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### Plan---1AC

#### The United States federal government should increase prohibitions on anticompetitive private sector business practices that substantially reduce bargaining power of workers in labor markets.

### Inequality---1AC

#### Increased concentration of buyer power in labor markets drives inequality---only antitrust can address the supply and demand side of wage suppression.

Lauren Sillman 20. Antitrust Associate, Clifford Chance LLP; J.D., Georgetown University Law Center; B.A., University of Iowa. “ANTITRUST FOR CONSUMERS AND WORKERS: A FRAMEWORK FOR LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS IN MERGER REVIEW.” https://lawjournal.ku.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4\_Sillman\_Antitrust\_V30\_I1.pdf

A détente is especially desirable today in light of the severe stagnation in American wages. In the past thirty-five years, U.S. gross domestic product has all in all grown but the purchasing power of the average worker has barely changed.3 Labor’s share of national income declined precipitously in the 2000s, and in the five years after the Great Recession it was lower than at any point since World War II.4 Because most people get most of their income from labor, and because those who get most of their income from capital tend to be wealthy, this income shift has dramatic consequences for inequality. Economists and policymakers have advanced numerous explanations for this troubling trend ranging from the decline of unions, to tighter monetary policy, to increased trade liberalization, and more.5 One explanation that has received attention in recent years is an apparent epidemic of market concentration and flagging competition.6 A growing body of evidence suggests that over time fewer and fewer firms have come to dominate sectors across the economy.7 One study found that from 1982 to 2012, the share of sales by the sectors’ top four firms increased in manufacturing, finance, services, utilities, retail trade, and wholesale trade.8 Average markups above cost—a manifestation of market power—rose from eighteen percent in 1980 to sixty-seven percent in 2014.9 This increase in concentration is due, in part, to a growing wave of mergers. By one count over 325,000 mergers have been announced since 1985.10 That year, around 2,000 mergers with a value of a little over $300 billion were announced.11 In 2018, 15,000 mergers occurred—valued at just under two trillion dollars.12 The ability of firms to charge prices for their products or services that exceed the competitive level harms workers in their role as consumers, and the reverberating inefficiencies have consequences for wages as well.13 Workers are harmed more directly, though by firms with buyer power in labor markets. Instead of enabling firms to charge high prices for the goods or services they sell, buyer power—also known as monopsony power—allows firms to push wages below the level workers would receive in competitive labor markets. A recent study applied the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), which is used to measure market concentration. The Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) (“the agencies”) used HHI in merger review, and found that at least forty percent of job markets fell into the “highly concentrated” category, making them especially susceptible to anticompetitive behavior by employers.14 The hiring markets for the twenty-five percent most concentrated occupations in almost every commuting zone in the country have concentration levels nearly tripled the “highly concentrated” threshold.15 In commuting zones across middle America, the hiring market for nearly every occupation is highly concentrated.16 As discussed below, a concentrated labor market generally increases the buyer power of participants in that market. Recent research on labor supply elasticity, which is an indicator of vulnerability to employers’ market power, further challenges traditional assumptions of competitiveness in labor markets.17 Historically, antitrust enforcers have given far less attention to firms’ power as buyers than as sellers and have been particularly hesitant to check their power as buyers of labor. However, the tide may be beginning to change. Federal and state enforcers have begun to challenge anticompetitive labor contracts,18 and there is a small but growing body of precedent addressing increased buyer power in mergers.19 In 2016, the Obama Administration’s Council of Economic Advisors issued a report describing the problem of labor market power and encouraging greater attention to the issue by the antitrust enforcement agencies.20 Separately, then-Acting Assistant Attorney General Renata Hesse stated that antitrust enforcement efforts should not only be concerned with the welfare of consumers, but should “also benefit workers, whose wages won’t be driven down by dominant employers with the power to dictate terms of employment.”21 Nevertheless, to date, the agencies have never blocked a merger on the basis of harm to workers. There are many reasons that may account for the dearth of enforcement, including misunderstandings of the relationship between labor and antitrust laws, the momentum of precedent focused on seller-side harms, and the resistance of some to increased antitrust enforcement as a general matter.22 In addition to these practical and ideological impediments, mistaken intuitions about the economics of buyer power create obstacles for enforcement. At first glance it would seem that if firms use their buyer power to lower their costs, downstream customers are ultimately benefitted. Therefore, the consumer welfare standard, which underpins modern antitrust enforcement, would seem to counsel against intervention contrary to buyer power. In most cases, though, this intuition is simply wrong.23 More competitive labor markets are not just good for workers; they are good for consumers too. Clarifying the relevant interests at stake is crucial as policy reforms begin in earnest, and there is reason to believe that such reforms are on the horizon. Several politicians have recently advocated for greater antitrust scrutiny of labor markets. For example, in 2017 Senator Amy Klobuchar introduced a bill that would require the enforcement agencies to pay greater attention to buyer power in merger review.24 Senator Elizabeth Warren—who seeks more interventionist antitrust policy on many fronts25—and Senator Cory Booker—who in 2017 sent a letter to the DOJ and FTC citing concern with the failure of the agencies to address labor market power—have also taken up the cause.26 Labor market issues are also garnering increased attention from antitrust scholars.27 In an article published in 2018, C. Scott Hemphill and Nancy Rose argued for more interventionist merger policy directed at various forms of buyer market power.28 The same year, Suresh Naidu, Eric Posner and Glen Weyl published Antitrust Remedies for Labor Market Power, a sweeping analysis of the myriad options available to enforcers to promote more competitive labor markets.29 This legal analysis has been spurred by a growing body of empirical work on buyer power in labor markets.30 An array of scholars concluded that labor market power is a problem and one that antitrust institutions should do more to address. This paper similarly argues that buyer power—and specifically buyer power in labor markets—deserves greater antitrust scrutiny and, to that end, develops a framework for systematically evaluating labor market power in merger analysis. The enthusiasm of some progressive politicians for more interventionist antitrust policy has drawn skepticism from many antitrust practitioners and scholars who worry that reforms will unmoor antitrust policy from its foundational principles and turn antitrust enforcement over to political whims.31 At least with respect to labor market power, however, economic theory and empirical evidence support increased enforcement without any reform of the basic legal framework and without deviating from substantial consensus about the proper role for antitrust in the economy.

#### Antitrust is key---permissive guidelines enabled the rise in monopsonies, expanding a worker welfare standard to labor markets is key to wage equality.

Joseph E. Stiglitz 21. Joseph E. Stiglitz is an economist and professor at Columbia University. He is the co-chair of the High-Level Expert Group on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress at the OECD, and the Chief Economist of the Roosevelt Institute. He has served as chief economist of the World Bank and chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in economics in 2001“Fostering More-Competitive Labor Markets” Inequality and the Labor Market: The Case for Greater Competition. Brookings Institution Press. (2021) https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctv13vdhvm.6

Of course, this is not the world in which we live. Even the corner grocery store knows it can raise its prices a little bit without losing all of its customers, which is what the standard competitive theory suggests. More and more, firms have demonstrated high and increasing levels of market power (Philippon 2019; Stiglitz 2019). At the same time, the bargaining power of workers has weakened. It was never an equal match. An employer typically can find an alternative worker far more easily than a worker can find an alternative employer. This is especially so during slack periods in the labor market, or in places where there has been persistent unemployment. Leaving or losing a job is often greatly disruptive to workers and their families. There are mortgages to pay, children to feed, bills coming due. From the perspective of workers, jobs are not easily substitutable. As the chapters in this volume make abundantly clear, this imbalance of market power has consequences. It enables firms to raise prices for goods and services—lowering the real incomes of workers. It enables firms to suppress wages of workers below what they would be in a competitive marketplace—contributing to the inequality crisis facing the country. This economic inequality gets translated into political inequality, especially in our money-driven politics, resulting in rules that evermore favor big corporations at the expense of workers. The growing political inequality, in turn, hampers economic performance, and ensures that most of the benefits of our anemic economic growth go to those at the very top (Stiglitz 2012). In the middle of the 20th century, John K. Galbraith (1952) described an economy based on countervailing power—where labor institutions and government checked the power of large corporations and financial institutions. But policy choices over the past half century have upset this balance in ways that have weakened not only the workers, but also the economy and the country. This volume explores what has happened by concentrating on one understudied part of the problem: the labor market. Explaining the Weakening of Workers’ Bargaining Power Multiple factors have contributed to the weakening of workers’ bargaining position. This volume focuses specifically on the ways that employers have increased their market power over workers. Employer Concentration Permissive antitrust enforcement has promoted concentration across industries, reducing the number of employers—particularly those in rural areas (Stiglitz 2016).1 With few alternatives, workers must accept the low wages that large local employers offer. More precisely, limited competition by buyers—in this case, employers who buy labor services—gives rise to monopsony power.2 Any firm with monopsony power knows that if it hires more workers, it will drive up the wage. The marginal cost of hiring an additional worker is thus greater than the wage. The result is lower employment and lower wages than if there were a competitive labor market. The chapter by Marinescu in this volume forcefully documents the degree of monopsony in labor markets across the United States, especially in rural areas—areas where, not surprisingly, wages lag behind the rest of the country. Collusion Typically there is some, but limited, competition in the labor market, but it is competition that is insufficient to achieve anything approximating what would emerge in a truly competitive marketplace. But employers often do not like even this limited competition, because even some competition means that wages are higher than they would be with no competition. Thus, firms sometimes collude to not compete; and that collusion drives down wages. The incentives for firms to do this—if they can get away with it—are obvious: collusion has been a feature of capitalism from the start. As Adam Smith observed in The Wealth of Nations, “Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform, combination, not to raise the wages of labour above their actual rate. . . . Masters, too, sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink the wages of labour even below this rate. These are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy” (Smith 1776, book 1, chap. 8). Even then, Smith had observed an asymmetry not only in bargaining power, but also in capitalists’ response to workers’ attempts to redress the balance. When workers combine their forces, “the masters . . . never cease to call aloud for the assistance of the civil magistrate, and the rigorous execution of those laws which have been enacted with so much severity against the combination of servants, labourers, and journeymen” (Smith 1776, book 1, chap. 8). This stance, of course, was markedly different from capitalists’ own behavior—not only in labor markets, but elsewhere, too. As Smith put it in one of his most famous statements, “People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices” (book 1, chap. 10). This issue is central: to redress the natural imbalance of bargaining power, workers have to band together and engage in collective bargaining. Unions are critical. But it is precisely because unions have been somewhat successful in redressing the imbalance that employers have worked so hard to suppress them, as I comment later in this introduction. Contracts In multiple contexts, business enterprises have not been satisfied with the increased profits brought by greater market concentration and occasional collusion. Businesses have figured out how to sustain and amplify those profits by the clever design of contracts that are conceived to inhibit competition in the labor market. This is another method that enables them to drive down wages still further.3 The chapters by Evan Starr and Terri Gerstein (this volume) provide ample evidence of the harmful impact of the misuse of labor contracts, noting in particular that often-used ruses distort the true impact on workers. Noncompete agreements, by definition, reduce competition. There might be some justification for not allowing employees with knowledge of trade secrets to go to work for competitors, but that hardly applies to employees of fast-food chains. Employers have also put into contracts provisions that weaken workers’ rights—and power—if a dispute arises. Inserting arbitration clauses into most contracts has moved dispute resolution out of the public domain— where it can be protected in the public interest, through transparency and basic standards—into private hands. This not only weakens workers’ position after a dispute arises, but also subtly changes the balance of power— making it easier for firms to take advantage of workers, knowing that their ability to get redress is so circumscribed. Making matters worse is a broader set of changes in legal frameworks that has hurt workers and consumers at the expense of corporations. For instance, the ability to bring class-action lawsuits, particularly in arbitration, has been greatly limited. Asymmetric Information The standard competitive theory assumes perfect information. Research over the past 50 years has explained how even a little information asymmetry can have a large impact. Employers have recognized this—they have figured out that such asymmetry can weaken workers’ position and lead to lower wages. They have responded by doing what they can to increase these asymmetries, sharing data with each other but insisting that workers keep their own compensation data confidential, and punishing employees who violate such confidentiality. The chapter by Harris in this volume describes the adverse effects of informational asymmetries, how firms have tried to increase these asymmetries, and what governments have done and can still do to promote transparency—and thus competition—in the labor market.

#### The plan solves inequality and wages.

Eric Posner 21. Professor at the University of Chicago Law School. “You Deserve a Bigger Paycheck. Here’s How You Might Get It.” https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/23/opinion/antitrust-workers-employers.html

The spectacle of the antitrust challenge to Big Tech has been riveting. But a far more consequential transformation in antitrust law has largely escaped notice — the movement to use antitrust law to address wage suppression and inequality caused by the power of employers in labor markets. Economic theory says that when a pool of workers has only one potential employer, or a small number of potential employers, those workers will be paid below-market wages. Without the credible threat to quit and work for a competitor, workers lack leverage that could allow them to secure a raise and better conditions. This situation is sometimes called monopsony, and it is similar to monopoly in the market for goods. When buyers have no choice among sellers, a monopolist can charge high prices; when workers have little choice among employers, the employer can “charge” low wages. Monopolies result in sluggish economic growth as well as high prices because in order to raise prices, monopolists make fewer goods or provide less in services. Companies that use their market power to suppress wages do something similar: They hire fewer workers, and this leads to unemployment and low growth as well. And because employers push down wages by reducing employment, they supply fewer goods, causing higher prices to consumers even though labor costs are reduced. A business might have monopoly power (over goods it sells), monopsony power (over workers), both or neither. If a small town has one newspaper, the newspaper has both a monopoly over local news and a monopsony over journalists. If the town has a single automobile manufacturing plant, that business will have a monopsony over the relevant skilled workers but not a monopoly over cars, which are sold into a national market where there are competitors. Economists have understood these things since Adam Smith, who famously called wage-fixing by employers “the natural state of things, which nobody ever hears of.” But economists did not take this risk very seriously until recently, instead usually assuming that employers compete vigorously for workers. As a result, though the logic for using antitrust law to address market power is the same for monopsony as it is for monopoly, the legal community did not embrace the possibility that antitrust law should be brought to bear against employers, except in unusual cases. But in recent years, thanks to the remarkable work of a diverse group of mostly young economists, this conventional wisdom was shattered. Exploiting vast data sets of employment and wages that had become available, they discovered that concentrated labor markets — that is, with one or few employers — are ubiquitous. In one paper, José Azar, Ioana Marinescu, Marshall Steinbaum and Bledi Taska found that more than 60 percent of labor markets exceeded levels of concentration that are regarded as presumptive antitrust problems by the Department of Justice. Numerous papers have made similar findings. In highly concentrated labor markets, wages fall — as economic theory would predict. For example, Elena Prager and Matt Schmitt examined hospital mergers and found that when hospitals expand through mergers and gain significant market power, the wage growth of employees declines. Notably, this decline affected skilled health care professionals like nurses — but not administrators and unskilled staff members like cafeteria workers, who could easily find jobs outside hospitals. The work on labor market concentration has been supplemented by growing evidence that employers collude with one another and engage in other anticompetitive practices. Evan Starr and his co-authors have found that agreements not to compete — where employers block workers from moving to competitors — are extremely common (as many as nearly 40 percent of workers have been subject to one) and are associated with lower wages. Alan B. Krueger and Orley Ashenfelter found that nearly 60 percent of major brand-name franchises — companies like McDonald’s and Jiffy Lube — subjected franchise employees to no-poaching agreements, which prevented them, even within the same franchise system, from quitting one employer to join another. As a result, many workers, especially in rural areas and small towns — areas subject to high unemployment and economic stagnation — are squeezed by employers and underpaid. For example, when farm equipment manufacturers merge, they close dealerships, and so a mechanic who used to be able to get a good job as several dealers competed for his work must accept a less-appealing job from the single place in the area or drop out of the labor market. Antitrust law applies to “restraint of trade,” and courts agree that when employers enter cartels to suppress wages, they violate the law. Yet until a few years ago, there were hardly any antitrust cases against employers. The major exception was a 2010 case against Big Tech after Google, Apple and other companies agreed not to solicit one another’s software engineers. This was potentially criminal behavior, but the Justice Department slapped them on the wrist. (A subsequent lawsuit secured more than $400 million in damages for the workers.) But it was the academic research, not the tech case, that finally woke the antitrust community from its torpor. In the past year, the Justice Department has brought several criminal indictments against employers for antitrust violations (the first ever). The Federal Trade Commission is pondering a rule to restrict noncompetes. State attorneys general brought cases against franchises and other employers that used no-poaching agreements and noncompetes. Congress is holding hearings next week on antitrust and the American worker. Private litigators have joined in as discoveries of abusive wage practices have piled up. For example, “Big Chicken” companies face lawsuits not only for fixing the prices of chicken but also for fixing the wages of their workers. If the academic research on labor markets is correct, then millions of Americans are paid thousands or even tens of thousands of dollars less than they should be paid. Labor monopsony affects people at all income levels, but it is a particular problem for lower-income workers and people living in stagnant rural and semirural parts of the country. In his recent executive order on antitrust, President Biden became the first president to commit government resources to ensure that the antitrust laws are used to help workers. Let’s hope he follows through.

#### Worker welfare is key.

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

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

#### Growing economic inequality drives diversionary nationalism and makes war inevitable.

Frederick Solt 11. Ph.D. in Political Science from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, currently Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa, Assistant Professor, Departments of Political Science and Sociology, Southern Illinois at the time of publication. “Diversionary Nationalism: Economic Inequality and the Formation of National Pride.” The Journal of Politics, Vol. 73, No. 3, pgs. 821-830, July 2011.

One of the oldest theories of nationalism is that states instill the nationalist myth in their citizens to divert their attention from great economic inequality and so forestall pervasive unrest. Because the very concept of nationalism obscures the extent of inequality and is a potent tool for delegitimizing calls for redistribution, it is a perfect diversion, and states should be expected to engage in more nationalist mythmaking when inequality increases. The evidence presented by this study supports this theory: across the countries and over time, where economic inequality is greater, nationalist sentiments are substantially more widespread. This result adds considerably to our understanding of nationalism. To date, many scholars have focused on the international environment as the principal source of threats that prompt states to generate nationalism; the importance of the domestic threat posed by economic inequality has been largely overlooked. However, at least in recent years, domestic inequality is a far more important stimulus for the generation of nationalist sentiments than the international context. Given that nuclear weapons—either their own or their allies’—rather than the mass army now serve as the primary defense of many countries against being overrun by their enemies, perhaps this is not surprising: nationalism-inspired mass mobilization is simply no longer as necessary for protection as it once was (see Mearsheimer 1990, 21; Posen 1993, 122–24). Another important implication of the analyses presented above is that growing economic inequality may increase ethnic conflict. States may foment national pride to stem discontent with increasing inequality, but this pride can also lead to more hostility towards immigrants and minorities. Though pride in the nation is distinct from chauvinism and outgroup hostility, it is nevertheless closely related to these phenomena, and recent experimental research has shown that members of majority groups who express high levels of national pride can be nudged into intolerant and xenophobic responses quite easily (Li and Brewer 2004). This finding suggests that, by leading to the creation of more national pride, higher levels of inequality produce environments favorable to those who would inflame ethnic animosities. Another and perhaps even more worrisome implication regards the likelihood of war. Nationalism is frequently suggested as a cause of war, and more national pride has been found to result in a much greater demand for national security even at the expense of civil liberties (Davis and Silver 2004, 36–37) as well as preferences for “a more militaristic foreign affairs posture and a more interventionist role in world politics” (Conover and Feldman 1987, 3). To the extent that these preferences influence policymaking, the growth in economic inequality over the last quarter century should be expected to lead to more aggressive foreign policies and more international conflict. If economic inequality prompts states to generate diversionary nationalism as the results presented above suggest, then rising inequality could make for a more dangerous world. The results of this work also contribute to our still limited knowledge of the relationship between economic inequality and democratic politics. In particular, it helps explain the fact that, contrary to median-voter models of redistribution (e.g., Meltzer and Richard 1981), democracies with higher levels of inequality do not consistently respond with more redistribution (e.g., Bénabou 1996). Rather than allowing redistribution to be decided through the democratic process suggested by such models, this work suggests that states often respond to higher levels of inequality with more nationalism. Nationalism then works to divert attention from inequality, so many citizens neither realize the extent of inequality nor demand redistributive policies. By prompting states to promote nationalism, greater economic inequality removes the issue of redistribution from debate and therefore narrows the scope of democratic politics.

