allies. Rather than risking direct war, they have employed low-intensity crises to test U.S. power in these regions. Like past revisionists, they have focused their probes on seemingly secondary interests of the leading power, either by humbling its weakest allies or seizing gray zones over which the United States is unlikely to fight. These probes test the United States on the outer rim of its influence, where the revisionist’s own interests are strongest while the U.S. is at its furthest commitments and therefore most vulnerable to defeat. Russia has launched a steady sequence of threatening military moves against vulnerable NATO allies and conducted limited offensives against former Soviet satellite states. China has sought out low-intensity diplomatic confrontations with small U.S. security clients, erected military no-go zones, and asserted claims over strategic waterways.

When we wrote about this behavior in The American Interest in 2011, it was composed mainly of aggressive diplomacy or threatening but small military moves. But the probes of U.S. rivals are becoming bolder. Sensing a window of opportunity, in 2014 Russia upped the ante by invading Ukraine—the largest country in Eastern Europe—in a war that has so far cost 7,000 lives and brought 52,000 square kilometers of territory into the Russian sphere of influence. After years of using unmarked fishing trawlers to harass U.S. or allied naval vessels, China has begun to militarize its probes in the South China Sea, constructing seven artificial islands and claiming (and threatening to fight over) 1.8 million square kilometers of ocean. Iran has recently humiliated the United States by holding American naval vessels and broadcasting photos of surrendering U.S. sailors. In all cases, revisionist powers increased the stakes because they perceived their initial probes to have succeeded. Having achieved modest gains, they increased the intensity of their probes.

The strategic significance of these latest probes for the United States is twofold. First, they have substantially increased the military pressure on frontline allies. The presence of a buffer zone of some sort, whether land or sea, between allies like Poland or Japan and neighboring revisionist powers, helped to reduce the odds of sustained contact and confrontation between allied and rival militaries. By successfully encroaching on or invading these middle spaces, revisionists have advanced the zone of contest closer to the territory of U.S. allies, increasing the potential for a deliberate or accidental military clash.

Second, the latest probes have significantly raised the overall pressure on the United States. As long as Russia’s military adventures were restricted to its own southern periphery, America could afford to shift resources to the Pacific without worrying much about the consequences in Europe—an important consideration given the Pentagon’s jettisoning of the goal to be able to fight a two-front war. With both Ukraine and the South China Sea at play (and with a chaotic Middle East, where another rival, Iran, advances its reach and influence), the United States no longer has the luxury of prioritizing one region over another; with two re-militarized frontiers at opposite ends of the globe, it must continually weigh trade-offs in scarce military resources between geographic theaters. This disadvantage is not lost on America’s rivals, or its most exposed friends.

Frontier Frenzy

The intensification of probing has reverberated through the ranks of America’s frontline allies. In both Europe and Asia, the edges of the Western order are inhabited by historically vulnerable small or mid-sized states that over the past seven decades have relied on the United States for their existence. The similarities in the geopolitical position and strategic options of states like Estonia and Taiwan, or Poland and South Korea, are striking. For all of these states, survival depends above all on the sustainability of U.S. extended deterrence, in both its nuclear and conventional forms. This in turn rests on two foundations: the assumption among rivals and allies alike that the United States is physically able to fulfill its security obligations to even the smallest ally, and the assumption that it is politically willing to do so.

Doubts about both have been growing for many years. Reductions in American defense spending are weakening the U.S. military capability to protect allies. Due to cuts introduced by the 2009 Budget Control Act, the U.S. Navy is smaller than at any point since before the First World War, the U.S. Army is smaller than at any point since before the Second World War and the U.S. Air Force has the lowest number of operational warplanes in its history. Nuclear force levels are static or declining, and the U.S. technological edge over rivals in important weapons types has diminished. The Pentagon in 2009 announced that for the first time since the Second World War it would jettison the goal of being able to conduct a two-front global war.

At the same time that U.S. capabilities are decreasing, those of our rivals are increasing. Both Russia and China have undertaken large, multiyear military expansion and modernization programs and the technological gap between them and the United States is narrowing, particularly in key areas such as short-range missiles, tactical nuclear weapons, and fifth-generation fighter aircraft.

Recent American statecraft has compounded the problem by weakening the belief in U.S. political will to defend allies. The early Obama Administration’s public questioning of the value of traditional alliances as “alignments of nations rooted in the cleavages of a long-gone Cold War” shook allied confidence at the same time that its high-profile engagement with large rivals indicated a preference for big-power bargaining over the heads of small states. The U.S.-Russia “reset” seemed to many allies both transactional and freewheeling, and left a lasting impression of the suddenness with which U.S. priorities could shift from one Administration to the next. This undermined the predictability of patronage that is the sine qua non of effective deterrence for any Great Power. As the revisionists’ probes have become more assertive and U.S. credibility less firm, America’s frontier allies have started to reconsider their national security options. Five years ago, many frontline states expressed security concerns, began to seek greater military capabilities, or looked to offset risk by engaging diplomatically with revisionists. But for the most part, such behavior was muted and well within the bounds of existing alliance commitments. However, as probing has picked up pace, allied coping behavior has become more frantic. In Europe, Poland, the Baltic States, and Romania have initiated military spending increases. In Asia, littoral U.S. allies are engaged in a worrisome regional arms race. In both regions, the largest allies are considering offensive capabilities to create conventional deterrence. Their willingness to build up their indigenous military capabilities is overall a positive development, but it carries risks, too, spurring dynamics that were absent over the past decades. The danger is that, absent a consistent and credible U.S. overwatch, rearming allies engage in a chaotic acquisition strategy, poorly anchored in the larger alliance. Fearing abandonment, such states may end up detaching themselves from the alliance simply by pursuing independent security policies. There is also danger on the other side of the spectrum of possible responses by frontline allies. Contrary to the hopeful assumptions of offshore balancers, not all frontline allies are resisting. Some are choosing strategies of accommodation. Bulgaria, Hungary, and Slovakia in Europe and Thailand and Malaysia in Asia are all examples of nominal U.S. allies that are trying to avoid antagonizing the stronger predator. Worsening regional security dynamics create domestic political pressures to avoid confrontation with the nearby revisionist power. Full-fledged bandwagoning in the form of the establishment of new alliances is not yet visible, but hedging is.

Seeds of Disorder

The combination of intensifying probes and fragmenting alliances threatens to unravel important components of the stability of major regions and the wider international order. Allowed to continue on their current path, security dynamics in Eastern Europe and the Western Pacific could lead to negative or even catastrophic outcomes for U.S. national security. One increasingly likely near-term scenario is a simmering, simultaneous security competition in major regions. In such a scenario, rivals continue probing allies and grabbing middle-zone territory while steering clear of war with the United States or its proxies; allies continue making half-measure preparations without becoming fully capable of managing their own security; and the United States continues feeding greater and greater resources into frontline regions without achieving reassurance, doggedly tested and put in doubt by the revisionists. Through a continued series of probes, the revisionist powers maintain the initiative while the United States and its allies play catch up. The result might be a gradual hardening of the U.S. security perimeter that never culminates in a Great Power war but generates many of the negative features of sustained security competition—arms races, proxy wars, and cyber and hybrid conflicts—that erode the bases of global economic growth.

A second, graver possibility is war. Historically, a lengthy series of successful probes has often culminated in a military confrontation. One dangerous characteristic of today’s international landscape is that not one but two revisionists have now completed protracted sequences of probes that, from their perspective, have been successful. If the purpose of probing is to assess the top power’s strength, today’s probes could eventually convince either Russia, China, or both that the time is ripe for a more definitive contest. It is uncertain what the outcome would be. Force ratios in today’s two hotspots, the Baltic Sea and South China Sea, do not favor the United States. Both Russia and China possess significant anti-access/area denial (A2AD) capabilities, with a ten-to-one Russian troop advantage in the Baltic and massive Chinese preponderance of coastal short-range missiles in the South China Sea. Moreover, both powers possess nuclear weapons and, in Russia’s case, a doctrine favoring their escalatory use for strategic effect. And even if the United States can maintain overwhelming military superiority in a dyadic contest, war is always the realm of chance and a source of destruction that threatens the stability of the existing international order. Having failed a series of probes, the United States could face the prospect of either a short, sharp war that culminates in nuclear attack or an economically costly protracted two-front conflict. Either outcome would definitely alter the U.S.-led international system as we know it.
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#### New antitrust is applied globally---offends allies---regs counterplan avoids it.

Herbert Hovenkamp 03. Ben V. & Dorothy Willie Professor of Law and History, University of Iowa. “Antitrust as Extraterritorial Regulatory Policy,” 48 Antitrust BULL. 629 (2003).

Today few of us are sympathetic with the view that the common law exists apart from and somehow transcends the jurisdiction of the courts that make it. Nevertheless, there is a powerful sense in which the rules of antitrust law are regarded as "natural," while explicitly regulatory rules are considered to be purely local, territorial, or political. This view is given considerable support by a powerful neoclassical economic model that views markets as natural, in the sense that they exist separate and apart from state policy making. 32

Within this model antitrust law is a kind of background umpire that does not make first instance choices about price, quantity, quality, new entry and the like, but that does limit the anticompetitive exercise of market power. Antitrust operates as a kind of "macro" version of contract law. The common law of contracts is designed to facilitate and protect the utility of individual private bargains; antitrust is designed to do much the same thing, but for markets as a whole. Under this conception a well defined set of antitrust principles always operates in the background, so to speak, permitting private bargaining to proceed without interference in the great majority of instances, but intervening when competitive processes go awry. Further, widespread agreement exists both inside and outside the United States on a set of core principles pertaining to such things as naked price fixing, market division agreements, and the like. Within this core, problems of extraterritoriality have largely been limited to the technical ones of devising appropriate jurisdictional rules and remedies.

In contrast, the power to regulate is different. Under the traditional view of regulation the power to set price, quantity, quality, or the right to enter a market emanates in the first instance from the government. Further, although there is widespread economic agreement on fundamental principles, regulatory design is much more specific to the sovereign-more likely to reflect the demographics, industrial or employment base, or politics of the particular state imposing the regulation.

For example, nearly all of the 50 states of the United States have an antitrust law. With relatively few exceptions, however, the substantive coverage of these antitrust laws is the same, and mimics federal law. Many states have court decisions or even legislative enactments stating that federal antitrust law should govern the interpretation of that particular state's antitrust law as well. 33 The result is that the coverage of state antitrust law is remarkably similar from one state to the next. But one can hardly say the same thing about each state's regulation of land use, power generation and distribution, taxicabs, liquor pricing, and the like. Whatever homogeneity regulatory theory might produce, the politics of regulation virtually guarantees jurisdiction-specific outcomes.

But homogeneity in antitrust policy also begins to break down when antitrust law moves beyond its fundamental neoclassical concern with cartels or well-defined exclusionary practices, and into areas where its role is more controversial or marginal. This is often the case when the antitrust laws are applied in recently deregulated markets. For example, a common antitrust problem that arises in deregulated industries falls under the general rubric of unilateral refusals to deal. In order to encourage competition, newly deregulated firms may be forced to share their facilities, information, intellectual property, or other assets with new rivals. Devising reasonable "nonregulatory" rules governing refusals to deal in such markets has always extended the antitrust laws to the margin of their competence.

Increasingly, American courts seem willing to apply antitrust law to markets regulated by foreign nations under circumstances where regulatory laws themselves would never reach. For example, neither Congress nor a state legislature would very likely attempt to regulate the customer service or information provision practices of a foreign national's telephone company. But both federal and state courts have done precisely that under the guise of antitrust enforcement.3 4

Antitrust policy makes this thinkable as a result of the confluence of two sets of doctrines. First is the expansive reach of our antitrust laws to practices that have a substantial effect on United States commerce. Second is the very narrow conception of comity that applies in antitrust cases.

As a general matter, comity concerns in the international conflict of laws requires the court to consider the competing interests of domestic and foreign sovereigns. 35 After a half century of debate over the meaning of comity in international Sherman Act adjudication, the Supreme Court gave the doctrine an extraordinarily narrow meaning in the Hartford Fire case.36 That case involved an alleged insurance boycott in which Lloyd's of London participated as reinsurer. Lloyd's conduct-agreeing with some United States insurers not to write reinsurance policies for other United States insurers who wanted to write policies with broader coverage-was neither forbidden nor compelled by British law. To the defendant's claim of comity the Supreme Court replied that the provisions of the Sherman Act governing jurisdiction over transactions in foreign commerce were mandatory. As a result, a federal court could not simply decline jurisdiction on the basis of some general balancing of interests. 37 Rather, "comity" permits a federal court to decline jurisdiction only when there was a "conflict" between the law of the foreign sovereign and United States law. Further, "conflict" was defined not under choice of law principles, but more absolutely, as occurring only when the foreign law compelled the conduct at issue. 38

Perhaps significantly, the activity of the London reinsurers was very likely reachable under United States antitrust law even under ordinary interest analysis principles. British law was found by the Supreme Court to be indifferent to what the London reinsurers were doing. Further, what they were doing was agreeing not to insure against liability for particular toxic pollution risks in the United States, and risk of liability is of course measured in relation to the physical environment and legal regime in which the injury occurs. 39 As a result, the London reinsurers were selling a product especially targeted for United States markets and allegedly participating in a boycott designed to keep broader coverage insurance policies out of that market.

But Hartford Fire's definition of comity is significantly problematic under deregulation. To the extent a foreign sovereign deregulates a public utility or common carrier, that firm enjoys greater discretion to make its own decisions. As a result, considerations of comity may no longer preclude a Sherman Act suit. What makes this especially problematic is the way that the Sherman Act has been used in the United States as a kind of replacement for the regulatory agency. Under comprehensive agency regulation a filed tariff plus regulatory oversight would have governed numerous acts by regulated firms, including pricing, entry into new markets, interconnection obligations and other duties to deal.40 Government relaxation of regulatory restrictions has given firms some discretion over these things but in the process has substituted the antitrust courts as governmental supervisor. In some situations this causes little difficulty because regulation may have been misapplied to a competitively structured industry to begin with.41 In other situations, such as long-distance telecommunication, a competitive environment has developed because of changes in technology, and topto-bottom price and product regulation is no longer necessary.42

But in a third class of situations the application of the antitrust laws is much more "regulatory" and more difficult to defend. These are the cases where unilateral conduct of the kind that was historically supervised by the regulatory agency now comes under antitrust jurisdiction. For example, under the essential facility doctrine a federal court of general jurisdiction may be asked to apply antitrust law to determine the scope of a formerly regulated firm's duty to interconnect with rivals. The circuit courts have applied the doctrine frequently in the telecommunications industry,43 but also to railroads" and natural gas pipelines.4 5 Problematically, supervising interconnection requirements involves the court in highly technical questions about the scope of the duty to deal and perhaps even about the price at which the deal must be made. In these cases we have not really "deregulated" at all; rather, we have simply substituted regulation by a government agency for regulation by a court, often through the highly inefficient and uncertain process of a jury trial. To do that in a purely domestic situation is ill-advised enough, but to do it abroad by taking advantage of the expansive jurisdictional reach of the Sherman Act is completely unjustified.

IV. Extraterritorial antitrust and foreign deregulation

As expansive as the regulatory power asserted by the United States sometimes becomes, it does not generally interfere directly into foreign governments' regulation of their own highly regulated industries. But to a large extent modem antitrust has inherited the regulatory attitude expressed by the Western Union decision discussed above. For several reasons, the idea that the United States Antitrust laws are jurisdictionally exceptional can produce overreaching that is offensive to foreign prerogatives. First, the United States antitrust laws are extremely general and make no distinction between ordinary competitive firms and public utilities or common carriers; the same rules purport to apply to all business firms. Second, the jurisdictional language of the antitrust laws is both mandatory and general to the same extent-that is, the "affecting foreign commerce" language of the basic Sherman Act and the export commerce language of the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvement Act 6 do not distinguish between regulated and ordinary competitive firms. And third, the limiting doctrines of international law-namely Act of State, foreign sovereign compulsion, foreign sovereign immunity, and comity-do not distinguish among types of firms or types of antitrust complaints. They apply equally to both price fixing, which is at the core of antitrust concern, and to the essential facility doctrine, which lies at or outside its margin.

#### Ends the Japan economic alliance---they respond with diplomatic protest to new extraterritorial antitrust.

Takaaki Kojima 02. Fellow, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, 2001-2002. “International Conflicts over the Extraterritorial Application of Competition Law in a Borderless Economy”. https://datascience.iq.harvard.edu/files/fellows/files/kojima.pdf

We are witnessing increasingly widespread and penetrating economic globalization today. As a result of trade liberalization, import restrictions or regulations on trade and investment have decreased substantially, and trans-border business activities face less barrier. At the same time, the role of trans-border business activities, especially those by so-called multinational or global enterprises, have become increasingly important and even dominant in some sectors.

As far as the territorial scope of business activities are concerned, state borders are more or less diminishing to become almost borderless; as for legal regimes, however, sovereign states retain in principle exclusive jurisdiction over their territories and nationals under international law. Business activities are regulated by the domestic laws of sovereign states or by international agreements concluded among sovereign states. The pertinent question is how to coordinate “borderless” business activities within the existing legal regimes governed by sovereign states. In the field of trade law, the measures of each state are restricted by international agreements, in particular under the GATT/WTO regime. In the field of competition law, such an international regime is lacking and the domestic laws of each state regulate private restraints of trade in the relevant markets.

Serious jurisdictional conflicts have transpired in the last several decades between the United States and other states over the so-called extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws on anticompetitive conducts abroad. This problem has also caused diplomatic frictions between the United States and other states, as it concerns state sovereignty. In this essay, the author will review the historical development of international conflicts caused by the extraterritorial application of competition law and attempt to examine the options available to circumvent or solve these conflicts. The main focus will be U.S. antitrust law and its relation with other jurisdictions, mainly the European Union and Japan, considering the grave implications to competition law and policy as well as to the world economy. 2

II. Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Antitrust Laws

Problems concerning the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws have been discussed in many publications. Of the U.S. antitrust laws, the Sherman Act applies to “commerce … with foreign nations ” (Section 1) without qualifying provisions concerning its territorial scope as “within the United States” (Section 2) or “in any section of the country” (Section 3) as specified in the Clayton Act. In the past, U.S. courts interpreting the Sherman Act of 1890 and other antitrust laws commonly followed the traditional territorial principle with regard to its jurisdictional reach. In the American Banana case (213 U.S. 347 (1909)), where all the acts complained of were committed outside the territory of the United States, including the defendant’s alleged inducements of the Costa Rican government to monopolize the banana trade, the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed the complaint on the ground, inter alia, that acts committed outside of the United States are not governed by the Sherman Act. In this case, the territorial principle in the classic sense was applied.

In later decisions such as the American Tobacco case (221 U.S. 106 (1911)) and the Sisal case (274 U.S. 268 (1927)), jurisdiction was exercised over the defendants on the ground that although the agreements in question were concluded by foreigners outside the United States, jurisdiction was limited to what was performed and intended to be performed within the territory of the United States. In these cases, the territorial principle was applied more flexibly, but it has been observed that this application cannot be argued other than as a sensible and reasonable deployment of the objective territorial theory. 3

An entirely different approach was taken in the Alcoa case (148 F.2d. 416 (1944)), in which foreign companies outside the United States had concluded the agreements. The Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit held it settled law that any State may impose liabilities, even upon persons not within its allegiance, for conduct outside its borders that has consequences within its borders. It went on further to state that the agreements, although made abroad, were unlawful if they were intended to affect imports and did affect them.

This theory of the intended effect (the effects doctrine) elaborated in the Alcoa case was criticized by many as an excess of jurisdiction under public international law. For instance, R.Y. Jennings noted that “in this new guise it apparently comprehends the exercise of jurisdiction over agreements made abroad, by foreigners with foreigners provided only that the agreement was intended to have repercussions upon American imports or exports,” 4 while F.A. Mann argued that “the type of effect within the meaning of the Alcoa ruling has nothing in common with the effect which by virtue of established principles of international jurisdiction confers that right of regulation.” 5 Neverthele ss, since the Alcoa case, U.S. courts have continued to follow the new jurisdictional formula of the effects doctrine.

In response to excessive application of U.S. antitrust laws, especially with respect to courts’ orders to produce documents such as subpoena duces tecum located abroad, a considerable number of states have issued diplomatic protests. Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and New Zealand have even enacted blocking legislation. 6 The protesting states maintain that taking evidence abroad, including an order to produce documents, is an exercise of extraterritorial enforcement of jurisdiction that, under international law, requires the consent of the state where the evidence is located. The United Kingdom has been one of the strongest opponents to U.S. claims of extraterritorial jurisdiction. The U.K. government stated for instance that “HM Government considers that in the present state of international law there is no basis for the extension of one country’s antitrust jurisdiction to activities outside of that country of the foreign national.” 7 The Protection of Trading Interest law was enacted in 1980, which provides to extensively thwart the extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws. The U.K. government invoked the provisions in the Laker Airways case (1983 W.L.R. 413) in 1983.

Having faced the antagonistic reactions of other states, U.S. courts began to show some restraint in assuming extraterritorial jurisdiction. In the Timberlane case (549 F.2d. 9 th Cir. (1976)), the court concluded that it had jurisdiction over alleged anticompetitive conducts in Honduras but refrained from asserting extraterritorial jurisdiction after having applied three tests: first, whether the challenged conduct had had some effect on the commerce of the United States; second, whether the conduct in question imposed a burden on U.S. commerce; and third, whether the complaint’s interests of and links to the United States were sufficiently strong vis-à-vis those of other nations to justify an assertion of extraterritorial authority. The Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act enacted in 1976 applies to foreign conduct that has a direct, substantial and reasonably foreseeable effect on U.S. commerce, The U.S. enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), have adopted this jurisdictional rule of reason formula since the Enforcement Guidelines for International Operations of 1988. However, divergent views exist as to whether the third test of balancing the interests of other states is a rule of international law or just a comity. 8 Furthermore, not all U.S. courts have consistently applied the test of balancing interests. 9

In 1993, the Supreme Court decision in the Hartford Fire Insurance case (113 S. Ct. 2891 (1993)) reaffirmed the effects doctrine, stating that the Sherman Act applies to foreign conduct that was meant to produce and did in fact produce some substantial effect in the United States. The Court then took a restrictive view on the test of balancing interests, stating that the only substantial question is whether there is a true conflict between domestic and foreign law, and held that no such conflict seemed to exist because British law did not require defendants to act in a manner prohibited by U.S. law. 10

Japan maintains the territorial principle and rejects the effects doctrine, stating that the effects doctrine cannot be regarded as an established rule of international law. In the view of the Government of Japan, the extraterritorial application of U.S. domestic laws (including U.S. antitrust laws) based on the effects doctrine is not allowed under general international law. 11 In the Nippon Paper case, where a Japanese company was prosecuted under the Sherman Act, the Japanese government submitted a brief of amicus curiae where it stated, inter alia, that the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a conduct of a Japanese company engaged in business in Japan is unlawful under international law. 12 Nonetheless, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the Court of Appeal decision, which assumed the extraterritorial application of the Sherman Act to a criminal case for the first time (118 S. Ct. 685 (1998)).

