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#### Increased concentration of buyer power in labor markets drives inequality.

Lauren Sillman, Antitrust Associate, 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.

#### Monopsony power depresses growth---results in underemployment and decreases labor productivity

Eric A. Posner, UChicago Professor, 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.

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

Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia Professor, 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, UChicago Professor, 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.

#### Income inequality is uniquely high now---wage growth is artificial.

Lawrence Mishel, Fellow at EPI, & Jori Kandra, Research Assistant at EPI, 12/13. \*\*Distinguished fellow at the Economic Policy Institute, served as president from 2002–2017. \*\*Research assistant at the Economic Policy Institute. “Wage inequality continued to increase in 2020.” 12/13/21. https://www.epi.org/blog/wage-inequality-continued-to-increase-in-2020-top-1-0-of-earners-see-wages-up-179-since-1979-while-share-of-wages-for-bottom-90-hits-new-low/

Newly available wage data from the Social Security Administration allow us to analyze wage trends for the top 1.0% and other very high earners as well as for the bottom 90% during 2020. The upward distribution of wages from the bottom 90% to the top 1.0% that was evident over the period from 1979 to 2019 was especially strong in the 2020 pandemic year, yielding historically high wage levels and shares of all wages for the top 1.0% and 0.1%. Correspondingly, the share of wages earned by the bottom 95% fell in 2020.

Two features of the pandemic economy distorted wage patterns in 2020 and led to faster wage growth, especially at the top. One feature was that inflation grew at a subdued 1.2% rate, boosting the average real wage (but not affecting distribution). A second feature was that, as employment fell (the number of earners fell by 1.7 million, or 1.6%) and unemployment rose (to 8.1%), the composition of the workforce changed. Specifically, job losses were heaviest for lower wage workers so the mix of jobs shifted toward higher paying ones, artificially boosting average wages (see Gould) and generating faster measured wage growth especially in the bottom half.

For last year, the data (Table 1) show annual wages rising fastest for those in the top 1.0% (up 7.3%) and top 0.1% (up 9.9%) while those in the bottom 90% saw wages grow by just 1.7%.

This continuous growth of wage inequality undercuts wage growth for the bottom 90% and reaffirms the need to place generating robust wage growth for the vast majority and rebuilding worker power at the center of economic policymaking. See Mishel and Bivens (2021) for the evidence that an erosion of worker power due to excessive unemployment, eroded collective bargaining, corporate-driven globalization, weaker labor standards, new employer-mandated agreements (such as noncompetes), and supply-chain dominance explains wage suppression and wage inequality growth.

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

Frederick Solt, Professor at University of Iowa, 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.

#### Inequality is the biggest internal link to growth and is an impact filter.

Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia Professor, 14. University Professor, Columbia University. “The Price of Inequality: How Today’s Divided Society Endangers our Future.” http://www.pas.va/content/dam/accademia/pdf/es41/es41-stiglitz.pdf

2. The second observation entails looking at the current levels of inequality in a historical context. While I have emphasized the growth of inequality in the last third of a century, Thomas Piketty in his recent book notes that the preceding four decades should perhaps be viewed as an historical anomaly: we are returning to the high levels of inequality that prevailed in the 19th century and in the 20th in the years before the Great Depression. Piketty concludes that inequality is likely to get worse.13 I will comment on this forecast later. But his analysis has some profound implications: it means that Kuznets’s optimism that increasing inequality in the initial process of development gives way to a decrease (an idea referred to as the Kuznets curve),14 may well be wrong. Countries should not accept increasing inequality today, in the blind faith that it will eventually be reversed.

3. The third observation is that much of the inequality at the top cannot be justified as “just deserts” for the large contributions that these individuals have made. If we look at those at the top, they are not those who have made the major innovations that have transformed our economies and societies; they are not the discoverers of DNA, the laser, the transistor; not the brilliant individuals who made the discoveries without which we would not have had the modern computer. Disproportionately, they are those who have excelled in rent seeking, in wealth appropriation, in figuring out how to get a larger share of the nation’s pie, rather than enhancing the size of that pie. (Such rent seeking activity typically actually results in the size of the economic pie shrinking from what it otherwise would be). Among the most notable of these are, of course, those in the financial sector, some of whom made their wealth by market manipulation, by engaging in abusive credit card practices, predatory lending, moving money from the bottom and middle of the income pyramid to the top. So too, a monopolist makes his money by contracting output from what it otherwise would be, not by expanding it.

The inaptness of the “just deserts” argument was shown by the Great Recession, a recession which in no small measure was caused by the financial sector, which itself is responsible for so much of the inequality today. Even as they were bringing their firms and the global economy to the brink of ruin, the managers of these firms walked off with multimillion dollar bonuses.

The notion that large fractions of today’s inequality are associated with rent seeking is supported by a look at the composition of the wealthiest and top income earners. But there is additional evidence. Three striking aspects of the evolution of the American economy (and the economies of other wealthy countries) in the last 35 years are (a) the increase in the wealth-to-income ratio; (b) the stagnation of median wages; and (c) the failure of the return to capital to decline. Standard neoclassical theories, in which “wealth” is equated with “capital”, would suggest that the increase in capital should be associated with a decline in the return to capital and an increase in wages. The failure of wages to increase has been attributed by some (especially in the 1990s) to skill-biased technological change, which increased the premium put by the market on skills. Hence, those with skills saw their wages rise, and those without skills saw them fall. But recent years have seen a decline in the wages paid even to skilled workers. Something else must be going on. While in production functions with multiple inputs (say multiple kinds of labor), an increase in capital does not necessarily increase the wages of each type of labor (capital and unskilled labor can be substitutes rather than complements), if the production function exhibits constant returns to scale (a standard assumption in neoclassical theory), then the average wage must increase.15This does not seem to be happening.

There are two alternative explanations. The first is that rents are increasing (the fraction of income that is appropriated by monopolists and by other forms of exploitation). These rents are captured by (large) owners of capital, and since they are, at least in part, marketable, the present discounted value of these rents themselves become part of “wealth”. But an increase in this form of wealth does not lead to an increase in the productivity of the economy – or to an increase in the average wage of workers; to the contrary, it reduces the amounts received.

The second is that there may be other assets – like land – that can increase in value. These assets may not be very directly related to the production of goods and services,16 and indeed, with more wealth invested in these assets, there may be less invested in real productive capital. (A disproportionate part of America’s savings in the years before the crisis went into the purchase of housing, which did not increase the productivity of the “real” sectors of the economy).

Monetary policies that lead to low interest rates can increase the present value of these fixed assets – an increase in the value of wealth that is unaccompanied by any increase in the flow of goods and services. By the same token, a bubble can lead to an increase in wealth – for an extended period of time – again with possibly adverse effects on the stock of “real” capital. Indeed, it is easy for capitalist economies to generate such bubbles (a fact that should be obvious from the historical record,17 but which has been confirmed in theoretical models).18There has been a “correction” in the housing bubble (and in the underlying price of land); but we should not be confident that there has been a full correction. We still may be on a “bubble” trajectory.

Still another piece of evidence supporting the importance of rent-seeking is that showing that increases in taxes at the very top do not result in decreases in growth rates. If these incomes were a result of their efforts, we might have expected those at the top to respond by working less hard, with adverse effects on GDP.19 Piketty’s recent research has emphasized a different aspect of the “just deserts” argument: the increasing fraction of inequality arising from inheritance.

4. The idea that one shouldn’t worry about inequality – because everyone will benefit as money trickles down – has been thoroughly discredited. In some ways, it would be nice if it were true, because it would mean that the average American would be doing very well today, since the country has been thrown so much money at the top. But the statistics show that trickle-down is a fallacy: while the top has been doing very well, the rest has been stagnating.

In the absence of a change in the degree of inequality, if mean income (GDP) increases, everyone can benefit. But I emphasized above that there has been a large increase in inequality, and this gives rise to an increasing disparity between the mean and the median, between what is happening on average, and what is happening to the typical individual. Those at the very top, in the 1% or the .1%, can see their income increase; while incomes for the bottom 99% (or the bottom 99.9%) can actually decrease. That is what has been happening. An economic system that only delivers for the very top is a failed economic system. If the failures were of a short duration, that would be one thing. But they have been persistent – and there is no evidence of a turnaround.

5. Some go further: it is not just that everyone will benefit from trickledown, but inequality is actually necessary for growth. One of the popular misconceptions is that those at the top are the job creators; and giving more money to them will thus create more jobs – and indeed this is the only way by which jobs can be created. This view, I believe, is fundamentally wrong: America and other countries are full of creative entrepreneurial people throughout the income distribution. What creates jobs is demand: when there is demand, firms (especially if the financial system could be made work in the way it should, providing credit to small and medium-sized enterprises) will create the jobs to satisfy that demand. But in the United States, for example, the distorted tax system provides incentives for those at the top to destroy jobs by moving them abroad.

6. In contrast to those who believe that inequality is necessary for good economic performance, recent research has shown that inequality – when it gets to the level that characterizes the US and some other countries and when it is generated in the manner that it is created in the US and some other countries – is bad for growth, stability, and economic efficiency. This was the central thrust of my book The Price of Inequality, where I argued that inequality was not just a moral issue, but an economic one – we were paying a high price for our inequality. This view has now become mainstream, and the IMF has produced research supporting it, and endorsed it. Thus, the IMF finds that countries with greater inequality tend to be marked by lower growth and greater instability.20

Economists used to think of there being a trade-off: we could achieve more equality, but only at the expense of giving up on overall economic performance. Now we realize that, especially given the extremes of inequality achieved in the United States and the manner in which inequality is generated, greater equality and improved economic performance are complements. By the same token, one of the reasons for the poor economic performance in many countries in recent years is the high and growing level of inequality.

This is especially true if we focus on appropriate measures of growth. If we use the wrong metrics, we will strive for the wrong things. Economic growth as measured by GDP is not enough – there is a growing global consensus that GDP does not provide a good measure of overall economic performance. What matters is whether growth is sustainable, and whether most citizens see their living standards rising year after year. This is the central message of the International Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress, which I chaired.21 Economists and policymakers need to focus not on what is happening on average, or to those at the top, but how the economy is performing for the typical citizen, reflected for instance in median income. We value opportunity directly, not just for the benefits which it might bring to conventionally measured GDP. And as inequality increases, so does insecurity. Everyone, even those higher up the rungs in the ladder, worry about slipping down: they know the consequences. Once this is taken into account, the surge in inequality looks every worse.

7. One of the reasons that inequality is bad for economic performance is that this growing inequality is weakening demand. The reason that inequality leads to weak demand is easy to understand: those at the bottom spend a larger fraction of their income (they need to, just to get by) than those at the top.

The problem of weak demand is compounded by the flawed responses to this weak demand by monetary authorities, by lowering interest rates, which can easily give rise to a bubble, the bursting of which leads in turn to recessions. This indeed describes what has happened in recent years. (This is not the only possible response: fiscal authorities could lower taxes on say the middle class, or increase government investments in infrastructure, technology and education. But the Bush administration took exactly the opposite strategy – lowering taxes on the rich. These responses are perhaps not a surprise: as I emphasize below, economic inequality translates into political inequality, and those at the top have a tendency to seek their own advantage).

8. There are still other reasons that inequality is bad for the economy and growth. One of the reasons is that today, inequality is associated with rent seeking, and rent seeking distorts the economy. Another is the observation made earlier that inequality of outcomes is associated with inequality of opportunity, and that means that those unfortunate enough to be born at the bottom of the income distribution are at great risk of not living up to their potential. We thus pay a price not only in terms of a weak economy today, but lower growth in the future. With nearly one in four American children growing up in poverty,22 many of whom face a lack of access to adequate nutrition and education, the country’s long-term prospects are being put into jeopardy.

A third is related to the corrosive effect of inequality on morale, especially when it cannot be well-justified (and as I have noted, the inequality evidenced in the United States and elsewhere cannot be justified). There is a widespread understanding of the adverse effects of corruption on morale, societal solidarity, and the functioning of the economy. But increasingly, inequality in the US is viewed as unfair, arising out of a corrupt political and economic system.

Still two further reasons are related to the political economy of inequality: societies with greater inequality are less likely to make investments in the common good, in say public transportation, infrastructure, technology, and education. The rich don’t need these public facilities, and they worry that a strong government which could increase the efficiency of the economy might at the same time use its powers to redistribute. Moreover, with so many at the top making their money from financial market shenanigans and rent-seeking, we wind up with tax and other economic policies that encourage these kinds of activities rather than more productive activities. When we tax speculators at less than half the rate that we tax workers, and when we give speculative derivatives priority in bankruptcy over workers, and when we have tax laws that encourage job creation abroad rather than at home, we wind up with a weaker and more unstable economy.

9. The ninth observation is that the weaknesses in the economy (partly caused by the high levels of inequality) have important budgetary implications. Deficits have become a central focus of policymakers in many countries. But worries about the deficit are exacerbating the real inequalities in our society; it is those at the bottom and middle that suffer the most from government cutbacks in expenditures.