#### Monopsonies are key---inequality hollows out economics resilience---shocks are inevitable, only worker stability makes recovery possible.

Kate Bahn 21. Washington Center for Equitable Growth Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, "Kate Bahn testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on monopsony, workers, and corporate power". Equitable Growth. 7-14-2021. https://equitablegrowth.org/kate-bahn-testimony-before-the-joint-economic-committee-on-monopsony-workers-and-corporate-power/

Thank you Chair Beyer, Ranking Member Lee, and members of the Joint Economic Committee for inviting me to testify today. My name is Kate Bahn and I am the Director of Labor Market Policy and the interim Chief Economist at the Washington Center for Equitable Growth. We seek to advance evidence-backed ideas and policies that promote strong, stable and broad-based growth. Core to this mission is understanding the ways in which inequality has distorted, subverted and obstructed economic growth in recent decades. Mounting evidence, which I will review today, demonstrates how the rising concentration of corporate power has increased economic inequality and made the U.S. economy less efficient. Reversing the trends that have led to a “second gilded age” is critical to encouraging a resilient economic recovery following the pandemic-induced economic crisis of 2020 and encouraging a healthy, competitive economy for the future. Introduction The United States boasts one of the wealthiest economies in the world, but decades of increasing income inequality, job polarization, and stagnant wages for most Americans has plagued our labor market and demonstrated that a rising tide does not lift all boats. Furthermore, economic evidence demonstrates how inequality results in an inefficient allocation of talent and resources while increasing corporate concentration that enriches the few while holding back the entire economy from its potential. Understanding the causes and consequences of the concentration of corporate power will guide policymaking in order to ensure that the economic recovery in the next phase of the pandemic will be broadly shared and ensure a more resilient economy. “Monopsony” is a key economic concept to understand in this discussion. Monopsony is the labor market equivalent of the better-known phenomenon of “monopoly,” but instead of having only one producer of a good or service, there is effectively only one buyer of a good or service, such as only one employer hiring people’s labor in a company town. Like in monopoly, this phenomenon is not limited to when a firm is strictly the only buyer of labor. Today I will explain the circumstances and effects of employers having significant monopsony power over the market and over workers. When employers have outsized power in employment relationships, they are able to set wages for their workers, rather than wages being determined by competitive market forces. Given this monopsony power, employers undercut workers. This means paying them less than the value they contribute to production. One recent survey of all the economic research on monopsony finds that, on average across studies, employers have the power to keep wages over one-third less than they would be in a perfectly competitive market. Put another way, in a theoretical competitive market, if an employer cut wages then all workers would quit. But in reality, these estimates are the equivalent of a firm cutting wages by 5 percent yet only losing 10 percent to 20 percent of their workers, thus growing their profits without significantly impacting their business. It is not only important for workers to earn a fair share so they can support themselves and their families, but also critical to ensure that our economy rebuilds to be stronger and more resilient. Prior to the current public health crisis and resulting recession, earnings inequality had been growing since at least the 1980s while the labor share of national income has been declining in same period. This is cause for concern as recent evidence suggests that the labor share of income has a positive impact on GDP growth in the long-run. The unprecedented economic shock caused by the coronavirus pandemic revealed how economic inequality leads to a fragile economy, where those with the least are hit the hardest, amplifying recessions since lower-income workers typically spend more of their income in the economy. But the crisis also demonstrated how economic policy targeted toward workers and families can provide a foundation for growth. This is because workers are the economy, and pushing back against the concentration corporate power by providing resources to workers is the foundation for strong, stable and broadly shared growth. The Causes of Monopsony The concept of monopsony was initially developed by the early 20th century economist Joan Robinson, who examined how lack of competition led to unfair and inefficient economic outcomes. The prototypical example of monopsony is a company town, where there is one very dominant employer and workers have no choice but to accept low wages since they have no outside options. This is the most extreme case, but it is important to note that firms have monopsony power in any circumstance where workers aren’t moving between jobs seamlessly in search of the highest wages they can get. Firms can use monopsony power to lower workers’ wages any time workers: Have few potential employers Face job mobility constraints Can only gather imperfect information about employers and jobs Have divergent preferences for job attributes Lack the ability to bargain over those offers I will go through each of these factors in turn and demonstrate how labor markets are unique compared to other markets in dealing with competitive forces. While concentrated labor markets are not the norm, they are pervasive across the United States, especially within certain sectors or locations. When markets are very concentrated, employers can give workers smaller yearly raises or make working conditions worse, knowing that their workers have nowhere to go to find a better job with better pay. (See Figure 1.) A study published in the journal Labour Economics by economists Jose Azar, Ioana Marinescu, and Marshall Steinbaum finds that 60 percent of U.S. local labor markets are highly concentrated as defined by U.S. antitrust authorities’ 2010 horizontal merger guidelines. This accounts for 20 percent of employment in the United States. Research by economists Gregor Schubert, Anna Stansbury, and Bledi Tsaka goes further by estimating workers’ outside options, or the likelihood a worker is able to change into a different occupation or industry. This study finds that even with a more expansive definition of job opportunities more than 10 percent of the U.S. workforce is in local labor markets where pay is being suppressed by employer concentration by at least 2 percent, and a significant proportion of these workers facing few outside options are facing pay suppression of 5 percent or more. As study co-author Anna Stansbury noted, “for a typical full-time workers making $50,000 a year, a 2 percent pay reduction is equivalent to losing $1,000 per year and a 5 percent pay reduction is equivalent to losing $2,500 per year.” Certain sectors are now very concentrated, such as the healthcare industry. In a paper by the economists Elena Prager and Matt Schmitt, they find that hospital mergers led to negative wage growth among skilled workers such as nurses or pharmacy workers. Consolidation and outsized employer power, alongside other phenomenon such as the fissuring of the workplace, may have broader impacts on the structure of the U.S. labor market when it affects the overall structure of the labor market, including the hollowing out of middle class jobs that have historically been a pathway for upward mobility.

#### It’s the key internal link to growth---wage depression constrains worker supply, constrains output, and decreases investment.

Sharon Block & Benjamin Elga 21. Sharon Block is the former executive director of the Labor and Worklife Program at Harvard Law School, where she also teaches. She currently serves as the Associate Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Benjamin Elga is the founding executive director of Justice Catalyst and Justice Catalyst Law. “The Legal Case for Reform”. Inequality and the Labor Market: The Case for Greater Competition. Brookings Institution Press. (2021) https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctv13vdhvm.7

Intuitively, it seems likely that less expensive inputs or lower wages would mean savings for firms to pass on to the consumers. But it turns out that inefficiencies and lack of competition in upstream markets have ripple effects that can harm everyone. In a competitive market, employers pay the market wage; when there are vacancies, a marginal increase in pay will follow so employers can fill those vacancies. Labor monopsonists have different incentives. If they raise pay to fill a marginal vacancy, they might also have to raise pay for their existing employees. The small increase in pay needed to attract one more worker could mean a massive swing in overall labor cost (Krueger 2017). So even if growth would generally be good for the company, they might not be able to add the workers they need specifically because of the special dynamics of controlling too much of the market.

This is an extreme example, but the same general principle applies when employers have the market power to depress wages below competitive levels. When the marginal cost of filling vacancies and growing one’s business to efficient levels diverges from the firm’s individual incentives for doing so, firms are constricted and leave jobs unfilled. Constraining inputs like labor leads to constrained outputs, and if firms are producing less of the products that consumers want, then prices for those products go up. After all, supply constraints and price increases are two sides of the same coin, economically. Fewer workers ultimately means fewer goods, and fewer goods means higher prices for the limited amount of goods available.4 Over time, this problem is magnified because fewer workers are incentivized to enter the field at all. The supply of qualified workers will go down, further reducing the firm’s ultimate output below efficient levels. In the end, everyone suffers except the firm with market power, which captures outsized profits.

Think: Why does America have a chronic undersupply of nurses or teachers, as well as stagnant wages (Council of Economic Advisers 2016)? In a competitive market, undersupply would lead to higher wages and increased entry to the field. If wages are inefficiently underpriced, we end up without enough nurses and ballooning healthcare costs. (Not to mention that, in the case of nurses, we end up with worse health outcomes for consumers!) This is part of the reason it is so problematic to interpret the consumer welfare standard to mean that short-term consumer prices are increased: presumed price effects could be irrelevant or misleading as to the overall effect on consumers.

Antitrust enforcement is supposed to be dynamic and to be able to keep up with the state of economic theory.5 But this cross-pollination is not in evidence. For example, even though inefficiency anywhere in the supply chain leads to worse outcomes for consumers, product market cases outnumber labor market cases by a factor of nearly 15, and in mergers by closer to 35. Moreover, no recent merger has been blocked on the basis of labor market effects alone (Levi 1948, 540, fn10). A quick foray into how antitrust law has developed follows.