#### Japan economic alliance is key to prevent Chinese challenges to the ILO---recovering now but smooth sailing is not guaranteed.

Shihoko Goto 21. deputy director for geoeconomics and senior associate for Northeast Asia at the Wilson Center. "When Trade No Longer Hampers U.S.-Japan Ties". 4-20-2021. https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/when-trade-no-longer-hampers-us-japan-ties

The April 16th meeting between President Joe Biden and Japanese Prime Minister Yoshihide Suga marked several milestones: not only was it the first foreign leader’s visit to the Biden White House, but it was also the first visit to the United States by Yoshihide Suga as the Japanese prime minister. It was also the first in-person summit meeting between the United States and Japan since the outbreak of a global pandemic. It marked a number of firsts in terms of content too, not least that it was the first time since the 1980s in which trade was not a sore point of contention between the two sides. Instead, trade relations projected as a way forward for further bilateral cooperation in confronting the China threat.

That isn’t to say trade relations between Japan and the United States are now smooth sailing. The U.S. trade deficit with the world’s third-largest economy runs to nearly $68 billion, and although the two sides signed a merchandise trade deal in 2019, the Japanese auto industry remains a point of contention for the United States. Indeed, Japan’s auto exports account for about $54 billion, or close to 80 percent, of the overall trade deficit. Meanwhile, the Biden administration is not expected to lift tariffs on steel and aluminum anytime soon, nor is it expected to make efforts to join the CPTPP in the near future, much to the frustration of Tokyo.

Yet instead of trying to negotiate a breakthrough on the trade front, the Biden-Suga meeting focused on bilateral economic relations based on their shared threat of dealing with China’s ambitions to challenge the regional status quo. Until recent months, Tokyo had aspired to maintain solid relations with China whilst furthering ties with the United States, most notably by endeavoring to decouple economic interests with Beijing from the security threat that China has increasingly been posing upon Tokyo. After the joint 2+2 joint security meeting in Tokyo in March, however, the two countries declared that China’s behavior is “inconsistent with the existing international order, presents political, economic, military, and technological challenges to the Alliance and to the international community.”

Since then, Tokyo has moved even closer to Washington publicly in pushing back against China, as the bilateral statement noted “the importance of peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait,” marking the first time since 1969 that Japan and the United States publicly referred to Taiwan which remains a core interest for China. In short, Japan’s hedging against the United States and maintaining a balancing act between China and the United States is now over. Not only is its security interests even more closely aligned with that of the United States, Japan’s economic interests are now more intertwined with that of the United States than ever.

Rather than focusing on the trade balance, Tokyo and Washington’s economic relations will concentrate more on economic resilience and maintaining free and fair economic rules of engagement in the Indo-Pacific. At the same time, the two countries are expected to work more closely together on competing against China in emerging technologies, from 5G to AI and information sciences.

For Japan, one of the biggest takeaways from the Biden-Suga meeting will be that the days of Japan posing an economic threat to the United States are now over. It will also be putting increasing pressure not only for Tokyo to be prepared to fight back against China on the economic as well as security fronts together with Washington, but it will also push Tokyo to step up its own efforts to compete in the innovation economy that goes beyond manufacturing.

#### ILO is sustainable and prevents great power war but can’t run on autopilot---preventing Chinese aggression is key.

Alan W. Dowd 21. Senior fellow with the Sagamore Institute, where he leads the Center for America’s Purpose. "Capstones: China’s Dream, the World’s Nightmare – Sagamore Institute". No Publication. 4-5-2021. https://sagamoreinstitute.org/capstones-chinas-dream-the-worlds-nightmare/

If China is indeed the future, if China is primed to “rule the world,” if China remakes the international order in its image, it won’t be pretty. A future dominated by the People’s Republic of China (PRC) will be demonstrably worse than the world we know. Just look at how Xi Jinping’s regime treats its own subjects—and plays its current role on the global stage.

NO RIGHTS

Those predictions aren’t outlandish. China already is the world’s top manufacturing nation, top exporting nation and second-largest economy. The PRC was the only major economy to emerge from 2020 claiming GDP growth (if we are to trust Beijing’s books). In the pandemic’s wake, China dislodged the U.S. as the world’s primary destination for foreign direct investment. PRC-backed firms are leaders in the global 5G and AI race. On the strength of a 517-percent binge in military spending since 2000, China bristles with anti-ship and anti-aircraft missiles, deploys a high-tech air force, has a growing and openly hostile presence in space, is doubling its nuclear arsenal, and boasts a 350-ship navy (now the world’s largest). Beijing’s growing cultural reach is evident in everything from its influence over Hollywood, to its puppet-master relationship with the NBA, to its 480 Confucius Institutes (designated by Washington as “part of the Chinese Communist Party’s global influence and propaganda apparatus”).

As President Joe Biden concludes, China is “the only competitor potentially capable of combining its economic, diplomatic, military, and technological power to mount a sustained challenge to a stable and open international system.”

Xi is doing exactly that. But the China challenge starts inside the PRC.

Xi is pursuing what he calls the “China Dream,” which enfolds goals such as sustained economic development, military power modeled after and matching that of the U.S., ideological conformity, “rejuvenation of the Chinese nation” and “complete unification of our country.” Making Xi’s “China Dream” come true is turning into a nightmare for his subjects.

Before leaving his State Department post, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo described what Xi is doing to Uighur Muslims as “genocide,” noting that Beijing has “forced more than a million people into internment camps in the Xinjiang region” and detailing “torture, sexual abuse…rape, forced labor…and unexplained deaths in custody.” As he took the baton from Pompeo, Secretary of State Antony Blinken agreed, affirming that “The forcing of men, women and children into concentration camps, trying to, in effect, re-educate them to be adherents to the ideology of the Chinese Communist Party—all of that speaks to an effort to commit genocide.”

The U.S. government isn’t alone. The Uighur Muslim region, according to a UN human-rights watchdog, “resembles a massive internment camp…a no-rights zone.” More accurately, all of China is a no-rights zone.

Xi’s China is a place where Christian churches are smashed and followers of Christ are sent to reeducation camps; Buddhist temples are bulldozed; Uighur men are packed into freight trains, Uighur women are forcibly sterilized and Uighur babies are forcibly aborted; and bishops and Nobel Peace Prize laureates die in prison. Under Xi, “Religious persecution has increased…with four communities in particular experiencing a downturn in conditions—Protestant Christians, Tibetan Buddhists, and both Hui and Uighur Muslims,” Freedom House reports. Amnesty International adds that “hundreds of thousands of people” are subjected to arbitrary arrest and detention in China, many of them for “peacefully exercising their rights to freedom of expression and freedom of belief.”

There’s a brutal logic to Xi’s brutal response to religious activity. The common denominator of most every religion is that there’s something above, something beyond, something bigger, more enduring and more important than the state. That notion represents a mortal threat to the legitimacy and durability of Xi’s regime, which is founded on the premise that people exist to serve the state—not to use their God-given gifts to serve others and God.

Xi’s capacity to control is growing ever more insidious. The PRC’s new “social credit system” is using mega-databases to monitor and catalogue every aspect of life of China’s 1.3 billion people—financial transactions, civil infractions, social-media postings, online activity—and then reward or sanction Xi’s subjects by feeding all that information to the National Development and Reform Commission, banking system and judicial system. PRC subjects with good social credit scores enjoy waived fees, lower utility bills, promotions and expedited overseas-travel approval, while those with poor social credit scores can be fired from their jobs, expelled from school, blocked from universities, or barred from accessing transportation.

An Orwellian surveillance state, more than a billion people denied religious freedom and other human rights, uncounted numbers tortured in reeducation camps, physicians jailed for following the Hippocratic Oath—that’s the kind of future and the kind of world Xi wants to build. As dissident leader Xu Zhangrun observed in the wake of Beijing’s criminal mishandling of COVID-19, “A polity that is blatantly incapable of treating its own people properly can hardly be expected to treat the rest of the world well.”

NO LIMITS

That idea—the notion that the PRC is incapable of treating the world any better than it treats its own—is not particularly profound. After all, this is a regime that over the decades has erased some 35 million of its subjects and tortured millions more. Regimes like this see no limits on their power. Since they believe nothing is above the state, they rationalize everything they do in the name of the state, the revolution, the Supreme Leader, the Dear Leader, the Core Leader (Xi’s new title). With no moral constraints on what they do, they believe their ends always justify their means.

That backwards worldview informs every aspect of decision-making in the PRC. This doesn’t mean Washington should refuse to talk with Beijing. But we must be ever vigilant when dealing with Xi. A regime that can justify imprisoning, torturing and killing its own people for peacefully practicing their faith can and will justify anything: seizing foreign lands, annexing international waterways, absorbing free peoples, stealing proprietary information, leveraging a pandemic to gain geopolitical advantage, breaking treaties. The godless USSR did those sorts of things, and so has the godless PRC.

“It is difficult to imagine that a government that continues to repress freedom in its own country,” President Ronald Reagan said of the USSR, “can be trusted to keep agreements with others.” And here we are yet again.

Experts in policy analysis, academia and military-security affairs conclude that Xi’s response to COVID-19 “was in breach of international law.” It pays to recall that COVID-19 was a local public-health problem that metastasized into a global pandemic due to Beijing’s incompetence or intention (either cause is reason not to entrust the future to Xi); that Xi’s regime lied about human-to-human transmission; that Xi’s regime willfully allowed millions to leave the epicenter in Wuhan for destinations around the world; that Xi’s regime carried out a premeditated plan to hoard 2.5 billion pieces of protective equipment as the virus swept the globe; that Xi’s regime blocked scientists from sharing findings about genome sequencing for weeks; that Xi’s regime continues to refuse to cooperate with international health agencies.

Xi’s intervention in Hong Kong and assertion of rule by remote-control is a brazen violation of an international treaty.

In and above the East China Sea, Beijing is constantly violating Japanese airspace and illegally loitering PRC coast guard vessels in Japanese waters. All the while, Beijing illegally claims some 90 percent of the South China Sea. Xi has backed up those claims by building 3,200 acres of illegal islands beyond PRC waters. These islands feature SAM batteries and warplanes. Xi promised the PRC wouldn’t militarize these islands. But as America and its allies learned at enormous cost last century, words don’t matter to men like Xi. Strength and the will to wield it are all that matters. Xi has both.

His goal is to control the resource-rich South and East China Seas, assert sovereignty claims in fait accompli fashion, and bring Chinese-speaking lands under his heel. Hong Kong—where only PRC-approved “patriots” are allowed to serve in government—was his first objective. Taiwan is next. Xi has made clear that democratic Taiwan “must and will be” absorbed by the communist Mainland. “We make no promise to abandon the use of force,” he warns. That explains Beijing’s ground-unit exercises, naval drills and bomber sorties around the island democracy.

Nor are Xi’s dreams and designs limited to his immediate neighborhood. Beijing is buying loyalty via development projects (see the Belt and Road Initiative), gaining a toehold in strategically located regions (see PRC control over ports in 18 countries), building an authoritarian bloc (see Russia, Serbia, North Korea, Iran, Venezuela), and fielding a power-projecting military capable of challenging the Free World across every region and every domain—land, sea, air, space and cyberspace. Xi’s relentless cybersiege of the Free World is siphoning away inventions, discoveries, technologies and wealth, penetrating defense firms, and interfering in elections.

For those with eyes to see—who know about the laogai camps and brutalization of Muslims and oppression of Tibet and assault on Christianity—none of this comes as a surprise. What’s surprising is that for 40 years, the trade über alles caucus convinced itself that such a regime could somehow be reformed by access to Buicks and Kentucky Fried Chicken.

TAKING AIM

Xi vows to build what he calls “a more just and reasonable new world order”—one that would supplant the liberal democratic order the United States and its allies began building after World War II. Importantly, the PRC not only has the intent to build a new world order; it has the resources and capabilities to do so—which helps explain why those who designed and uphold the existing world order are answering China’s challenge.

The PRC is a country of 1.3 billion people. Its GDP is already $14.1 trillion. Its economic tendrils—trade, banking, manufacturing, logistics, shipping, technology, super-computing, artificial intelligence—stretch into every part of the globe. All of this is fueling the PRC’s relentless military modernization and buildup. The PRC’s annual military expenditure is at least $261 billion. (Beijing recently announced an increase in military spending of 6.8 percent for 2021). The PRC has a 2-million-man military, the world’s largest navy and an intense focus on its neighborhood.

None of this would be a particularly worrisome if China embraced the values of liberal democracy—the rule of law, individual freedom, religious liberty, free enterprise and free trade, majority rule with minority rights. These are the foundation stones of what Churchill and FDR envisioned when they drafted the Atlantic Charter in 1941. Their vision led to what some call the “rules-based democratic order,” others the “liberal international order,” still others the “free world order.” These terms aim to describe how the peoples of the West have tried to make the world work and indeed manage the world: They embraced and encouraged democratic governance; developed rules and norms of behavior; promoted liberal (freedom-oriented) political and economic institutions; and called upon governments to live up to the responsibilities of nationhood by respecting international borders and promoting good order within those borders. The result has been an unparalleled spread of prosperity, an unprecedented expansion of free government and an unexpected remission of great-power war (which had become an increasingly-destructive feature of the centuries leading up to 1945).

To be sure, many regimes reject the values of liberal democracy. But the PRC, like the USSR before it, not only rejects those values; it possesses the military-technological-industrial-economic assets to challenge those values, erode the liberal international order built upon those values, and forge a new international order or at least bend the existing order toward its own goals. But don’t take my word for it.

“Some seek to challenge the international order—that is, the rules, values and institutions that reduce conflict and make cooperation possible among nations,” Blinken and Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin warn, pointedly adding that “China in particular is all too willing to use coercion to get its way.”

Former national security advisor Gen H.R. McMaster concludes that PRC “leaders believe they have a narrow window of strategic opportunity to…revise the international order in their favor.”

Before he retired as Indo-Pacific commander ,Adm. Phil Davidson told the Senate Armed Services Committee that Xi and his lieutenants are “accelerating their ambitions to supplant the United States and our leadership role in the rules-based international order.”

A NATO panel noted late last year that Beijing’s “approach to human rights and international law challenges the fundamental premise of a rules-based international order.”

These political, diplomatic and military leaders recognize that the liberal order has promoted the peace and prosperity of the Free World for nearly 75 years. But it doesn’t run on autopilot. If we want the benefits of a liberal order that sustains our way of life, we need to sustain the liberal order. As Robert Kagan of the Brookings Institution observes, “The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it.” He adds, “Every international order in history has reflected the beliefs and interests of its strongest powers, and every international order has changed when power shifted to others with different beliefs and interests.”

Indeed, the liberal order and its guarantors have arrived at a turning point or breaking point: Either they will marshal the means and will to update, strengthen and preserve the existing order, or Beijing will dramatically transform it. Xi’s callous treatment of his own subjects and contempt for international norms offer a glimpse of what his “more reasonable new world order” would look like.

## Unification Adv

### AT: Innovation

#### Innovation Fails

Bee 18 [Vanessa A. Bee. Senior Litigation Counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a JD from Harvard Law. Innovation Under Socialism. 10-24-2018. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2018/10/innovation-under-socialism> ]

The profit motive and exclusive proprietary rights are central to capitalist innovation. By law, private firms must prioritize the interest of their shareholders, which tends to be interchangeable with making as much money as possible. Accordingly, investments in any stage of the innovative process must eventually produce profits. To maximize profit, private firms jealously guard the value of their invention through regulations and restrictive contracts. Statutes and regulations help protect their trade secrets. The U.S. Patent and Trademarks Office routinely grants them utility and design patents that “exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling … or importing the invention” for 20 years after the patent is issued. They enforce licensing agreements that can limit the uses and dissemination of all or part of their inventions. To further frustrate efforts to innovate on the back of their inventions, private firms subject their former employees to non-compete agreements that can severely limit them from using their knowledge and skills on competing projects for a period following their departure. Breaches carry dire consequences like expensive lawsuits, big money judgments, and other enormous hassles.

### AT: Emerging Tech

#### It’s far off.

Lanoszka 19 – Alexander Lanoszka, Political Science Professor at the University of Waterloo. [How Emerging Technologies Might Affect Baltic Security, in *The Return of Deterrence: Credibility and Capabilities in a New Era*, eds. William G. Braun III, Stéfanie von Hlatky, and Kim Richard Nossal]

The Baltic Countries and Emerging Technologies

So where does this leave the Baltic countries? The discussion above suggests that in the foreseeable these emerging technologies will marginally enhance Russia’s military capabilities while the United States will gradually and cautiously adopt them. The local balance of power will remain largely static. For one, Russia already enjoys a massive military advantage over the Baltic countries, with or without autonomous weapons. For another, these emerging technologies do not alter how the Baltic countries receive an Article 5 commitment from their NATO partners. Any military activity that triggers this clause of the Washington Treaty could lead to escalatory dynamics that Russia would prefer to avoid. As for the Baltic countries, capabilities remain underdeveloped. Having already embraced digital technologies for its governance, Estonia has been the most advanced of the three Baltic countries in thinking about AI. In March 2018 the Estonian government announced the development of a national strategy towards AI.53 It will also contemplate how to address AI in its legal structures, with one subject being the provision of a special legal status conferred upon robots.

Military robotics and AI could be leveraged for various purposes in the Baltic context. In the long-term, military robots might compensate for the lack of available manpower that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania might face in the future due to high emigration, low birthrates, and low immigration. As Mick Ryan argues, “it is possible that a technologically advanced country with a smaller population could build a significant advantage using AI-based military systems and fielding large numbers of robotic warfighters.”54 Such systems — redolent of many Hollywood films — remain a distant possibility. In the medium term, military robotics and AI could serve logistical as well as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) purposes.

In the more immediate term, however, AI would be most useful for early warning, especially with respect to the monitoring of social media, energy flows, or even encrypted communications between Russia and sources inside the Baltic countries. Consider how AI could help bolster Baltic defences in such a way as to defeat, if not to prevent, some of the tactics that Russia used against Ukraine in its annexation of Crimea in early 2014. Recall that so-called “little green men” — military personnel bearing no insignia or other identifying marks — suddenly appeared in Crimea manning checkpoints, clearing areas, and intimidating members of the local population in the run-up to the independence referendum that Russia used to lend legitimacy to its effort. The Baltic countries fear that Russia might attempt something similar against them, not least because — especially in the case of Estonia and Latvia — their populations contain Russian-speakers who may sympathize with the Kremlin enough to do its bidding.55 One measure that they have taken is to practice retaking sites from paramilitary forces of unknown origin.56

AI is useful for such situations because the Baltic countries have home-field advantage. As such, they can amass data on certain environments and sites most at risk of being targeted by Russia. Such data could thus be used to understand regular patterns of behaviour of individual contained within those environments, thereby offering earlier detection and warning in the event that something untoward or irregular is happening. Of course, this technology is not impervious to countermeasures. Algorithms could be vulnerable to a battery of malicious queries by adversaries, leading those very algorithms to make faulty or bad predictions.57

As for 3D printing, the Baltic countries could benefit in at least two ways. To begin with, observers believe that because they face such a massive imbalance of power, the Baltic countries should not prepare their armed forces for fighting set-piece battles with the Russian military. Instead, they should prepare to wage an insurgency campaign designed to make themselves difficult to swallow and to occupy.58 Because 3D printing might reduce supply chains, violent organizations may be able to make their own weapons or weapons parts. 3D printed guns have so far proven to be unreliable, but as one Deloitte report warns, 3D printing “can help terrorist groups not only acquire new weapons or capabilities, but also allow them to do so more rapidly and stealthily than before, across a wider range of locations.”59 This can apply equally to insurgent groups, with such capabilities being homemade firearms and improvised explosive devices. 3D printers are not impervious to countermeasures, however. A RAND study cautions that 3D printers — if they are connected to the global internet — can be susceptible to sabotage if a malicious actor hacks into the system and encodes a flaw into the designs of a product that would be printed.60 Moreover, if Russia could mass firepower and saturate hostile environments by using killer robots, then the advantage gained from 3D printing weapons could be offset. Finally, 3D printing could allow forward deployed forces — like the NATO battlegroups stationed on Baltic territory as part of the alliance’s “Enhanced Forward Presence” — to buy more time before reinforcements arrive. They can replenish themselves “on the spot” without relying too much on supply chains and logistical tails. Such additional time could help if Russian aerial and naval assets located in Kaliningrad complicate NATO efforts to enter, and to move within, the theater of operations if war were to erupt.61

Conclusion  
Some security analysts argue that the introduction of emerging technologies on the battlefield will have a transformational impact on international security. Military robots, AI, and additive manufacturing (3Dprinting) could allow non-state or weak actors to level the playing field with more powerful countries. Yet the preceding discussion suggests that a more tentative attitude is appropriate. In the long-term, the impact of these technologies could be dramatic. However, in the foreseeable future at least, the changes generated by these technologies will be gradual, if not modest. Their significance for Baltic regional security will remain limited despite Russian investments in military robotics and AI. Nevertheless, AI holds some promise for the Baltic countries, especially if it enables them to improve their early warning capabilities so as to thwart “little green men” scenarios.

This essay offers some policy implications for NATO to consider. First, the United States, the Baltic countries, and their fellow allies should be mindful of how these emerging technologies might affect interoperability. If progress in robotics, AI, and 3D printing will be more evolutionary than revolutionary, then the development of these technologies could produce further capability gaps between the United States and its NATO allies. Buying American might help prevent a greater widening of those gaps, but European countries — especially those in the Baltic region — will need to invest in their own research and development (R&D) so that they can tailor these technologies to their own needs.62 Indeed, capability gaps could develop between the Baltic countries. Since Estonia may already be ahead of the curve, Latvia and Lithuania could find themselves lagging too far behind. Capability gaps could create gaps in coverage if AI has the potential for enhancing early warning.

Second, because AI draws on deep learning methods to improve prediction, more data would allow for a more robust understanding of trends and behaviour patterns. NATO’s new Baltic-focused regional command could provide a clearinghouse of the data drawn from individual allies. Of course, European allies have already agreed to a Declaration of Cooperation on AI in order to share information and to foster research and development links. Yet the regional command can focus on the peculiarities of the Baltic security economy and exploit economies of scale. This regional command can offset the risk of stove piping between the three NATO Centers of Excellence in the Baltic countries. The one in Riga focuses on strategic communications; the one in Tallinn addresses cyber security; and the one in Vilnius is dedicated to energy security. Although these centers of excellence should preserve their specialisations, they admittedly work on overlapping areas and AI is most effective when algorithms crunch the largest amount of relevant data possible. Indeed, another advantage of data sharing and aggregation is to reduce the possibility of bias and to improve the quality of algorithms.

