# Aff disclosure---texas doubles

## 1ac

### Inequality---1AC

#### Advantage 1 is Inequality---

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Labor monopsony is the biggest internal link.

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

In the United States, and much of the Western world, economic growth has slowed, inequality has risen, and wages have stagnated. Academic research has identified several possible causes, ranging from structural shifts in the economy to public policy failure. One possible cause that has received increasing attention from economists is labor market power, the ability of employers to set wages below workers’ marginal revenue product.1 New evidence suggests that many labor markets around the country are not competitive but instead exhibit considerable market power enjoyed by employers, who use their market power to suppress wages. This phenomenon—the power of employers to suppress wages below the competitive rate—is known among economists as labor monopsony, or simply labor market power. Wage suppression enhances income inequality because it creates a wedge between the incomes of people who work in concentrated and competitive labor markets. Wage suppression also reduces the incomes of workers relative to those of people who live off capital, and the latter are almost uniformly wealthier than the former. Wage suppression also interferes with economic growth since it results in underemployment of labor and, while it may seem to raise the return on capital, actually depresses it, as capital must lie idle to take advantage of monopsony power. With wages artificially suppressed, qualified workers decline to take jobs, and workers may underinvest in skills and schooling. Many workers exit the workforce and rely on government benefits, including disability benefits that have become a hidden welfare system.2 This in turn costs the government both in lost taxes and in greater expenditures. One estimate finds that monopsony power in the U.S. economy reduces overall output and employment by 13% and labor’s share of national output by 22%.3 The claim that labor market power raises inequality and reduces growth mirrors another claim that has received attention lately—that the product market power of firms has contributed to rising inequality and faltering growth.4 A product market is a collection of products defined by frequent consumer substitution. When a small number of sellers or one seller of these products exist, we say that each seller has product market power, which enables it to charge a price higher than marginal cost, or the price that would prevail in a competitive market. When a small number of employers hire from a pool of workers of a certain skill level within the geographic area in which workers commute, the employers have labor market power. One major source of market power in both types of markets is thus concentration, where only a few firms operate in a given market. Imagine, for example, a small town with only a few gas stations. Each gas station sets the price of gas to compete with the prices of the other gas stations. When a gas station lowers its price, it may obtain greater market share from the other gas stations—which increases profits—but it also receives less revenue per sale. If only a single gas station exists, it will maximize profits by charging a high (“monopoly”) price because the gains from buyers willing to pay the price exceed the lost revenue from buyers who stay away. If only a few gas stations exist, they might illegally enter a cartel in which they charge an above-market price and divide the profits, or they might informally coordinate, which is generally not illegal, though the social harm is the same. In contrast, if many gas stations compete, prices will be bargained down to the efficient level—the marginal cost—resulting in low prices for consumers and high aggregate output of gasoline. Labor market concentration creates monopsony (or, if more than one employer, oligopsony, but I use these terms interchangeably) where labor market power is exercised by the buyer rather than (as in the example of gas stations) the seller. Employers are buyers of labor who operate within a labor market. A labor market is a group of jobs (e.g., computer programmers, lawyers, or unskilled workers) within a geographic area where the holders of those jobs could with relative ease switch among the jobs. The geographic area is usually defined by the commuting distance of workers. A labor market is concentrated if only one or a few employers hire from this pool of workers. For example, imagine the gas stations employ specialist maintenance workers who monitor the gas-pumping equipment. If only a few gas stations exist in that area, and no other firms (e.g., oil refineries) hire from this pool of workers, then the labor market is concentrated, and the employers have market power in the labor market. To minimize labor costs, the employers will hold wages down below what the workers would be paid in a competitive labor market—their marginal revenue product. Faced with these low wages, some people qualified to work will refuse to. But the employers gain more from wage savings than they lose in lost output because of the small workforce they employ. Antitrust law does not distinguish monopoly and monopsony (including labor monopsony): firms that achieve monopolies or monopsonies through anticompetitive behavior violate antitrust law. But product market concentration has received a huge amount of attention by courts, researchers, and regulators, while labor market concentration has received hardly any attention at all.5 The Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) Horizontal Merger Guidelines, which are used to screen potential mergers for antitrust violations, provide an elaborate analytic framework for evaluating the product market effects of mergers. Yet, while the Merger Guidelines state that there is no distinction between seller and buyer power,6 they say nothing about the possible adverse labor market effects of mergers. Similarly, while there are thousands of reported cases involving allegations that firms have illegally cartelized product markets, there are few cases involving allegations of illegally cartelized labor markets.7 This historic imbalance between what I will call product market antitrust and labor market antitrust has no basis in economic theory. From an economic standpoint, the dangers to public welfare posed by product market power and labor market power are the same. As Adam Smith recognized, businesses gain in the same way by exploiting product market power and labor market power—enabling them to increase profits by raising prices (in the first case) or by lowering costs (in the second case).8 For that reason, businesses have the same incentive to obtain product market power and labor market power. Hence the need—in both cases—for an antitrust regime to prevent businesses from obtaining product and labor market power except when there are offsetting social gains.

#### The plan solves inequality and wages.

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

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

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

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

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

#### Labor market inequities create slow and unstable growth.

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

Why It Matters It should be fairly obvious why these imperfections in the labor market matter so much: one of the most disturbing aspects of growth in the United States in recent decades is the growing inequality (see, e.g., Ostry, Berg, and Tsangarides 2019; Stiglitz 2012, 2019; and a rash of other books on the topic). Most of the gains in the economy have gone to the top 10 percent, the top 1 percent, and the top 0.1 percent. Some of the growing inequality has to do with increases in wage disparity—known as labor market polarization. But much of it has to do with the decreasing share of national income going to workers.8 This is where the decreasing market power of workers and the increasing market power of corporations comes in. This decreasing market power is more than just changes in technology or even globalization: it is also the broader changes in our economy, society, and politics—and especially the changes described earlier in this introduction and elsewhere in this volume—that have led to this growing imbalance of market power. Research at the International Monetary Fund (Ostry, Berg, and Tsangarides 2014) and elsewhere (Ostry, Berg, and Tsangarides 2019) has highlighted the broader consequences of this growing inequality, even on economic performance. Economies that are more unequal are less stable and grow more slowly. In The Price of Inequality I explain the reasons that we pay such a high price for inequality.

#### Now is key.

Christopher Rugaber 21. Associated Press. “Federal Reserve keeps key interest rate near zero, signals COVID-19 economic risks receding.” https://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-biz-fed-interest-rates-economy-20210428-bumyc3ynpza6ri4ygsntmdsmya-story.html.

WASHINGTON — The Federal Reserve is keeping its ultra-low interest rate policies in place, a sign that it wants to see more evidence of a strengthening economic recovery before it would consider easing its support. In a statement Wednesday, the Fed expressed a brighter outlook, saying the economy has improved along with the job market. And while the policymakers noted that inflation has risen, they ascribed the increase to temporary factors. The Fed also signaled its belief that the pandemic’s threat to the economy has diminished, a significant point given Chair Jerome Powell’s long-stated view that the recovery depends on the virus being brought under control. Last month, the Fed had cautioned that the virus posed “considerable risks to the economic outlook.” On Wednesday, it said only that “risks to the economic outlook remain” because of the pandemic. The central bank left its benchmark short-term rate near zero, where it’s been since the pandemic erupted nearly a year ago, to help keep loan rates down to encourage borrowing and spending. It also said in a statement after its latest policy meeting that it would keep buying $120 billion in bonds each month to try to keep longer-term borrowing rates low. The U.S. economy has been posting unexpectedly strong gains in recent weeks, with barometers of hiring, spending and manufacturing all surging. Most economists say they detect the early stages of what could be a robust and sustained recovery, with coronavirus case counts declining, vaccinations rising and Americans spending their stimulus-boosted savings.

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

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

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

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

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

Intuitively, it seems likely that less expensive inputs or lower wages would mean savings for firms to pass on to the consumers. But it turns out that inefficiencies and lack of competition in upstream markets have ripple effects that can harm everyone. In a competitive market, employers pay the market wage; when there are vacancies, a marginal increase in pay will follow so employers can fill those vacancies. Labor monopsonists have different incentives. If they raise pay to fill a marginal vacancy, they might also have to raise pay for their existing employees. The small increase in pay needed to attract one more worker could mean a massive swing in overall labor cost (Krueger 2017). So even if growth would generally be good for the company, they might not be able to add the workers they need specifically because of the special dynamics of controlling too much of the market. This is an extreme example, but the same general principle applies when employers have the market power to depress wages below competitive levels. When the marginal cost of filling vacancies and growing one’s business to efficient levels diverges from the firm’s individual incentives for doing so, firms are constricted and leave jobs unfilled. Constraining inputs like labor leads to constrained outputs, and if firms are producing less of the products that consumers want, then prices for those products go up. After all, supply constraints and price increases are two sides of the same coin, economically. Fewer workers ultimately means fewer goods, and fewer goods means higher prices for the limited amount of goods available.4 Over time, this problem is magnified because fewer workers are incentivized to enter the field at all. The supply of qualified workers will go down, further reducing the firm’s ultimate output below efficient levels. In the end, everyone suffers except the firm with market power, which captures outsized profits. Think: Why does America have a chronic undersupply of nurses or teachers, as well as stagnant wages (Council of Economic Advisers 2016)? In a competitive market, undersupply would lead to higher wages and increased entry to the field. If wages are inefficiently underpriced, we end up without enough nurses and ballooning healthcare costs. (Not to mention that, in the case of nurses, we end up with worse health outcomes for consumers!) This is part of the reason it is so problematic to interpret the consumer welfare standard to mean that short-term consumer prices are increased: presumed price effects could be irrelevant or misleading as to the overall effect on consumers. Antitrust enforcement is supposed to be dynamic and to be able to keep up with the state of economic theory.5 But this cross-pollination is not in evidence. For example, even though inefficiency anywhere in the supply chain leads to worse outcomes for consumers, product market cases outnumber labor market cases by a factor of nearly 15, and in mergers by closer to 35. Moreover, no recent merger has been blocked on the basis of labor market effects alone (Levi 1948, 540, fn10). A quick foray into how antitrust law has developed follows.

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

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

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.

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

Michael Oppenheimer 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.

#### It overcomes traditional barriers to conflict.

Jomo Kwame Sundaram & Vladimir Popov 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.

#### Income inequality is high---wage growth is artificial---only the plan solves.

Lawrence Mishel & Jori Kandra 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.