#### Slow growth collapses the liberal order AND causes global hotspot escalation---extinction.
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Four structural forces will shape the future of International Relations: globalization (but without liberal rules, institutions, and leadership)1; multipolarity (the end of American hegemony and wider distribution of power among states and non-states2); the strengthening of distinctive, national and subnational identities, as persistent cultural differences are accentuated by the disruptive effects of Western style globalization (what Samuel Huntington called the “non-westernization of IR”3); and secular economic stagnation, a product of longer term global decline in birth rates combined with aging populations.4 These structural forces do not determine everything. Environmental events, global health challenges, internal political developments, policy mistakes, technology breakthroughs or failures, will intersect with structure to define our future. But these four structural forces will impact the way states behave, in the capacity of great powers to manage their differences, and to act collectively to settle, rather than exploit, the inevitable shocks of the next decade. Some of these structural forces could be managed to promote prosperity and avoid war. Multipolarity (inherently more prone to conflict than other configurations of power, given coordination problems)5 plus globalization can work in a world of prosperity, convergent values, and effective conflict management. The Congress of Vienna system achieved relative peace in Europe over a hundred-year period through informal cooperation among multiple states sharing a fear of populist revolution. It ended decisively in 1914. Contemporary neoliberal institutionalists, such as John Ikenberry, accept multipolarity as our likely future, but are confident that globalization with liberal characteristics can be sustained without American hegemony, arguing that liberal values and practices have been fully accepted by states, global institutions, and private actors as imperative for growth and political legitimacy.6 Divergent values plus multipolarity can work, though at significantly lower levels of economic growth-in an autarchic world of isolated units, a world envisioned by the advocates of decoupling, including the current American president.7 Divergent values plus globalization can be managed by hegemonic power, exemplified by the decade of the 1990s, when the Washington Consensus, imposed by American leverage exerted through the IMF and other U.S. dominated institutions, overrode national differences, but with real costs to those states undergoing “structural adjustment programs,”8 and ultimately at the cost of global growth, as states—especially in Asia—increased their savings to self insure against future financial crises.9 But all four forces operating simultaneously will produce a future of increasing internal polarization and cross border conflict, diminished economic growth and poverty alleviation, weakened global institutions and norms of behavior, and reduced collective capacity to confront emerging challenges of global warming, accelerating technology change, nuclear weapons innovation and proliferation. As in any effective scenario, this future is clearly visible to any keen observer. We have only to abolish wishful thinking and believe our own eyes.10 Secular Stagnation This unbrave new world has been emerging for some time, as US power has declined relative to other states, especially China, global liberalism has failed to deliver on its promises, and totalitarian capitalism has proven effective in leveraging globalization for economic growth and political legitimacy while exploiting technology and the state’s coercive powers to maintain internal political control. But this new era was jumpstarted by the world financial crisis of 2007, which revealed the bankruptcy of unregulated market capitalism, weakened faith in US leadership, exacerbated economic deprivation and inequality around the world, ignited growing populism, and undermined international liberal institutions. The skewed distribution of wealth experienced in most developed countries, politically tolerated in periods of growth, became intolerable as growth rates declined. A combination of aging populations, accelerating technology, and global populism/nationalism promises to make this growth decline very difficult to reverse. What Larry Summers and other international political economists have come to call “secular stagnation” increases the likelihood that illiberal globalization, multipolarity, and rising nationalism will define our future. Summers11 has argued that the world is entering a long period of diminishing economic growth. He suggests that secular stagnation “may be the defining macroeconomic challenge of our times.” Julius Probst, in his recent assessment of Summers’ ideas, explains: …rich countries are ageing as birth rates decline and people live longer. This has pushed down real interest rates because investors think these trends will mean they will make lower returns from investing in future, making them more willing to accept a lower return on government debt as a result. Other factors that make investors similarly pessimistic include rising global inequality and the slowdown in productivity growth… This decline in real interest rates matters because economists believe that to overcome an economic downturn, a central bank must drive down the real interest rate to a certain level to encourage more spending and investment… Because real interest rates are so low, Summers and his supporters believe that the rate required to reach full employment is so far into negative territory that it is effectively impossible. …in the long run, more immigration might be a vital part of curing secular stagnation. Summers also heavily prescribes increased government spending, arguing that it might actually be more prudent than cutting back – especially if the money is spent on infrastructure, education and research and development. Of course, governments in Europe and the US are instead trying to shut their doors to migrants. And austerity policies have taken their toll on infrastructure and public research. This looks set to ensure that the next recession will be particularly nasty when it comes… Unless governments change course radically, we could be in for a sobering period ahead.12 The rise of nationalism/populism is both cause and effect of this economic outlook. Lower growth will make every aspect of the liberal order more difficult to resuscitate post-Trump. Domestic politics will become more polarized and dysfunctional, as competition for diminishing resources intensifies. International collaboration, ad hoc or through institutions, will become politically toxic. Protectionism, in its multiple forms, will make economic recovery from “secular stagnation” a heavy lift, and the liberal hegemonic leadership and strong institutions that limited the damage of previous downturns, will be unavailable. A clear demonstration of this negative feedback loop is the economic damage being inflicted on the world by Trump’s trade war with China, which— despite the so-called phase one agreement—has predictably escalated from negotiating tactic to imbedded reality, with no end in sight. In a world already suffering from inadequate investment, the uncertainties generated by this confrontation will further curb the investments essential for future growth. Another demonstration of the intersection of structural forces is how populist-motivated controls on immigration (always a weakness in the hyper-globalization narrative) deprives developed countries of Summers’ recommended policy response to secular stagnation, which in a more open world would be a win-win for rich and poor countries alike, increasing wage rates and remittance revenues for the developing countries, replenishing the labor supply for rich countries experiencing low birth rates. Illiberal Globalization Economic weakness and rising nationalism (along with multipolarity) will not end globalization, but will profoundly alter its character and greatly reduce its economic and political benefits. Liberal global institutions, under American hegemony, have served multiple purposes, enabling states to improve the quality of international relations and more fully satisfy the needs of their citizens, and provide companies with the legal and institutional stability necessary to manage the inherent risks of global investment. But under present and future conditions these institutions will become the battlegrounds—and the victims—of geopolitical competition. The Trump Administration’s frontal attack on multilateralism is but the final nail in the coffin of the Bretton Woods system in trade and finance, which has been in slow but accelerating decline since the end of the Cold War. Future American leadership may embrace renewed collaboration in global trade and finance, macroeconomic management, environmental sustainability and the like, but repairing the damage requires the heroic assumption that America’s own identity has not been fundamentally altered by the Trump era (four years or eight matters here), and by the internal and global forces that enabled his rise. The fact will remain that a sizeable portion of the American electorate, and a monolithically proTrump Republican Party, is committed to an illiberal future. And even if the effects are transitory, the causes of weakening global collaboration are structural, not subject to the efforts of some hypothetical future US liberal leadership. It is clear that the US has lost respect among its rivals, and trust among its allies. While its economic and military capacity is still greatly superior to all others, its political dysfunction has diminished its ability to convert this wealth into effective power.13 It will furthermore operate in a future system of diffusing material power, diverging economic and political governance approaches, and rising nationalism. Trump has promoted these forces, but did not invent them, and future US Administrations will struggle to cope with them. What will illiberal globalization look like? Consider recent events. The instruments of globalization have been weaponized by strong states in pursuit of their geopolitical objectives. This has turned the liberal argument on behalf of globalization on its head. Instead of interdependence as an unstoppable force pushing states toward collaboration and convergence around market-friendly domestic policies, states are exploiting interdependence to inflict harm on their adversaries, and even on their allies. The increasing interaction across national boundaries that globalization entails, now produces not harmonization and cooperation, but friction and escalating trade and investment disputes.14 The Trump Administration is in the lead here, but it is not alone. Trade and investment friction with China is the most obvious and damaging example, precipitated by China’s long failure to conform to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles, now escalated by President Trump into a trade and currency war disturbingly reminiscent of the 1930s that Bretton Woods was designed to prevent. Financial sanctions against Iran, in violation of US obligations in the Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action (JCPOA), is another example of the rule of law succumbing to geopolitical competition. Though more mercantilist in intent than geopolitical, US tariffs on steel and aluminum, and their threatened use in automotives, aimed at the EU, Canada, and Japan,15 are equally destructive of the liberal system and of future economic growth, imposed as they are by the author of that system, and will spread to others. And indeed, Japan has used export controls in its escalating conflict with South Korea16 (as did China in imposing controls on rare earth,17 and as the US has done as part of its trade war with China). Inward foreign direct investment restrictions are spreading. The vitality of the WTO is being sapped by its inability to complete the Doha Round, by the proliferation of bilateral and regional agreements, and now by the Trump Administration’s hold on appointments to WTO judicial panels. It should not surprise anyone if, during a second term, Trump formally withdrew the US from the WTO. At a minimum it will become a “dead letter regime.”18 As such measures gain traction, it will become clear to states—and to companies—that a global trading system more responsive to raw power than to law entails escalating risk and diminishing benefits. This will be the end of economic globalization, and its many benefits, as we know it. It represents nothing less than the subordination of economic globalization, a system which many thought obeyed its own logic, to an international politics of zero-sum power competition among multiple actors with divergent interests and values. The costs will be significant: Bloomberg Economics estimates that the cost in lost US GDP in 2019- dollar terms from the trade war with China has reached $134 billion to date and will rise to a total of $316 billion by the end of 2020.19 Economically, the just-in-time, maximally efficient world of global supply chains, driving down costs, incentivizing innovation, spreading investment, integrating new countries and populations into the global system, is being Balkanized. Bilateral and regional deals are proliferating, while global, nondiscriminatory trade agreements are at an end. Economies of scale will shrink, incentivizing less investment, increasing costs and prices, compromising growth, marginalizing countries whose growth and poverty reduction depended on participation in global supply chains. A world already suffering from excess savings (in the corporate sector, among mostly Asian countries) will respond to heightened risk and uncertainty with further retrenchment. The problem is perfectly captured by Tim Boyle, CEO of Columbia Sportswear, whose supply chain runs through China, reacting to yet another ratcheting up of US tariffs on Chinese imports, most recently on consumer goods: We move stuff around to take advantage of inexpensive labor. That’s why we’re in Bangladesh. That’s why we’re looking at Africa. We’re putting investment capital to work, to get a return for our shareholders. So, when we make a wager on investment, this is not Vegas. We have to have a reasonable expectation we can get a return. That’s predicated on the rule of law: where can we expect the laws to be enforced, and for the foreseeable future, the rules will be in place? That’s what America used to be.20 The international political effects will be equally damaging. The four structural forces act on each other to produce the more dangerous, less prosperous world projected here. Illiberal globalization represents geopolitical conflict by (at first) physically non-kinetic means. It arises from intensifying competition among powerful states with divergent interests and identities, but in its effects drives down growth and fuels increased nationalism/populism, which further contributes to conflict. Twenty-first-century protectionism represents bottom-up forces arising from economic disruption. But it is also a top-down phenomenon, representing a strategic effort by political leadership to reduce the constraints of interdependence on freedom of geopolitical action, in effect a precursor and enabler of war. This is the disturbing hypothesis of Daniel Drezner, argued in an important May 2019 piece in Reason, titled “Will Today’s Global Trade Wars Lead to World War Three,”21 which examines the preWorld War I period of heightened trade conflict, its contribution to the disaster that followed, and its parallels to the present: Before the First World War started, powers great and small took a variety of steps to thwart the globalization of the 19th century. Each of these steps made it easier for the key combatants to conceive of a general war. We are beginning to see a similar approach to the globalization of the 21st century. One by one, the economic constraints on military aggression are eroding. And too many have forgotten—or never knew—how this played out a century ago. …In many ways, 19th century globalization was a victim of its own success. Reduced tariffs and transport costs flooded Europe with inexpensive grains from Russia and the United States. The incomes of landowners in these countries suffered a serious hit, and the Long Depression that ran from 1873 until 1896 generated pressure on European governments to protect against cheap imports. …The primary lesson to draw from the years before 1914 is not that economic interdependence was a weak constraint on military conflict. It is that, even in a globalized economy, governments can take protectionist actions to reduce their interdependence in anticipation of future wars. In retrospect, the 30 years of tariff hikes, trade wars, and currency conflicts that preceded 1914 were harbingers of the devastation to come. European governments did not necessarily want to ignite a war among the great powers. By reducing their interdependence, however, they made that option conceivable. …the backlash to globalization that preceded the Great War seems to be reprised in the current moment. Indeed, there are ways in which the current moment is scarier than the pre-1914 era. Back then, the world’s hegemon, the United Kingdom, acted as a brake on economic closure. In 2019, the United States is the protectionist with its foot on the accelerator. The constraints of Sino-American interdependence—what economist Larry Summers once called “the financial balance of terror”—no longer look so binding. And there are far too many hot spots—the Korean peninsula, the South China Sea, Taiwan—where the kindling seems awfully dry. Multipolarity We can define multipolarity as a wide distribution of power among multiple independent states. Exact equivalence of material power is not implied. What is required is the possession by several states of the capacity to coerce others to act in ways they would otherwise not, through kinetic or other means (economic sanctions, political manipulation, denial of access to essential resources, etc.). Such a distribution of power presents inherently graver challenges to peace and stability than do unipolar or bipolar power configurations,22 though of course none are safe or permanent. In brief, the greater the number of consequential actors, the greater the challenge of coordinating actions to avoid, manage, or de-escalate conflicts. Multipolarity also entails a greater potential for sudden changes in the balance of power, as one state may defect to another coalition or opt out, and as a result, the greater the degree of uncertainty experienced by all states, and the greater the plausibility of downside assumptions about the intentions and capabilities of one’s adversaries. This psychology, always present in international politics but particularly powerful in multipolarity, heightens the potential for escalation of minor conflicts, and of states launching preventive or preemptive wars. In multipolarity, states are always on edge, entertaining worst-case scenarios about actual and potential enemies, and acting on these fears—expanding their armies, introducing new weapon systems, altering doctrine to relax constraints on the use of force—in ways that reinforce the worst fears of others. The risks inherent in multipolarity are heightened by the attendant weakening of global institutions. Even in a state-centric system, such institutions can facilitate communication and transparency, helping states to manage conflicts by reducing the potential for misperception and escalation toward war. But, as Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu argues in his chapter on the United Nations, the influence of multilateral institutions as agent and actor is clearly in decline, a result of bottom-up populist/nationalist pressures experienced in many countries, as well as the coordination problems that increase in a system of multiple great powers. As conflict resolution institutions atrophy, great powers will find themselves in “security dilemmas”23 in which verification of a rival’s intentions is unavailable, and worst-case assumptions fill the gap created by uncertainty. And the supply of conflicts will expand as a result of growing nationalism and populism, which are premised on hostility, paranoia, and isolation, with governments seeking political legitimacy through external conflict, producing a siege mentality that deliberately cuts off communication with other states. Finally, the transition from unipolarity (roughly 1989–2007) to multipolarity is unregulated and hazardous, as the existing superpower fears and resists challenges to its primacy from a rising power or powers, while the rising power entertains new ambitions as entitlements now within its reach. Such a “power transition” and its dangers were identified by Thucydides in explaining the Peloponnesian Wars,24 by Organski (the “rear-end collision”)25 during the Cold War, and recently repopularized and brought up to date by Graham Allison in predicting conflict between the US and China.26 A useful, and consequential illustration of the inherent challenge of conflict management during a power transition toward multipolarity, is the weakening of the arms control regime negotiated by the US and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Despite the existential, global conflict between two nuclear armed superpowers embracing diametrically opposed world views and operating in economic isolation from each other, the two managed to avoid worst-case outcomes. They accomplished this in part by institutionalizing verifiable limits on testing and deployment of both strategic and intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Yet as diplomatically and technically challenging as these achievements were, the introduction of a third great power, China, into this twocountry calculus has proven to be a deal breaker. Unconstrained by these bilateral agreements, China has been free to build up its capability, and has taken full advantage in ramping up production and deployment of intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles, thus challenging the US ability to credibly guarantee the security of its allies in Asia, and greatly increasing the costs of maintaining its Asian regional hegemony. As a result, the Intermediate Nuclear Force treaty is effectively dead, and the New Start Treaty, covering strategic missiles, is due to expire next year, with no indication of any US–Russian consensus to extend it. The US has with logic indicated its interest in making these agreements trilateral; but China, with its growing power and ambition, has also logically rejected these overtures. Thus, all three great powers are entering a period of nuclear weapons competition unconstrained by the major Cold War arms control regimes. In a period of rapid advances in technology and worsening great power relations, the nuclear competition will be a defining characteristic of the next decade and beyond. This dynamic will also complicate nuclear nonproliferation efforts, as both the demand for nuclear weapons (a consequence of rising regional and global insecurity), and supply of nuclear materials and technology (a result of the weakening of the nonproliferation regime and deteriorating great power relations) will increase. Will deterrence prevent war in a world of several nuclear weapons states, (the current nuclear powers plus South Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Japan, Turkey), as it helped to do during the bipolar Cold War? Some neorealist observers view nuclear weapons proliferation as stabilizing, extending the balance of terror, and the imperative of restraint, to new nuclear weapons states with much to fight over (Saudi Arabia and Iran, for example).27 Others,28 examining issues of command and control of nuclear weapons deployment and use by newly acquiring states, asymmetries in doctrines, force structures, and capabilities between rivals, the perils of variable rates in transition to weapons deployment, problems of communication between states with deep mutual grievances, the heightened risk of transfer of such weapons to non-state actors, have grave doubts about the safety of a multipolar, nuclear-armed world.29 We can at least conclude that prudence dictates heightened efforts to slow the pace of proliferation, while realism requires that we face a proliferated future with eyes wide open. The current distribution of power is not perfectly multipolar. The US still commands the world’s largest economy, and its military power is unrivaled by any state or combination of states. Its population is still growing, despite a recent decline in birth rates. It enjoys extraordinary geographic advantages over its rivals, who are distant and live in far worse neighborhoods. Its economy is less dependent on foreign markets or resources. Its political system has proven—up to now—to be resilient and adaptable. Its global alliance system greatly extends its capacity to defend itself and shape the world to its liking and is still intact, despite growing doubts about America’s reliability as a security guarantor. Based on these mostly material and historical criteria, continued American primacy would seem to be a good bet, if it chooses to use its power in this way.30 So why multipolarity? The clearest and most frequently cited evidence for a widening distribution of global power away from American unipolarity is the narrowing gap in GDP between the US and China. The IMF’s World Economic Outlook forecasts a $0.9 trillion increase in US GDP for 2019–2020, and a $1.3 trillion increase for China in the same period.31 Many who support the American primacy case argue that GDP is an imperfect measure of power, that Chinese GDP data is inflated, that its growth rates are in decline while Chinese debt is rapidly increasing, and that China does poorly on other factors that contribute to power—its low per capita GDP, its political succession challenges, its environmental crisis, its absence of any external alliance system. Yet GDP is a good place to start, as the single most useful measure and long-term predictor of power. It is from the overall economy that states extract and apply material power to leverage desired behavior from other states. It is true that robust future Chinese growth is not guaranteed, nor is its capacity to convert its wealth to power, which is a function of how well its political system works over time. But this is equally the case for the US, and considering recent political developments is not a given for either country. As an alternative to measuring inputs—economic size, political legitimacy, technological innovation, population growth—in assessing relative power and the nature of global power distribution, we should consider outputs: what are states doing with their power? The input measures are useful, possibly predictive, but are usually deployed in the course of making a foreign policy argument, sometimes on behalf of a reassertion of American primacy, sometimes on behalf of retrenchment. As such, their objectivity (despite their generous deployment of “data”) is open to question. What is undeniable, to any clear-eyed observer, is a real decline in American influence in the world, and a rise in the influence of other powers, which predates the Trump administration but has accelerated into America’s free fall over the last four years. This has produced a de facto multipolarity, whether explainable in the various measures of power—actual and latent—or not. This decline results in part from policy mistakes: a reckless squandering of material power and legitimacy in Iraq, an overabundance of caution in Syria, and now pure impulsivity. But more fundamentally, it is a product of relative decline in American capacity—political and economic—to which American leadership is adjusting haphazardly, but in the direction of retrenchment/restraint. It is highly revealing that the last two American presidents, polar opposites in intellect, temperament and values, agreed on one fundamental point: the US is overextended, and needs to retrench. The fact that neither Obama nor Trump (up to this point in his presidency) believed they had the power at their disposal to do anything else, tells us far more about the future of American power and policy—and about the emerging shape of international relations—than the power measures and comparisons made by foreign policy advocates. Observation of recent trends in US versus Russian relative influence prompts another question: do we understand the emerging characteristics of power? Rigorously measuring and comparing the wrong parameters will get us nowhere at best and mislead us into misguided policies at worst. How often have we heard, with puzzlement, that Putin punches far above his weight? Could it be that we misunderstand what constitutes “weight” in the contemporary and emerging world? Putin may be on a high wire, and bound to come crashing down; but the fact is that Russian influence, leveraging sophisticated communications/social media/influence operations, a strong military, an agile (Putin-dominated) decision process, and taking advantage of the egregious mistakes by the West, has been advancing for over a decade, shows no sign of slowing down, and has created additional opportunities for itself in the Middle East, Europe, Asia, Latin America, the Arctic. It has done this with an economy roughly the size of Italy’s. There are few signs of a domestic political challenge to Putin. His external opponents are in disarray, and Russia’s main adversary is politically disabled from confronting the problem. He has established Russia as the Middle East power broker. He has reached into the internal politics of his Western adversaries and influenced their leadership choices. He has invaded and absorbed the territory of neighboring states. His actions have produced deep divisions within NATO. Again, simple observation suggests multipolarity in fact, and a full explanation for this power shift awaiting future historians able to look with more objectivity at twenty-first-century elements of power. When that history is written, surely it will emphasize the extraordinary polarization in American politics. Was multipolarity a case of others finding leverage in new sources of power, or the US underutilizing its own? The material measures suggest sufficient capacity for sustained American primacy, but with this latent capacity unavailable (as perceived, I believe correctly, by political leadership) by virtue of weakening institutions: two major parties in separate universes; a winnertake-all political mentality; deep polarization between the parties’ popular bases of support; divided government, with the Presidency and the Congress often in separate and antagonistic hands; diminishing trust in the permanent government, and in the knowledge it brings to important decisions, and deepening distrust between the intelligence community and policymakers; and, in Trump’s case, a chaotic policy process that lacks any strategic reference points, mis-communicates the Administration’s intentions, and has proven incapable of sustained, coherent diplomacy on behalf of any explicit and consistent set of policy goals. Rising Nationalism/Populism/Authoritarianism The evidence for these trends is clear. Freedom House, the go-to authority on the state of global democracy, just published its annual assessment for 2020, and recorded the fourteenth consecutive year of global democratic decline and advancing authoritarianism. This dramatic deterioration includes both a weakening in democratic practice within states still deemed on balance democratic, and a shift from weak democracies to authoritarianism in others. Commitment to democratic norms and practices—freedom of speech and of the press, independent judiciaries, protection of minority rights—is in decline. The decline is evident across the global system and encompasses all major powers, from India and China, to Europe, to the US. Right-wing populist parties have assumed power, or constitute a politically significant minority, in a lengthening list of democratic states, including both new (Hungary, Poland) and established (India, the US, the UK) democracies. Nationalism, frequently dismissed by liberal globalization advocates as a weak force when confronted by market democracies’ presumed inherent superiority, has experienced a resurgence in Russia, China, the Middle East, and at home. Given the breadth and depth of right-wing populism, the raw power that promotes it—mainly Russian and American—and the disarray of its liberal opponents, this factor will weigh heavily on the future. The major factors contributing to right-wing populism and its global spread is the subject of much discussion.32 The most straightforward explanation is rising inequality and diminished intergenerational mobility, particularly in developed countries whose labor-intensive manufacturing has been hit hardest by the globalization of capital combined with the immobility of labor. Jobs, wages, economic security, a reasonable hope that one’s offspring has a shot at a better life than one’s own, the erosion of social capital within economically marginalized communities, government failure to provide a decent safety net and job retraining for those battered by globalization: all have contributed to a sense of desperation and raw anger in the hollowed-out communities of formerly prosperous industrial areas. The declining life expectancy numbers33 tell a story of immiseration: drug addition, suicide, poor health care, and gun violence. The political expression of such conditions of life should not be surprising. Simple, extremist “solutions” become irresistible. Sectarian, racial, regional divides are strengthened, and exclusive identities are sharpened. Political entrepreneurs offering to blow up the system blamed for such conditions become credible. Those who are perceived as having benefited from the corrupt system—long-standing institutions of government, foreign countries and populations, immigrants, minorities getting a “free ride,” elites—become targets of recrimination and violence. The simple solutions of course, don’t work, deepening the underlying crisis, but in the process politics is poisoned. If this sounds like the US, it should, but it also describes major European countries (the UK, France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic), and could be an indication of things to come for non-Western democracies like India. We have emphasized throughout this chapter the interaction of four structural forces in shaping the future, and this interaction is evident here as well. Is it merely coincidence that the period of democratic decline documented by Freedom House, coincides precisely with the global financial and economic crisis? Lower growth, increasing joblessness, wage stagnation, superimposed on longer-term widening of inequality and declining mobility, constitute a forbidding stress test for democratic systems, and many continue to fail. And if we are correct about secular stagnation, the stress will continue, and authoritarianism’s fourteen-year run will not be over for some time. The antidemocratic trend will gain additional impetus from the illiberal direction of globalization, with its growth suppressing protectionism, weaponization of global economic exchange, and weakening global economic institutions. Multipolarity also contributes, in several ways. The former hegemon and author of globalization’s liberal structure has lost its appetite, and arguably its capacity, for leadership, and indeed has become part of the problem, succumbing to and promoting the global right-wing populist surge. It is suffering an unprecedented decline in life expectancy, and recently a decline in the birth rate, signaling a degree of rot commonly associated with a collapsing Soviet Union. While American politics may once again cohere around its liberal values and interests, the time when American leadership had the self-confidence to shape the global system in its liberal image is gone. It may build coalitions of the like-minded to launch liberal projects, but there will be too much power outside these coalitions to permit liberal globalization of the sort imagined at the end of the Cold War. In multipolarity, the values around which global politics revolve will reflect the diversity of major powers, their interests, and the norms they embrace. Convergence of norms, practices, policies is out of the question. Global collective action, even in the face of global crises, will be a long shot. To expect anything else is fantasy Unbrave New World and Future Challenges At the outset of this chapter we described these structural forces as interacting to produce more conflict and diminished prosperity. We also predicted a world with shrinking collective capacity to address new challenges as they arise. What specifically will such a world look like? We address below three principal challenges to global problem solving over the next decade. Interstate Conflict In the world experienced by most readers of this volume, conflict is observed within weak states, sometimes promoted by regional competitors, by terrorist groups, or by great powers, acting through surrogates or by indirect means. Sometimes, as in Syria, this conflict spills over to contiguous states and contributes to regional instability, and challenges other regions to respond effectively, a challenge that Europe has not met. Much of this will continue, but the global significance of such local conflicts will be greatly magnified by increasing great power conflict, which will feed—rather than manage or resolve—local instabilities and will in turn be exacerbated by them. Great powers will jockey for advantage, support their local partners, escalate preemptively. Conflicts initially confined to failing states or unstable regions will be redefined by great powers as global in scope and significance. This tendency of states to view local conflicts in the context of a zero-sum, global struggle for power is familiar to students of the Cold War, but now with the additional challenges to collective action, expanded uncertainty and worst-case thinking associated with the power transition to multipolarity. We can easily observe increased conflict in US–China relations, as we will in US–Russia relations as future US administrations try to make up for ground lost during the Trump presidency, especially in the Middle East. We can observe it among powerful states with mutual historical grievances, now with a weakening presence of the hegemonic security guarantor and having to consider the renationalization of their defense: Japan-South Korea, Germany-France. We can observe it among historical rivals operating in rapidly changing security landscapes: India-China. We can observe it within the Middle East, as internal rivalries are appropriated by regional powers in a contest for regional dominance. We can observe it clearly in Syria, where the regime’s violent suppression of Arab Spring resistance led to all-out civil war, attracted outside support to proxy forces by aspiring regional hegemons Saudi Arabia and Iran, enabled the rise of ISIS, and eventually to great power intervention, principally by Russia. In a world of effective great power collaboration or American primacy, the Syrian civil war might have been settled through power sharing or partition, or if not, contained within Syria. The collapse of Yugoslavia, occurring during a period of US “unipolarity” and managed effectively, demonstrates the possibilities. Instead, with the US retrenching, Middle East rivals unconstrained by great powers, and great power competition rising, the Syria civil war was fed by outside powers, then metastasized into the region, and—in the form of refugee flows—into Europe, fundamentally altering European politics. Libya may be at the early stages of this scenario. This is not the end of the Syria story. Russia has established itself as a major player in Syria and the Middle East’s power broker, the indispensable country with leverage throughout the region. China is poised to reap the financial and power benefits of Syrian reconstruction. The US has just demonstrated, in its act of war against the Iranian regime, its willingness, without consultation, to put its allies’ security in further jeopardy, accentuating the risks of security ties with Washington and generating added opportunities for Russia and China. The purpose here is not to critique US policy, but to point out the dramatically shifting power balance in a critical region, toward multipolarity. The dangers of such a shift will become apparent as some future US president attempts to reassert US influence in the region and finds a crowded playing field. Can a multipolar distribution of power among several states whose interests, values, and political practices are divergent, all experiencing bottom-up nationalist pressures, all seeking advantages in the oversupply of regional instability, be made to work? I think not. Will this more dangerous world descend into direct military confrontation between great powers, and could such confrontation lead to use of nuclear weapons? Here the question becomes, what will this more dangerous world actually look like; what instruments of coercion will be available to states as technology change accelerates; how will states employ these instruments; how will deterrence work (if at all) among several states with large but unequal levels of destructive capacity, weak command, and control, disparate— or opaque—strategies and simmering rivalries; can conflict management work in a world of weak institutions? The collapse of the Cold War era nuclear arms control regime, the threat to the Non-Proliferation Treaty represented by the demise of the JCPOA, and multiple indications of an accelerating nuclear arms race among the three principle powers, augurs badly. Given the structural forces at play, and without predicting the worst, we are indeed entering perilous times. Global Poverty and Inequality Despite the challenges of volatility and disruptive change inherent in globalization, the world under American liberal leadership has managed a dramatic reduction of extreme poverty. According to World Bank estimates, in 2015, 10 percent of the world’s population lived on less than $1.90 a day, down from nearly 36 percent in 1990.34 In fact, as of September 2018, half the world is now middle class or wealthier.35 The uneven success of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) exemplifies this achievement, and demonstrates what is possible when open markets are managed through strong global institutions, effective leadership and interstate collaboration. What this liberal hegemonic system did not achieve, however, was a fair distribution of the gains from globalization within states, and among those states that for various reasons were not full participants in this system. This record of partial achievement leaves us with a full agenda for the next fifteen years, but without the hegemonic leadership, strong institutions, ascendant liberalism or robust global growth that enabled previous gains. There are powerful reasons to question the sustainability of these poverty reduction gains, leading to doubts about the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, which have replaced the MDGs as global development targets.36 (See Jens Rudbeck’s chapter and Sidhu’s UN chapter for SDGs). Skeptics have pointed to slowing global growth, specifically in China, whose demand for imported commodities was a major factor in developing country growth and job creation; growing protectionism in developed country markets, fueled by bottom-up forces of nationalism, and from top-down by a weakened global trading regime and increased geopolitical rivalry; the effects of accelerating climate change on agriculture, migration and communal conflict in poor countries; and the growth burst among poor countries from the rapid transition to more efficient use of resources, a transition that is now slowing down.37 Perhaps the greatest concern in this scenario is a general deterioration in the developing country foreign investment climate. Foreign direct investment (FDI) has been a major contributor to growth, job creation, and poverty alleviation among poor countries. It has incentivized growthfriendly policies, reduced corruption, introduced technology and effective management practices, and linked poor countries to foreign markets through global supply chains.38 It has stimulated growth of indigenous manufacturing and service companies to supply new foreign investments. It has been the major cause of economic convergence between rich and poor countries. From 2000 to 2009, developing economies’ growth rates were more than four percentage points higher than those of rich countries, pushing their share of global output from just over a third to nearly half.39 However, FDI flows into poor countries are imperiled by the structural forces discussed here. Political instability arising from slower growth and environmental stress will increase investors’ perception of higher risk, reinforcing their developed country bias. Protectionism among developed countries will threaten the global market access upon which manufacturing investment in developing countries is premised, causing firms to pare back their global supply chains. As companies retrench from direct investment in poor countries, the appeal to those countries of Chinese debt financed infrastructure projects, under the Belt-Road Initiative with little or no conditionality, but at the risk of “debt traps,” will increase. Global Warming The question posed at the beginning of this section is whether the international system, evolving toward multipolarity and rising nationalism, will find the collective political capital to confront challenges as they arise. Global warming is the mother of all challenges, and the weakness in the system’s capacity to respond is clear. With the two major political/economic powers and greenhouse gas emitters locked in deepening geopolitical conflict (and with one of them locked in climate change denial, possibly through 2024), the chances of significantly slowing global warming or even ameliorating its effects are very slim. We are reduced to the default option, nation-specific adaptation to climate change, which will impose rising human, political and economic costs on all, and will widen the gap between rich countries with adaptive capacity (of varying degrees), and the poor, who will suffer deteriorating economic, political, and social conditions. (For a contrary, optimistic view see Michael Shank’s chapter, which credits new actors—like cities—as playing a more constructive role in climate mitigation.) This would bring to a close liberal globalization’s greatest achievement; the raising of 1.1 billion people out of extreme poverty since 1990,40 with all its associated gains in quality of life (in the WHO Africa region, for example, life expectancy rose by 10.3 years between 2000 and 2016, driven mainly by improvements in child survival and expanded access to antiretrovirals for treatment of HIV).41 Several forces are at work here. The problem itself is graver—in magnitude and in rate of worsening—than predicted by climate scientists. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the major source of information on global warming, has consistently underpredicted the rate of climate deterioration. This holds true even for its “worst-case scenarios,” meaning that what was meant as a wake-up call has in fact reinforced complacency.42 (see Michael Shank’s chapter for further discussion of climate change). The IPCC, in its 2019 report, has tried to undo the damage by emphasizing the acceleration in the rate of warming and its effects, the only partially understood dynamic of climate change, and—given wide uncertainty—the possibility of unpleasant surprises yet to come. This strengthens the scientific case for urgency—to both severely limit greenhouse gas emissions, and to increase investment in ameliorating the effects. Unfortunately, the crisis comes at a moment when the climate for collective action is ice cold. Geopolitical competition incentivizes states to out produce each other, regardless of the environmental effects. Multipolarity complicates collective action. Economic stagnation mandates job creation, making regulation politically toxic. Bottom-up nationalism/populism causes states to pursue “relative gains,” meaning that if the nation is seen as gaining in a no-holds-barred economic competition with others, the negative environmental effects can be tolerated. A post-Trump presidency would help, with the US rejoining the Paris Agreement, and lending its weight to tighter regulation, increased R and D, and stronger economic incentives to reduce carbon emissions. Keep in mind, however, that President Obama was fully behind such efforts, but in a deeply polarized America was unable to implement measures needed to fulfill the Paris obligations through legislation, and his executive orders to do this were swiftly overturned by Trump. Conclusion It may be tempting to hope that post-Trump, the US can regain its global leadership and exert its considerable power in a liberal direction, but with enough self-awareness of its relative decline to share responsibility with others. This was, I believe, the broad direction of the Obama strategy, evidenced by the JCPOA and the Trans-Pacific Partnership: liberal, collective solutions to global problems, as US dominance receded. This would constitute an optimistic scenario, and it confronts two major problems: can US internal politics support it (can, for example, the country legislate controls on carbon, essential for the global credibility and durability of such commitments); and is the world ready to reengage with American leadership, given the damage to its reputation and the structural forces discussed in this chapter? My educated guess is no, on both counts. The rot within is extensive, the concrete evidence clear in the economic inequality/immobility numbers, the life expectancy numbers, the deep political polarization, between the two major parties, between regions, between cities and rural areas. We are in fact a long way from fitness for global leadership, and the recognition of this by others will accelerate the decline of American influence. The rest of the world is well on its way toward adjusting to post-American hegemony, some by renationalizing their defense, or by cutting deals with adversaries, by building new alliances or by seizing new opportunities for influence in the vacuum left by American retrenchment. The evidence for this will accumulate. Observe the current and emerging Middle East, where all these post-hegemonic strategies are visible.