Third, emerging technologies offer no “absolute weapon,” since countermeasures are possible. This could be both good news and bad news. For example, if Russia leans too heavily on military robotics, then it would face new problems that manned systems might not have to confront. Latvia has many forests, but it also has marshes and swamps like the Teiči State Reserve in its east. This terrain would already be difficult for military robots to overcome without further intervention. Russian RPAs might also be vulnerable to man-portable air-defence systems. If Russia comes to rely on AI for military purposes, then it might be susceptible to hacking and manipulation. NATO should also heed these issues. Hence the importance of regional cooperation: no one country should find itself a potential weak link that can be exploited.

### AT: FDI

#### Card is terrible---two lines wrong---FDI empirically fails---companies invest all around the world but it doesn’t top states from going to war

### AT: Admin State

#### No IL---even if FTC loses---they won’t be shut down, and it won’t effect other agencies

### AT: Inequality

#### Inequality claims are overstated---accounting for government transfers, benefits, and consumption tells a different story.

Elyse Dorsey et. al. 20. Adjunct Professor, Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University. Geoffrey A. Manne. President and founder of the International Center for Law and Economics (ICLE). Jan M. Rybnicek. Attorney at Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer in Washington, D.C. Kristian Stout. ICLE’s Director of Innovation Policy. Joshua Wright. Executive Director of the Global Antitrust Institute. CONSUMER WELFARE & THE RULE OF LAW: THE CASE AGAINST THE NEW POPULIST ANTITRUST MOVEMENT. Pepperdine Law Review. 05-01-2020. Pg. 902-905

Populist antitrust supporters further note that income inequality in the United States has increased dramatically in recent decades, and proffer that lax antitrust enforcement is (to varying degrees) to blame.246 The general intuition here is fairly easily stated: lenient antitrust enforcement allows firms to obtain market power, which allows them to reduce output, raise prices, and generate monopoly profits—all of which enriches shareholders.247 Shareholders are, by and large, in the top percentage of wealth and income distribution, so these increasing returns increase the wealth of the wealthiest and, thus, inequality.248

Imbedded in this theory are a couple of key assumptions, both of which can be empirically tested. First, that inequality is increasing.249 The evidence here suggests inequality is likely increasing, though the magnitude of this increase is probably overstated. Second, that increasing antitrust enforcement would reverse this trend.250 On the proffered causal link between antitrust enforcement and inequality, there is, so far, a notable dearth of empirical support or development.

First, consider the evidence on inequality trends.251 Populist claims regarding increasing inequality largely rely upon analysis of the Gini coefficient for United States incomes over the last 50 years, which appears to show a steep increase in inequality.252 Examining the ratio of the share of United States income among the 5th quintile of income-earning households to the share among the 1st quintile of households likewise seems to show increasing inequality.253

While these data points offer interesting insights, it is again important to understand their limitations. As Robert Kaestner and Darren Lubotsky emphasize, for example, failing to account for government transfers and employee benefits—that presumably substitute, in part, for cash income—can meaningfully affect these kinds of inequality measures.254 One important example they explore is that of healthcare benefits. As healthcare costs have rapidly increased in recent years, omitting a measure of health insurance benefits (provided by employers or by the government) could significantly affect ultimate inequality findings. Kaestner and Lubotsky, in fact, analyze inequality measures accounting for this omission, and find that including health insurance benefits substantially lessens the difference between high-end and low-end incomes

.255 They find the ratio of income between households at the 90th percentile and the 10th percentile to be approximately 5.0 in 1995, 5.2 in 2004, and 5.6 in 2012.256 So while their findings support the notion that inequality is increasing, they also suggest that the trend is significantly smaller than reported.

Examining household consumption trends tells a similar story. Scholars have argued that consumption might be a superior measure of welfare, given a “closer link between consumption and well-being.”257 Consumption trends would also seem to be relevant when considering antitrust enforcement efforts, as they offer more information regarding economic effects than isolated income or wealth measurements. Examining household consumption over the last couple decades indicates that inequality is increasing but at a muted rate.

Accordingly, the evidence does seem to indicate inequality is increasing by some amount. Potentially more-accurate measures of income and welfare, however, suggest this trend is not as significant as populists claim.258 So, the first assumption in this particular populist theory appears to be valid, if often overstated.259 That leads us to the second—and for this discussion, the critical—assumption that antitrust enforcement is driving the apparent inequality trend.

## Turf Wars Adv

### AT: Tech Leadership

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Chart omitted]

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

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

2A large inflow of experienced talent from other countries

3 Unrivaled access to venture capital

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

5 An economy big enough to make achieving scale relatively easy

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

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

Given these factors, US tech leadership should continue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### AT: Cyber

#### 5G race’ is bullshit

Nilay Patel 19, J.D. from the University of Wisconsin Law School, Editor-in-Chief of The Verge, Former Acting Managing Editor for Vox, AB in Political Science from the University of Chicago, “Wait, Why The Hell Is The ‘Race To 5G’ Even A Race?”, The Verge, 5/23/2019, https://www.theverge.com/2019/5/23/18637213/5g-race-us-leadership-china-fcc-lte

I have a dumb question that no one seems capable of answering directly: *Why is 5G a race?*

Everyone — the wireless industry, Democrats, Republicans, the major media, you name it — frames the building of next-generation 5G networks as a “race” in which the United States needs to demonstrate “leadership.”

Here is The Washington Post declaring America has the lead in the race to 5G. Here’s CNN asking “Who’s winning the race to 5G?” Here’s AT&T CEO Randall Stephenson declaring that China isn’t beating the US to 5G “yet,” as some sort of ominous warning. Here’s T-Mobile CEO John Legere telling the House Subcommittee on Communications and Technology that merging with Sprint will let his company “win the race to 5G.” Here is an entire microsite from industry lobbying group CTIA titled “The Race to 5G.”

Let us never forget AT&T being so desperate to lead this “race” that it rolled out fake 5Ge logos on its phones.

But the stakes of this supposed race are wholly unclear. What happens if we win, besides telecom execs getting slightly richer? More importantly, what are the drawbacks to coming in second, or even third? Where is the list of specific negative outcomes of China building a 5G network a month, a year, or even five years before the United States? I’ve never seen it, and I keep asking about it.

NO ONE CAN SAY WHAT BAD THINGS WILL HAPPEN IF WE DON’T WIN THE RACE TO 5G

For example, here’s FCC Commissioner Geoffrey Starks on The Vergecast this week, when I asked why 5G is a race.

“I think it is important for us to continue to lead the race ... we obviously led to 4G and I think we get to set some of the standards that are ultimately going to be implemented worldwide, which is why there is a little bit of a race.”

Starks went on to say that China wants to be a global leader in supplying 5G equipment and that’s why Huawei has been so aggressively building and pricing its gear. But Huawei depends on American chip technology to make its products, and the US government has just put Huawei on a blacklist anyway. So... the race is so we can set some wireless standards? I suspect Apple, Google, Qualcomm, Verizon, and AT&T can fend for themselves when it comes to that process.

The other main argument for winning the “race” to 5G is that having the world’s best and fastest networks will create new economic opportunities for businesses of all kinds — we’ll enable self-driving cars and telemedicine and all the other stuff you hear about during interminable 5G slideshows at trade conferences. At a hearing before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation earlier this year, Mississippi Sen. Roger Wicker confidently declared that “failing to win the race to 5G would not only materially delay the benefits of 5G for the American people, it would forever reduce the economic and societal gains that come from leading the world in technology.”

WE WON THE RACE TO LTE AND OUR LTE NETWORKS ARE AMONG THE SLOWEST AND MOST EXPENSIVE IN THE WORLD

Maybe. It is indeed true that better networks lead to better opportunities, and that widespread high-speed broadband is something everyone wants. But I sincerely doubt that all of these companies will pick up and move to China or Europe if the United States builds 5G networks slightly slower. After all, we already have some of the slowest and most expensive networks in the world, and Apple and Facebook have not yet relocated to South Korea.

The more I hear about the race, the more I don’t buy it. I think the “race” framing is there to make some big decisions seem urgent and important — to make it appear as though some serious trade-offs are worth it in order to “win.” And those trade-offs are indeed serious: 5G networks will require a serious rethinking of how we use wireless spectrum. There are incredible privacy implications around putting millions of IoT devices in a “smart city” on 5G. Investment dollars will naturally flow toward building 5G networks in cities instead of expanding our networks to rural areas, exacerbating the digital divide.

THE “RACE” IS TO THERE TO MAKE SERIOUS TRADE-OFFS SEEM WORTH IT SO WE CAN “WIN”

And once the “race” to build out 5G in big cities is “won,” the pressure to expand access to other places in the country will vanish, making that divide even worse. It is worth carefully considering all of these things before giving in to haste.

Oh, and it appears that some of the required 5G spectrum might interfere with important weather sensors, a concern raised by NASA, the Navy, and the NOAA in hearings before Congress last week. How did the wireless industry respond to these concerns? By writing a blog post accusing meteorologists from across three government agencies of “risking our 5G leadership.” The implication, of course, is that worrying about detecting major weather events could make us lose the race.

This race is imaginary bullshit. It’s being foisted on us by huge telecom companies that know internet access is fundamentally a commodity and want something new to sell at high prices instead of competing to improve service and lower prices on the networks they have. After all, the United States “won” the “race” for LTE, but it bears repeating: our LTE networks are among the slowest in the world, and our prices among the highest. What did winning that race accomplish for the millions of people across the country that still can’t get a reliable LTE signal?

### AT: Infrastructure

#### Grid’s resilient AND no cascades

Selena Larson 18, Cyber Threat Intelligence Analyst at Dragos, Inc., “Threats to Electric Grid are Real; Widespread Blackouts are Not”, 8/6/2018, https://dragos.com/blog/industry-news/threats-to-electric-grid-are-real-widespread-blackouts-are-not/

The US electric grid is not about to go down. Though it’s understandable if someone believed that. Over the last few weeks, numerous media reports suggest state-backed hackers have infiltrated the US electric grid and are capable of manipulating the flow of electricity on a grand scale and cause chaos. Threats against industrial sectors including electric utilities, oil and gas, and manufacturing are growing, and it’s reasonable for people to be concerned. But to say hackers have invaded the US electric grid and are prepared to cause blackouts is false. The initial reporting stemmed from a public Department of Homeland Security (DHS) presentation in July on Russian hacking activity targeting US electric utilities. This presentation contained previously-reported information on a group known as Dragonfly by Symantec and which Dragos associates to activity labeled DYMALLOY and ALLANITE. These groups focus on information gathering from industrial control system (ICS) networks and have not demonstrated disruptive or damaging capabilities. While some news reports cite 2015 and 2016 blackouts in Ukraine as evidence of hackers’ disruptive capabilities, DYMALLOY nor ALLANITE were involved in those incidents and it is inaccurate to suggest the DHS’s public presentation and those destructive behaviors are linked. Adversaries have not placed “cyber implants” into the electric grid to cause blackouts; but they are infiltrating business networks – and in some cases, ICS networks – in an effort to steal information and intelligence to potentially gain access to operational systems. Overall, the activity is concerning and represents the prerequisites towards a potential future disruptive event – but evidence to date does not support the claim that such an attack is imminent. The US electric grid is resilient and segmented, and although it makes an interesting plot to an action movie, one or two strains of malware targeting operational networks would not cause widespread blackouts. A destructive incident at one site would require highly-tailored tools and operations and would not effectively scale. Essentially, localized impacts are possible, and asset owners and operators should work to defend their networks from intrusions such as those described by DHS. But scaling up from isolated events to widespread impacts is highly unlikely.

### AT: Disease

#### Disease can’t cause extinction.

Dr. Toby Ord 20, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10

The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11

When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox.

During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13

Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined.

Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15

[FOONOTE]

In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biological observations and theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extreme rarity of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed tendency of pandemics to become less virulent as they progress and the theory of optimal virulence. However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts.

[END FOOTNOTE]

In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale.

The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16

It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk.

# 2NC

## 2NC---K

### 2NC---Link

#### Market competition inevitably creates economic busts and proves capitalism’s contradiction --- link turns the case.

Alan Maass 21. Communications staff for Rutgers AAUP-AFT. Marxism Shows Us How Our Problems Are Connected. Jacobin. 1-5-2021. https://jacobinmag.com/2021/01/marxism-capital-socialism-capitalism-book-review

When Things Fall Apart Marxist economics explains not only how capitalism works but why it regularly doesn’t — during the periodic economic busts that inevitably follow the booms. As Marx and Engels wrote: Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. Of course, in a world where billions go without enough food, there’s no such thing as “too much means of subsistence.” There’s only too much from the point of view of the capitalists — too much to sell their products at an acceptable profit. Thier introduces the chapters on capitalist crisis by unpacking a long quotation from Engels that ends: “The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation is reproduced as the antagonism between the organization of production in the single factory and the anarchy of production in society as a whole.” Under capitalism, production within workplaces is generally highly regimented, but the economy as a whole is a free-for-all. Businesses make their investment decisions behind closed doors, each hoping to get a leg up on the competition — by introducing the most popular model, the new product, the next trend. Success means a greater share of the market and therefore more profits. All the important questions for society as a whole — how much food should be produced, how many homes to build, what kind of drugs to research and manufacture, how to generate electricity — are decided by the free market. In economic good times, success seems contagious. Companies make ambitious investments, produce more and more, and watch the money roll in. But when enough companies jump in, the market gets saturated, sales slump, debts grow, and the record profits start to sink. The effects spread from part of the economy to the next, as Thier explains, using the example of oil: If refineries sit idle because there is an overproduction of oil, the workers are laid off, and the creditors, who financed the investment, are dragged down as well. But as future oil extraction and refining projects are pulled back, so too is demand for the raw materials (steel, concrete, plastics, electricity, etc.) and engineering necessary for the production of oil rigs, pipelines, and so on. The construction business and service and retail companies, which had benefited from the springing up of oil boomtowns, suffer as well. Because of the complexity of the international capitalist economy, the boom-slump roller-coaster ride can look and feel different each time around. Thier devotes a chapter to analyzing the crash last time: the Great Recession of 2008–9. She explains why and how the parasitical realm of banking and finance was the detonator of this slump but looks beyond popular left explanations about “financialization” to reveal the underlying crisis of global overproduction. Among Marxist economics writers, there are some disagreements about the details here, specifically about “which aspects of Marx’s writing — falling profitability, overproduction (or in some cases, underproduction), disproportionality among branches, the role of credit — are emphasized and how these pieces fit together,” Thier writes. In her account, Thier tends to stress overproduction, to the disappointment of those who emphasize falling profit rates. This focus on overproduction crucially emphasizes how an organic mechanism of capitalism — inevitable in a system driven by exchange, exploitation, and competition — repeatedly causes crisis. Regardless of their ideology or morality (or lack thereof), capitalists are inevitably driven to reduce costs, they inevitably see an advantage in producing more for less, and this inevitably leads to frantic overproduction that undermines profitability and ultimately slams the economy into reverse. In other words, capitalism stops working not because of a mistake or failed policy, but because it’s been working the way it’s supposed to. As Thier writes: Competition is the mainstay of capitalism. It can’t be made friendlier or softer because it requires an accumulation of capital at any cost, in order to get ahead or get left behind.… These same processes of accumulation necessarily lead to contradictions that threaten the very profits that capitalists seek. Every contradiction for capitalism is both a great hazard to our lives — since we are made to pay the price — and also an important crack in the system. Every periodic crisis is a potential point around which to organize.

### 2NC---AT: Cap Solves War

#### Now key – transition stops short term war

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]

Until recently, it has for most ‘been easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism.’89 The COVID-19 pandemic has been a disruptive event, for the food system, for the wider economy, for national and global political elites, and for populations everywhere. Glimpses of a different, quieter, more peaceful and less destructive world have emerged, albeit fleetingly and falteringly. At the same time, the suffering wrought by the pandemic, both directly in the form of disease and death, and indirectly via the cascading economic shocks brought about through societywide shutdowns, has fallen, and will continue to fall, on the most vulnerable and marginalised members of societies. In many ways it has accelerated and intensified a growing systemic crisis that has been building for decades, politically, economically, ecologically and culturally.

We have reached a fork in the road. The last time the global capitalist system confronted a systemic crisis was in the 1970s, and that crisis created the conditions for the emergence of neoliberalism, ushering us into the cancer stage of capitalism. The time before that, in the 1930s, the profound economic crisis heralded the rise of genocidal fascism and world war, with tens of millions dead in the worst slaughter humanity has ever unleashed. The embers and echoes of both these earlier decades of systemic crisis are with us now, at the beginning of the 2020s. Capitalism is once more in profound, systemic crisis. The political far right is, once more, in the ascendancy. The drums of war are being beaten, with China the clearly identified ‘enemy.’

At the same time, the yearning for profound change in the direction of greater equality and ecological integrity is both powerful and substantial, with major political protests in 2019 and 2020 in many parts of the world. Hence the significance, relevance and importance of proposals for transformative change in both food system governance and in the social relations that underpin the food system. Currently we have global and national food systems that are oligopolistic in nature, supported by political structures that resemble plutocracies and oligarchies more closely than they do democracies, insofar as that characterisation is based on their policy development and policy outcomes. Dardot and Laval’s theorisation of the political principle of the common, informed by Holt-Gimenez and van Lammeren’s historically and materially grounded modification of the food as commons proposal, with Federici’s insistence on an explicit anti-capitalist orientation, offers progressive scholars, activists and practitioners a principled and hopeful pathway beyond the contemporary crisis.

### 2NC---AT: Tech Solves Warming

#### Too small, failed tests, funneled money to petro capital

Black 21 [Emma, Educational Background in continental philosophy and is a member of Socialist Alternative. Capitalism’s fake solutions to the climate crisis. 5-23-2021. https://redflag.org.au/article/capitalisms-fake-solutions-climate-crisis]

While the disappearance of the outright climate denialism of the Trump era might seem cause for celebration, the new trend for spruiking the magical power of technology to solve the climate crisis is cause for serious concern. When you look beyond the headline-grabbing announcements of increased long-term ambition, the Earth Day summit amounted to little more than another case of government greenwashing of the business as usual of fossil-fuelled capitalism. Instead of detailing the changes to be made in the here and now to reduce emissions, Biden and other world leaders instead promoted faith in the capacity of science and technology to come to the rescue at an indeterminate point in the future. Australian Prime Minister Scott Morrison was among them. While the media highlighted the supposed gulf between a progressive, “green” Biden and the conservative, fossil-fuel-loving Morrison, they both promoted the same faith in the powers of technology. Like Biden, Morrison has vowed to invest tens of billions of dollars in developing carbon capture and storage technologies, “clean” hydrogen, “blue” carbon and “green” steel—among other colourful innovations. In May’s federal budget, the Coalition allocated more than half a billion dollars to developing the first two of these technologies—$263.7 million for carbon capture and storage (CCS) and $275.5 million for “clean” hydrogen. CCS mostly involves capturing C02 emissions at their source—in mines, power stations and so on—and pumping them deep underground (so the theory goes) to be permanently stored in appropriately porous and stable rock formations. But despite politicians and business leaders spruiking CCS as an easy fix for the climate crisis for decades, it has never been shown to work on anything near the scale required. Australia already boasts the world’s largest, supposedly functional, CCS facility at Chevron’s Gorgon gas project in Western Australia. However, according to the Climate Council, “the Gorgon CCS trial has been a big, expensive failure ... capturing less than half the emissions needed to make CCS viable”. In what is only the latest in a series of problems since it became operational in 2019, Michael Mazengarb reported in Renew Economy earlier this year that pumping equipment required to clear water from the undersea formation into which the C02 is to be injected had become clogged with sand. However, while CCS may be useless for addressing climate change, it remains an extremely useful political tool for the government—providing it with green cover while it continues to funnel money to Coalition supporters in the coal and gas industries. And of course, it’s also useful for those companies on the receiving end of the government’s “green” largesse. Bernard Keane was right in his assessment of it as a scam in Crikey. “Fossil fuel interests”, he wrote in 2019, “sense the opportunity to extract some taxpayer funding from a government worried it might have to pretend it believes in climate change”. With this year’s budget, they hit the jackpot. But if CCS is a scam, what about “clean” hydrogen? In his speech to the Earth Day summit, Morrison vowed to rival US innovation by investing billions in high-tech “hydrogen valleys”. “In the United States you have the Silicon Valley”, he said. “Here in Australia we are creating our own ‘Hydrogen Valleys’, where we will transform our transport industries, our mining and resource sectors, our manufacturing, our fuel and energy production.” Hydrogen is potentially a clean energy source, but only if it’s produced using renewable energy. And to be produced at the scale required to transform the economy in the way Morrison is implying would require a lot of electricity. In his recent contribution to the Quarterly Essay, Australia’s former chief scientist, Alan Finkel, calculates that to produce the equivalent volume of hydrogen to what Australia currently exports in liquefied natural gas would require “approximately 2,200 terawatt-hours” of electricity. This, Finkel notes, “is about eight times Australia’s total electricity generation in 2019”. If Morrison genuinely believes the “hydrogen boom” he envisages will be based on production of renewable energy on that kind of scale, the government would have provided increased funding for renewables in the budget. None was forthcoming. The reality is that Morrison sees the talk of “hydrogen valleys” as a way of greenwashing the same old “gas-fired recovery” he was promoting last year. The government doesn’t envisage producing hydrogen with electricity from renewables, but rather from gas. The focus on CCS gives the game away. The “hydrogen valleys” of the future will be criss-crossed with pipelines and peppered with gas-fired power stations with (we’re supposed to believe) the magic of CCS ensuring that the whole operation can nevertheless be run green and guilt-free. “Clean” hydrogen then, just like CCS, turns out to be just another technological chimera designed to greenwash capitalism’s continuing addiction to fossil fuels. What then of the other technological solutions being touted? Perhaps the most headline grabbing of them has been Biden’s proposed US$174 billion investment in the infrastructure for electric vehicles and their production. On the surface, again, this might sound like a good idea. Who wouldn’t want to live in a world in which we can all drive around in sleek, silent, powerful and “green” electric vehicles like Teslas? Again, however, this is just another fake technological “fix” to the climate crisis that will help perpetuate the environmentally destructive status quo. A genuinely sustainable society won’t be built around the kind of car culture that exists today. What’s needed, among other things, is a massive investment in public transport and the transformation of cities to reduce the need for long commutes. The promotion of electric vehicles as part of a technological “green” utopia is designed to forestall this kind of change, to protect as much as possible the car makers and other big business interests that profit from the status quo. Elon Musk personifies this. In his authorised biography, Elon Musk: Tesla, SpaceX, and the Quest for a Fantastic Future, Ashlee Vance revealed that Musk’s California “hyperloop” proposal was aimed at quashing plans for a high-speed rail link between Los Angeles and San Francisco. “Musk had dished out the Hyperloop proposal just to make the public and legislators rethink the high-speed train”, wrote Vance. “He didn’t intend to build the thing ... With any luck, the high-speed rail would be cancelled. Musk said as much to me during a series of emails and phone calls leading up to the announcement.” For those who can afford it (a base-level Tesla will set you back an eye-watering $73,900 in Australia today), driving an electric car might make you feel like you’re doing something to help save the planet. This is an illusion. Even if your car is charged from electricity produced by renewable energy, you also have to consider all the emissions produced in the construction and maintenance of the roads and freeways on which you drive. Then there’s the material of the car itself, and the lithium needed for the battery. Already, the skyrocketing demand is causing major environmental problems for major lithium producers like China, Chile and Bolivia. Tellingly, Musk has already devised the ultimate escape plan for himself—moving to Mars. This is not an option for most people. The long list of fake technological fixes to the climate crisis is nothing more than a delaying tactic, designed to create the impression of change to ensure the profits bonanza of the fossil fuel economy can continue for as long as possible. Only a total transformation of society, in which technological production is rationally designed and democratically organised and controlled, can ensure that we are able, in Marx’s words, “to bequeath the Earth in an improved state to succeeding generations”.