#### Studies to the contrary are lobbyist hype.

Kate Kaye 20. Award-winning multimedia journalist who has chronicled the evolution of digital media, data use and technology. "In Portland Debate, Facial Recognition Giants Hide Behind Tech Lobby Think Tank". No Publication. 2-2-2020. https://redtailmedia.org/2020/01/20/in-portland-debate-facial-recognition-giants-hide-behind-tech-lobby-think-tank/

Enter Information Technology and Innovation Foundation and its article in the state’s biggest newspaper. ITIF may not be well-known in Rip City, but the think tank is led by lobbyists working for some of tech’s best-known names – many of which would benefit from the proliferation of facial recognition.

Several ITIF board members are lobbyists for the biggest facial recognition players:

* Frederick Humphries, Jr, VP government affairs for Microsoft
* Cynthia Hogan, VP public policy for Apple
* Shannon Kellogg, VP of public policy for Amazon
* Jason Oxman, president and CEO of tech industry trade group International Technology Industry Council (members include Amazon, Google, Facebook and IBM)

Google lists ITIF among groups “that receive the most substantial contributions from Google’s U.S. Government Affairs and Public Policy team.” This 2017 Gizmodo article by Libby Watson provides a good roundup of the group’s funding, and its efforts to squelch regulations it views as anti-tech.

Daniel Castro, ITIF’s vice president said the group’s analyst team operates separately from its board as well as its development and fundraising staff. “I don’t even really interact with our board,” he said. “They don’t peer over our shoulders and get advanced copies of what we are going to say.”

The group will not name specific funders. Jackie Whisman, ITIF’s VP of development and outreach said in an email ITIF funding comes from “a diverse range of corporations, charitable foundations, government agencies, and individual contributors” and “corporate support comes from a diverse range of industries, including everything from advanced manufacturing to telecommunications, creative content, IT hardware, software and services, Internet, and life sciences.”

Winning Hearts and Minds

A quick search shows ITIF has been in the business of facial recognition influence peddling since at least 2018. The group has placed opinion articles in publications warning that facial recognition bans will hinder safety and stifle innovation. Its Vice President Daniel Castro gave testimony at a House Oversight Committee hearing on facial recognition technology the same day the Oregonian article ran.

The group joined a coalition of tech and security entities that sent an open letter to Congress in September. The letter’s message reflected the one in the Oregonian article, and noted that “Bans would keep this important tool out of the hands of law enforcement officers, making it harder for them to do their jobs efficiently, stay safe, and protect our communities.”

ITIF’s Oregonian article also argues that facial recognition is a helpful security tool. “One of the top benefits of facial recognition technology is improved public safety.”

Perhaps the most ardent supporter in local government of a ban has been Portland City Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (above). She told RedTail last year she believed outlawing government, police and private use of facial recognition would prevent the spread of tech that has a disparate impact on people of color. She also argued use of facial recognition technology by law enforcement could chip away at civil liberties and data privacy rights.

The Problem with Taking Research at Face Value

The ITIF column implies that city government’s evaluation of a facial recognition ban, particularly in the law enforcement context, is influenced by “inaccurate claims about the technology.” It mentions how some concern about facial recognition is based on an American Civil Liberties Union study which found that Amazon’s Rekognition software incorrectly identified 28 members of Congress as people who had been arrested for crimes.

ITIF argues, the ACLU’s “results have been shown to be spurious.” The article points to Amazon’s own defense against the ACLU’s findings. Amazon — a close affiliate of ITIF and a prominent facial recognition tech developer — said the ACLU’s test results were moot because the civil liberties defender did not apply the appropriate settings recommended by Amazon for public safety use of its system.

But, after damning the ACLU’s research, The ITIF article goes on to cite its own. And its interpretation of that research warrants some inspection. The article states:

“It is likely that the majority of Portlanders would not want the technology banned. In fact, a poll conducted by our partner organization found that fewer than one in five Americans agree with limitations on facial recognition technology that come at the expense of public safety, which clearly a ban would do.”

The “partner organization” that conducted the study is the Center for Data Innovation. Its top senior staff? Daniel Castro, ITIF’s own vice president, along with Eline Chivot, senior policy analyst for both organizations. In other words, for all intents and purposes, ITIF is citing its own study, one it conducted under the auspices of its closely-linked sibling.

The survey used in the study asked, “Agree or disagree? The government should strictly limit the use of facial recognition technology even if it comes at the expense of public safety.” Eighteen percent of respondents said they strongly or somewhat agree, while 55% said they somewhat or strongly disagree.

This 18% is what ITIF refers to in the article’s claim that “fewer than one in five Americans” is OK with limiting facial recognition even if it hinders public safety.

center\_data\_innovation\_facialrecog\_study2

But 18+55=73. What happened to the remaining 27%?

The study results show that portion of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. And the organization’s own chart highlighting results ignores this group entirely. But consider an interpretation combining those groups – the 18% who agree and the 27% who are unsure. That makes for a far more significant 45% who either agree or are unsure.

Policy through Honesty and Transparency

So, here we have instances of two organizations on opposite sides conducting their own research to support their opposing sides of a highly-contested debate that affects how governments craft policy for technologies that have life-altering impacts.

There is facial recognition research out there that is respected by both researchers in corporate tech and privacy and civil liberties groups; that’s the research provided by the National Institutes of Standards and Technology. In December, NIST finally published its long-awaited study of facial recognition algorithms and their demographic effects.

Scientific American’s coverage of the NIST study notes, “many of these algorithms were 10 to 100 times more likely to inaccurately identify a photograph of a black or East Asian face, compared with a white one. In searching a database to find a given face, most of them picked incorrect images among black women at significantly higher rates than they did among other demographics.”

No matter what side we’re on, we should all want reliable research when it comes to evaluating automated systems that could be used to decide if someone is arrested or if someone is allowed in a convenience store like the Jacksons in SE Portland (more on that here and in this video).

Like many others, this situation illustrates the need for media literacy. The NIST research itself states that “Reporting of demographic effects often has been incomplete in academic papers and in media coverage.” One glance at NIST’s most recent research illustrates the deep complexity of facial recognition, the issues it raises and the limits of splashy headlines, soundbytes and tweets.

We are immersed in an increasingly muddled information landscape where few people have the inclination or media literacy tools to inspect who’s behind the “expert” opinions offered in the local paper. But these opinions could sway attitudes about important government policy.

A discussion involving multiple voices and opinions is healthy. However, the conversation around Portland’s potential facial recognition ban is corrupted when tech giants seek to influence it by hiding behind the cloak of a seemingly impartial third party.

#### They’re paid off by big tech.

Debra Kaufman 20. "Amazon, Google, Qualcomm Support Global Antitrust Institute". ETCentric. 7-28-2020. https://www.etcentric.org/amazon-google-qualcomm-support-global-antitrust-institute/

Last year, the Global Antitrust Institute, part of the Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University, organized and paid for a weeklong conference in California for antitrust regulators from 30 foreign countries, including Australia, Brazil, China and Japan. At the conference, these officials attended classes that were described as continuing education to learn more about the economic foundation of competition regulations. According to attendees and critics, however, the message of the conference also benefited Big Tech companies.

The New York Times reports that, “the sessions were more about delivering a clear message to international officials that benefited the companies paying for the event … [that] the best way to foster competition is to maintain a hands-off approach to antitrust law.”

Among the companies supporting the event were Amazon, Google, Qualcomm and other Big Tech firms facing antitrust probes, all of them major corporate donors to the Global Antitrust Institute. In researching documents, NYT found “donation checks for hundreds of thousands of dollars from Google and Amazon, as well as a three-year, multimillion-dollar donation agreement from Qualcomm,” which were “a key component of the institute’s $2.1 million budget in the year that ended in June 2019.”

NYT found emails that “showed how the institute cultivated and tapped relationships with top competition officials” and that its director, Joshua Wright, “has longstanding ties to Google … [and has] worked closely with tech companies to fend off antitrust criticism.”

### FTC---1AC

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

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

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

US president Joe Biden is poised to promote two of the country’s most prominent anti-monopoly crusaders to top jobs in his administration. The moves signal that Biden is serious about cracking down on dominant companies that include Facebook, Google, Amazon, and Apple. But for the president’s trustbusting champions to make a real impact, they’ll need support from Congress. Biden appointed Columbia law professor Tim Wu to the National Economic Council (NEC) as his top advisor on technology and competition on March 5. Politico reports that Biden will soon follow up by nominating Lina Khan, also a Columbia law professor, to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (Before she can take her seat as one of the antitrust agency’s five commissioners, Khan must be confirmed by the Senate.) Khan and Wu are two of the leading voices in a new movement of legal thought that argues the US should fundamentally overhaul the way it approaches antitrust. The crux of their argument is that courts should broaden the values they consider when deciding whether to block a merger or break up a dominant company. Rather than focus narrowly on the impact a company has on consumer prices, they argue that judges should also think about a company’s impact on small businesses, labor rights, and the health of democracy. Khan and Wu have already secured a win for their cause just by being appointed—essentially a White House stamp of approval on their viewpoints. But despite much handwringing from industry groups, neither appointee will be able to single-handedly remake American antitrust in their image. How the FTC can tackle antitrust To be sure, Wu can advocate loudly for his preferred policies from his perch at the NEC, which advises the president on economic policy. And if Khan makes it to the FTC, which is the top US antitrust enforcement agency, she’ll have direct influence over which investigations the agency prioritizes, which lawsuits it brings, and whether its prosecutors will ask judges to impose fines, break up dominant firms, or require them to change their business practices. But there are clear limits to their power. The most the FTC can do is bring more antitrust cases that ask courts for more aggressive remedies, like breakups. That would allow the agency to make a point about what it considers acceptable business behavior. But many of those lawsuits would be bound to lose in front of judges who have grown far more skeptical of antitrust cases over the past four decades and far more conservative over the past four years. A larger caseload would also require Congress to approve more funding for the cash-strapped agency, which is already struggling to pay for its current docket. “The agencies have been asked on many occasions to do a lot with relatively little…but it’s not for free,” says former FTC chair and George Washington University law professor Bill Kovacic. If the FTC wants to pursue more large cases without a bigger budget, “they’ll have to make choices, and those choices will involve backing off of other areas of enforcement.” The FTC could also decide to dust off its rarely used rule-making power and declare certain anticompetitive business practices illegal. But any new rule would almost certainly trigger legal challenges, which would spark a long, expensive court battle in front of judges who aren’t likely to be sympathetic. Kovacic estimates the process could take four or five years—and in the end, judges might just strike the rule down. How Congress can tackle antitrust The best hope for stricter antitrust enforcement lies in Congress. Lawmakers could pass bills, like one recently proposed by Minnesota senator Amy Klobuchar, that would make it easier for enforcement agencies to challenge mergers and acquisitions. They could even go a step further and draft an updated set of antitrust laws, perhaps following the blueprint laid out in last year’s antitrust report from the House of Representatives (which was co-authored by Khan). Armed with new laws clearly banning specific behaviors, prosecutors at the Department of Justice and the FTC would stand a better chance winning cases against well-funded adversaries like Facebook and Google. Those steps wouldn’t hinge on heroics from antitrust hardliners like Khan and Wu. Instead, their success would depend on the whims of Senate centrists like West Virginia’s Joe Manchin, who has lately been flexing his power to derail the chamber’s democratic majority in opposition to left-wing priorities like a $15 minimum wage. Ultimately, Congress should be the body that sets US antitrust policy. It has the clearest authority to ban the bullying business tactics for which Big Tech firms have been criticized. Legislative fixes are likely to be quicker and less vulnerable to court challenges—not to mention more democratic—than changing FTC rules. And it has traditionally been Congress’s prerogative to keep the country’s antitrust policy up to date: Legislators updated the monopoly laws every two decades or so between 1890 and 1950 to respond to new threats. They’ve just neglected that tradition for the past 70 years.