### Democracy---1AC

#### Advantage 2 is democracy:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Judicial activism undermines respect for rule of law and usurps democracy.

Jane S. Schacter 17. William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Law at Stanford Law School. “PUTTING THE POLITICS OF “ JUDICIAL ACTIVISM” IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE”. The Supreme Court Review Volume 2017. https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Jane.S.Schacter-Putting-the-Politics-of-Judicial-Activism-in-Historical-Perspective-2018.pdf

In 1980, as issues associated with the religious right rose, Republican rhetoric began to emphasize the idea that Democrats had shunted the family aside and “given its jurisdiction to the courts,” along with a call for judges who “respect the traditional family and the sanctity of innocent human life.”170 By 1984, when Ronald Reagan ran for reelection, Republicans offered a more fully elaborated set of institutional ideas about courts, arguing that: judicial power must be exercised with deference towards State and local officials; it must not expand at the expense of our representative institutions. It is not a judicial function to reorder the economic, political, and social priorities of our nation. The intrusion of the courts into such areas undermines the stature of the judiciary and erodes respect for the rule of law. Where appropriate, we support congressional efforts to restrict the jurisdiction of federal courts.171 The platform went on to “commend the President for appointing federal judges committed to the rights of law-abiding citizens and traditional family values,” “shar[ing] the public’s dissatisfaction with an elitist and unresponsive federal judiciary,” and calling for judges committed to “judicial restraint.”172 The language in George H. W. Bush’s 1992 acceptance speech marked the appearance of particular language about judicial activism that became common in GOP platforms and speeches thereafter. He said that Bill Clinton would “stock the judiciary with liberal judges who will write laws they can’t get approved by the voters.”173 By 1996 and the Dole campaign, the anti-activism rhetoric in Republican platforms was ramping up. At the same time, although no court had yet legalized same-sex marriage, the possibility of that result had been introduced by the Hawaii Supreme Court in a preliminary decision in 1993,174 and the Republican Party began to fold same-sex marriage into its portfolio of complaints about judicial activism. In 1996, for example, the platform applauded congressional passage of the Defense of Marriage Act, noting that it would prevent “federal judges and bureaucrats from forcing states to recognize other living arrangements as ‘marriages.’”175 Since 1996, references to same-sex marriage in relation to judicial activism have been a mainstay for Republican platforms. The 1996 platform also quoted the Tenth Amendment and said “[f]or more than half a century, that solemn compact has been scorned by liberal Democrats and the judicial activism of the judges they have appointed.”176 It admonished that: The federal judiciary, including the U.S. Supreme Court, has overstepped its authority under the Constitution. It has usurped the right of citizen legislators and popularly elected executives to make law by declaring duly enacted laws to be “unconstitutional” through the misapplication of the principle of judicial review. [These actions are] fundamentally at odds with our system of government in which the people and their representatives decide issues great and small.177 The sharper tone of 1996 has been maintained ever since. Succeeding platforms have argued, for example, that “scores of judges with activist backgrounds in the hard-left now have lifetime tenure” (2000 and 2004);178 the President should “name only judges who have demonstrated respect for the Constitution and the processes of our republic” (2000);179 “the sound principle of judicial review has turned into an intolerable presumption of judicial supremacy” (2004);180 “[j]udicial activism is a grave threat to the rule of law because unaccountable federal judges are usurping democracy, ignoring the Constitution and its separation of powers, and imposing personal opinions upon the public . . .” (2008);181 “judicial activism” is a “threat to the constitution” and “Republican Senators [must] do all in their power to prevent the elevation of additional leftist ideologues to the courts” (2012);182 and, most recently, the activist judiciary is a “critical threat to our country’s constitutional order,” and “only Republican appointments will enable the courts to begin to reverse the long line of activist decisions, including Roe, Obergefell and the Obamacare cases,” which have “expanded the power of the judiciary at the expense of the people and their elected representatives” (2016).183

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

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

3. Implications for Interpretation

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Democracy solves great power war.

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

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

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

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

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

### FTC---1AC

#### Advantage 3 is the FTC:

#### Khan is advocating for the aff but is constrained by the existing body of antitrust law---only adopting a new standard solves.

Tara L. Reinhart et al 21. \*Tara Reinhart is head of the Antitrust/Competition Group in Skadden’s Washington, D.C. office. She focuses on civil litigation and government investigations, with an emphasis on complex antitrust litigation and international cartel probes. \*Steven C. Sunshine is the head of Skadden’s Global Antitrust/Competition Group. He represents clients in connection with antitrust aspects of mergers and acquisitions, litigation, counseling and grand jury investigations. \*David Wales is recognized as a leading antitrust lawyer and has over 25 years of experience in both private and public sectors. His practice focuses on providing antitrust advice to U.S. and international clients in a wide range of industries on all aspects of antitrust, including mergers and acquisitions, alliances, criminal grand jury investigations, dominant firm conduct, distribution arrangements, licensing and competitor collaborations. \*Julia York has represented numerous global corporations in various industries, including pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, energy and financial markets, in both litigation and transactional matters. “FTC Chair Khan Highlights Key Policy Priorities Going Forward, but Aggressive Agenda Faces Uphill Climb” Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP and Affiliates. 10-04-21. <https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2021/10/ftc-chair-khan-highlights-policy-priorities>

In a September 22, 2021, memorandum to staff, Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Chair Lina Khan formally laid out her “Vision and Priorities for the FTC,” reaffirming her calls for broad antitrust enforcement organized around three key policy priorities: merger enforcement, dominant intermediaries and restrictive contract terms. The memo further describes her vision for the agency’s strategic approach and operational objectives to support those priorities. Like her prior calls for antitrust reform and aggressive enforcement,1 the policy priorities outlined by Chair Khan are somewhat abstract and do not specify concrete actions the agency will take to achieve them. However, a close review of these high-level priorities, approach and objectives reveals some **practical obstacles to implementation**, including limitations **imposed by resource constraints and the existing body of antitrust law.** Policy Priorities: Merger Enforcement, Dominant Intermediaries and Restrictive Contract Terms Chair Khan listed three policy priorities for the agency going forward. First, she identified a need to strengthen the agency’s merger enforcement work to combat what she described as rampant consolidation and the market dominance she believes that consolidation has enabled. In particular, she expressed a concern that markets “will only become more consolidated” absent FTC vigilance and assertive action. She noted that revising the merger guidelines will be important to achieve merger reform, characterizing prior iterations of the guidelines as a “somewhat narrow and outdated framework for assessing mergers.” She also highlighted a need to find ways to deter unlawful transactions, including “facially illegal deals.” Second, Ms. Khan indicated her desire to focus enforcement on “dominant intermediaries and extractive business models.” After suggesting that market power is an increasingly systemic problem in the economy, and that the FTC should devote resources to regulating the most significant actors — with “next-generation technologies, innovations, and nascent industries” requiring particular vigilance, she focused specifically on the market position of “gatekeeper” companies and “dominant middlemen.” Such entities, according to Chair Khan, have been able to “hike fees, dictate terms, and protect and extend their market power.” She also posited that the involvement of private equity and other investment vehicles may strip such businesses of productive capacity and harm consumers. In discussing the agency’s strategic approach to address these issues, Chair Khan noted her intention to “focus[] on structural incentives that enable unlawful conduct,” and to “look[] upstream at the firms that are enabling and profiting from this conduct.” Third, Ms. Khan discussed certain contract terms, including **noncompete provisions**, repair restrictions and exclusionary clauses, that she believes could constitute unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive trade practices. She also **advocated for a “holistic” approach to identifying harms to account for effects on workers** and independent businesses. Describing this holistic approach in broad terms, she indicated that the agency would **focus on “power asymmetries** and the unlawful practices those imbalances enable,” and the effects such conduct has, for example, on **marginalized communities**. In sharing her hopes to “further democratize the agency,” Chair Khan similarly expressed that the FTC’s work should help “shape[] the **distribution of power and opportunity** across our economy.” More generally, the memo identifies areas of investment for the agency to help achieve these priorities. This includes incorporating a greater range of analytical tools and skillsets into the agency’s work, and expanding the agency’s regional footprint to grow its ranks, including by hiring additional technologists, data analysts, financial analysts and experts from outside disciplines. Chair Khan also announced that she will name Holly Vedova and Samuel Levine, both career FTC staff (as opposed to political appointees), as the director of the Bureau of Competition and the director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection, respectively. Practical Limitations on Implementation of Chair Khan’s Policy Priorities Chair Khan describes the antitrust agenda outlined in her memorandum as “robust,” and the memo communicates her intention to attempt to reshape antitrust policy and enforcement. However, a revolutionary shift in antitrust enforcement by the FTC will **face substantial practical challenges.** Most significantly, the path to reshaping antitrust enforcement will be constrained by the substantial body of existing antitrust law and the need to convince a federal judge that the **conduct in question is unlawful**. Chair Khan’s memo generally advocates for a new, more expansive and holistic approach to identifying antitrust harms **beyond the traditional focus on consumer welfare** and price effects. However, **courts have — and will likely continue to — rely on existing standards developed** in the case law over many decades. Those standards focus on consumer welfare and predominantly price effects. **Absent legislative change**, then, a **practical gap** will persist between Chair Khan’s **vision of refocused and more assertive antitrust enforcement**, on the one hand, and **the law that would apply** to any FTC enforcement action, on the other.2

#### The CWS means they’ll lose cases on labor they’re bringing now.

Nicolás Rivero 21. NU Graduate. "Biden’s antitrust crusaders can’t crusade without Congress". Quartz. 3-11-2021. https://qz.com/1982437/lina-khan-and-tim-wu-need-congress-to-push-their-antitrust-agenda/amp/

US president Joe Biden is poised to promote two of the country’s most prominent anti-monopoly crusaders to top jobs in his administration. The moves signal that Biden is serious about cracking down on dominant companies that include Facebook, Google, Amazon, and Apple. But for the president’s trustbusting champions to make a real impact, they’ll need support from Congress.

Biden appointed Columbia law professor Tim Wu to the National Economic Council (NEC) as his top advisor on technology and competition on March 5. Politico reports that Biden will soon follow up by nominating Lina Khan, also a Columbia law professor, to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (Before she can take her seat as one of the antitrust agency’s five commissioners, Khan must be confirmed by the Senate.)

Khan and Wu are two of the leading voices in a new movement of legal thought that argues the US should fundamentally overhaul the way it approaches antitrust. The crux of their argument is that courts should broaden the values they consider when deciding whether to block a merger or break up a dominant company. Rather than focus narrowly on the impact a company has on consumer prices, they argue that judges should also think about a company’s impact on small businesses, labor rights, and the health of democracy.

Khan and Wu have already secured a win for their cause just by being appointed—essentially a White House stamp of approval on their viewpoints. But despite much handwringing from industry groups, neither appointee will be able to single-handedly remake American antitrust in their image.

How the FTC can tackle antitrust

To be sure, Wu can advocate loudly for his preferred policies from his perch at the NEC, which advises the president on economic policy. And if Khan makes it to the FTC, which is the top US antitrust enforcement agency, she’ll have direct influence over which investigations the agency prioritizes, which lawsuits it brings, and whether its prosecutors will ask judges to impose fines, break up dominant firms, or require them to change their business practices.

But there are clear limits to their power. The most the FTC can do is bring more antitrust cases that ask courts for more aggressive remedies, like breakups. That would allow the agency to make a point about what it considers acceptable business behavior. But many of those lawsuits would be bound to lose in front of judges who have grown far more skeptical of antitrust cases over the past four decades and far more conservative over the past four years.

A larger caseload would also require Congress to approve more funding for the cash-strapped agency, which is already struggling to pay for its current docket. “The agencies have been asked on many occasions to do a lot with relatively little…but it’s not for free,” says former FTC chair and George Washington University law professor Bill Kovacic. If the FTC wants to pursue more large cases without a bigger budget, “they’ll have to make choices, and those choices will involve backing off of other areas of enforcement.”

The FTC could also decide to dust off its rarely used rule-making power and declare certain anticompetitive business practices illegal. But any new rule would almost certainly trigger legal challenges, which would spark a long, expensive court battle in front of judges who aren’t likely to be sympathetic. Kovacic estimates the process could take four or five years—and in the end, judges might just strike the rule down.

How Congress can tackle antitrust

The best hope for stricter antitrust enforcement lies in Congress. Lawmakers could pass bills, like one recently proposed by Minnesota senator Amy Klobuchar, that would make it easier for enforcement agencies to challenge mergers and acquisitions. They could even go a step further and draft an updated set of antitrust laws, perhaps following the blueprint laid out in last year’s antitrust report from the House of Representatives (which was co-authored by Khan). Armed with new laws clearly banning specific behaviors, prosecutors at the Department of Justice and the FTC would stand a better chance winning cases against well-funded adversaries like Facebook and Google.

Those steps wouldn’t hinge on heroics from antitrust hardliners like Khan and Wu. Instead, their success would depend on the whims of Senate centrists like West Virginia’s Joe Manchin, who has lately been flexing his power to derail the chamber’s democratic majority in opposition to left-wing priorities like a $15 minimum wage.

Ultimately, Congress should be the body that sets US antitrust policy. It has the clearest authority to ban the bullying business tactics for which Big Tech firms have been criticized. Legislative fixes are likely to be quicker and less vulnerable to court challenges—not to mention more democratic—than changing FTC rules. And it has traditionally been Congress’s prerogative to keep the country’s antitrust policy up to date: Legislators updated the monopoly laws every two decades or so between 1890 and 1950 to respond to new threats. They’ve just neglected that tradition for the past 70 years.

#### That decimates the FTC---losses threaten the institution.

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

But the current FTC leadership seems to have overlooked the agency’s history. As such, it has already promised to produce different policy outcomes and noted that the Section 5 Policy Guidelines were shortsighted. As a result, the current FTC has decided, with the support of the other two Democratic Commissioners, to rescind the Policy Guidelines.

It is unknown whether the current FTC will try to adopt different guidelines or whether it will start opening more cases under Section 5 of the FTC Act. Furthermore, it is less clear whether the new FTC leadership currently counts with the sufficient and aligned Neo-Brandeisian human talent to bring solid cases that are not based on the consumer welfare standard or to litigate before judges that support the Neo-Brandeisian vision of antitrust.