The budget deficits of recent years are a result of the weak economy, not the other way around. If we had more robust growth, the budgetary situation would be far improved. That’s why investments in decreasing inequality and increasing equality of opportunity make sense not only for the economy, but for the budget. When we invest in our children, the asset side of our country’s balance sheet goes up, even more than the liability side: any business would see that its net worth is increased. In the long run, even looking narrowly at the liability side of the balance sheet, it will be improved, as these young people earn higher incomes and contribute more to the tax base. But if we look at these issues the wrong way, the budgetary weaknesses will lead to cutbacks in public investments – including those that help ameliorate inequality – and we reinforce the vicious circle, with lower investment in the public sector (including education) leading to a weaker economy and more inequality, and leading in turn to still lower investments and growth.

10. Countries also pay a high price for this inequality in terms of their democracy and the nature of their societies. A divided society is different – it doesn’t function as well. Democracy is undermined, as economic inequality inevitably translates into political inequality. I describe in my book how the outcomes of America’s politics are increasingly better described as the result of a system not of one person, one vote but of one dollar, one vote. 23 And just as we described earlier how the rules of the economic game affect the outcomes, so too in the realm of politics: with the rich having more and more influence, they write the rules of the political game to give them more power and influence, which means economic inequality gets even more translated into political inequality, and the political inequality gets translated into ever more economic inequality, in a vicious circle. The same process is occurring in other countries where the wealth and income have become stubbornly concentrated.

11. There are further adverse effects of this economic/political inequality as we view societal well-being from the broader perspective that I argued for earlier. Special interests have incentives and scope to shape our society – in their interests. Even when most citizens care about the environment, they see actions to protect the environment as costing them profits, and they use their economic and political power resist such actions. This has proved to be a major impediment to dealing with the challenges of global warming. But as I comment on more extensively in the second part of this paper, the costs of failing to deal with climate change and other environmental hazards are borne disproportionately by the poor.

12. With extreme inequality, the nature of society changes in fundamental ways. Those at the top come to believe that they are entitled to what they have. And this can lead to behaviors which themselves undermine the cohesiveness of society. Those excluded from prosperity begin to expect the worst from their governments and leaders. Trust is eroded, along with civic engagement and a sense of common purpose.

13. For those who believe we would have a better world were more countries to become committed to market economies with democracy, there are further adverse effects: Will other countries want to emulate an economic system in which most individuals’ incomes are simply stagnating? A political system which seems to be captured by the wealthy?

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

Sharon Block, OMB Associate Administer, & Benjamin Elga, Justice Catalyst Law, 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.

#### Employee welfare increases innovation---improves talent retention and productivity.

Yu Wei et al., Yunnan University, 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.

#### Shocks are inevitable, only worker stability makes recovery possible.

Kate Bahn, Washington Center for Equitable Growth, 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.

#### Slow growth collapses the liberal order AND causes global hotspot escalation---extinction.

Michael Oppenheimer, NYU Professor, 21. Clinical Professor, Center for Global Affairs, New York University. Senior Consulting Fellow, Scenario Planning at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Former Executive Vice President, The Futures Group. Member, Council on Foreign Relations. Member, The Foreign Policy Roundtable at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs. Member, The American Council on Germany, The Future of Global Affairs: Managing Discontinuity, Disruption and Destruction. “The Turbulent Future of International Relations.”

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.
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Jomo Kwame Sundaram, UN Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, & Vladimir Popov, Former senior economics researcher, 19. Former economics professor, was United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, and received the Wassily Leontief Prize for Advancing the Frontiers of Economic Thought in 2007. Former senior economics researcher in the Soviet Union, Russia and the United Nations Secretariat, is now Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War.” <http://www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/>.

Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict. More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and ‘morph’ into military conflict, and worse, world war. Crisis responses limited The 2008-2009 global financial crisis almost ‘bankrupted’ governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the world economy from the brink, but soon switched from counter-cyclical fiscal efforts to unconventional monetary measures, primarily ‘quantitative easing’ and very low, if not negative real interest rates. But while these monetary interventions averted realization of the worst fears at the time by turning the US economy around, they did little to address underlying economic weaknesses, largely due to the ascendance of finance in recent decades at the expense of the real economy. Since then, despite promising to do so, policymakers have not seriously pursued, let alone achieved, such needed reforms. Instead, ostensible structural reformers have taken advantage of the crisis to pursue largely irrelevant efforts to further ‘casualize’ labour markets. This lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented liquidity central banks injected into economies has not been well allocated to stimulate resurgence of the real economy. From bust to bubble Instead, easy credit raised asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. US house prices are now 8% more than at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, while its price-to-earnings ratio in late 2018 was even higher than in 2008 and in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash precipitated the Great Depression. As monetary tightening checks asset price bubbles, another economic crisis — possibly more severe than the last, as the economy has become less responsive to such blunt monetary interventions — is considered likely. A decade of such unconventional monetary policies, with very low interest rates, has greatly depleted their ability to revive the economy. The implications beyond the economy of such developments and policy responses are already being seen. Prolonged economic distress has worsened public antipathy towards the culturally alien — not only abroad, but also within. Thus, another round of economic stress is deemed likely to foment unrest, conflict, even war as it is blamed on the foreign. International trade shrank by two-thirds within half a decade after the US passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, at the start of the Great Depression, ostensibly to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition! Liberalization’s discontents Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened.Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization. Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality. To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries. Insecurity, populism, conflict Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern. Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts. Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse. At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies. Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers. They patently ignored Thucydides’ warning, in chronicling the Peloponnesian wars over two millennia before, when the rise of Athens threatened the established dominance of Sparta! Anticipating and addressing such possibilities may well serve to help avoid otherwise imminent disasters by undertaking pre-emptive collective action, as difficult as that may be.

### FTC---1AC

#### Advantage 2 is the FTC---

#### FTC promised labor protection---they’ll lose now without congressional action.

Nicolás Rivero, NU Graduate, 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.

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

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 scams.

Testimony of Ted Mermin, UC Berkeley School of Law, 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.

#### Scamming causes extinction.

Casey Newton, Verge editor, 20. Verge contributing editor. "The massive Twitter hack could be a global security crisis". Verge. 7-15-2020. https://www.theverge.com/interface/2020/7/15/21325708/twitter-hack-global-security-crisis-nuclear-war-bitcoin-scam

Beginning in the spring of 2018, scammers began to impersonate noted cryptocurrency enthusiast Elon Musk. They would use his profile photo, select a user name similar to his, and tweet out an offer that was effective despite being too good to be true: send him a little cryptocurrency, and he’ll send you a lot back. Sometimes the scammer would reply to a connected, verified account — Musk-owned SpaceX, for example — giving it additional legitimacy. Scammers would also amplify the fake tweet via bot networks, for the same purpose. The events of 2018 showed us three things. One, at least some people fell for the scam, every single time — certainly enough to incentivize further attempts. Two, Twitter was slow to respond to the threat, which persisted well beyond the company’s initial comments that it was taking the issue seriously. And three, the demand from scammers coupled with Twitter’s initial measures to fight back set up a cat-and-mouse game that incentivized bad actors to take more drastic measures to wreak havoc. That brings us to today. The story picks up with Nick Statt in The Verge: The Twitter accounts of major companies and individuals have been compromised in one of the most widespread and confounding hacks the platform has ever seen, all in service of promoting a bitcoin scam that appears to be earning its creator quite a bit of money. We don’t know how it’s happened or even to what extent Twitter’s own systems may have been compromised. The hack appears to have subsided, but new scam tweets were posting to verified accounts on a regular basis starting shortly after 4PM ET and lasting more than two hours. Twitter acknowledged the situation after more than an hour of silence, writing on its support account at 5:45PM ET, “We are aware of a security incident impacting accounts on Twitter. We are investigating and taking steps to fix it. We will update everyone shortly.” Among the hacked accounts were President Barack Obama, Joe Biden, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, the Apple and Uber corporate accounts, and pop star Kanye West. But they came later. The first prominent individual account to be compromised? Elon Musk, of course. Within the first hours of the attack, people were duped into sending more than $118,000 to the hackers. It also seems possible that a great number of sensitive direct messages could have been accessed by the attackers. Of even greater concern, though, is the speed and scale at which the attack unfolded — and the national security concerns it raises, which are profound. The first and most obvious question is, of course, who did this and how? And at press time, we don’t know. At Vice, Joseph Cox, one of the best security reporters I know, reported that members of the underground hacking community are sharing screenshots suggesting someone gained access to an internal Twitter tool used for account management. Cox writes: Two sources close to or inside the underground hacking community provided Motherboard with screenshots of an internal panel they claim is used by Twitter workers to interact with user accounts. One source said the Twitter panel was also used to change ownership of some so-called OG accounts—accounts that have a handle consisting of only one or two characters—as well as facilitating the tweeting of the cryptocurrency scams from the high profile accounts. Twitter has been deleting screenshots of the panel and has suspended users who have tweeted the screenshots, claiming that the tweets violate its rules. To speculate much further would be irresponsible, but Cox’s reporting suggests that this is not a garden-variety hack in which a bunch of people reused their passwords, or a hacker used social engineering to convince AT&T to swap a SIM card. One possibility is that hackers accessed internal Twitter tools; another that Cox raises is that a Twitter employee was involved in the incident — which, if true, would make this the second inside job revealed at Twitter this year. In any case, Twitter’s response to the incident offered further cause for distress. The company’s initial tweet on the subject said almost nothing, and two hours later it had followed only to say what many users were forced to discover for themselves: that Twitter had disabled the ability of many verified users to tweet or reset their passwords while it worked to resolve the hack’s underlying cause. The near-silencing of politicians, celebrities, and the national press corps led to much merriment on the service — see this, along with Those good tweets below, for some fun — but the move had other, darker implications. Twitter is, for better and worse, one of the world’s most important communications systems, and among its users are accounts linked to emergency medical services. The National Weather Service in Lincoln, IL, for example, had just tweeted a tornado warning before suddenly going dark. To the extent that anyone was relying on that account for further information about those tornadoes, they were out of luck. Of course, Twitter’s move to stop verified accounts from tweeting represents a difficult balancing on equities. You would probably rather the National Weather Service not tweet than a hacker sell the account to a bad actor who logs in and falsely suggests that tornadoes are sweeping through every city in America. But the ham-fisted approach to resolving the issue — banning a huge portion of 359,000 verified accounts — reflects the staggering scale of the breach. This is as close to pulling the plug on Twitter as Twitter itself has ever come. And that makes you wonder what contingencies the company has put into place in the event that it is someday taken over not by greedy Bitcoin con artists, but state-level actors or psychopaths. After today it is no longer unthinkable, if it ever truly was, that someone take over the account of a world leader and attempt to start a nuclear war. (A report on that subject from King’s College London came out just last week.) It is in such a world that I find myself in the unusual position of agreeing with Sen. Josh Hawley, the Missouri Republican who among other things wants to end content moderation. He wrote a letter to Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey, and I found myself agreeing with all of it: “I am concerned that this event may represent not merely a coordinated set of separate hacking incidents but rather a successful attack on the security of Twitter itself. As you know, millions of your users rely on your service not just to tweet publicly but also to communicate privately through your direct message service. A successful attack on your system’s servers represents a threat to all of your users’ privacy and data security.” And yet even Hawley doesn’t go far enough. The threat here is not simply user privacy and data security, though those threats are real and substantial. It is about the striking potential of Twitter to incite real-world chaos through impersonation and fraud. As of today, that potential has been realized. And I can only worry about how, with a presidential election now less than four months away, it might be realized further. Twitter will likely spend the next several days investigating how this incident took place. A criminal investigation seems likely, during which the company may not be able to fully describe Wednesday’s events to our satisfaction. But it is vital that as soon as possible, Twitter share as much about what happened today as it can — and, just as importantly, what it will do to ensure that it never happens again. After Wednesday’s catastrophe, it hardly seems like hyperbole to suggest that our world could hang in the balance.

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

Michael Spiro, WashU JD, 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.