#### That decimates the FTC.

Marianela Lopez-Galdos 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 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 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 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. 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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.

#### Antitrust is inevitable.

Joseph Miller 21. Co-chair, Mintz Antitrust Practice. “More Antitrust News, Still None of it Good.” *The National Law Review*. July 10th, 2021. <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/more-antitrust-news-still-none-it-good>.

In a joint press release, the FTC and Antitrust Division announced they are launching a review of the Merger Guidelines so the agencies "review mergers with the skepticism the law demands" in order to "determine if they are too permissive." Richard Powers, the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust is a criminal lawyer by background and has no significant merger experience so it's fair to assume this initiative is being promoted by FTC Chair Lina Khan. Merger Guidelines are often cited by courts for their persuasive authority but do not carry the force of law. They are influential because they reflect a fair view of current economic learning, reduced to an administrable set of principles to guide agency merger staffs and businesses alike. The current horizontal merger guidelines were published in 2010 so perhaps it is time for an update. What we see in the press release, however, is a strong signal that the agencies will not incorporate the latest economic literature, but rather take a hyper-aggressive enforcement posture based on a literal reading of a very old statute. Merger guidelines will need to be backed by sound law and economics in order to persuade the federal courts. If this initiative reflects nothing more than ideologically driven hostility towards efficient transactions we will see a burst of enforcement activity, followed by legal sophistry about textualism, Brown Shoe, Von's, and other bad but not explicitly overturned precedent, followed by a well-deserved thrashing in the courts of appeal. I guess antitrust lawyers should settle in for the best of times/worst of times period, lots of activity but also hard for counselors and clients to plan transactions if enforcement decisions are untethered to the consumer welfare standard, without which enforcement decisions will necessarily be driven by broader policy goals or raw political calculations. I may be reading too much into a short press release and I hope I'm wrong about how bad this will get in the short term. I'm also grateful that the FTC has staggered terms for commissioners so Christine Wilson and Noah Feldman can continue to articulate sound, traditional enforcement principles, and priorities.

#### Tons of antitrust now.

Lina **Saigol,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.”

#### Worker suppression hurts growth, prices, and innovation.

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.**

## 2ac

### Inequality adv---2ac

#### 3---wage increases benefit growth.

James Manyika et al 18. James Manyika Jaana Remes, and Jan Mischke. “The U.S. Economy Is Suffering from Low Demand. Higher Wages Would Help” Harvard Business Review. 02-21-18. https://hbr.org/2018/02/the-u-s-economy-is-suffering-from-low-demand-higher-wages-would-help

To put it simply, when consumers have more to spend, they buy more sophisticated things. That’s good not just for consumers and producers, but **for the overall economy**, because making more sophisticated, higher-value things **makes everyone involve more productive**, and therefore helps **increase overall standards of living.** In addition, we found two other ways weak demand hurt productivity growth in the aftermath of the financial crisis: a reduction in economies of scale and weak investment. First, the economies of scale effect. In finance, productivity growth declined particularly in the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain due to contractions in lending volumes that banks were unable to fully offset with staff cuts due to the need for fixed labor (for example to support branch networks and IT infrastructure or to deal with existing loans and bad debt). The utilities sector, which has seen flattening demand growth due to both energy efficiency policies as well as a decline in economic activity during the crisis, was similarly not able to downsize labor due to the need for labor to support electricity distribution and the grid infrastructure, and here, too, productivity growth fell. Second, the effect of weak investment. We have found from our global surveys of businesses that almost half of companies that are increasing their investment budgets are doing so because of an increase in demand. **Demand is the single most important factor** driving corporate investment decisions. Investment, in turn, is critical for productivity growth, as it equips workers with more – and with more recent and innovative – equipment, software, and structures. But we have seen capital intensity growth fall to the lowest levels in post-WWII history. Weaker demand leads to weaker investment and creates a vicious cycle for productivity and income growth. Of course, the financial crisis is long since over, and the economy has recovered, at least by some measures. So what’s to worry about? Won’t demand return to pre-recession levels, and thereby increase productivity? Unfortunately, there is reason to believe that some of the drags on demand for goods and services may be **more structural than crises-related**. Slowing population growth means less rapid expansion of the pool of consumers. And **rising income inequality** is shifting purchasing power from those most likely to spend to those more likely to save. This is reflected in **slowing growth expectations in many markets**. For example, across our sectors and countries studied, in the decade from 1995 to 2004, growth in demand for goods and services averaged 4.6%, slowed to 2.3% in 2010 to 2014, and is forecast to slightly increase to 2.8% in 2014 to 2020. Today, there is concern about where the next wave of growth will come from. Some prominent economists worry that we may be stuck in a **vicious cycle of economic underperformance** for some time. Our analyses strongly suggest that **supporting sustained demand growth needs to be part of the answer**. Demand may deserve attention to help boost productivity growth not only during the recovery from the financial crisis but also in terms of longer-term structural leakages and their impact on productivity. Suitable tools for this longer-term situation include: focusing on productive investment as a fiscal priority, **growing the purchasing power of low-income consumers** with the highest propensity to consume, unlocking private business and residential investment, and supporting worker training and transition programs to ensure that periods of transition do not disrupt incomes.

### T exemptions---2ac

#### a---The plan expands the area, so core laws deal with employer power. That’s a non-statutory exemption because Courts are ruling against labor.

Sanjukta Paul 19. Assistant Professor of Law, Romano Stancroff Research Scholar. “9 - The Case for Repealing the Firm Exemption to Antitrust (A Modest Proposal; or, a Response to Professor Epstein)”. from Part II - Labor Law Is Out of Date. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 01 November 2019 <https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-us-labor-law-for-the-twentyfirst-century/case-for-repealing-the-firm-exemption-to-antitrust/E8BA98C6D6606A6E6BC1073291C3F277>

Professor Epstein argues in this volume and elsewhere for repealing the already limited economic coordination rights accorded to working people. In this chapter, I respond to his argument – and by extension, to the more general skepticism toward the coordination rights of working people. I begin by first questioning a different exemption from the putatively general norm about the “dangers of collective behavior.”Footnote6 Business associations themselves enjoy an almost unlimited exemption from antitrust law, one that is now treated as axiomatic. But it wasn’t always. The “firm exemption” is not based upon the text of the statute, and it was never endorsed by the legislators who conceived and drafted the Sherman Act. Indeed, they would likely have rejected it in its present form. At the same time, the legislative record is plain that legislators favored and intended coordination rights for working people to be preserved under the statute.Footnote7 But judges rewrote the Act in light of their own vision for the allocation of coordination rights – and that vision favored business firms as the locus of economic coordination and disfavored labor organizations.Footnote8

Professor Epstein’s “welfarist” argument against the labor exemption relies upon a normative benchmark given by “the competitive order” centered by Chicago School law and economics.Footnote9 But no such benchmark can exist without a definition – necessarily supplied by law, not economics – of the entities that are to engage in that competition.Footnote10 The law defines business firms, rather than, say, cartels, as the entities that are to engage in competition, thereby exempting their internal coordination from antitrust scrutiny. The other normative benchmark upon which Professor Epstein’s argument at least indirectly relies is the notion of freedom of contract, as embodied in the pre–New Deal common law of labor relations. However, the common law’s denial of coordination rights to working people was in fact justified in hierarchical, antiliberty terms – illustrating a more basic justificatory problem with the policy decision to abridge working people’s freedom of association from a liberal perspective.

#### The scope of competition law defines it goals.

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

Competition Policy

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

Theory and Implementation of Competition Policy

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

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

Scope of Competition Policy

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

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

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

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

Neo-Brandeisians seek to replace the longstanding objective and principles-based framework of the consumer welfare standard in antitrust enforcement with an amorphous, process-based framework guided by an ethos one Neo-Brandeisian described as: “Big is bad. Just don’t let big firms merge. The end.” A movement dedicated to replacing a consumer welfare-maximizing approach with an assortment of competing goals has proven unable to offer a quantified, systematic cost-benefit analysis justifying such a radical change, instead relying upon anecdotal evidence and moving prose. The many goals of the Neo-Brandeisian approach are often rhetorically appealing, but the rhetoric hides a simple truth: When you target every variable, you effectively target none. Addressing a wide range of goals through antitrust policy requires de-emphasizing consumer welfare, creating fundamental tradeoffs expected to harm consumers relative to the status quo. The willingness to sacrifice consumer welfare in order to achieve other ends is a defining characteristic of Neo-Brandeisian antitrust. This is illustrated by concrete Neo-Brandeisian critiques, which typically emphasize perceived harms to businesses rather than harms to consumers. For example, the Neo-Brandeisian activist group American Economic Liberties Project (AELP) published a pair of policy briefs on May 3 that criticize online service operators for a litany of purported inconveniences to businesses over a combined 22 pages, but struggle to quantify any harms to ordinary consumers and users. Those few purported harms to consumers that AELP raised are distinctly qualitative rather than quantitative, consistent with the broader reluctance of prominent Neo-Brandeisian thinkers to conduct a rigorous quantitative cost-benefit analysis of their antitrust policy prescriptions relative to the consumer welfare standard.

### Buddhism K---2ac

#### Buddhism isn’t science – can’t translate normative ideas like the self to the scientific method

CBC 20 (Quoting Evan Thompson, who grew up around renowned Buddhist teachers. At university, he studied Buddhist scripture, philosophy and classical Chinese. And his mentor in graduate school was Francisco Varela, a neuroscientist who was also a serious practitioner of Tibetan Buddhism. Buddhism and science: a doomed romance? <https://www.cbc.ca/radio/ideas/buddhism-and-science-a-doomed-romance-1.5745107> //shree)

"They turn the tables… and they say, well, Buddhism is actually the scientific religion because we don't believe in a creator God. We don't believe in an immortal, unchanging, essential soul," Thompson tells IDEAS.