What seems clear is that the new agency’s leader might find it hard to bring all Commissioners to an agreement with respect to what the agency can do with Section 5 of the FTC Act, and this situation, in and of itself, puts the agency in peril.

The FTC’s Rulemaking Authority

Another important policy change that may be detrimental to the FTC is its expressed willingness to expand the agency’s rulemaking authority under, e.g., Section 18 of the FTC Act. It is well known that in addition to its authority to investigate law violations by individuals and businesses, the FTC also has federal rulemaking authority to issue industry-wide regulations.

However, the agency’s rulemaking authority has been self-limited since the 80s in an effort to ensure the institution doesn’t overuse its capacity to adopt industry-wide regulations and raise concerns with those policy makers that are against the legislature deferring its core mandate to an independent agency that doesn’t represent the people.

Traditionally the legislature has the constitutional mandate to create laws affecting different sectors of the economy. Whereas it is legally accepted to design independent agencies with constrained mandates to adopt regulations, such powers are not necessarily understood to construe independent agencies as substitutes for the legislature’s powers. It is a basic tenet of administrative law, that agencies are constrained by the enabling statute that gives them authority to promulgate regulations in the first place.

Against this background, it seems risky for the new leadership to engage in broad rulemaking endeavors that might raise concerns from an institution legitimacy perspective. In the long term, it is predictable that many policymakers might not be supportive of an agency that implements its rulemaking authority in its broadest sense. As a result, some degree of political backlash against the agency might not help the agency’s lifecycle, especially if the agency is not granted with specific legislative guidance in the form of new legislation.

The Future of the FTC

One of the most challenging matters to tackle when it comes to leadership of antitrust authorities, or administrative agency for that matter, is legacy and the impact for the future of the agency. To put it simply, while antitrust leaders leave agencies, the side effects of leadership’s successes and failures condition the future of the agencies. Their leadership has consequences and sets precedent which will bind the agency well into the future.

Under the current political context, it would not be surprising if the current Neo-Brandeisian FTC enjoyed political support and success with its decision to bring big cases, especially against leading tech companies. In the short term, if the FTC makes headlines for opening cases against “Big Tech”, policymakers pushing for antitrust reforms will surely applaud the new changes as they would reflect a commitment to enhanced enforcement outcomes notwithstanding the strength of the cases.

However, in the mid-and long-term, if the FTC loses the big cases, the commitment to policy outcomes won’t be met. And then, it is unlikely that the question would be whether the antitrust norms are fit for today’s economy, but rather if the agency is capable of executing its mandate effectively. The recent decision in the FTC v. Facebook case is a good example of this paradigm, where the Judge expressed that the FTC had not carried out a sufficiently robust analysis supported by evidence, and therefore dismissed the case.

Eventually, the agency’s short-term reputational gains could quickly turn into a debacle for the institution itself with the caveat that by then, most probably, Neo-Brandeisian leadership will be long gone. Unfortunately then, the U.S. antitrust system — which is the only one to keep two federal antitrust agencies, bringing about positive outcomes for consumers — might be at risk. Political support to merge these two institutions could gain even more support, as has happened in the past, to the detriment of consumers.

#### Trust solves fraud and privacy violation---it’s a prerequisite to all reforms.

Testimony of Ted Mermin 21. Executive Director Center for Consumer Law & Economic Justice UC Berkeley School of Law. Before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy & Commerce Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce Hearing on “The Consumer Protection and Recovery Act: Returning Money to Defrauded Consumers”. https://docs.house.gov/meetings/IF/IF17/20210427/112501/HHRG-117-IF17-Wstate-MerminT-20210427.pdf

10. Trust the FTC. This final step informs all the others. There can be no doubt that there is more work to do protecting consumers than the FTC currently has the tools or resources to accomplish. There is also no doubt that the FTC has been trammeled in ways that its sister agencies, federal and state, have not. Whatever the reason, it is high time to retire the “zombie ideas” about the FTC – that the Commission is unnecessary, or overreaching, or heavy-handed, or inefficient.23 It is time, as one commissioner stated in Senate testimony last week, to “turn the page on the FTC’s perceived powerlessness.”24

For an American public eager for greater – not lesser – protection from increasingly sophisticated scam artists, deceptive advertisers, and privacy violating tech companies, building an effective FTC is an easy decision. It can and should be for this committee as well.

IV. Conclusion

This subcommittee meets at a remarkable historical moment, when the COVID-19 pandemic has revealed the profound need for a robust Federal Trade Commission just days after the Supreme Court made action by Congress an absolute necessity. This is a perilous time, with the chief protector of American consumers rendered nearly powerless just when those consumers are experiencing a heightened threat resulting from a once-in-a-century pandemic. The Consumer Protection and Recovery Act provides a critical first step toward restoring authority and effectiveness to the nation’s leading consumer protection agency.

Swift action to restore the FTC’s traditional 13(b) authority means that when constituents contact your office, and tell your staff that they have lost their life’s savings to a work-at-home scam, or their identity has been stolen and someone has opened accounts in their name, or they just spent their stimulus payment on a supposed cure for COVID for their grandmother who’s on a respirator – there will still be an agency to refer them to. No one wants that staffer to have to add: “Well, we could send you to the FTC, but they don’t actually have the power to get you your money back.”

Inaction or delay will mean no recovery for millions of wronged American consumers. The time to pass the Consumer Protection and Recovery Act is now.

#### Fraud funds terrorists.

Frank S. Perri 10. Frank S. Perri, J.D., CFE, CPA. "The Fraud-Terror Link:". No Publication. xx-xx-xxxx. https://www.fraud-magazine.com/article.aspx?id=4294967888

The threat of terrorism has become the principal security concern in the United States since 9/11. Some might perceive that fraud isn’t linked to terrorism because white-collar crime issues are more the province of organized crime, but that perception is misguided. Terrorists derive funding from a variety of criminal activities ranging in scale and sophistication – from low-level crime to organized narcotics smuggling and fraud. CFEs need to know the latest links between fraud and terror.

Credit card fraud, wire fraud, mortgage fraud, charitable donation fraud, insurance fraud, identity theft, money laundering, immigration fraud, and tax evasion are just some of the types of fraud commonly used to fund terrorist cells. Such groups will also use shell companies to receive and distribute illicit funds. On the surface, these companies might engage in legitimate activities to establish a positive reputation in the business community.

Financing is required not just to fund specific terrorist operations but to meet the broader organizational costs of developing and maintaining a terrorist organization and to create an enabling environment necessary to sustain their activities. The direct costs of mounting individual attacks have been relatively low considering the damage they can yield.

“Part of the problem is that it takes so little to finance an operation,” said Gary LaFree, director of the University of Maryland’s National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism.2 For example, the 2005 London bombings cost about $15,600.3 The 2000 bombing of the USS Cole is estimated to have cost between $5,000 and $10,000.4 Al-Qaida’s entire 9/11 operation cost between $400,000 and $500,000, according to the final report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.5

Terrorist groups require significant funds to create and maintain an infrastructure of organizational support, sustain an ideology of terrorism through propaganda, and finance the ostensibly legitimate activities needed to provide a veil of legitimacy for their shell companies.6 However, don’t think that only large operations are needed for terrorists to carry out attacks; small semi-autonomous cells in many countries are often just as capable of conducting disruptive activities without extensive outside financial help – they just conduct smaller-scale frauds.7

Even though the nexus between fraud and terrorism is undisputed, there’s concern at state and local levels that law enforcement professionals lack specialized knowledge on how to detect the fraud-terror link because they’re more apt to investigate and prosecute violent crimes.8

A critical lack of awareness about terrorists’ links to fraud schemes is undermining the fight against terrorism. Fraud analysis must be central, not peripheral, in understanding the patterns of terrorist behavior.9

#### Causes extinction---nuclear escalation.

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

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

#### FTC’s enforcement reputation solves global emerging tech---leadership and legitimacy are key.

Michael Spiro 20. JD from the University of Washington School of Law, an L.L.M. in Innovation and Technology Law from Seattle University School of Law. Corporate counsel at Smartsheet Inc. “The FTC and AI Governance: A Regulatory Proposal.” Seattle Journal of Seattle Journal of Technology Environmental & Innovation Law. Volume 10 Issue 1 Article 2. 12-19-2020. https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=sjteil

Despite these limitations, the FTC has a formidable reputation as an enforcement authority, and commercial entities, and their lawyers, pay close attention to its orders and decisions.248 For example, when the FTC issues a complaint, it is published on the FTC’s website, which often generates significant attention in the privacy community.249 One reason for this is the fear firms have of the FTC’s auditing process, which not only is “exhaustive and demanding,” but can last for as long as 20 years.250 As such, the FTC settles most of the enforcement actions it initiates.251 Firms are motivated to settle with the FTC because they can avoid having to admit any wrongdoing in exchange for taking remedial measures, and thus they also avoid the costs to their reputation from apologizing.252

Though done by necessity, the rule-making process the FTC engages in with its consent orders and settlement agreements can be of benefit when regulating emerging technologies. 253 For one, it allows the flexibility needed to adapt to new and rapidly changing situations.254 Further, the FTC can wait and see if an industry consensus develops around a particular standard before codifying that rule through its enforcement actions.255 As with the common law, which has long demonstrated the ability to adjust to technological changes iteratively, the FTC’s incremental case-bycase approach can help minimize the risks of producing incorrect or inappropriate regulatory policy outcomes.256

In addition to its use of consent orders and settlement agreements, the FTC has created a type of “soft law” by issuing guidelines, press releases, workshops, and white papers.257 Unlike in enforcement actions, where the FTC looks at a company’s conduct and sees how its behavior compares to industry standards, the FTC arrives at the best practices it develops for guidance purposes through a “deep and ongoing engagement with all stakeholders.”258 As such, not only is the FTC’s authority broad enough to regulate the use of emerging technologies such as AI in commerce, but the FTC’s enforcement actions also constitute a body of jurisprudence the FTC can rely on to address the real and potential harms that stem from the deployment of consumeroriented AI.259

Given its broad grant of authority, the regulatory tools at its disposal, and its experience dealing with emerging technologies, the FTC is currently in the best position to take the lead in regulating AI. The FTC’s leadership is sorely needed to fill in the remaining – and quite large – gaps in those few sectoral laws that specifically address AI and algorithmic decision-making.260 Several factors make the FTC the ideal agency for this role. First, the FTC can use its broad Section 5 powers to respond rapidly and nimbly to the types of unanticipated regulatory issues AI is likely to create.261

Second, the FTC has an established history of approaching emerging technologies with “a light regulatory touch” during their beginning stages, waiting to increase its regulatory efforts only once the technology has become more established.262 This approach provides the innovative space needed for new technologies such as AI to develop to their full potential. Thus, as it has in the past, the FTC would focus on disclosure requirements rather than conduct prohibition, and take a case-by-case approach rather than rely on rulemaking.263 Also, as it has traditionally done, the FTC can hold public events on consumer-related AI and issue reports and white papers to guide industry.264

In other words, the FTC has long taken a co-regulatory approach to regulation, which it can and should proceed to do with AI. As in other emerging technology areas, this will help industry continue to grow and innovate, while allowing for the calibration among all relevant stakeholders of the “appropriate expectations” concerning the use and deployment of AI decision-making systems.265 At the same time, the FTC should use its regulatory powers to nudge, and when necessary, push companies to refrain from engaging in unfair and deceptive trade practices in the design and deployment of AI systems.266 The FTC should also place the onus on firms that design and implement those systems to ensure misplaced or unrealistic consumer expectations about AI are corrected.267

By nudging (or pushing) firms in this way, the FTC can “gradually impose a set of sticky default practices that companies can only deviate from if they very explicitly notify consumers.”268 In terms of disclosure requirements, as it has done in other contexts, the FTC can develop rules and guidelines for “when and how a company must disclose information to avoid deception and protect a consumer from harm,” which can include requiring firms to adopt the equivalent of a privacy policy. 269 Given the black box like nature of most algorithmic decision-making processes, there is much that AI developers might have to disclose to prevent those processes from being deemed unfair or deceptive.270

In addition, given its broad authority under Section 5, the FTC is able to address small, nuanced changes in AI design that could adversely affect consumers, but that other areas of law, such as tort, may not be able to adequately handle.271 Again, this is important because AI and algorithmic decision-making can pose profound and systemic risks of harm, even though the actual harm to individual consumers may be small or hard to quantify. And as it has done in the area of privacy, the FTC can become the de facto federal agency authority charged with protecting consumers from harms caused by AI systems and other algorithmic decisionmaking processes.272

The FTC also can, and should, seek to work with other agencies to address AI-related harms, given that the regulatory efforts of other agencies will still occur and be needed in specific sectors or industries, which would impact and be relevant to the FTC’s efforts as well.273 Agency cooperation is essential to ensuring regulatory consistency, accuracy, and efficiency in the type of complex, varied technological landscape that AI presents.274 This should not be a problem as the FTC’s Section 5 authority overlaps regularly with the authority of other agencies, and the FTC itself has a history of cooperating with those agencies.275 Further, the FTC can use its experience working with other agencies to build standards and policy consensus within the regulatory community and among stakeholders. 276

The overarching role the FTC has played in protecting consumer privacy within the United States also has given it legitimacy within the wider privacy community. The FTC has been pivotal over time in promoting international confidence in the United States’ ability to regulate privacy by for example acting as the essential mechanism for enforcing the Safe Harbor Agreement with the European Union.277 As it takes on a similar overarching regulatory role for AI and algorithmic decision-making processes in this country, the FTC should gain a similar level of legitimacy internationally. This is important given the increasingly cross border nature of AI research and development.

#### Unregulated emerging tech cause extinction---outweighs nuclear war.

Anders Sandberg et al. 08. Anders Sandberg is a James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University. Jason G. Matheny is a PhD candidate in Health Policy and Management at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Milan M. Ćirković is senior research associate at the Astronomical Observatory of Belgrade. "How can we reduce the risk of human extinction?". Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. 9-9-2008. https://thebulletin.org/2008/09/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction/

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We may face even greater risks from emerging technologies. Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of extinction-level pandemics. The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to become exponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species. Although most pandemics “fade out” by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore’s Law.

Farther out in time are technologies that remain theoretical but might be developed this century. Molecular nanotechnology could allow the creation of self-replicating machines capable of destroying the ecosystem. And advances in neuroscience and computation might enable improvements in cognition that accelerate the invention of new weapons. A survey at the Oxford conference found that concerns about human extinction were dominated by fears that new technologies would be misused. These emerging threats are especially challenging as they could become dangerous more quickly than past technologies, outpacing society’s ability to control them. As H.G. Wells noted, “Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.”

Such remote risks may seem academic in a world plagued by immediate problems, such as global poverty, HIV, and climate change. But as intimidating as these problems are, they do not threaten human existence. In discussing the risk of nuclear winter, Carl Sagan emphasized the astronomical toll of human extinction:

A nuclear war imperils all of our descendants, for as long as there will be humans. Even if the population remains static, with an average lifetime of the order of 100 years, over a typical time period for the biological evolution of a successful species (roughly ten million years), we are talking about some 500 trillion people yet to come. By this criterion, the stakes are one million times greater for extinction than for the more modest nuclear wars that kill “only” hundreds of millions of people. There are many other possible measures of the potential loss–including culture and science, the evolutionary history of the planet, and the significance of the lives of all of our ancestors who contributed to the future of their descendants. Extinction is the undoing of the human enterprise.

There is a discontinuity between risks that threaten 10 percent or even 99 percent of humanity and those that threaten 100 percent. For disasters killing less than all humanity, there is a good chance that the species could recover. If we value future human generations, then reducing extinction risks should dominate our considerations. Fortunately, most measures to reduce these risks also improve global security against a range of lesser catastrophes, and thus deserve support regardless of how much one worries about extinction. These measures include:

### Solvency---1AC

#### Solvency!

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

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

Anticompetitive behavior. Plaintiffs would be able to base their case on any of the following anticompetitive acts: mergers in highly concentrated markets; use of noncompete and related clauses; restrictions on employees’ freedom to disclose wage and benefit information; unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act;38 misclassification of employees as independent contractors; no-poaching, wage-fixing, and related agreements that are also presumptively illegal under Section 1; and prohibitions on class actions. Of course, current law gives employees the theoretical right to allege these types of anticompetitive behavior, but the cases show a pattern of judicial skepticism, as noted earlier. Codification would help employees by compelling courts to take these claims seriously. Employers would be allowed to rebut a prima facie case of anticompetitive behavior by showing that the act in question would likely lead to an increase in wages.

This reform would strengthen and extend Section 2 actions against labor monopsonists by standardizing a list of anticompetitive acts. While not all of these acts are invariably anticompetitive, the employer would be able to defend itself by citing a business justification. For example, a noncompete could be justified because it protects an employer’s investment in training. If so, an employer could avoid antitrust liability by showing that its use of noncompetes benefits workers, who obtain higher wages as a result of their training.39

These reforms would strengthen Section 2 claims against labor monopsonies but would also preserve the doctrinal structure of Section 2. They would not generate significant legal uncertainty or require a revision in the way that we think about antitrust law.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Prioritizing worker welfare solves inequality

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

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

### Extra---Inequality---2AC

#### Concentration reduces wages---antitrust solves.

Zachary Brown 21. Program Associate. “The Harms of Monopolies on American Workers” Public Citizen. 11-2-21. <https://www.citizen.org/news/the-harms-of-monopolies-on-american-worker/>

Antitrust law and its enforcement **need a major overhaul.** Mergers of large corporations across the country disastrously impacts our economy. And while the broad economic effect of monopolistic rule often hogs all of the attention, we can’t forget the **strong impact** these corporate behemoths have on **American workers.**

In a hearing last month, the House Judiciary Committee took up this very problem. Multiple antitrust experts were called to testify. They illustrated that **effective antitrust protections benefit workers.** Just in case you missed it, here are a few quick hits from the hearing to keep you in the loop.

**More Competition, More Worker Empowerment**

Throughout the hearing, it was repeatedly shown that the lack of competition in the economic landscape **damages conditions for workers**. As markets become more concentrated, **income and wages decrease**, Brian Callaci, chief economist of the Open Markets Institute, testified. Additionally, labor market concentration also has a positive correlation with the amount of **labor rights violations**. Callaci went on to explain that monopsony power, in which there is one dominant buyer (employer) with many sellers (employees), leads to an unfair power balance that leaves workers at a distinct disadvantage. Put simply, if there’s an overwhelmingly powerful boss in town, they can set the salary to whatever they want without fear of competition.

During the hearing, we also heard about the effects of consolidation on workers from Daniel Gross, a delivery driver for United Parcel Service. Citing Amazon’s growth over the years, Gross explained that Amazon’s last mile delivery network especially harms workers because Amazon occupies an increasing percentage of the delivery market yet pays its workers less than UPS. Amazon’s unique power to link its online retail business to its delivery and logistics business puts other delivery services such as USPS, UPS, FedEx, and DHL at a clear disadvantage. This allows Amazons to unduly influence the market for labor conditions.

A Gap in Antitrust Law

Speaking to the distinct impact that the enforcement of antitrust laws could have on the labor markets, Eric Posner, a professor from the University of Chicago Law School, detailed a **“litigation gap” in antitrust** law. While antitrust cases usually revolve around the harms done to other companies, very few decisions consider the effects that mergers and monopolies **have on workers**. Concerns about mergers leading to higher prices are usually central to the debate, while concerns about mergers’ effect on wages are often treated as an afterthought. But recent research shows that **anticompetitive behaviors are just as prevalent in the labor market space** as the product market space.

Posner explained that the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission have never challenged a merger because of its anticompetitive effects on labor markets, specifically. Workers deserve fair resources, wages, and conditions – encouraging and protecting competition between companies provides the everyday worker better options.

We can find some encouragement that both President Biden and Jonathan Kanter, Biden’s recent nominee to lead the Justice Department’s Antitrust Division, have expressed an understanding of market concentration’s impact on workers. But it is up to all of us to keep the pressure on our elected officials and government.

