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#### The scope of competition law defines it goals---the plan attempts to meet current goals by banning practice – that’s implementation.

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

Competition Policy

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

Theory and Implementation of Competition Policy

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

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

Scope of Competition Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – Cap K

#### Anti-trust is capitalist---competition inevitably replicates market collapse.

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

Today I'm going to devote the program to something many of you have asked me to present, to talk about, to analyze, and that is the question of monopoly. It has to do with the assertions we hear often these days that somehow our capitalist system, here in the United States and beyond, is being negatively affected because monopolies have replaced or displaced competition. The idea here is if only we can get competition back, recreate a competitive capitalism, why then the problems we face will go away. Today's program is a design to show you how and why that is not the case, to think about these things in a different way from this nice story that capitalism is basically fine; it's just the monopoly form we have to get rid of so we get back to the competition which we're all supposed to believe is wonderful and presents us with no problems to solve. So let's go, and let's do it in a systematic way.

First, it is of course easier, faced with a declining capitalism, a capitalism that's all around us with its extreme inequalities, with its instabilities – here we are, trying to cope with the effects of the Great Crash of 2008, even while we anticipate the next downturn coming down the road soon – an economic system that has shown (that is, capitalism) that it is not respectful of the natural environment; it is not, as the words now go, sustainable in a reasonable way. Yeah, we're surrounded by problems of capitalism. So it's comforting in that situation to get the idea from somewhere that this really isn't a problem of capitalism as a system but rather the problem brought in somehow from the outside – monopoly – a situation in which competition among many companies gives way in some way we're not quite sure about to a domination by one or a small handful of companies. And so the argument goes, we don't have to be critical of capitalism; we don't have to think about an alternative system. No, no, we just have to deal with this little detail, the monopoly problem. And if we can deal with that, well, we'll get back to a competition, to a competitive capitalism that is good.

There are three big mistakes involved in this way of thinking, which is nonetheless very widespread and very popular, more so now than in quite some years. First mistake: Capitalism has been wrestling with the problem of monopoly from day one. We have had repeated periods of monopoly. They have eventually led to movements, often of many people, to destroy or remove monopoly. We used to call that in America trust-busting, or antitrust. We even have a department within the Department of Justice in Washington devoted to antitrust activities. Yeah, we've been waging battles against monopoly over and over again, and you know why? Because we keep having monopolies over and over again. Google is a monopoly. Amazon is a monopoly. They're all around us: companies that have effectively no real competition. This is a problem that capitalism has always displayed. And that ought to lead you to wonder whether thinking about it as something we can do away with isn't maybe the best possible example of wishful thinking.

The second big mistake is to imagine that competition is some unmixed blessing. It never was, and it isn't today. A competitive market is a human institution. Like every other human institution, it has strengths, and flaws, and weaknesses. To think of competition as some magical perfection is a silly abnegation of your own rational capability to evaluate something. It's sort of advertising thinking. By that, I mean the advertiser tells you what's good about the product they've been told to advertise; they don't tell you what's bad about it. If you want to evaluate it, you don't talk to an advertiser because they only give you one side. The people who promote competition use advertising logic. We're not going to do that here. Competition is no unmixed blessing.

And finally, I'm going to show you that competition is itself the major cause of monopoly. So that even if we ever got back to a competitive capitalism, all that would mean is we're back in the process that produces monopoly – as it always has.

All right, so let's begin. I'm going to start with explaining how competition has all kinds of consequences that most of you, like me, don't like, don't want. It's a discussion, if you like, of competition's other side: you know, the part that the advertiser doesn't tell you about. The used-car salesman who wants you to buy that junk doesn't tell you about what happened last week in the car crash that that was part of, etc., etc.

All right, let's begin. One of the major reasons that American corporations shut down their operations in the United States and moved them to China, among other places, is because of – you guessed it – competition. They wanted to make more money than they had been before. They were afraid of other companies beating them in the competitive game, so they said wow, let's go to China, because there you can pay workers a lot less. There you don't have the same rules to obey. There they don't care that much about pollution as they do here. So we can save on all kinds of costs, and that will allow us to undercut our competitors. Yeah, one of the consequences of competition was the exodus of American companies to other parts of the world, and the enormous unemployment that resulted from it. Yeah, that was a result, among other things, of competition.

Here's another one: Capitalists, employers, seeking to compete with one another, often engage in what we call automation. They bring in machines that are cheaper to use than human laborers, and that gets them a step ahead of their competitors. Okay, if we replace people with machines, we throw those people out of work. That has an impact on them, their self-esteem, their relationship to their spouse, their relationship to their children, their relationship to alcohol – should I continue? What are the social costs of automation? They're huge. They've been documented over and over again. Competition provokes and produces automation.

Let me give you another example: Companies are competing, say, in the food business – you know, trying to get a customer like you or me to buy this kind of cereal rather than another. So they get their labs to go to work, and they discover we can replace wheat, which we used to put in our little flakes, with – Lord help us – some chemical that is cheaper than wheat. We're not going to worry about what that chemical does to your chemistry in your body because we can now lower the price of our cereal, because we're saving on wheat, and undercut the competitor. The human beings who eat this stuff will suffer, now and in the future, but competition left our producer of cereal no choice.

And in case you think I'm making some up, let me give you some concrete ones. The Boeing Corporation, the major producer of airplanes in this country, is in a crisis as a corporation. You know why? Because the 737 Max crashed a couple of times, killing hundreds of people. And you know why? It turns out they economized on safety measures, and training measures. And you know why they did that? Because they're in a very tight competition with European and other airplane manufacturers, and that leads them – as it usually does – to look to cut corners: that race for, quote, "efficiency." Yeah, it was competition that contributed to those deaths and to that problem. That's competition too. You can't whitewash this story; they're real. One of the ways Amazon beats its competition is it speeds up the work process. It has figured out ways to make people work much more intensely, using up their brains, their muscles, their nerves, in ways that cause real long-term physical damage to working people. That, too, is a result of the competitive effort.

And you know, it wasn't so long ago that children were part of the labor force. That's right, kids as young as five and six years of age. We were told they have little fingers, you see. They can be more productive than people who are adults with big fat fingers, you know – that doesn't work. And by the way, you should be grateful because poor kids are the ones we hire, and that gives their poor families more income than they would otherwise have. We heard those arguments. Competition, the companies said, required them to use the more productive, and the lower-wage, children rather than adults. So child labor was also a result of competition. It was so ugly and so troubling to so many people that finally there were movements in the United States and many other countries simply to outlaw child labor. So it became a crime for any employer to use a worker who was under 16 or 18 years of age. That was a way in which people said we are not going to allow competition among capitalists to destroy our children. They were recognizing that competition has an awful effect in what it does to children.

Well, it has many awful effects. So let's be clear: In the history of capitalism, the monopoly problem (which we're going to get to in the second half of today's program) is no worse, it's just different, from the competition problems. Capitalism goes through phases of competition and monopoly, going from one to the other, as I will explain. But we shouldn't bemoan the one in favor of the other, any more than vice-versa. These are neither of them solutions; they are both phases of the problem. And the problem is capitalism, which does its number on us both in the period when it's competitive and in the period when it's monopoly. People who want us to engage one more time in an anti-monopoly crusade are doing something that in the end evades the problem, which is the system – capitalism – not this or that form of that system, such as competition and monopoly.

We've come to the end of the first half of today's Economic Update. This gives me an opportunity to remind you, please, to sign up if you haven't already, to subscribe to our YouTube channel. It's a way easily for you to support us, doesn't cost any money, and it is a big help to us in terms of our reputation and what we can accomplish. Likewise, please make use of our websites. They are there for your communication with us. They are there for you to be able to, with a click of a mouse, to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. And finally, a special thanks goes, as always, to our Patreon community for their ongoing enthusiastic support. It means the world to us. My final, very final for this first half, is about a new book that we have just produced and released. It's a follow-up to an earlier volume I have spoken to you about that was called Understanding Marxism. For the same reason, we have now produced a brand-new book, just out, called Understanding Socialism. It is a response, as this program is, to issues, questions, comments you have sent to us in large numbers. It's an attempt to give an overview of the different interpretations of what socialism means, of what happened in countries like Russia and China that tried to create this – the strengths, the weaknesses, the lessons to be learned, what to do, and what not to do. Please, if you're interested and want to follow up, check us out, check the book out: lulu.com is how you find both books. And I will be right back; stay with us.

Welcome back, friends, to the second half of today's Economic Update. This program, as I explained, is devoted to the analysis of competition and monopoly as two interactive, sequential phases of capitalism as a system. The first part of the program was devoted mostly to competition, so let's turn now to monopoly. What is the basic definition and criticism of monopoly? Strictly speaking, monopoly is defined simply as a situation in which the producers of a particular commodity – shoes, software programs, haircuts, it doesn't matter – have been reduced to only one. Literally one seller – a monopolist. But in general language, it includes also situations where many producers who once competed with one another have been reduced to only a handful. The strict term for only a handful is "oligopoly," but we don't have to split hairs about this. "Monopoly" will be the word we use for either one or a very small number.

For example, there were once dozens of automobile companies, but very quickly their competition reduced them to basically three for much of the post-World War II period, and you know their names: Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. And likewise there were once many cigarette producers, there were once many television-set producers, and they became very few, whose names, therefore, we all know.

What's the criticism of a monopoly or oligopoly situation? Again, very simple: The idea is, if there's only one seller of something, that seller can jack up the price way above what he might have otherwise because he doesn't have any competitor. If he had a competitor, if he raised the price, the competitor would get all the business because we'd all go to the competitor who hadn't raised the price rather than buy it at a higher price from the monopolist. So we don't like monopolies, because they can jack up their prices and their profits because they don't have a competitor. And if it's a few, a handful, well then we talk about things like cartels: arrangements when a few get together over dinner, or out on the golf course, and tell us what the price is. If you ever wondered why the prices of different cars, different cigarettes, and so on, are so close to one another – mm-hmm – that's because there are few sellers, and somehow they worked it all out. But the basic criticism is that a monopoly is a situation in which the seller of something jacks the price up way beyond what they could otherwise get because there are no more competitors.

So let's talk about this monopoly problem and where the monopolies come from. Well, the first and most important lesson is this: Competition produces monopoly. It's not something external, imposed on competition. It has nothing to do with human greed or anything else. Are people greedy? You betcha – some more, some less – but that's really a separate matter. It's competition that produces monopoly, and let me show you how that works. In competition, we have, by definition, a whole bunch of producers. They all produce the same thing. They compete with one another, hoping we, the consumer, will buy from one rather than the other. They compete in the quality of what they produce and in the price of what they produce. And we are supposed, as consumers, to go look for the best quality at the lowest price, and to patronize that one who offers that to us better than the others that we could buy from but choose not to.

Okay, that's a fair definition. Now let's follow the logic. Company A produces – however it manages it – a better quality and/or a lower price than Company B. So we all go to Company A. Company B can't find any buyers because it's not competitive. Or to say the same thing in other words, Company A outcompetes Company B. Here's what happens: Company B collapses. Because it can't sell its goods, we're all going to Company A. So Company B sooner or later declares bankruptcy. It can't continue. It lays off its employees, it stops buying inputs, because it can't compete. Good. Now what happens in Company A? Company A says hey, there's a whole bunch of workers that have just lost their job at Company B; they're trained in producing what we produce; let's go hire some of them. And likewise, Company A says, they're not using their computers, or their trucks, or their other inputs. They're going to have to sell them on the secondhand market. We can get some important inputs we need at a lower price than we would have to pay if we bought them new. So what begins to happen is, where before there were two companies, A and B, there's now one larger A, and B has disappeared. Or to say the same thing in simple English, A – the winner in the competitive struggle – eats, absorbs into itself, what's left of Company B.

And this process is repeated over and over, until 30, or 300, companies have become one, or two, or three. That's the result of competition. That's how competition is supposed to work. That's how competition does work. It's important to understand: Monopoly is where competition leads. And as if that weren't enough, let me make sure you understand this from the business point of view: It is the great dream of every entrepreneur to become the last one standing in the competition, to win the competition, not just because it makes you feel good you outmaneuvered your competitors, but because if you're the last one standing, you're the monopolist. The reward for having outcompeted the others is that you're now in a position to jack up the profits, and the prices, way beyond what you could have done before.

So we have a system that produces monopoly, and all the incentives for every entrepreneur in competition to work as hard as possible to become the monopolist. So why is anyone surprised that monopolies keep happening, because they're the whole point and purpose of capitalist competition. If you ever were – and we never have, but if you ever were – able to get rid of all the monopolies and re-establish competition, all you would be doing is setting this same process in motion again for the umpteenth historical time. In other words, fighting against monopoly is pointless as long as you have capitalism, because it is the endless reproducer of this problem – as it always has been.

Now, how do monopolies maintain themselves? If you're the only one standing, you're a monopolist. Or you're an oligopoly, you're a few, and you get together and jack up your prices together. The question becomes look, a monopolist makes very high profits – much higher than a competitor can achieve – and isn't that an enormous incentive for other capitalists to get in on that business? Because look at the profits they're earning, because they're the only one. Apple, Amazon, Google – the profits are staggering. Everybody wants to get in. So the way a monopolist has to think is, I've got to create obstacles that block other people from coming in to get a piece of the enormous profits my monopoly allows me to get. We call that in economics "barriers to entry." Monopolists need to create barriers. Let me give you a couple of examples.

The major soft drink makers in the United States – basically Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola – they produce a drink that has sugar and coloring in it, and lots and lots of water. Let me assure you, there is nothing difficult or complicated about producing a mixture of sugar, color, and water. It doesn't take a genius; it never did. Pepsi and Coca-Cola make a fortune off of their product, as we know, and they have for decades. They have a virtual monopoly. Now, lots of other people could produce water, sugar, and color close to, if not identical with, whatever they produce, but they can't break through. They can't really get to that status. And you know why? Because Coca-Cola and Pepsi erected a barrier to entry. And the way they did that was with advertising. Every billboard, every magazine cover, every doorway of every institution you've ever been to has a picture of smiling, happy people drinking one or the other. You've learned: that's the drink, that's the drink. Another company might make a perfect substitute, but they can't afford the enormous cost of advertising. The advertising costs more than the water, and the sugar, and the color. What you pay for when you buy Pepsi and Coke is the advertising that got you to buy it. You're paying for being hustled. But it works, because it means other companies know that they can't get in there by cheaply producing an alternative, because you have to produce the advertising that goes with it, or else you can't do it. And so their monopoly is maintained.

Here's another way to maintain a monopoly: Get the government to step in. Here the famous example is the milk producers. Some years ago, there was a crisis with milk. There was contamination; people were getting sick. So the clever milk monopolies came in and said, we're going to support the enormously expensive, special equipment to guarantee pasteurization, and so on, of milk. Why did they support it? Because your small farmer, your small dairy producer, can't afford it, so they go out of business. Only the big, rich few that are left can afford the enormous equipment. They used governmental rules to create a barrier to entry.

Here's another way: corrupt public officials. President Trump denounces Huawei corporation because it compromises our national security. It denounces European car producers because somehow their shipping cars here compromises our security. Who cares? As long as the president blocks other companies from getting into the business that might compete with an American, a barrier to entry exists. Monopolists have been very creative in coming up with ways to preserve their monopolies.

I don't want to lose the basic point. The basic point is: Capitalism oscillates, back and forth between competition and monopoly – first this industry, then that one. For a while, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler were the monopolies – or the oligopoly, if you like – in automobiles. But eventually, Toyota, and Nissan, and Peugeot, and Fiat broke the monopoly. In that case, it was foreigners who did it. And then we had some competition, and that, then, is now shrinking. The French – the last two producers in France – have just agreed to merge. You get the picture. Industry by industry, first this one, then that one, go through one phase or another.

The important point is: The phases are not our problem. They merge into, and incentivize, each other. Each provokes movement in the other direction. The point to understand is that the problems of a capitalist system are not about this oscillation of phases. We're not going to solve the problem of monopoly by getting rid of them and re-establishing competition. We've been there; we've done that; it reproduces monopoly; and it doesn't change the basic inequality, unsustainability, instability of capitalism. We need to get beyond that stale, old debate – competition versus monopoly – and face the underlying reality: Capitalism is the problem, and getting beyond it is the solution.