"We ground our ethical system on an understanding of cause and effect. We emphasize causality, that things are impermanent, that things are in flux. So they present Buddhism as either not a religion, or as the truly scientific religion."

As it turned out, Buddhist modernism was tailor-made for the modern West's preoccupation with rationality, scientific validity, and independent thought. But as Thompson argues, things have gotten a little out of hand.

Buddhism now enjoys a kind of exceptionalism among religions. It's regarded as a 'science of the mind,' mindfulness meditation is a 'brain-changing,' commodified, individualistic activity, and complex ideas of the self in Buddhist teaching are conflated with scientific contentions that the self doesn't exist because it can't be found in the brain. It's at this point, Thompson argues, that we begin to miss the point.

"One of the problems with this scientific statement that, 'Well, science shows that there is no self and that validates Buddhism,' is it just completely elides or ignores the difference between a scientific description and scientific use of a concept like the self, and the Buddhist one, where the Buddhist one is inherently ethical or normative," says Thompson, a philosophy professor at the University of British Columbia.

#### Avidya isn’t the root of suffering, which isn’t solely created by personal desire – war happens external to our cravings, plan is the only viable solution

Rachel 11 (blogger, contesting “author quals” in a Buddhism debate IS an epistemology of ignorance, “The Cause of Suffering,” <http://www.rabe.org/thoughts-on-buddhism/cause-of-suffering/> , August 16, 2011//shree)

Basically, life is suffering. And we create our suffering by thirsting or craving for what we cannot have. But are these really all the causes of suffering? Do we really create all of our suffering? I would argue that there is more to suffering than what we cause with our craving. Fighting with reality surely adds to our suffering – if I do not accept that I am sick, for example, and moan the whole time that I shouldn’t be sick, I will suffer more. But the original illness is suffering as well – as the Buddha taught –and it is caused by some sort of germ or an autoimmune attack of the body. So, even in the simple case of, say, a cold, there are two elements of suffering: the actual cold, which is caused by a virus, and possibly my mental fight with reality. There are thus two causes: only one is caused by craving (“I wish I were healthy”), the other is caused by something unknown at the time of the Buddha. Yet, his Second Noble Truth is not questions, not amended. Going beyond the simple, to the societal causes of suffering, the insidiousness of this teaching becomes clear. Despite what the Buddha taught, there is much that can be avoided about physical and mental suffering by changing things outside of ourselves. The story of a water pump spreading cholera might be a good example here. Cholera certainly creates suffering but the causes of this suffering are manifold: there is the cholera bacterium, there is the pump handle that is teaming with the bacterium, (going beyond the story) there is the city that is refusing to belief that the pump handle is the problem, and there is the merchant who charges more for a pump handle than the villagers can afford. True, some suffering might be caused because people afflicted with cholera are craving to be healthy again (who wouldn’t!). The many other factors that actually preceded the illness are never addressed by the Buddha. His teaching ignores any interplay between the personal and the larger society. He essentially teaches us that suffering is our fault and we can overcome it simply by changing our minds. This leads to a closed mind toward other potential causes.

#### Strategic studies is self-reflexive – not purely rational, linear, or state centered – solves risks thru problem-driven approach

Pascal Vennesson 19. Professor of political science, Joint Chair RSCAS, the European University Institute, Social and Political Science Department and Robert Schuman Center for Advanced Studies. “Is Strategic Studies Rationalist, Materialist, and A-Critical? Reconnecting Security and Strategy.” Journal of Global Security Studies, 0(0), 2019, 1–17

Conclusion: Reconnecting IR, Security, and Strategy

By revisiting the conceptions of Carl von Clausewitz and Thomas Schelling, two central, yet distinctive, strategists, I have showed that strategic studies helps transcend the rationalism/constructivism, materialism/idealist, problem-solving/critical theorizing dichotomies and bridges gaps (see also Vennesson 2017). While reason certainly plays a central role in strategic studies, the field is not dogmatically rationalist and combines material and nonmaterial factors. The quest for emancipation is not only compatible with, but often necessitates, the logics of strategy. These dimensions have never been hidden or suppressed (except perhaps in critical security accounts): they have always been constitutive of strategic studies.

Although these dichotomies prove to be misleading, it does not mean that nothing has been learned by engaging with them. One lesson is that it is important to distinguish strategic studies from related, but distinct, bodies of thought. These dichotomies miss the mark in part because strategic studies is at times conflated with weapon-systems-centered operational research, system analysis, or even Kenneth Waltz’s neorealism. Such reductionist perspectives lead to a distorted view of the field as a whole. Critical security advocates are, nevertheless, correct that “hectic empiricism” and the permanent quest of the new fad has been a cause of strategic studies decline. Critics are also right to remind students of strategy that references to strategic thinkers such as Carl von Clausewitz or Thomas Schelling cannot remain shallow and ritualistic. While they should not become the exclusive focus of the field, conceptual and epistemological questions about strategy are important and deserve careful consideration (see for example Nordin and Öberg 2015).

Breaking out of the conceptual jails in which strategy has been incarcerated makes it easier for students of security and IR to reappropriate strategy, one of the oldest and central forms of practice and knowledge surrounding international security. It offers a distinctive conception of the very nature of world politics and, more specifically, a theory of political action in international relations. While I can only sketch a research agenda here, several promising dimensions stand out. First, strategic thinking provides a versatile, not military-focused, view of security: it has a core—the threat and use of organized force for political ends—but it can go well beyond. This is because strategic thinking can be (and has been) used to analyze any security issue when actors interacting in a conflicting environment are involved and use a range of coercive means. Second, strategic studies is politics and polities-centered, not state-centric: any kind of political community, large or small, can develop strategic actions. Political communities’ political ends provide guiding parameters that are connected to diverse means in myriad ways. Third, strategy is global, not Western-centric, in its roots and manifestations (Vennesson 2017). Fourth, strategy is about real reason, how security actors actually think and feel, not rationalism. Fifth, it is social-materialist: it recognizes the reciprocal determination of technology and society. Finally, strategic thinking can make emancipations possible through problem-solving.

Showing that strategic studies is not intrinsically rationalist, materialist, and acritical also facilitates the intellectual reacquisition of, and critical reengagement with, strategic thought. The examination of strategic thought reveals a rich repository of insights, concepts, precedents, and categories profoundly well suited to probe current situations and needs in world politics. Instead of dealing with strategic thinking at arm’s length, security and IR specialists can embrace a vast reservoir of ideas, concepts, and mechanisms available for theory building. Strategic thinking provides an intricate set of information, knowledge, and concepts, which are partially universal and transhistorical and partially contextual historically and culturally. This information crystalizes in the discourses of strategic thinkers and in the actions of strategists. Security and IR scholars can profitably revisit this vast reservoir of concepts and mechanisms forged by strategists and strategic theorists and borrow and reformulate them to serve their purpose. Examples include polarity, escalation, grammar of war, freedom of action, stability, indirect approach, threat that leaves something to chance, and political-strategic expectation.

Moreover, by focusing on how states use their material resources, strategic perspectives offer a promising path to reconceptualizing power (Biddle 2004; Seybert and Katzenstein 2018). They notably suggest that capability is not primarily a matter of material resources but how potential capacities are actualized in creative ways. Viewed through these lenses, the concept of power itself requires more disaggregate treatment, as it is inherently multidimensional and not easily fungible across specific tasks and geopolitical contexts. Strategic perspectives also suggest a careful examination of differences in the ways in which strategic actors actualize and employ their potential capacities. In addition, the strategic understanding of world politics emphasizes the logics of the situation and their interlocking features—including the tactics of the actors involved—and downplays preconditions, antecedents, or previously existing causes. It recognizes that international interactions have logics of their own and tend to take off and become independent from the conditions of their genesis. It seeks to explore what these critical events or processes are made of. In that sense, strategic thinking is indispensable for approaching what Lucia Seybert and Peter Katzenstein call “protean power”—that is, “the effect of improvisational and innovative responses to uncertainty that arise from actors’ creativity and agility in response to uncertainty” (Seybert and Katzenstein 2018, 4).

Finally, going beyond conventional dichotomies helps reconnect practical and social scientific knowledge (Desch 2019). Strategic thought is a central form of enriched practical knowledge about conflict, and international relations more broadly, which finds its source over centuries of practical self-reflection and judgement. Emptying strategy out of security theories and policies that do not involve military force, such as poverty, famine, political oppression, and environmental degradation— to name but a few—is proving unwise, as well as unsustainable. These security issues might not directly implicate military power, but they often involve a set of mental and physical operations to calculate, prepare, and conduct finalized collective action in a conflictual environment.

### Adv Cp---2ac

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### UBI fails.

Anna Coote 19. Principal fellow at the New Economics Foundation and and co-author of Universal Basic Income: A Union Perspective. “Universal basic income doesn’t work. Let’s boost the public realm instead” The Guardian. 05-06-19. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/may/06/universal-basic-income-public-realm-poverty-inequality

A study published this week **sheds doubt on ambitious claims made for universal basic income** (UBI), the scheme that would give everyone regular, unconditional cash payments that are enough to live on. Its advocates claim it would help to reduce poverty, narrow inequalities and tackle the effects of automation on jobs and income. Research conducted for Public Services International, a global trade union federation, reviewed for the first time **16 practical projects** that have tested different ways of distributing regular cash payments to individuals across a range of poor, middle-income and rich countries, as well as copious literature on the topic. It could find **no evidence** to suggest that such a scheme could be **sustained for all individuals** in **any country** in the short, medium or longer term – or that this approach could achieve lasting improvements in wellbeing or equality. The research confirms the importance of generous, non-stigmatising income support, but everything turns on how much money is paid, under what conditions and with what consequences for the welfare system as a whole. From Kenya and southern India to Alaska and Finland, cash payment schemes have been claimed to show that UBI “works”. In fact, what’s been tested in practice is almost infinitely varied, with cash paid at different levels and intervals, usually well below the poverty line and mainly to individuals selected because they are severely disadvantaged, with funds provided by charities, corporations and development agencies more often than by governments. Experiments in India and Kenya have been funded, respectively, by Unicef and Give Directly, a US charity supported by Google. They give money to people on very low incomes in selected villages for fixed periods of time. Giving small amounts of cash to people who have next to nothing is **bound to make a difference** – and indeed, these schemes have helped to improve recipients’ health and livelihoods. But nothing is revealed about their **longer-term viability**, or how they could be **scaled up to serve whole populations.** And there is a democratic deficit: people who get their basic income from charities or aid agencies have no control over how payments are made, to whom, at what level or over what period of time. The Alaska Permanent Fund, built from the state’s oil revenues, pays all adults and children a dividend each year – in 2018, it was $1,600 (£1,230). The scheme is popular and enduring; it has been found to produce some positive impacts on rural indigenous groups, but it makes no claim to sufficiency and **has done nothing to reduce child poverty or to prevent widening income inequalities.** Helsinki city centre Finland undertook a two-year trial, from January 2017 to December 2018, of modest monthly payments of €560 (£477) to 2,000 unemployed people – but the government has refused to fund further expansion. It told us little about UBI except that, when push comes to shove, elected politicians may balk at paying for a universal scheme. The cost of a sufficient UBI scheme would be **extremely high** according to the International Labour Office, which estimates average costs equivalent to 20-30% of GDP in most countries. Costs can be reduced – and have been in most trials – by paying smaller amounts to fewer individuals. But there is no evidence to suggest that a partial or conditional UBI scheme could do anything to mitigate, let alone reverse, current trends towards worsening poverty, inequality and labour insecurity. **Costs may be offset by raising taxes** or shifting expenditure from other kinds of public expenditure, but either way there are huge and risky trade-offs. Money spent on cash payments cannot be invested elsewhere. The more generous the payments, the wider the range of recipients, the longer the scheme continues, the less money will be left to build the structures and systems that are needed to realise UBI’s progressive goals. As this week’s report observes, “If cash payments are allowed to take precedence, there’s a serious risk of **crowding out efforts** to build collaborative, sustainable services and infrastructure – and setting a pattern for future development that promotes commodification rather than emancipation.” This may help to explain why UBI has attracted support from Silicon Valley tycoons, who are more interested in **defending consumer capitalism than in tackling poverty and inequality.**