#### Material inputs undo enviro benefit

Mccollum 19 [John. Assistant professor of sociology at Minot State University. Limits of the Green New Deal. Section on Marxist Sociology. 12-11-2019. https://marxistsociology.org/2019/12/limits-of-the-green-new-deal/]

The treadmill of production idea becomes relevant in the context of the GND because of the gains in energy production efficiency, as well as the program’s proposed investments in the expansion of public transportation and “clean” manufacturing methods. The efficiency gains of a nation-wide energy efficiency program can be undone by a total increase in material inputs. Examining renewables in greater detail, wind turbines and solar panels produce a host of environmental externalities. Both technologies rely on the availability of rare earth metals. Their manufacturing and disposal generate other forms of toxic pollutants. Also, converting land from either “natural” usage to land for renewables will also have a variety of environmental externalities, exemplified by solar farms in California’s deserts, which have displaced native species like the desert tortoise. Another issue resulting from this practice will be a widening of the “metabolic rift” between global regions and between the natural metabolism of the earth and humanity’s production and consumption of natural resources. John Bellamy Foster’s work on the “metabolic rift” derives from Marx’s Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 and Marx’s attendant interest in the widening gap between “town and country.” Marx studied the developments in agricultural science and soil chemistry during his era and noted the tendency of capitalism’s material demands to outstrip nature’s restorative capacities. As the natural fertility of soil declined, agricultural producers came to rely on distant sources of nitrogen-based fertilizers. This shift led to a “metabolic rift” in the spatial distribution of soil nutrients and a temporal rupture in the earth’s natural cycles of soil fertility. The GND threatens to reproduce this gap. To use a single example, though the US has some deposits, the rare earth metals used in solar panels and wind turbines will come from Global South states where mining and processing these minerals poses great risks to human health and the environment. The benefits of using these materials in renewable technologies will not be seen by the citizens of those countries where extraction occurs. The GND’s agricultural methods hold some promise of making major gains in de-carbonizing the US’s agricultural system, but the movement of soil fertility around the US as agricultural goods made in one region move to another still would widen the spatial and temporal elements of the metabolic rift. At present, it does not appear that the GND is dealing with the contradictions of the treadmill of production and a widening metabolic rift. The “treadmill of production” poses yet another problem though: the contradiction of continually expanding production to meet the systemic demands of capital to accumulate and workers’ attendant dependence on this cycle for wages. Production of “green” things may need to expand continually to generate employment and welfare benefits for workers. Workers in a new state sector could find themselves dependent on this expansion, just as they would have under private capital. Although “green”, this expanded production will recreate the environmental problems the GND is meant to end. Getting off this treadmill is going to require more than just vigorous investment by the state in green infrastructure. Next, I turn to the GND’s potential to create a state-sponsored green capitalism. The creation of a green fraction of capital The GND is consciously modeled on the New Deal of the 1930s. The New Deal saw an expansion of social programs benefiting wide swathes of the working class. Social Security was lifted wholesale from socialist programs. Farm aid encouraged both recovery from environmental problems like the Dust Bowl and debt relief for poor farmers. Infrastructural development raised wages and boosted further growth. In terms of arts and culture, working people were mobilized into new forms of cultural production celebrating working-class identity. The general agitation during this period by the broad left pushed these programs forward despite the opposition of powerful factions of the capitalist class in the United States. Despite this legacy, the New Deal preserved capitalism during one of its most dire crises to date; the GND may perform a similar regulatory function. One of the boosts the GND is likely to give to capital is through state investment through private partnerships. The GND does not propose the creation of state ownership of utilities, much less agriculture, housing, or medical care. Similarly, the bill has provisions for energy upgrades through refurbishing existing buildings, environmental cleanup, and an unusual provision to “ensure businesspersons are free from unfair competition.” Without further establishing state ownership over these sectors, many of these provisions are going to add value to existing private property or rely on contractors to do the work, paid for by large sums of public money. Although the GND provides decent employment and these emission reduction programs are desperately needed, much of this activity will generate further wealth in private hands if not performed by the state. The present electoral left may not be capable of enacting or want to deliver on this revolutionary goal.

#### Profit incentive insufficient – bourgeois distancing, consumerism

Schutz 19 [Schultz, Professor of Economics, Rollins College of Arts and Sciences. “Planetary Eco-Collapse and Capitalism: A Contemporary Marxist Perspective.” *Forum for Social Economics* 49(3): 257-280. DOI: 10.1080/07360932.2018.1556177]

5. CAPITALIST CLASS AND PLANETARY ECO-COLLAPSE And of course it cannot co-opt any solutions to the enormous social problems described here, which must be addressed if humanity is to resolve the overwhelming coincident problem of its place in the ecosphere. How exactly are we to address these problems with this system in place? Marx reflected often on the equivocal or ambiguous social value of capitalism as an economic system: while at once it raised the exploitation and alienation of human beings to what he felt was their highest levels in history, he also praised what he perceived to be its indomitable power to organize and move production (Marx & Engels, 1848, pp. 475–476). In order for socialism—the next and alternative system he counter-posed to capitalism and hoped would follow it historically—to be progressive, it must transcend capitalism in the sense of carrying forward that very power. But capitalism is a class-based economic system, and socialism must get past that. Getting past capitalism thus surely must involve a true revolution. That it is a class-based system is apparent from the beginning in any direct confrontation with its reality, as Marx, and indeed all the classical economists from Adam Smith through David Ricardo, were all well aware, even if they seemed not as greatly concerned as Marx. Again, the central and every-where present institution of capitalism, the business firm, is a straightforward hierarchy constructed on the basic framework of the owner-employee relationship, enormously complex though it may appear in its corporate form today. The actual class structure of the system is highly complex, and other theorists, e.g., Max von Weber, elaborated at length on the many stratifications of class in earlier capitalism. Marx himself was, of course, quite aware of these complexities, but he found the simplification “boss vs. workers” or “bourgeoisie vs. proletariat” or in our own terms, “owners vs. employees,” to suffice his purposes well enough. That bifurcation captures indeed the most basic and perennial power relationship, everywhere extant in the vast complexity of whatever capitalist firm we may consider. For Marx, it was also the direction toward which things in his social situation seemed to be shaking down, for in his time the many classes seemed to be coalescing into those two great classes. It may not be too farfetched to observe that precisely such a coalescing may be occurring in our own time too, as “the 1%” moves away from “the rest” not only famously in the U.S. but also in many countries worldwide in what is now an increasingly dichotomous distribution globally of income and wealth (WIR, 2018). In either case, whether one refers to a dichotomous class system of bosses vs. workers or “the 1% vs. the rest,” or instead a much more complex, stratified hierarchy, we do behold a system of classes, that is, in which some people occupy higher level positions of domination over other people, and from which positions they both command or rule and exploit the latter in the sense of taking material benefit from them (Schutz, 2011). In the context we are considering here, the monumental implications of these realities are becoming increasingly clear with every passing year. For social scientists have verified empirically what most people know intuitively: a strong tendency for people higher up in the class and status hierarchy to be conservative on most political dimensions (McElwee, 2015). This conservatism derives partly from those who are more affluent or who have more status or power thereby having both more to lose from any change in the status quo and more resources to resist change by means of political or other action. Thus, the rich head corporations, run media firms, hire and fire people, pay lobbyists and contribute to political causes in disproportionate amounts, network and organize easily with each other, and so forth. Those in power in the capitalist system derive their power directly from that system as owners, financiers, investors, etc., and they are least likely to want major changes in that system, and most likely to be able to help sustain it. Marx not only noted but scathingly derided and satirized “the 1%” of his time, ridiculing their conservatism in their manners and their politics, as well as their childish self-indulgence in their over-paid, self-aggrandizing, narrow striving after what he saw as the often small-minded baubles of the silly rich. As he was pained to point out of his “Mr. Moneybags” of Capital, Vol. 1 (Marx, 1867, Chapter 6), their conservatism is devastating for the lives of ordinary people, who have to suffer through the indifference of those in command in their society. Marx was also aware of what the American commentator Thorstein Veblen would point out somewhat later about the conservatism of the rich (Veblen, 1899), that it derived also partly from their leading such sheltered and protected lives: behind the riches of their material wealth they tended simply to be much less aware of things affecting the lives of ordinary people, and thereby unwilling to react to things ordinary people felt more pressing. In Marx’s view, the rich simply were, in effect, uniquely stupid. Thorstein Veblen added in his account on the conservatism of the rich (Veblen, 1899) the observation that they are unfortunately emulated by the rest of the population, an insight that contemporary marxists have noted helps to explain the often confounding conservative politics of working class people that so frequently contradicts the latters’ own self interests. Nowhere is this clearer than in Veblen’s own America today, 120 years after he wrote: ours is another Gilded Age indeed, the rich oligarchs currently running our government are totally out of touch with the realities of environmental collapse, realities increasingly felt by the rest of the population, despite the many distractions of life in capitalism today—even though in the U.S. a major portion of that population still refuses to acknowledge the human sources of climate change (around half, according to the latest polls as of this writing), or even that climate change is occurring at all (about 30%), or that if it is, it constitutes a peril (Aton, 2017). Veblen added another pertinent and closely related insight acknowledged by contemporary marxists’ in the latters’ understanding of the roots of the current eco-crisis: the idea that people emulate not only the conservatism of the rich but also their conspicuous consumption.7 Today’s consumerism—again, the ultimate fuel of the engine of the capitalist earth-eating machine—thus derives not only from a deeply human need for fulfillment in an otherwise all too alienating life system; and not only from the capitalist sales-effort’s continual and ever-present, literally mind-boggling harangue; but also from a perfectly normal tendency of people to emulate that which is conspicuously comfortable, i.e., here the consumption of the rich, which is broadcast everywhere as exemplary in that sales-effort harangue and displayed continually also in every other possible medium and venue. 6. AVOIDING ECO-COLLAPSE, DEMOCRATIZING THE ECONOMY The U.S. has long been the world’s leading capitalist nation but its empire seems now nearing collapse. Governance is in such disarray in this country as of this writing as to seem completely hopeless of providing any direction to the world capitalist order whatsoever—our time recalls the times of Caligula and Nero during the fall of that earlier empire! It is a dangerous time we are entering, with a truly capricious incompetent in our Presidential office and a Congress divided as it has never been before between a thus-far subservient pro-Presidential wing, another bunch of total-wing-nuts, and several contending but confused traditionalist wings that together cannot decide which way is up. Still, at least many Americans may have finally had amply demonstrated, despite having been long convinced otherwise, that theirs too is truly a class system. The upshot, as Marx was so pained to show for his own time, is that in this system, like in all others to date, it is elites who actually run the important things, democracy notwithstanding. That is most unfortunate for the concerns at hand in this essay. For what will be required to mitigate the planetary catastrophe of eco-collapse, with all that it entails for human life and indeed all of life, is staggering both in breadth and complexity and in its urgency, and clearly capitalists and their system are not going to provide it. A de-automobilized, de-sprawled-out, de-globalized, de-consumption-addicted life-world is not the kind that capitalist elites in charge of things will provide for themselves and their own nations, nor for the impoverished rest of their world to ever hope to achieve. The global economy must be fairly quickly and relatively painlessly transitioned (1) away from fossil fuels and toward alternative renewable energy sources; (2) out of the private automobile and into massand pedestrian-based transit; (3) out of the suburbs and exurbs and into more humane urban neighborhoodand village-based residential life; (4) out of the agricultural, resource and manufacturing export-based global economy and into a more locally based one; and (5) into expanding environmental repair and resource recycling far beyond what has yet been attempted. Social control over critical economic investments will clearly be necessary, and while Marx and marxists have highlighted and often extolled in capitalism its socialization of production and investment processes (e.g., Engels, 1880, p. 702), they decry that it is not a democratic socialization but one transfixed by the capitalist quest for profit. In terms of population and consumption, humanity’s ecological footprint must be brought back into accord with the earth’s biocapacity,8 and as hastily and with as little suffering as possible. Doing that democratically will be critical to minimizing the pain. Thus, developing the institutional requisites of real democratic politics is a key part of addressing the plight of the planet. Partly because of the Cold War between the U.S. and U.S.S.R., and partly because of the latter’s own particular brand of marxism, the profound commitment of Marx and of most other marxists to democracy—for example, in Marx’s The Civil War in France (Marx, 1871) —was in the past not much acknowledged by others. But most marxists are in agreement with other environmentalists on the necessity of democratic decision-making in the face of environmental crisis. While in every nation, it is powerful capitalist obstructionism that thwarts intelligent responses to climate change and eco-collapse, the institutional requisites of real popular democracy are well-understood. Here in the U.S. as of this writing the biggest immediate hurdles include such things as partisan gerrymandering, corporate person-hood, and political contributions, but of course those are just the beginning. Concentrated private mass and social media also stand in the way of developing democracy, and indeed of any intelligent discussion of the rising ecological storm. And certainly in the U.S. and elsewhere, obscenely excessive wealth and income inequality, and social, cultural, political and institutional patriarchy and racism are major barriers to real democracy as well.

1. No decoupling---Peer review consensus of 835 studies say success cherrypicks data – no political will for innovation

Ehrenreich ‘21 [Ben Ehrenreich. Journalist, author of Desert Notebooks: A Roadmap for the End of Time. “We’re Hurtling Toward Global Suicide.” The New Republic. 3-18-21. <https://newrepublic.com/article/161575/climate-change-effects-hurtling-toward-global-suicide> //shree]

A strange sort of faith lies at the core of mainstream climate advocacy—a largely unexamined belief that the very system that got us into this mess is the one that will get us out of it. For a community putatively committed to scientific empiricism, this is an extraordinary conviction. Despite reams of increasingly apocalyptic research, and despite 25 years of largely fruitless international climate negotiations, carbon emissions have continued to rise, and temperatures along with them. We are at nearly 1.2 degrees Celsius of warming already—more than 2 degrees Fahrenheit over preindustrial averages—and three-tenths of a degree away from blowing the Paris accord’s aspiration to limit warming to a still-calamitous 1.5 degrees Celsius. Scientists now expect us to hit that threshold in about 10 years, and large swaths of the Arctic have been in actual flames for two summers running, but most governments with the option to do so are still feeding the beast that got us here. Even with the grim opportunity presented by the Covid-19 pandemic, which slowed the economy so much that growth in fossil fuel production dropped an almost unprecedented 7 percent last year, governments—ours very much included—have so far dumped much more stimulus spending into high-carbon industries than into renewable energy. It’s as if our economic system, and the politics it breeds, will not allow us to diverge from the straight path to self-obliteration. The faith nonetheless persists: The market will provide. It has not done so yet, but renewables are perhaps finally cheap enough—cheaper at last than conventional energy sources—that the transition is now inevitable. So the credo goes. The change that is coming will be largely technological: a bold new era of “green growth.” Modern societies erected on dirty coal and oil can be jacked up and shifted to cleaner forms of energy like an old house in need of a new foundation. Government may have a larger role in this transition than neoliberal dogma has recently allowed, but its primary task will still be to encourage innovation and feed the markets by shepherding the resulting growth. It is no coincidence that some version of this faith, so all-pervasive now that it does not register as a piety, has been reshaping the planet for almost precisely as long as fossil energy—first coal, then oil—has been altering the atmosphere. Capitalism is guided by a carbon creed, an ecstatic vision of a market that chugs along eternally, needing only new inputs—the earth itself, commodified as minerals, or water, housing, health care, or almost any living thing—to spew out wealth that can be shoveled back into the machine, converting more and more of the biosphere into zeros in a digital account: more fleshless, magical money that can be invested once again. If appetites are bottomless, and apparently they are, shouldn’t growth be endless too? The market’s grip on the political imagination so effectively blinds us to alternatives that we are unable fully to grasp that this is the basic script that the new administration is following. Even the Green New Deal does not substantively diverge from it. The climate crisis, an existential threat to planetary life, must be sold to Wall Street and the public at large as a growth opportunity. On January 31, John Kerry, acting as Biden’s new climate envoy, enthused to CNN’s Fareed Zakaria about “literally millions of jobs” that would soon be created, about all the “new products coming online,” and about oil companies’ newfound passion for “carbon capture and storage and so forth.” The private sector, he said, “has already made the decision that there is money to be made here, that’s capitalism, and they are investing in that future.” If that makes you nervous, it shouldn’t, Kerry insisted. The changes ahead would be like the analog-to-digital shift of the 1990s, only better: “the important point, Fareed, for people to really focus on is it’s a very exciting economic transition.” If Kerry struck a cheerier tone than that of the doomsaying consensus in the scientific community, it wasn’t just a question of polishing a turd. “Green growth” is mainstream climate discourse. A “green transition” that does not significantly alter existing economic structures—or their vast inequities—is still, for most climate advocates, the only imaginable way forward. Kerry was speaking a made-for-TV version of the sole language available to him—one that in its most basic assumptions excludes the possibility of fundamental social transformation, and of any heresy that casts doubt on the Great God Growth. The one thing all those thousands of scientists agree on is our only hope—that the economic structures that mediate our relation to the planet must be profoundly altered—is the one thing that Kerry and Biden are quite careful not to consider at all. In climate policy jargon, the crucial concept is “decoupling.” The notion lies deep in the hidden heart of the “sustainable development goals” held dear by international bodies such as the United Nations and the World Bank: Economic growth can be safely divorced from the ecological damage that it has heretofore almost universally wreaked. If the train of capital appears to be hurtling us toward the abyss, we can cut the engine loose and cruise someplace more comfortable: same train, same speed, different destination. Like millions of clean-tech jobs and a crisis-induced transition magically unlocking unimaginable wealth, it is an attractive and reassuring idea. The only problem is that there is next to no evidence that anything analogous has ever occurred, or that it is likely to occur in the future. Examples of successful decoupling tend to involve shifts in the location rather than the nature of industrial production: Rich countries green their economies by offshoring the manufacture of the goods they consume to China and countries in the global south, which they can then chastise for their lax emissions standards. But Earth’s atmosphere is not divided by national boundaries. Greenhouse gases cause the same degree of global warming no matter where they are produced, and to the extent that this kind of decoupling is a meaningful measure of anything, it is only of the colonial relations that still set the terms for the shell game of global capital. What policy wonks call “absolute decoupling”—the only kind that would do the climate any good—turns out to be a fantasy akin to a perpetual motion machine, a chimera of growth unhindered by material constraints. One recent analysis of 835 peer-reviewed articles on the subject found that the kind of massive and speedy reductions in emissions that would be necessary to halt global warming “cannot be achieved through observed decoupling rates.” The mechanism on which mainstream climate policy is betting the future of the species, and on which the possibility of green growth rests, appears to be a fiction. This fiction is nonetheless fundamental to the very math used by international climate institutions. In 2018, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s benchmark Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5oC—which announced in no uncertain terms that global emissions must be decreased by nearly half by 2030 and reach net zero by 2050 to avoid cataclysm at an almost unthinkable scale—set out a number of possible scenarios for policymakers to consider. It relied on algorithmic models linking greenhouse gas emissions and their climate impacts to various socioeconomic “pathways.” Whatever other variables they accounted for, though, all of the scenarios envisioned by the IPCC assumed the continuation of economic growth comparable to the past half-century’s. Even as they acknowledged levels of atmospheric carbon unseen in the last three million years, they were unable to conceive of an economy that does not perpetually expand. Fredric Jameson’s oft-cited dictum that it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism was baked into the actual modeling. At the same time, all but one of the ­IPCC’s scenarios that envision us successfully limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius rely on the use of technology to remove carbon from the atmosphere after the fact. (The one exception involves converting an area more than half the size of the United States to forest. None of the scenarios imagines that we can reach the 1.5 degrees Celsius target by cutting emissions alone.) But the technology in question is at this point largely speculative. “No proposed technology is close to deployment at scale,” the report’s authors concede, and “there is substantial uncertainty” about possible “adverse effects” on the environment. The international body, in other words, is more willing to gamble on potentially destructive technologies that do not currently exist than to even run the math on a more substantive economic transformation. A version of this same wager animates the Biden climate plan, which, as Canada, the European Union, the U.K., and South Korea all have, commits to “net-zero emissions no later than 2050.” (China plans to reach the same goal by 2060.) This sounds like great news, and is without doubt worlds better than the status quo ante of no ambitions at all. But “net zero” is a slippery notion. It does not mean zero at all. To avoid exceeding 1.5 degrees Celsius of warming, emissions need to fall 7.6 percent every year for the next 10 years. Even with the pandemic-induced slowdown, global emissions shrank only 6.4 percent in 2020. Since, as Biden reassured a nervous oil industry during the campaign, “We’re not getting rid of fossil fuels for a long time,” net-zero calculations assume some degree of “overshoot”—i.e., they stipulate that we’re not going to be able to cut emissions fast enough, and that we’ll therefore have to rely on those same untested carbon removal technologies to eventually bring us to zero. But a planet is not a balance sheet. The climate has tipping points—the collapse of the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets and the Himalayan glaciers, the deterioration of Atlantic Ocean currents, the melting of the permafrost, the transition of the Amazon from rain forest to savannah. We are perilously close to hitting some of them already: In February, 31 people were killed and 165 went missing when a chunk of a Himalayan glacier broke off, releasing an explosive burst of meltwater and debris. In the most nightmarish scenario, which could be tripped with less than 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) of warming, those tipping points could begin to trigger one another and cascade, locking us in, as one widely cited study put it, to “conditions that would be inhospitable to current human societies and to many other contemporary species.” Without major emissions cuts, we may reach 2 degrees Celsius of warming before 2050. That’s a heavy risk to bet against, but there it is, pulsing away inside the net-zero promises that not only politicians but corporate boards have been proudly rolling out. Over the last two years, more and more corporations in fossil fuel–intensive industries—BP, Shell, Maersk, GM, Ford, Volkswagen, at least a dozen major airlines—have made similar pledges. Shell’s plan alone would require tree planting over an area nearly the size of Brazil. By the estimate of the NGO ActionAid, “there is simply not enough available land on the planet to accommodate all of the combined corporate and government ‘net zero’ plans” for offsets and carbon-sinking tree plantations. To save this planet, it appears we’ll need another one. This is what currently counts as pragmatism.