Anders Sandberg et al., Research Fellow at Oxford, 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:

#### Khan is constrained by the existing body of antitrust law---only the plan solves.

Tara L. Reinhart et al, head of the Antitrust Group in Skadden, 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

### Plan---1AC

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

### Solvency---1AC

#### Contention 3 is Solvency.

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

Firat Cengiz, School of Law and Social Justice at the University of Liverpool, 20. School of Law and Social Justice, University of Liverpool. "The conflict between market competition and worker solidarity: moving from consumer to a citizen welfare standard in competition law". Cambridge Core. 10-8-2020. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-studies/article/conflict-between-market-competition-and-worker-solidarity-moving-from-consumer-to-a-citizen-welfare-standard-in-competition-law/6E783D1FC4BAB5605DFABCD17FBE3F35

Introduction

This paper offers a critical investigation of the law and economics of competition law enforcement in conflicts between workers and employers in the European Union (hereinafter EU) and the US. In such cases competition law comes into direct conflict with the principle of worker solidarity: according to the principle of market competition individuals are expected to take independent economic decisions and actions, whereas workers need to take collective economic actions and decisions to protect their interests. This conflict is particularly obvious in the context of the so-called gig economy,1 in which employers keep casualised workers at legal arms’ length to reduce labour and regulatory costs.2 If gig workers take collective action against their working conditions, they might face attack from competition law, because legally they might be considered independent service providers, rather than workers.3 The legal conundrum facing gig workers has become an increasingly popular subject in the law and economics literature.4 Nevertheless, the more fundamental question of how the enforcement of competition rules affects the overall position of workers beyond the limited case of the gig economy remains largely unexplored. This paper aims to investigate this broader and more fundamental question. In order to provide a sufficiently global answer, the paper focuses on the legal positions of the EU and US, as the leading competition law jurisdictions and primary competition policy exporters.5 The EU–US comparison shows that despite the slightly different legal tests applied in these polities, competition rules constitute nearly equally disciplining mechanisms against collective worker action on either side of the Atlantic. This paper also makes an original contribution to the emerging debate on whether and how competition law can contribute to wealth equality between citizens in the post-2008 crisis economy. The existing debate on the competition law–equality relationship takes the ‘consumer welfare’ standard as its main reference point: it focuses exclusively on the distribution of wealth between consumers and producers; as a result, it overlooks the production process that takes place before consumers meet products and services, and the position of workers within it.6 This is a natural result of competition law's reliance on a limited area of neoclassical economics called ‘equilibrium economics’ that understands efficiency exclusively as a market mechanism in which the price manifests itself where supply meets demand.7 Departing from the mainstream competition law and economics methodology, this paper builds its investigation on a holistic theoretical foundation, looking beyond equilibrium economics at labour exploitation theory as established in neoclassical as well as Marxian models. This analysis shows that despite standing at opposing ends of the political spectrum and whilst having some fundamental differences, Marxist and neoclassical models agree that collective worker action is economically beneficial and socially necessary. As a result, a critical analysis of the current legal situation on both sides of the Atlantic in light of this holistic framework illustrates how competition law's hostility towards collective worker action is not only unjust but also economically unsound. This paper demonstrates that the key problem in competition law's treatment of labour stems from the application of the consumer welfare standard in cases involving the competition–solidarity conflict without paying any attention to the idiosyncratic qualities of labour that render it naturally open to exploitation. Similarly, the consumer welfare standard overlooks the fact that consumers and workers are essentially the same group of people and one's welfare cannot be increased or decreased without affecting the other's.8 Even if worker exploitation could result in reduced labour costs and decreased prices, this cannot be deemed efficient as it reduces the workers’ welfare and results in broader negative socio-economic effects. Similarly, collective worker action resulting in higher labour costs and potentially higher prices cannot automatically be deemed inefficient, because although this might increase the prices consumers pay, they benefit from higher wages and better working conditions in their position as workers. As a result of this critical analysis, the paper proposes an original and more inclusive ‘citizen welfare’ standard that takes into account the economic effects of anti-competitive behaviour on workers as well as consumers. The citizen welfare standard could also potentially be applied in other contexts to solve long-standing conflicts between competition and other policy objectives, such as industrial, environmental and social policy objectives,9 although this paper primarily focuses on the application of citizen welfare to the competition–solidarity conflict. The structure of the paper is as follows: the next section provides an opening discussion of competition law, consumer welfare and equality. This is followed by a discussion of the economic theory of labour exploitation. Then, the paper investigates how competition law approaches the competition–solidarity conflict in the EU and the US. The fourth section critically discusses the EU and US legal positions in light of economic theory. This section also develops the citizen welfare approach as an alternative to consumer welfare for the resolution of the competition–solidarity conflict. This is finally followed with conclusions. Regarding terminology, this paper uses the term ‘worker’ (rather than employee) as a non-legal, generic term encompassing all individuals who make a living by providing labour power as a production factor in the production process of goods and services. Similarly, the term ‘labour’ is used to refer to the contribution of the workers to the production process as an abstract human factor. However, if the courts or authorities in question use a different term (such as employee) in a specific case, the paper uses the same term in the discussion of that specific case.

#### Worker welfare can easily be assessed.

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

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

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

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

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

#### Alternative remedies don’t solve deterrence.

Samuel Weinstein, Professor at Yeshiva University, 19. Assistant Professor of Law, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University. “Article: Financial Regulation in the (Receding) Shadow of Antitrust.” *Temple Law Review* (91): 487-491.

Even when sector regulators prioritize protecting competition, many lack the expertise and institutional mechanisms to do so effectively. Regulatory agencies might not employ investigatory and adjudicatory procedures sufficient to root out anticompetitive conduct. While courts must in many cases allow for exhaustive discovery, the same cannot be said for most agency proceedings. As a result, even those sector regulators that value protecting competition may not have the institutional systems necessary to follow through effectively. The relative weakness of remedies typically available to regulatory agencies compounds these problems. Most agencies do not have access to remedies as stringent as an antitrust court's power to assign treble damages under the Sherman Act or to permanently enjoin anticompetitive conduct. The administrative record in Trinko showed that Verizon admitted it had violated its open-access commitments and voluntarily paid $ 3 million to the FCC and $ 10 [\*488] million to competitive local exchange carriers. While the Trinko opinion relied on these sanctions in part for its conclusion that the FCC's regulatory regime had fulfilled the antitrust function, the FCC Chairman subsequently told Congress that the Commission's maximum fine authority was in many instances "insufficient to punish and deter violations" that incumbent local exchange carriers like Verizon had committed with the aim of "slow[ing] the development of local competition." Among other measures, Chairman Powell recommended increasing the FCC's forfeiture authority against common carriers for single continuing violations of the Telecommunications Act from $ 1.2 million to "at least $ 10 million." Agency capture is another explanation for regulators' relative weakness as competition enforcers. The literature on capture is well developed. There is a general scholarly consensus that the political nature of top agency jobs and the revolving door between agencies and the industries they oversee make sector regulators much more susceptible to industry pressure than antitrust courts. Studies have shown that capture may be a particular problem at the financial regulatory agencies. There is a steady flow of lawyers between the SEC and CFTC, on the one hand, and Wall Street firms and the law firms and lobbyists [\*489] that represent them on the other, which appears to affect outcomes of agency proceedings in some cases. Objective measures of the relative competition-enforcement abilities of the antitrust agencies versus the sector regulators tend to confirm the supposition that sector regulators generally cannot be relied on to fulfill the antitrust function in regulated markets. The expert staffs of the antitrust agencies are far larger and more experienced than the competition staffs, if any, at the sector regulators. In recent years, the Antitrust Division typically has had between 340 and 400 attorneys and approximately 50 economists dedicated to competition enforcement, while the FTC's Bureau of Competition has had around 300 attorneys and support staff and approximately 50 antitrust economists. Some regulatory agencies, like the FCC, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and the Federal Reserve, have dedicated competition staff with specific expertise. The FCC has a Wireline Competition Bureau, which includes a Competition Policy Division. The FDIC, Federal Reserve, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency have staff dedicated to reviewing proposed bank mergers. Even at these agencies, however, the competition staff is smaller and more narrowly focused than the staffs of the Antitrust Division and FTC. [\*490] The comparison with the SEC and CFTC is starker. Neither agency has a dedicated competition division or group. And neither agency established such a body post-Credit Suisse, when it appeared the SEC and CFTC would have increased responsibility for competition matters, or in the wake of Dodd-Frank, which required the agencies to monitor and protect competition in the derivatives markets. This paucity of personnel resources is perhaps predictable given these agencies' bureaucratic cultures. Considering this lack of experienced competition staff, it is unsurprising that the SEC and CFTC bring very few independent competition-related enforcement actions. While these agencies have collaborated with the [\*491] Department of Justice and other enforcement agencies on significant competition investigations, there is little evidence that they would bring such cases on their own. It seems clear that the financial services agencies are either unwilling or unable to "perform the antitrust function" as envisioned by the Supreme Court's case law balancing antitrust and regulation. This conclusion is troubling. It means that when courts apply Credit Suisse or Trinko to shift the responsibility for policing competition away from the expert antitrust agencies to regulatory bodies that are unprepared for the task, they are leaving some regulated markets, especially the financial markets, vulnerable to anticompetitive conduct.

#### Only the plan can adapt to market conditions.

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

A longstanding debate examines the comparative advantages of antitrust and regulation. The late Cornell economist Alfred Kahn, the architect of airline deregulation in the Carter Administration, wrote that “society’s choices are always between or among imperfect systems, but that, wherever it seems likely to be effective, even very imperfect competition is preferable to regulation.”117 Kahn does not address antitrust in that quotation, but it suggests that he would find antitrust law’s more targeted, case-by-case approach to governing competition to be preferable to regulation. Indeed, Kahn elsewhere wrote, while expressing his “belief in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws,” that “the antitrust laws are not just another form of regulation but an alternative to it—indeed, its very opposite.”118 Then-Judge Stephen Breyer has similarly stated that “antitrust is not another form of regulation. Antitrust is an alternative to regulation and, where feasible, a better alternative.”119 The comparisons that Breyer and Kahn made were, in context, mostly between antitrust and rate regulation, where the agency was trying to protect consumers from monopoly pricing.120 But some of these criticisms, including “high cost; ineffectiveness and waste; procedural unfairness, complexity, and delay; unresponsiveness to democratic control; and the inherent unpredictability of the end result,” apply to most kinds of regulation.121 Regulation might well be worthwhile despite those potential drawbacks, but certain attributes—ex post and case-by-case enforcement, judicial oversight with the government bearing the burden of proof—make antitrust enforcement less vulnerable to those critiques. Regulation can also be comparatively slow to adapt to new market conditions, and that delay can affect an entire regulated industry.122 Antitrust authorities also might fail to foresee relevant market changes, but their actions typically affect only one discrete case and they generally have flexibility, as conditions change, to modify relevant consent decrees and decline to pursue similar investigations or sanctions.123 It is harder for government agencies to make changes to established regulatory programs,124 making regulation more likely than antitrust to outlast the problems it was implemented to solve. Regulation’s delayed adaptation to changing conditions can be costly,125 especially as markets transition to more competitive structures.126 As Michael Boudin, a former DOJ antitrust official (and later federal judge) put it, “regulation almost always will be very difficult to dislodge, even if it proves mistaken. Almost any regulatory regime will develop a constituency, armed with congressmen and self-interested bureaucrats . . . [and] become[] the foundation on which private arrangements are constructed, arrangements that cannot easily be discarded.”127

#### The plan creates a flexible standard that overcomes new challenges faced by workers.

Alden Abbott, Research Fellow at Mercatus Center, 21. Senior Research Fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. “FTC Competition Regulation: A Cost-Benefit Appraisal.” 6/28/2021. https://www.mercatus.org/publications/antitrust-and-competition/ftc-competition-regulation-cost-benefit-appraisal

Competition rules, however, inherently would be overbroad and would suffer from a very high rate of false positives. By characterizing certain practices as inherently anticompetitive without allowing for consideration of case-specific facts bearing on actual competitive effects, findings of rule violations inevitably would condemn some (perhaps many) efficient arrangements. Furthermore, because rules by their nature are fixed in stone (at least until they are amended or repealed), they “frequently fail to account for market dynamic, new sources of competition, and consumer preferences.” Thus, they lack case law adjudication’s feature of analytic improvement (reflected in periodically updated federal antitrust guidelines) based on changing market conditions and improved economic analysis.

In sum, competition rules are a far more blunt and inflexible tool than adjudication and, as such, are less conducive to welfare-enhancing competition policy outcomes.

#### State action gets struck down.

Moshe Marvit, Attorney, 17. attorney and fellow at the Century Foundation, and co-author with Richard D. Kahlenberg of Why Labor Organizing Should Be a Civil Right: Rebuilding a Middle-Class Democracy by Enhancing Worker Voice. “The Way Forward for Labor Is Through the States.” The American Prospect. 9/1/2017. <https://prospect.org/labor/way-forward-labor-states/>

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

#### Tons of antitrust now.

Lina **Saigol, reporter, 1-18**-22. reporter for Barron's in London, spent 16 years at the Financial Times Reuters. "M&A Is Booming. Gear Up for an Antitrust Crackdown.". Barrons. 1-18-2022. <https://www.barrons.com/articles/mergers-booming-us-regulators-crackdown-51642534456?tesla=y>