#### Using antitrust to secure global competitiveness is monopolization that ensures war, and makes capitalist development unsustainable

Bai Yang 19. Associate Professor at the Shanghai University of Finance and Economics. Re-understanding of the Marxist Monopoly Capital Theory in the New Period. Canadian Social Science. 06-26-2019. 15(6): 51-52

No matter how the times develop, the essence of capitalism has not changed, and monopoly is still its economic foundation. However, with the progress of the times and the development of society, capitalism has moved to a new stage of development. Under the new era, the development of monopoly capitalism has shown new development characteristics, at the same time it cannot conceal the irreconcilable contradiction of capitalist society. 2.1 New Features of Monopoly Capitalism 2.1.1 The Degree of Economic Globalization Has Deepened - The Globalization of Monopoly Capital The essence of economic globalization is the globalization of monopoly capital, and monopoly capital is dominated by financial capital. The current financial capital monopoly in the capitalist world can be called “a new type of financial war monopoly”. It can be said that scientific and technological progress provides the necessary conditions for financial monopoly. Network information and financial liberalization have enabled financial capital to achieve a dominant position in the world economy. A series of financial derivatives such as stocks, options, securities, and futures created by financial innovation are full of capital markets, and even determine the circulation of world capital and the rise and fall of the economy. Monopoly organizations constantly carry out capital expansion, capital export, and seizure of the world market for maximizing economic benefits. At the same time, monopoly capital is united with the government and gains government protection. 2.1.2 Changes in the Form of Monopoly Organization - The All-Round Rule of Multinational Corporations In the stage of financial monopoly capitalism, multinational corporations have become the main carriers. They formed global network layouts and established global production systems through subsidiaries and branches throughout the world, gradually infiltrated its branches and veins into the markets of various countries and realizing the all-round rule of the world economy by controlling key technologies, information, capital, production, sales and markets. In the Fortune 500 list released by Fortune 2016, WalMart, which ranked first for three consecutive years, had revenues of $482.1 billion in 2015, while the country’s gross domestic product with a population of 4 million in 2016 was 471.8 billion. The US dollar ranks 149th in the world. In 2013, the world’s top 500 business revenues were 30.3 trillion US dollars, twice the total US GDP. Among them, there are 132 US companies with a total operating income of 8.6 trillion US dollars, exceeding China’s total GDP in 2012. In 2011, the “World’s 500 Largest Economy” released by China Economic News, there are 408 multinational corporations rich in enemy countries, they are from 20 countries (regions), of which 114 companies belong to the United States. As we know, there are more than 200 countries and regions. The above data shows that the extraordinary dominance of multinational corporations in today’s world economy, their economic strength and influence can completely compete with a considerable number of independent regimes, and even control the world political situation. In the book “Target China: Washington’s ‘Slaughter Dragon’ Strategy”, American economist William Endol called the Rockefeller family, the George Bush family, the DuPont family, and the Bill Gates family “Global Carter Alliance.” They control the lifeblood of the world economy through 150 multinational corporations in their hands, occupying more than 40% of the world’s wealth. In addition, they control the media and elections, making them their spokesmen and envy, coercing the government to make concessions and Compromise. They even use military and political means to provoke war, interfere in internal affairs, seize strategic resources, capture ideological and cultural positions, and infiltrate and disseminate Westernization ideas. These superenterprises have formed a network layout that controls the development of the world with their own super strength, and also exposed the greed nature of monopoly capitalism. 2.1.3 Anti-Monopoly With Monopoly With the prevalence of monopoly capitalism, the banner of anti-monopoly is also lifted by governments and international organizations. As the name implies, antimonopoly mainly regulates and restricts the monopolistic behaviors and trends of enterprises, and intervenes in market structure and corporate behavior. The history of antitrust in the United States has been more than a hundred years. After the end of the American Civil War, there was a national unified market, at the same time a monopoly organization in the form of trusts was created. Mobil Oil was the first trust of the US oil industry at the time. In order to curb these monopoly organizations and safeguard the interests of consumers, the Sherman Act was promulgated in the United States in 1890, which is also the first anti-monopoly law in the world. In 1914, as a supplement to the Sherman Act, the United States successively promulgated the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Subsequently, Japan, Germany, and Italy also introduced anti-monopoly laws. As a developing country, the anti-monopoly legislation process is relatively late. On the one hand, these developing countries, especially socialist countries, generally implement a planned economic system, enterprises cannot compete freely, and naturally there is no need for anti-monopoly. In addition, the main industrial sectors of these countries are state-owned enterprises, and it is more important to maintain their dominant position. However, with the development and opening up of the market, the advantages of free competition and private enterprises are gradually shaking the status of stateowned monopolies. Private economy and competition mechanisms can stimulate market vitality and improve economic efficiency. Countries have also joined the team of anti-monopoly legislation. China’s anti-monopoly began to receive attention after joining the World Trade Organization. In 1993, China promulgated the “AntiUnfair Competition Law of the People’s Republic of China”, and it promulgated the “Anti-Monopoly Law of the People’s Republic of China” in 2007. 2.2 New Contradiction of Monopoly Capitalism 2.2.1 Polarization Is Getting Worse Rich countries are richer, poor countries are poorer, and world countries are becoming more and more polarized. This is a contradiction facing the current world. To analyze the reasons, we can briefly summarize the following points: First, due to the existence of “top effect”, the market mechanism of rich countries (developed capitalist countries) is perfect and the level of productivity is very high. Therefore, in the context of economic globalization, it will be suppressed. Even destroying the immature productive forces of developing countries and seriously hindering the development of relatively backward countries; second, the developed capitalist countries have aggressed by virtue of sufficient capital advantages and advanced technological advantages, possessing the superior resources, cheap labor and open market of developing countries. Developing countries can only be used as primary factories, while developed countries have mastered core technologies and earn high monopoly profits. Third, monopoly organizations in developed capitalist countries occupy the position of world economic hegemon, not only in economics, but also in the political, cultural, social and other fields are rule makers.

#### Capitalism drives extinction and structural violence.

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

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

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

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

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

#### Vote neg for global syndicalism---pressures towards socialist state action are building, forces the hand of monopolies.

Cecilia Rikap 21. Professor of Economics and Coordinator of YSI States and Markets Working Group, Institute for New Economic Thinking. “Tilting the Scale Against Intellectual Monopoly Capitalism.” *Capitalism, Power and Innovation Intellectual Monopoly Capitalism Uncovered*. Routledge. 2021. 287-289

Capitalism is a system based on asymmetries and inequalities (of income, wealth, between classes, genders, races, countries and more). Quite striking for a system born from the motto “Liberté, égalité, fraternité”. As time passes by, this broken promise of modernity becomes all the more apparent. Inequalities deepen as knowledge is monopolized, digital surveillance reinforces firms and states control capacities over workers and citizens, and political conflicts never cease – with the US-China tech cold war at the current epicentre.

Social disrupts are an expected recurring outcome, and we have seen them everywhere in the 21st century. The specific motives differed, but there is a common root: people are fed up with capitalism’s growing inequalities, with a stagnant or even declining “middle class” in developed countries for several decades already and the highest gains accumulating at the global level for those in the richest 5% (Milanovic, 2016).

There is another shared feature; demonstrations are increasingly being organized online. The same technology that is used for surveillance, for broadcasting extreme right and even fascist ideas, and that drives the USChina world hegemony conflict, is also being used as a counterbalancing weapon. Internet, particularly social networks, is a powerful tool for the organization of grassroots movements. Workers’ unions can also learn from each other’s experiences online.

The absence or weakness of unions and social movements in some parts of the world has benefited intellectual monopolies rentiership and predation. For instance, hiring workers with a vendor contract not only hides the working relation (see Chapter 10) but also impedes unionization as it currently stands. Still, unions are adapting and workers organizing. In 2018, Google employees managed to stop the company from renewing an artificial intelligence contract with the Pentagon and to cancel its plans for a censored search engine for China. And, in 2020, 2,000 employees urged the company to cease selling technology to the US police after George Floyd’s killing. These initiatives should be taken by workers in other companies and contribute to unionization. Unions should be reconceived as a political actor capable of exercising their influence beyond wage claims. Workers’ organization is indispensable to counterbalance the power of intellectual monopolies, given both their global reach and states’ internal contradictions and limitations.

Peripheral countries should cease competing to attract outsourcing and offshoring by allowing worse wages and working conditions. As mentioned above in this chapter, world cooperation agreements to establish minimum labour regulations, forbidding new and old forms of informality and granting minimum working conditions are urgent. However, these agreements require great social pressures to take place. When it comes to transforming capitalism, social disrupts, grassroots social movements and unions play a crucial role.

To illustrate their paramount importance, let us briefly consider taxes. It is crystal clear that the global taxing system has failed. As pointed out in Chapters 7 and 10, global intellectual monopolies declare profits and IPRs in tax havens and use tax loopholes to minimize paid taxes. Global tax reform should consider the separation between ownership and control. Intellectual monopolies control production and innovation networks beyond their legal ownership and have the capacity to trickle down the burden of taxes. However, the intertwined relationship between global intellectual monopolies and their home (core) states renders highly unlikely to accomplish such global tax reform without intense social pressure. Even the recent US corporate tax reform was not – at least so far – successful in this respect (Clausing, 2020). Then, as far as tax havens are not eliminated, there will still be room for tax avoidance and evasion (Zucman, 2015). Countries acting as tax havens will not comply with a global reform unless huge social disrupt forces them to do so.

Additionally, workers’ protests must be coordinated at the level of the global production network because the production unit is no longer the factory but the network. The same applies to global innovation networks. Intellectual monopolies’ recognized employees have greater bargaining power than workers in subordinate firms, which are precisely those that generally need a more urgent improvement in their salaries and working conditions. “Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains” (Marx & Engels, 1848) can and must become an everyday reality for the French Revolution motto to be more than aspirational.

### Forecasting CP – 1NC

#### The United States should only allow the continuation of anticompetitive mergers in the defense industry under antitrust law only when a team of the Good Judgment Project’s “super-forecasters” has determined that the mergers reduce the numerical probability of harm to national security from an unacceptably high level.

\* The Good Judgment Project’s “Super-forecasters” are team members of the Good Judgement Project that have ended in the top 2% of forecasters tournaments, selected by Tetlock’s team.

#### ONLY the counterplan solves---the plan can’t keep up with market changes.

AMC 07. Antitrust Modernization Commission. Deborah A. Garza, Chair. Bobby R. Burchfield ,Commissioner. W. Stephen Cannon, Commissioner. Dennis W. Carlton, Commissioner. Makan Delrahim, Commissioner. Jonathan M. Jacobson, Commissioner. Jonathan R. Yarowsky, Vice-Chair. Donald G. Kempf, Jr., Commissioner. Sanford M. Litvack, Commissioner. John H. Shenefield, Commissioner. Debra A. Valentine, Commissioner. John L. Warden, Commissioner. “Report and Recommendations.” https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/amc/report\_recommendation/amc\_final\_report.pdf

To determine whether and when particular forms of business conduct may harm competition requires an understanding of the market circumstances in which they are undertaken. Antitrust agencies and the courts have long looked to economic learning for assistance in understanding market circumstances and the likely competitive effects of particular business conduct.23 Indeed, economics now provides the core foundation for much of antitrust law. Not surprisingly, as economic learning about competition has advanced over the decades, so have the contours of antitrust doctrine.

Antitrust law also must keep pace with developments in the business world. Business practices may change, especially as technological innovation and global economic integration alter the competitive forces at work in particular markets. To protect competition and consumer welfare, antitrust analysis must offer sufficient flexibility to take account of these changes, while maintaining clear and administrable rules of antitrust enforcement.

B. Periodic Assessments of the Antitrust Laws Are Advisable

The antitrust laws in the United States require ongoing evaluation and assessment to ensure they are keeping pace with both economic learning and the ever-changing economy.24 In past decades, various entities have empowered six different commissions to assess how well antitrust law operates to serve consumers. The Antitrust Modernization Commission is the seventh such commission in almost seventy years.25 Prior commissions have made recommendations about both the substance and procedure of antitrust law.

#### Flexibility is key to super forecasting competition policy---the aff locks in policy failure.

Michelle Baddeley 17. Institute for Choice, University of South Australia. Journal of Behavioral Economics for Policy, Vol. 1, No. 1, 27-31, 2017. “Experts in policy land - Insights from behavioral economics on improving experts’ advice for policy-makers”. https://sabeconomics.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/JBEP-1-1-4-F.pdf

Whichever side one takes on these political divides, if the modern fashion is to allow subjective, partisan opinions to trump expert advice, what are the likely implications? Is it wise to be so mistrustful of experts? Expert advice is irreplaceable. Scientific experts and academics play a crucial role in developing new findings and insights to help inform policy, with implications across the range of human activity – from health and environmental policy through to competition policy, consumer protection and financial regulation – to name just a few. But to what extent are experts objective and impartial? Is their advice really impartial and unbiased, based around a cool and calculating objective assessment of evidence, after the careful application of robust research methodologies? In practice - uncertainty, insufficient information, unreliable data or flawed analysis can limit the expert’s ability to untangle the truth, and make it difficult for the policy-maker to assess the extent to which expert advice is reliable. Robust statistical methods, careful experimental design and clear hypotheses can guide the expert but impartial advice is also compromised by a range of economic, behavioural and socio-psychological constraints, some of which may be beyond the expert’s conscious control. Heuristics, biases and social influences driving experts can have significant negative consequences for the public, especially if misleading research findings are used to guide public policy.

This paper will explore some of these influences on experts’ judgement. In Section 2, some of problems around information, risk and uncertainty are outlined; in Section 3, key economic and socio-psychological constraints are explored. Policy implications and solutions are suggested in Section 3, focussing on how we can ensure that expert advice is devised and applied in the most robust and objective ways possible.

Information, risk and uncertainty

Risk and uncertainty is an unavoidable problem, especially for the scientific research that backs up expert judgement because it is about investigating novel, poorly understood phenomena. When information is scarce, a situation is profoundly uncertainty, and/or we have had no prior experience of an event or phenomenon, we cannot quantify the risk of one event versus another. Frequency ratios capturing the incidence of similar events in the past are of no use when there have been no similar events in the past. Given uncertainty, it is not possible to tell before the fact whether experts are right or wrong. It is not like we have given them a difficult mathematical problem which we can double check ourselves using a computer or calculator. With scientific research and expert advice – there is no way to know what the truth might be, and that is why we need experts to find it. And we can only judge expert judgements with the benefit of hindsight, if at all. This is a Catch-22: we need expert evidence to judge expert evidence.

An example of how policy-makers confront these problems of uncertainty and poor information affecting expert advice is the work of the Hazardous Substances Advisory Committee (HSAC) – an advisory committee to the UK’s Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. This committee focuses on another complication arising from uncertainty – the difference between a risk and a hazard. Hazards exist, they are there – but if we know where they are, we can avoid them and thereby minimize our risk. The problem comes in knowing what and where the hazards are. Scientific experts on HSAC – including a range of toxicologists, environmental scientists and biochemists, as well as social scientists – assess evidence to help to inform the UK’s regulatory policy with respect to chemicals harmful to the environment and human health. Often a key constraint is that they are asked to provide advice around the likely environmental impacts of hazardous substances such as endocrine disruptors, antiobiotics and nanomaterials – often we do not know too much about these substances and their long-term impacts, especially for innovative technologies such as nanomaterials. HSAC has therefore devised a structure for assessing the quality of evidence when information is scarce and uncertainty is endemic –spanning not only the usual scientific evidence around experiments and field observation, but also including computational modelling and anecdotal evidence (Collins et al. 2016). For experts used to analysing large data sets, the latter would seem like an anathema but when experts are facing fundamental uncertainty the types of evidence they might use must expand accordingly. If we are forced to rely on anecdote, we need to understand what distinguishes good anecdotal evidence from bad anecdotal evidence: anecdotes that are corroborated across a range of sources are more reliable than single anecdotes, for example.

Economic and socio-psychological constraints

The problems of poor information, risk and uncertainty are not about the fallibility of individuals or even differences between individuals – either in terms of their individual differences and characters, and/or their susceptibility to biases and social influences. Once we introduce these additional constraints – which reflect the characters of the experts not the nature of the evidence – the opportunities for mistakes and misleading guidance increase significantly.

Individual differences

Individual differences seem to play a role, including in terms of innate ability to make judgements about uncertain futures. Philip Tetlock conducted a study which showed that, in forecasting uncertain future events, most experts are only just better than an ordinary person guessing at random (Tetlock 2006). In a second study, however – a collaboration with Dan Gardner – he showed that some particular individuals – experts or not – are “super-forecasters” who have a particular aptitude for forecasting (Tetlock and Gardner 2015). What ideal characteristics might enable these super-forecasters to predict so well? In a complex world, we need experts who are able to understand and analyse a wide range of evidence. Do we need experts who can cover a broad range, or experts who know a narrow field very well? Linking to Isaiah Berlin’s distinction between the fox-types who have a wide but relatively superficial knowledge, and the hedgehog-types who have a deep but relatively narrow knowledge, Tetlock (2006) argues that we may prefer to be advised by foxes – who know many little things, can draw on an eclectic range of evidence and are able to improvise relatively easily when evidence shifts. The hedgehogs, who know one area very well and focus on one tradition may be too inclined to impose formulaic and inflexible solutions.

#### Binding forecasting is key to spillover---solves security.

J. Peter Scoblic and Philip E. Tetlock 20. J. Peter Scoblic is Co-Founder of Event Horizon Strategies, a Senior Fellow in the International Security Program at New America, and a Fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School. Philip E. Tetlock is Leonore Annenberg University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, Co-Founder of Good Judgment, and a co-author of Superforecasting: The Art and Science of Prediction. “A Better Crystal Ball The Right Way to Think About the Future”. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-10-13/better-crystal-ball

The greatest barrier to a clearer vision of the future is not philosophical but organizational: the potential of combining scenario planning with probabilistic forecasting means nothing if it is not implemented. On occasion, the intelligence community has used forecasting tournaments to inform its estimates, but that is only a first step. Policymakers and consumers of intelligence are the ones who must understand the importance of forecasts and incorporate them into their decisions. Too often, operational demands—the daily business of organizations, from weighty decisions to the mundane—fix attention on the current moment.

Overcoming the tyranny of the present requires high-level action and broad, sustained effort. Leaders across the U.S. government must cultivate the cognitive habits of top forecasters throughout their organizations, while also institutionalizing the imaginative processes of scenario planners. The country’s prosperity, its security, and, ultimately, its power all depend on policymakers’ ability to envision long-term futures, anticipate short-term developments, and use both projections to inform everything from the budget to grand strategy. Giving the future short shrift only shortchanges the United States.

### 1NC – Regs Counterplan

#### Counterplan: the United States federal government should penalize mergers in the defense industry through non-antitrust regulations.

#### statistics agree regs are better

Sumit Majumdar 21. Professor of Information Systems, University of Texas, Dallas. “Stick Versus Carrot: Comparing Structural Antitrust and Behavioral Regulation Outcomes.” *The Antitrust Bulletin*. June 2021. DOI: 10.1177/0003603X211023463.

The issue is which method works better, the antitrust (structural) or the regulatory (behavioral)? Using a standard test of differences in magnitude between two variables, as natural experiment 3 I evaluate if the antitrust (structural) approach or the regulatory (behavioral) remedy has had a greater impact in enhancing efficiency. Results are in Table 4. Column (A) relates to the performance outcome variable comparatively evaluated. Column (B) reports if the antitrust (structural) impact is less than that of the regulatory (behavioral) measures, on performance, and column (C) reports if the difference has been statistically significant.

[CHART EXCLUDED]

For the productive efficiency score, the regulatory (behavioral) remedy has statistically had a greater impact than the antitrust (structural) method in enhancing efficiency. (Recollect that Tables 2 and 3 reported results on how the structural vs. behavioral remedies impacted efficiency scores. The impacts were 2.23% for the structural remedy (column [A] in panel [B] of Table 2) and 4.33% (column [A] in panel [B] of Table 3) for the behavioral remedy.)