1. CCS fails---

#### Leaks cause extinction

Ash 15 [Kyle Ash, Greenpeace’s Senior Legislative Representative. One of the most quoted sources during the Copenhagen Climate Conference] “Carbon Capture SCAM” July 23, 2015 (http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/research/carbon-capture-scam/)

In order for CCS to deliver a lasting benefit to the climate, the vast majority of sequestered CO2 must remain underground permanently. Geological formations proposed are sub-seabed and saline aquifers. The IEA says that depleted oil and gas reservoirs would be the most likely candidates for initial storage operations because of both their geology and proximity to industrial development. The problem with IEA’s assertion is it is too convenient for expanding CO2-EOR operations. In addition, the multiple bore holes and wells drilled in them to find and extract oil and gas further increase the risk of leakage. The IEA also admits that, “[t] he long-term storage integrity of oil fields that have been exploited with multiple wells has yet to receive serious scientific investigation.”108 The prominent Sleipner project, a CCS storage testing site off the coast of Norway injecting CO2 scrubbed from raw gas after extraction, was found in 2012 to have many nearby fractures, warranting increased expense toward surveying the geology of such sites.109 Some scientists say it’s not a matter of if the site will leak, it’s just a question of when.110 Researchers devoted to the promise of CCS remain unconcerned.111 However, undue confidence in understanding of the geology at Sleipner is not new.112 While offshore injection may be easier for the public to accept, deepsea sites will be more difficult to monitor. There are few studies to ascertain potential effects of undersea CO2 leakage, but scientists have concluded that it may be detrimental across the ocean food web.113 CO2 leakage from sequestration could exacerbate already rising ocean acidification, since the ocean absorbs about 25% of anthropogenic CO2 pollution. This is threatening a different type of planetary disaster altogether.114

#### Profit motive means it won’t be adopted – and drives coal use

McDonnell 20 [Tim, reporter covering global climate change and energy issues, 8-13-2020, “The business model for carbon capture is broken,” <https://qz.com/1891765/the-uss-only-clean-coal-system-got-shuttered-by-covid-19/>]

In the months since the pandemic cratered the price of oil, the financial fallout has spread from drilling companies to refineries and oilfield maintenance companies. Now the crash has claimed another, more unlikely victim: The only system built to capture carbon emissions from a coal plant in the US, one of only two worldwide. The $1 billion system, known as Petra Nova, was built in 2017 to catch CO2 from one unit of a coal plant near Houston. That plant is one of the dirtiest in Texas, both in terms of climate and air quality impacts, according to a Rice University study. Petra Nova was meant to cut the unit’s carbon footprint by about a third—roughly the equivalent of taking 300,000 cars off the road each year. But on July 28, E&E News broke the story that the facility has been shuttered since May. And while the plant’s owners have said they plan to get it running again once the economy improves, Petra Nova’s shutdown exposes the weird market dynamics that could threaten the sustainability of carbon capture facilities in progress around the world. The case for carbon capture Capturing the carbon emissions from power plants and other industrial facilities is widely considered a key part of any successful climate strategy. The trouble is, there’s not a whole lot you can do with the CO2 after you capture it. That makes the economic case for installing a big, expensive piece of equipment a bit shaky. Some companies are helping create a market for CO2 by using it to make mattresses, cement, and other manufactured products. But the use with the greatest market potential today is, ironically for a climate project, oil drilling. That’s what Petra Nova went after. So-called “enhanced oil recovery” (EOR) projects inject CO2 into oil wells to shake loose the dregs stuck in subterranean rocky pores. The technology is decades old, but has traditionally relied on CO2 pulled from natural sources underground. If the CO2 comes from a power plant’s emissions, though, it can reduce the climate impact of drilling. A barrel of oil produced with EOR using captured CO2 is, on net, about 37% less carbon-intensive than a normal barrel, according to the International Energy Agency. “EOR is a stepping stone,” said John Thompson, technology and markets director at the Clean Air Task Force, a research group. “If you have to choose between oil produced the conventional way or one that’s reduced, you’d like all your oil to come from that.” The coal plant conundrum Large-scale carbon capture and storage (CCS) systems, many of which rely on EOR, have been rolled out at nearly two dozen facilities worldwide, from chemical and fertilizer factories to natural gas processing plants. But they’ve remained elusive for power plants. In large part, that’s because the CO2 in power plant emissions is relatively diffuse. And that means it’s more expensive to capture. One groundbreaking coal plant CCS project in Mississippi turned into an infamous $8 billion boondoggle before it was scrapped in 2018. The world’s only other power plant CCS project, in Canada, has fared better: It claims to have captured 3 million tons of CO2 since 2014, and has managed to stay open despite the low oil price because the country’s strict limits on coal pollution make the economics more favorable. The $1 billion Petra Nova project was supposed to top them all. But according to a report the plant’s owners filed to the Department of Energy in March, the results have been mixed. The technology itself appears to be working: It managed to capture 92.4% of the CO2 that passed through it since 2017. It experienced outages on 367 days, but a majority were either planned for routine maintenance or the result of something outside the system—for example, the entire coal plant being switched off for weeks following Hurricane Harvey. But in part because of those outages, the system fell 17% short of its capture goal. Ultimately, it only captured about 7% of the plant’s total carbon emissions, according to the Energy and Policy Institute. Then the pandemic tossed the project’s whole business model on its head. In order to operate, the system requires oil prices of at least $75 per barrel. Otherwise, it’s not worth the oil company’s money to bother purchasing CO2 for EOR. Even before the pandemic, the oil price was around $60; after briefly dipping below zero in April, it’s now around $40. Few experts expect the price to return to pre-pandemic levels anytime soon, if ever. “Petra Nova was a success in terms of technology,” said Daniel Cohan, a civil engineering professor at Rice who co-authored the power plant study. “But the premise behind it no longer makes sense environmentally or financially.” Petra Nova’s portent Arij van Berkel, director of research for the consulting firm Lux Research, agrees: The chances of an economical EOR model of carbon capture get smaller every year, he said. It’s not just coal plants feeling the pinch: A solar power farm in Oman that produced concentrated steam for oil drilling was liquidated in May because of the low oil price. Some of the oil price issues could be smoothed out with a new carbon capture tax credit, known as 45Q, that Petra Nova was just filing paperwork to tap before the pandemic struck. That credit is even higher if a company chooses to inject the CO2 directly into underground reservoirs, rather than sell it for EOR. But oil prices aren’t the only vulnerability for other coal CCS projects coming down the pike, including one in New Mexico and another in North Dakota. The pandemic also crushed demand for electricity—and coal plants, which are expensive to run, are often the first to get switched off. Decreased demand means fewer emissions, and therefore fewer tax credits to keep an operation afloat. It’s a Catch-22: A promising technology for reducing emissions from coal requires both high oil prices (aka, more oil being produced) and a lot of coal consumption. “Proponents of these projects are selling an unproven dream that in all likelihood will become a nightmare for unsuspecting investors,” Dennis Wamsted, an analyst at the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis, said in a recent report on Petra Nova. “Investors would do well to conduct their due diligence before investing in any coal-fired carbon capture project anywhere.”

### 2NC---AT: Cap Unsustainable

#### Ag collapse---short term.

Allinson et al ’21. [Jamie Allinson is Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Edinburgh University and author of The Age of Counter-revolution. China Miéville is the author of a number of highly acclaimed and prize-winning novels including October: The History of the Russian Revolution. Richard Seymour is the author of numerous works of non-fiction, His writing appears in the New York Times, London Review of Books, Guardian, Prospect, Jacobin. Rosie Warren is an Editor at Verso and the Editor-in-Chief of Salvage. All are writing for the Salvage Collective. “The Tragedy of the Worker: Toward the Proletarocene.” Chapter 1: M-C-M’ and the Death Cult. July 2021. Verso EBook. ISBN: 9781839762963 //shree]

The Triassic-Permian ‘great dying’ was a megaphase change taking place through pulses lasting for tens of thousands of years, separated by interludes of hundreds of thousands of years, if not millions. The current mass extinction event is a megaphase change taking place in microphase time. Mass extinction is punctuated by the production of what the environmentalist Jonathan Lymbery calls ‘dead zones’: the conversion of wild ecosystems into dead monocultures. In Sumatra, these dead zones are made by burning rainforest and, amid the stench of death, planting palm crop. The palm oil is used in foods and household items, while the nut is used in animal feed. It is secured with barbed wire, and treated with poison, to prevent the crop from being eaten. Surviving animal life, and surrounding human communities, are pushed to the edges, to the brink of extinction. Agricultural workers are abused, underpaid, even enslaved. This is an example of what Moore would call ‘cheap food’, where the ‘value composition’ of the goods, the amount of waged labour necessary to produce each item is ‘below the systemwide average for all commodities’. In this case, a ‘cheap nature’ is produced by a distinctly capitalist form of territorialisation, wherein forestry is converted through deforestation into palm monoculture, while ‘cheap labour’ is secured partly through the dispossession of neighbouring human communities. More calories with less socially-necessary labour-time is cheap food. Cheap is not, of course, the same thing as efficient. Food production is, alongside fuel, a fulcrum of the capitalist organisation of work-energetics. It is one that, as with fossil fuels, wastes an incredible amount of the energy it extracts. According to the FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 30 per cent of cereals grown for human and animal consumption are wasted, along with almost half of all root crops, fruits and vegetables. To conclude from this grotesque squander that a ‘more efficient’ capitalism would ‘solve the problem’ of ‘the environment’ would be to fail to understand waste, capitalism and ecology: that the first is intrinsic to the second; that the second, whatever the degree to which it is inflected by the first, is inimical to the third. Capitalism also directly undermines its own productivity, precisely through its industrially-produced biospheric destruction. According to the UN, for example, there are at most sixty harvests remaining before the world’s soils are too exhausted to feed the planet. This edaphic impoverishment is a product, not a byproduct. It is the predictable, and long-predicted, consequence of intensive agriculture, over-grazing and the destruction of natural features (such as trees) that prevent erosion. Likewise, the death-drop of insect biomass, the decline of pollinating bees, are hastened by the extensive use of pesticides and fertilisers. Capitalist food production can only evade the problem – a problem, in its terms, of accumulation – either by establishing new ‘cheap natures’ through such means as deforestation, or by extracting rent from competitor producers through such means as intellectual property rights. For instance, since 1994’s notorious TRIPS agreement (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights), through the rules of UPOV (Union for the Protection of New Plant Varieties), particularly the notorious UPOV 1991, and in the face of local fightbacks from Guatemala to Ghana, the World Trade Organisation has enforced property agreements outlawing the saving of seeds from one season to the next, thus sharply raising costs for farmers producing 70 per cent of the global food supply.

#### 2) Carbon bubble, peak oil.

Rifkin ‘19 [Jeremy, Honorary Doctorate in Economics at Hasselt University. Recipient of the 13th annual German Sustainability Award in December 2020. BS in Economics at UPenn – Wharton School. Founder of People’s Bicentennial Commission. The Green New Deal: Why the Fossil Fuel Civilization Will Collapse By 2028, and the Bold Economic Plan to Save Life on Earth. St Martin’s Press. P7-8. Google Book. //shree]

The Carbon Tracker Initiative, a London-based think tank serving the energy industry, reports that the steep decline in the price of generating solar and wind energy “will inevitably lead to trillions of dollars of stranded assets across the corporate sector and hit petro-states that fail to reinvent themselves,” while “putting trillions at risk for unsavvy investors oblivious to the speed of the unfolding energy transition.”19 “Stranded assets” are all the fossil fuels that will remain in the ground because of falling demand as well as the abandonment of pipelines, ocean platforms, storage facilities, energy generation plants, backup power plants, petrochemical processing facilities, and industries tightly coupled to the fossil fuel culture. Behind the scenes, a seismic struggle is taking place as four of the principal sectors responsible for global warming—the Information and Communications Technology (ICT)/telecommunications sector, the power and electric utility sector, the mobility and logistics sector, and the buildings sector—are beginning to decouple from the fossil fuel industry in favor of adopting the cheaper new green energies. The result is that within the fossil fuel industry, “around $100 trillion of assets could be ‘carbon stranded.’”20 The carbon bubble is the largest economic bubble in history. And studies and reports over the past twenty-four months—from within the global financial community, the insurance sector, global trade organizations, national governments, and many of the leading consulting agencies in the energy industry, the transportation sector, and the real estate sector—suggest that the imminent collapse of the fossil fuel industrial civilization could occur sometime between 2023 and 2030, as key sectors decouple from fossil fuels and rely on ever-cheaper solar, wind, and other renewable energies and accompanying zero-carbon technologies.21 The United States, currently the leading oil-producing nation, will be caught in the crosshairs between the plummeting price of solar and wind and the fallout from peak oil demand and accumulating stranded assets in the oil industry.22

#### 3) Mineral cycles---that’s Allinson---copper, lithium, and manganese hit bottlenecks.

Ahmed 20 [Nafeez. M.A. in contemporary war & peace studies and a DPhil (April 2009) in international relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University. Capitalism Will Ruin the Earth By 2050, Scientists Say. Vice. 10-21-2020. https://www.vice.com/en/article/v7m48d/capitalism-will-ruin-the-earth-by-2050-scientists-say]

Endless growth will generate minerals scarcity within decades The EV transition is, in short, a massive industrial project. Electrification of roads and rail will require upgraded smart grids, complex routes connected to high power lines, and regular battery-swap stations. The paper explores several scenarios to explore how such a transition would take place. In a continuing GDP growth scenario, the authors note that the economy begins to stagnate “due to peak oil limits at around 2025-2040,” but GDP is able to continue growing thanks to the EV transition. This shows that the reduction in liquid fuels in transportation can play a powerful role in avoiding “energy shortages in the economy as a whole.” But then the economy hits the limits of mineral and material production to sustain this electric transition—in just three decades. And this is even with high levels of minerals recycling. By 2050, in this scenario, the EV transition will “require higher amounts of copper, lithium and manganese than current reserves. For the cases of copper and manganese the depletion is mainly due to the demand from the rest of the economy,” but most lithium demand “is for EV batteries,” and this alone “depletes its estimated global reserves.” Mineral depletion takes place even with “a very high increase in recycling rates” in a continuing GDP growth scenario. In one such scenario, the authors apply what they consider to be realistic upper level recycling rates of 57 percent, 30 percent and 74 percent to copper, lithium and manganese respectively. These are based on extremely optimistic projections of recycling capabilities relative to their costs. But still they find that even these high recycling rates wouldn’t prevent depletion of all current estimated reserves by 2050. The conclusion corroborates findings of other studies, estimating an expected bottleneck for lithium by 2042-2045 and for manganese by 2038-2050. Actual bottlenecks could come even earlier because existing studies—including the MEDEAS model—don’t account for material requirements needed for internal wiring, the EV motor, EV chargers, building and maintaining the grid to connect and charge EV batteries, the catenaries to electrify the railways, as well as inherent difficulties in recycling metals.

#### COVID---“recovery” is sugar rush that drives crisis.

Roberts & Smith ‘21 [Michael Roberts worked as an economist for over 40 years, Activist in British Labor Movement in Britain. Interviewed by Ashley Smith, Author at Specter Journal. “Out of Lockdown and Back into the Long Depression.” 7-6-21. <https://spectrejournal.com/out-of-lockdown-and-back-into-the-long-depression/> //shree]

The Covid slump of 2020-21 was basically a supply-side shock due to the global spread of the Covid-19 virus and the failure of governments in the major economies (with a few exceptions) to prevent its spread. There were delayed and bungled measures along with weakened health systems, so economies had to close down as lockdowns and isolation measures were the only answer to avoiding catastrophe. Economically, that meant supply stopped, and then that led to a collapse in demand as people were laid off and businesses crashed. But recovery is now under way (more or less) in most major economies. Demand was propped up in the major advanced economies through massive government fiscal spending and central bank injections of credit for businesses (particularly large ones). And now through a combination of lockdowns and the incredibly fast development and rollout of effective vaccinations (thanks to publicly funded science), the major economies are now able to recover. But in the G7 economies this initial recovery has the aspect of a “sugar rush.” The “sugar” of fiscal stimulus and historic levels of easy credit is infusing capitalist businesses and household spending with an energy boost. Indeed, during the pandemic slump sections of capitalism did not suffer at all; on the contrary, they gained hugely, e.g., the social media and tech sector, the mega-distribution companies, and Big Pharma. Better-off households also suffered less (at least materially) as they continued to be paid, could work at home, and saved income significantly. This led to a house purchase boom as these sectors of labour looked to change their lifestyles post-Covid. At the same time, zero interest rates and cheap credit allowed financial institutions to make hay in financial markets and billionaire wealth rocketed as stock and bond markets hit historic highs. But, for most manual workers in the cities and in low-paid service industries, the pandemic slump was a disaster and with little prospect of returning to “normal” for them in the recovery. And it’s the advanced capitalist economies and the East Asian states that are recovering best in 2021-22. The so-called global South suffered hugely in the pandemic, with record levels of excess deaths and a massive rise in unemployment and poverty levels. Fiscal support from governments was limited and the rollout of vaccines to get economies going again is way short. Estimates are that the target vaccination levels in these countries will not be achieved until 2023-4! So, what we are going to see is the major capitalist economies of the West and China returning to pre-pandemic levels of national output by the end of this year or in early 2022, but Latin America, Africa, South Asia failing to do so. What are the weaknesses and contradictions of the recovery in those economies? Before the pandemic, the world economy was slowing down. Real GDP growth rates in the G7 were dropping to just 1 percent or lower; the so-called emerging economies had growth rates down to 3 percent (hardly enough to cover increases in population). World trade was declining. Even the giant economies of China and India had slowed. The main reason was that growth in investment in productive assets that can boost the productivity of labor and expand technology and employment had also slowed. In my view, investment and productivity growth are key to developing the productive forces of modern capitalist economies, and they were failing because under capitalism, profitability is the driving force behind investment. And according to the best estimates, US and global profitability levels are at historic lows. This is the long-term result of the basic contradiction of capitalism: between raising the productivity of labour and sustaining profitability. Over the long term, this cannot be done, and this is the economic Achilles heel of capital. At first sight, this result seems strange when we read of the huge profits being made by the likes of the so-called FAANGS (the tech and social media monopolies) and Amazon. But these are the exceptions that prove the rule. On average, the profitability of firms in the productive sectors of capitalist economies are low. That’s partly why profits have been reinvested into financial and other unproductive sectors like property where profitability is higher. Indeed, it is estimated that before the pandemic, about 15-20 percent of companies in the major economies were what are called “zombies,” i.e., not making enough profit to invest or expand, but just enough to pay wages and service their debts. They are the “living dead” in capitalist terms. At the same time, however, corporate debt is at record highs in most countries, raising the risk of bankruptcies if interest rates were to rise. All this makes it unlikely that we shall see any significant change post-pandemic from what we saw in the post-great recession decade, i.e., slow growth in investment, low wage growth, poor productivity growth, rising inequality, and unchanged or worsened global poverty. In the US, a lot has been made about Biden’s turn away from the neoliberal consensus toward Keynesianism. What has he done, why has he done it, and what has been its impact so far? The pandemic fiscal packages introduced by various G7 governments and, of course, by the Biden administration were emergency measures by states to avoid complete meltdown and catastrophe from the pandemic. In my view, they do not signify a change of ideology or policy by pro-capitalist governments. The usual talk is “let’s get out of this slump and preserve capitalist businesses using state funds and credit and then worry about paying it all down later.” The “later” is still to come. Biden’s fiscal packages have been heralded as a sea change in government policy and a return to Keynesian macro-management and stimulation of capitalist economies. But first, let’s leave aside the fact that Keynesian stimulus and macro-management was mainly a myth anyway and really the product of a war economy after 1945 which was ditched in the mid-1970s. Instead let us consider the actual impact of the Biden packages. The latest estimates by Goldman Sachs, hardly a voice of the left, is that after all the machinations of Congress by the end of this year, the Biden package will be equivalent to about 1 percent of US GDP each year for the rest of Biden term. But Biden is going to pay for these partly by increasing taxation by 0.75 percent of GDP a year. Given that the best estimates of so-called multiplier effects on GDP from fiscal stimulus are about one, that means the net effect of the Biden packages, if fully implemented, might boost US real GDP growth by 0.25 percent a year. The current forecast for long-term us real GDP growth is just 1.8 percent a year. So, the “great” return to Keynes by Biden will be minimal. If Biden manages to get his larger proposals for increased spending on infrastructure and social welfare spending through Congress, what impact will that have on the US and world economies? If the Biden package will have a limited effect on the US economy, any spillover effect into other economies will be even less substantial. The EU is also planning an economic recovery package that will boost government funds in EU countries with already large debt burdens like Italy and Spain. But again, the impact on the capitalist sectors of these economies will be minimal. Japan is about to announce a fiscal package that aims to “balance the books” over the next decade – hardly stimulus then! Indeed, the latest growth forecast for japan is a further slowing from its pre-pandemic pace of less than 1 percent a year. And apart from China, Vietnam, and the small East Asian states, the rest of the global South has little prospect of any fiscal stimulus or economic recovery. Most estimates from international agencies are that these economies will not recover to pre-pandemic GDP levels before 2023 and will never recover to pre-pandemic trajectories of economic growth. There is a permanent “scarring” of these weak peripheral capitalist economies. There has been a whole range of bourgeois commentators like Lawrence Summers warning about the threat of inflation. What’s your assessment about the arguments about inflation? What are the dangers of a return to what in the 1970s was called stagflation, a combination of slow growth and increased inflation? In the short term, inflation has returned to many economies. This is because of the sugar rush of consumer demand as economies open up again and people start spending down savings built up during the pandemic slump, while companies search for raw materials and components to restart businesses. Coupled with a significant disruption of global value chains, supply cannot meet demand and bottlenecks have created an inflation of prices in raw materials and consumer goods and services. But is this as transitory as the federal reserve and other central banks claim (though to be fair, there are divergent views within these banks)? Some, like Summers, argue that credit and fiscal stimulation boost demand without engendering enough supply because there is a secular stagnation in investment and productivity in modern economies. Others argue that credit injections and monetary easing after the great recession did not lead to inflation. On the contrary, easing only boosted financial and property prices. The Keynesian view is that inflation only happens when wage costs rise, i.e., inflation is caused by labor rather than capital. And that is not happening so far. My view is that price inflation in goods and services in capitalist economies comes about through a combination of demand generated by new value (as expressed in wages and profits) and the pace of money supply growth. But it is the change in value production that matters most. Capitalist economies have experienced a slowdown in new value growth for decades, so inflation rates have slowed to a trickle. Central banks have tried very hard with monetary easing to get some inflation (2 percent targets, etc.) and failed. Tinkering with interest rates and money quantities cannot deliver even moderate inflation in these conditions. So, after this initial burst, inflation will rise above pre-pandemic rates (i.e., 2 percent or so) only if the world capitalist economies generate faster growth in new value (unlikely) and/or there are sustained levels of double-digit growth money supply (possible). The latter is what central banks control, and they are divided on how long to maintain that. This raises larger theoretical questions on the left. Many believe that Keynesianism or Modern Monetary Theory can stimulate growth and bring about a more egalitarian capitalist order. You have challenged these ideas in your blog, The Next Recession. Why do Marxists argue that Keynesianism can’t overcome capitalist crisis in general and in this slump? The key to answering this is to recognize that capitalists decide whether economies grow or go into slump. By that I mean capitalists will only invest in means of production and employment if there is a profit to be made. Profit calls the tune under capitalism. And as mentioned above, average profitability in the major capitalist economies is low; corporate debt is high, and many firms are just surviving through cheap credit and not investing productively. But Keynesian theory does not consider capitalist economies from the perspective of profitability. It’s effective demand that decides. If government spending can increase demand, then it can get capitalist economies going. If Marxist theory is a better explanation of capitalist accumulation, then if profitability of capital stays low and does not recover to new higher levels post-pandemic, then government spending will be ineffective.