Aggressive antitrust enforcement is back. That is the stark message that President Joe Biden has sent the business community, and regulators have already kicked into action, threatening to rein in a [record-setting merger boom](https://www.wsj.com/articles/m-a-likely-to-remain-strong-in-2022-as-covid-19-looms-over-business-plans-11640255406?mod=Searchresults_pos9&page=1). Those charged with delivering Biden’s message are two Big Tech critics: Lina Khan, chair of the Federal Trade Commission, and Jonathan Kanter, head of the Justice Department’s antitrust division. On Tuesday, they outlined a plan to [revise how the agencies will review mergers](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2022/01/ftc-and-justice-department-seek-to-strengthen-enforcement-against-illegal-mergers). They want public comment on how to update federal guidelines “to better detect and prevent illegal, anticompetitive deals,” they said in a statement. “Our country depends on competition to drive progress, innovation, and prosperity,” Kanter said. “We need to understand why so many industries have too few competitors, and to think carefully about how to ensure our merger enforcement tools are fit for purpose in the modern economy.” Earlier on Tuesday, [Microsoft](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/msft)(ticker: MSFT) said it would acquire gaming company [Activision Blizzard](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/atvi)(ATVI) in [an all-cash transaction valued at nearly $70 billion](https://www.barrons.com/articles/microsoft-buys-activision-blizzard-stock-acquisition-51642513147?mod=hp_LEAD_1&mod=article_inline). The acquisition needs regulatory and shareholder approval. Wedbush analyst Dan Ives wrote that there may be regulatory hurdles because of [the acquisition’s size](https://www.barrons.com/articles/microsoft-stock-activision-blizzard-deal-metaverse-51642522838?mod=hp_LEAD_1_B_1&mod=article_inline). But he expects the deal to close because Microsoft isn’t under the same scrutiny as some of its tech rivals. Earlier this month, a federal judge ruled the [FTC can move forward with its revised antitrust lawsuit](https://www.wsj.com/articles/federal-judge-rejects-facebooks-request-to-dismiss-ftcs-latest-antitrust-lawsuit-11641932982?mod=Searchresults_pos5&page=1) against [Meta Platform](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/fb)‘s (FB) Facebook that alleges the social media platform is unlawfully suppressing competition. Many bankers and lawyers say they aren’t too worried, contending that tighter enforcement might slow the mergers and acquisitions market rather than derail it. That is due in part because the FTC is constrained by limited manpower and budget. Also, regulators don’t have authority on their own to block a merger—federal judges can issue orders blocking it. “Of course there has been an increased level of scrutiny and managements and boards have raised the bar on what they will consider, but we will continue to see large deals with compelling strategic imperative,” Bruce Evans, global co-head of M&A at [Deutsche Bank](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/db), told Barron’s. In December, the FTC [sued to block](https://www.barrons.com/articles/ftc-sues-to-block-nvidias-40b-acquisition-of-arm-51638481709?mod=article_inline) computer-chip powerhouse [Nvidia](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/nvda)(ticker: NVDA) from spending [$40 billion](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2021/12/ftc-sues-block-40-billion-semiconductor-chip-merger) for British technology provider Arm, saying the blockbuster deal would unfairly stifle competition. Just weeks earlier, the Justice Department [sued to halt](https://www.barrons.com/articles/justice-department-penguin-random-house-simon-schuster-merger-51635873536?mod=article_inline) a proposed [$2.2 billion](https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/1445916/download) tie-up between publishers Penguin Random House and Simon & Schuster, which would create a mega-publisher in the books market. The agency argues that consolidation would hurt authors and readers. The lawsuits come after Biden signed a sweeping [executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/07/09/executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) in July aimed at curbing the power of big business by cracking down on anticompetitive practices in sectors ranging from agriculture to pharmaceuticals to labor. Consolidation in industries over the past several decades has denied Americans the benefits of an open economy and widened racial, income, and wealth inequality, the executive order stated. The administration sees less corporate competition as one of the causes of inflation. “Higher prices and lower wages caused by lack of competition are now estimated to cost the median American household [$5,000](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/07/09/fact-sheet-executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/) a year,” according to the order. Rising equity markets and widespread stimulus measures helped spur companies worldwide to clinch more than 62,000 deals worth [$5.8 trillion](https://www.barrons.com/articles/global-deal-making-record-high-2021-51640960224?mod=article_inline) last year, up 64% from the previous year, according to data provider Refinitiv. [Big pharmaceutical companies](https://www.barrons.com/articles/drug-companies-cash-product-buys-research-51641423117?tesla=y&mod=article_inline) could be one of the biggest sectors at risk of regulatory scrutiny. The FTC put the industry on alert in July when it said it would review more deals amid skyrocketing drug prices and ongoing concerns about anticompetitive conduct. The industry still has record levels of cash to spend and needs to merge to innovate. By the end of this year, 18 large-cap U.S. and European biopharmas will have more than $500 billion in cash on hand, according to estimates by SVB Leerink analyst Geoffrey Porges. Deal makers will be closely watching [Pfizer](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/pfe)‘s (PFE) [$6.7 billion takeover](https://www.barrons.com/articles/pfizer-arena-pharmaceuticals-acquisition-51639396154?mod=article_inline) of [Arena Pharmaceuticals](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/arna), announced in December, which could become a test case for the FTC’s view of pharma M&A. Citi analyst Andrew Baum said the deal was “highly attractive” for Pfizer, but the key issue would be whether the “newly muscular” FTC would fight it and allow it to proceed given the significant overlap between important drugs. The two companies might need to sell parts of the business to push the deal through. Some companies are calling off their planned mergers as soon as they receive feedback. In December, outdoor sporting goods retailer [Sportsman’s Warehouse Holdings](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/spwh)(SPWH) and Great Outdoors Group, owner of the Bass Pro Shops chain, [canned](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/sportsman-s-warehouse-shares-fall-19-after-takeover-deal-terminated-271638556601) their deal in the belief that it wouldn’t be approved, according to a regulatory filing. Months earlier, insurance brokers [Aon](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/aon)(AON) and [Willis Towers Watson](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/wtw)(WTW) pulled their merger after the DOJ sued to stop the [$30 billion](https://www.barrons.com/articles/aon-willis-towers-scrap-30-billion-merger-amid-antitrust-impasse-51627328024?mod=article_inline)tie-up. The brokers said regulators’ objections created “unacceptable delay and uncertainty.”

## 2ac

### Inequality adv---2ac

#### And it hasn’t changed.

David Leonhardt 10-21. Senior writer, New York Times. "Where Are the Workers?" New York Times. 10-21-2021. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/20/briefing/labor-shortage-us-low-wage-economy.html

The big uncertainty is what happens next. One possibility is that we have entered a new era of tight labor markets. With more Americans choosing not to work — including aging baby boomers — companies would then need to increase pay and improve working conditions to attract employees. Some are already doing so, Ben Casselman notes: Hourly wages in the leisure-and-hospitality sector, for example, have surged this year. In this scenario, the pandemic would represent a turning point. Almost a half-century of a low-wage economy would end, and incomes would grow more rapidly, as they did from the 1940s until the early ’70s. But I find it hard to believe this is the most likely scenario. For one thing, the financial cushion of most households still is not large. The median cash savings of the bottom quarter of households (ranked by earnings) has risen by 70 percent over the past two years — but it’s still only about $1,000, Fiona Greig of the JPMorgan Chase Institute points out. And the pandemic stimulus programs have mostly ended. Eventually, more Americans will feel the need to go back to work. When they do, they will find a job market where employers hold a decided power advantage, because of the decline of labor unions and an increase in corporate concentration. The college dropout crisis, leaving many workers struggling to keep up with technological changes, plays a role, too.

#### 1nc 6 - Walt goes Aff

\*FULL ARTICLE---NO TEXT REMOVED\*

Walt 20. Stephen M. Walt, Professor of IR @ Harvard & PhD in Poli Sci from UC Berkeley, (5-13-2020, "Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?," *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/>, pacc)

By many measures, 2020 is looking to be the worst year that humankind has faced in many decades. We’re in the midst of a pandemic that has already claimed more than 280,000 lives, sickened millions of people, and is certain to afflict millions more before it ends. The world economy is in free fall, with unemployment rising dramatically, trade and output plummeting, and no hopeful end in sight. A plague of locusts is back for a second time in Africa, and last week we learned about murderous killer wasps threatening the bee population in the United States. Americans have a head-in-the-sand president who prescribes potentially lethal nostrums and ignores the advice of his scientific advisors. Even if all those things magically disappeared tomorrow—and they won’t—we still face the looming long-term danger from climate change. Given all that, what could possibly make things worse? Here’s one possibility: war. It is therefore worth asking whether the combination of a pandemic and a major economic depression is making war more or less likely. What does history and theory tell us about that question? For starters, we know neither plague nor depression make war impossible. World War I ended just as the 1918-1919 influenza was beginning to devastate the world, but that pandemic didn’t stop the Russian Civil War, the Russo-Polish War, or several other serious conflicts. The Great Depression that began in 1929 didn’t prevent Japan from invading Manchuria in 1931, and it helped fuel the rise of fascism in the 1930s and made World War II more likely. So if you think major war simply can’t happen during COVID-19 and the accompanying global recession, think again. But war could still be much less likely. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Barry Posen has already considered the likely impact of the current pandemic on the probability of war, and he believes COVID-19 is more likely to promote peace instead. He argues that the current pandemic is affecting all the major powers adversely, which means it isn’t creating tempting windows of opportunity for unaffected states while leaving others weaker and therefore vulnerable. Instead, it is making all governments more pessimistic about their short- to medium-term prospects. Because states often go to war out of sense of overconfidence (however misplaced it sometimes turns out to be), pandemic-induced pessimism should be conducive to peace. Moreover, by its very nature war requires states to assemble lots of people in close proximity—at training camps, military bases, mobilization areas, ships at sea, etc.—and that’s not something you want to do in the middle of a pandemic. For the moment at least, beleaguered governments of all types are focusing on convincing their citizens they are doing everything in their power to protect the public from the disease. Taken together, these considerations might explain why even an impulsive and headstrong warmaker like Saudi Arabia’s Mohammed bin Salman has gotten more interested in winding down his brutal and unsuccessful military campaign in Yemen. Posen adds that COVID-19 is also likely to reduce international trade in the short to medium term. Those who believe economic interdependence is a powerful barrier to war might be alarmed by this development, but he points out that trade issues have been a source of considerable friction in recent years—especially between the United States and China—and a degree of decoupling might reduce tensions somewhat and cause the odds of war to recede. For these reasons, the pandemic itself may be conducive to peace. But what about the relationship between broader economic conditions and the likelihood of war? Might a few leaders still convince themselves that provoking a crisis and going to war could still advance either long-term national interests or their own political fortunes? Are the other paths by which a deep and sustained economic downturn might make serious global conflict more likely? One familiar argument is the so-called diversionary (or “scapegoat”) theory of war. It suggests that leaders who are worried about their popularity at home will try to divert attention from their failures by provoking a crisis with a foreign power and maybe even using force against it. Drawing on this logic, some Americans now worry that President Donald Trump will decide to attack a country like Iran or Venezuela in the run-up to the presidential election and especially if he thinks he’s likely to lose. This outcome strikes me as unlikely, even if one ignores the logical and empirical flaws in the theory itself. War is always a gamble, and should things go badly—even a little bit—it would hammer the last nail in the coffin of Trump’s declining fortunes. Moreover, none of the countries Trump might consider going after pose an imminent threat to U.S. security, and even his staunchest supporters may wonder why he is wasting time and money going after Iran or Venezuela at a moment when thousands of Americans are dying preventable deaths at home. Even a successful military action won’t put Americans back to work, create the sort of testing-and-tracing regime that competent governments around the world have been able to implement already, or hasten the development of a vaccine. The same logic is likely to guide the decisions of other world leaders too. Another familiar folk theory is “military Keynesianism.” War generates a lot of economic demand, and it can sometimes lift depressed economies out of the doldrums and back toward prosperity and full employment. The obvious case in point here is World War II, which did help the U.S economy finally escape the quicksand of the Great Depression. Those who are convinced that great powers go to war primarily to keep Big Business (or the arms industry) happy are naturally drawn to this sort of argument, and they might worry that governments looking at bleak economic forecasts will try to restart their economies through some sort of military adventure. I doubt it. It takes a really big war to generate a significant stimulus, and it is hard to imagine any country launching a large-scale war—with all its attendant risks—at a moment when debt levels are already soaring. More importantly, there are lots of easier and more direct ways to stimulate the economy—infrastructure spending, unemployment insurance, even “helicopter payments”—and launching a war has to be one of the least efficient methods available. The threat of war usually spooks investors too, which any politician with their eye on the stock market would be loath to do. Economic downturns can encourage war in some special circumstances, especially when a war would enable a country facing severe hardships to capture something of immediate and significant value. Saddam Hussein’s decision to seize Kuwait in 1990 fits this model perfectly: The Iraqi economy was in terrible shape after its long war with Iran; unemployment was threatening Saddam’s domestic position; Kuwait’s vast oil riches were a considerable prize; and seizing the lightly armed emirate was exceedingly easy to do. Iraq also owed Kuwait a lot of money, and a hostile takeover by Baghdad would wipe those debts off the books overnight. In this case, Iraq’s parlous economic condition clearly made war more likely. Yet I cannot think of any country in similar circumstances today. Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that Trump occasionally hints at—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible. If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished. On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).” Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself. The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success. Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term. To be sure, I can’t rule out another powerful cause of war—stupidity—especially when it is so much in evidence in some quarters these days. So there is no guarantee that we won’t see misguided leaders stumbling into another foolish bloodletting. But given that it’s hard to find any rays of sunshine at this particular moment in history, I’m going to hope I’m right about this one.

### FTC adv---2ac

#### 5---the plan is popular too

Tirza J Angerhofer and Roger D Blair 21. Tirza J Angerhofer, Doctoral Fellow, Department of Economics. \*\*Roger D Blair, Professor, Department of Economics and Affiliate Faculty of Law, University of Florida. “Considerations of Buyer Power in Merger Review” Journal of Antitrust Enforcement. 10-18-21. <https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/advance-article/doi/10.1093/jaenfo/jnab015/6400043?searchresult=1>

Recently, there has been **increasing recognition** of the adverse welfare effects of buyer power in various jurisdictions around the world.2 First, a firm that has monopsony power can reduce the quantity that it buys in order to depress the price that it pays for inputs which leads to a social welfare loss. Secondly, a firm with bargaining power can use the threat of walking away from the negotiations to extract surplus from suppliers. Mergers have the potential to increase buyer power and thereby cause substantial . anticompetitive harm. But this harm has traditionally been ignored in merger review. Our improved understanding of the relationship between mergers and buying power has led to **requests by Congress and policymakers** that the US Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) **pay closer attention to threats of monopsony when conducting their merger reviews.** In the USA, at least, policymakers have focused their efforts on monopsony power due to its clear social welfare impact and its relevance to labour markets. Congress and policymakers have **proposed bills** that would encourage the Agencies to **consider monopsony in merger review** and would help them to do this by increasing their budget.3 In both the House and Senate, a **proposed bill would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act** by explicitly including monopsony in the statutory language in order to strengthen the emphasis on monopsony in merger review.4 As we will show in this Article, both the economic theory and the empirical evidence provide support for considering the potential effects of monopsony in merger review. This evidence is particularly clear in labour markets but is also relevant to other input markets.