B. Robustness Check

An evaluation of why price caps, as endogenous phenomena,64 were implemented would depend on firm-level factors, such as past performance; these would have influenced the implementation of price cap regulatory schemes for specific firms. As a robustness check, controlling for inclusion of endogenous factors, past performance variables have been included as price caps determinants for each observation, in a selection equation with the price cap variable then determining performance in an outcome equation. The results show the price cap estimates to be of relatively the same magnitude (in fact, they are larger), sign, and significance as the estimate values already reported in this article.65

C. Summary

Overall, significantly larger positive outcomes have emerged from sector-specific regulatory (behavioral) remedy applications vis-à-vis the concurrent antitrust (structural) remedy application. The use of further performance variables to comparatively test the ideas has yielded very similar results. Such additional results are available on request.

### Disad – FTC – 1NC

#### FTC’s increasing enforcement in privacy now.

James V. Fazio 21. Special counsel in the Intellectual Property Practice Group at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP, with Liisa M. Thomas, 3/11. “What Is FTC’s Course Under Biden?” https://www.natlawreview.com/article/what-ftc-s-course-under-biden

The new acting FTC chair, Rebecca Kelly Slaughter, recently signaled that the FTC may increase enforcement and penalties in the privacy and data security realm. Slaughter pointed to several areas of focus for the FTC this year, which companies will want to keep in mind: Notifying Consumers About FTC Allegations: Slaughter referred favorably to two recent cases: (1) the Everalbum biometric settlement from earlier this year (which we wrote about at the time); and (2) the Flo Health settlement over alleged deceptive data sharing practices (which we also wrote about at the time). In drawing on these two cases, Slaughter indicated that in future cases the FTC intends to include as part of any settlement a requirement to notify customers of any FTC allegations. This, she said, would allow consumers to “vote with their feet” and help them decide whether to recommend their services to others. FTC Intent to Plead All Relevant Violations: According to Slaughter, another lesson the FTC is taking from the Flo case is to include in the cases it brings all potentially applicable violations of all relevant privacy-related laws. In the Flo case, Slaughter said the FTC should have pleaded a violation of the Health Breach Notification Rule, which requires that vendors of personal health records notify consumers of data breaches. Focus on Ed Tech and COPPA: Given the explosive growth of education technology during COVID-19, the FTC is conducting an industry sweep of the industry. Related to this, the FTC is reviewing its Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act Rule. This goes beyond the refresh the agency did of their FAQs earlier in the pandemic (which we wrote about at the time). For now, Slaughter reminds companies that parental consent is needed before collecting information online from children under the age of 13. Examination of Health Apps: The FTC will take a closer look at health apps, including telehealth and contact tracing apps, as more and more consumers are relying on such apps to manage their health during the pandemic. Overlap Between Competition and Privacy: Slaughter also indicated that it is worth looking at situations where there may be not only privacy concerns, but antitrust as well. Because the FTC has a dual mission (consumer protection and competition) she notes that it has a “structural advantage” over other regulators in that it can look at these issues, especially since -she states- “many of the largest players in digital markets are as powerful as they are because of the breadth of their access to and control over consumer data.” Racial Equality and AI/Biometrics/Geotracking: Slaughter noted that COVID-19 is exacerbating racial inequities. She pointed to the unequal access to technology, as well as algorithmic discrimination (the idea that discrimination offline becomes embedded into algorithmic system logic). The FTC intends to focus on algorithmic discrimination, as well as on the discrimination potentially embedded into facial recognition technologies. (This mirrors concerns that gave rise to the recent Portland facial recognition law, which we recently wrote about). Finally, Slaughter commented on the use of location data to identify characteristics of Black Lives Matter protesters, and said she is concerned about the misuse of location data to track Americans engaged in constitutionally protected speech. Putting it Into Practice: Companies that operate health apps, that are in the education technology space, or that use algorithms or facial recognition tools will want to keep in mind that these are areas of focus for the FTC. And for everyone, keep in mind that the FTC has indicated it will beef up privacy law penalties and will ask for more notification to injured consumers.

#### Antitrust enforcement saps up finite resources and personnel

Tara L. Reinhart, et al. 21. \*\*Head of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*Steven C. Sunshine, Co-head of Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP’s Antitrust/Competition Group. \*\*David P. Whales, antitrust lawyer with over 25 years of experience in both private and public sectors. \*\*Julia Y. York, partner at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP. \*\*Bre Jordan, associate at Skadden, Arps, Slat, Meagher & Flom LLP focusing on antitrust law. “Lina Khan’s Appointment as FTC Chair Reflects Biden Administration’s Aggressive Stance on Antitrust Enforcement.” 6/18/21. https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2021/06/lina-khans-appointment-as-ftc-chair

Second, like all antitrust enforcers, Ms. Khan and the FTC will face resource constraints. Bringing antitrust litigation is an expensive and laborious process, often requiring millions of dollars for expert fees and a large army of FTC staff attorneys and taking many months or even years to accomplish. Typically, the FTC can only litigate a handful of antitrust matters at a time. It seems likely that Congress will provide more funding to the FTC in the current environment, but even with these extra resources, the FTC will still have to pick its cases carefully and cannot challenge every deal or every instance of alleged unlawful conduct.

#### That trades off

John O. McGinnis\* and Linda Sun\*\* 20. \*George C. Dix Professor, Northwestern University, and Associate-Designate, Wilmer Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP. “Unifying Antitrust Enforcement for the Digital Age.” Northwestern Public Law Research Paper No. 20-20. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3669087

The FTC needs more resources to adequately address the nation’s growing privacy concerns. Currently, the FTC oversees both consumer protection—encompassing privacy—and antitrust,249 making the FTC the chief federal agency on privacy policy and enforcement250 and the nation’s de-facto privacy agency.251 The agency has long-standing experience in enforcing privacy statutes252 and also has special privacy assets, such as an internet lab capable of high-quality tech forensics to track invasions of privacy.253 The FTC, however, has failed to keep pace with the massive growth of privacy concerns—a phenomenon also driven by modern technology. Very few Americans feel conﬁdent in the privacy of their information in the digital age.254 According to a 2019 study, over 80% of Americans feel that they have little to no control over the data collected on them by companies and the government.255 To adequately address privacy concerns, the FTC needs more resources.256 The agency has been explicit that it needs more manpower to police tech companies. In requesting increased funding from Congress, FTC Director Joseph Simons said the money would allow the agency to hire additional staff and bring more privacy cases.257 A former director of the FTC’s Bureau of Consumer Protection, which houses the privacy unit, has called the FTC “woefully understaffed.”258 As of the spring of 2019, the FTC had only forty employees dedicated to privacy and data security, compared to 500 and 110 employees at comparable agencies in the UK. and Ireland, respectively.259 Without more lawyers, investigators, and technologists, the FTC will be forced to conduct privacy investigations less thoroughly, and in some cases, forgo them altogether.260 Currently, the FT C’s resources are spread thin across multiple missions, to the detriment of its privacy efforts. Removing the agency’s antitrust responsibilities would reallocate resources from the antitrust department to its privacy unit and other areas of consumer protection. Further, it would free up the scarce time of the commissioners to oversee this essential effort.261

#### extinction

Mike Thomas 20. Quoting AI experts including MIT Physics Professors, Senior Features Writer for BuiltIn. THE FUTURE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: 7 ways AI can change the world for better ... or worse, Updated: April 20, 2020, <https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/artificial-intelligence-future>

Klabjan also puts little stock in extreme scenarios — the type involving, say, murderous cyborgs that turn the earth into a smoldering hellscape. He’s much more concerned with machines — war robots, for instance — being fed faulty “incentives” by nefarious humans. As MIT physics professors and leading AI researcher Max Tegmark put it in a 2018 TED Talk, “The real threat from AI isn’t malice, like in silly Hollywood movies, but competence — AI accomplishing goals that just aren’t aligned with ours.” That’s Laird’s take, too. “I definitely don’t see the scenario where something wakes up and decides it wants to take over the world,” he says. “I think that’s science fiction and not the way it’s going to play out.” What Laird worries most about isn’t evil AI, per se, but “evil humans using AI as a sort of false force multiplier” for things like bank robbery and credit card fraud, among many other crimes. And so, while he’s often frustrated with the pace of progress, AI’s slow burn may actually be a blessing. “Time to understand what we’re creating and how we’re going to incorporate it into society,” Laird says, “might be exactly what we need.” But no one knows for sure. “There are several major breakthroughs that have to occur, and those could come very quickly,” Russell said during his Westminster talk. Referencing the rapid transformational effect of nuclear fission (atom splitting) by British physicist Ernest Rutherford in 1917, he added, “It’s very, very hard to predict when these conceptual breakthroughs are going to happen.” But whenever they do, if they do, he emphasized the importance of preparation. That means starting or continuing discussions about the ethical use of A.G.I. and whether it should be regulated. That means working to eliminate data bias, which has a corrupting effect on algorithms and is currently a fat fly in the AI ointment. That means working to invent and augment security measures capable of keeping the technology in check. And it means having the humility to realize that just because we can doesn’t mean we should. “Our situation with technology is complicated, but the big picture is rather simple,” Tegmark said during his TED Talk. “Most AGI researchers expect AGI within decades, and if we just bumble into this unprepared, it will probably be the biggest mistake in human history. It could enable brutal global dictatorship with unprecedented inequality, surveillance, suffering and maybe even human extinction. But if we steer carefully, we could end up in a fantastic future where everybody’s better off—the poor are richer, the rich are richer, everybody’s healthy and free to live out their dreams.”

### CP

#### The United States should only allow the continuation of mergers in the defense industry with national security as a consideration under antitrust law when the president determines it is necessary to prevent a condition which may pose a direct threat to the national defense or its preparedness programs.

#### The counterplan maintains DPA authority---the plan eliminates it.

Michael H. Cecire and Heidi M. Peters 20. Michael H. Cecire, Analyst in Intergovernmental Relations and Economic Development Policy. Heidi M. Peters, Analyst in U.S. Defense Acquisition Policy. “The Defense Production Act of 1950: History, Authorities, and Considerations for Congress” Updated March 2, 2020. https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R43767.html

Authorities Under Title VII of the DPA

Title VII of the DPA contains various provisions that clarify how DPA authorities should and can be used, as well as additional presidential authorities. Some significant provisions of Title VII are summarized below.

Special Preference for Small Businesses

Two provisions in the DPA direct the President to accord special preference to small businesses when issuing contracts under DPA authorities. Section 701 reiterates89 and expands upon a requirement in Section 108 of Title I directing the President to "accord a strong preference for small business concerns which are subcontractors or suppliers, and, to the maximum extent practicable, to such small business concerns located in areas of high unemployment or areas that have demonstrated a continuing pattern of economic decline, as identified by the Secretary of Labor."90

Definitions of Key Terms in the DPA

The DPA statute historically has included a section of definitions.91 Though national defense is perhaps the most important term, there are additional definitions provided both in current law and in E.O. 13603.92 Over time, the list of definitions provided in both the law and implementing executive orders has been added to and edited, most recently in 2009, when Congress added a definition for homeland security93 to place it within the context of national defense.94

Industrial Base Assessments

To appropriately use numerous authorities of the DPA, especially Title III authorities, the President may require a detailed understanding of current domestic industrial capabilities and therefore need to obtain extensive information from private industries. Under Section 705 of the DPA, the President may "by regulation, subpoena, or otherwise obtain such information from ... any person as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or the administration of this Act [the DPA]."95 This authority is delegated to the Secretary of Commerce in E.O. 13603.96 Though this authority has many potential implications and uses, it is most commonly associated with what the DOC's Bureau of Industry and Security calls "industrial base assessments."97 These assessments are often conducted in coordination with other federal agencies and the private sector to "monitor trends, benchmark industry performance, and raise awareness of diminishing manufacturing capabilities."98 The statute requires the President to issue regulations to insure that the authority is used only after "the scope and purpose of the investigation, inspection, or inquiry to be made have been defined by competent authority, and it is assured that no adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal or other responsible agency."99 This regulation has been issued by DOC.100

Voluntary Agreements

Normally, voluntary agreements or plans of action between competing private industry interests could be subject to legal sanction under anti-trust statutes or contract law. Title VII of the DPA authorizes the President to "consult with representatives of industry, business, financing, agriculture, labor, and other interests in order to provide for the making by such persons, with the approval of the President, of voluntary agreements and plans of action to help provide for the national defense."101 The President must determine that a "condition exists which may pose a direct threat to the national defense or its preparedness programs"102 prior to engaging in the consultation process. Following the consultation process, the President or presidential delegate may approve and implement the agreement or plan of action.103 Parties en

tering into such voluntary agreements are afforded a special legal defense if their actions within that agreement would otherwise violate antitrust or contract laws.104 Historically, the National Infrastructure Advisory Council noted that the voluntary agreement authority has been used to "enable companies to cooperate in weapons manufacture, solving production problems and standardizing designs, specifications and processes," among other examples.105 It could also be used, for example, to develop a plan of action with private industry for the repair and reconstruction of major critical infrastructure systems following a domestic disaster.

The authority to establish a voluntary agreement has been delegated to the head of any federal department or agency otherwise delegated authority under any other part of E.O. 13603.106 Thus, the authority could be potentially used by a large group of federal departments and agencies. Use of these voluntary agreements is tracked by the Secretary of Homeland Security,107 who is tasked under E.O. 13603 with issuing regulations that are required by law on the "standards and procedures by which voluntary agreements and plans of action may be developed and carried out."108 The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which at the time was an independent agency and tasked with these responsibilities under the DPA, issued regulations in 1981 to fulfill this requirement.109 FEMA is now a part of DHS, and those regulations remain in effect.

The Maritime Administration (MARAD) of the U.S. Department of Transportation manages the only currently established voluntary agreements in the federal government, the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement (commonly referred to as "VISA") and the Voluntary Tanker Agreement. These programs are maintained in partnership with the U.S. Transportation Command of DOD, and have been established to ensure that the maritime industry can respond to the rapid mobilization, deployment, and transportation requirements of DOD. Voluntary participants from the maritime industry are solicited to join the agreements annually.110

Nucleus Executive Reserve

Title VII of the DPA authorizes the President to establish a volunteer body of industry executives, the "Nucleus Executive Reserve," or more frequently called the National Defense Executive Reserve (NDER).111 The NDER would be a pool of individuals with recognized expertise from various segments of the private sector and from government (except full-time federal employees). These individuals would be brought together for training in executive positions within the federal government in the event of an emergency that requires their employment. The historic concept of the NDER has been used as a means of improving the war mobilization and productivity of industries.112

The head of any governmental department or agency may establish a unit of the NDER and train its members.113 No NDER unit is currently active, though the statute and E.O. 13603 still provide for this possibility. Units may be activated only when the Secretary of Homeland Security declares in writing that "an emergency affecting the national defense exists and that the activation of the unit is necessary to carry out the emergency program functions of the agency."114

Authorization of Appropriations, as amended by P.L. 113-72

Appropriations for the purpose of the DPA are authorized by Section 711 of Title VII.115 Prior to the P.L. 113-172, "such sums as necessary" were authorized to be appropriated. This has been replaced by a specific authorization for an appropriation of $133 million per fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, starting in FY2015, to carry out the provisions and purposes of the Defense Production Act.116

Table 1 shows that the annual average appropriation to the DPA Fund between FY2010 and FY2019 was $109.1 million,117 with a high of $223.5 million in FY2013 and a low of $34.3 million in FY2011. Monies in the DPA Fund are available until expended, so annual appropriations may carry over from year to year if not expended. Recently, the only regular annual appropriation for the purposes of the DPA has been made in the DOD appropriations bill, though appropriations could be made in other bills directly to the DPA Fund (or transferred from other appropriations).

Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States118

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) is an interagency committee that serves the President in overseeing the national security implications of foreign investment in the economy. It reviews foreign investment transactions to determine if (1) they threaten to impair U.S. national security; (2) the foreign investor is controlled by a foreign government; or (3) the transaction could affect homeland security or would result in control of any critical infrastructure that could impair the national security. The President has the authority to block proposed or pending foreign investment transactions that threaten to impair the national security.

CFIUS initially was created and operated through a series of Executive Orders.119 In 1988, Congress passed the "Exon-Florio" amendment to the DPA, granting the President authority to review certain corporate mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers, and to investigate the potential impact on national security of such actions.120 This amendment codified the CFIUS review process due in large part to concerns over acquisitions of U.S. defense-related firms by Japanese investors. In 2007, amid growing concerns over the proposed foreign purchase of commercial operations of six U.S. ports, Congress passed the Foreign Investment and National Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-49) to create CFIUS in statute.

On August 13, 2018, President Trump signed into law new rules governing national security reviews of foreign investment, known as the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act (FIRRMA, Title XVII, P.L. 115-235).121 FIRRMA amends several aspects of the CFIUS review process under Section 721 of the DPA.122 Notably, it expands the scope of transactions that fall under CFIUS' jurisdiction. It maintains core components of the current CFIUS process for evaluating proposed or pending investments in U.S. firms, but increases the allowable time for reviews and investigations. Upon receiving written notification of a proposed acquisition, merger, or takeover of a U.S. firm by a foreign investor, the CFIUS process can proceed potentially through three steps: (1) a 45-day national security review; (2) a 45-day maximum national security investigation (with an option for a 15-day extension for "extraordinary circumstances"); and (3) a 15-day maximum Presidential determination. The President can exercise his authority to suspend or prohibit a foreign investment, subject to a CFIUS review, if he finds that (1) "credible evidence" exists that the foreign investor might take action that threatens to impair the national security; and (2) no other laws provide adequate and appropriate authority for the President to protect national security. FIRRMA shifts the filing requirement for foreign investors from voluntary to mandatory in certain cases, and provides a two-track method for reviewing certain investment transactions. Other changes mandated by FIRRMA would provide more resources for CFIUS, add new reporting requirements, and reform export controls.

Termination of the Act

Title VII of the DPA also includes a "sunset" clause for the majority of the DPA authorities. All DPA authorities in Titles I, III, and VII have a termination date, with the exception of four sections.123 As explained in Section 717 of the DPA, the sections that are exempt from termination are

* 50 U.S.C. §4514, Section 104 of the DPA that prohibits both the imposition of wage or price controls without prior congressional authorization and the mandatory compliance of any private person to assist in the production of chemical or biological warfare capabilities;
* 50 U.S.C. §4557, Section 707 of the DPA that grants persons limited immunity from liability for complying with DPA-authorized regulations;
* 50 U.S.C. §4558, Section 708 of the DPA that provides for the establishment of voluntary agreements; and
* 50 U.S.C. §4565, Section 721 of the DPA, the so-called Exon-Florio Amendment, that gives the President and CFIUS review authority over certain corporate acquisition activities.