#### A wealth tax won’t solve inequality.

Ike Brannon 20. senior fellow at the Jack Kemp Foundation. “A Wealth Tax Is Not A Solution For Income Inequality” Forbes. 09-29-20. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ikebrannon/2020/09/29/a-wealth-tax-is-not-a-solution-for-income-inequality/?sh=6353462b7f5b>

However, a wealth tax would **do nothing to help low-income earners** while **hurting the rest of the economy.** Wealth taxes are **difficult to administer** and—more importantly—invariably **reduce savings, investment, productivity, and economic growth.** A wealth tax imposes an annual tax based not on a person's income but on their net assets. For instance, the wealth tax advocated by Senator Bernie Sanders would impact only people who own more than $32 million of assets. Its rates would range from 1 percent at the bottom to 8% for wealth above $10 billion, and it would raise an estimated $4.4 trillion in ten years—more than the entire Biden plan. While the wealth tax champions aver that such a tax would only impact the wealthiest of the wealthy, a tax on wealth would be much more harmful than Biden’s proposed tax increases and would end up **reducing the wealth of everyone, rich or poor.** A good rule of thumb is that we get less of something if we tax it. Do we want to reduce the amount of capital the wealthy accumulate? The Democratic party has made reducing income inequality one of their key goals for the country, and it is one that should be a priority for everyone else as well. However, how we accomplish such a thing matters quite a bit. One salient observation from the last quarter-century is that when the unemployment rate gets below four percent, the wages of people at the bottom quintile start to increase precipitously. At that rate genuine labor shortages for low-skilled and entry level jobs develop, and firms must pay more to attract these workers—or else find people who have been out of the labor market and persuade them to enter, and possibly train them as well. This happened in the late 1990s and in the last couple of years it was again occurring. In 2019 Median Household Income increased by 6.8 percent, and for African Americans it went up by 7.1 percent. More importantly, the mean income for people in the bottom income quintile increased by nine percent, higher than anywhere else in the distribution. A **permanent increase in pay in the occupations of low-income households is infinitely preferable** than any commensurate increase in transfer payments. Successive governments abetted this increase beneficial development by quickly acting to ameliorate the effect of the financial crisis and then making economic growth writ large a priority across both Democratic and Republican Administrations. And after the economic expansion reached 7 years, wages at the bottom started to increase. This also describes our success at reducing inequality in the 1990s. A wealth tax short-circuits that process by merely reducing income at the very top of the distribution. While doing such a thing will, in fact, allow inequality measures to report significant progress, doing so would do **nothing by itself to improve living standards of people at the bottom** of the distribution, or make it easier for people to climb up the income ladder. It’s akin to losing weight by lopping off body parts—it achieves a numeric goal but is counterproductive for the overarching goal. Its advocates invariably counter by saying that if those trillions are spent effectively it would lead to steep gains in living standards, but **much of what they propose to spend that money on**—such as Medicare for all or free college tuition for everyone—**would do little to help them**. They amount to entitlements that would ultimately benefit middle class workers and above more than people at the bottom.

### CIL CP---2ac

#### c--- Contravening CIL causes uncertainty, ends legitimacy, and destroys the constitution.

Kundmueller ‘2 [Michelle; May 1; Attorney specializing in constitutional law, candidate for a J.D. and M.A. in Political Theory from the University of Notre Dame, B.A. from Flagler College; Journal of Legislation, “Note: The Application of Customary International Law in US Courts: Custom, Convention, or Pseudolegislation?” vol. 28]

V. CONCLUSION

This Note has attempted to demonstrate some of the difficulties of applying customary international law in U.S. courts. At every level, there are unanswered questions. Many of these issues, like how "general" a practice or its acceptance must be in order to constitute customary international law, can only be given imprecise answers. Not only are these general problems inherent in all legal questions involving line-drawing in the defining of customary international law, but there is a virtual war being waged over where that line should be drawn and by whom. This issue, in turn, raises questions of constitutional importance, the gravity of which it is almost impossible to overstate. Practical concerns about the balance of powers, no less than theoretical misgivings over undermining our government's consent-based authority and legitimacy, demand our attention as the possibility of directly incorporating customary international law, perhaps even when in direct contravention of federal statute, comes closer to becoming a reality.

Current cases do not present any of these possibilities as realities. They do, however, contain the beginnings of what could become fundamental structural changes in customary-and hence, United States-law should the judicial system prove dominant in determining customary international law. Current cases show U.S. courts, on a fairly modest level, defining, determining, and applying customary international law. The cases have yet to produce a real showdown between domestic, either constitutional or congressional, and customary law. To date, congressional and executive actions and statements have been taken as one type of evidence in determining the content of customary international law, but they have not served as dispositive or controlling in the face of overwhelming evidence that customary international law as a whole dictates a contrary outcome.

This,. of course, is the real issue. What happens when the will of the people or a dictate of the Constitution conflicts directly with customary international law? No doubt, our courts will do their best to interpret creatively so as to avoid such a conflict, but, eventually, the conflict will come, and a decision will be made. The conflict is inevitable due to the nature of modern customary international law. No longer delegated to issues traditionally understood as exterior, modern customary international law is beginning to define relationships between governments and their citizens and amongst citizens.

#### No CIL to rule on---impossibility to define general acceptance means the counterplans appear self-interested and arbitrary---turns the net benefit.

Kundmueller ‘2 [Michelle; May 1; Attorney specializing in constitutional law, candidate for a J.D. and M.A. in Political Theory from the University of Notre Dame, B.A. from Flagler College; Journal of Legislation, “Note: The Application of Customary International Law in US Courts: Custom, Convention, or Pseudolegislation?” vol. 28]

B. General Acceptance as Law

The second component of customary international law, general acceptance as law, is often referred to as opinio juris. Thirlway, author of International Customary Law and Codification, refers to this as "the psychological element in the formation of custom.' 6 Thirlway also explains the

problematic nature of opinio juris and the necessity of a better understanding: [O]pinio juris. . has probably caused more academic controversy than all the actual contested claims made by States on the basis of alleged custom, put together. A present-day writer may be understandably reluctant to call upon his readers to devote further time to this juridical squaring of the circle, but it is impossible to discuss the future of customary law without some study of the elements which are regarded as going into its making.' 7

This problematic aspect of customary international law is a necessary component of the definition, because, as Byers points out, "something in addition to State practice should be necessary . . . for it is essential that one be able to distinguish between legally binding rules and patterns of behavior which are not legally required."' 8 The most fundamental problem with opinio juris stems from the fact that "it involves the apparent chronological paradox that States creating new customary rules must believe that those rules already exist, and that their practice, therefore, is in accordance with law.""9 Various theories have been suggested as solutions to this inquiry, but, as of yet, none of them seem to have gained consensus support.

For the purposes of this Note, theoretical quandaries aside, the problems of the second component of customary international law closely resemble that of the first component: they are practical problems. What degree of acceptance is necessary to meet the standard of "general?" What acts on the part of States or their agents constitute acceptance? The level of acceptance which meets the standard of general is no better defined in the context of the second component than the first. What criteria can the international community use to distinguish between State action motivated by fear, the interests of the State, or belief that the State action is required by customary international law? The definition of "acceptance" within the international legal community is not any clearer than that of "practice" or "general."

This attempt to better understand the basic definition of customary international law, like all such attempts which produce a non-controversial definition, produces very little more than a simple reiteration of the definition. Customary international law is (1) general practice of States which is (2) generally accepted by States as law. Deeper analysis of this definition finds a world divided, in both theory and in practice.

#### 9---I-law fails and violations thump.

Yoo, 14– John, Emanuel Heller Professor of Law at the University of California, Berkeley (“Ukraine and the fall of the UN system,” Oxford University Press, 5/3/14, <http://blog.oup.com/2014/05/ukraine-un-system-international-law-failure-pil/> //red)

Russia’s annexation of the Crimean peninsula and its continuing military pressure on Ukraine demonstrates that the United Nations-centered system of international law has failed. The pressing question is not whether Russia has violated norms against aggression — it has — but how the United States and its allies should respond in a way that will strengthen the international system. It should be clear that Russia has violated the UN Charter’s restrictions on the use of force. It has resorted to “the use of force against the territorial integrity” and “political independence” of Ukraine in violation of Article 2(4) of the Charter’s founding principles. Russia has trampled on the fundamental norm that the United States and its allies have built since the end of World War II: that nations cannot use force to change borders unilaterally. Like the League of Nations in the interwar period, the current system of collective security has failed to maintain international peace and security in the face of great power politics. According to widely-shared understandings of the UN Charter, nations can use force only in their self-defense or when authorized by the Security Council. Great powers with permanent vetoes on the Security Council (the United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China) can always block formal efforts to respond to their own uses of force. Hence, the United Nations remains as powerless now as when Vladimir Putin ordered the 2008 invasion of Georgia. The United Nations and its rules have not reduced the level of conflict between the great powers. That doesn’t mean there has not been a steep drop in conflict, despite Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. From 1945 to the present, deaths due to great power wars have fallen to a level never seen under the modern nation-state system. Collective security, however, is not the agent of this “Long Peace,” as diplomatic historian John Lewis Gaddis has called it. Rather, the deterrent of nuclear weapons and stable superpower competition reduced conflict during the Cold War. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States has continued to supply the global public goods of security and free trade on its own. Democratic nations’ commitment to maintaining that liberal international order, not the collective security of the UN Charter, has kept peace among the great powers. As someone who worked in the Bush administration during the 2003 Iraq War, I am struck by today’s absence of criticism for Russia’s violations of international law and its effective neutering of the United Nations. About a decade ago, criticism of the United States reached unprecedented heights for its failure to win a second Security Council resolution authorizing the use of force. The United States and its allies claimed that it already had authority from Iraq’s refusals to obey its obligations at the end of the 1991 Gulf War and its continuing threat to regional peace. Some of the United States’ closest European allies, such as France and Germany, violently disagreed — although these nations seem to urge compromise today with Russia. Even though the United States went to war without Security Council authorization, it sought to build a legal case in support. UN rules only constrain democracies that value the rule of law, while autocracies seem little troubled by legal niceties. Paralysis continues to afflict the democratic response to the invasion of Ukraine. The United States responded to the invasion of Ukraine and annexation of Crimea with the symbolic measures of sanctioning a few members of Vladimir Putin’s inner circle, kicking Moscow out of the G-8, and halting NATO-US military cooperation. Russian officials mocked the United States and raised the price of natural gas sold to Ukraine, an implicit warning to other European nations that depend on Russian natural gas. The Russian and US stock markets sighed with relief that no serious economic disruptions would follow.