### Vagueness---2ac

#### 2---counter interpretation------Prohibitions include per se and rule of reason.

Anu Bradford and Adam S. Chilton 18. Anu Bradford Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia Law School. Adam S. Chilton. Assistant Professor of Law and Walter Mander Research Scholar. “Competition Law Around the World from 1889 to 2010: The Competition Law Index”. JOURNAL OF COMPETITION LAW & ECONOMICS, VOL. 14, P. 393, 2018 (2018). https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3519&context=faculty\_scholarship

Before discussing our data and the coding of the CLI, it is important to recognize that there are limitations to any index that attempts to quantify competition regulation. This is because it is difficult to produce a single metric that tells the comprehensive story of country’s competition regime. For example, if a specific type of conduct is prohibited, is it prohibited always (per se) or sometimes (rule of reason)? This seems like a relevant distinction to code, but it turns out to be difficult to capture systematically in many jurisdictions. For instance, Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) seems to regulate anticompetitive agreements under the rule of reason standard in the European Union, but, in practice, cartels are per se prohibited. This highlights the challenge of coding even just the law in books, let alone accounting for all the nuances of a country’s competition policies.20

### Security K---2ac

#### 4---No internal link and alt fails

Goddard & Krebs 15 Stacie E. Goddard & Ronald R. Krebs 15, Goddard, Jane Bishop Associate Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College; Krebs, Beverly and Richard Fink Professor in the Liberal Arts and Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, “Securitization Forum: The Transatlantic Divide: Why Securitization Has Not Secured a Place in American IR, Why It Should, and How It Can,” Duck of Minerva, 9-18-2015, http://duckofminerva.com/2015/09/securitization-forum-the-transatlantic-divide-why-securitization-has-not-secured-a-place-in-american-ir-why-it-should-and-how-it-can.html

Securitization theory has rightly garnered much attention among European scholars of international relations. Its basic claims are powerful: that security threats are not given, but require active construction; that the boundaries of “security” are malleable; that the declaration that a certain problem lies within the realm of security is itself a productive political act; and that “security” issues hold a trump card, demanding disproportionate resources and silencing alternative perspectives. Securitization thus highlights a familiar, even ubiquitous, political process that had received little attention in the international relations or comparative foreign policy literatures. It gave scholars a theoretical language, if not quite a set of coherent theoretical tools, with which to make sense of how a diverse set of issues, from migration to narcotics flows to global climate change, sometimes came to be treated as matters of national and global security and thereby—and this is where securitization’s critical edge came to the fore—impeded reasoned political debate. No surprise that, as Jarrod and Eric observe, securitization has been the focus of so many articles in the EJIR—and even more in such journals as the Review of International Studies and Security Dialogue. But there are (good) substantive and (not so good) sociological reasons that securitization has failed to gain traction in North America. First, and most important, securitization describes a process but leaves us well short of (a) a fully specified causal theory that (b) takes proper account of the politics of rhetorical contestation. According to the foundational theorists of the Copenhagen School, actors, usually elites, transform the social order from one of normal, everyday politics into a Schmittian world of crisis by identifying a dire threat to the political community. They conceive of this “securitizing move” in linguistic terms, as a speech act. As Ole Waever (1995: 55) argues, “By saying it [security], something is done (as in betting, a promise, naming a ship). . . . [T]he word ‘security’ is the act . . .” [emphasis added]. Securitization is a powerful discursive process that constitutes social reality. Countless articles and books have traced this process, and its consequences, in particular policy domains. Securitization presents itself as a causal account. But its mechanisms remain obscure, as do the conditions under which it operates. Why is speaking security so powerful? How do mere words twist and transform the social order? Does the invocation of security prompt a visceral emotional response? Are speech acts persuasive, by using well-known tropes to convince audiences that they must seek protection? Or does securitization operate through the politics of rhetorical coercion, silencing potential opponents? In securitization accounts, speech acts often seem to be magical incantations that upend normal politics through pathways shrouded in mystery. Equally unclear is why some securitizing moves resonate, while others [are ignored] ~~fall on deaf ears~~. Certainly not all attempts to construct threats succeed, and this is true of both traditional military concerns as well as “new” security issues. Both neoconservatives and structural realists in the United States have long insisted that conflict with China is inevitable, yet China has over the last 25 years been more opportunity than threat in US political discourse—despite these vigorous and persistent securitizing moves. In very recent years, the balance has shifted, and the China threat has started to catch on: linguistic processes alone cannot account for this change. The US military has repeatedly declared that global climate change has profound implications for national security—but that has hardly cast aside climate change deniers, many of whom are ironically foreign policy hawks supposedly deferential to the uniformed military. Authoritative speakers have varied in the efficacy of their securitizing moves. While George W. Bush powerfully framed the events of 9/11 as a global war against American values, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a more gifted orator, struggled to convince a skeptical public that Germany presented an imminent threat to the United States. After thirty years as an active research program, securitization theory has hardly begun to offer acceptable answers to these questions. Brief references to “facilitating conditions” won’t cut it. You don’t have to subscribe to a covering-law conception of theory to find these questions important or to find securitization’s answers unsatisfying. A large part of the problem, we believe, lies in securitization’s silence on the politics of security. Its foundations in speech act theory have yielded an oddly apolitical theoretical framework. In its seminal formulation, the Copenhagen school emphasized the internal linguistic rules that must be followed for a speech act to be recognized as competent. Yet as Thierry Balzacq argues, by treating securitization as a purely rule-driven process, the Copenhagen school ignores the politics of securitization, reducing “security to a conventional procedure such as marriage or betting in which the ‘felicity circumstances’ (conditions of success) must fully prevail for the act to go through” (2005:172). Absent from this picture are fierce rhetorical battles, where coalitions counter securitizing moves with their own appeals that strike more or less deeply at underlying narratives. Absent as well are the public intellectuals and media, who question and critique securitizing moves sometimes (and not others), sometimes to good effect (and sometimes with little impact). The audience itself—whether the mass public or a narrower elite stratum—is stripped of all agency. Speaking security, even when the performance is competent, does not sweep this politics away. Only by delving into this politics can we shed light on the mysteries of securitization. We see rhetorical politics as constituted less by singular “securitizing moves” than by “contentious conversation”—to use Charles Tilly’s phrase. To this end, we would urge securitization theorists, as we recently have elsewhere, to move towards a “pragmatic” model that rests on four analytical wagers: that actors are both strategic and social; that legitimation works by imparting meaning to political action; that legitimation is laced through with contestation; and that the power of language emerges through contentious dialogue. We are heartened that our ambivalence about securitization—the ways in which we find it by turns appealing and dissatisfying—and our vision for how to move forward have in the last decade been echoed by (mostly) European colleagues. These critics have laid out a research agenda that would, if taken up, produce more satisfying, and more deeply political, theoretical accounts. In our own work, both individual and collective, we have tried to advance that research agenda. So long as securitization theorists resist defining the theory’s scope and mechanisms, and so long as it remains wedded to apolitical underpinnings, we think it unlikely to gain a broad following on this side of the pond. Second, securitization has been held back by another way in which it is apolitical—this time thanks to its Schmittian commitments and political vision. Successful securitization, in seminal accounts, replaces normal patterns of politics with the world of the exception, in which contest has no place. They imagine security as the ultimate trump card. But, in reality, the divide is not nearly so stark. Security does not crowd out all other spending priorities—or states would spend on nothing but defense and “securitized” issues. Nor does simply declaring something a matter of national security guarantee its funding—or global climate change counter-measures, including research on renewable energies, would be well-funded. Nor are security issues somehow aloof from politics: politics has never truly stopped “at the water’s edge.” Securitization considers only the politics of security. Its strangely dichotomous optic cannot see or make sense of the politics within security. In ignoring the politics within security, securitization is of course in good company. Realists of all stripes have paid little attention to domestic political contest, except as a distraction from structural imperatives. But while realism is unquestionably a powerful first-cut, this inattention to the politics within security is also among the reasons so many have found it wanting. As Arnold Wolfers long ago observed, some degree of insecurity is the normal state of affairs. But “some may find the danger to which they are exposed entirely normal and in line with their modest security expectations while others consider it unbearable to live with these same dangers.” And states, he further argues, do not actually maximize security—almost ever. “Even when there has been no question that armaments would mean more security, the cost in taxes, the reduction in social benefits, or the sheer discomfort involved have militated effectively against further effort” (1962:151, 153). A securitization perspective renders all this politics within security inexplicable. And yet, as Wolfers saw half a century ago, it is crucial.

#### 7---Securitization and scenario building is good.

**Junio 13**—John Hopkins strategic studies visiting scholar, 2013 (Timothy, “Conceiving of Future War: The Promise of Scenario Analysis for International Relations”, International Studies Review, 15.3, Wiley)

This article introduces political scientists to scenarios—future counterfactuals—and demonstrates their value in tandem with other methodologies and across a wide range of research questions. The authors describe best practices regarding the scenario method and argue that scenarios contribute to theory building and development, identifying new hypotheses, analyzing data-poor research topics, articulating “world views,” setting new research agendas, avoiding cognitive biases, and **teaching**. The article also establishes the low rate at which scenarios are used in the international relations subfield and situates scenarios in the broader context of political science methods. The conclusion offers two detailed examples of the effective use of scenarios. In his classic work on scenario analysis, The Art of the Long View, Peter Schwartz commented that “social scientists often have a hard time [building scenarios]; they have been trained to stay away from ‘what if?’ questions and concentrate on ‘what was?’” (Schwartz 1996:31). While Schwartz's comments were impressionistic based on his years of conducting and teaching scenario analysis, his claim withstands empirical scrutiny. Scenarios—counterfactual narratives about the future—are woefully underutilized among political scientists. The method is almost never taught on graduate student syllabi, and a survey of leading international relations (IR) journals indicates that scenarios were used in only 302 of 18,764 sampled articles. The low rate at which political scientists use scenarios—less than 2% of the time—is surprising; the method is popular in fields as disparate as business, demographics, ecology, pharmacology, public health, economics, and epidemiology (Venable, Li, Ginter, and Duncan 1993; Leufkens, Haaijer-Ruskamp, Bakker, and Dukes 1994; Baker, Hulse, Gregory, White, Van Sickle, Berger, Dole, and Schumaker 2004; Sanderson, Scherbov, O'Neill, and Lutz 2004). Scenarios also are a **common tool employed by the policymakers** whom political scientists study. This article seeks to elevate the status of scenarios in political science by demonstrating their usefulness for **theory building and pedagogy**. Rather than constitute mere speculation regarding an unpredictable future, **as critics might suggest**, scenarios assist scholars with developing testable hypotheses, gathering data, and identifying a theory's upper and lower bounds. Additionally, **scenarios are an effective way to teach students to apply theory to policy**. In the pages below, a “best practices” guide is offered to advise scholars, practitioners, and students, and an argument is developed in favor of the use of scenarios. The article concludes with two examples of how political scientists have invoked the scenario method to improve the specifications of their theories, propose falsifiable hypotheses, and design new empirical research programs. Scenarios in the Discipline What do counterfactual narratives about the future look like? Scenarios may range in length from a few sentences to many pages. One of the most common uses of the scenario method, which will be referenced throughout this article, is to study the conditions under which **high-consequence, low-probability** events may occur. Perhaps the best example of this is **nuclear warfare**, a circumstance that has never resulted, but has captivated generations of political scientists. For an introductory illustration, let us consider a very simple scenario regarding how a first use of a nuclear weapon might occur: During the year 2023, the US military is ordered to launch air and sea patrols of the Taiwan Strait to aid in a crisis. These highly visible patrols disrupt trade off China's coast, and result in skyrocketing insurance rates for shipping companies. Several days into the contingency, which involves over ten thousand US military personnel, an intelligence estimate concludes that a Chinese conventional strike against US air patrols and naval assets is imminent. The United States conducts a preemptive strike against anti-air and anti-sea systems on the Chinese mainland. The US strike is far more successful than Chinese military leaders thought possible; a new source of intelligence to the United States—unknown to Chinese leadership—allowed the US military to severely degrade Chinese targeting and situational awareness capabilities. Many of the weapons that China relied on to dissuade escalatory US military action are now reduced to single-digit-percentage readiness. Estimates for repairs and replenishments are stated in terms of weeks, and China's confidence in readily available, but “dumber,” weapons is low due to the dispersion and mobility of US forces. Word of the successful US strike spreads among the Chinese and Taiwanese publics. The Chinese Government concludes that for the sake of preserving its domestic strength, and to signal resolve to the US and Taiwanese Governments while minimizing further economic disruption, it should escalate dramatically with the use of an extremely small-yield nuclear device against a stationary US military asset in the Pacific region. This short story reflects a future event that, while unlikely to occur and far too vague to be used for military planning, contains many dimensions of political science theory. These include the following: what leaders perceive as “limited,” “proportional,” or “escalatory” uses of force; the importance of private information about capabilities and commitment; audience costs in international politics; the relationship between military expediency and political objectives during war; and the role of compressed timelines for decision making, among others. The purpose of this article is to explain to scholars how **such stories**, and more rigorously developed narratives that specify variables of interest and draw on extant data, may **improve the study of IR**. An important starting point is to explain how future counterfactuals fit into the methodological canon of the discipline.