P.L. 115-232 extended the termination date of Section 717 from September 30, 2019, to September 30, 2025. In addition, Section 717(c) provides that any termination of sections of the DPA "shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, guarantee, commitment or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act" prior to its termination. This means, for instance, that prioritized contracts or Section 303 projects created with DPA authorities prior to September 30, 2025, would still be executed until completion even if the DPA is not reauthorized. Similarly, the statute specifies that the authority to investigate, subpoena, and otherwise collect information necessary to administer the provisions of the act, as provided by Section 705 of the DPA, will not expire until two years after the termination of the DPA.124 For a chronology of all laws reauthorizing the DPA since inception, see Table A-4.

Defense Production Act Committee

The Defense Production Act Committee (DPAC) is an interagency body originally established by the 2009 reauthorization of the DPA.125 Originally, the DPAC was created to advise the President on the effective use of the full scope of authorities of the DPA. Now, the law requires DPAC to be centrally focused on the priorities and allocations authorities of Title I of the DPA.

The statute assigns membership in the DPAC to the head of each federal agency delegated DPA authorities, as well as the Chairperson of the Council of Economic Advisors. A full list of the members of the DPAC is included in E.O. 13603.126 As stipulated in law, the Chairperson of the DPAC is to be the "head of the agency to which the President has delegated primary responsibility for government-wide coordination of the authorities in this Act."127 As currently established in E.O. 13603 delegations, the Secretary of Homeland Security is the chair-designate, but the language of the law could allow the President to appoint another Secretary with revision to the E.O.128 The Chairperson of the DPAC is also required to appoint one full-time employee of the federal government to coordinate all the activities of the DPAC. Congress has exempted the DPAC from the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.129

The DPAC has annual reporting requirements relating to the Title I priority and allocation authority, and is also required to include updated copies of Title I-related rules in its report. The annual report also contains, among other items, a "description of the contingency planning ... for events that might require the use of the priorities and allocations authorities" and "recommendations for legislative actions, as appropriate, to support the effective use" of the Title I authorities.130 The DPAC report is provided to the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the House Committee on Financial Services.

Impact of Offsets Report

Offsets are industrial compensation practices that foreign governments or companies require of U.S. firms as a condition of purchase in either government-to-government or commercial sales of defense articles and/or defense services as defined by the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. §2751, et seq.) and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 C.F.R. §§120-130). In the defense trade, such industrial compensation can include mandatory co-production, licensed production, subcontractor production, technology transfer, and foreign investment.

The Secretary of Commerce is required by law to prepare and to transmit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report on the impact of offsets on defense preparedness, industrial competitiveness, employment, and trade. Specifically, the report discusses "offsets" in the government or commercial sales of defense materials.131

Considerations for Congress

Enhance Oversight

Expand Reporting or Notification Requirements

Congress may consider whether to add more extensive notification and reporting requirements on the use of all or specific authorities in the DPA. These reporting or notification requirements could be added to the existing law, or could be included in conference or committee reports accompanying germane legislation, such as appropriations bills or the National Defense Authorization Act. Additional reporting or notification requirements could involve formal notification of Congress prior to or after the use of certain authorities under specific circumstances. For example, Congress may consider whether to require the President to notify Congress (or the oversight committees) when the priorities and allocations authority is used on a contract valued above a threshold dollar amount.132 Congress might also consider expanding the existing reporting requirements of the DPAC, to include semi-annual updates on the recent use of authorities or explanations about controversial determinations made by the President. Existing requirements could also be expanded from notifying/reporting to the committees of jurisdiction to the Congress as a whole, or to include other interested committees, such as the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Enforce and Revise Rulemaking Requirements

Congress may consider reviewing the agencies' compliance with existing rulemaking requirements. A rulemaking requirement exists for the voluntary agreement authority in Title VII that has been completed by DHS, but it has not been updated since 1981 and may be in need of an update given changes to the authority and government reorganizations since that date.133 One of the agencies responsible for issuing a rulemaking on the use of Title I authorities has yet to do so. Congress may also consider potentially expanding regulatory requirements for other authorities included in the DPA. For example, Congress may consider whether the President should promulgate rules establishing standards and procedures for the use of all or certain Title III authorities. In addition to formalizing the executive branch's policies and procedures for using DPA authorities, these regulations could also serve an important function by offering an opportunity for private citizens and industry to comment on and understand the impact of DPA authorities on their personal interests.

Broaden Committee Oversight Jurisdiction

Since its enactment, the House Committee on Financial Services, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and their predecessors have exercised legislative oversight of the Defense Production Act. The statutory authorities granted in the various titles have been vested in the President, who has delegated some of these authorities to various agency officials through E.O. 13603. As an example of the scope of delegations, the membership of the Defense Production Act Committee (DPAC), created in 2009 and amended in 2014, includes the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Labor, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, the Interior, Transportation, the Treasury, and State; the Attorney General; the Administrators of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and of General Services, the Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency and National Intelligence.

In order to complement existing oversight, given the number of agencies that currently use or could potentially use the array of DPA authorities to support national defense missions, Congress may consider reestablishing a select committee with a purpose similar to the former Joint Committee on Defense Production.134 As an alternative to the creation of a new committee, Congress may consider formally broadening DPA oversight responsibilities to include all relevant standing committees when developing its committee oversight plan.

Should DPA oversight be broadened, Congress might consider ways to enhance inter-committee communication and coordination of its related activities. This coordination could include periodic meetings to prepare for oversight hearings or ensuring that DPA-related communications from agencies are shared appropriately. Finally, because the DPA was enacted at a time when the organization and rules of both chambers were markedly different to current practice, Congress may consider the joint referral of proposed DPA-related legislation to the appropriate oversight committees.

Amending the Defense Production Act of 1950

While the act in its current form may remain in force until September 30, 2025, the legislature could amend the DPA at any time to extend, expand, restrict, or otherwise clarify the powers it grants to the President. For example, Congress could eliminate certain authorities altogether. Likewise, Congress could expand the DPA to include new authorities to address novel threats to the national defense. For example, Congress may consider creating new authorities to address specific concerns relating to production and security of emerging technologies necessary for the national defense.

#### Key to pandemic response.

J. Mark Gidley et al. 20. J. Mark Gidley chairs the White & Case Global Antitrust/Competition practice. Martin M. Toto and Sean Sigillito. “A Novel Antitrust Defense for COVID-19 Agreements: Section 708 of the Defense Production Act” <https://www.whitecase.com/sites/default/files/2020-04/novel-antitrust-defense-covid-19-agreements-section-708-defense-production-act.pdf>

There is a dire need for the assistance of private industry in developing vaccines and treatments for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, and for the manufacture and distribution of medical and other supplies to aid in the United States’ response to the COVID-19 health emergency. The Government’s recent actions indicate a desire to allow private sector companies to work together to do so quickly.

While many of the needs arising from the ongoing emergency focus specifically on medical supplies, the President’s delegation of Section 708 authority to the DHS as well as HHS potentially opens the door to voluntary agreements within broader sectors of the US economy. Under the right circumstances, and if the business combination could garner the governmental sponsor needed for the voluntary agreement, invoking the Defense Production Act’s antitrust relief provision through the enactment of voluntary agreements could allow for a more robust response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

#### Extinction.

Dennis Pamlin & Stuart Armstrong 15. \*Executive Project Manager Global Risks, Global Challenges Foundation. \*\*James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford. February 2015, “Global Challenges: 12 Risks that threaten human civilization: The case for a new risk category,” Global Challenges Foundation, p.30-93. https://api.globalchallenges.org/static/wp-content/uploads/12-Risks-with-infinite-impact.pdf

A pandemic (from Greek πᾶν, pan, “all”, and δῆμος demos, “people”) is an epidemic of infectious disease that has spread through human populations across a large region; for instance several continents, or even worldwide. Here only worldwide events are included. A widespread endemic disease that is stable in terms of how many people become sick from it is not a pandemic. 260 84 Global Challenges – Twelve risks that threaten human civilisation – The case for a new category of risks 3.1 Current risks 3.1.4.1 Expected impact disaggregation 3.1.4.2 Probability Influenza subtypes266 Infectious diseases have been one of the greatest causes of mortality in history. Unlike many other global challenges pandemics have happened recently, as we can see where reasonably good data exist. Plotting historic epidemic fatalities on a log scale reveals that these tend to follow a power law with a small exponent: many plagues have been found to follow a power law with exponent 0.26.261 These kinds of power laws are heavy-tailed262 to a significant degree.263 In consequence most of the fatalities are accounted for by the top few events.264 If this law holds for future pandemics as well,265 then the majority of people who will die from epidemics will likely die from the single largest pandemic. Most epidemic fatalities follow a power law, with some extreme events – such as the Black Death and Spanish Flu – being even more deadly.267 There are other grounds for suspecting that such a highimpact epidemic will have a greater probability than usually assumed. All the features of an extremely devastating disease already exist in nature: essentially incurable (Ebola268), nearly always fatal (rabies269), extremely infectious (common cold270), and long incubation periods (HIV271). If a pathogen were to emerge that somehow combined these features (and influenza has demonstrated antigenic shift, the ability to combine features from different viruses272), its death toll would be extreme. Many relevant features of the world have changed considerably, making past comparisons problematic. The modern world has better sanitation and medical research, as well as national and supra-national institutions dedicated to combating diseases. Private insurers are also interested in modelling pandemic risks.273 Set against this is the fact that modern transport and dense human population allow infections to spread much more rapidly274, and there is the potential for urban slums to serve as breeding grounds for disease.275 Unlike events such as nuclear wars, pandemics would not damage the world’s infrastructure, and initial survivors would likely be resistant to the infection. And there would probably be survivors, if only in isolated locations. Hence the risk of a civilisation collapse would come from the ripple effect of the fatalities and the policy responses. These would include political and agricultural disruption as well as economic dislocation and damage to the world’s trade network (including the food trade). Extinction risk is only possible if the aftermath of the epidemic fragments and diminishes human society

to the extent that recovery becomes impossible277 before humanity succumbs to other risks (such as climate change or further pandemics). Five important factors in estimating the probabilities and impacts of the challenge: 1. What the true probability distribution for pandemics is, especially at the tail. 2. The capacity of modern international health systems to deal with an extreme pandemic. 3. How fast medical research can proceed in an emergency. 4. How mobility of goods and people, as well as population density, will affect pandemic transmission. 5. Whether humans can develop novel and effective anti-pandemic solutions.

## Heg

### AT: Heg

#### Military hegemony becomes a vehicle to expand into, intervene, and control periphery nations and their resources as a method of status consolidation – defense spending trades-off with services for the working-class while feeding monopolies that crack down on movements.

Cheng Enfu and Lu Baolin 21. President of the World Association for Political Economy, and Chief Professor at the University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Monthly Review. Monthly Review. 5-1-2021. https://monthlyreview.org/2021/05/01/five-characteristics-of-neoimperialism/

Military Hegemony and Fraud

Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the United States has become increasingly presumptuous and has tended to resort to military force or threats in dealing with questions of international relations. In 1999, U.S.-led NATO forces bombed the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, invoking the formula of “human rights above sovereignty.” In 2003, despite strong opposition from other countries, the United States invaded the sovereign state of Iraq. The Iraq War was not authorized by the UN Security Council, and Washington did not have any legal basis for its military intervention. The United States falsely claimed that Iraq possessed chemical weapons of mass destruction. After occupying Iraq, however, the United States found no evidence to prove that Iraq could produce chemical weapons of mass destruction. The real purpose of the United States in fabricating this lie was to control Iraq’s oil resources by military means.

The United States has consistently emphasized that its own interests should take first place and that its military advantages are not to be challenged. Although its economic strength has declined in relative terms, the United States is still expanding its arsenal and substantially increasing its defense spending. Since the Cold War, the United States has continued to create various military threats and pressures in Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific region. To consolidate its hegemonic status, the United States has advocated and promoted NATO’s eastward expansion, with the goal of including all the Central and Eastern European countries in NATO’s sphere of influence and thus constricting Russia’s strategic space. In the Middle East, the United States aims to subvert the legitimate regimes of countries such as Syria and Iran by military means, and to support “color revolutions” in the region. In Asia in recent times, Washington has heightened tensions on the Korean peninsula and has also implemented its “Indo-Pacific strategy” aimed at containing China. The U.S. “Indian strategy” is serving to reveal the identity of its military allies and partners. Allies of the United States include Japan, South Korea, Australia, the Philippines, and Thailand, and its claimed “partners” include Singapore, Taiwan (China), New Zealand, Mongolia; a number of South Asian countries such as India, Sri Lanka, the Maldives, and Nepal; and various Southeast Asian countries such as Vietnam, Indonesia, and Malaysia. The United States further proposes to strengthen its cooperation with Brunei, Laos, and Cambodia. In addition, it will work together with traditional allies such as Britain, France, and Canada to protect so-called Indo-Pacific freedom and openness.74

With the increase in China’s national strength, various U.S. scholars have been eager to invoke the Thucydides trap, claiming that it is difficult for Sino-U.S. relations to escape from this logic. But the truth, as China’s president Xi Jinping has pointed out, is that there is currently no Thucydides trap. Such a trap might, however, be created if the United States and its allies repeatedly make strategic miscalculations involving great powers.75 It may be asserted that it is the military hegemony and fraud of the United States that provides the root cause of the widespread instability, constant local wars, rise of war threats, and refugee crises around the world.

Neoimperialism Is a Parasitic and Decaying Late Imperialism

As Lenin stated,

Imperialism is an immense accumulation of money capital in a few countries.… Hence the extraordinary growth of a class, or rather, of a stratum of rentiers, i.e., people who live by “clipping coupons,” who take no part in any enterprise whatever, whose profession is idleness. The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labour of several overseas countries and colonies.76

In the era of neoimperialism, the number of rentiers is increasing sharply, and the nature of the rentier countries is becoming more pronounced. The parasitism and decay of a small number of capitalist countries is further worsened, as can be seen specifically in the following aspects.

First, the United States employs its military, intellectual property, political, and cultural hegemony, as well as the U.S. dollar, to plunder the wealth of the world, especially that of developing countries. The United States is the world’s largest parasitic and decaying country. As evidence of this, we may take the trade between China and the United States. China sells to the United States goods produced by cheap labor, land, and environmental resources. The United States does not need to produce anything in order to buy these goods; it can simply print banknotes. With the money earned, China can then buy only virtual assets such as U.S. treasury bonds, and provide finance for U.S. consumer lending and outward expansion. The United States exports to China securities to which value cannot be added, while China exports to the United States mainly physical goods and labor services. The National Health Report released by the National Health Research Group of the Chinese Academy of Sciences shows that the United States is the country with the most hegemonic dividends in the world, due to the position of its currency, while China is the country with the largest loss of hegemonic dividends. For the year 2011, U.S. hegemonic dividends totaled $7396.09 billion, corresponding to 52.38 percent of the country’s GDP, and the average hegemonic dividends obtained per day came to $20.263 billion. Meanwhile, the sum lost by China totaled $3663.4 billion. In terms of labor time, about 60 percent of the working hours of the Chinese workforce were effectively given without recompense to serve international monopoly capital.77

Second, military spending has increased, which in turn increases the burden on working-class people. Neoimperialism leads and promotes military-related scientific and technological research, the development of advanced weapons, and the expansion of military production. As the People’s Daily observed in 2016, “the military-industrial complex supported by monopoly capital and the cultural hegemony formed on the basis of colonialism have prompted the western countries to intervene in other countries’ affairs at their will.”78 Neoimperialism has thus become the initiator of regional turmoil and instability, and the engine of war. Over the past thirty years, the United States has spent $14.2 trillion on waging thirteen wars.79 Meanwhile, lack of money hinders improvements to the living conditions of the U.S. people in areas such as medical insurance. Exorbitant military spending has become a heavy burden on the country and its people, while the parasitic monopolies in the arms industry have reaped immense profits. According to statistics of the British Institute for International Strategic Studies, official U.S. military expenditures in 2018 came to $643 billion, and in 2019 will reach $750 billion, more than the sum of the military spending of the world’s eight next largest military powers. Since the end of the first Cold War, the United States has launched or participated in six major conflicts: The Gulf War (1991), Kosovo War (1999), Afghanistan War (2001), Iraq War (2003), Libya War (2011), and Syria War (2011).80 The addiction of monopoly capitalism to war is a manifestation of its parasitic and decaying nature. This barbaric characteristic of the system runs counter to civilization and threatens the shared future of the human community. It proves that neoimperialism is the primary root of war.

Third, wealth and incomes are concentrated in the hands of a specific class of owners of financial assets, as reflected in the 1 percent versus the 99 percent formulation. At the neoimperialist stage, the socialization, informatization, and internationalization of production have reached unprecedented levels, and the ability of human beings to create wealth is many times greater than in the old imperialist period. Nevertheless, the advance of productivity that is supposed to be a common gain for humankind has mainly benefited the financial oligarchy. “The bulk of the profits go to the ‘geniuses’ of financial manipulation,” one observer notes.81 In 2001, for example, the financial wealth (excluding property rights) held by the wealthiest 1 percent of the U.S. population was four times greater than that of the poorest 80 percent. The 1 percent held assets on the stock market of $1.9 trillion, roughly equivalent to the value of the stock held by the other 99 percent.82

Fourth, monopoly hinders technological innovation, slowing its advance. The greed and parasitism of financial monopoly capital make its attitude to technological innovation ambivalent. Monopoly capital relies on technological innovation to maintain its monopoly status, but the high profits that result from this status mean that monopoly capital shows a certain inertia in promoting innovation. Even if many advanced functions of mobile phones are successfully developed in the same year, the monopoly producers of mobile phones will divide up these functions to be introduced and promoted over several years. The purpose is to ensure that consumers will continuously purchase mobile phones with new functions, allowing the corporations to obtain high monopoly profits every year.