Revamping antitrust enforcement to address effects on labor would **more equitably protect** **workers** across the country.

# 2AC

## Inequality

### AT: Turn

#### Inequality turns the DA---worker suppression hurts growth, prices, and innovation.

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

The economic consequences of labor market power are analogous to those of product market power. Product market power has two wellknown effects. It redistributes from consumers to the firm: consumers must pay more for products, and the firm earns greater profits at their expense. And it creates waste or deadweight loss. Some consumers would be willing to pay the efficient, marginal cost price that the firm would have charged in a competitive market but are not willing to pay the higher price the monopolist chooses to charge.

Similarly, monopsony power has two effects. It redistributes from workers to employers by lowering wages. And it creates waste: some workers would have been willing to work for the employer if they had been paid their full marginal revenue product but will quit if they are paid the marked-down wage the monopsonist offers. This leads to increased unemployment or nonemployment as workers find prevailing wages unacceptable and exit the labor force or refuse to take available jobs. Economic output also declines.

Monopsony power creates other negative effects as well. First, to the extent that the degree of monopsony power differs across employers, it will also lead to misemployment: workers may be more productive at employer A, which has a lot of labor market power, than at employer B, which has a little. But B may offer higher wages because of its limited labor market power. The worker may thus choose to work at B, lowering the productivity of the economy. Misallocation may be particularly severe because of the two-sided matching problem. If matches between workers and firms generate specific benefits, monopsony can distort which firms match which workers, which will lower the allocative efficiency of the market.

Second, employers will often cut benefits, rather than cut wages, to take advantage of workers who are locked into the job. The firm has no need to retain these workers and thus may wastefully degrade conditions of work these “stuck” workers particularly value, instead catering only to the workers the firm is worried about losing.26

Third, monopsony raises prices for consumers. This may seem counterintuitive: won’t lower wages to workers be passed through to consumers as reduced prices? That argument is often made as a defense of monopsony power.

In fact, however, this argument is wrong. To see this, note that if firms employ fewer workers, they will produce less output, resulting in higher prices. The labor cost savings accrue to the employer itself (or its shareholders), not to the buyers of its goods. Those buyers will pay a price that is determined by the structure of the product market, not the labor market. So, for example, if the employer is also a monopolist in the product market, it will charge the buyers the monopoly price—which is determined by how much buyers are willing to pay. And if the product market is competitive, the employer will charge prices for its goods that are no higher than the competitive price—with its competitors taking up the slack as the employer itself will produce less given its small workforce. The technical explanation is that while the firm lowers wages to workers, the cost to the firm of hiring workers rises as the firm now considers the fact that, when it hires an additional worker, it also will pay its other workers more. When a monopsonist hires a single worker, it must increase wages for all its workers. (Recall that employers cannot easily wage-discriminate.)27 If this seems paradoxical, note that it is merely the flip side of a well-understood feature of monopolistic control of product markets: that a monopolist produces fewer products and charges a higher price for them than does a competitive firm. Monopoly and monopsony are two sides of the same coin, and both harm labor and product markets.

Fourth, and precisely for this reason, monopsony power reinforces and exacerbates monopoly power. In fact, both can be seen as two alternative ways for the owners of capital to squeeze workers and thus reduce the returns to productive work and the output of the economy. The markdown on wages caused by monopsony and the markup on prices caused by monopoly are akin to taxes: payments that ordinary people must pay in order to go about their daily life as producers and consumers. However, the payments go not to governments to fund programs, but to firms and, ultimately, investors. And the payments do not spur investment and raise economic growth because they depend in the first place on the willingness of managers to leave capital idle to obtain market power, while driving workers out of the workforce and onto taxpayer-financed relief programs.

#### High wages don’t cause inflation.

Dr. Roy Cordato 18. Senior Economist, Emeritas. “The Myth of “Wage Push” Inflation” John Locke Foundation. 10-25-18. https://www.johnlocke.org/update/the-myth-of-wage-push-inflation/

Now, this doesn’t mean that we may not be seeing increased inflation over the coming months or years. For well over a decade, the Fed has been pursuing a policy of easy money. That’s what the talk of interest rates approaching zero and so-called “quantitative easing” has been all about. The fears of inflation that are all the chatter among the business commentator class are real and justified. What is **wrongheaded is the explanation that it might be caused by increased wages.** This also doesn’t mean that rising wages in certain sectors couldn’t be part of the story of how the new Fed-created money is working its way through the economy. New money flows from the Fed through the banks and into the economy unevenly. Therefore, **prices and wages are also bid up unevenly.** So, as different sectors of the economy receive the new money, possibly through new investment stimulated by the artificially low-interest rates, wages will rise. This, in turn, may lead to those wage earners having more money to spend on goods and services, which will drive up prices generally. But the **higher wages are not the cause of the inflation but a symptom of it.** The **idea that higher wages can cause inflation is simply bad economics**. It is part of the same discredited Keynesian analysis that tells us that government budget deficits create economic growth and that increased saving reduces it. As a wise graduate school professor of mine once told me, to ignore changes in money supply when trying to explain inflation is the equivalent of ignoring the eruption of Mount Vesuvius when trying to explain the destruction of Pompeii.

#### Prices hit a 30-year high.

Jeff Cox 11-10. “U.S. consumer prices jump 6.2% in October, the biggest inflation surge in more than 30 years” CNBC. 11-10-21. <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/11/10/consumer-price-index-october.html>

Inflation across a **broad swath of products that consumers buy every day** was even worse than expected in October, hitting its **highest point in more than 30 years**, the Labor Department reported Wednesday. The consumer price index, which is a basket of products ranging from gasoline and health care to groceries and rents, **rose 6.2%** from a year ago, the most since December 1990. That compared with the 5.9% Dow Jones estimate. On a monthly basis, the CPI increased 0.9% against the 0.6% estimate. Stripping out volatile food and energy prices, so-called core CPI was up 0.6% against the estimate of 0.4%. Annual core inflation ran at a 4.6% pace, compared with the 4% expectation and the highest since August 1991. **Fuel oil prices soared 12.3%** for the month, part of a 59.1% increase over the past year. Energy prices overall rose 4.8% in October and **are up 30%** for the 12-month period. Used vehicle prices again were a big contributor, rising 2.5% on the month and 26.4% for the year. New vehicle prices were up 1.4% and 9.8%, respectively. **Food prices also showed a sizeable bounce**, up 0.9% and 5.3% respectively. Within the food category, meat, poultry, fish and eggs collectively rose 1.7% for the month and 11.9% year over year.

## Democracy

### AT: Turn

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Expanding antitrust law won’t allow China to rise.

Shira Ovide 21. Shira writes the On Tech newsletter, a guide to how technology is reshaping our lives and world. "China Isn’t the Issue. Big Tech Is." New York Times. 6-17-2021. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/17/technology/china-big-tech.html

We need to have a vigorous debate about what Americans might gain or lose if government officials succeed in forcing changes to technology services and companies as we know them.

One thing that’s standing in the way of such a debate is fearmongering by tech companies and their allies. They tend to decry anything that might alter how Big Tech operates as somehow helping China win the future. It’s an intellectually dishonest tactic and a distraction from important questions about our future. It bugs the heck out of me.

What prompted my eye rolling was how tech companies have responded to a recent flurry of activity that could profoundly alter life for America’s tech superstars, and all of us who are affected by their products. Several Democrats in Congress have proposed new laws to crack down on big technology companies. And the new chair of the Federal Trade Commission, Lina Khan, has advocated for aggressive enforcement of monopoly laws to stop what she sees as big tech companies preying on consumers.

Those steps could unravel the status quo in technology, or not. We’re in a messy phase that makes it tricky to predict what Congress, states, courts and government enforcers might do to change the rules for tech companies — and whether it will do more good than harm.

But powerful corporations and people who support them aren’t grappling with the nuances. Publicly at least, they have responded as they often do, by essentially implying that guardrails on some U.S. technology companies create the conditions for China to take over the world. Somehow. Don’t ask how.

Here’s what an official at NetChoice, a group that represents Google, Facebook and Amazon, told The Washington Post about the crop of Big Tech regulation bills: “At the same time Congress is looking to boost American innovation and cybersecurity, lawmakers should not pass legislation that would cede ground to foreign competitors and open up American data to dangerous and untrustworthy actors.”

And this is what the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, a policy group that gets funding from telecommunications and tech companies, said this week about the appointment of Khan as F.T.C. chair: “In a time of increased global competition, antitrust populism will cause lasting self-inflicted damage that benefits foreign, less meritorious rivals.”

Sounds bad! You might notice that these statements don’t name China, which is the magic word to make stuff happen in Washington. But that’s what they mean by referencing unnamed foreign rivals.

Yes, it’s reasonable for Americans to want strong U.S. companies in a competitive global economy. But making a handful of tech kings play fair isn’t likely to break them.

As for the security arguments, the logic doesn’t work if you think about it for more than two seconds. Does preventing Amazon from selling its own brand of batteries — as one congressional bill might do — hold America back from fighting foreign cyberattacks? Nope. How do proposals that might restrain giant companies from doing whatever they want with our personal information weaken America on the world stage? They do not.

There are absolutely legitimate concerns about China shaping global technology or online conversations in ways that clash with America’s values and interests. It’s right to be concerned about China’s participation in swiping America’s secrets. That has almost nothing to do with whether Americans would be better off if Facebook were prohibited from buying the next Instagram or whether Apple shouldn’t be able to give a leg up to its fitness and music services on iPhones.

Restraining U.S. corporate powers from enriching themselves at the expense of Americans doesn’t weaken the country’s ability to restrain abuses by China or support competitive U.S. companies. We can do all of it.

#### Increasing worker welfare strengthens innovation.

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

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

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

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

## Innovation DA

### Innovation DA---2AC

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

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

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

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

The authors conclude that, when app developers are "threatened by the platform owner, they do not stop investing and innovating; rather, they shift innovation effort from affected markets to unaffected markets."39 They further conclude that "Google's entry threats and actual entry [can] discourage further investment in developing duplicative features [yet] encourage app developers to introduce more new apps in other markets" by creating incentives to design around the platform owner. 40 The study therefore illustrates the potential for the CW standard's focus on price effects to generate false positives: seizing on higher app prices might miss the potential for increases in innovation and variety. Even the short-run price effects that the authors observe may be endogenous, assuming that Google's entry is a signal for app quality and that app prices are correlated with their quality. Their findings also highlight the potential for the CW standard, through its focus on output effects, to generate false negatives: if independents are merely displaced into new app spaces by discriminatory treatment such that total short-run output is unfazed, intervention is unwarranted under the CW standard even though a platform provider has altered the trajectory of innovation, potentially dampening the incentives for future edge innovation. Traditional antitrust enforcement, at least under the CW standard, could not do this balancing; Congress would need to make a balancing decision and set the rules.

### Big Pharma DA---2AC

#### Consumers are still considered, just secondary to workers.

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

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

#### Pharma monopolies cause skyrocketing health care costs and undermine innovation.

Garrett Johnson and Wayne T. Brough 19. CNN Business Perspectives. “Big Pharma is abusing patents, and it’s hurting Americans” CNN Business. 09-12-19. https://www.cnn.com/2019/09/12/perspectives/drug-patents-abuse/index.html

The American patent system has, since our nation’s founding, served as a cornerstone of innovation. But the pharmaceutical industry’s willingness to undermine this system is having real **consequences for American patients.** The **skyrocketing cost of health care** has been fueled by rapidly rising prescription drug prices, which are significantly higher for Americans than patients in other wealthy countries. While some argue that this is just the cost of being a global innovator, it is more complicated than that, and a key source of the problem is the abuse of the patent system. Health care costs could be brought down through greater availability of generic drugs and biosimilars - drugs that are identical to branded drugs but distributed by another company after the original patent expires. Unfortunately, these lower-cost alternatives face an uphill battle to gain market access because pharmaceutical companies employ myriad tactics to prevent competition. Large pharmaceutical companies have continually engaged in the strategic accumulation of patents to restrict patient access to more affordable drugs by **delaying the entry of generic options into the market.** While some of the additional patents represent true incremental innovation, many are deployed strategically to preserve a company’s monopoly rights on the original discovery. All in all, the tactics used are not new or useful, they are simply a way for Big Pharma to maintain their drug monopolies and continue **charging American consumers more for drugs** than they could if they had competition in the market. Take Namenda, a drug produced by Forest Laboratories used to treat the confusion associated with Alzheimer’s Disease. Forest Laboratories faced generic competition on Namenda starting in 2015. Instead of competing with a generic drug on the market, the company responded by changing its formulation of Namenda from a twice-daily pill to a once-daily version. This new version was patented with protection on the product extending to 2029. The actions of Forest Laboratories were a clear example of the company’s attempt to game the patent system. In fact, they were successfully sued by the State of New York for attempting to block patients from having a choice between the twice-daily and once-daily pills and were forced to settle with New York and abandon their efforts. By gaming the patent system to secure monopolies on their products, pharmaceutical companies are **removing the motivation to innovate** because they are simply creating new patents that are similar in scope to previously obtained ones, thus creating a captured market. This lack of competition has resulted in price increases averaging 68% since 2012 for the top selling drugs in the United States.

#### Biden executive order thumps.

Theresa C. Carnegie and Lauren M. Moldawer 21. \*\*Theresa C. Carnegie counsels health care clients on a variety of transactional, regulatory, and fraud and abuse matters. \*\*Lauren M. Moldawer’s practice focuses on advising health care providers, PBMs, and managed care organizations on a variety of regulatory issues. “Biden Administration Takes Aim at Rising Drug Prices through its Executive Order on Promoting Competition” The National Law Review. 07-20-21. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/biden-administration-takes-aim-rising-drug-prices-through-its-executive-order>

On Friday, July 9, 2021, President Biden released an Executive Order “to promote competition in the American economy” and to “to reduce the trend of corporate consolidation” (the "Order"). As part of this Order, the Biden Administration **specifically targets competition** in the pharmaceutical industry and sets forth policies to **combat the high cost of prescription drugs.** As the Administration’s first major policy initiative on drug pricing, this Order may serve as a preview of the Administration’s drug pricing reform agenda. Canadian Drug Importation Among the more controversial provisions, the Order supports **importing drugs from Canada** as an effort to reduce prescription drug costs. The Order calls on the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to work with States seeking to import drugs under Section 804 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, known as the Section 804 Importation Program (SIP). FDA, under the Trump administration, previously implemented regulations and guidance to States and other entities seeking to import drugs from Canada through the SIP. In November 2020, Florida submitted a proposal to FDA to begin the importation of a limited number of drugs. HHS Plan to Address Drug Pricing Rather than calling on Congress to address drug pricing, President Biden is requesting that the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) develop a plan to address drug pricing by the end of the summer (Drug Pricing Plan). Specifically, within 45 days of the release of the Order, the HHS Secretary must develop and submit to the White House, a Drug Pricing Plan to: Continue the effort to combat excessive pricing of prescription drugs and enhance domestic pharmaceutical supply chains; Reduce the prices paid by the Federal Government for such drugs; and Address the recurrent problem of price gouging. Provisions Related to Generics and Biosimilars The Order also includes multiple provisions to increase the availability of generics and biosimilars. It specifically encourages the Federal Trade Commission to use its **rulemaking authority to combat unfair anticompetitive conduct.** In the Order’s press release, the Administration makes it clear that they are targeting “pay for delay” arrangements or other agreements to delay the market entry of generic drugs or biosimilars.

### AT: Innovation---2AC

#### Big pharma isn’t innovative.

Audrey Clare Farley 19. A lecturer in the history department at Mount St. Mary’s University. “Big Pharma Is Pushing a Big Lie” The New Republic. 05-10-19. https://newrepublic.com/article/153864/innovation-drug-price-myth

Lawmakers have floated other measures to reduce the cost of drugs to consumers, such as capping U.S. list prices at the median in other developed nations, authorizing Medicare to directly negotiate drug prices, and allowing the personal importation of prescription drugs from Canada. The pharmaceutical industry has invariably responded to these proposals by blaming high costs on “middlemen” who don’t pass rebates to patients and by doubling down on the **“innovation” myth**—the **unproven notion that high list prices are necessary to fund tomorrow’s breakthroughs.** For instance, at an April House Energy and Commerce Committee hearing on insulin prices, a representative of Sanofi, a French multinational pharmaceutical company, began her testimony with an anecdote about how Sanofi’s PCSK9 inhibitors (the latest generation of cholesterol drugs) saved the lives of her husband and 7-year-old son, both of whom have a genetic disorder called Familial Hypercholesterolemia (FH). In doing so, she inferred that the steep price of insulin and other drugs is necessary to advance medicine and protect future generations. The trouble is Sanofi didn’t identify the PCSK9 gene or link this protein-regulating gene to FH. Nor did the company have the idea to develop PCSK9 inhibitors to reduce the risk of cardiac events in those with this condition. Researchers at public hospitals and universities around the world collaborated on these tasks. Realizing the potential for profit, the drugmaker shepherded the therapy through later stage trials and FDA approval. Until very recently, Sanofi’s PCSK9 inhibitor, Praluent, retailed at $14,000 per year and was not always covered by insurance. Like insulin, the drug was priced out of many patients’ reach. It’s common for industry representatives to tell stories of individuals whose lives have been saved by innovation—or of individuals who are desperately waiting for a breakthrough. These emotional appeals should not distract from the facts: Big Pharma does not apply the majority of profits from costly medicines to research and development (R&D); **Big Pharma does not drive innovation**; and Big Pharma does not meaningfully invest in treatments for rare and neglected diseases. As industry representatives are sure to plug “innovation” again at the next hearing, and at other high-level discussions on drug prices, it’s important to understand the industry’s actual role in the development of lifesaving medicines. Industry spending on R&D is a **fraction** of what it spends on **marketing and lobbying**, and as many academics and journalists have noted, it also pales in comparison to the drug manufacturers’ claims. Citing a 2014 report by the industry-funded Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development, manufacturers have posited that it costs about $2.6 billion dollars to develop a new drug. The cost, according to consumer advocacy groups like Public Citizen, is actually closer to $161 million—an amount manufacturers can sometimes make back within days of introducing a product. For instance, drugmaker Novartis likely recovered R&D expenses for the leukemia drug Gleevec in less than two weeks. And drug companies’ contributions to R&D are even slimmer when considering government tax credits that come with these expenditures, which can reduce corporate costs by almost 50 percent. Drugmakers would also have us believe that scientists in corporate laboratories conduct the “basic” or preliminary research for most new medicines. Their ads feature in-house researchers peering in microscopes and studying brain scans. In reality, it is **the federal government** that **funds 84 percent** of initial drug research, and charitable organizations additionally contribute on top of that. A recent study showed that all 210 of the new drugs approved by the FDA between 2010 and 2016 were **funded by the National Institutes of Health.** This taxpayer-funded agency was behind Sovaldi, a novel treatment for Hepatitis C; Gleevec, which treats chronic myelogenous leukemia; and Cervarix, Gardasil, and Gardasil 9, vaccines that protect against HPV.

#### Monopolies reduce innovation.

Justus Haucap and Joel Stiebale 16. “Research: Innovation Suffers When Drug Companies Merge” Harvard Business Review. 08-03-16. https://hbr.org/2016/08/research-innovation-suffers-when-drug-companies-merge

Unfortunately, our recent research shows that antitrust authorities have been **too lenient**, at least when it comes to drug company mergers. We find that regulators have been overlooking how these mergers reduce innovation and research and development at the merging firms. That’s not the only thing regulators are largely ignoring. These mergers are also having a **sizable negative impact on innovation and R&D at** the combined firm’s rivals. It’s not unexpected that merging companies reduce their R&D spending following a merger. That may be due to the cost savings of pooling efforts and combining their labs. Research has shown that **pharma mergers reduce innovation**. But what’s suprising and troubling is that our new evidence shows that the merging companies’ competitors also spend less on R&D after the merger. Hence, industry **competition and innovation become less dynamic overall.** To be more precise, we **analyzed 65 pharma mergers** that were all scrutinized, but eventually approved, by the European Commission and also other jurisdictions. We wanted to know measurements of innovation (such as R&D spending and resulting patents) change after a merger for both the merging parties and for their rivals. What makes our study unique is that we compared firms’ innovation activities not only before and after acquisitions, but we also compared those merging companies to firms in similar pharmaceutical markets without merger activities. Our results very clearly show that R&D and patenting within the merged entity **decline substantially after a merger**, compared to the same activity in both companies beforehand. Then we applied a market analysis, the same one used by the European Union in its models, to analyze how the rivals of the merging firms change their innovation activities afterward. On average, patenting and R&D expenditures of non-merging competitors also fell — by **more than 20%** — within four years after a merger. Therefore, pharmaceutical mergers seem to substantially **reduce innovation activities in the relevant market as a whole.** What’s the reason for this? At least for the mergers we looked at, acquirers often target firms that have a relatively similar patent portfolio. That means there’s **less competition** for discovering and developing new therapies. If a non-merging rival is also researching similar therapies, that outside firm also now has one less competitior. It experiences a similar reduction in competition as the acquiring firm.