## 2NC---Unification Advantage

### 2NC---AT: Innovation

#### Propriety rights, no incentive for R&D

Bee 18 [Vanessa A. Bee. Senior Litigation Counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a JD from Harvard Law. Innovation Under Socialism. 10-24-2018. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2018/10/innovation-under-socialism> ]

But prioritizing profit is a double-edged sword that can hamper innovation. Owning the proprietary rights allows private firms to block workers—through anti-competitive tools like non-compete agreements, patents, and licenses—who put labor into the innovation process from applying the extensive technical expertise and intimate understanding of the product to improve the innovation substantially. This becomes especially relevant once the workers leave the firm division in which they worked, or leave the firm altogether. Understandably, this lack of control and ownership will cause some workers, however passionate they may be about a project, to be less willing to maximize their contribution to the innovation. Of course, the so-called nimbleness that allows firms to make drastic changes like mass layoffs is extremely harmful to the workers. This is no fluke. The capitalist economy thrives on a reserve army of labor. Inching closer to full employment makes workers scarcer, which empowers the labor force as a whole to bargain for higher wages and better work conditions. These threaten the firm’s bottom line. So, the capitalist economy is structured to maintain the balance of power towards the owners of capital. Positions that pay well (and less than well) come with the precariousness of at-will employment and disappearing union power. A constant pool of unemployed labor is maintained through layoffs and other tactics like higher interest rates, which the government will compel to help slow growth and thereby hiring. This system harms the potential for innovation, too. The fear of losing work can dissuade workers from taking risks, experimenting, or speaking up as they identify items that could improve a taken approach—all actions that foster innovation. Meanwhile, thousands of individuals who could be contributing to the innovative process are instead involuntarily un-employed. This model also encourages monopolization, as concentrating market power gives private firms the most control over how much profit they can extract. But squashing competition that could contribute fresh ideas hurts every phase of the innovation process, while giving workers in fewer workplaces space to innovate. Deferring to profit causes many areas of R&D to go unexplored. Private firms have less reason to invest in innovations likely to be made universally available for free if managers or investors do not see much upside for the firm’s bottom line. In theory, the slack in private research can be picked up by the public sector. In reality, however, decades of austerity measures threaten the public’s ability to underwrite risky and inefficient research. Both the Democratic and Republican parties increasingly adhere to a neoliberal ideology that vilifies “big government,” promotes running government like a business, pretends that government budgets should mirror household budgets or the private firm’s balance sheet, and rams privatization under the guises of so-called public-private partnerships and private subcontractors. In the United States, public investment in R&D has been trending downward. As documented in a 2014 report from the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, “[f]rom 2010 to 2013, federal R&D spending fell from $158.8 to $133.2 billion … Between 2003 and 2008, state funding for university research, as a share of GDP, dropped on average by 2 percent. States such as Arizona and Utah saw decreases of 49 percent and 24 percent respectively.” Even if public investment in the least profitable aspect of research suddenly surged, in our current model, the private sector continues to be the primary driver of development, production, and distribution. Where there remains little potential for profit, private firms will be reluctant to advance to the next phases of the innovation process. Public-private projects raise similar concerns. Coordinated efforts can increase private investment by spreading some costs and risk to the public. But to attract private partners in the first place, the public sector has a greater incentive to prioritize R&D projects with more financial upsides. This is how the quest for profits and tight grip over proprietary rights, both important features of the capitalist model, discourage risk. Innovations are bound for plateauing after a few years, as firms increasingly favor minor aesthetic tweaks and updates over bold ideas while preventing other avenues of innovation from blossoming. At the same time, massive amounts of capital continue to float into the hands of a few. The price of innovating under capitalism is then both decreased innovation and decreased equality. The idea that this approach to innovation must be our best and only option is a delusion.

### 2NC---AT: Emerging Tech

#### No emerging tech impact

Caitlin Talmadge 19, Associate Professor of Security Studies in the School of Foreign at Georgetown University, as well as Senior Non-Resident Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution. "Emerging Technology and Intra-War Escalation Risks: Evidence from the Cold War, Implications for Today." https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390.2019.1631811

Yet the future relationship between emerging technologies and escalation may not be as straightforward as these statements imply. The debate about emerging technologies tends to portray them as a powerful independent variable – an exogenous factor that is both necessary and sufficient to cause conflict escalation. This paper argues instead that emerging technologies are more likely to function as intervening variables; they may be necessary for escalation to happen in some cases, but they alone are not sufficient, and sometimes they will not even be necessary. The strongest drivers of escalation will actually lie elsewhere, in the realms of politics and strategy. As a result, concern about new technologies is warranted, but determinism is not. An overemphasis on the dangers of technology alone ignores the critical role of political and strategic choices in shaping the impact of technology, and also could lead to a misplaced faith in arms control or other means of trying to stuff the technological genie back in the bottle.5

## 2NC---Turf Wars Advantage

### AT: Infrastructure

#### The grid is resilient to cyber-attacks and states have no motive.

Jesse Dunietz and Robert M. Lee 17. \*\*Scientific American's 2017 AAAS Mass Media fellow, and a Ph.D. candidate in computer science at Carnegie Mellon University. \*\*CEO of industrial cybersecurity firm Dragos. “Is the Power Grid Getting More Vulnerable to Cyber Attacks?” Scientific American. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/is-the-power-grid-getting-more-vulnerable-to-cyber-attacks/>

Two weeks ago it was cyberattacks on the Irish power grid. Last month it was a digital assault on U.S. energy companies, including a nuclear power plant. Back in December a Russian hack of a Vermont utility was all over the news. From the media buzz, one might conclude that power grid infrastructure is teetering on the brink of a hacker-induced meltdown. The real story is more nuanced, however. Scientific American spoke with grid cybersecurity expert Robert M. Lee, CEO of industrial cybersecurity firm Dragos, Inc., to sort out fact from hype. Dragos, which aims to protect critical infrastructure from cyberattacks, recently raised $10 million from investors to further its mission. Before he founded the company, Lee worked for the U.S. government analyzing and defending against cyberattacks on infrastructure. For a portion of his military career, he also worked on the government’s offensive front. His work has given him a front-row view on both sides of infrastructure cybersecurity. [An edited transcript of the interview follows.] How concerned should we be about grid and infrastructure cybersecurity, and what should we be most worried about? The electric grid and most infrastructure we have is actually fairly well built for reliability and safety. We’ve had a strong safety culture in industrial engineering for decades. That safety and reliability has never been thought of from a cybersecurity perspective, but it has afforded us a very defensible environment. As an example: if a portion of the U.S. power grid goes down. We usually anticipate those things for hurricanes or winter-weather storms. And we’re good at moving away from the computers and doing manual operations, just working the infrastructure to get it back. Usually it’s hours, maybe days; never more than a week or so. A lot of these cyberattacks deal with the computer technology and the interconnected nature of the infrastructure. And so when they target it in that way, you’re talking hours, maybe a day, at most a week of disruption. For reasonable scenarios, we’re not talking about a long time of outages, and we’re not talking about compromising safety. Now, the scary side of it is [twofold]. One, our adversaries are getting much more aggressive. They’re learning a lot about our industrial systems, not just from a computer technology standpoint but from an industrial engineering standpoint, thinking about how to disrupt or maybe even destroy equipment. That’s where you start reaching some particularly alarming scenarios. The second thing is, a lot of that ability to return to manual operation, the rugged nature of our infrastructure—a lot of that’s changing. Because of business reasons, because of lack of people to man the jobs, we’re starting to see more and more computer-based systems. We’re starting to see more common operating platforms. And this facilitates a scale for adversaries that they couldn’t previously get. When you say our adversaries are getting more aggressive, what are you referring to? The key events are things like the Ukraine attack in 2015–2016, [in which a cyberattack brought down portions of the Ukrainian power grid], as well as two different campaigns in 2013–2014, BlackEnergy2 and Havex, [two malware programs that were deployed against energy sector companies]. Basically, far-reaching espionage on industrial facilities one year; the next year getting into industrial environments; and then culmination in attacks in 2015–2016. That’s aggressive in itself. For my own firm, what we’re seeing in the [overall] activity in the space is it’s growing. Over the last decade, I have seen adversary activity increase in some measure, and then around 2013–2014 just start spiking. What are the adversaries actually doing in these attacks? [There are two broad categories of attacks.] Stage I intrusions are those designed to gain information. These are the traditional espionage efforts we’ve become accustomed to hearing about, where information is stolen or deleted. A Stage II attack could result in temporary loss of power, physical damage to equipment, or other types of scenarios we often hear about. It is important to note these are not trivial to accomplish. If an attacker wants to progress to a Stage II attack, during the Stage I intrusion they have to steal information specific to [that] industrial environment. The 2013–2014 campaigns that I mentioned were exactly the kinds of Stage I activity that you’d want to use to pivot into a Stage II activity. And so they scared the heck out of all of us. But the stuff we’ve heard about recently—the nuclear site and about a dozen energy companies that were compromised in a phishing campaign that made the news—none of that sounded tailored toward pivoting into a Stage II. Once an adversary has broken into the “business networks” used for email, documents and so on, how far a jump is it for them to access the industrial control system (ICS) networks used to control and monitor the industrial equipment? In nuclear environments, [business networks and control networks are] airgapped—[i.e., computers on one network cannot talk to those on the other]—because of safety regulations. The idea that because you got into the business network you can easily move into the ICS network is ridiculous. That is not true with other industrial infrastructures—electric energy, oil and gas, manufacturing, etc. You absolutely have [ICS] networks that are connected up. The nuance here is that we have a joke in the community: you’ll get security folks who don’t know much about ICS coming in with penetration testers and saying, “Oh my gosh, I found so many vulnerabilities!” And so the joke is, why don’t I just sit you down at the terminal? I will give you 100 percent access. Now make the lights blink. There’s a big gap there. [So the challenge is] not so much getting access. It’s once you get access, do you know what to do in a way that’s not just going to be embarrassing? What motivation do these adversaries have to attack the U.S. grid? I do not feel that there is a legitimate reason for adversaries to disrupt or destroy industrial infrastructure outside of a conflict scenario. Ukraine and Russia is a great example. I don’t necessarily mean declared war, but in places where we see conflict, I think we’ll see industrial attacks: North Korea-South Korea, China-Taiwan. But there are some scenarios that concern me, where we might have our hands forced and not have clarity around what happened. I’m aware of at least one case where a skilled adversary broke into an industrial environment, and in the course of intelligence operations they accidentally knocked over some sensitive system that led to visible destruction and almost to multiple casualties. And the worst part is, we didn’t actually realize it was a failed operation until about a month after, because the forensics and analysis take time. So you could have a scenario where the U.S., Russia, China, Iran—big players—are doing intelligence operations on each other, are doing pre-positioning to have deterrence or political leverage, and mess up that operation in a way that looks like an attack that we do not have transparency on for some time. We do not have international norms around how to handle that. Outside of conflict scenarios, though, I don’t see the advantage to [deliberate] disruptive or destructive attacks. I think we haven’t seen it not because they haven’t wanted to, but because the return on investment is minimal. What’s really advantageous is sitting U.S. congressmen and policymakers fearing what can happen with industrial infrastructure. That fear drives policy far more than actually turning the lights off and having them realize [they will] come back on in six hours.

#### China isn’t a cyber threat.

Lindsay ’15 [Jon; Lindsay is a researcher at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, and an assistant research scientist at the University of California, San Diego; May 2015; “Exaggerating the Chinese Cyber Threat”; http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/25321/exaggerating\_the\_chinese\_cyber\_threat.html; International Security; accessed 3/25/17; TV] \*edited for offensive language

INFLATED THREATS AND GROWING MISTRUST Policymakers in the United States often portray China as posing a serious cybersecurity threat. In 2013 U.S. National Security Adviser Tom Donilon stated that Chinese cyber intrusions not only endanger national security but also threaten U.S. firms with the loss of competitive advantage. One U.S. member of Congress has asserted that China has “laced the U.S. infrastructure with logic bombs.” Chinese critics, meanwhile, denounce Western allegations of Chinese espionage and decry National Security Agency (NSA) activities revealed by Edward Snowden. The People’s Daily newspaper has described the United States as “a thief crying ‘stop thief.’” Chinese commentators increasingly call for the exclusion of U.S. internet firms from the Chinese market, citing concerns about collusion with the NSA, and argue that the institutions of internet governance give the United States an unfair advantage. The rhetorical spiral of mistrust in the Sino-American relationship threatens to undermine the mutual benefits of the information revolution. Fears about the ~~paralysis~~ [shutdown] of the United States’ digital infrastructure or the hemorrhage of its competitive advantage are exaggerated. Chinese cyber operators face underappreciated organizational challenges, including information overload and bureaucratic compartmentalization, which hinder the weaponization of cyberspace or absorption of stolen intellectual property. More important, both the United States and China have strong incentives to moderate the intensity of their cyber exploitation to preserve profitable interconnections and avoid costly punishment. The policy backlash against U.S. firms and liberal internet governance by China and others is ultimately more worrisome for U.S. competitiveness than espionage; ironically, it is also counterproductive for Chinese growth. The United States is unlikely to experience either a socalled digital Pearl Harbor through cyber warfare or death by a thousand cuts through industrial espionage. There is, however, some danger of crisis miscalculation when states field cyberweapons. The secrecy of cyberweapons’ capabilities and the uncertainties about their effects and collateral damage are as likely to confuse friendly militaries as they are to muddy signals to an adversary. Unsuccessful preemptive cyberattacks could reveal hostile intent and thereby encourage retaliation with more traditional (and reliable) weapons. Conversely, preemptive escalation spurred by fears of cyberattack could encourage the target to use its cyberweapons before it loses the opportunity to do so. Bilateral dialogue is essential for reducing the risks of misperception between the United States and China in the event of a crisis. THE U.S. ADVANTAGE The secrecy regarding the cyber capabilities and activities of the United States and China creates difficulty in estimating the relative balance of cyber power across the Pacific. Nevertheless, the United States appears to be gaining an increasing advantage. For every type of purported Chinese cyber threat, there are also serious Chinese vulnerabilities and growing Western strengths. Much of the international cyber insecurity that China generates reflects internal security concerns. China exploits foreign media and digital infrastructure to target political dissidents and minority populations. The use of national censorship architecture (the Great Firewall of China) to redirect inbound internet traffic to attack sites such as GreatFire.org and GitHub in March 2015 is just the latest example of this worrisome trend. Yet prioritizing political information control over technical cyber defense also damages China’s own cybersecurity. Lax law enforcement and poor cyber defenses leave the country vulnerable to both cybercriminals and foreign spies. The fragmented and notoriously competitive nature of the Communist Party state further complicates coordination across military, police, and regulatory entities. There is strong evidence that China continues to engage in aggressive cyber espionage campaigns against Western interests. Yet it struggles to convert even legiti mately obtained foreign data into competitive advantage, let alone make sense of petabytes of stolen data. Absorption is especially challenging at the most sophisticated end of the value chain (e.g., advanced fighter aircraft), which is dominated by the United States. At the same time, the United States conducts its own cyber espionage against China , as the Edward Snowden leaks dramatized, which can indirectly aid U.S. firms (e.g., in government trade negotiations). China’s uneven industrial development, fragmented cyber defenses, erratic cyber tradecraft, and the market dominance of U.S. technology firms provide considerable advantages to the United States. Despite high levels of Chinese political harassment and espionage, there is little evidence of skill or subtlety in China’s military cyber operations. Although Chinese strategists describe cyberspace as a highly asymmetric and decisive domain of warfare, China’s military cyber capacity does not live up to its doctrinal aspirations. A disruptive attack on physical infrastructure requires careful testing, painstaking planning, and sophisticated intelligence. Even experienced U.S. cyber operators struggle with these challenges. By contrast, the Chinese military is rigidly hierarchical and has no wartime experience with complex information systems. Further, China’s pursuit of military “informatization” (i.e., emulation of the U.S. network-centric style of operations) increases its dependence on vulnerable networks and exposure to foreign cyberattack. To be sure, China engages in aggressive cyber campaigns, especially against nongovernmental organizations and firms less equipped to defend themselves than government entities. These activities, however, do not constitute major military threats against the United States, and they do nothing to defend China from the considerable intelligence and military advantages of the United States.

### AT: Disease

#### Every empiric AND basic theories of evolution disprove any risk of extinction from disease.

Bryan Walsh 20, Future Correspondent for Axios, Editor of the Science and Technology Publication OneZero, Former Senior and International Editor at Time Magazine, BA from Princeton University, End Times: A Brief Guide to the End of the World, Orion Publishing Group, Limited Edition, p. 183-185

Yet despite epidemic after epidemic, despite mass killers like smallpox and the 1918 flu, at no point has disease threatened humans with extinction. Even the Black Death, likely the most concentrated epidemic of all time, now appears as little more than a minor downturn in what has otherwise been a bull market for long-term human population growth. That’s true for animals as well. The International Union for Conservation of Nature reports that of the 833 plant and animal extinctions that have been documented since 1500, less than 4 percent can be attributed to infectious disease. Those species that were eradicated by disease tended to be small in number and geographically isolated—very much unlike human beings, who are both numerous and have spread to every corner of the world.38

With the exception of HIV—which can now be managed as a chronic condition with antiviral drugs—every major epidemic mentioned above took place before the dawn of modern medicine, before the development of antibiotics and widespread vaccines. Smallpox was even fully eradicated from the wild in 198039—the only known samples of the virus are kept at highly secure government facilities in Atlanta and Koltsovo, Russia.40 Plague is now so rare that when it breaks out in countries like Madagascar, it makes global news—yet fewer than 600 deaths from the disease were reported between 2010 and 2015. Studies have shown that most of the fatalities from the 1918 flu were actually due to secondary bacterial infections that today could be controlled by antibiotics,41 which were introduced less than a century ago. Influenza pandemics remain the great fear of infectious disease experts, but the most recent one in 2009 killed only about 284,000 people worldwide.42 That was fewer than the number of people who die from seasonal flu in an ordinary year.43

Modern science has defanged most infectious diseases, at least outside the developing world—and great progress has been made there in recent years—but basic evolution also plays a role in limiting the catastrophic potential of natural disease. Every pathogen faces a trade-off. In general, the more rapidly it kills, the harder it is to spread widely, because an extremely virulent disease would run out of victims and hit an epidemiological dead end. Pathogens that are highly transmissible, like influenza, rarely kill, even absent the countermeasures of modern medicine. The 1918 flu had a fatality rate of about 2.5 percent.44 That’s tremendously high by the standards of the flu, but it still meant that more than 97 out of every 100 patients survived. Even a virus like HIV—which kills slowly and shows no symptoms for years, permitting the infected plenty of time to spread the disease—is hindered because transmission requires direct contact with blood or with bodily fluids. The self-replication that makes infectious disease such an effective weapon also prevents it from becoming a true existential threat. What viruses and bacteria want—if packets of genes and single-celled organisms can be said to want anything—is to survive and to replicate. They can’t do that if they kill all humans.

# 1NR

## 1NR---DOJ DA

### AT: Monopolization

#### Ruling against Google key to innovation.

MITCH STOLTZ 20. Senior Staff Attorney at the Electronic Frontier Foundation, 10/29/20. “Antitrust Suit Against Google is a Watershed Moment.” https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2020/10/antitrust-suit-against-google-watershed-moment-0

The complaint also employs a strategy that EFF has long advocated: treating consumer privacy as an aspect of product quality, such that overcollection and misuse of customers’ personal information by a monopolist can be evidence of harm to consumer welfare, the touchstone of modern antitrust law. “Google’s conduct,” says the complaint, “has harmed consumers by reducing the quality of general search services (including dimensions such as privacy, data protection, and use of consumer data), lessening choice in general search services, and impeding innovation.”

On the innovation angle, the complaint alleges that Google’s contracts deny potential search competitors the benefits of scale, which “affects a general search engine’s ability to deliver a quality search experience.” In other words, we would see more innovation in search engines if other entrepreneurs were able to compete with Google at scale.

#### Breaking up Big Tech fosters innovation.

Jeff Bell 21. CEO of LegalShield, protecting and empowering people through legal and privacy management services, 2/2/21. “The Heartache of Big Tech Breakups: Should We, or Shouldn’t We?” https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/heartache-big-tech-breakups-should-we-shouldnt-jeff-bell/

Breaking up monopolies benefits consumers: Currently, U.S. antitrust law reflects the legal theories of Robert Bork, an influential solicitor general, who in 1978 successfully argued that antitrust laws should only be enforced when a merger results in higher prices for consumers. One consequence is that over the last 40 years, industries have merged and contracted until three or four companies dominate that market segment. Without price increases, the limits of antitrust enforcement allow Goliaths like the FAANG companies to squelch competitors, resulting in less innovation that would benefit consumers beyond pricing. So much so, that many investors are hesitant to put money in companies that would compete directly with FAANG, referring to that market space as ‘the kill zone.’ Breaking up these monopolies would encourage innovation that would improve the lives of consumers.