### Unions DA---2ac

#### Unions are strong now

David **Huerta, 12-7**- David Huerta is president of Service Employees International Union, United Service Workers West. (“Here’s why labor unions are winning again,” Cal Matters, December 7, 2021, <https://calmatters.org/commentary/2021/12/heres-why-labor-unions-are-winning-again/>

Most Californians understand that the economy is not working for them. A recent statewide survey revealed disturbing pessimism about the state of things. Nearly two-thirds of us believe that children growing up today will be worse off financially than their parents. More than two-thirds believe the gap between rich and poor is growing wider. While there is not a lot of hope among many, there is this: 78% believe it is important for workers to organize so that their employers don’t take advantage of them. We are seeing that on an ad hoc basis in a phenomenon some are calling the “great resignation.” A record number of workers quit their jobs in 2021, spawning a worker-driven labor shortage. Job levels have not returned to pre-pandemic levels not because there is a shortage of low-wage jobs, but because of widespread dissatisfaction with the conditions that come with those jobs. Workers are fed up and feeling empowered. We are seeing it also on an organized basis in a surge of work-stoppages that has been termed by some “Striketober” and “Strikesgiving.” From John Deere to Kellogg’s and beyond, workers are asserting their interests in a way not seen for decades. Here in California, fast food workers are rallying to end unsafe working conditions and pushing for higher wages during the “Fight for 15” campaign, which includes advocating for passage of Assembly Bill 257, dubbed the “FAST Act,” which would require franchise owners to meet industry standards on working conditions, wages and working hours. Also this year, more than 20,000 janitors across the state in my union fought for and ratified a new contract. It provides many with a fully-paid, family health care plan, a $20 per hour minimum wage and employer contributions to a pension plan that will provide them with the retirement security they deserve. This puts their compensation far above what a comparable non-union janitor earns in California. Americans are taking note of worker progress. The Gallup organization, which has since 1936 periodically polled Americans on how they rate labor unions, found in September that support for unions is now at its highest point since 1965. Support is particularly high among young adults and those with annual household incomes below $40,000. Seeing all this, those who are satisfied with the status quo are beginning to push back, asserting that organized workers somehow have too much political influence. But if you’ve watched what’s happened in Washington, D.C., or even Sacramento this year, you know that the evidence is otherwise. It wasn’t labor lobbying that scuttled attempts to lower prescription drug costs by allowing Medicare to negotiate prices, and it wasn’t labor that blocked paid family and medical leave for workers, and it hasn’t been labor that has kept billionaires and big corporations from paying their fair share of taxes. Corporate lobbying did all that. Working people united in unions have, however, played a significant role in advocating for actions that have helped families weather the COVID-19 crisis – stimulus checks, increased support for child care, supplemental unemployment benefits, a federal eviction moratorium and more. There have been periods in our history when dissatisfied workers have successfully pushed for change. There were periods, such as after the World Wars or coming out of the Great Depression, when working people made great contributions to society and then insisted that they be rewarded. For the essential workers – Black, Latinx, Asian, white – whose sacrifices made it possible for us to get through the worst of the COVID-19 pandemic, this is another such time. To move our economy forward so that it works for all of us, workers need a stronger voice, not a muffled voice. It will take collective resolve to bend the arc of inequality, to close the gap between rich and poor, to re-create a thriving, racially inclusive middle class that can again have faith that children will fare better than their parents. That’s the union agenda. Californians are on board.

#### DOJ investigation into monopsonies thumps.

Michael Volkov 2/3. Owner of The Volkov Law Group, LLC, has over 30 years of experience in practicing law, former federal prosecutor and veteran white collar defense attorney. “Antitrust Division Indicts Four Individuals for Wage Fixing in Labor Markets (Part III of III).” 2/3/22. https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/antitrust-division-indicts-four-8820942/

Criminal antitrust is burning a path in prosecuting illegal wage-fixing agreements in labor markets. The Justice Department warned companies over five years ago and now DOJ is executing on its warning. Over the last two years, the Antitrust Division has indicted four companies and seventeen (17) individuals. The Antitrust Division is promising more indictments.

At the end of 2021, DOJ indicted six individuals, one of whom worked at Pratt Whitney, in a major case against aerospace engineering firms. Prior to this case, DOJ focused its initial cases against healthcare companies.

Last week, DOJ announced another major indictment against four managers of home health care agencies for conspiracy to suppress the wages and restrict job mobility of essential workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. DOJ announced the indictment as the beginning of a larger investigation into wage fixing and worker allocation schemes involving the Personal Support Specialist (PSS) workers.

#### Manufacturing economy is impossible to recover – and, any domestic gains offset global growth.

Porter 16—Editor and finance reporter at NYT and a MS in quantum fields and fundamental forces from Imperial College, London [Eduardo “The Mirage of a Return to Manufacturing Greatness,” *The New York Times*, 26 Apr, http://tinyurl.com/mco6p24, accessed 22 Apr 2017]

In America’s factories, jobs are inevitably disappearing, too. But despite the political rhetoric, the problem is not mainly globalization. Manufacturing jobs are on the decline in factories around the world. “The observation is uncontroversial,” said Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel-winning economist at Columbia University. “Global employment in manufacturing is going down because productivity increases are exceeding increases in demand for manufactured products by a significant amount.” The consequences of this dynamic are often misunderstood, not least by politicians offering slogans to fix them. No matter how high the tariffs Mr. Trump wants to raise to encircle the American economy, he will not be able to produce a manufacturing renaissance at home. Neither would changing tax rules to limit corporate flight from the United States, as Mrs. Clinton proposes. “The likelihood that we will get a manufacturing recovery is close to nil,” Professor Stiglitz said. “We are more likely to have a smaller share of a shrinking pie.” Look at it this way: Over the course of the 20th century, farm employment in the United States dropped to 2 percent of the work force from 41 percent, even as output soared. Since 1950, manufacturing’s share has shrunk to 8.5 percent of nonfarm jobs, from 24 percent. It still has a ways to go. The shrinking of manufacturing employment is global. In other words, strategies to restore manufacturing jobs in one country will amount to destroying them in another, in a worldwide zero-sum game.

#### BUT no impact

Harvey M. Sapolsky and Eugene Gholz, 5/17/2018. \*\*Professor Emeritus at MIT and the former Director of the MIT Security Studies Program. \*\*Associate professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame. “Calm Down, Folks: Enemies Still Fear US Military Tech Innovation.” Defense One. <https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2018/05/us-military-innovation-doing-just-fine-thanks/148287/>.

Where most countries focus on one or two areas, America has a huge, well-funded R&D infrastructure that pushes the envelope everywhere.

Panting warnings that the United States is falling dangerously behind our opponents in the race for military innovation are commonplace. The United States is a strange country in which outside critics and defense insiders, both in government and in private industry, are quick to attack the very innovation system that has produced the many incredible weapons that give the United States its global reputation for military-technological leadership.

Once it was the Soviet Union or Japan who were outpacing us. Today, they claim that China or Russia or Middle Eastern terrorists are the ones applying the latest technology faster. They fear that we are, or soon will be, lagging in cyberspace, drone swarming, hybrid warfare, or long-range strike, and they blame our dysfunctional government, so tangled in its own regulations that it can no longer innovate. The Department of Defense needs, we are told, to reorganize and trim its oversized bureaucracy to become more fleet of foot like the Wizards of Silicon Valley and the hawk-eyed investors of venture capital.

There are many things wrong with these assessments. The United States is not lagging in any major area of military relevant technology. Yes, the Europeans produce good armored vehicles. The Russians are good at air defenses, and several nations, including Russia and China, are good at hacking computer networks. But truth be told, so are we.

Our major defense contractors seem always in trouble, but that is because they are working at the very edge of technology, where problems are constant. Our armed services are the best equipped in the world, and well they should be, given that we are spending at more than Cold War levels. On defense-focused research and development alone, we spend about two-thirds of what the entire world spends. That is about $70 billion this year, which is more than any other nation (save only China and Saudi Arabia) spends on all of its defenses.

And we have been spending vast amounts, often $60 billion to $80 billion per year in constant dollars, for decades, building a foundation of knowledge and experience that guides further efforts to push the state of the art. The United States takes on a difficult job in seeking true innovation; others generally focus on what is innovative for them but would not produce technology new to the United States. Moreover, the U.S. level of effort creates innovative capability in many technical areas, while other countries focus at most on one or two. Breadth reduces the risk that the United States might be surprised by a breakthrough in an underexplored area and allows us to counter adversaries’ one-off capabilities with its broader system-of-systems approach.

U.S. investment has created a thick infrastructure of laboratories,

test facilities, technology development centers, and program analysis units that is unmatched anywhere. It includes government agencies, universities, and firms, and it involves the efforts of hundreds of thousands of individuals. It is an amazing system, devoted entirely to developing better weapons, better ways of killing with advanced technologies.

Three uniquely American factors drive the system. First, there is inter-service rivalry. Most nations have a dominant service, their army or their navy, determined by their geography. The United States, a continent away from troubles, has rivalrous services, each vying for prominence and pushing for technologies that further its role as America’s best defender. Despite pledges of jointness, we have several armies (the Army, Marine Corps, Special Operations), several air forces (the Air Force, Navy, Army, Marine Corps), and a Navy and a half (Coast Guard), and we have just added a Cyber Force and are talking about a Space Force. Decentralization and competition spur innovation.