#### Drug companies exaggerate innovation.

Richard Frank 19. A professor of health economics at Harvard Medical School and previously (2014-2016) served as assistant secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. “Drug companies exaggerate — controlling drug prices won't threaten innovation” The Hill. 11-13-19. https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/470266-drug-companies-exaggerate-controlling-drug-prices-wont-threaten-innovation

In fact, the pharmaceutical industry frequently claims that any efforts to control prescription drug prices “threatens future innovation." The result is that for the **past 50 years** we have strongly emphasized innovation over affordability. It is time to **reconsider that balance. Drug companies have exaggerated the threats to innovation.** Most new drugs **aren’t that innovative**. The existing proposals to reduce prices leave many opportunities to make money from truly innovative drugs. And the drug industry could do a great deal to make their research and development activities much more efficient thereby reducing the need for such high prices. Let’s start with the level of innovation being supplied by the pharmaceutical industry. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently reported that novel drugs — those recognized by the FDA as meeting a previously unmet need or significantly advance patient care or public health — accounted by between **8 percent** and 18 percent of all drug approvals between 2005 and 2016. Academic research and industry data reflect a similar pattern. That is, the majority of new products enter markets where 5 products are already being sold Moreover, only 1/3 of products approved under priority review by the FDA were new to their class of treatments. So if drug companies claim lowering drug prices means somewhat fewer new drug launches, remember that there are numerous new products sold every year whose **elimination would have little to no impact on the health of Americans.**

## Trade DA

### Trade/Protectionism DA---Core---2AC

#### Trade’s down and protectionism’s up.

Marco Annunziata 21. Co-Founder of Annunziata + Desai Advisors and former Chief Economist at General Electric and Unicredit, 6/28/21. “Covid-19 shifts pattern of globalization.” https://www.omfif.org/2021/06/covid-19-shifts-pattern-of-globalisation/

Globalisation is undergoing a number of profound structural changes that we are only beginning to understand.

Global trade has diminished in importance. It was a major driver of global economic growth between the early 1990s and the onset of the 2008 financial crisis. Trade expanded at an average annual rate of 7% between 1992-2006, almost double the 3.7% average growth rate of global gross domestic product.

In the ten years after the financial crisis, the world economy expanded at almost the same pace, 3.5%, but global trade grew at a significantly lower 2.5%; it was no longer the primary driving force. The pandemic then caused a disproportionately severe shock to trade, which last year contracted by 5.5%, helping shrink the global economy by 3.3%.

Several factors combined to cut global trade.

Rising incomes in China and other emerging markets eroded the labour cost advantage. When companies decide where to open a new factory, cheap labour is no longer the predominant factor.

Protectionism has been on the rise. Even before former US President Donald Trump made trade wars fashionable, many countries had been resorting to a wide arsenal of trade barriers, from tariffs to local content requirements.

The pandemic has underscored the vulnerability of global supply chains to shocks that can come in a variety of flavours, from natural disasters to geopolitical tensions.

The pandemic was the most severe and unexpected issue; it came on top of ongoing disruptions to trade and caused havoc in domestic production sectors. The consequences have been staggering. If you are in the US and want to order a new car today, you’ll probably have to wait a year for delivery. If your fridge breaks down, good luck finding a new one. When Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell says he’s confident these problems will sort themselves out in a few months, a lot of people in the corporate world must be rolling their eyes.

Key raw materials are also rising in both economic and geopolitical importance. Technological innovation is making some raw materials a lot more sought after than ever. Lithium is essential for the development of batteries and electric vehicles. Rare earth metals are crucial for electronics, clean energy and the military. Titanium is needed in aviation, space technology and health care.

In short, a limited number of natural resources hold the key to industries that will drive prosperity and guarantee national security in the coming decades. But reserves and production of these natural resources are unevenly distributed, often concentrated in countries such as China and Russia. This has encouraged many countries to adopt an active strategic approach, where natural resources and supply chains become a geopolitical asset. China, for example, has made no secret of its goal to achieve global leadership in most high-tech industries.

Alongside these considerations, industrial corporates are changing their strategies. They have already started to react to the new global situation by striving to make their supply chains more flexible and resilient. This means making supply chains more local. They are taking advantage of innovations like manufacturing platforms that provide real-time access to a wider range of suppliers and 3D printing that allows for smaller-scale and more distributed production. This has begun to drive reshoring of production and jobs to the US and other developed economies. Some corporates are also working to develop reserves of strategic natural resources in the US. Western governments are taking heed, prioritising investment in infrastructure as well as research and development to support domestic investment and innovation.

These changes are persistent and mutually reinforcing. Governments across the globe are showing extreme caution and reluctance to relax the myriad restrictions imposed in response to the pandemic. In the end, Covid-19 will have disrupted our economies and lives for at least two years. Fear of a new pandemic will influence individual and economic behaviour for much longer.

The economic and geostrategic competition between the US and China will dominate the global scene for the next decades. The rediscovered importance of national economic priorities is also here to stay. International media like to showcase the return of globalist leaders like President Joe Biden in the US and Prime Minister Mario Draghi in Italy in contrast to the demonised populist trend epitomised by Trump and Brexit.

But the truth is that governments will remain a lot more focused on local jobs and incomes than ever before, especially once they exhaust the current scope for sustaining local living standards through debt financed fiscal handouts.

#### If COVID doesn’t trigger their impacts, nothing will.

Pepita Barlow et al. 21. Assistant Professor of Health Policy at the London School of Economics and Political Science, with May CI van Schalkwyk, MPH, Prof Martin McKee, DSc, Prof Ron Labonté, PhD, and Prof David Stuckler, PhD, February. “COVID-19 and the collapse of global trade: building an effective public health response.” https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(20)30291-6/fulltext

The COVID-19 pandemic is primarily a health crisis, but it has become clear that it has ramifications that extend to many aspects of the international order. International trade is especially hard hit; global merchandise trade recorded its largest ever one-period decline in the second quarter of 2020, falling 14·3% compared with the previous period.1 Although there has since been a partial rebound as lockdowns eased during summer in the northern hemisphere, total global merchandise trade for 2020 is forecast to fall by 9·2% in 2020, and a recovery to the precrisis trend is unlikely for several years. These changes to the global trading landscape have wide-ranging consequences for physical and mental health, as they affect supplies of drugs and medical equipment, nutrition and food security, and government income necessary to pay for health services.

To understand the possible health consequences of this evolving situation and how best to respond, it is first necessary to understand the reasons why trade is declining. Although most economic shocks are precipitated either by reductions in demand (eg, due to bank failures and income losses) or supply (eg, with sudden increases in prices and rising production costs), COVID-19 has created both situations simultaneously. For example, by April 24, 2020, more than 80 countries and customs territories had introduced export prohibitions or restrictions as an immediate response to the pandemic.2 In a world characterised by integrated and often just-in-time manufacturing processes, these actions caused marked reductions in the supply of manufactured goods, initially in China, but then elsewhere. Labour shortages at ports, caused by the pandemic, further slowed the movement of goods. Meanwhile, workplace closures in many countries and subsequent wage losses reduced demand for retail goods and traded services. Many of these trends are expected to continue as further lockdowns are introduced in response to second waves of infections.

#### Trade’s resilient.

Stephen Olson 21. Research fellow at the Hinrich Foundation, 8/12/21. “How trade’s resilience defies expectations amid coronavirus and global tensions.” https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3144511/how-trades-resilience-defies-expectations-amid-coronavirus-and

Scepticism about trade has been intensified by the Covid-19 pandemic. Countries and companies are now aggressively looking to reduce trade risk through more localised production and less trade.

Given these sobering realities, one might have reasonably expected to see a sharp decline in trade. In defiance of most projections, though, trade has held up surprisingly well.

Given the fallout from the pandemic and rising protectionism, the World Trade Organization estimated in June last year that global trade could fall by as much as 32 per cent in 2020. Yet, the actual decline was roughly 5 per cent. Given the broader macroeconomic environment, in which overall demand was dampened by a 3.8 per cent reduction in global GDP, trade remained buoyant.

Of course, specific circumstances produced eye-catching trade reductions for individual countries. Japanese exports slumped to their lowest level in 11 years in 2020, and German exports were down 9.3 per cent.

While these apparent doomsday scenarios for trade dominated the headlines, they masked the real story. Despite the headwinds, trade took a beating but kept on ticking. What explains the surprising resilience of trade?

Bilateral tariff and non-tariff barriers have proliferated. These restrictions can sometimes be effective in accomplishing their primary objective of diminishing imports from the targeted country. But in many cases, their overall effect is to redirect rather than block trade.

#### Antitrust complements free trade---empirical support

TIM BÜTHE 14. Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, and Senior Fellow, Rethinking Regulation Project at the Kenan Institute for Ethics, Duke University, 3/20/14. “THE POLITICS OF MARKET COMPETITION: TRADE AND ANTITRUST IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY,” For the Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Trade, edited by Lisa Martin. https://leitner.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/resources/papers/Buthe\_chapter\_all\_2014-03-20.pdf

Interviews with competition regulators suggest that the increase in the detection of such cartels has been at least in part a function of increased enforcement efforts, including increased monitoring of international rather than just domestic markets and increased trans-governmental enforcement cooperation (discussed below). Importantly, the transnational collusion appears to have began, for most of the major transnational cartels that have been detected, only after the relevant markets experienced a substantial increase in international openness.

The second point above implies that competition regulators will recognize the increased market competition as their primary objective unless institutional features (such as the lack of agency independence) provide specific reasons to expect otherwise. To the contrary, it assumes that competition regulators see safeguarding probability of transnational anti-competitive behavior and that they will seek to counteract it.15

Empirically, this implies a positive relationship between the probability of adopting a competition law and trade openness, as in fact seen in Table 1, which yielded anomalous findings for the other theoretical approaches. It implies further that we should expect to see greater trade openness (across countries and over time) result in more resources devoted to monitoring international rather than just domestic markets. There is strong anecdotal evidence that this has occurred, at least in the United States, several European countries, and in the EU, though research completed to date does not allow a full assessment of this observable implication.

Relatedly, we should expect to see trade openness result in increased efforts to establish and institutionalize transgovernmental antitrust enforcement collaboration. Preliminary empirical findings provide substantial support for this hypothesis. The long-existing but loose and entirely informal trans-governmental network of competition regulators, now known as the International Competition Network, has over the last twenty years become increasingly institutionalized; it also has grown tremendously (Aydin 2010; Djelic and Kleiner 2006; Svetiev 2010). It has been complemented by efforts to foster international and transgovernmental collaboration on antitrust enforcement through the OECD and the UN Conference on Trade and Development.

There also is growing evidence of increased bilateral (and occasionally minilateral) enforcement cooperation among competition regulators. In a recent analysis of antitrust provisions in preferential trade agreements (PTAs), Bradford and Büthe (2014, forthcoming) find that competition provisions generally were rare and usually minimalist through the early 1990s, but since the mid-1990s have become a common and prominent feature of PTAs, coinciding with the qualitative shift toward a much more institutionalized multilateral trade regime under the WTO (and with the increase in specificity and scope of PTAs, i.e., the increase in the institutionalization of minilateral trade agreements). Importantly, Bradford and Büthe find that provisions for information exchange and mutual assistance in antitrust enforcement strikingly common, suggesting a real interest in facilitating transgovernmental cooperation. By contrast, provisions that seek to exempt a country's firms from the other country's domestic competition regime or in other ways signal concern about the other side's abuse of competition policy for protectionist purposes are relatively rare (Bradford and Büthe 2014, forthcoming).

This institutionalization of enforcement cooperation in trade agreements is supplemented by a nearly simultaneous growth in separate antitrust enforcement cooperation agreements over the same time period, shown in Figure 2. It provides further support for the hypothesis that governments indeed see effective competition policy as a complement to trade openness (Büthe and Bradford 2012).

## Politics

### AT: Reconciliation---2AC

#### BBB got pushed back---tons of thumpers.

Burgess Everett 11-14. Co-congressional bureau chief for POLITICO, specializing in the Senate since 2013. "Schumer shakes up schedule as reconciliation bill slog continues ." POLITICO. 11-14-2021. https://www.politico.com/news/2021/11/14/schumer-schedule-reconciliation-bill-521931

President Joe Biden’s $1 trillion-plus social spending plan will probably have to wait several weeks to hit the Senate floor.

With Congress reconvening Monday and the House still working to pass the massive climate, safety net and tax package, the Senate will likely turn instead this week to the massive annual defense policy bill, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said Sunday. That’s because even if the House passes the so-called budget reconciliation bill this week, there’s still work to do to ready the legislation for the Senate floor.

The House passed the Senate’s infrastructure bill earlier this month but left without passing the reconciliation bill. And with Democrats focused on clinching a big spending deal on the effort to fight climate change, install universal pre-K and raise taxes on the wealthy and corporations, the National Defense Authorization Act has stalled in the Senate thus far. It’s one of the few bills Congress passes every year; the House passed its version in September.

“Due to the House pushing back consideration of the [Build Back Better Act ] to the week of November 15th, it is likely that the Senate considers the NDAA this upcoming week as we await House passage of the BBBA,” Schumer told Democrats in a Dear Colleague letter on Sunday morning. After one week in session, Congress is scheduled for a Thanksgiving break next weekend.

The move toward NDAA on the Senate floor in the coming days makes it all the more likely Congress will be working well into December to finish out Biden’s domestic agenda. The Senate parliamentarian needs to go through the reconciliation bill before bringing it to the floor, making sure none of the the language runs afoul of the bill’s protections from a GOP filibuster. Schumer said he hopes to finish that process this week.

Senators will also begin meeting with the parliamentarian this week to debate whether key components of the bill have a direct budgetary effect, called a “Byrd Bath.” Some House moderates want a full Congressional Budget Office score for the legislation before voting; some of that information will arrive this week. Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) has also said he wants more fiscal information about the bill’s impact before moving forward.

“On a bill of this magnitude, this process takes time and patience,” Schumer said Sunday. "Timing of consideration of the BBBA in the Senate will largely depend on when the House sends us the bill and when CBO finalizes their scores for all of the committees, which are needed to complete the ‘Byrd Bath’ process."

Unlike other legislation that requires 60 votes to advance, the reconciliation bill needs just a simple majority to pass the Senate, though there are strict rules on what can be included. Schumer also needs lockstep unity from all 50 Democrats to support it, and Manchin has made it clear he’s in no rush as he raises concerns about increasing inflation.

However, Brian Deese, a top economic adviser to Biden, called for quick congressional action in the face of inflation.

Americans "are looking for us to deliver on the things that matter most in their lives," Deese said on ABC‘s “This Week“ on Sunday.

Senate Democrats also have to prepare for a vote-a-rama, an opportunity for unlimited amendments on the legislation that could test Senate moderates' support for key components, like paid leave.

Though reconciliation continues to hang over Schumer’s caucus, moving to NDAA will pacify some restive Democrats. House Armed Services Chair Adam Smith (D-Wash.) has criticized Schumer for not moving more quickly to the bill, and several Democrats on the Senate’s Armed Services Committee have privately lobbied Schumer for action.

What’s more, action on NDAA will probably help move forward a big Schumer priority: the competitiveness bill Schumer began pushing through Congress this spring. That bill has yet to pass the House, but Schumer confirmed the Senate may put it in the must-pass defense bill as an amendment to force negotiations with the House.

Schumer conceded that the Senate will need to pass a stopgap funding bill to avoid a government shutdown after Dec. 3 and possibly need to address the debt limit next month as well. In addition, he said votes on Biden’s nominees will continue, sometimes at “inconvenient times.”

With holidays looming and tons of work to do, Schumer asked Democrats to “keep your schedule flexible for the remainder of the calendar year. … I am confident we can get each of these important items done this year, but it will likely take some long nights and weekends.”

#### Biden PC fails

The Intercept, 11-5-2021, "Deconstructed: Biden Should Look to Obama’s Mistakes," Intercept, <https://theintercept.com/2021/11/05/deconstructed-biden-build-back-better-obama/>

What do you think it is about Democrats that they can’t move that quickly? And they can’t move as efficiently as Republicans? Because it’s not as if the tax code is necessarily simpler? It was still a monster of a piece of legislation.

DS: Oh sure. I think part of it is a lack of presidential leadership. Look, we saw this with the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. Obama essentially delegated responsibility for the details of the bill to Congress. Now, obviously, constitutionally, that’s what Congress does.

But the point is, is that Obama very clearly said: Listen, I’m going to wait for the Max Baucus-run Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to come up with a bill; I’ll lay out a couple of principles, and they can duke it out, and they can weigh in every now and again.

That’s much different than what we saw with, for instance, Donald Trump and his tax cuts, or George Bush and those tax cuts. The White House had a plan, they had a specific set of plans, and they rammed it through Congress. Now, here’s got to be a middle ground there somewhere. But the point is that it’s the same thing that’s happened with Biden, and the current reconciliation bill. Biden, in a certain sense, where is he? What is he doing? Why hasn’t the White House been much more on the ball about a specific set of proposals, going to different states to campaign for it? None of that has happened.

And the one that kind of blows my mind, although I’m no longer surprised by this kind of thing: OK, you can argue, West Virginia, Biden lost it. He doesn’t have as much political capital in a state like that

MARKED

. He won Arizona. He has a lot of leverage to use in a place like Arizona, with somebody like Kyrsten Sinema. That leverage in my view, I don’t see any evidence that that’s even been used.

So again, it comes back to: If your entire attitude is a conflict aversion with your own party; if you’re trying to somehow appease your corporate donors, and tell voters you’re solving the problems created by your corporate donors, and you have a hands-off attitude about how to actually get an agenda passed, then you end up with what we have now — a morass that’s going on for weeks and weeks and months of capitulations and surrenders.

And, not surprisingly, that ends up not being all that popular. Joe Biden, by one estimate, is at the lowest approval rating of any president in modern history at this time in his presidency. You can try to blame all sorts of external forces for that. But I think usually the most simple explanation is the correct one. And the most simple explanation is: He and his White House have spent months generating headlines, surrendering on the most popular policies that people want.

# 1AR

## Inequality

### AT: Link Turn---1AR

#### 1. They’re wrong about concentration----It undermines output by 22%, outweighs the link.

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

In the United States, and much of the Western world, economic growth has slowed, inequality has risen, and wages have stagnated. Academic research has identified several possible causes, ranging from structural shifts in the economy to public policy failure. One possible cause that has received increasing attention from economists is labor market power, the ability of employers to set wages below workers’ marginal revenue product.1 New evidence suggests that many labor markets around the country are not competitive but instead exhibit considerable market power enjoyed by employers, who use their market power to suppress wages. This phenomenon—the power of employers to suppress wages below the competitive rate—is known among economists as labor monopsony, or simply labor market power. Wage suppression enhances income inequality because it creates a wedge between the incomes of people who work in concentrated and competitive labor markets. Wage suppression also reduces the incomes of workers relative to those of people who live off capital, and the latter are almost uniformly wealthier than the former. Wage suppression also interferes with economic growth since it results in underemployment of labor and, while it may seem to raise the return on capital, actually depresses it, as capital must lie idle to take advantage of monopsony power. With wages artificially suppressed, qualified workers decline to take jobs, and workers may underinvest in skills and schooling. Many workers exit the workforce and rely on government benefits, including disability benefits that have become a hidden welfare system.2 This in turn costs the government both in lost taxes and in greater expenditures. One estimate finds that monopsony power in the U.S. economy reduces overall output and employment by 13% and labor’s share of national output by 22%.3

The claim that labor market power raises inequality and reduces growth mirrors another claim that has received attention lately—that the product market power of firms has contributed to rising inequality and faltering growth.4 A product market is a collection of products defined by frequent consumer substitution. When a small number of sellers or one seller of these products exist, we say that each seller has product market power, which enables it to charge a price higher than marginal cost, or the price that would prevail in a competitive market. When a small number of employers hire from a pool of workers of a certain skill level within the geographic area in which workers commute, the employers have labor market power.