Fifth, the tendency for monopoly capital and its agents to cause decay in the mass movement is becoming more serious. Lenin observed that “in Great Britain the tendency of imperialism to split the workers, to strengthen opportunism among them and to cause temporary decay in the working-class movement, revealed itself much earlier than the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries.”83 Neoimperialism divides the working class, striking at and weakening the labor unions using the excuse provided by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the tremendous changes in Eastern Europe. It also uses its monopoly profits to buy the support of individuals, and fosters opportunist and neoliberal forces within the workers’ movement and various other mass movements. The results of such ploys include the downturn in size and activity of labor unions and other progressive movements, the low ebb of the world socialist movement, and a more obvious and serious tendency for workers to worship the forces of neoimperialism or to be intimidated by them.

#### It doesn’t solve anything

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

These assessments of conflict are by necessity relative, because there has not been a “high” level of conflict in any region outside the Middle East during the period of the New Peace. Putting aside for the moment that important caveat, some points become clear. The great powers of the world are clustered in the upper right quadrant, where US intervention has been high, but conflict levels low. US intervention is imperfectly correlated with stability, however. Indeed, it is conceivable that the relatively high level of US interest and activity has made the security situation in the Persian Gulf and broader Middle East worse. In recent years, substantial hard power investments (Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq), moderate intervention (Libya), and reliance on diplomacy (Syria) have been equally ineffective in stabilizing states torn by conflict. While it is possible that the region is essentially unpacifiable and no amount of police work would bring peace to its people, it remains hard to make the case that the US presence has improved matters. In this “strong point,” at least, US hegemony has failed to bring peace.

In much of the rest of the world, the United States has not been especially eager to enforce any particular rules. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been enough to inspire action. Washington’s intervention choices have at best been erratic; Libya and Kosovo brought about action, but much more blood flowed uninterrupted in Rwanda, Darfur, Congo, Sri Lanka, and Syria. The US record of peacemaking is not exactly a long uninterrupted string of successes. During the turn-of-the-century conventional war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, a highlevel US delegation containing former and future National Security Advisors (Anthony Lake and Susan Rice) made a half-dozen trips to the region, but was unable to prevent either the outbreak or recurrence of the conflict. Lake and his team shuttled back and forth between the capitals with some frequency, and President Clinton made repeated phone calls to the leaders of the respective countries, offering to hold peace talks in the United States, all to no avail.67 The war ended in late 2000 when Ethiopia essentially won, and it controls the disputed territory to this day.

The Horn of Africa is hardly the only region where states are free to fight one another today without fear of serious US involvement. Since they are choosing not to do so with increasing frequency, something else is probably affecting their calculations. Stability exists even in those places where the potential for intervention by the sheriff is minimal. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological, of the United States. It seems hard to make the case that the relative peace that has descended on so many regions is primarily due to the kind of heavy hand of the neoconservative leviathan, or its lighter, more liberal cousin. Something else appears to be at work.

Conflict and US Military Spending

How does one measure polarity? Power is traditionally considered to be some combination of military and economic strength, but despite scores of efforts, no widely accepted formula exists. Perhaps overall military spending might be thought of as a proxy for hard power capabilities; perhaps too the amount of money the United States devotes to hard power is a reflection of the strength of the unipole. When compared to conflict levels, however, there is no obvious correlation, and certainly not the kind of negative relationship between US spending and conflict that many hegemonic stability theorists would expect to see.

During the 1990s, the United States cut back on defense by about 25 percent, spending $100 billion less in real terms in 1998 that it did in 1990.68 To those believers in the neoconservative version of hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace,” argued Kristol and Kagan at the time.69 The world grew dramatically more peaceful while the United States cut its forces, however, and stayed just as peaceful while spending rebounded after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the military budget was cut under President Clinton, in other words, and kept declining (though more slowly, since levels were already low) as the Bush administration ramped it back up. Overall US military spending has varied during the period of the New Peace from a low in constant dollars of less than $400 billion to a high of more than $700 billion, but war does not seem to have noticed. The same nonrelationship exists between other potential proxy measurements for hegemony and conflict: there does not seem to be much connection between warfare and fluctuations in US GDP, alliance commitments, and forward military presence. There was very little fighting in Europe when there were 300,000 US troops stationed there, for example, and that has not changed as the number of Americans dwindled by 90 percent. Overall, there does not seem to be much correlation between US actions and systemic stability. Nothing the United States actually does seems to matter to the New Peace.

It is possible that absolute military spending might not be as important to explain the phenomenon as relative. Although Washington cut back on spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. The United States has accounted for between 35 and 41 percent of global military spending every year since the collapse of the Soviet Union.70 The perception of relative US power might be the decisive factor in decisions made in other capitals. One cannot rule out the possibility that it is the perception of US power—and its willingness to use it—that keeps the peace. In other words, perhaps it is the grand strategy of the United States, rather than its absolute capability, that is decisive in maintaining stability. It is that to which we now turn.

Conflict and US Grand Strategy

The perception of US power, and the strength of its hegemony, is to some degree a function of grand strategy. If indeed US strategic choices are responsible for the New Peace, then variation in those choices ought to have consequences for the level of international conflict. A restrained United States is much less likely to play the role of sheriff than one following a more activist approach. Were the unipole to follow such a path, hegemonic-stability theorists warn, disaster would follow. Former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski spoke for many when he warned that “outright chaos” could be expected to follow a loss of hegemony, including a string of quite specific issues, including new or renewed attempts to build regional empires (by China, Turkey, Russia, and Brazil) and the collapse of the US relationship with Mexico, as emboldened nationalists south of the border reassert 150-year-old territorial claims. Overall, without US dominance, today’s relatively peaceful world would turn “violent and bloodthirsty.” 71 Niall Ferguson foresees a post-hegemonic “Dark Age” in which “plunderers and pirates” target the big coastal cities like New York and Rotterdam, terrorists attack cruise liners and aircraft carriers alike, and the “wretchedly poor citizens” of Latin America are unable to resist the Protestantism brought to them by US evangelicals. Following the multiple (regional, fortunately) nuclear wars and plagues, the few remaining airlines would be forced to suspend service to all but the very richest cities.72 These are somewhat extreme versions of a central assumption of all hegemonic-stability theorists: a restrained United States would be accompanied by utter disaster. The “present danger” of which Kristol, Kagan, and their fellow travelers warn is that the United States “will shrink its responsibilities and—in a fit of absentmindedness, or parsimony, or indifference— allow the international order that it created and sustains to collapse.” 73

Liberals fear restraint as well, and also warn that a militarized version of primacy would be counterproductive in the long run. Although they believe that the rule-based order established by United States is more durable than the relatively fragile order discussed by the neoconservatives, liberals argue that Washington can undermine its creation over time through thoughtless unilateral actions that violate those rules. Many predicted that the invasion of Iraq and its general contempt for international institutions and law would call the legitimacy of the order into question. G. John Ikenberry worried that Bush’s “geostrategic wrecking ball” would lead to a more hostile, divided, and dangerous world.74 Thus while all hegemonicstability theorists expect a rise of chaos during a restrained presidency, liberals also have grave concerns regarding primacy.

Overall, if either version is correct and global stability is provided by US hegemony, then maintaining that stability through a grand strategy based on either primacy (to neoconservatives) or “deep engagement” (to liberals) is clearly a wise choice.75 If, however, US actions are only tangentially related to the outbreak of the New Peace, or if any of the other proposed explanations are decisive, then the United States can retrench without fear of negative consequences. The grand strategy of the United States is therefore crucial to beliefs in hegemonic stability.

Although few observers would agree on the details, most would probably acknowledge that post-Cold War grand strategies of American presidents have differed in some important ways. The four administrations are reasonable representations of the four ideal types outlined by Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross in 1996.76 Under George H. W. Bush, the United States followed the path of “selective engagement,” which is sometimes referred to as “balance-of-power realism”; Bill Clinton’s grand strategy looks a great deal like what Posen and Ross call “cooperative security,” and others call “liberal internationalism”; George W. Bush, especially in his first term, forged a strategy that was as close to “primacy” as any president is likely to get; and Barack Obama, despite some early flirtation with liberalism, has followed a restrained realist path, which Posen and Ross label “neo-isolationism” but its proponents refer to as “strategic restraint.” 77 In no case did the various anticipated disorders materialize. As Table 2 demonstrates, armed conflict levels fell steadily, irrespective of the grand strategic path Washington chose.

Neither the primacy of George W. Bush nor the restraint of Barack Obama had much effect on the level of global violence. Despite continued warnings (and the high-profile mess in Syria), the world has not experienced an increase in violence while the United States chose uninvolvement. If the grand strategy of the United States is responsible for the New Peace, it is leaving no trace in the evidence.

Perhaps we should not expect a correlation to show up in this kind of analysis. While US behavior might have varied in the margins during this period, nether its relative advantage over its nearest rivals nor its commitments waivered in any important way. However, it is surely worth noting that if trends opposite to those discussed in the previous two sections had unfolded, if other states had reacted differently to fluctuations in either US military spending or grand strategy, then surely hegemonic stability theorists would argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. Many liberals were on the lookout for chaos while George W. Bush was in the White House, just as neoconservatives have been quick to identify apparent worldwide catastrophe under President Obama.78 If increases in violence would have been evidence for the wisdom of hegemonic strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem

As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the relationship between US power and international stability suggests that the two are unrelated. The rest of the world appears quite capable and willing to operate effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise have precious little empirical support upon which to build their case. Hegemonic stability is a belief, in other words, rather than an established fact, and as such deserves a different kind of examination.

The Political Psychology of Unipolarity

Evidence supporting the notion that US power is primarily responsible for the New Peace is slim, but belief in the connection is quite strong, especially in policy circles. The best arena to examine the proposition is therefore not the world of measurable rationality, but rather that of the human mind. Political psychology can shed more light on unipolarity than can any collection of data or evidence. Just because an outcome is primarily psychological does not mean that it is less real; perception quickly becomes reality for both the unipolar state and those in the periphery. If all actors believe that the United States provides security and stability for the system, then behavior can be affected. Beliefs have deep explanatory power in international politics whether they have a firm foundation in empirical reality or not.

Like all beliefs, faith in the stability provided by hegemony is rarely subjected to much analysis. In their simplest form, beliefs are ideas that have become internalized and accepted as true, often without much further analysis Although they almost always have some basis in reality, beliefs need not pass rigorous tests to prove that they match it. No amount of evidence has been able to convince some people that vaccines do not cause autism, for example, or that the world is more peaceful than at any time before, or that the climate is changing due to human activity. Ultimately, as Robert Jervis explains, “we often believe as much in the face of evidence as because of it.”

When leaders are motivated to act based on unjustified, inaccurate beliefs, folly often follows. The person who decides to take a big risk because of astrological advice in the morning's horoscope can benefit from baseless superstition if the risk pays off. Probability and luck suggest that successful policy choices can sometimes flow from incorrect beliefs. Far more often, however, poor intellectual foundations lead to suboptimal or even disastrous outcomes. It is worthwhile to analyze the foundations of even our most deeply held beliefs to determine which ones are good candidates to inspire poor policy choices in those who hold them.

People are wonderful rationalizers. There is much to be said for being the strongest country in the world; their status provides Americans both security and psychological rewards, as well as strong incentives to construct a rationale for preserving the unipolar moment that goes beyond mere selfishness. Since people enjoy being “number one,” they are susceptible to perceiving reality in ways that brings the data in line with their desires. It is no coincidence that most hegemonic stability theorists are American. Of the few hegemonic-stability theorists from elsewhere, most hail from the United Kingdom and counsel the United States to follow the lead of the British Empire. Perhaps the satisfaction that comes with being the unipolar power has inspired Americans to misperceive the positive role that their status plays in the world.

Three findings from political psychology can shed light on perceptions of hegemonic stability. They are mutually supportive, and, when taken together, suggest that it is likely that US policymakers overestimate the extent to which their actions are responsible for the choices of others. The belief in the major US contribution to world peace is probably unjustified.

The Illusion of Control

Could 5 percent of the world’s population hope to enforce rules upon the rest? Would even an internationally hegemonic United States be capable of producing the New Peace? Perhaps, but it also may be true that believers in hegemonic stability may be affected by the very common tendency of people to overestimate their ability to control events. A variety of evidence has accumulated over the past forty years to support Ellen J. Langer’s original observations about the “illusion of control” that routinely distorts perception.82 Even in situations where outcomes are clearly generated by pure chance, people tend to believe that they can exert control over events.83 There is little reason to believe that leaders are somehow less susceptible to such illusions than subjects in controlled experiments.

The extensive research on the illusion of control has revealed two further findings that suggest US illusions might be even stronger than average. First, misperceptions of control appear to be correlated with power: individuals with higher socioeconomic status, as well as those who are members of dominant groups, are more likely to overestimate their ability to control events.84 Powerful people tend to be far more confident than others, often overly so, and that confidence leads them to inflate their own importance.85 Leaders of superpowers are thus particularly vulnerable to distorted perceptions regarding their ability to affect the course of events. US observers had a greater structural predisposition than others, for example, to believe that they would have been able to control events in the Persian Gulf following an injection of creative instability in 2003. The skepticism of less powerful allies was easily discounted.

Second, there is reason to believe that culture matters as well as power. People from societies that value individualism are more likely to harbor illusions of control than those from collectivist societies, where assumptions of group agency are more common. When compared to people from other parts of the world, Westerners tend to view the world as “highly subject to personal control,” in the words of Richard Nisbett.86 North Americans appear particularly vulnerable in this regard.87 Those who come from relatively powerful countries with individualistic societies are therefore at high risk for misperceiving their ability to influence events.

For the United States, the illusion of control extends beyond the water’s edge. An oft-discussed public good supposedly conferred by US hegemony is order in those parts of the world uncontrolled by sovereign states, or the “global commons.” 88 One such common area is the sea, where the United States maintains the only true blue-water navy in the world. That the United States has brought this peace to the high seas is a central belief of hegemonic-stability theorists, one rarely examined in any serious way. Indeed the maritime environment has been unusually peaceful for decades; the biggest naval battles since Okinawa took place during the Falklands conflict in 1982, and they were fairly minor.89 If hegemony is the key variable explaining stability at sea, maritime security would have to be far more chaotic without the US Navy.

It is equally if not more plausible to suggest, however, that the reason other states are not building blue-water navies is not because the United States dissuades them from doing so but rather because none feels that trade is imperiled.90 In earlier times, and certainly during the age of mercantilism, zero-sum economics inspired efforts to cut off the trade of opponents on occasion, making control the sea extremely important. Today the free flow of goods is vital to all economies, and it would be in the interest of no state to interrupt it.91 Free trade at sea may no longer need protection, in other words, because it essentially has no enemies; the sheriff may be patrolling a crime-free neighborhood. The threat from the few remaining pirates hardly requires a robust naval presence, and is certainly not what hegemonic-stability advocates mean when they compare the role played by the US Navy in 2016 to that of the Royal Navy in 1816. It is at least possible that shared interest in open, free commons keeps the peace at sea rather than the United States. Oceans unpatrolled by the US Navy may be about as stable as they are with the presence of its carriers. The degree to which 273 active-duty ships exert control over vast common parts is not at all clear.

People overestimate the degree to which they control events in their lives. Furthermore, if these observations from political psychology are right about the factors that influence the growth of illusions of power, then US leaders and analysts are particularly susceptible to misperception. They may well be overestimating the degree to which the United States can affect the behavior of others. The rest of the world may be able to get along just fine, on land and at sea, without US attempts to control it.

### US-China War---1NC/2AC

#### China war is inevitable – monopolies are selectively maintained in order to geopolitical tensions with China, which ensures military conflict – also turns solvency

Cecilia Rikap 21. Professor of Economics and Coordinator of YSI States and Markets Working Group, Institute for New Economic Thinking. “The Interplays of the United States, China and their Intellectual Monopolies.” *Capitalism, Power and Innovation Intellectual Monopoly Capitalism Uncovered*. Routledge. 2021. 77-80.

As Strange (1996) anticipated, the decline of the state’s power vis-à-vis corporations can be partly explained by the acceleration of technological change, which tilts the scale in favour of corporations. As identified by Feenberg (2010, p. 5) “political democracy is largely overshadowed by the enormous power wielded by the masters of technical systems”. Indeed, we should consider that powerful intellectual monopolies pass over their home states in specific contexts or respects.11 With this in mind we reconceived core states as one of capitalism’s multiple powerful actors.

Beyond explicit confrontations, since intellectual monopolies organize and plan production and innovation networks taking place in different countries, they generate an overlap of political realms with sometimes contradictory rules and norms. Who oversees production and innovation inside the networks organized by intellectual monopolies? The latter or the different states where intellectual monopolies’ production or innovation networks are based? To whom subordinate firms and other organizations are accountable for their actions? Their state or the intellectual monopoly coordinating the network? The simple answer is both. The complicated part is to identify what happens when they are in contradiction, and what are the consequences of this complex set of power structures for workers and subordinated organizations.

Intellectual monopolies have replaced state functions as policymakers. An extreme example recently disclosed is Eric Schmidt, Alphabet’s former executive chairman, advising the US federal government while still managing Alphabet. He was the chair of the US Defense Innovation Board, which recommended the use of artificial intelligence to the US Department of Defense. He also chaired the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence which advises the US Congress on analogous topics (Klein, 2020).

The government’s threat over China is – at least to some extent – driven by US data-driven intellectual monopolies’ concern over Chinese rivals like Alibaba, Tencent and Huawei. The CEOs of Google, Amazon, Facebook and Apple made this clear in their testimonies in the 2020 US Congress Hearing. As a remedy, Schmidt had been pushing for more public investment in research related to artificial intelligence and tech-enabling infrastructure (such as 5G) (Klein, 2020). Furthermore, these data-driven intellectual monopolies make their own rules and norms for their digital republics and, to some degree, replace the role of states. Facebook’s founder and chief executive, Mark Zuckerberg, states it clearly

Every day, platforms like Facebook have to make trade-offs on important social values – between free expression and safety, privacy and law enforcement, and between creating open systems and locking down data.12

(Mark Zuckerberg, Feb 16, 2020)

And immediately afterwards, he advocates for more public regulations and informs that Facebook is working together with different governments to that end. A similar claim was raised by Sundar Pichai, arguing that artificial intelligence needs to be regulated.13

The division of power is not clear, given that corporate power and planning capacities go beyond national frontiers and beyond the capital they own. Overall, there is a legal vacuum in the reach of each state’s power and where the power of the intellectual monopoly controlling a portion of global production and innovation begins. This vacuum allows intellectual monopolies to expand their power and profits.