#### Big Tech threatens the DIB.

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

Big Tech and the Defense Industrial Base

Concentration in the tech sector also threatens the defense industrial base due to higher costs, lower quality, less innovation, and even corruption and fraud.71 Each of these dynamics has already been a problem for America’s over-consolidated defense industrial base. As technology becomes more and more central to defense and national security, it is likely that these same dynamics will replicate themselves with big tech companies. This will become a national security threat, both directly, in terms of the quality and speed of procurement, and indirectly, by reducing innovation and functionally redirecting defense budgets from research spending to higher monopoly profits.72

Conventional economic theory suggests that monopolists have the ability to increase prices and reduce quality because consumers are captive.73 When it comes to defense spending, the Government Account- ability Office commented in 2019 that “competition is the cornerstone of a sound acquisition process and a critical tool for achieving the best return on investment for taxpayers.”74 At the same time, the GAO observed that “portfolio-wide cost growth has occurred in an environment where awards are often made without full and open competition.”75 Indeed, it found that 67 percent of 183 major weapons systems contracts had no compe- ition and almost half of contracts went to a handful of firms. Of course, consolidation also means that the Defense Department is in a symbiotic relationship with these big contractors. Some startup executives wanting to sell to the government thus see the Pentagon as “a bad customer, one that is heavily skewed in favor of larger, traditional players,” and they don’t feel like they can break into the sector.76

#### Big Tech locks the Pentagon into relationships that undermine innovation and concentrate vulnerability---kills the DIB.

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

As technology becomes more integral to the future of national security, it is hard to see how big tech will not simply go the way of the big defense contractors. Corporate mottos not to “be evil” are long gone,85 and big tech companies spend millions on conventional Washington, D.C., lobbying efforts.86 Over time, as contracts move to tech behemoths, there will no longer be competitive alternatives, and the Pentagon will likely be locked into relationships with big tech companies—just as they currently are with big defense contractors.87 Some commentators suggest that robust antitrust policies are a problem because only a small num- ber of tech companies can contract for defense projects.88 But there is another way to look at it: The goal should be to encourage competition in the tech sector so that there are multiple contractors available. As former secretary of homeland security Michael Chertoff has said, defending the antitrust case against Qualcomm, “a single-source national champion creates an unacceptable risk to American security—artificially concentrat- ing vulnerability in a single point. ... We need competition and multiple providers, not a potentially vulnerable technological monoculture.”89

The consequence of consolidation in tech is that taxpayers will likely see higher bills even as innovation slows due to reduced competition. Worse still, every taxpayer dollar that goes to monopoly profits—whether in the form of higher prices or fraud and corruption—is a dollar that is not going toward innovation for the future. A concentrated defense sector means not only less innovation due to the lack of competition in the sector; it means that funding that could have been available for innova- tion instead gets redirected via monopoly profits to the pockets of big tech executives and shareholders.

### AT: No Russia War

#### Russian war outweighs

Owen Cotton-Barratt et al. 17. Sebastian Farquhar, John Halstead, Stefan Schubert, Haydn Belfield, and Andrew Snyder-Beattie. PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute. 2-3-2017. “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance” Global Priorities Picture. https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf.

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki demonstrated the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons. However, even in an all-out nuclear war between the United States and Russia, despite horrific casualties, neither country’s population is likely to be completely destroyed by the direct effects of the blast, fire, and radiation.8 The aftermath could be much worse: the burning of flammable materials could send massive amounts of smoke into the atmosphere, which would absorb sunlight and cause sustained global cooling, severe ozone loss, and agricultural disruption – a nuclear winter. According to one model 9 , an all-out exchange of 4,000 weapons10 could lead to a drop in global temperatures of around 8°C, making it impossible to grow food for 4 to 5 years. This could leave some survivors in parts of Australia and New Zealand, but they would be in a very precarious situation and the threat of extinction from other sources would be great. An exchange on this scale is only possible between the US and Russia who have more than 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons, with stockpiles of around 4,500 warheads each, although many are not operationally deployed.11 Some models suggest that even a small regional nuclear war involving 100 nuclear weapons would produce a nuclear winter serious enough to put two billion people at risk of starvation,12 though this estimate might be pessimistic.13 Wars on this scale are unlikely to lead to outright human extinction, but this does suggest that conflicts which are around an order of magnitude larger may be likely to threaten civilisation. It should be emphasised that there is very large uncertainty about the effects of a large nuclear war on global climate. This remains an area where increased academic research work, including more detailed climate modelling and a better understanding of how survivors might be able to cope and adapt, would have high returns. It is very difficult to precisely estimate the probability of existential risk from nuclear war over the next century, and existing attempts leave very large confidence intervals. According to many experts, the most likely nuclear war at present is between India and Pakistan.14 However, given the relatively modest size of their arsenals, the risk of human extinction is plausibly greater from a conflict between the United States and Russia. Tensions between these countries have increased in recent years and it seems unreasonable to rule out the possibility of them rising further in the future.

#### No checks

Wood 17 - senior military correspondent for The Huffington Post. His second book, What Have We Done: the Moral Injury of Our Longest Wars, based on his Pulitzer Prize-winning reporting on veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, was published by Little, Brown in November 2016. (David, “THIS IS HOW THE NEXT WORLD WAR STARTS,” https://highline.huffingtonpost.com/articles/en/trump-russia-putin-military-crisis/)//BB

And yet few of these agreements have survived Putin’s regime and the brewing animosity between Moscow and Washington. The problem, a senior U.S. official explained, isn’t that the agreements are faulty or outdated, but rather that the Russians can no longer be trusted to observe them. The result is that the U.S and Russia are now more outwardly antagonistic than they have been in years. Since the Cold War ended in 1991, NATO has accepted 10 European countries formerly allied with the Soviet Union. In response, Russia has expanded its military; engaged in powerful cyberwar attacks against Estonia, Germany, Finland, Lithuania and other countries; seized parts of Georgia; forcibly annexed Crimea; sent its troops into Ukraine; and staged multiple no-notice exercises with the ground and air power it would use to invade its Baltic neighbors. In one such maneuver last year, Russia mobilized some 12,500 combat troops in territory near Poland and the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. According to a technical analysis by the RAND Corp., a lightning Russia strike could carry its troops into NATO capitals in the Baltics in less than 60 hours. Last year, NATO shifted its official strategy from “assurance”—a passive declaration to stand by its allies—to “deterrence,” which requires sufficient combat power to repel armed aggression. The alliance also approved a new multinational response force, some 40,000 troops in all. In January, under a separate Obama administration initiative, the United States rushed a 4,000-strong armored brigade combat team to Poland and the Baltic states. (Lieutenant General Tim Ray, the deputy commander of U.S. forces in Europe, explained that its objective is to “to deter Russian aggression” by stationing “battle-ready” forces in forward positions.) Army engineers have started strengthening eastern European runways to accept heavier air shipments and are reconfiguring some eastern European railroads to handle rail cars carrying tanks and heavy armor. This March, a U.S. combat aviation brigade arrived in Germany with attack gunships, transport and medevac helicopters and drones, and is deploying its units to Latvia, Romania and Poland. So far, these efforts to shore up NATO have proceeded despite the Trump administration’s occasional shows of disdain for the military alliance.[4] 4. Trump has called NATO “obsolete” and repeatedly chastised members for not paying their fair share of defense costs. In a March meeting with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Trump pointedly did not shake her hand. In late March, Scaparrotti acknowledged that he had not yet briefed the president about NATO-Russia relations. However, Trump’s secretary of defense, Jim Mattis, recently made a point of affirming that NATO is the “fundamental bedrock” of American security. Any change to that policy would be met with fierce opposition in Congress from defense stalwarts like Senator John McCain of Arizona, who is demanding that the United States use “all elements of American power” against Russia. This February, the two top commanders of the United States and Russia met in Azerbaijan, in a rare effort to bring some stability to U.S.-Russia relations. A month later, they met again in Turkey to review a procedure to prevent accidents involving aircraft operating over Syria. But that’s a narrow issue. A broader restoration of the Cold War-era constraints on military activity seems unlikely. Increasingly, each side sees the other as an adversary. A senior Russian diplomat put the blame squarely on the United States. “We are being seen as an object to deter—as the enemy,” he told me. “In that case, how are we going to talk?” What this means is that there are few remaining mechanisms to defuse unexpected emergencies. In testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee in late March, Scaparrotti acknowledged that he has virtually no contact with Russian military leaders. (“Don’t you think that would be a good idea?” Independent Senator Angus King of Maine queried. “If you could say, ‘Wait a minute, that missile was launched by accident, don’t get alarmed’?”) In 2014, in response to Russia’s intervention in Crimea, Congress passed a law halting almost all military-to-military communications. Even the spontaneous and informal exchanges that used to occur among Russian and American officers have largely ended.

#### Once a minor conflict starts, it escalates --- neither side has de-escalation measures in place, and both leaders are conflict-prone.

Wood 17 - senior military correspondent for The Huffington Post. His second book, What Have We Done: the Moral Injury of Our Longest Wars, based on his Pulitzer Prize-winning reporting on veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, was published by Little, Brown in November 2016. (David, “THIS IS HOW THE NEXT WORLD WAR STARTS,” <https://highline.huffingtonpost.com/articles/en/trump-russia-putin-military-crisis/)//BB>

Putin’s favored tactic, intelligence officials say, is known as “escalation dominance.” The idea is to push the other side until you win, a senior officer based in Europe explained—to “escalate to the point where the adversary stops, won’t go farther. It’s a very destabilizing strategy.” Stavridis cast it in the terms of an old Russian proverb: “Probe with a bayonet; when you hit steel withdraw, when you hit mush, proceed.” Right now, he added, “the Russians keep pushing out and hitting mush.” This mindset is basically the opposite of how both American and Soviet leaders approached each other during the Cold War, even during periods of exceptional stress such as the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. Having endured the devastation of World War II, they understood the horror that lurked on the far side of a crisis. “When things started to get too close, they would back off,” said Miller, the retired Pentagon official. The term of art for this constant recalibration of risk is “crisis management”—the “most demanding form of diplomacy,” writes Sir Lawrence Freedman, an emeritus professor of war studies at King’s College London. Leaders had to make delicate judgments about when to push their opponent and when to create face-saving off-ramps. Perhaps most critically, they had to possess the confidence to de-escalate when necessary. Skilled crisis management, Freedman writes, requires “an ability to match deeds with words, to convey threats without appearing reckless, and to offer concessions without appearing soft, often while under intense media scrutiny and facing severe time pressures.” A recent textbook example came in January 2016, when Iran seized those 10 U.S. Navy sailors, claiming that they had been spying in Iranian waters in the eastern Persian Gulf. President Barack Obama’s secretary of state, John Kerry, immediately opened communications with his counterpart in Tehran, using channels established for negotiating the nuclear deal with Iran. By the next morning, the sailors had been released. The U.S. acknowledged the sailors had strayed into Iranian waters but did not apologize, asserting that the transgression had been an innocent error. Iran, meanwhile, acknowledged that the sailors had not been spying. (The peaceful resolution was not applauded by Breitbart News, headed at the time by Stephen Bannon, who is now Trump’s chief White House strategist. Obama, a Breitbart writer sneered, has been “castrated on the world stage by Iran.”) Neither Putin nor Trump, it’s safe to say, are crisis managers by nature. Both are notoriously thin-skinned, operate on instinct, and have a tendency to shun expert advice. (These days, Putin is said to surround himself not with seasoned diplomats but cronies from his old spy days.) Both are unafraid of brazenly lying, fueling an atmosphere of extreme distrust on both sides. Stavridis, who has studied both Putin and Trump and who met with Trump in December, concluded that the two leaders “are not risk-averse. They are risk-affectionate.” Aron, the Russia expert, said, “I think there is a much more cavalier attitude by Putin toward war in general and the threat of nuclear weapons. He continued, “He is not a madman, but he is much more inclined to use the threat of nuclear weapons in conventional [military] and political confrontation with the West.” Perhaps the most significant difference between the two is that Putin is far more calculating than Trump. In direct negotiations, he is said to rely on videotaped analysis of the facial expressions of foreign leaders that signal when the person is bluffing, confused or lying. At times, Trump has been surprisingly quick to lash out at a perceived slight from Putin, although these moments have been overshadowed by his effusive praise for the Russian leader. On December 22, Putin promised to strengthen Russia’s strategic nuclear forces in his traditional year-end speech to his officer corps. Hours later, Trump vowed, via Twitter, to “greatly strengthen and expand” the U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal. On Morning Joe the following day, host Mika Brzezinski said that Trump had told her on a phone call, “Let it be an arms race. We will outmatch them at every pass and outlast them all.” And in late March, the Wall Street Journal reported that Trump was becoming increasingly frustrated with Russia, throwing up his hands in exasperation when informed that Russia may have violated an arms treaty. Some in national security circles see Trump’s impulsiveness as a cause for concern but not for panic. “He can always overreact,” said Anthony Cordesman, senior strategic analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and a veteran of many national security posts throughout the U.S. government. “[But] there are a lot of people [around the president] to prevent an overreaction with serious consequences.” Let’s say that Trump acted upon his impulse to tell a fighter pilot to shoot a jet that barrel-rolled an American plane. Such a response would still have to be carried out by the Pentagon, Cordesman said—a process with lots of room for senior officers to say, “Look, boss, this is a great idea but can we talk about the repercussions?” And yet that process is no longer as robust as it once was. Many senior policymaking positions at the Pentagon and State Department remain unfilled. A small cabal in the White House, including Bannon, Jared Kushner and a few others, has asserted a role in foreign policy decisions outside the normal NSC process. It’s not yet clear how much influence is wielded by Trump’s widely respected national security adviser, Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster. When lines of authority and influence are so murky, it increases the risk that a minor incident could boil up into an unintended clash, said retired Marine Corps General John Allen, who has served in senior military and diplomatic posts. To complicate matters further, the relentless pace of information in the social media age has destroyed the one precious factor that helped former leaders safely navigate perilous situations: time. It’s hard to believe now, but during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, for instance, President Kennedy and his advisers deliberated for a full 10 weeks before announcing a naval quarantine of the island. In 1969, a U.S. spy plane was shot down by North Korean jets over the Sea of Japan, killing all 31 Americans on board. It took 26 hours for the Pentagon and State Department to recommend courses of action to President Richard Nixon, according to a declassified secret assessment. (Nixon eventually decided not to respond.) Today, thanks to real-time video and data streaming, the men in the Kremlin and White House can know—or think they know—as much as the guy in the cockpit of a plane or on the bridge of a warship. The president no longer needs to rely on reports from military leaders that have been filtered through their expertise and deeper knowledge of the situation on the ground. Instead, he can watch a crisis unfold on a screen and react in real time. Once news of an incident hits the internet, the pressure to respond becomes even harder to withstand. “The ability to recover from early missteps is greatly reduced,” Marine Corps General Joseph Dunford, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has written. “The speed of war has changed, and the nature of these changes makes the global security environment even more unpredictable, dangerous, and unforgiving.” And so in the end, no matter how cool and unflappable the instincts of military men and women like Kevin Webster, what will smother the inevitable spark is steady, thoughtful leadership from within the White House and the Kremlin. A recognition that first reports may be wrong; a willingness to absorb new and perhaps unwelcome information; a thick skin to ward off insults and accusations; an acknowledgment of the limited value of threats and bluffs; and a willingness to recognize the core interests of the other side and a willingness to accept a face-saving solution. These qualities are not notably on display in either capital.

### AT: Aff Solves China Impact

#### US-China war causes extinction via nuclear escalation.

Sherman ’17 (Jon; reporter for the Independent; 2-5-2017; "War between China and America 'could end life as we know it on Earth'"; Independent; https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-china-war-be-end-of-life-earth-nuclear-weapons-apocalypse-steve-bannon-donald-trump-white-house-a7561821.html; Accessed 8-22-2019; AH)

While the prospect remains relatively remote, experts have told The Independent they believe such a conflict would be **catastrophic**, throwing the entire globe into **turmoil** and potentially **ending "life as we know it** on Earth". The United States would **likely wi**n because sending China's **untested forces** against the might of America's military would be like pitching farmers against Achilles and his warriors, said one, but even a **conventional** military victory would be a strategic **disaster**. It would set off a **global economic crisis** and create a potential **power vacuum** inside defeated China "the like of which we can't imagine". Steve Bannon: the unelected 'alt-right' figurehead running America Mr Bannon said **war would erupt** in the South China Sea in "five to 10 years". He said: "They’re taking their sandbars and making basically stationary aircraft carriers and putting missiles on those. They come here to the United States in front of our face—and you understand how important face is—and say it’s an ancient territorial sea." The US and China have been **engaged** in a back-and-forth dispute over military build-up and territorial claims in the region for **some years**. In December the US said it would base its deadliest fighter jets in Australia, and days later China seized an unmanned US Navy drone. It followed a diplomatic spat around then-President-elect Trump's congratulatory phone call with Taiwan's Prime Minister Tsai Ing-wen, which broke with decades of US policy. Mr Trump has been forthright about China's influence, blaming it for the loss of American jobs. The war of words recently heated up when a Chinese military official was quoted as saying talk of war with the US under Mr Trump "are not just slogans, they are becoming a practical reality". Trevor McCrisken, associate professor of politics and international studies at the University of Warwick, said that if war broke out "we would be looking, I would imagine, at World War Three". He said: "I really do think that would be the end of life as we know it on Earth. "From a **global strategic risk level** I would say the **last thing** you want is war between the United States and any of the major powers because of the risks of **escalation**, obviously the potential for **nuclear weapons** to be used. The likelihood of **nuclear exchange** between the two principals involved is high."

#### Those flashpoints will go nuclear.

Talmadge ’18 (Catilin; Associate Professor of Security Studies at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, PhD in Political Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, A.B. in Government from Harvard College; Nov/Dec 2018; “Beijing’s Nuclear Option: Why a U.S.-Chinese War Could Spiral Out of Control”; <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option>; Foreign Affairs; accessed 11/24/18; TV)