One major source of market power in both types of markets is thus concentration, where only a few firms operate in a given market. Imagine, for example, a small town with only a few gas stations. Each gas station sets the price of gas to compete with the prices of the other gas stations. When a gas station lowers its price, it may obtain greater market share from the other gas stations—which increases profits—but it also receives less revenue per sale. If only a single gas station exists, it will maximize profits by charging a high (“monopoly”) price because the gains from buyers willing to pay the price exceed the lost revenue from buyers who stay away. If only a few gas stations exist, they might illegally enter a cartel in which they charge an above-market price and divide the profits, or they might informally coordinate, which is generally not illegal, though the social harm is the same. In contrast, if many gas stations compete, prices will be bargained down to the efficient level—the marginal cost—resulting in low prices for consumers and high aggregate output of gasoline.

Labor market concentration creates monopsony (or, if more than one employer, oligopsony, but I use these terms interchangeably) where labor market power is exercised by the buyer rather than (as in the example of gas stations) the seller. Employers are buyers of labor who operate within a labor market. A labor market is a group of jobs (e.g., computer programmers, lawyers, or unskilled workers) within a geographic area where the holders of those jobs could with relative ease switch among the jobs. The geographic area is usually defined by the commuting distance of workers. A labor market is concentrated if only one or a few employers hire from this pool of workers. For example, imagine the gas stations employ specialist maintenance workers who monitor the gas-pumping equipment. If only a few gas stations exist in that area, and no other firms (e.g., oil refineries) hire from this pool of workers, then the labor market is concentrated, and the employers have market power in the labor market. To minimize labor costs, the employers will hold wages down below what the workers would be paid in a competitive labor market—their marginal revenue product. Faced with these low wages, some people qualified to work will refuse to. But the employers gain more from wage savings than they lose in lost output because of the small workforce they employ.

Antitrust law does not distinguish monopoly and monopsony (including labor monopsony): firms that achieve monopolies or monopsonies through anticompetitive behavior violate antitrust law. But product market concentration has received a huge amount of attention by courts, researchers, and regulators, while labor market concentration has received hardly any attention at all.5 The Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) Horizontal Merger Guidelines, which are used to screen potential mergers for antitrust violations, provide an elaborate analytic framework for evaluating the product market effects of mergers. Yet, while the Merger Guidelines state that there is no distinction between seller and buyer power,6 they say nothing about the possible adverse labor market effects of mergers. Similarly, while there are thousands of reported cases involving allegations that firms have illegally cartelized product markets, there are few cases involving allegations of illegally cartelized labor markets.7

This historic imbalance between what I will call product market antitrust and labor market antitrust has no basis in economic theory. From an economic standpoint, the dangers to public welfare posed by product market power and labor market power are the same. As Adam Smith recognized, businesses gain in the same way by exploiting product market power and labor market power—enabling them to increase profits by raising prices (in the first case) or by lowering costs (in the second case).8 For that reason, businesses have the same incentive to obtain product market power and labor market power. Hence the need—in both cases—for an antitrust regime to prevent businesses from obtaining product and labor market power except when there are offsetting social gains.

## Democracy

### Democracy---1AR

#### US democratic leadership is key to prevent great power war.

Matthew Kroenig 18. Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. *The Democratic Advantage: America’s Edge over Russia and China*. Princeton University Press. 9/24/2018. https://www.princeton.edu/politics/graduate/departmental-colloquia/international-relations/The-Democratic-Advantage-Americas-Edge-over-Russia-and-China.pdf

To answer these questions, we lack a crystal ball, but **theory** and **history** can serve as a guide they suggest a clear answer: **democracies** enjoy a **built-in advantage** in long-run geopolitical competitions.¶ The idea that **democracies** are better able to **accumulate** and **maintain power** in the international system has a distinguished pedigree. Polybius, Machiavelli, and Montesquieu are among the classical political theorists who argued that republican forms of government are best able to harness available domestic resources toward national greatness. And recent social science research concurs. For the past two decades, **cutting-edge research** in **economics** and **political science** has been obsessed with the issue of whether democracies are different and the **consistent finding** is that they perform a number of key functions better than their autocratic counterparts. They have higher long-run rates of economic growth.13 They are better able to raise debt in international capital markets and become international financial centers.14 They build stronger and more reliable alliances.15 They are more effective in international coercive diplomacy.16 They are less likely to fight wars (at least against other democracies).17 And they are more likely to win the wars that they fight.18¶ This book takes this line of argument a step further by aggregating these narrower findings into a broader theory about the relative fitness of democracy and autocracy in great power political competitions. The central argument of this book is that democracies do better in major power rivalries. After all, it is not much of a logical leap to assume that states that systematically perform better on these important economic, diplomatic, and military tasks will do better in long-run geopolitical competitions than those that do not¶ This hunch is supported by the empirical record. As this book will show, autocrats often put up a good fight, but they fail to ultimately seize lasting global leadership. Napoleon, Hitler, and the Soviet Union are among the examples of authoritarian nations that launched campaigns for world domination, but came up short. On the other hand, states with relatively more open forms of government have often been able to establish themselves as the international system’s leading state, from Athens and the Roman Republic in the Ancient world to British Empire and the **U**nited **S**tates in more recent times. According to some scholars, the world’s leading state since the 1600s has also been among its most democratic. 19 It is hard to argue with an **undefeated record of four centuries and counting**.¶ America’s greatest strength in its coming competition with Russia and China, therefore, is **not its military might or economic strength, but its institutions**.

For all of its faults, America’s fundamentals are still better than Russia’s and China’s. There is good reason to believe, therefore, that the American era will **endure** and the autocratic challenges posed by China and Russia will **run out of steam**.¶ The idea that democracies dominate may seem counterintuitive. After all, throughout history many have argued that dictators have a foreign policy advantage. 20 Autocrats can be ruthless when necessary, but democracies are constrained by public opinion and ethical and legal concerns. Autocrats take decisive action, but democracies dither in endless debate. Autocrats strategically plan for the long-term while democracies cannot see beyond a two or four-year election cycle. Many today laud Russia and China’s autocratic systems for precisely these reasons. Russians play chess and Chinese play go, but Americans play checkers, as the aphorism has it.¶ It is true that autocracies are better at taking swift and bold action, but **impulsive decisions** uninformed by **vigorous public debate** often result in **spectacular failure**. Hitler, for example, was able to harness new technology to create Blitzkrieg warfare and conquer much of Europe, but he also invaded Russia in winter and needlessly declared war on the **U**nited **S**tates. Unfortunately, for autocracies, this story is **all too common**. As Machiavelli wrote in his Discourses on Livy in the 16th century: “Fewer errors will be seen in the people than in the prince—and those lesser and having greater remedies.”21 “Hence it arises that a republic has greater life and has good fortune longer than a principality.”22¶ There is good reason to hope that this argument is true because continued American leadership would be beneficial to the **U**nited **S**tates and the rest of the free world. The decline of American power would certainly be unwelcome for the **U**nited **S**tates. Americans have certainly grown accustomed to the benefits that accrue to the world’s leading power. But **billions** of others also have a **stake in America’s success**. For all of its faults, the **U**nited **S**tates has been a fairly benevolent hegemon. While far from perfect, it has gone to extraordinary lengths to provide security, promote economic development, and nurture democracy and human rights. The world is certainly safer, richer, and more free today than it was before the dawn of the American era.¶ There is little reason to believe that Russia and China will be as kind. These autocratic powers long to establish spheres of influence in their near abroad and they have shown little concern for the sovereignty or personal freedoms of their own citizens or subjected populations. If readers doubt these claims, they can simply ask citizens of American allies in Eastern Europe or East Asia whether they desire continued American leadership, or whether they would prefer to live under the thumb of Moscow and Beijing, respectively.¶ Even more consequentially for the globe, however, the decline of the **U**nited **S**tates could very well result in a **major war**. As noted above, international relations theory maintains that the decline of one dominant power and the rise of another often results in great power war.23 According to this telling, **World War I** and **World War II** were primarily the result of the decline of the British empire and the rise of Imperial and then Nazi Germany as a major competitor on the European continent. Falling powers fight **preventive wars** in a bid to remain on top and rising powers launch conflicts to dislodge the reigning power and claim their “place in the sun.”24Many fear that a power transition between Beijing and Washington would produce a **similar catastrophic result**. 25 **Continued American leadership**, therefore, **could forestall this transition** and may be a **necessary condition** for **continued world peace and stability** among the great powers.

## Innovation DA

### No Link---1AR

#### 3] There’s no tradeoff in abandoning the consumer welfare standard and consumer welfare.

Michelle Meagher 21. A competition lawyer and Senior Policy Fellow at the University College London Centre for Law, Economics and Society. This paper has been prepared for the ABA Spring Meeting 2021 session on the consumer welfare standard. “Adaptive Antitrust.” 03-24-21. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3816662

(6) Consumers will suffer – It is argued that if we are to protect labour, the environment and so on, we must mean to sacrifice consumers. The **mechanics of this trade-off are less than obvious**. Consumer welfare, in its fullest sense, is **not antithetical to workers being paid well**, quite the opposite. But it is also **not clear that prices must rise if there is room for profits to fall**, and rising markups suggest that **there is such room**. Equally, from this we must conclude that **consumers are already suffering.** Reducing the responsibilities and excusing a lack of accountability on the part of dominant businesses to their other stakeholders will not help consumers.

### Innovation---1AR

#### 2] Their warrant for innovation in the 1nr is acquisitions --- Consolidation in pharma stifles innovation.

Raksha Kopparam 19. Senior Research Assistant. “Killer acquisitions lead to decreased innovation and competition in the U.S. prescription drug market” Washington Center for Equitable Growth. 09-25-19. <https://equitablegrowth.org/killer-acquisitions-lead-to-decreased-innovation-and-competition-in-the-u-s-prescription-drug-market/>

The co-authors find that **consolidation** in the pharmaceutical industry is probably **stifling rather than promoting innovation**. Approximately 6 percent of pharmaceutical acquisitions are what the authors refer to as “killer acquisitions,” in which an incumbent firm acquires a product in development that could compete with the incumbent’s own product and then subsequently terminates development of the target firm’s product, **thus killing competition and innovation.** An example of this kind of acquisition that the three researchers examined is Questcor Pharmaceuticals Inc.’s acquisition of the drug Synacthen from Novartis International AG of Switzerland. United States-based Questcor in 2000 held a monopoly over an adrenocorticotropic hormone drug called Acthar, the then-dominant treatment for rare epileptic diseases such as infantile spasms. In 2000, Acthar was priced at roughly $40 a vial. In the mid-2000s, however, Novartis began developing Synacthen, a synthetic version of Acthar. In 2013, Questcor acquired the production rights for Synacthen and shut down development of the drug shortly thereafter. **As a competitor** to Acthar, Synacthen **would have been a cheaper alternative** that would have taken away significant market share from Questcor. Today, Acthar costs $39,000 a vial, which is a 97,000 percent increase in price over 19 years.

### Pharma Thumpers---1AR

#### AND Yes implementation --- Biden promotes generic competition.

Fraiser Kansteiner 21. A staff writer at Fierce Pharma. “With sweeping executive order, Biden puts drug pricing, anti-competitive strategies in the crosshairs” 07-12-21. https://www.fiercepharma.com/pharma/biden-order-puts-drug-pricing-anti-competitive-pharma-practices-crosshairs

President Joe Biden campaigned on the goal of lowering prescription drug costs. So far, those promises haven't amounted to much. But late last week, the president unveiled a **series of initiatives** taking aim at pricing, anti-competitive practices, and more. In an executive order penned Friday, Biden **doubled down on efforts to combat high prescription** **drug prices** in the U.S. by promoting generic and biosimilar competition, allowing Medicare to negotiate drug costs and more. Despite the administration’s lofty ambitions, it remains “far from clear” whether Biden’s goals will pan out, one antitrust and competition lawyer said.

#### 2] Other legislation thumps Pharma.

Garrett Johnson and Wayne T. Brough 19. CNN Business Perspectives. “Big Pharma is abusing patents, and it’s hurting Americans” CNN Business. 09-12-19. https://www.cnn.com/2019/09/12/perspectives/drug-patents-abuse/index.html

The good news is that, despite Big Pharma spending hundreds of millions on lobbying and donations, President **Trump has targeted rising drug prices** and the **Senate Judiciary Committee recently unanimously passed bipartisan legislation** sponsored by Senators John Cornyn of Texas and Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut that attempts to address the way pharmaceutical companies game the US patent system in pursuit of higher profits. Their legislation is a great first step to combat product hopping, a tactic used to get around pharmacy-level generic substitution laws and patent thickets, where manufacturers deploy multiple patents to prevent competition.

## Politics

### Won’t Pass---1AR

#### They won’t --- it goes against their campaign agendas --- it’s the best and most recent ev on manchin and sinema

Tony Romm, 11-6-2021, "With infrastructure victory in hand, Democrats brace for next battle over $2 trillion spending bill," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2021/11/06/congress-biden-spending-deal/

The infrastructure bill is soon set to become law. The $2 trillion package, meanwhile, has yet to clear either chamber and has drawn considerable Republican opposition. Instead, Democrats in Congress are preparing to return to the package later in November, embarking anew in a debate that has divided the party considerably since the spring.

The first hurdle is the House, where Democrats are eyeing the week of Nov. 15 to consider the $2 trillion proposal. The time frame stems from an agreement between liberals and moderates that helped put an end to months of fighting and paved the way for the infrastructure bill to clear the House on Friday.

For months, left-leaning lawmakers with the Congressional Progressive Caucus had held up the public-works bill as leverage in talks with centrists over their broader spending ambitions. In doing so, they insisted both proposals had to move in tandem to win their support. But they ultimately agreed to ease their blockade in a late-night Friday compromise with a group of moderates that had been in revolt. Liberals said they would back infrastructure, assuaging centrists, who in turn pledged they would support the Build Back Better Act, provided they can see an official analysis of its fiscal impacts to determine if it is deficit neutral. (The bill’s top backers say it is funded in full.)

“We commit to voting for the Build Back Better Act, in its current form other than technical changes, as expeditiously as we receive fiscal information from the Congressional Budget Office,” said five moderates, including Rep. Stephanie Murphy (D-Fla.), a leader of the Blue Dog Coalition, and Rep. Josh Gottheimer (D-N.J.), who helped broker the pact. They also promised to work “to resolve any discrepancies” if the budgetary analysis is unfavorable.

Joining moderates on the steps of the Capitol to announce the truce, Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.), the head of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, stressed the two factions are “going to trust each other because the Democratic Party is together on this.”

“We’ve always said we need to get both bills done,” Jayapal told reporters. “And tonight we have an agreement that will get both bills done.”

The agreement is critical in the narrowly divided House: Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) can only afford to lose three votes in the narrowly divided chamber, where Republicans vehemently oppose the measure and are unwilling to aid in the same way they did with the infrastructure deal. If liberals and moderates are not in lockstep, the entire $2 trillion endeavor would be doomed.

Speaking to reporters Friday, Pelosi expressed a measure of confidence that they could finalize the bill in the House in the coming weeks. “As we do, then, we’ll have a Thanksgiving gift for the American people,” she said.

The package then heads to the Senate, where the battle is likely only to intensify. There, centrists including Manchin and another moderate holdout, Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.), for months have angled to whittle down Democrats’ spending ambitions. Their campaign already has forced the party to scale back the bill from its original $3.5 trillion size, a process that forced them to jettison some of their original policy priorities — including a fulsome expansion of Medicare and a plan to provide community college for all Americans.

And the cuts may not be finished.

Manchin, for example, has insisted for months the package should be capped at $1.5 trillion —

though at one point he appeared open to the $1.75 trillion ceiling that Biden put forward as a potential compromise in October. Manchin never did endorse that framework anyway, rankling liberal Democrats, who long have felt they have slashed their signature spending initiative too dramatically.

In the days before the House finalized its bill — and held a key procedural vote late Friday to open debate — Pelosi and her top aides went as far as to add funds and programs to the measure that could draw Manchin’s ire. That included a plan to offer four weeks of paid family and medical leave to millions of Americans, a widely supported program that the West Virginia senator previously has opposed as part of the package.

Even Biden on Saturday appeared to acknowledge the potential changes on the horizon as Democrats advance it through the Senate. Asked about the future of the paid-leave proposal, the president replied: “Time will tell.”

Manchin is not the sole obstacle in the chamber, where concerns linger among a wider community of lawmakers. Even Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), the architect of the original $3.5 trillion spending blueprint, has taken issue with the House-drafted bill for the way it handles state and local taxes — restoring a deduction, he has said, that amounts to an “absurd and hypocritical” tax break for higher-income earners.

But an even tougher test may not come from any senator at all. To pass their package in the narrowly divided chamber, where Democrats have only a tiebreaking advantage, the party has opted to rely on a process known as reconciliation. It allows them to avoid a GOP filibuster, but it carries strict rules that limit the measure to proposals with clear budgetary effects.

To stay within the confines of reconciliation, Democrats have to craft their proposal carefully and survive scrutiny from the chamber’s parliamentarian. Otherwise, entire portions of the bill could be struck — a prospect that looms especially large over the party’s plans to try to address immigration in the so-called Build Back Better Act. The newly revised House bill would allow the government to “parole” undocumented immigrants by giving them five-year work permits that shield them from deportation. The Senate’s rulekeeper previously has advised Democrats against including some immigration policies in the package.

The Senate process is long and arduous, allowing lawmakers in the course of debate to offer unlimited amendments in what typically becomes a marathon, overnight process known as a vote-a-rama. And any changes in the chamber could force the Senate to send the bill back to the House.

#### Most the other ev they read on PC either isn’t about reconciliation---Biden PC can’t stop dem fights or get reconciliation done

Keith Naughton, 11-11-2021, Ph.D., is co-founder of Silent Majority Strategies, a public and regulatory affairs consulting firm. "McConnell wins, Biden loses, Trump fumes," The Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/campaign/581075-mcconnell-wins-biden-loses-trump-fumes

What McConnell set in motion was an epic fight within the Democratic Party, as progressives decided — in their infantile wisdom — to hold the popular bill hostage to their multi-trillion-dollar wish list. McConnell and the Republicans escaped the obstructionist epithet and let the internal fractures of the Democrats take center stage.

Passage of the bill after losing in Virginia was not much of a win for Biden, more like political crumbs.

Biden can celebrate his “win” all he wants, but the political carnage is likely to continue. Passage of the $1.75 trillion (or more) somewhat trimmed-down “Build Back Better” is hardly assured. The bill is only modestly less of a grab-bag of policy and spending sops for the seething mass of interests called the Democratic Party.

The new bill has some popular components, but, as with its now-dead predecessor, it also contains plenty of poison pills.

Foremost among the problems is the demand to repeal the SALT tax deduction limit passed during the Trump administration. After caving in on one issue after another, Bernie Sanders is not exactly in a mood to hand a big tax cut to wealthy New Yorkers.

The Democratic civil war is the gift that keeps giving to McConnell.

Biden looks impotent — sidelined and waiting for Democratic congressional leaders to try to forge a compromise. Such a compromise might not even happen, leaving bitterness to fester on all sides.