Another source of conflict between intellectual monopolies and core states concerns the relative absence of the usual benefits of being home to big corporations: employment generation and tax payments. Considering their earnings, global leading corporations do not generate in their home countries expected employment due to outsourcing and offshoring (of production and innovation), which is particularly the case of US and also European intellectual monopolies. This has contributed to the rise in inequalities in these regions. The consequent social distress put pressure on stringent regulations. In the US, we referred in Section 2.1 to the 2017 Tax and Jobs Act (Public Law 115-97), but changes have not been significant.

US intellectual monopolies are masters of tax avoidance. As we mentioned before, operations leading to lower tax bills and financialized profits are easier for companies with higher shares of intangible over tangible assets. Offshoring IPRs to countries where corporations are not required to pay taxes for their intellectual property is a mechanism frequently used to divert profits to tax havens (Bryan et al., 2017) (see Chapter 7 on Apple’s case). By the end of 2016, the top ten companies in terms of offshored savings were: Apple, Microsoft, Cisco, Oracle, Alphabet, Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer, Qualcomm, Amgen and Merck (Pozsar, 2018).

In China, whose global intellectual monopolies sprang from the sustained stimulus and protection of its state, the latter’s central planning capacity is starting to find limits vis-à-vis new intellectual monopolies. These corporations were not born as the chosen ones by the state, but still enjoyed the benefits of China’s protectionism. The recent case of Bytedance provides a good example. The company was spending its Chinese profits to expand its unprofitable business in the US when the US government banned its blockbuster TikTok app. Bytedance was not among Beijing’s favoured companies, among others, because of the difficulties in controlling the videos uploaded to TikTok (Yang, 2020). Regardless of the end of the story between TikTok, the US and Chinese governments and US intellectual monopolies as potential buyers for part of TikTok’s business, what the case put forward was a possible surge of clashes between emerging Chinese (data-driven) intellectual monopolies and their state. Indeed, in late 2020 the Chinese state delayed Ant Group’s IPO, followed by the introduction of antitrust regulation for digital companies.

Meanwhile, Europe remained focused on increasing regulations on foreign data-driven intellectual monopolies, including different accusations of excessive market power and unfair competition. Unlike previous stages in capitalism, Europe risks playing in the subordinate side, where the peripheries have historically been and generally remain. Germany’s fear of falling behind the US and China’s tech giants should also be read as a broader European concern to lag (far) behind those core economies.14 Overall, Europe and Japan are latecomers of the digital economy, and this space is being filled primarily by China, emerging as a digital technological power (UNCTAD, 2019). Moreover, with a drop of eight companies between March 2009 and December 2019, Europe’s share of global top 100 corporations in market capitalization fell from 27% to 15%. This drop was taken over by the US (PWC, 2020). Regulating the digital economy could thus be seen as Europe’s geopolitical rebalancing move.15

5 Final remarks

In this chapter, we argued that core states and certain corporations built a mutually beneficial relationship. We identified US and Chinese policies that contributed to the emergence and spread of global intellectual monopolies. Likewise, we elaborated on how these corporate leaders sustain and expand their respective countries’ geopolitical power. Nevertheless, we also addressed states’ concerns and the overall tensions of the juxtaposition of power between core states and intellectual monopolies.

The US state cannot afford to lose its intellectual monopolies since its global hegemon power significantly depends on those companies. Likewise, it cannot afford to let its intellectual monopolies be given their consequences for income and wealth concentration resulting in increasing social unrest. From the US state perspective, the technological war with China is necessary to remain the only superpower. Nevertheless, this conflict is also a powerful device to redirect public attention and blame – as it has always been the case of the United States – an “other” of the internal consequences of home (and global) capitalism.

Neither can the Chinese state afford to lose its alliance with its intellectual monopolies. Its national innovation system and geopolitical power are based on a strong partnership – although not without tensions – between China’s state and intellectual monopolies, the only ones challenging the US and its intellectual monopolies.

All in all, the US and Chinese states have benefited from their respective intellectual monopolies to build and reinforce their geopolitical power. Meanwhile, in the rest of the world, knowledge and data extractivisms are further expanding inequalities, diminishing social well-being and curtailing development opportunities (see Chapters 11–13). The resulting world scenario is a ticking bomb.

A missing piece in this puzzle that will be addressed in future research concerns integrating international organizations to our analysis, seeking to understand how intellectual monopolies influence them and their role as arenas of core states’ contest for global hegemony. Let us just point out that each time the US withdraws from international coordination, China moves forward. Remarkably, during Trump’s administration, the US withdrew from international treaties and organizations, putting into question its historical openness. A possible interpretation could be that the hegemon fosters an open world economy but as far as it benefits from it.

To conclude, beyond the focus on the US and China, this chapter has also made self-evident that unfolding the interplay between state and corporate power is always context-dependent. While in some contexts the state rules over global leader corporations, the latter overcome even core states’ power in other contexts. As capitalism develops through the interplay of its powerful actors, it is not possible to anticipate concrete outcomes of such a multifaceted relationship. Neither can we anticipate the counter-hegemonic tendencies that, as Cox (1981) emphasized, generally emerge to oppose the state and world order structures of capitalism. The institutions that will lead the counter-offensive to intellectual monopoly capitalism remains to be seen.

#### BUT no escalation

Abraham Denmark et al 20 is director of the Asia Program at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a former deputy assistant secretary of defense for East Asia, April 16, “SAME AS IT EVER WAS: CHINA’S PANDEMIC OPPORTUNISM ON ITS PERIPHERY”, <https://warontherocks.com/2020/04/same-as-it-ever-was-chinas-pandemic-opportunism-on-its-periphery/>

While Washington and Beijing’s overheated rhetoric and mutual recriminations amid the ongoing coronavirus pandemic are grabbing headlines, equally important is what has been playing out across China’s eastern and southern peripheries over the past several weeks. At a moment when the Chinese Communist Party has been touting the generosity of its approach to COVID-19, there has been a marked increase in the number of incidents between China and its neighbors. Beijing has used its naval and paramilitary forces as well as its increasingly sophisticated information operations to ratchet up tensions, probe responses, and see how much it can get away with. This raises the question of what exactly China is up to. Has Beijing truly embraced a new approach of cooperation with its neighbors? Is it trying to take advantage of the COVID-19 mess to assert its interests more aggressively? Or is this simply an extension — albeit an opportunistic one — of its pre-pandemic strategy? BECOME A MEMBER The novel coronavirus pandemic has not curtailed geopolitics — in fact, it seems to be intensifying preexisting tensions. Understanding if and how China’s foreign policy has shifted is critical for assessing what is happening along China’s periphery and what Beijing might do next. Answering these questions is necessary for the United States and its allies to fashion a proper response. This, in turn, demands understanding what Beijing was doing before the crisis and thinking through what might actually signal a significant shift toward a more confrontational foreign policy. How Did I Get Here? China’s Latest Moves Chinese ships and aircraft have been involved in a spate of recent incidents across China’s maritime periphery. While there have been no fatalities, lives were certainly put at risk. Considering these incidents have involved two of China’s primary regional rivals — Japan and Vietnam — as well as Taiwan, the possibility that Beijing may see the COVID-19 pandemic as an opportunity to press an advantage during a time of geopolitical distraction and uncertainty should be considered. In mid-March, a group of People’s Liberation Army (PLA) aircraft crossed the median line in the Taiwan Strait — an unofficial demarcation line between Taiwan and China — in an exercise intended to intimidate Taiwan by demonstrating China’s ability to conduct operations at night while also testing Taiwan’s ability to react. While PLA ships and aircraft have been operating within the vicinity of Taiwan for several years, the pace and assertiveness of these activities have noticeably increased in recent years: The latest incident was the fourth time in two months that PLA aircraft forced Taiwan’s air force to scramble and intercept. Considering the impending second inauguration of Taiwan’s leader, President Tsai Ing-wen, as well as dwindling levels of support in Taiwan for Beijing’s “One Country, Two Systems” formulation, these exercises are likely to grow even more common and assertive. In late March in the East China Sea, a Chinese fishing vessel collided with a Japanese destroyer. The collision ripped a hole in the destroyer, but the ship was able to move on its own, and its crew suffered no casualties. Beijing announced that one Chinese fisherman had been hurt and blamed the Japanese vessel for the incident, calling for Japan’s cooperation to prevent future incidents. It is unclear if the Chinese vessel was a part of China’s “maritime militia,” described by the U.S. Department of Defense as “an armed reserve force of civilians available for mobilization” that plays a “major role in coercive activities to achieve China’s political goals without fighting.” The South China Sea has also seen several recent incidents involving Chinese vessels. In early March, a Vietnamese fishing vessel was moored near a small island in the Paracel archipelago — islands claimed by both Vietnam and China, among others — when a Chinese vessel chased it and fired a water cannon, causing the boat to sink after hitting some rocks. The crew was rescued by another Vietnamese fishing boat, with Hanoi claiming that the fishing boat was rammed by the Chinese vessel. The U.S. State Department issued a statement in early April expressing its serious concerns about the incident and calling on China “to remain focused on supporting international efforts to combat the global pandemic, and to stop exploiting the distraction or vulnerability of other states to expand its unlawful claims in the South China Sea.” The State Department also noted that since the outbreak of the pandemic, “Beijing has also announced new ‘research stations’ on military bases it built on Fiery Cross Reef and Subi Reef, and landed special military aircraft on Fiery Cross Reef.” Most recently, a Chinese coast guard (CCG) ship — one of several Chinese ships that harassed a Philippine commercial vessel in September 2019 — was seen patrolling near the Scarborough Shoal, representing one of many CCG ships that have been patrolling nearly all of the disputed areas between China and the Philippines in the South China Sea. Are these incidents merely a coincidence? Are they a sign that Beijing is distracted by COVID-19 and the resulting historic economic slowdown, and aggressive local commanders are pushing the envelope of their own accord? Or is this merely the result of China fielding more ships and more aircraft, leading to a predictable increase in incidents and exercises? While these explanations are all plausible, a more likely driver of China’s actions is, in fact, continuity. These incidents are not unprecedented and likely do not indicate a new, post-pandemic Chinese strategy. Rather, these incidents are consistent with a Chinese approach to foreign affairs under CCP General Secretary Xi Jinping’s leadership that even before the outbreak of COVID-19 demonstrated flexibility, assertiveness, and a singular desire to exploit opportunities of external weakness and distraction in order to advance China’s interests. For more than a decade, Chinese leaders have come to see their external security environment as generally favorable, representing a “strategic window of opportunity” in which China could achieve its primary objective of national revitalization through economic and social development, military modernization, and the expansion of its regional and global influence. Since the 2008 to 2009 global financial crisis, Beijing has perceived an opportunity to expand its geopolitical power relative to the United States yet does not seek an explicit conflict with the United States or its allies. As a result, Beijing has intensified its use of “gray zone” tactics that seek to gradually advance Chinese interests using ambiguity and tactics that are tailored to not provoke a military retaliation. These activities also serve as “probing behavior” that tests how far China can go before encountering determined resistance. In recent years, Beijing has used this approach to increase pressure on Japan in the East China Sea and advance Beijing’s territorial claims in the South China Sea against the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia. Throughout, Beijing’s approach to regional geopolitics has been adaptive to specific conditions, flexible to broader strategic trends, and opportunistic to perceptions of weakness or distraction in its adversaries. Chinese actions are not the reckless gambles they may initially appear to be. Rather, they are premeditated probes seeking to identify weakness and opportunity. Chinese pressure is carefully calibrated to fit, but not necessarily to exceed, a given situation. This approach reflects a maxim of Vladimir Lenin, whom the Chinese Communist Party continues to revere to this day: “Probe with a bayonet: if you meet steel, stop. If you meet mush, then push.” In multiple instances, Beijing has continued to push when it perceives that its actions are unlikely to cause a significant response. But when Chinese assertiveness has been met with resolute counterpressure, Beijing’s response has not been predictably escalatory.Beijing has demonstrated flexibility when confronted with determined opposition. Examples include Japan’s response to China’s rollout of an air defense identification zone in the East China Sea in 2013 and President Obama’s reported drawing of a red line around Scarborough Shoal to Xi Jinping in March 2016. Moreover, India’s response to Chinese activities in Doklam did not lead to war.

### No Miscalc ---1NC

#### NO Russia war

Jim Townsend 19. Townsend is an adjunct senior fellow in the CNAS Transatlantic Security Program. “The Tale of Turkey and the Patriots.” War on the Rocks, https://warontherocks.com/2019/07/the-tale-of-turkey-and-the-patriots/

In November 2015, the region seemed moments from an explosion when Turkey shot down a Russian aircraft which had reportedly entered Turkish airspace for a few moments. Had Russia retaliated militarily against NATO ally Turkey, the rest of NATO could have been dragged into war with Russia. The potential of facing NATO forces under Article 5 likely deterred Russia from a direct, violent response, although Russian-backed Syrian forces did exchange blows with Turkish-backed forces. Rather than spoil his efforts to split the Turks off from the West and to avoid war, Putin — who had been wooing his fellow autocrat Erdogan for years — limited the Russian reaction to economic sanctions against Turkey.

### AT: Readiness---No Impact

#### There is no correlation between deterrence or readiness and conflict and past declines disprove the impact

Mark F. Cancian & Seamus Daniels 18. \*\*Mark F is a senior adviser with the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C. \*\*Seamus Daniels is a research assistant for defense budget analysis at CSIS. “The State of Military Readiness: Is There a Crisis?” Center for Strategic & International Studies. 04-18-18. https://www.csis.org/analysis/state-military-readiness-there-crisis

Q4: Has readiness declined? A4: **In 2013**, readiness took a hit as a result of sequestration. Because cuts had to be made late in the fiscal year, the services were forced to cut **facility maintenance**, **international exercises**, and most significantly, **training activities**. The services have been digging out of that hole ever since. Some commentators have raised concerns about a “readiness crisis” while others, like retired Gen. David Petraeus and Michael O’Hanlon, have argued that readiness is essentially sound. Part of the difficulty in assessing the state of the military’s readiness is the lack of publicly available data as measured by the DRRS. That problem is exacerbated by directives from the secretary of defense to limit public discussion of readiness shortfalls. Readiness discussions are further distorted by the opposing incentives to exaggerate shortfalls to defend budgets and to exaggerate capabilities to deter adversaries. The Trump administration emphasized readiness in its FY 2017 and FY 2018 budgets. Nevertheless, readiness data are conflicting. Some metrics, like Army rotations to Combat Training Centers, service flying hours, and Navy ship steaming days, have recovered from post-2013 lows, but others, like Navy and Marine Corps aircraft availability, remain depressed. With overall DOD budgets rising, targeted readiness increases, such as aviation spare parts, may be better investments than across-the-board increases. The services have worked hard to deploy forces at a high level of readiness because these forces are either going into conflicts (such as Afghanistan, Iraq, or Syria) or will be the first sent to a crisis or a new conflict (carrier battle groups and Marines afloat). Low readiness levels, therefore, typically affect nondeployed forces at their home bases. These forces would deploy if an emergency erupts that the forward-deployed forces cannot handle. The risk is that they would need to deploy before they can be brought up to a high level of readiness. Q5: Have low readiness levels caused an increase in accidents? A5: There would seem to be a connection here: lower readiness, less training, fewer skills, more accidents. However, it is **difficult to determine the direct connection** between readiness and recent incidents. Accidents have **continued to occur even as readiness funding has recovered**. What is clear is that the high tempo of current operations (optempo) has taken a toll on the readiness of forces.

### Circumvention

#### Circumvention – the plan causes offshoring – that re-creates monopolies over defense production and make intervention inevitable.

Kopf et al 13 [Jerry. Professor of Economics, Radford University. Charles Vehorn, Professor of Economics, Radford University. Joel Carnevale, Professor of Economics, Syracuse University. “Emerging Oligopolies in Global Markets: Was Marx Ahead of His Time?” *Journal of Management Policy and Practice* 14(3): 96-98. <http://www.m.www.na-businesspress.com/JMPP/KopfJ_Web14_3_.pdf>]

With firms branching out into global competition and countries lowering their trade barriers to promote such competition, the absence of effective global regulation once again raises Marx concerns. Because of strong federal governments, national governments were able to pass and enforce, through the uses of military or police force where necessary, laws that regulated externalities, such as pollution, and antitrust. At the moment there is no strong federal government at the global level and, therefore, no one to pass and enforce laws that effectively regulate externalities or antitrust. Epstein and Greve raise a Marx like concern, “when firms have international market power, one would expect them to behave as monopolists just like domestic firms with market power” (2004). Therefore, without any dominant form of regulatory governance, industry concentration could very well replicate what was seen in the late 19th century, though, globally instead of nationally. Carstensen & Farmer discusses this tendency towards M&A’s: The transformation of formerly regulated or noncompetitive industries to competition is closely linked with merger movements. The historical record demonstrates that once faced with competition, leading firms in these industries began to merge. This has been the pattern in airlines, banks, railroads, electric and gas utilities, health care and, with great prominence, telecommunications (2008).

While some may argue that reaching that level of concentration is unlikely, one should consider current industries that hold a considerable global market share. “Although it may be more difficult to establish and maintain market power internationally, there is no reason to believe that it is impossible or, for that matter, rare. Industries such as pharmaceuticals, passenger aircraft, and software illustrate the phenomenon” (Epstein & Greve, 2004).

There are actually quite a few firms who have emerged into the global market that hold what can be considered a significant share within global industries, ranging from manufacturing, financial intermediation, and transport service along with other service industries. For example, The European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company and The Boeing Company combined hold more than 50% market share within the global civil aerospace products manufacturing industry. Goldman and Sachs hav2 20.20% market share within the global investment banking and brokerage industry and Vivendi holds 20.10% within the global music production and distribution industry. United Parcel Service holds 23.80%, within the global logistics – couriers industry (IBISW, 2011).