### Court Clog DA---2ac

#### 2---Won’t clog the courts---plan is clear and easy to interpret---that’s kim… and

William Berkowitz et. al, 21. Berkowitz is Partner and National Chair, Antitrust & Competition Practice Group. Brandon Bigelow is Partner and National Co-Chair, Antitrust & Competition Practice Group and Alison Eggers is Partner, Antitrust & Competition and Franchise & Distribution Practice Groups. “Key Trends in Commercial Litigation: Antitrust.” Commercial Litigation Outlook 2021, p. 8, https://www.seyfarth.com/dir\_docs/publications/Commercial-Litigation-Outlook-2021-Edition.pdf

Companies in all sectors should expect that the FTC and DOJ may give more scrutiny to transactions that in the past might have easily cleared HSR review. Finally, the parties in a number of major antitrust class action litigation matters reached settlements in 2020, including matters involving alleged price fixing in the packaged seafood market and collusion among various Blue Cross/Blue Shield insurance providers to suppress competition between those plans. Businesses are often members of these certified classes, and given the volume of their purchases in these markets, often can recover substantial sums from these settlement funds. Businesses should be on the lookout for court-ordered notices concerning these settlements to make sure they do not waive any rights. Businesses also should be skeptical of companies that offer to “assist” with the submission of claims; these companies often demand a substantial percentage of any recovery for their work, even though settlements are typically designed to make claims submission easy.

#### 4----Courts clogged now---covid, backlogs, vacancies

Meagan Flynn & Michael Brice-Saddler, 1/1. Meagan Flynn covers the Virginia, Maryland and D.C. congressional delegations on The Post's Metro team. She was previously a reporter at the Houston Press and the Houston Chronicle. Michael Brice-Saddler covers D.C. government and politics for The Washington Post's Metro desk. He joined The Post in June 2018 as an intern after graduating from the University of Maryland. “D.C. courts ‘sound the alarm’ on judicial vacancies as local officials demand movement in Senate.” January 1, 2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2022/01/01/dc-judges-vacancy-senate/

He noted that the D.C. Superior Court has the distinction among the nation’s trial courts of having the highest number of case filings per capita in the United States. There are more than 10,000 criminal cases pending, more than doubling 2020′s case load, he noted. The coronavirus pandemic added an additional challenge; jury trials resumed in the spring after being suspended for roughly a year. D.C. Council member Charles Allen (D-Ward 6), who chairs the council’s judiciary committee, said the vacancies cause delays in justice for perpetrators, victims and survivors, and he added that some people have been waiting for trial in the D.C. jail for a longer period of time than they would serve if they were convicted. “This is a massively dysfunctional part of our criminal justice system, which is already dysfunctional because of so many federally controlled elements,” Allen said. “When you add on top of it a massive case backlog in the months and years to come, it puts our entire criminal justice system at a massive disadvantage.” Jurors in a fire station, high school gym and the ‘Cow Palace.’ How Maryland is restarting jury trials in the pandemic. Allen stressed that the challenges created by the vacancies aren’t just limited to criminal cases; other judicial matters involving families, estates and marriages are also affected. Beverly L. Perry, senior adviser to Mayor Muriel E. Bowser (D), said judges have had to shuffle around their schedules to accommodate cases they wouldn’t otherwise be hearing. She said she recently learned Superior Court judges typically have 200 cases or fewer on their docket, but now have 300 to 400. “A criminal judge might be handling a family court calendar — this problem keeps escalating,” Perry said. Perry applauded Norton’s legislation, noting its similarity to how local D.C. legislation can be passively approved by Congress if there is no action after 30 working days. “It’s one of those things that should be perfunctory, it shows another reason we should be a state — and it shows how people that have disregard for our city can create a harmful outcome,” Perry added. “It exemplifies how we have no voice in the Senate at all.” The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee scrutinized problems created by the vacancies during a recent hearing for three judicial nominees last month, and Chairman Gary Peters (D-Mich.) highlighted these problems in his opening remarks. When Sen. James Lankford (R-Okla.) asked the three nominees what they thought the biggest problems were facing the D.C. courts, Court of Appeals nominee Loren L. AliKhan, the D.C. solicitor general, described the backlog as “the first-, second-, third- and fourth-biggest problem facing the District.”

## 1ar

### Adv CP---1ar

#### card

Robert Greenstein 19. Founder and President Emeritus of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. “Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. 06-13-19. https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it

There are over 300 million Americans today. Suppose UBI provided everyone with $10,000 a year. That would cost **more than $3 trillion a year** — and $30 trillion to $40 trillion over ten years. This single-year figure equals more than three-fourths of the entire yearly federal budget — and double the entire budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. It’s also equal to close to 100 percent of all tax revenue the federal government collects. Or, consider UBI that gives everyone $5,000 a year. That would provide income equal to about **two-fifths of the poverty line for an individual** (which is a projected $12,700 in 2016) and less than the poverty line for a family of four ($24,800). But it would cost as much as the entire federal budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. Some UBI proponents respond that policymakers could make the UBI payments taxable. But the savings from doing so would be relatively modest, because the vast bulk of Americans either owe no federal income tax or are in the 10% or 15% tax brackets. For example, if you gave all 328 million Americans a $10,000 UBI and the cost was $3.28 trillion a year (about $33 trillion over ten years) before taxes, then making the UBI payments taxable would reduce that cost only to something like $2.5 trillion or $2.75 trillion (or $25 trillion to $27.5 trillion over ten years). Paying For It Where would the money to finance such a large expenditure come from? That it would come mainly or entirely from new taxes isn’t plausible. We’ll already need substantial new revenues in the coming decades to help keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and avoid large benefit cuts in them. We’ll need further tax increases to help repair a crumbling infrastructure that will otherwise impede economic growth. And if we want to create more opportunity and reduce racial and other barriers and inequities, we’ll also need to raise new revenues to invest more in areas like pre-school education, child care, college affordability, and revitalizing segregated inner-city communities. A UBI that’s financed primarily by tax increases would require the American people to accept a level of taxation that vastly exceeds anything in U.S. history. It’s hard to imagine that such a UBI would advance very far, especially given the tax increases we’ll already need for Social Security, Medicare, infrastructure, and other needs. The Risk UBI’s daunting financing challenges raise fundamental questions about its **political feasibility**, both now and in coming decades. Proponents often speak of an emerging left-right coalition to support it. But consider what UBI’s supporters on the right advocate. They generally propose UBI as a **replacement for the current “welfare state.”** That is, they would finance UBI by eliminating all or most programs for people with low or modest incomes. Consider what that would mean. If you take the dollars targeted on people in the bottom fifth or two-fifths of the population and convert them to universal payments to people all the way up the income scale, you’re redistributing income upward. That would **increase poverty** and inequality rather than reduce them. Yet that’s the platform on which **the (limited) support for UBI on the right largely rests**. It entails abolishing programs from SNAP (food stamps) — which largely eliminated the severe child malnutrition found in parts of the Southern “black belt” and Appalachia in the late 1960s — to the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Section 8 rental vouchers, Medicaid, Head Start, child care assistance, and many others. These programs lift tens of millions of people, including millions of children, out of poverty each year and make tens of millions more less poor. Some UBI proponents may argue that by ending current programs, we’d reap large administrative savings that we could convert into UBI payments. But that’s mistaken. For the major means-tested programs — SNAP, Medicaid, the EITC, housing vouchers, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and school meals — administrative costs consume only 1 to 9 percent of program resources, as a CBPP analysis explains.[1] Their funding goes overwhelmingly to boost the incomes and purchasing power of low-income families. Moreover, as the Roosevelt Institute’s Mike Konczal has noted, eliminating Medicaid, SNAP, the EITC, housing vouchers, and the like would still leave you **far short of what’s needed** to finance a meaningful UBI.[2] Would we also end Pell Grants that help low-income students afford college? Would we terminate support for children in foster care, for mental health services, and for job training? Ed Dolan, who favors UBI, has calculated that we could finance it by using the proceeds from eliminating all means-tested programs outside health care — including Pell Grants, job training, Head Start, free school lunches, and the like, as well as refundable tax credits, SNAP, SSI, low-income housing programs, etc. The result, Dolan found, would be an annual UBI of $1,582 per person, well below the level of support most low-income families (especially working-poor families with children) now receive. The increase in poverty and hardship would be very large.[3] That’s why the risk is high that under any UBI that could conceivably gain traction politically, **tens of millions of poor people would likely end up worse off.**

Matt Weidinger 19. Rowe Fellow in poverty studies at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). “Could Universal Basic Income Actually Make Inequality Worse?” The National Interest. 11-24-19. https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/could-universal-basic-income-actually-make-inequality-worse-98807

Maybe UBI will free everyone to get training and make a dramatic leap up the income ladder. But prior UBI-like programs, such as the Negative Income Tax experiments of the 1970s, resulted in negative effects in terms of work and earnings. More recent trials show neutral to slightly negative impacts on work. But confidence in these experiments is low due to small sample sizes, low external validity, or convoluted designs. Participants also know these free checks are not going to last forever, so quitting a job to pursue “whatever,” to use Pelosi’s term, would make little sense. Yang’s permanent program could displace far more work. At the very least, it begs **broad testing** before jumping off the UBI cliff. Another cause for concern is the staggering cost of UBI: giving every US adult $12,000 each year would cost roughly $3 trillion annually, equal to about three quarters of all current federal expenditures. With the federal government already operating trillion-dollar deficits and unable to pay for currently-promised entitlements, that would **require tax hikes** that spook even normal tax hike advocates: “A UBI that’s financed primarily by tax increases would require the American people to accept a level of taxation that vastly exceeds anything in U.S. history. It’s hard to imagine that such a UBI would advance very far, especially given the tax increases we’ll already need for Social Security, Medicare, infrastructure, and other needs.” But the universality of UBI is what really sets it apart from past efforts to boost family incomes. Instead of growing refundable tax credits for lower income workers to “make work pay,” or even adding more “near poor” people to the welfare rolls, the new money in UBI heads for people with **middle and higher incomes**. That points to the ultimate irony of UBI — it **would worsen inequality by shifting federal spending higher up the income ladder.** That seems unlikely to become law, or if it somehow did, would not last long as budget cutters target payments to upper income households. Yang suggests it would take a constitutional amendment to curtail his UBI, but Congress could have other ideas. In that case, “universal basic income” could quickly become just “basic income” for the poor — that is, a massive new welfare program that supplants work. Either way, that’s a bad idea that risks more harm than good.