As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States. Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic pressure on Taiwan and built military installations on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil. A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but the prospect of a military confrontation—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think. Members of China’s strategic com­munity tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict. Asked about the issue in 2015, Dennis Blair, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Indo-Pacific, estimated the likelihood of a U.S.-Chinese nuclear crisis as “somewhere between nil and zero.” This assurance is misguided. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States’ signature approach to war has been simple: punch deep into enemy territory in order to rapidly knock out the opponent’s key military assets at minimal cost. But the Pentagon developed this formula in wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Serbia, none of which was a nuclear power. China, by contrast, not only has nuclear weapons; it has also intermingled them with its conventional military forces, making it difficult to attack one without attacking the other. This means that a major U.S. military campaign targeting China’s conventional forces would likely also threaten its nuclear arsenal. Faced with such a threat, Chinese leaders could decide to use their nuclear weapons while they were still able to. As U.S. and Chinese leaders navigate a relationship fraught with mutual suspicion, they must come to grips with the fact that a conventional war could skid into a nuclear confrontation. Although this risk is not high in absolute terms, its consequences for the region and the world would be devastating. As long as the United States and China continue to pursue their current grand strategies, the risk is likely to endure. This means that leaders on both sides should dispense with the illusion that they can easily fight a limited war. They should focus instead on managing or resolving the political, economic, and military tensions that might lead to a conflict in the first place. A NEW KIND OF THREAT There are some reasons for optimism. For one, China has long stood out for its nonaggressive nuclear doctrine. After its first nuclear test, in 1964, China largely avoided the Cold War arms race, building a much smaller and simpler nuclear arsenal than its resources would have allowed. Chinese leaders have consistently characterized nuclear weapons as useful only for deterring nuclear aggression and coercion. Historically, this narrow purpose required only a handful of nuclear weapons that could ensure Chinese retaliation in the event of an attack. To this day, China maintains a “no first use” pledge, promising that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. The prospect of a nuclear conflict can also seem like a relic of the Cold War. Back then, the United States and its allies lived in fear of a Warsaw Pact offensive rapidly overrunning Europe. NATO stood ready to use nuclear weapons first to stalemate such an attack. Both Washington and Moscow also consistently worried that their nuclear forces could be taken out in a bolt-from-the-blue nuclear strike by the other side. This mutual fear increased the risk that one superpower might rush to launch in the erroneous belief that it was already under attack. Initially, the danger of unauthorized strikes also loomed large. In the 1950s, lax safety procedures for U.S. nuclear weapons stationed on NATO soil, as well as minimal civilian oversight of U.S. military commanders, raised a serious risk that nuclear escalation could have occurred without explicit orders from the U.S. president. The good news is that these Cold War worries have little bearing on U.S.-Chinese relations today. Neither country could rapidly overrun the other’s territory in a conventional war. Neither seems worried about a nuclear bolt from the blue. And civilian political control of nuclear weapons is relatively strong in both countries. What remains, in theory, is the comforting logic of mutual deterrence: in a war between two nuclear powers, neither side will launch a nuclear strike for fear that its enemy will respond in kind. The bad news is that one other trigger remains: a conventional war that threatens China’s nuclear arsenal. Conventional forces can threaten nuclear forces in ways that generate pressures to escalate—especially when ever more capable U.S. conventional forces face adversaries with relatively small and fragile nuclear arsenals, such as China. If U.S. operations endangered or damaged China’s nuclear forces, Chinese leaders might come to think that Washington had aims beyond winning the conventional war—that it might be seeking to disable or destroy China’s nuclear arsenal outright, perhaps as a prelude to regime change. In the fog of war, Beijing might reluctantly conclude that limited nuclear escalation—an initial strike small enough that it could avoid full-scale U.S. retaliation—was a viable option to defend itself. STRAIT SHOOTERS The most worrisome flash point for a U.S.-Chinese war is Taiwan. Beijing’s long-term objective of reunifying the island with mainland China is clearly in conflict with Washington’s longstanding desire to maintain the status quo in the strait. It is not difficult to imagine how this might lead to war. For example, China could decide that the political or military window for regaining control over the island was closing and launch an attack, using air and naval forces to blockade Taiwanese harbors or bombard the island. Although U.S. law does not require Washington to intervene in such a scenario, the Taiwan Relations Act states that the United States will “consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.” Were Washington to intervene on Taipei’s behalf, the world’s sole superpower and its rising competitor would find themselves in the first great-power war of the twenty-first century. In the course of such a war, U.S. conventional military operations would likely threaten, disable, or outright eliminate some Chinese nuclear capabilities—whether doing so was Washington’s stated objective or not. In fact, if the United States engaged in the style of warfare it has practiced over the last 30 years, this outcome would be all but guaranteed. Consider submarine warfare. China could use its conventionally armed attack submarines to blockade Taiwanese harbors or bomb the island, or to attack U.S. and allied forces in the region. If that happened, the U.S. Navy would almost certainly undertake an antisubmarine campaign, which would likely threaten China’s “boomers,” the four nuclear-armed ballistic missile submarines that form its naval nuclear deterrent. China’s conventionally armed and nuclear-armed submarines share the same shore-based communications system; a U.S. attack on these transmitters would thus not only disrupt the activities of China’s attack submarine force but also cut off its boomers from contact with Beijing, leaving Chinese leaders unsure of the fate of their naval nuclear force. In addition, nuclear ballistic missile submarines depend on attack submarines for protection, just as lumbering bomber aircraft rely on nimble fighter jets. If the United States started sinking Chinese attack submarines, it would be sinking the very force that protects China’s ballistic missile submarines, leaving the latter dramatically more vulnerable. Even more dangerous, U.S. forces hunting Chinese attack submarines could inadvertently sink a Chinese boomer instead. After all, at least some Chinese attack submarines might be escorting ballistic missile submarines, especially in wartime, when China might flush its boomers from their ports and try to send them within range of the continental United States. Since correctly identifying targets remains one of the trickiest challenges of undersea warfare, a U.S. submarine crew might come within shooting range of a Chinese submarine without being sure of its type, especially in a crowded, noisy environment like the Taiwan Strait. Platitudes about caution are easy in peacetime. In wartime, when Chinese attack submarines might already have launched deadly strikes, the U.S. crew might decide to shoot first and ask questions later. Adding to China’s sense of vulnerability, the small size of its nuclear-armed submarine force means that just two such incidents would eliminate half of its sea-based deterrent. Meanwhile, any Chinese boomers that escaped this fate would likely be cut off from communication with onshore commanders, left without an escort force, and unable to return to destroyed ports. If that happened, China would essentially have no naval nuclear deterrent. The situation is similar onshore, where any U.S. military campaign would have to contend with China’s growing land-based conventional ballistic missile force. Much of this force is within range of Taiwan, ready to launch ballistic missiles against the island or at any allies coming to its aid. Once again, U.S. victory would hinge on the ability to degrade this conventional ballistic missile force. And once again, it would be virtually impossible to do so while leaving China’s nuclear ballistic missile force unscathed. Chinese conventional and nuclear ballistic missiles are often attached to the same base headquarters, meaning that they likely share transportation and supply networks, patrol routes, and other supporting infrastructure. It is also possible that they share some command-and-control networks, or that the United States would be unable to distinguish between the conventional and nuclear networks even if they were physically separate. To add to the challenge, some of China’s ballistic missiles can carry either a conventional or a nuclear warhead, and the two versions are virtually indistinguishable to U.S. aerial surveillance. In a war, targeting the conventional variants would likely mean destroying some nuclear ones in the process. Furthermore, sending manned aircraft to attack Chinese missile launch sites and bases would require at least partial control of the airspace over China, which in turn would require weakening Chinese air defenses. But degrading China’s coastal air defense network in order to fight a conventional war would also leave much of its nuclear force without protection. Once China was under attack, its leaders might come to fear that even intercontinental ballistic missiles located deep in the country’s interior were vulnerable. For years, observers have pointed to the U.S. military’s failed attempts to locate and destroy Iraqi Scud missiles during the 1990–91 Gulf War as evidence that mobile missiles are virtually impervious to attack. Therefore, the thinking goes, China could retain a nuclear deterrent no matter what harm U.S. forces inflicted on its coastal areas. Yet recent research suggests otherwise. Chinese intercontinental ballistic missiles are larger and less mobile than the Iraqi Scuds were, and they are harder to move without detection. The United States is also likely to have been tracking them much more closely in peacetime. As a result, China is unlikely to view a failed Scud hunt in Iraq nearly 30 years ago as reassurance that its residual nuclear force is safe today, especially during an ongoing, high-intensity conventional war. China’s vehement criticism of a U.S. regional missile defense system designed to guard against a potential North Korean attack already reflects these latent fears. Beijing’s worry is that this system could help Washington block the handful of missiles China might launch in the aftermath of a U.S. attack on its arsenal. That sort of campaign might seem much more plausible in Beijing’s eyes if a conventional war had already begun to seriously undermine other parts of China’s nuclear deterrent. It does not help that China’s real-time awareness of the state of its forces would probably be limited, since blinding the adversary is a standard part of the U.S. military playbook. Put simply, the favored U.S. strategy to ensure a conventional victory would likely endanger much of China’s nuclear arsenal in the process, at sea and on land. Whether the United States actually intended to target all of China’s nuclear weapons would be incidental. All that would matter is that Chinese leaders would consider them threatened. LESSONS FROM THE PAST At that point, the question becomes, How will China react? Will it practice restraint and uphold the “no first use” pledge once its nuclear forces appear to be under attack? Or will it use those weapons while it still can, gambling that limited escalation will either halt the U.S. campaign or intimidate Washington into backing down? Chinese writings and statements remain deliberately ambiguous on this point. It is unclear which exact set of capabilities China considers part of its core nuclear deterrent and which it considers less crucial. For example, if China already recognizes that its sea-based nuclear deterrent is relatively small and weak, then losing some of its ballistic missile submarines in a war might not prompt any radical discontinuity in its calculus.

#### Strong DIB solves multiple existential threats.

Hendrix 17 (Jerry Hendrix, naval expert at the Center for a New American Security. 7-26-2017, "Trump Acts To Revitalize America’s Defense Industrial Base," Breaking Defense, https://breakingdefense.com/2017/07/trump-acts-to-revitalize-americas-defense-industrial-base)

President Donald Trump has identified a fact few of his recent predecessors have understood: the Defense Industrial Base of the United States (DIB) is a critical component of our national security. The DIB is more important than any individual weapons program – be it an aircraft carrier, long range bomber, or high-tech tank. But for too long, the DIB has been ignored, mismanaged or even attacked.

With his signing of an executive order to review and revitalize America’s industrial base, the president has taken the first step to rebuilding the nation’s defense infrastructure. This will also encourage the restoration of redundancies in our industrial capability that are crucial both in peace time and in times of war. Like Ronald Reagan, President Trump also understands that DIB jobs are high-paying and give skilled workers in regions that have suffered from economic neglect a chance to get back to work in our factories and shipyards.

That he chose to sign the executive order on the USS Gerald Ford aircraft carrier Friday carries real symbolism. Only America has the capacity to build a super carrier. The Russians want such ships but cannot construct them and even the Chinese, with all of their recently-acquired shipbuilding prowess, are years away from replicating the Ford-class carriers that will soon enter America’s fleet. But this technological and manufacturing edge can no longer be taken for granted as the nation’s DIB becomes increasingly fragile.

With his focus on the DIB, Trump now follows in the footsteps of both Roosevelt’s, Theodore and Franklin. Each President Roosevelt served as the assistant secretary of the Navy, managing the rapid expansion of the US Navy prior to the Spanish-American War (Theodore) and World War I (Franklin). These experiences dramatically informed their understanding of the DIB during their presidencies. For Theodore Roosevelt, it was the “up-building” of the Great White Fleet that heralded the United States’ emergence as a world power at the dawn of the twentieth century. His cousin, Franklin, was required to shift the entire American economy to war footing, altering Detroit assembly lines from automobiles to bombers while building warships on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. That incredible output turned the tide of the war and defeated the Axis.

As the Cold War moved into full-swing, five star general-turned-president Dwight Eisenhower’s launched the Solarium project. The wise men of Solarium reviewed the entire breadth and depth of the American economy, identifying the areas to be strengthen if the United States was to win its competition with the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, much of the focus of the project was on America’s DIB. The Trump White House’s National trade Council its Industrial policy shop has come to the same conclusion today that the Solarium scholars did in the 1950s.

Like the Roosevelts, Eisenhower and Reagan before him, President Trump has inherited a world in crisis. A resurgent and aggressive Russia, a rising and assertive China, an Iran intent on establishing a Middle East hegemony and a nuclear-crazed rogue-state North Korea all are undermining the free market and rules-based international order that America has encouraged and protected for decades. In light of these challenges, a vibrant United States DIB is an imperative today just as it has been in past eras.

Trump’s executive order is necessary to address a generation of neglect of the DIB that followed the West’s victory in the Cold War. Dramatic contractions in defense spending, especially the Obama Administration’s sequestration program that it exacted from Congress in exchange for reopening the government, waves of industrial mergers and defense contractor consolidations and naïve strategic assumptions regarding the “end of history” have left the America’s DIB fragile and lacking in redundant capability. Trump’s executive order requires the government undertake a thorough inventory of the breadth and depth of the nation’s DIB so the administration can identify where it is thin and requires strengthening.

Unfortunately, many policy makers’s understanding of the DIB begins and ends with seeing ships, planes and tanks rolling off the factory assembly line. While impressive, the port, tarmac or tank parking lot give a very limited view of the DIB. What is not seen are the thousands of individual part and component manufacturers who supply the nation’s big defense factories. A missile assembly line in St. Louis may employ 500 people, but there are likely to be over a 1,000 workers, spread across the country, manufacturing the various parts that combine to produce just one of the missiles that ultimately rolls of the line.

Often, there are many suppliers of ubiquitous nuts, bolts and screws that go into a weapon, which is how it should be. In other cases, however, there is merely one supplier in the entire country of a key widget or component upon which an important weapon’s platform depends. It is well-known, for example in defense circles that critical items such as five-axis tooling machines or circuit boards, are in very short supply. Consequently, the DIB, like the nation’s overall economy, has come to depend on foreign manufacturers, including some that are China-based, for important defense components. Few questions are being asked in Washington how the nation might gain access to these foreign components in a time of war.

The narrowing of the country’s DIB is not just limited to subcontractors and suppliers. It has affected America’s great companies as well, many of which no longer exist. In the past, the United States boasted 10 major military aircraft manufacturers. Today we have four. During World War II, we had over 50 shipyard dry docks capable of producing warships over 400 feet in length, some of them on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. Today we have 12. Even among the dozen, several are under economic strain. America is down to one tank factory and it only produces a handful of tanks per year and exists only at the insistence of Congress, which has fought to keep it open.

The DIB is not just the sum of components, platforms, contractors and factories. It is also composed of the hundreds of thousands of welders, electricians, pipefitters, metal workers, heating and air conditioning specialists, tool makers, composite material molders, engineers, scientists, logistics specialists, test pilots and managers who actually invent and build our weapons systems. All of these jobs, and many more, skilled blue collar and while collar positions alike, are critical to the our country. They are solid, stable occupations that enhance our nation’s defense while also providing comfortable middle and upper income livings for the men and women engaged in them. Yet these jobs have disappeared at an alarming rate as the DIB has shrunk. Once the critical skills they embody are lost, it is very difficult to reconstitute them within the workforce. Thus, America’s current and future skilled defense industry work force should also benefit from the President’s executive order.

We recognize that in today’s economy, with its global supply chains and “just-in-time deliveries”, redundancy signifies inefficiency and waste. We are free marketeers and agree that the DIB should operate as efficiently as possible, but we reject the idea that all redundancies should be wrung out of the base or that we should be content to rely on foreign competitors for our national security.

It was not too long ago, at the height of the Cold War, that our national leadership was concerned about where important elements of our national defense could be produced if Soviet or Chinese nuclear strikes destroyed our major centers of manufacturing. Given the range of threats today, from asymmetric strikes and terrorism from Iran, North Korea or non-state actors to a peer competitor conflict with Russia or China, it is time again to care about a level of redundancy in the physical plants of our DIB.

Similarly, we do not have the luxury of simply assuming continued access to key foreign components in a time of crisis or war a time of war. For example long-range missiles are built with components that contain rare earth minerals that currently are only mined in China. In a crisis or conflict with China, such materials would no doubt be cutoff. Many key rare earth minerals are found and could be mined in the American West on a relatively cost-efficient basis but they are not for lack of encouragement from the federal government and industry, which has become complacent in its reliance on China.

We expect that President Trump’s executive order with lead to a true revitalization of America’s defense industrial base – both its physical plant and its skilled workforce. We believe that it will likely lead to the requisite level of redundancy returning to the defense sector. As a result, America will gain strength, which will go a long way to ensuring the peace during this time of crisis and uncertainty in the world. We applaud the President and his team for taking this important step as he joins an elite club of past presidents who had a similar vision.

#### Cascading wars escalate.

Helprin 15 Mark Helprin, senior fellow of the Claremont Institute, 6/22/15,”Indefensible Defense”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/419604/indefensible-defense-mark-helprin> - BS

\*edited for language – in brackets

Continual warfare in the Middle East, a nuclear Iran, electromagnetic-pulse weapons, emerging pathogens, and terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction variously threaten the United States, some with catastrophe on a scale we have not experienced since the Civil War. Nevertheless, these are phenomena that bloom and fade, and that, with redirection and augmentation of resources we possess, we are equipped to face, given the wit and will to do so. But underlying the surface chaos that dominates the news cycle are the currents that lead to world war. In governance by tweet, these are insufficiently addressed for being insufficiently immediate. And yet, more than anything else, how we approach the strength of the American military, the nuclear calculus, China, and Russia will determine the security, prosperity, honor, and at long range even the sovereignty and existence of this country. THE AMERICAN WAY OF WAR Upon our will to provide for defense, all else rests. Without it, even the most brilliant innovations and trenchant strategies will not suffice. In one form or another, the American way of war and of the deterrence of war has always been reliance on surplus. Even as we barely survived the winter of Valley Forge, we enjoyed immense and forgiving strategic depth, the 3,000-mile barrier of the Atlantic, and the great forests that would later give birth to the Navy. In the Civil War, the North’s burgeoning industrial and demographic powers meshed with the infancy of America’s technological ascendance to presage superiority in mass industrial — and then scientific — 20th-century warfare. The way we fight is that we do not stint. Subtract the monumental preparations, ~~cripple~~ [harm] the defense industrial base, and we will fail to deter wars that we will then go on to lose.

#### Turns case on multiple levels:

1---Link level---the aff decimates the DOJ’s ability to do anything antitrust related because they get overwhelmed with the immensity of the aff---they literally dump hundreds of massive cases on them, which causes DOJ failure and creates massive uncertainty across the industry

Failure or moderation of the DOJ suit signals that antitrust law is broken across industries.

Steven Pearlstein 20. Former business and economics columnist for The Washington Post and the Robinson professor of public affairs at George Mason University, 12/18/20. “Facebook and Google cases are our last chance to save the economy from monopolization.” https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/12/18/google-facebook-antitrust-lawsuit/?outputType=amp

Which is why the government’s recent decision to sue Google and Facebook is so significant.

First and foremost, these cases represent a recognition that regulators and judges were asleep at the switch over the past two decades and failed to prevent monopolization in the economy’s fastest-growing sector and a linchpin of American competitiveness.

The extent of that failure has now been laid out not only in the various suits filed by the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission and nearly every state attorney general, but also in similar cases brought by the European Commission and in an exhaustive report released this year by the antitrust subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

Simply by bringing these cases, the government will temporarily restrain the predatory instincts of Facebook and Google, which will be on their best behavior for the next five to eight years as the cases wind their way through the federal court system. More broadly, the cases will be seen as a legal shot across the bow of dominant firms in other highly concentrated industries — pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, financial services — who are now on notice that their nonstop acquisitions and hardball business practices could invite similar challenge.

Filing cases is one thing, of course, and winning them quite another — particularly given a steady stream of adverse rulings in recent decades from federal judges who, in the thrall of free-market ideology, have adopted an increasingly cramped and skeptical view of antitrust law. No less than the companies, state and federal antitrust regulators also have a lot riding on these cases. For if they fail to convince the courts that Google and Facebook acted illegally in entrenching their monopolies — or if they are forced to accept a settlement that leaves the companies intact and only modestly restrains their business practices — such a defeat will effectively signal the demise of antitrust enforcement in the United States.

“That would be a damning outcome,” warns Diana Moss, president of the American Antitrust Institute. “It would mean that anti-monopolization law is broken not just for digital platforms but for all sorts of different industries.”

#### Google suit’s outcome determines the direction of antitrust precedent.

Brent Kendall and Rob Copeland 20. Legal affairs reporter in the Washington bureau of The Wall Street Journal and reporter for The Wall Street Journal, 10/20/20. “Justice Department Hits Google With Antitrust Lawsuit.” https://www.wsj.com/articles/justice-department-to-file-long-awaited-antitrust-suit-against-google-11603195203

Some Big Tech detractors have called to break up Google and other dominant companies. Courts have indicated such broad action should be a last resort.

The outcome could have a considerable impact on the direction of U.S. antitrust law.

The Sherman Act, which prohibits restraints of trade and attempted monopolization, is broadly worded, leaving courts wide latitude to interpret its parameters. Because litigated antitrust cases are rare, any one ruling could affect governing precedent for future cases.

2---Impact Level---Readiness solves every threat---deters both state and non state actors from aggressing or escalating conflicts

#### The defense industrial base sustains US power projection, bolsters alliance credibility, and dampens hotspot escalation globally. Reducing arms sales decimates the synergistic cooperation that deters revanchist powers.

Trimble ’17 (Michael M; Major and Aircraft Mechanic in the US Air Force, overseen by Dr. Ronald Dains, PhD in Political Science from the University of Alabama; 3/17/17; “BEYOND MANAGERS OF VIOLENCE: THE REVOLUTION IN MILITARY ROLES AND THE FORCE OF THE FUTURE”; <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1054999.pdf>; Air Command and Staff College; accessed 10/7/19; TV)

AFPAK Hands and the C-27 represent extremes to be avoided, but security cooperation initiatives and the alliances they support, are vital to today’s American military operations. In early 2017, the national debt exceeds $19 trillion. US interests are besieged abroad while isolationism gains traction at home. China fortifies disputed claims in the South China Sea, building islands and airstrips despite its neighbors’ protests. Vladimir Putin’s Russia tests international norms regarding sovereignty, invading foreign lands and meddling in foreign politics. Islamist insurgencies endure, supported by Iran, despite decades of US operations in the Middle East. Meanwhile, as previously discussed, policymakers in Washington, DC look to the military to take on an ever-lengthening list of roles, missions, and demands. But despite such concerns, scholars G. John Ikenberry and David Rothkopf argue that US power remains “unrivaled”—that the United States currently faces fewer existential threats than at any other time in our history.39 An Air Force senior leader recently reminded an audience of Air Force officers that historically speaking, we are in an “interwar” period.40 I agree that the United States currently enjoys the ability to choose where to accept risk. But we cannot continue to demur in the face of aggression while competitors decisively pursue their interests. Without a clearer strategy and a force matched to that strategy, we slip toward a future in which more proactive states set the terms of the international order, and we are forced to act on their terms, or worse, rendered unable to act at all. To avoid such a future, given today’s economic and political constraints, the United States must accept the risks inherent to alliances, and build a force that is better prepared for twenty-first century international security challenges. The United States already maintains a great comparative advantage in coalition-building over its rivals. Ikenberry reports active US security cooperation with 60 nations, compared to Russia’s eight and China’s one.41 These alliances are vital to our efforts abroad, such as countering Chinese intimidation in the South China Sea. As is well known to any interested observer at this point, China has built up reefs and artificial islands with military-grade airstrips in the region, despite international condemnation, in order to project power and solidify its grandiose claim of sovereignty over that entire maritime region. 42 And for the time being, neither the United States nor even an increasingly expeditionary Japan can rationalize contesting Chinese expansion with force. Given its limited options, the Obama administration shrewdly increased diplomatic relations with Vietnam and Laos, and bolstered military partnerships with the Philippines and Australia, in order to counter Chinese influence in the region.43 Of course, alliances have challenges of their own. John Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago points out that alliances require resources, maintenance, and patience, and they always involve discord.44 But working to overcome these challenges can benefit partner nations’ security while enhancing the US defense posture in tense regions, and providing domestic benefits. As a case in point, during a 2016 visit to Hanoi, President Barack Obama repealed the US ban on arms sales to former enemy Vietnam. The repeal is one step in a long process, but it is a good first step. Foreign military sales increase partner nations’ capabilities and our diplomatic ties, while enriching our defense industry by keeping weapons programs alive long after the last US purchase.45 The F-16 is a good example: the USAF received its last F-16 in 2005, but exports continue, providing a long list of allies—including former enemy Iraq—with proven aircraft that enhance their defenses and increase interoperability with US forces.46 Foreign military sales must also satisfy a great deal of government, military, legal, and business rules in order to prevent compromising US technological advantages, inadvertently shifting regional balances of power, or inviting corruption. Improving our alliance with former enemy Vietnam within the prudent framework of foreign military sales will benefit the US defense industry and build mutual trust with a relatively new partner nation, helping to deter against Chinese aggression. FMS programs with allies can be expected to yield synergistic benefits in Eastern Europe and the Middle East as well, strengthening our partnerships at the expense of Russia, Iran, and radical Islamists. Building Synergy Today’s military and government elites love the term “synergy,” from the ancient Greek synergos, meaning “working together.” “Synergy” appears throughout joint warfighting doctrine, and is liberally applied whenever two or more organizations interact. Synergy can be deliberately planned for, as in the aforementioned diplomatic, military, and economic benefits of foreign military sales. At other times, synergy can be less deliberate, the result of a confluence of related events or geographical proximity of interested groups. Examples include the new levels of USallied military interoperability achieved during recent Pacific disaster responses, and the frequent public-private partnerships between the US Department of State and neighboring Georgetown University. The value of multinational security cooperation rests upon an institutional belief in synergy: US interests are too broad even for our ample resources; therefore, alliances must be nurtured, so that they remain a third pillar of our national defense. For example, bilateral and multinational large-force military exercises such as Cope India, Cobra Gold (Thailand), Combined Resolve (Eastern Europe), and Eager Lion (Jordan) bolster allied cooperation while honing US forces’ combat skills and exposing areas for improvement in their primary war-fighting capacities. While these exercises might not compare to the realistic operational and tactical challenges offered by the US-based Red Flag exercises, multinational exercises abroad have multiple, synergistic purposes. While there is certainly a benefit to honing one’s tactical skills against any opponent, especially against dissimilar types and tactics, the “optics” of such exercises also demonstrate America’s resolve to act as an offshore balancer in tense regions such as Eastern Europe and the South China Sea. Furthermore, large-scale multinational exercises can provide cover for actual combat deployments, leveraging the global access our alliances provide. Ikenberry summarizes the multiple rewards in simple terms: “Not only do alliances provide a global platform for the projection of US power, but they also distribute the burden of providing security.”47 Given the unappealing cost-benefit conclusions of more forceful options, for the foreseeable future the DOD should continue partnering and training with allies, old and new, in order to distribute the burdens of challenges like Chinese expansionism, Russian revanchism, and violent extremism.