### ADV CP---2ac

#### b---Growth alone can’t solve inequality---protections for workers are key.

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

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

#### antitrust is the less stringent option.

Daniel Crane 18. Frederick Paul Furth Professor of Law, University of Michigan. “Antitrust's Unconventional Politics.” *Virginia Law Review* (104): 134-135. <https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3019&context=articles>.

Beyond the concern that, absent antitrust, capitalism itself might succumb to reformist pressures, there is a more modest possibility that, absent antitrust, political pressures would lead to overregulation. Antitrust and administrative regulation are conventionally viewed as alternatives to address market failures. From the Reagan Administration to the Financial Crisis of 2008, the overall arc of American law involved simultaneous deregulation and relaxation of antitrust enforcement. If popular dissatisfaction with the economic status quo grows, demand might grow to pull either the regulatory or antitrust lever. Those ideologically committed to a light governmental hand on the market might prefer the antitrust alternative.

It is hard to judge at any given moment how much political support for antitrust intervention is motivated by genuine concern over monopoly and competition, and how much of it derives from the fact that, in the face of popular demand for a governmental cure to a perceived evil, it is often easier to delegate the solution to antitrust than to propose a regulatory solution. From the Sherman Act forward, however, it is certain that antitrust has often been deployed as a foil to more interventionist forms of regulation. The ideological and political implications of that move are complex and not neatly housed in left– right categories.

#### 4---perm do the counterplan---antitrust laws are regulations.

Robinhood Financial LLC 20. “What are Antitrust Laws?”. 10-6-20. https://learn.robinhood.com/articles/4x5oCZOtg43uORfxEnxPRW/what-are-antitrust-laws/

Antitrust laws are regulations that aim to promote fair business competition in an open market and protect consumers by banning certain predatory practices.

#### Taxes causally harm growth---recent studies prove.

Alex Durante 21. Federal Tax Economist “Reviewing Recent Evidence of the Effect of Taxes on Economic Growth” Tax Foundation. 05-21-21. <https://taxfoundation.org/reviewing-recent-evidence-effect-taxes-economic-growth/>

With the Biden administration proposing a variety of new taxes, it is worth **revisiting the literature** on how taxes impact economic growth. In 2012, we published a review of the evidence, noting that most studies find negative impacts. However, many papers have been written since, some using more sophisticated empirical methods to identify a causal impact of taxes on economic growth. Below we review this **new evidence**, again confirming our original findings: **Taxes**, particularly on corporate and individual income, **harm economic growth.** The economic impacts of tax changes on economic growth, measured as a change in real GDP or the components of GDP such as consumption and investment, are difficult to measure. Some tax changes occur as a response to economic growth, and looking at a tax cut at a certain point in time could lead to the mistaken conclusion that tax cuts are bad for growth, since tax cuts are often enacted during economic downturns. For this reason, most of the literature in recent years, and reviewed below, has followed the methodology developed in Romer and Romer (2010): Looking at unanticipated changes in tax policy, which economists refer to as “exogenous shocks.” There are other methodological challenges as well. Failure to control for other factors that impact economic growth, such as government spending and monetary policy, could understate or overstate the impact of taxes on growth. Some tax changes in particular may have stronger long-run impacts relative to the short run, such as corporate tax changes, and a study with only a limited time series would miss this effect. Finally, tax reforms involve many moving parts: Certain taxes may go up, while others may drop. This can make it difficult to characterize certain reforms as net tax increases or decreases, leading to mistaken interpretations of how taxes impact growth. We **investigate papers in top economics journals** and National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) working papers over the past few years, considering both U.S. and international evidence. This research covers a wide variety of taxes, including income, consumption, and corporate taxation. All seven papers reviewed here find that **tax cuts** have **positive effects** on growth, although some papers note that the strength of this effect depends on which taxes are cut, for whom, and when. Mertens and Olea (2018) used time series data from 1946 to 2012 to estimate the impacts of marginal tax rates on individual income. They found that marginal rate cuts led to both increases in real GDP and declines in unemployment. A 1 percentage-point decrease in the tax rate increases real GDP by 0.78 percent by the third year after the tax change. Importantly, they find that changes in income following a tax change are responsive to the marginal rate change regardless of the change in the average tax rate. This illustrates that the positive GDP changes the authors find are the response to changes in the incentives, rather than due to an increase aggregate demand through the consumption channel. Cuts in tax rates for the top 1 percent also have positive impacts on other income groups, consistent with a supply-side narrative of how reductions in top marginal rates can increase incomes for other groups over time. However, tax cuts for the top 1 percent do increase inequality. Zidar (2019) examines the impact of federal tax burdens on economic growth and labor supply across different income groups and states from 1950-2011. He finds positive impacts of tax cuts on economic growth following two years after the change in policy but finds that tax cuts for low- and moderate-income taxpayers affect growth more than tax cuts for high-income taxpayers. The paper finds that a 1 percent of state GDP tax decrease for the bottom 90 percent of earners increases state GDP by 6.6 percent. Looking at labor supply effects in particular, he finds that a 1 percent of state GDP tax decrease increases labor force participation for the bottom 90 percent of earners by 3.5 percentage points and hours worked by 2 percent. He does not find any significant impact on labor force participation rates, hours worked, or GDP growth for the top 10 percent of earners from a similarly sized tax change, somewhat in contrast to the results found in Mertens and Olea (2018) for top earners. This result may lead some to assume that Zidar is identifying “Keynesian” effects of tax changes, or aggregate demand effects. However, the paper finds strong effects of tax cuts on real wages as well. As Zidar notes, “the increase in real wages suggests that supply-side responses are important and may exceed demand-side responses to tax changes for the bottom 90%.” Additionally, some may go further and argue that this paper shows that tax cuts for top earners have no impact on growth. However, this paper only looks at short-run impacts of tax changes on GDP and does not consider the broader implication of tax policy on long-run growth, human capital, or innovation. Nonetheless, the paper **provides compelling evidence** of tax cuts impacting growth through the supply side, consistent with neoclassical economic theory. Ljungvist and Smolyansky (2018) **look at 250 state corporate tax changes** from 1970-2010 to assess their impact on employment and income. By comparing nearby counties across states, this allows the authors to isolate the impacts of corporate tax changes relative to other policies that might affect economic growth. They find that a 1 percentage-point cut in statutory corporate tax rates leads to a 0.2 percent increase in employment and a 0.3 percent increase in wages. They find that **tax increases are** almost **uniformly harmful**, while tax cuts seem to have their strongest positive impact during recessionary environments. As with some of the other studies discussed here, the paper mainly examines short-runs effects, and it is possible that these positive effects could grow over a longer time horizon.

### Biz Con DA---2ac

#### 2---it’s been low

Grant Thornton, 2-17. Grant Thornton LLP is the U.S. member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd, this firm does audit, tax, advisory consulting services. “CFO optimism wanes amid continued inflation, supply chain, and labor issues.” February 17, 2022. https://www.consulting.us/news/7241/cfo-optimism-wanes-amid-continued-inflation-supply-chain-and-labor-issues

Chief financial officers saw their optimism about the US economy drop as a majority cited concerns about cash flow, inflation, talent shortages, and supply chain disruptions, according to Grant Thornton’s 2021 Q4 CFO Survey. Just 57% of CFOs told Grant Thornton in December that they have a positive outlook on the US economy for the next six months – down from 69% in the third quarter of 2021. Net pessimism on US economic outlook nearly doubled from 11% in Q3 to 21% in Q4. Over half of CFOs (52%) cited an increased focus on cash flow and liquidity in response to disruptions, up from 35% in Q3. “CFOs continued to face unprecedented levels of disruption in the fourth quarter of 2021 and adjusted their plans accordingly,” said Enzo Santilli, national managing partner of transformation at Grant Thornton. “At the same time, CFOs are uniquely positioned to map a successful future for their organizations. It’s important for them to realize that many of these challenges are interconnected — then act accordingly.” CFOs no longer see inflation as a short-term reaction to the pandemic, with 53% expecting inflation to impact their businesses for at least 6 months and 33% expecting it to persist for more than 12 months. “Most CFOs have gone their entire careers without having to model the effect of inflation on pricing and profits,” Santilli said. “Finance leaders will have to help manage cost structures while addressing and communicating potential margin erosion as material and workforce costs skyrocket.” Workforce shortages are another top challenge, with the Great Resignation showing no signs of slowing down after a record number of employee departures in November 2021. Sixty-eight percent of CFOs told Grant Thornton that their organization is likely to see a shortage of talent in 2022, with over half (53%) expecting the talent crunch to have a negative impact on their business.

#### Any increases will be temporary---our ev assumes 2022 indexes.

Admir Kolaj, 1-11-22. Economist. “U.S. NFIB Small Business Optimism Index (December 2021)”. TD economics. https://economics.td.com/us-nfib-small-business-optimism

Confidence among American small businesses recorded a mild improvement at the end of 2021. This **does not appear to fully reflect** the **drawbacks** of the latest infection wave, given the that sharp increase in COVID-19 cases occurred only in late-December. The **worsening public health backdrop** is likely to **take a toll** on confidence at the start of this year, as it weighs on consumer-related industries and exacerbates worker shortages in light of surging absenteeism. The survey's labor market indicators show that the labor market tightness theme remained intact through December, with job openings and the share of firms raising and planning to further raise compensation, all at or near record highs. This suggests that businesses will look past the near-term Omicron hurdle and hang on to their workers. Higher labor costs continue to be unloaded onto consumers and an elevated share of small businesses cite labor costs and inflation as **key business problems**. These indicators help explain why the Fed will begin to reduce monetary stimulus this year.

#### 5--- Business confidence is a useless indicator of economic prosperity.

Cameron Bagrie 18. Managing Director and Chief Economist at Bagrie Economics. Independent and straight-talking economics. Formerly Chief Economist, ANZ, New Zealand. "Business confidence is a hopeless indicator. But that doesn't mean the economy isn't in trouble," Spinoff, https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/09-08-2018/business-confidence-is-bullshit-but-that-doesnt-mean-the-economy-isnt-in-trouble/

Business confidence has fallen off a cliff. Economist Cameron Bagrie says it’s meaningless, but other bad indicators can’t be ignored. The economy is headed for recession if you believe the readings from business confidence. Thankfully we can largely ignore business confidence readings. We can’t ignore other survey measures though that are saying growth has slowed and the official statistics are showing the same. The last three quarterly GDP prints have been 0.6, 0.6 and 0.5% and we only have data up to March 2018. That’s annualised growth in the low 2’s and a dip below 2% now looks likely. We have the potential for a growth pothole. That is becoming a concern as the wheels of the economy need to be turning and tax revenue coming in the door for social agenda demands to be met. A whopping net 45% of firms are pessimistic about the general economy according to the ANZ Business Outlook survey. That’s a level last seen around the global financial crisis. Of course, no one really believes things are that bad. We can’t blame the global scene as other countries would be seeing massive falls in confidence too if that was a key factor. Other countries are not. The New Zealand Institute of Economic Research (NZIER) is showing weak readings for business confidence within their Quarterly Survey of Business Opinion (QSBO) too. The good news is that business confidence is hopeless as an economic indicator. The correlation with economic growth is poor and I largely ignore business confidence readings. Changes in direction can provide some insightful information – whether things are picking up or slowing down, but not the levels. Businesses tend to be more upbeat regarding general confidence about the economy under a blue flag as opposed to a red one. Business confidence averaged minus 18 between 2000 and 2007. The economy (measured by real gross domestic product) grew on average by more than 3.5% per year. Yep, confidence was negative, but growth was positive. So, we ignore business confidence as an economic indicator. This is nothing new. It’s surprising headline business confidence figures receive so much attention.

#### 7--- Economic predictions fail---variables have undergone pandemic-induced deterioration.

David J. Lynch 1-11. Global Economics Correspondent for Washington Post with a MA in International Relations from Wesleyan University. Here’s another thing the pandemic has screwed up: Economic forecasts. Washington Post. 1-11-2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2022/01/11/jobs-pandemic-shepherdson-omicron/

Ian Shepherdson knew he was sticking his neck out. But last Thursday, he went public with a startling forecast: The next government labor market report would show that the U.S. economy had created 850,000 jobs in December.

Less than 24 hours later, it became clear that Shepherdson, the chief economist and founder of Pantheon Macroeconomics, had missed the mark and missed badly. Employers in the last month of the year actually had hired just 199,000 workers, less than one-fourth the number he predicted, according to the government’s closely watched monthly tally.

For Shepherdson — and many others on Wall Street — the jobs forecast was both an unmitigated flop and an illustration of how difficult the pandemic makes it for even the most astute observers to assess the $23 trillion economy.

“Everybody wants to be pursuing precision,” he said Monday in an interview. “But even before covid, it was like hitting a moving target from a moving vehicle. Now, we’ve got a blindfold on as well.”

Indeed, economic prognostication long has provided proof for a remark attributed to baseball great Yogi Berra: “It’s tough to make predictions, especially about the future.”