We do not intend to imply that the monopolization that had plagued the United States in the late 19th century has emulated itself at the global level, creating one dominant firm controlling an entire global industry. However, it does appear that a number of industries are starting to exhibit Marx, “inevitable move toward a monopoly.”

The increase in oligopoly power at the global level presents unprecedented challenges. Reaching a cross-country consensus on competition policy is a difficult. Epstein & Greve discuss some of the issues that arise when attempting to unite foreign and domestic competition policy. Competition policy embodies imprecise normative judgments that invite controversy and defection rather than consensus and commitment. Because its scope extends to such a wide range of economic activity, it has the potential to inflict significant costs on many transactors. In particular, competition policy tempts states both to impose nominally neutral policies that favor local producers and consumers at the expense of global welfare, and to administer their policies in a discriminatory fashion to similar ends” (2004).

While more and more countries are adopting competition policies, this seemingly positive step towards unification of trust law has its negative effects. “Nearly one hundred jurisdictions now have antitrust laws” according to Epstein & Greve, this raises increasing issues of “jurisdictional overlaps” since many countries will assert their “jurisdiction over extraterritorial conduct that has a domestic impact” (2004).

Antitrust enforcement agencies around the world have tried to cope with the increased power of global corporations by staying in regular and increasing contact with one another on individual merger cases as well as on general issues of mutual enforcement interest. Through instruments such as the 1995 Recommendation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that its 29 members cooperate with one another in antitrust enforcement and bilateral agreements like that which exists between the United States and the European Community, the antitrust agencies notify one another when a case under investigation affects another's important interests and they share what information they can and otherwise cooperate in the investigation and resolution of those cases (1999).

Richard Parker, Senior Deputy Director of the Bureau of Competition FTC, presenting on global merger enforcement, discussed the implementation of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and concluded with examples of global merger enforcement. While attempts at unified standards of competition policy are underway, the efforts of the OECD are considered to have substantial limitations on enforcing global merger laws. Epstein and Greve state: Information sharing or “soft” cooperation has also been pursued at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which has generated several aspirational texts. None of these impose obligations on states, and they are not intended to do so. Their goals are modestly limited to improving communication on competition issues.

History shows us that even with a strong federal government with the ability to enforce laws through the use of force where necessary, such as the United States federal government has on its states, firms are very good at ignoring or getting around antitrust laws. If the U.S. government did not have strong federal power over states, and it was up to the states to reach agreements on antitrust laws, one can easily imagine that there would likely be problems resulting in less strenuous competition policy. Take for example state control over age discrimination laws. When these laws originated, states chose whether to enact policies aimed at protecting workers rights. By 1960 only 8 states had age discrimination laws until the federal government enacted such regulations as the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). This, along with the Department of Labor in 1979 giving administrative authority to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), established unified laws protecting individual employment rights (Lahey, 2007). Without this dominant authority of the federal government, fair employment practices may still continue to be a regionally dependent right. In the current era of globalization, where industry’s actions domestically can be felt by all corners of the globe and vice versa, without a global entity with strong “federal” powers capable of monitoring and enforcing competition policy, it seems reasonable to conclude that Marx may in fact be proven correct: the inevitable result of the efficient market is increasing concentration of power resulting in global oligopolies or, eventually, monopolies.

### DIB a/c

#### Defense industry is strong

John Keller, 19. Editor-in-chief of Military & Aerospace Electronics magazine. "Good times continue for the U.S. defense industry, as Pentagon budget money continues to roll-in," March 26, 2019. https://www.militaryaerospace.com/articles/2019/03/good-times-pentagon-budget-money-continues-to-roll-in.html

Remember last year when we considered the 2019 Pentagon budget request to be one of the biggest of all time? Well fast-forward a year, and the 2020 military budget request is even bigger. Last spring when top Pentagon leaders were asking Congress for $686.1 billion, many of us thought it would be the largest U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) budget we might ever see. At the time it was a breath of fresh air, after what seemed like years of sequestration, congressional continuing resolutions, and other sources of uncertainty, things finally were looking up. Now comes the 2020 DOD budget request, and the news for the nation's defense industry just keeps looking better. The Pentagon is asking for $718.3 billion next year, which is up 4.7 percent over the 2019 request -- promising another record year for U.S. defense spending.

#### Or there’s alt causes

Doug Cameron 8/12/20. "Aerospace Suppliers Brace for Hard Landing ". WSJ. 8-12-2020. https://www.wsj.com/articles/aerospace-suppliers-brace-for-hard-landing-11597233600

Companies that make parts for Boeing Co. BA 3.33% and Airbus SE EADSY -0.82% jets, and provide airlines with everything from engine spares to window shades, are shrinking rapidly in the wake of the pandemic-driven travel downturn.

The Precision Castparts unit of Berkshire Hathaway Inc. BRK.B 0.39% this week became the latest supplier to flag huge job cuts as the maker of aircraft-engine parts said it had shed 10,000 staff—30% of its workforce—since the start of the year.

Warren Buffett’s investment vehicle took a $10 billion write-down on its 2015 acquisition, highlighting how the crisis gripping the airline industry is expected to linger. The world’s two biggest plane makers signaled to suppliers that they plan to lower jet production for several years.

U.S. aerospace manufacturers have already shed more than 100,000 jobs since the start of the year, according to Labor Department data and regulatory filings, with the pandemic adding to existing pressures from the sharply reduced production of the still-grounded Boeing 737 MAX jet. Sector employment had climbed to almost a million at the end of last year and fell to 925,000 by June 30. Job cuts have continued to mount in recent weeks.

The biggest supplier on the MAX program, Spirit AeroSystems Holdings Inc., is cutting 8,000 jobs, around 40% of its commercial aerospace workforce. General Electric Co. is shedding 13,000 from its aviation unit, and other big suppliers such as Raytheon Technologies Corp., Howmet Aerospace Inc. and France’s Safran SA have disclosed cuts in recent weeks.

“We have received more production schedule changes this year than I think we’ve seen in the last five years,” said Spirit Chief Financial Officer Mark Suchinski on a recent earnings call.

In addition to the MAX, the supply chain is taking other hits. The overall production of new jets has declined, and the big drop in flying—a third of the global fleet remains grounded—has reduced demand for spares and improvements such as new seats. The reduced workload comes as companies had invested in new equipment and hiring to support higher jet production and the steady rise in airline passengers, only for the pandemic to render their business plans redundant.
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#### 4 – turns case---competition fails – that’s Yang and…

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

When Things Fall Apart

Marxist economics explains not only how capitalism works but why it regularly doesn’t — during the periodic economic busts that inevitably follow the booms. As Marx and Engels wrote:

Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce.

Of course, in a world where billions go without enough food, there’s no such thing as “too much means of subsistence.” There’s only too much from the point of view of the capitalists — too much to sell their products at an acceptable profit.

Thier introduces the chapters on capitalist crisis by unpacking a long quotation from Engels that ends: “The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation is reproduced as the antagonism between the organization of production in the single factory and the anarchy of production in society as a whole.”

Under capitalism, production within workplaces is generally highly regimented, but the economy as a whole is a free-for-all. Businesses make their investment decisions behind closed doors, each hoping to get a leg up on the competition — by introducing the most popular model, the new product, the next trend. Success means a greater share of the market and therefore more profits.

All the important questions for society as a whole — how much food should be produced, how many homes to build, what kind of drugs to research and manufacture, how to generate electricity — are decided by the free market.

In economic good times, success seems contagious. Companies make ambitious investments, produce more and more, and watch the money roll in. But when enough companies jump in, the market gets saturated, sales slump, debts grow, and the record profits start to sink. The effects spread from part of the economy to the next, as Thier explains, using the example of oil:

If refineries sit idle because there is an overproduction of oil, the workers are laid off, and the creditors, who financed the investment, are dragged down as well. But as future oil extraction and refining projects are pulled back, so too is demand for the raw materials (steel, concrete, plastics, electricity, etc.) and engineering necessary for the production of oil rigs, pipelines, and so on. The construction business and service and retail companies, which had benefited from the springing up of oil boomtowns, suffer as well.

Because of the complexity of the international capitalist economy, the boom-slump roller-coaster ride can look and feel different each time around. Thier devotes a chapter to analyzing the crash last time: the Great Recession of 2008–9. She explains why and how the parasitical realm of banking and finance was the detonator of this slump but looks beyond popular left explanations about “financialization” to reveal the underlying crisis of global overproduction.

Among Marxist economics writers, there are some disagreements about the details here, specifically about “which aspects of Marx’s writing — falling profitability, overproduction (or in some cases, underproduction), disproportionality among branches, the role of credit — are emphasized and how these pieces fit together,” Thier writes.

In her account, Thier tends to stress overproduction, to the disappointment of those who emphasize falling profit rates. This focus on overproduction crucially emphasizes how an organic mechanism of capitalism — inevitable in a system driven by exchange, exploitation, and competition — repeatedly causes crisis.

Regardless of their ideology or morality (or lack thereof), capitalists are inevitably driven to reduce costs, they inevitably see an advantage in producing more for less, and this inevitably leads to frantic overproduction that undermines profitability and ultimately slams the economy into reverse.

In other words, capitalism stops working not because of a mistake or failed policy, but because it’s been working the way it’s supposed to. As Thier writes:

Competition is the mainstay of capitalism. It can’t be made friendlier or softer because it requires an accumulation of capital at any cost, in order to get ahead or get left behind.… These same processes of accumulation necessarily lead to contradictions that threaten the very profits that capitalists seek. Every contradiction for capitalism is both a great hazard to our lives — since we are made to pay the price — and also an important crack in the system. Every periodic crisis is a potential point around which to organize.

#### Cap causes private AI development into super-intelligence

Xiang 18 [Feng. Professor of law at Tsinghua University and one of China’s most prominent legal scholars. Opinion: AI will spell the end of capitalism. Washington Post. 5-3-2018. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/05/03/end-of-capitalism/> ]

BEIJING — The most momentous challenge facing socio-economic systems today is the arrival of artificial intelligence. If AI remains under the control of market forces, it will inexorably result in a super-rich oligopoly of data billionaires who reap the wealth created by robots that displace human labor, leaving massive unemployment in their wake.

But China’s socialist market economy could provide a solution to this. If AI rationally allocates resources through big data analysis, and if robust feedback loops can supplant the imperfections of “the invisible hand” while fairly sharing the vast wealth it creates, a planned economy that actually works could at last be achievable.

The more AI advances into a general-purpose technology that permeates every corner of life, the less sense it makes to allow it to remain in private hands that serve the interests of the few instead of the many. More than anything else, the inevitability of mass unemployment and the demand for universal welfare will drive the idea of socializing or nationalizing AI.

Marx’s dictum, “From each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs,” needs an update for the 21st century: “From the inability of an AI economy to provide jobs and a living wage for all, to each according to their needs.”

Even at this early stage, the idea that digital capitalism will somehow make social welfare a priority has already proven to be a fairytale. The billionaires of Google and Apple, who have been depositing company profits in offshore havens to avoid taxation, are hardly paragons of social responsibility. The ongoing scandal around Facebook’s business model, which puts profitability above responsible citizenship, is yet another example of how in digital capitalism, private companies only look after their own interests at the expense of the rest of society.

One can readily see where this is all headed once technological unemployment accelerates. “Our responsibility is to our shareholders,” the robot owners will say. “We are not an employment agency or a charity.”

These companies have been able to get away with their social irresponsibility because the legal system and its loopholes in the West are geared to protect private property above all else. Of course, in China, we have big privately owned Internet companies like Alibaba and Tencent. But unlike in the West, they are monitored by the state and do not regard themselves as above or beyond social control.

It is the very pervasiveness of AI that will spell the end of market dominance. The market may reasonably if unequally function if industry creates employment opportunities for most people. But when industry only produces joblessness, as robots take over more and more, there is no good alternative but for the state to step in. As AI invades economic and social life, all private law-related issues will soon become public ones. More and more, regulation of private companies will become a necessity to maintain some semblance of stability in societies roiled by constant innovation.

I consider this historical process a step closer to a planned market economy. Laissez-faire capitalism as we have known it can lead nowhere but to a dictatorship of AI oligarchs who gather rents because the intellectual property they own rules over the means of production. On a global scale, it is easy to envision this unleashed digital capitalism leading to a battle between robots for market share that will surely end as disastrously as the imperialist wars did in an earlier era.

For the sake of social well-being and security, individuals and private companies should not be allowed to possess any exclusive cutting-edge technology or core AI platforms. Like nuclear and biochemical weapons, as long as they exist, nothing other than a strong and stable state can ensure society’s safety. If we don’t nationalize AI, we could sink into a dystopia reminiscent of the early misery of industrialization, with its satanic mills and street urchins scrounging for a crust of bread.

The dream of communism is the elimination of wage labor. If AI is bound to serve society instead of private capitalists, it promises to do so by freeing an overwhelming majority from such drudgery while creating wealth to sustain all.

If the state controls the market, instead of digital capitalism controlling the state, true communist aspirations will be achievable. And because AI increasingly enables the management of complex systems by processing massive amounts of information through intensive feedback loops, it presents, for the first time, a real alternative to the market signals that have long justified laissez-faire ideology — and all the ills that go with it.

#### 1 – S risk – outweighs extinction

**Shino 15** [Yuya, Journalist at Reuters "Capitalist forces could create ‘uncontrollable’ artificial intelligence – scientist," RT International, https://www.rt.com/uk/235143-capitalism-ai-dangerous-technology]

Murray Shanahan, professor of cognitive robotics at Imperial College London, cautioned against “capitalist forces” developing AI without any sense of morality, arguing it could lead to potentially “uncontrollable military technologies.” Shanahan’s comments follow warnings from leading scientists and entrepreneurs, including Stephen Hawking, Bill Gates, and Tesla Motors CEO Elon Musk. Gates admitted last month that he doesn’t “understand why some people are not concerned” by the threat of AI. Speaking to the Centre for the Study of Existential Risk at the University of Cambridge last week, Shanahan argued that AI development faces two options. Either a potentially dangerous AI is developed – with no moral reasoning and based on ruthless optimization processes – or scientists develop AI based on human brains, borrowing from our psychology and even neurology. “Right now, my vote is for option two, in the hope that it will lead to a form of harmonious co-existence [with humanity],” Shanahan said. AI based on the human brain would not be possible without first mapping the organ – a task the Human Connectome Project (HCP) is undertaking and aims to complete by late 2015. However, once the map is complete, it could take years to analyze all the data gathered. Experts disagree as to how long it will be before AI is successfully developed – or if it is even possible. Estimates range from 15 years to 100 years from now, with Shanahan believing that by the year 2100, AI will be “increasingly likely but still not certain.” Whether the technology is helpful or harmful to humans depends on which of Shanahan’s two options becomes the driving force behind its development. There is a fear that current economic and political systems are leading to the development of option one – a machine with no moral reasoning. “Capitalist forces will drive incentive to produce ruthless maximization processes. With this there is the temptation to develop risky things,” Shanahan said. For Shanahan, risky things include AI which could rig elections, subvert markets, or become dangerous military technology. “Within the military sphere governments will build these things just in case the others do it, so it's a very difficult process to stop.” Shanahan’s comments echo fears expressed by Gates and Musk last year, both of whom were influenced by Nick Bostrom’s book “Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies,” he said. In his book 'Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies,' Nick Bostrom – a professor of philosophy at Oxford University – argues that if machine brains surpass humans in intelligence, they could eventually replace us as the dominant species on earth. “As the fate of the gorillas now depends more on us humans than on the gorillas themselves,” Bostrom writes, “so the fate of our species then would come to depend on the actions of the machine superintelligence.” After reading Bostrom's book, Musk warned that the threat posed by AI could be greater than nuclear weapons. He donated $10 million to the Future of Life Institute in January, a global research program aimed at keeping AI beneficial to humanity.

#### 6 – knowledge policing disad: frames standards---capitalist economics coalesce through discursive realism

McCarraher 19 [Eugene; 11/12/19; Associate Professor of Humanities at Villanova University, PhD in US Cultural and Intellectual History from Rutgers University; The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became the Religion of Modernity, p. 15-18]

Words such as “paradise” or “love” or “communion” are certainly absent from our political vernacular, excluded on account of their “utopian” connotations or their lack of steely-eyed “realism.” Although this is a book about the past, I have always kept before me its larger contemporary religious, philosophical, and political implications. The book should make these clear enough; I will only say here that one of my broader intentions is to challenge the canons of “realism,” especially as defined in the “science” of economics. As the master science of desire in advanced capitalist nations, economics and its acolytes define the parameters of our moral and political imaginations, patrolling the boundaries of possibility and censoring any more generous conception of human affairs. Under the regime of neoliberalism, it has been the chief weapon in the arsenal of what David Graeber has characterized as “a war on the imagination,” a relentless assault on our capacity to envision an end to the despotism of money.24 Insistent, in Margaret Thatcher’s ominous ukase, that “there is no alternative” to capitalism, our corporate plutocracy has been busy imposing its own beatific vision on the world: the empire of capital, with an imperial aristocracy enriched by the labor of a fearful, overburdened, and cheerfully servile population of human resources. Every avenue of escape from accumulation and wage servitude must be closed, or better yet, rendered inconceivable; any map of the world that includes utopia must be burned before it can be glanced at. Better to follow Miller’s wisdom: we already inhabit paradise, and we can never make ourselves fit to live in it if we obey the avaricious and punitive sophistry professed in the dismal pseudoscience.