### Unions DA

**Military readiness is high now**

Caroline **Houck 17**. Staff correspondent at Defense One. “Top Enlisted Leaders Push Back: There Is No Readiness ‘Crisis.’” 11/28/2017. https://www.defenseone.com/politics/2017/11/top-enlisted-leaders-push-back-there-no-readiness-crisis/142808/

Despite a rash of fatal accidents across the services, the U.S. military’s top enlisted leaders said Monday that Washington’s talk of a readiness crisis was **overblown**. “I’ve been in 34 years. Every day there’s a crisis in something,” Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps Ronald Green said at a press briefing with his fellow service senior enlisted advisors today. “But you walk out and ask the average Marine, ‘Are we in a crisis?’ I don’t think he’ll tell you we are in a crisis.” Still, Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said he was “shocked” at the military’s poor state of readiness when he returned to the Pentagon as its civilian leader. And lawmakers have grown increasingly concerned that 2017’s plane crashes, ship collisions, and other non-combat deaths are evidence that the military is breaking under the strain of 16 years of war. Just last week, a U.S. Navy C-2A Greyhound transport plane crashed in the western Pacific, killing three sailors. The enlisted leaders said observer in and out of the Pentagon aren’t wrong to say more demands are being placed on the services. Investigations found that several of the Navy’s recent collisions at sea, for example, were at least partly the result of overworked or under-trained crews. But “from my perspective, from a joint perspective, I don’t think we’re in crisis right now,” said Army Command Sgt. Maj. John Troxell, the senior enlisted adviser to the chairman of the **J**oint Chiefs of **S**taff. Yes, the services and their troops are concerned — about everything from those accidents and maintenance issues to the ever-unpredictable federal budget — but there’s a **difference** between an acute catastrophe and the **reality** of operating a force of **over a million** active duty troops around the world. “You may see the challenges that we all have as a service, that any organization might have,” said Chief Master Sgt. of the Air Force Kaleth Wright. “What you might not see are the thousands and thousands of great things our servicemembers do on a regular basis…While we do have challenges, we’ve always had challenges, we likely always will have challenges in the future.” Top national-security voices on Capitol Hill, however, are deeply troubled by the state of the military’s readiness. It’s one of the key reasons cited by Armed Services Committee leaders for passing a near $**700-billion** defense authorization bill for 2018. “Most importantly, this legislation will help reverse the dangerous readiness crisis that is endangering the lives of our men and women in uniform,” read a joint statement by Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., Sen. Jack Reed, D-RI, and Rep. Mac Thornberry R-Texas, when the House and Senate armed services committees agreed to a conference report on the bill.

Daniel L. DAVIS 17, retired U.S. Army colonel [“America Should Not Act as the World's Policeman,” *The National Interest*, January 16, 2017, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/americans-lose-when-america-runs-world-order-19064>, gender modified]

Second, the implication that the use of the military in scores of countries around the world has helped the United States is flatly and demonstrably wrong. Over the past decade, the United States has fought or is currently fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Somalia, Africa and covertly in many other locations. The security environment in none of these locations has been improved as a result. To the contrary, the threat to American interests is higher in every single location than it was prior to the deployment of military power. That is clearly not the way to buttress American national security and economic prosperity.

Third, advocates of the imperial worldview incorrectly posit that the only way to “enrich” the United States is to dominate the rest of the globe militarily. Such thinking is an insult to the citizens of this country. Quite to the contrary, the American worker is industrious, intelligent, creative and driven to succeed. Instead of predicating our financial security on sending the armed forces to military dominate and “call the shots” abroad, we would benefit far more by increasing our international engagement by focusing on expanding commercial markets, expanding win-win trade relations and increasing the use of diplomacy.

**Drones solve even if we beef it**

Amy **Zegart &** Clifton B. **Parker 18**. \*\*Professor of political science, Stanford; Hoover Institution and Center for International Security and Cooperation. \*\*Hoover Institution. “Armed drones changing conflict faster than anticipated, Stanford scholar finds.” Stanford News. 3/5/2018. https://news.stanford.edu/2018/03/05/armed-drones-changing-conflict-faster-anticipated/

Could the mere threat of using an armed drone ever coerce an enemy to change their behavior – without attacking them? **Yes**, says Stanford political scientist Amy Zegart, who argues in a new research paper that countries that simply possess deadly, armed **drones** could change an adversary’s behavior **without even striking** them. Zegart is the Davies Family Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and co-director of Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation. “Armed drones are likely to offer coercion ‘windows of opportunity’ in at least one important circumstance: states that have armed drones confronting states that do not,” she said. “As wars grow longer and less conclusive, armed drones enable states to **sustain combat operations**, making threats to ‘stay the course’ more believable.” Zegart believes that drone technology is becoming a **more effective** instrument to change a state’s behavior than yesteryear’s more costly option of using **ground troops** or large-scale military movements in war or conflict. “Drones may be **turning deterrence theory on its head**,” said Zegart, referring to the cost-benefit calculation a potential aggressor makes when assessing an attack. Zegart’s focus is on **next-gen**eration drones, which are essentially unmanned **fighter jets** and are currently in development. She is not examining the use of existing drones like quadcopters and Reaper and Predator unmanned aerial vehicles. Foreign military officers surveyed Zegart’s research is based on surveys of 259 foreign military officers conducted between 2015 and 2017. Participants were highly experienced foreign military officers who were attending classes at the National Defense University and Naval War College. A drone is an unmanned aircraft that can be piloted remotely to deliver a lethal payload to a specific target. Today, Zegart said, many scholars are studying whether drone proliferation across the world could change the future of warfare. “But even here the focus has been the implications for the use of force, not the threat of force,” she said. New drones are more lethal than ever, offering greater speeds, ranges, stealth and agility, according to Zegart. The U.S. is ahead, but not alone, in using drones. Nine countries have already used armed drones in combat, and at least 20 more are developing lethal drone programs – including Russia and China. “It is time for a rethink” about drones, Zegart said. Technological advances will soon enable drones to function in hostile environments better than ever before. “Drones offer three unique coercion advantages that theorists did not foresee: sustainability in long duration conflicts; certainty of precision punishment, which can change the psychology of adversaries; and changes in the relative costs of war,” she said. Threats involving a high cost may be actually less credible than assumed, said Zegart. Her findings challenge the belief of “cost signals,” a military strategy where a country threatens another with a high-cost option, such as ground troops, which is intended to show resolve. Drones may actually **signal a nation’s resolve more effectively** because – as a low-cost option – they can be part of an **enduring** offensive campaign against an enemy. “The advent of armed drones suggests that **costly signals** may no longer be the best or only path to threat credibility,” she said. As wars grow longer and less conclusive, a particular country’s test of resolve becomes “more about sustaining than initiating action.” “In situations where a coercing state has armed drones but a target state does not, drones make it possible to implement threats in ways that impose vanishingly low costs on the coercer but disproportionately high costs on the target,” Zegart said. Combat, coercion Zegart said that throughout history, whenever a new military technology emerges, adversaries have basically faced two choices – either concede or innovate to overcome the other side’s advantage.

**No readiness crisis**

David **Petraeus &** Michael **O’Hanlon 16**. \*\*Retired Army general, commanded coalition forces in Iraq (2007-08) and in Afghanistan (2010-11) and later served as director of the CIA (2011-12). \*\*Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. “The Myth of a US Military Readiness Crisis.” The Wall Street Journal. 8/9/2016. www.wsj.com/articles/the-myth-of-a-u-s-military-readiness-crisis-1470783221

U.S. military readiness is again a hot issue in the presidential election, but unfortunately the current debate glosses over some of the most important facts. While Congress’s sequestration-mandated cuts to military spending have hurt preparedness, America’s fighting forces remain ready for battle. They have extensive combat experience across multiple theaters since 9/11, a tremendous high-tech defense industry supplying advanced weaponry, and support from an extraordinary intelligence community. For those concerned that America’s military is in decline or somehow not up to the next challenge, we offer a few reassuring facts: • The current national defense budget of over $600 billion a year far exceeds the Cold War average of about $525 billion (in inflation-adjusted 2016 dollars) and the $400 billion spent in 2001, according to official Pentagon and Office of Management and Budget data. The national defense budget, which doesn’t include Veterans Affairs or the Department of Homeland Security, constitutes 35% of global military spending and is more than that of the next eight countries—including China and Russia—combined. Spending has been reduced from the levels of the late Bush and early Obama years, but that isn’t unreasonable in light of scaled-down combat operations abroad and fiscal pressures at home. • Assuming no return to sequestration, as occurred in 2013, Pentagon budgets to buy equipment now exceed $100 billion a year, a healthy and sustainable level. The so-called “procurement holiday” of the 1990s and early 2000s is over. • While some categories of aircraft and other key weapons are aging and will need replacement or major refurbishment soon, most equipment remains in fairly good shape. According to our sources in the military, Army equipment has, on average, mission-capable rates today exceeding 90%—a historically high level. Marine Corps aviation is an exception and urgently needs to be addressed. • Training for full-spectrum operations is resuming after over a decade of appropriate focus on counterinsurgency. By 2017 the Army plans to rotate nearly 20 brigades—about a third of its force—through national training centers each year. The Marine Corps plans to put 12 infantry battalions—about half its force—through large training exercises. The Air Force is funding its training and readiness programs at 80%-98% of what it considers fully resourced levels. This situation isn’t perfect, but it has improved—and while the military is still engaged in combat operations across the world. • The men and women of today’s all-volunteer military continue to be outstanding and committed to protecting America. Typical scores of new recruits on the armed forces qualification test are now significantly better than in the Reagan years or the immediate pre-9/11 period, two useful benchmarks. The average time in service, a reflection of the experience of the force, is now about 80 months in the enlisted ranks, according to Defense Department data. That is not quite as good as in the 1990s, when the average was 85-90 months, but is better than the 75-month norm of the 1980s. While there are areas of concern, **there is no crisis in military readiness**. But that doesn’t mean the U.S. is good enough—especially in a world of rapidly changing technology, new threats emerging across several regions, and a constantly evolving strategic landscape. Here are some of the most pressing issues: Should the Army and Navy, considerably reduced in size in recent years, be modestly larger? Are the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps overemphasizing short-range tactical manned fighter jets in their aircraft modernization plans, and underemphasizing drones and bombers? Can the Navy develop underwater robotics and unmanned systems more aggressively? How can the U.S. more effectively counter other nations’s ballistic- and cruise-missile capabilities? What more needs to be done to structure and enhance Defense Department capabilities for operations in cyberspace? How should the military best prepare and structure forces for “advise and assist” missions to the Middle East, Europe and elsewhere? Beyond Defense Secretary Ash Carter’s admirable initiatives, are there other ways the military can bring Silicon Valley and other innovators into the defense world? How much larger does the defense budget need to be, and how should it be structured, in base budget and supplemental funds for ongoing overseas operations? And what next steps might be needed to counter the growing assertiveness of Russia and China? The good news is that there are reasonable answers to each of these challenges that are affordable and at least partially achievable. The bad news is that such issues are getting insufficient attention in the continuing debate. It’s time to remedy that.