But the pandemic is making a tough job even tougher. As the virus waxed and waned, it delivered some of the wildest ups and downs in U.S. labor market history. The covid recession and recovery also erased long-standing economic relationships, emptying downtown office districts, sending workers to toil in their living rooms and leaving economists fumbling for insight.

That’s resulted in an economy perched uncomfortably between the world of early 2020 and whatever reality will emerge once the pandemic is a memory. Meanwhile, familiar relationships among key economic variables have gone haywire.

Though wages are growing faster than at any point in the decade before the pandemic, for example, the number of Americans lured back into the labor market has been disappointing. Two years after covid-19 first hit the United States, the labor force participation rate remains near its lowest mark since the 1970s, when women began entering the workforce in significant numbers.

Yet a different measure, which tracks the number of employed Americans 25 to 54 years of age, relative to the total population, last year showed the fastest one-year gain since the government began keeping track in 1949.

“This is a historically unique U.S. economy,” tweeted economist Skanda Amarnath, executive director of Employ America, a nonprofit that promotes tight labor markets.

Monthly jobs gains also have been exceptionally volatile. In the last half of 2019, each month’s hiring ranged between 161,000 and 234,000 individuals. The last six months of 2021 saw swings between 199,000 and 1.1 million, a much wider band.

All this tumult has left government and private-sector economists struggling to fathom what businesses, workers and consumers will do next.

“It is extremely difficult to forecast in the current environment,” said Gregory Daco, chief U.S. economist for Oxford Economics. “It requires a heavy dose of humility. We’re more likely to be wrong, given how rapidly things are shifting.”

Even if economists are well schooled to calculate future levels of hiring, investment or trade, they are no better qualified than anyone else to foretell the next move by a shape-shifting virus — or the likely policy response in a hyper-polarized capital.

Still, after more than three decades tracking major economies, Shepherdson is no novice. He launched the research firm Pantheon, which is based in Newcastle upon Tyne in the United Kingdom, in 2012 after stints at two other firms. And he is a two-time winner, in 2014 and 2003, of the Wall Street Journal’s award for best economic forecaster.

He also wasn’t alone in botching the December jobs call. The consensus of professional economists called for more than twice as many jobs as were actually added. Moody’s Mark Zandi expected 750,000 while analysts at Goldman Sachs predicted 500,000.

Economic forecasters rely on computer models to predict the future. In layman’s language, they analyze how companies and workers have behaved in the past under various economic conditions to predict how they will behave in the future.

Ideally, economists make predictions by comparing current conditions to a previous period when the underlying structure of the economy was similar, said economist Michael Strain of the American Enterprise Institute.

But there is no precedent for determining what happens when a globalized economy operates amid a lethal respiratory virus that has killed more than 5 million people worldwide.

“The problem is what possible period do we have when the economy is close to what it is today?” said Strain, a former Federal Reserve system economist. “Some people are just using the same models they’ve been using and that’s not working.”

Shepherdson isn’t one of them. He says he realized that the pandemic had rendered traditional models — based on macroeconomic indicators such as industrial production and oil prices — “more or less useless.”

So he completely overhauled his proprietary formula to take account of the economy’s ongoing makeover, placing greater reliance upon high-frequency data from HomeBase, a provider of scheduling and payroll software for small businesses.

The British-born economist blends the HomeBase data with additional real-time input from ADP, a payroll processing company that releases its own employee count, as well as other economic inputs, to get a monthly payrolls estimate.

HomeBase data has been praised by Federal Reserve officials for its usefulness in anticipating labor market moves. But the firm has been producing its monthly reports only since the start of the pandemic, while traditional government labor market data extends to the late 1940s.

Relying on a shorter data series inevitably means a fatter margin of error, Shepherdson said.

“Until we’ve got five years of this HomeBase data, we won’t really know how useful it is,” he said, adding that he may begin emphasizing the wide range of possible outcomes when he issues future payroll estimates.

Forecasters today face a double-barreled challenge: uncertainty over where the United States is in the business cycle and what the post-pandemic economy will look like, according to Erica Groshen, senior economic adviser to Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

The adjustments that government economists use to compensate for routine seasonal fluctuations, including retailers’ big holiday season hiring and firing cycle, also are misfiring amid the pandemic. Lower response rates to the government’s monthly surveys are further complicating assessments.

“Models are predicting what’s normal in a world that isn’t normal,” said Groshen, a former head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This is not the first time models have failed. In 2008, many Wall Street firms were stunned when the housing implosion triggered huge losses on mortgage-backed securities. The big banks’ “value-at-risk” models, based on years of housing market data, had made no provision for housing prices to decline on a national basis.

Since previous downturns had been limited to specific regions, such as Southern California, Wall Street’s best-and-brightest assumed future declines would be similarly limited. When they weren’t, a wave of foreclosures led to massive losses on securities made up of repayment streams from hundreds of individual mortgages.

Venerable firms such as Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers and Merrill Lynch failed or were swallowed up by rivals. American households’ net worth fell by more than $11 trillion.

“This entire market depended on finely honed computer models — which turned out to be divorced from reality,” concluded the 2011 report of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission.

Wall Street’s reliance on the past to predict the future has limits. Most investment solicitations carry some version of the warning “past performance is no guarantee of future results,” Wall Street’s way of saying your mileage may vary.

#### supply chain disruptions

Grant **Thornton, 2-17.**Grant Thornton LLP is the U.S. member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd, this is a firm that does audit, tax, advisory consulting services. “CFO optimism wanes amid continued inflation, supply chain, and labor issues.” February 17, 2022. <https://www.consulting.us/news/7241/cfo-optimism-wanes-amid-continued-inflation-supply-chain-and-labor-issues>

In response, just over half (52%) of CFOs are increasing investment in benefits and compensation, likely in a bid to head off resignations and attract talent. Supply chain disruption was the top concern of surveyed CFOs, with 40% including supply chain in their list of the three biggest challenges facing their business – a 14% increase from Q3. Fifty-three percent said they believe supply chain disruption will negatively impact their business. In response, large companies such as Walmart and Costco have been chartering their own container ships to transport goods from Asia to North America. “A few companies are taking exceptional measures to address supply chain issues, such as buying their own container ships and starting to manufacture their own containers,” said Ben YoKell, Grant Thornton’s national sourcing and supply chain transformation practice leader. “But the vast majority of businesses are settling into a new reality that requires some very hard choices.” The accounting and consulting firm notes that optimizing benefits and focusing on retaining drivers and warehouse staff would help mitigate parts of the supply chain disruption. “Talent shortages contribute to disruptions in supply chains, which, in turn, lead to low supply, high demand and inflation,” Santilli added. “CFOs need to collaborate with HR leaders and other key executives across their organizations to ensure their businesses weather the storm appropriately. Now is not the time to panic; it’s the time to get creative.”

#### it’s been low

**AP, 2-1.** Associated Press. “Report: Loss of Manufacturing Jobs Leads to Index Drop.” February 1, 2022. <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/nebraska/articles/2022-02-01/report-loss-of-manufacturing-jobs-leads-to-index-drop>

A loss of manufacturing jobs combined with other factors to slow growth in the regional economy of nine Midwest and Plains states, according to a new monthly report released Tuesday. Business leaders in nine Midwest and Plains states indicated in Creighton University's Mid-America Business Conditions cited the job losses, continued supply chain problems and growing inflation. The overall index for January fell to 56.2 from December’s 64.6. Any score above 50 on the survey’s indexes suggests growth, while a score below 50 suggests recession. Consumer spending drops, inflation rises in December Creighton University economist Ernie Goss, who oversees the monthly survey, said that for the first time since the spring of 2020, the region lost manufacturing jobs. "In terms of supply chain disruptions and bottlenecks for the first half of 2022, approximately one-third of supply managers expect delays to worsen, with only 12% anticipating improvements,” Goss said. Conditions also had a roller coaster effect on the survey’s business confidence index, which looks ahead six months. After soaring to 64.0 in December, the index plummeted in January to 36.2 — the lowest reading since the beginning of the pandemic. Goss blamed disappointing jobs numbers, the supply chain issues and rising inflation, combined with the added concern of the Federal Reserve's promise to raise interest rates starting as soon as March.

### USICA DA---2ac

#### 1---Won’t pass---Dem amendments are too polarizing

Rachel Oswald 2/14, staff at Roll Call, “House competition bill packed with progressive policy goals,” Roll Call, 2/14/2022, https://rollcall.com/2022/02/14/house-competition-bill-packed-with-progressive-policy-goals/

A host of progressive foreign policy provisions on issues like scrutinizing advanced weapon sales to the United Arab Emirates and welcoming more asylum-seekers fleeing Beijing’s oppression were tucked into House Democrats' bill aimed at bolstering competition with China.

It remains unclear just how many of these liberal foreign policy provisions on such wide-ranging topics — including Afghanistan-related sanctions, combating anti-Asian racism, improving COVID-19 vaccine access in developing countries and boosting respect for indigenous peoples — might be included in any compromise measure that a House-Senate conference committee soon will begin working on.

House Republicans have been scathing about what they’ve termed Democrats’ “Christmas tree” of a bill, which they argue mostly opted for platitudes in its international affairs-focused title. Republicans wanted more provisions like what they consider the harder-nosed policies they were unable to secure during floor work on the bill, such as new export controls on advanced technology to China.

“There’s a lot of work to do to move this bill to the president’s desk,” Senate Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer acknowledged last week. The coming conference negotiations must reconcile the House-passed measure with the Senate’s China policy bill, which was passed last year with 18 Republicans voting in favor.

But only one House Republican, Adam Kinzinger of Illinois, voted for the House's response bill, setting up a potentially prickly conference.

Democratic amendments

The House bill includes several amendments adopted on the floor that address the rising tide of anti-Asian racism in the United States, as well as lawmakers’ worries that the growing long-term strategic competition with Beijing could further inflame such prejudices.

“The president shall ensure that the provisions of this act which are aimed at countering the influence of the Chinese Communist Party are implemented in a manner that does not result in discrimination against people of Asian descent,” reads an adopted amendment from Rep. Anna G. Eshoo, D-Calif.

Another adopted amendment from Rep. Judy Chu, D-Calif., offers a sense of the Congress opposing recent “dangerous” Justice Department counter-economic espionage investigations into Chinese-American and Chinese scientists working in the United States that appeared to be mainly motivated by “Asian ancestry or having ties to China.”

“I am grateful that the House adopted my amendment on the importance of opposing the targeting of Chinese researchers and scientists based on their race, something we’ve seen ruin numerous careers and lives already,” Chu, who leads the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, said in a statement.

Democrats also included language offered by Rep. Grace Meng, D-N.Y., that condemns the spread of anti-Asian hate speech and hate crimes since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic while urging the U.S. and other foreign governments to “combat the spread of anti-Asian racism and discrimination.”

Additionally, the legislation includes a provision from Rep. Sara Jacobs, D-Calif., that would prohibit any of the hundreds of millions of dollars in annual new security assistance for Indo-Pacific countries authorized by the underlying bill from going to foreign military or law enforcement units found to have engaged in any of a long list of human rights violations, such as torture or prolonged detention without charges.

Another adopted amendment from Jacobs would repeal a congressionally imposed cap on how much money the United States can annually contribute to its assessed U.N. peacekeeping dues. During the Trump administration, the United States accumulated over $1 billion in arrears from unpaid dues for U.N. peacekeeping efforts.

“Our failure to pay our full UN peacekeeping dues has been a problem for decades — and frankly it’s been counterproductive,” Jacobs said in a statement. “UN Peacekeeping missions make the world safer and are more cost effective than U.S. military operations.”

As amended with language from Rep. Raja Krishnamoorthi, D-Ill., the bill would order a U.S. intelligence community assessment of efforts by the United Arab Emirates to prevent the transfer of U.S. technology to China. In late 2020, the Trump administration approved a deal to export the prized — if long-delayed and drastically over budget — F-35 fighter jet to Abu Dhabi.

Democrats oppose the F-35 sale for several reasons, including worries over the UAE’s deepening commercial and security ties with China. Democrats are concerned that those links could create more openings and incentives for the illicit proliferation of Lightning II-related technology into the hands of the Chinese military.

Democrats also included in the bill provisions that, while not ordering the lifting of sanctions on the Taliban, could be used to lay the groundwork for a potential future legislative effort to ease some economic restrictions. Since the hard-line Taliban seized control of Afghanistan late last summer, the international commerce on which the import-reliant country relies has come to a screeching halt. Foreign businesses have stayed away over fears of stepping afoul of U.S. sanctions on the Taliban.

As amended, the legislation would direct the Treasury Department to study the impacts of U.S. and international sanctions on Afghanistan’s environment and public health sectors, as well as the possibility of establishing foreign trade zones in Afghanistan within the current sanctions regime.

#### 2---Even if it passes---it’ll take forever

John Bresnahan et al. 2/18, John Bresnahan, Anna Palmer and Jake Sherman, with Max Cohen and Christian Hall, staff at Punchbowl News, “Assessing Schumer and McConnell,” Punchbowl News, 2/18/22, https://punchbowl.news/archive/punchbowl-news-am-2-18-22/

Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo held a call Thursday with lawmakers key to developing a compromise bill to spur domestic semiconductor chip production and combat the rise of China’s high-tech industry.

Raimondo spoke with Sens. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.) and Roger Wicker (R-Miss.), the top lawmakers on the Senate Commerce Committee, and Reps. Frank Pallone (D-N.J.) and Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-Wash.), the top lawmakers on the House Energy and Commerce panel.

USICA/Endless Frontiers/America COMPETES/Make It In America – the various names of the anti-China legislation – will be the subject of a high-stakes negotiation between the House and Senate in the months ahead. This wasn’t the beginning of negotiations, but rather just a catch-up briefing, according to sources familiar with the call.

#### Conference committee will take months

Abby Vesoulis, 2-28-22, "How Record-Setting Inflation Could Affect Democrats in the Midterms," Time, https://time.com/6152697/inflation-democrats-midterm-elections-2022/

Axne also supports the America COMPETES Act, which would invest $52 billion into the U.S. production of semiconductors, a key element of vehicles and consumer electronics, in addition to tackling other supply chain vulnerabilities stemming from America’s reliance on other countries, including China. The COMPETES Act is the House’s response to the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA), which passed last year in the Senate. The legislation now needs to go through the conference process where lawmakers resolve the two chambers’ versions before it heads to Biden’s desk for signature. Axne anticipates that process will wrap up “in the next coming months.”Axne also supports the America COMPETES Act, which would invest $52 billion into the U.S. production of semiconductors, a key element of vehicles and consumer electronics, in addition to tackling other supply chain vulnerabilities stemming from America’s reliance on other countries, including China. The COMPETES Act is the House’s response to the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA), which passed last year in the Senate. The legislation now needs to go through the conference process where lawmakers resolve the two chambers’ versions before it heads to Biden’s desk for signature. Axne anticipates that process will wrap up “in the next coming months.”

#### 4---Congress has proposed the plan---there’s support.

Tirza J Angerhofer and Roger D Blair 21. Tirza J Angerhofer, Doctoral Fellow, Department of Economics. \*\*Roger D Blair, Professor, Department of Economics and Affiliate Faculty of Law, University of Florida. “Considerations of Buyer Power in Merger Review” Journal of Antitrust Enforcement. 10-18-21. <https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/advance-article/doi/10.1093/jaenfo/jnab015/6400043?searchresult=1>

Recently, there has been **increasing recognition** of the adverse welfare effects of buyer power in various jurisdictions around the world.2 First, a firm that has monopsony power can reduce the quantity that it buys in order to depress the price that it pays for inputs which leads to a social welfare loss. Secondly, a firm with bargaining power can use the threat of walking away from the negotiations to extract surplus from suppliers. Mergers have the potential to increase buyer power and thereby cause substantial . anticompetitive harm. But this harm has traditionally been ignored in merger review. Our improved understanding of the relationship between mergers and buying power has led to **requests by Congress and policymakers** that the US Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) **pay closer attention to threats of monopsony when conducting their merger reviews.** In the USA, at least, policymakers have focused their efforts on monopsony power due to its clear social welfare impact and its relevance to labour markets. Congress and policymakers have **proposed bills** that would encourage the Agencies to **consider monopsony in merger review** and would help them to do this by increasing their budget.3 In both the House and Senate, a **proposed bill would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act** by explicitly including monopsony in the statutory language in order to strengthen the emphasis on monopsony in merger review.4 As we will show in this Article, both the economic theory and the empirical evidence provide support for considering the potential effects of monopsony in merger review. This evidence is particularly clear in labour markets but is also relevant to other input markets.

#### 5---Issues are compartmentalized.

Chad Pergram 18. Congressional reporter. “Amid Kavanaugh cacophony, Congress forges bipartisan agreements on key issues”. Fox News. 10-13-18. <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/amid-kavanaugh-cacophony-congress-forges-bipartisan-agreements-on-key-issues>

Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., fretted that “tribalism” was on the rise in American politics and “is ruining us.” “I’m so tempted to use the ‘l’ word,” said Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-NY, on the floor when describing the tactics of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky. “But he’s my friend.” Schumer instead tempered the aspersion directed at his Senate counterpart as a “blatant falsehood.” “Boy, ya’ll want power!” spat Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., across the dais at Democrats at the second confirmation hearing for Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh.. “God, I hope you never get it.” After delivering his closing floor speech in opposition to Kavanaugh, Sen. Ed Markey, D-Mass., lamented that the Senate has “hit rock bottom.” Lawmakers shredded civility like a Banksy painting at Sotheby’s during the confirmation fight over Brett Kavanaugh. Angst and enmity often consume Capitol Hill when big issues split the sides. The rise of former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., and the 1994 Republican takeover of the House. Multiple government shutdowns. The impeachment of President Clinton. The Bush administration’s handling of the Iraq War. The skirmish to approve ObamaCare. A monumental 2011 fight over the debt ceiling. The 2013 government shutdown over repealing ObamaCare. And now, Kavanaugh. The rancor spilled over the Kavanaugh confirmation ranks right up there with some of the most intense imbroglios in Washington over the past quarter century. You know it’s tense in Congress when the workers who operate the trolleys which shuttle people back and forth from the Russell Senate Office Building and the Capitol start browbeating aides and journalists. Sen. Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, is the lone Republican to oppose Kavanaugh. She didn’t cast a ballot for or against the nominee. Instead, Murkowski “paired” her vote with Sen. Steve Daines, R-Mont. Daines backed Kavanaugh but couldn’t cast a ballot due his daughter’s wedding. So neither registered their view on the Senate floor. Still, President Trump and former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin (R) directed invective at Alaska’s senior senator. New York Yankees fans were more gentle with Aaron Boone after some of his managerial decisions in the playoffs than some Republicans were with Murkowski. “The Senate is no place for sissies,” said Murkowski. “The feelings are pretty raw.” She added that Senate’s ebb “feels lower than any place I have ever been.” Murkowski huddled with a scrum off reporters in the Senate Reception Room just off the floor after the historic confirmation vote. A reporter asked Murkowski what she thought about when listening to the screams from protesters, blasting senators as they cast their ballots inside the chamber. “I was closing my eyes and praying,” said Murkowski. “Praying for them. Praying for us. I’m praying for the country. We need prayers. We need healing.” Congress is a hemorrhaging gash right now, bleeding odium and hostility….. Or…. Is it? Step back from the Kavanaugh cacophony. Examine what lawmakers from both parties in both chambers accomplished in September and early October, with virtually zero fanfare. Amid the turmoil, Congress approved the first revamp of national aviation policy in years. The Senate approved the final version of the legislation 93-6. This came after a staggering six extensions due to bickering and disagreement. Then, Congress approved a sweeping, bipartisan measure to combat opioid abuse. The House okayed the package 393-8. The Senate adopted the measure 98-1. And, there was no government shutdown. The House and Senate came to terms on two bipartisan bills which funded five of the 12 annual spending bills which operate the government. The sides agreed to latch an additional measure to one of the spending plans to fund the remaining seven areas of federal spending through December 7. President Trump briefly threatened to force a government shutdown if lawmakers didn’t include money for his border wall in the plan. But the President ultimately punted that battle until December. Democrats praised Republicans for keeping conservative “poison pill” riders out of the appropriations bills. That decision drew Democratic support for the measures. The Senate approved a bipartisan water and infrastructure package. McConnell hailed the bipartisanship which descended upon the Senate – even as the senators fought over Kavanaugh. Nearly in the same breath, McConnell derided boisterous, anti-Kavanaugh protesters outside the Capitol as a “mob.” McConnell insisted this week he needed the Senate to clear a slate of 15 conservative judges to lower courts before he could cut senators loose for the midterm elections. McConnell and Schumer appeared at loggerheads. McConnell’s goal was clear: extract the confirmation of these nominees – or tether to Washington vulnerable Democratic senators from battleground states to keep them off the campaign trail. Schumer knew McConnell would ultimately prevail on the nominees after the midterms. So the New York Democrat accepted McConnell’s ransom, permitting the Senate vote on a slate of nominees on Thursday night. Schumer also extracted a concession from McConnell: send senators home until November 13th. One may wonder how lawmakers can find themselves in an imbroglio over a major issue like Kavanaugh – yet forge major bipartisan accords on another. Frankly, that’s just politics. Politics always elicits strange bedfellows. Successful lawmakers know they should compartmentalize their disputes. The enemy today may be your best ally tomorrow.

#### 7---Ukraine thumps- takes up all of Biden’s attention

Jonathan Lemire, 3-1-2022, "How the Russia-Ukraine conflict has fundamentally changed Biden’s presidency," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/03/01/biden-white-house-russia-putin-00012696

For weeks, President Joe Biden has started and ended his day trying to get inside Vladimir Putin’s head.

The most consequential foreign policy crisis of his young term has overwhelmed the president’s schedule, shoving everything — from the State of the Union to a Supreme Court pick — to the backburner. And while he leans on a trusted inner circle of advisers to decipher Putin’s moves, he has also relied on his own experience, having practiced diplomacy with European leaders for decades and having been able to size up Putin face-to-face a number of times.

#### 8---Biden and Manchin fighting over Russian oil

JOSH SIEGEL, 3-3-2022, "Bipartisan bill banning Russian oil sets up clash with White House ," https://www.politico.com/news/2022/03/03/bill-ban-russia-oil-white-house-00013962

A growing bipartisan group of lawmakers released legislation on Thursday that would block imports of Russian oil despite President Joe Biden’s opposition to cutting off the shipments, setting up a potential standoff over how to ratchet up punishments against Moscow for its war on Ukraine.

Lead co-sponsors Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.), who chairs the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) said they would take the blame for a jump in gasoline prices that would likely follow a move to restrict supply from Russia, one of the world’s top energy producers.

“If there was a poll being taken and they said, ‘Joe, would you pay 10 cents more per gallon to support the people of Ukraine and stop the support of Russia?’ I would gladly pay 10 cents more per gallon,” Manchin said at a press conference.

Manchin knocked the White House for opposing the halt on imports of Russian oil based on fears it would further raise pump prices. Crude oil prices touched their highest level since 2008 early on Thursday, and the average retail gasoline price jumped 7 cents overnight to $3.73 a gallon, up $1 from a year ago.

“They are so wrong,” Manchin said, calling White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki “irresponsible” for reiterating that the White House doesn’t back a ban on Russian oil.

At Thursday’s White House briefing, Psaki told reporters that “we don’t have a strategic interest in reducing the global supply of energy, and that would raise prices at the gas pump for the American people.”

Despite the continued White House resistance to a U.S. oil embargo, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi said this morning that she backs the growing push to ban Russian oil.

#### Labor monopsony turns---reduces employment by 13% and labor’s share of national output by 22%---wages boost growth---increases talent retention, spending, tax profits, lowers welfare, causes education and productivity---that’s posner and wei

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

#### Tech innovation fails now.

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.

#### China tech fears are unfounded---they can’t catch up.

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

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

**Edelstein 10** – PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and the Department of Government at Georgetown University (David, “Why realists don’t go for bombs and bullets,” <http://foreignpolicy.com/2010/07/21/why-realists-dont-go-for-bombs-and-bullets/>)

Thanks to Steve Walt for inviting me to contribute to his blog while he is away on vacation. I have been a regular reader of Steve’s blog since it launched, and for my first post, I wanted to pick up on a motif that I have seen running through Steve’s posts: Will realists ever again support the use of military force by the United States? Followers of this blog will by now have little doubt about how Walt felt about the Iraq War or how he views the prospects for U.S. success in Afghanistan. In fact, throughout the history of his blog, I can only recall one case in which Walt advocated the use of U.S. military force (and I think the realist credentials in that case are rather dubious). **There is a common perception** in the field of political science **that realists are war-mongering Neanderthals** anxious to use military force at the drop of a hat. Attend any meeting (if you must) of the American Political Science Association or the International Studies Association, and one will find realists derided as the "bombs and bullets guys" as if we were all direct descendants of Curtis LeMay. What is notable about this --- and what has been notable about Steve’s blog --- is just how **infrequently realists have supported the use of American military force**. Take the U.S. interventions of the post-Cold War period: Panama, the Gulf War, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq. Of those interventions, Afghanistan was the only one that received anything close to strong support from most realists. Others, most notably the Iraq War, **received vehement opposition from the vast majority of realists**. Even in the case of Afghanistan, realists expressed trepidation about the prospects for ultimate success despite early victories. Go back to the Cold War, and realists like Kenneth Waltz and Hans Morgenthau were famously opposed to the U.S. intervention in Vietnam. Lest one think this is an academic phenomenon, realist policymakers like Brent Scowcroft were equally critical of the Bush administration’s actions in Iraq, and George F. Kennan was skeptical of the U.S. interventions in both Korea and Vietnam. Today, should anyone dare to suggest the use of military force in new contexts such as Iran, they are summarily dismissed by prominent realists. **Not a single** (self-proclaimed or attributed) **realist** I know of **has advocated the use of military force against Iran** in response to its apparent development of nuclear weapons, and most are adamantly opposed to it. From one perspective, this opposition is surprising. It is realists, after all, who so value material power, in particular military capabilities. It is not difficult to understand why so many would assume that realists are anxious to use military force because realists are anxious to focus on military capabilities as a primary explanatory variable for international politics. But **it is precisely because realists have spent so much time studying military force that they are also so reluctant to use military force**. Though realists themselves are divided on the question, many have concluded that the use of military force is often counterproductive, inviting balancing coalitions that simply make life more difficult. Moreover, as I have argued elsewhere, using military force to reorder societies is very difficult and unlikely to succeed except in uncommon circumstances.