The grotesque ontology of scarcity and money, the tawdry humanism of acquisitiveness and conflict, the reduction of rationality to the mercenary principles of pecuniary reason—this ensemble of falsehoods that comprise the foundation of economics must be resisted and supplanted. Economics must be challenged, not only as a sanction for injustice but also as a specious portrayal of human beings and a fictional account of their history. As a legion of anthropologists and historians have repeatedly demonstrated, economics, in Graeber’s forthright dismissal, has “little to do with anything we observe when we examine how economic life is actually conducted.” From its historically illiterate “myth of barter” to its shabby and degrading claims about human nature, economics is not just a dismal but a fundamentally fraudulent science as well, akin, as Ruskin wrote in Unto This Last, to “alchemy, astrology, witchcraft, and other such popular creeds.”25

Ruskin’s courageous and bracing indictment of economics arose from his Romantic imagination, and this book partakes unashamedly of his sacramental Romanticism. “Imagination” was, to the Romantics, primarily a form of vision, a mode of realism, an insight into the nature of reality that was irreducible to, but not contradictory of, the knowledge provided by scientific investigation. Romantic social criticism did not claim the imprimatur of science as did Marxism and other modern social theories, yet the Romantic lineage of opposition to “disenchantment” and capitalism has proved to be more resilient and humane than Marxism, “progressivism,” or social democracy. Indeed, it is more urgently relevant to a world hurtling ever faster to barbarism and ecological calamity. I wrote this book in part out of a belief that many on the “left” continue to share far too much with their antagonists: an ideology of “progress” defined as unlimited economic growth and technological development, as well as an acceptance of the myth of disenchantment that underwrites the pursuit of such expansion. The Romantic antipathy to capitalism, mechanization, and disenchantment stemmed not from a facile and nostalgic desire to return to the past, but from a view that much of what passed for “progress” was in fact inimical to human flourishing: a specious productivity that required the acceptance of venality, injustice, and despoliation; a technological and organizational efficiency that entailed the industrialization of human beings; and the primacy of the production of goods over the cultivation and nurturance of men and women. This train of iniquities followed inevitably from the chauvinism of what William Blake called “single vision,” a blindness to the enormity of reality that led to a “Babylon builded in the waste.”26

Romantics redefined rather than rejected “realism” and “progress,” drawing on the premodern customs and traditions of peasants, artisans, and artists: craftsmanship, mutual aid, and a conception of property that harkened back to the medieval practices of “the commons.” Whether they believed in some traditional form of religion or translated it into secular idioms of enchantment, such as “art” or “beauty” or “organism,” Romantic anticapitalists tended to favor direct workers’ control of production; the restoration of a human scale in technics and social relations; a sensitivity to the natural world that precluded its reduction to mere instrumental value; and an apotheosis of pleasure in making sometimes referred to as poesis, a union of reason, imagination, and creativity, an ideal of labor as a poetry of everyday life, and a form of human divinity. In work free of alienation and toil, we receive “the reward of creation,” as William Morris described it through a character in News from Nowhere (1890), “the wages that God gets, as people might have said time agone.”27

Rendered gaudy and impoverished by the tyranny of economics and the enchantment of neoliberal capitalism, our sensibilities need replenishment from the sacramental imagination. As Americans begin to experience the initial stages of imperial sclerosis and decline, and as the advanced capitalist world in general discovers the reality of ecological limits, we may find in what Marx called the “prehistory” of our species a perennial and redemptive wisdom. We will not be saved by our money, our weapons, or our technological virtuosity; we might be rescued by the joyful and unprofitable pursuits of love, beauty, and contemplation. No doubt this will all seem foolish to the shamans and magicians of pecuniary enchantment. But there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of on Wall Street or in Silicon Valley.

#### C – Shareholder value maximization ensures green assets can’t solve.

Katharina Pistor 9/21. Professor of Comparative Law at Columbia Law School. “The Myth of Green Capitalism.” Project Syndicate. 9/21/2021. <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/green-capitalism-myth-no-market-solution-to-climate-change-by-katharina-pistor-2021-09>

NEW YORK – Heat waves, floods, droughts, and wildfires are devastating communities around the world, and they will only grow more severe. While climate-change deniers remain powerful, the need for urgent action is now recognized well beyond activist circles. Governments, international organizations, and even business and finance are bowing to the inevitable – or so it seems. In fact, the world has wasted decades tinkering with carbon trading and “green” financial labeling schemes, and the current vogue is merely to devise fancy hedging strategies (“carbon offsets”) in defiance of the simple fact that humanity is sitting in the same boat. “Offsetting” may serve individual asset holders, but it will do little to avert the climate disaster that awaits us all. The private sector’s embrace of “green capitalism” appears to be yet another gimmick to avoid a real reckoning. If business and finance leaders were serious, they would recognize the need to change course drastically to ensure that this planet remains hospitable for all of humanity now and in the future. This is not about substituting brown assets for green ones, but about sharing the losses that brown capitalism has imposed on millions and ensuring a future even for the most vulnerable. The notion of green capitalism implies that the costs of addressing climate change are too high for governments to shoulder on their own, and that the private sector always has better answers. So, for advocates of green capitalism, public-private partnership will ensure that the transition from brown to green capitalism will be cost-neutral. Efficiently priced investments in new technologies supposedly will prevent humanity from stepping over into the abyss. But this sounds too good to be true, because it is. Capitalism’s DNA makes it unfit to cope with the fallout from climate change, which in no small part is the product of capitalism itself. The entire capitalist system is premised on the privatization of gains and the socialization of losses – not in any nefarious fashion, but with the blessing of the law. The law offers licenses to externalize the costs of despoiling the planet to anybody who is smart enough to establish a trust or corporate entity before generating pollution. It encourages the off-loading of accrued environmental liabilities through restructuring in bankruptcy. And it holds entire countries hostage to international rules that privilege the protection of foreign investors’ returns over their own people’s welfare. Several countries have already been sued by foreign companies under the Energy Charter Treaty for trying to curb their carbon dioxide emissions. Two-thirds of total emissions since the Industrial Revolution have come from just 90 corporations. Yet even if the managers of the world’s worst polluters were willing to pursue rapid decarbonization, their shareholders would resist. For decades, the gospel of shareholder value maximization has reigned supreme, and managers have known that if they deviate from the orthodoxy, they will be sued for violating their fiduciary duties. No wonder Big Business and Big Finance now advocate climate disclosures as a way out. The message is that shareholders, not managers, must spur the necessary behavioral change; solutions must be found through the price mechanism, not through science-based policies. Left unanswered is the question of why investors with an easy exit option and plenty of hedging opportunities should care about the disclosure of future harm to some companies in their portfolio. There is obviously a need for more drastic changes, such as ca

rbon taxes, permanent moratoria on extracting natural resources, and so forth. These policies are often dismissed as mechanisms that would distort markets, and yet they idealize markets that don’t exist in the real world. After all, governments have lavishly subsidized fossil-fuel industries for decades, spending $5.5 trillion (both pre- and post-tax), or 6.8% of global GDP, in 2017. And should fossil-fuel companies ever run out of profits to offset these tax breaks, they can simply sell themselves to a more profitable company, thereby rewarding their shareholders for their loyalty. The script for these strategies has long been written in the law of mergers and acquisitions. 1 But the mother of all subsidies is the centuries-old process of legally encoding capital through property, corporate, trust, and bankruptcy law. It is law, not markets or firms, that protects the owners of capital assets even as they saddle others with enormous liabilities. Advocates of green capitalism are hoping to continue this game. That is why they are now lobbying governments to subsidize asset substitution, so that as the price of brown assets declines, the price of green ones will rise to compensate the asset holders. Again, this is what capitalism is all about. Whether it represents the best strategy for ensuring the planet’s habitability is an entirely different question. Instead of tackling such questions, governments and regulators have once again succumbed to the siren song of market-friendly mechanisms. The new consensus focuses on financial disclosure because that path promises change without having to deliver it. (It also happens to generate employment for entire industries of accountants, lawyers, and business consultants with powerful lobbying arms of their own.) Not surprisingly, the result has been a wave of greenwashing. The financial industry has happily poured trillions of dollars into green-labeled assets that turned out not to be green at all. According to a recent study, 71% of ESG-themed funds (supposedly reflecting environmental, social, or governance criteria) are negatively aligned with the goals of the Paris climate agreement. We are running out of time for such experiments. If greening the economy was really the goal, the first step would be to eliminate all direct subsidies and tax subsidies for brown capitalism and mandate a halt to carbon “proliferation.” Governments should also place a moratorium on shielding polluters, their owners, and investors from liability for environmental damages. Incidentally, these moves would also remove some of the worst market distortions around.

#### 3 – Ukraine proves cap unsustainable

Ross Douthat 22. Opinion columnist for The Times since 2009, former senior editor at the Atlantic, 1/22/22. “How to Retreat From Ukraine.” https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/22/opinion/russia-ukraine-us-nato.html

Now we face the same problem with Ukraine. The United States in its days as a hyperpower made a series of moves to extend our perimeter of influence deep into Russia’s near-abroad. Some of those moves appear to be sustainable: The expansion of NATO to include countries of the former Warsaw Pact was itself a risk, but at the moment those commitments seem secure. But the attempt to draw Ukraine out of Russia’s orbit, the partway-open door to Ukrainians who preferred westward-focused alliances, was a foolish overcommitment even when American power was at its height.

Note that this is not a question of what Ukrainians deserve. Russia is an authoritarian aggressor in the current crisis; Ukraine is a flawed democracy but a more decent regime than Vladimir Putin’s oligarchy. When we gave Ukraine security assurances under Bill Clinton, opened the door to NATO membership under George W. Bush and supported the Maidan protests under Barack Obama, we were in each case acting with better intentions than Moscow in its own machinations.

But in geopolitics good intentions are always downstream from the realities of power. Whatever its desires or ours, the government in Ukraine has simply never been in a position to fully join the West — it’s too economically weak, too internally divided and simply in the wrong place. And the actions of the Bush and Obama administrations — and for all of Trump’s personal sympathies for Putin, some Trump administration acts as well — have left us overstretched, our soft-power embrace of Kyiv ill-equipped to handle hard-power countermoves from Moscow.

#### 4 – Semiconductor shortages---filters aff offense

David Atkins 6-19. President of the Pollux Group, a Qualitative Research Firm. The Semiconductor Crisis Is a Failure of Modern Capitalism. Washington Monthly. 6-19-2021. https://washingtonmonthly.com/2021/06/19/the-semiconductor-crisis-is-a-failure-of-modern-capitalism-it-may-require-new-answerTop of Form

Bottom of Form

But there’s increasingly an argument to be made that a just-in-time lowest-cost supply system may not just be bad for the climate or for domestic employment. It may also in many cases be bad for business. The semiconductor crisis tells an exemplary tale. As information technology becomes essential to daily life in developed countries, semiconductors are essential for making the world go round. Phones, computers, gaming consoles and automobiles all require increasingly sophisticated semiconductors. And most of them are made by a single company: Taiwan Semiconductor. Indeed, Taiwan Semiconductor is so dominant in the field that few competitors can match them, and they’re falling farther behind.

Analysts say it will be difficult for other manufacturers to catch up in an industry that requires hefty capital investments. And TSMC can’t make enough chips to satisfy everyone—a fact that has become even clearer amid a global shortage, adding to the chaos of supply bottlenecks, higher prices for consumers and furloughed workers, especially in the auto industry.

The situation is similar in some ways to the world’s past reliance on Middle Eastern oil, with any instability on the island threatening to echo across industries. Companies in Taiwan, including smaller makers, generated about 65% of global revenues for outsourced chip manufacturing during the first quarter of this year, according to Taiwan-based semiconductor research firm TrendForce. TSMC generated 56% of the global revenues.

Being dependent on Taiwanese chips “poses a threat to the global economy,” research firm Capital Economics recently wrote.

The semiconductor shortage is harming vehicle production lines. It’s why the next generation gaming consoles that were supposed to be available last Christmas are still in vanishingly short supply. It is starting to impact smartphones and personal computers as well.

There are many correlated aspects to this problem. It’s partly a matter of national security: what does the global economy do when it relies so heavily on a single actor in a location of geopolitical instability? It’s partly a problem of monopoly: is the market truly free or stable if so many essential products depend on the fate of a single company? How can there be genuine competition if the cost of entry makes establishing new competition prohibitive? It’s partly a matter of the pandemic: Taiwan Semiconductor and other manufacturers have been struggling to meet production targets due to reduced capacity from COVID restrictions.

We have seen global supply chain failures hurt consumers frequently, especially when domestic production of essential goods are eliminated in favor of easily disrupted or costly global trade. Haiti, for instance, has been particularly victimized by the destruction of its domestic food production as the U.S. subsidized its own rice exports. The blocking of the Suez Canal by the Ever Green earlier this year was in part the result of larger and larger ships being forced through waterways that were not built to sustain them.

But the scale of the semiconductor issue raises the question of whether unregulated global capitalism is really the best way to run essential services in a world economy. Consider these staggering numbers from the same Wall Street Journal story:

Semiconductors have become so complex and capital-intensive that once a producer falls behind, it’s hard to catch up. Companies can spend billions of dollars and years trying, only to see the technological horizon recede further.

A single semiconductor factory can cost as much as $20 billion. One key manufacturing tool for advanced chip-making that imprints intricate circuit patterns on silicon costs upward of $100 million, requiring multiple planes to deliver.

TSMC’s own expansion plans call for spending $100 billion over the next three years. That’s nearly a quarter of the entire industry’s capital spending, according to semiconductor research firm VLSI Research.

#### 5 – Speculation---market overload

Nick Beams 21. Member of the International Editorial Board of the World Socialist Web Site and former longtime national secretary of the Socialist Equality Party in Australia. "Rampant Wall Street speculation: The fever chart of a terminally diseased system." World Socialist Web Site. 5-6-2021. https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2021/05/07/pers-m07.html

Over the past year, the global financial system, above all Wall Street, has been in the grip of a speculative mania, the like of which has never been seen before in economic history. Two questions therefore immediately arise: how has this situation come about and what are its implications?

In March 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic began to make its effects felt and workers undertook wildcat strikes and walkouts to demand health measures to protect their lives and those of their families, the financial markets plunged.

Wall Street was concerned that any effective health measures to contain the spread of the pandemic would result in a collapse in the bloated price of financial assets, above all stocks, that had been boosted by the trillions of dollars poured into the financial system by the US Federal Reserve and other central banks following the crash of 2008.

The US government and the Fed rode once again to the rescue of Wall Street. The Trump administration organised a multi-billion-dollar bailout of the corporations under the CARES Act while the Fed stepped in to provide trillions of dollars of support for all areas of the financial system, including for the first time the purchase of stocks.

Since then, on the back of this $4 trillion intervention and rising, as the Fed continues to purchase financial assets at the rate of more than $1.4 trillion a year, the world has seen an unprecedented orgy of financial speculation.

Wall Street’s main stock index, the S&P 500, has risen by some 88 percent since its March 2020 lows, reaching record highs on multiple occasions throughout the past year. Margin debt, used to finance the speculation in shares, has reached record levels, and the yield on the lowest-rated corporate junk bonds—barely one step away from default—has fallen to historic lows.

But the most egregious expression of the speculation has been the rise of the cryptocurrency market. Over the past year the most prominent cryptocurrency, Bitcoin, has risen by 600 percent, rising from about $7,000 per bitcoin to $54,000, reaching a high of $65,000 in the middle of last month.

Last month Coinbase, a trading exchange for cryptocurrencies, launched itself on Wall Street with a floatation that put its market value at $85 billion, compared to its valuation of $8 billion in 2018, exceeding that of some of the world’s major banks and the valuation of the NASDAQ exchange on which it was launched.

However, in recent days, even the level of bitcoin speculation has been put in the shade by another cryptocurrency, Dogecoin.

It was created in 2013 as a joke. Whereas the promoters of Bitcoin insist that it has some intrinsic value because it may be used to organise financial transactions without the intervention of a bank or some other third party via a blockchain ledger system, no such claims are made for Dogecoin.

Despite being worthless, Dogecoin has risen in price 11,000 percent this year alone. This week its market value reached $87 billion compared to $315 million a year ago. And as one cryptocurrency enjoys a rapid rise, speculators start a search for the next “big thing.”

The Dogecoin phenomenon is not an isolated event. It seems to be an expression of what could be described as a new operating principle in the world of speculation—the more worthless the so-called asset, the higher its price.

A little sandwich shop in Paulsboro, New Jersey, with sales of just $13,976, has made financial news after it was revealed that its parent company, Hometown International, achieved a market valuation of $100 million last month. Two of its biggest shareholders are Duke and Vanderbilt universities.

The rise of Dogecoin also reveals the high-level intervention of hedge funds and other financial institutions seeking to take advantage of its price momentum.

Then there is the case of non-fungible tokens (NFTs). These are images of pieces of art, a sports photo, or even a tweet—the first ever tweet issued by Twitter founder Jack Dorsey was sold as an NFT for $2.9 million—that are stored on a blockchain ledger. They are like a collector’s item but are not stored physically but digitally.

The class dynamics of this speculative orgy, fuelled by the endless supply of virtually free money by the Fed, are revealed in the escalation of the wealth of the world’s billionaires.

In the last year, as COVID-19 brought untold pain, suffering and economic distress for billions of the world’s people, the combined wealth of the global billionaires rose by 60 percent, from $8 trillion to $13.1 trillion. The number of billionaires rose by 660 to 2,775—the highest rate of increase and the largest number ever.

In the US, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos and Tesla CEO Elon Musk have wealth of $177 billion and $151 billion respectively.

The speculative frenzy has extended into the broader economy. The prices of major industrial commodities, such as steel, lumber, copper, and soybeans, which feed into inflation for workers and consumers, are rapidly rising.

But the financial authorities, having created this frenzy by the endless outflow of cheap money since the crash of 2008 and the near collapse of March 2020, are caught in a trap of their own making. They fear that any move to try to bring it under control, with even a slight tightening of the financial spigots, will set off a financial crisis.

The extreme nervousness over such an outcome was revealed earlier this week when US Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, a former Fed chief, raised the prospect that the central bank may have to tighten interest rates at some point. Almost immediately, fearing market reaction, she walked back the comment saying she was neither advocating nor predicting a rise in rates.

The incident has cast a revealing light on one of the most significant developments in the US—the open advocacy of unionisation of the workforce by the Biden administration.

Last month in an executive order, Biden created a “White House Task Force on Worker Organizing and Empowerment” which includes as members Yellen, Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin and Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. The “empowerment” of government-sponsored unions takes place under the direction of cabinet officials responsible for military operations, economic policy and domestic repression.

The administration is fearful that the pent-up anger in the working class over the pandemic and the enrichment of the financial oligarchy at the expense of hundreds of thousands of lives, will be further fuelled by the escalation of inflation, leading to an uncontrolled eruption of the class struggle that will come into headlong conflict with the institutions of the capitalist state.

In times past, the Fed would have moved to contain such an upsurge by lifting interest rates and inducing a recession. But that road is now fraught with danger because even a relatively small increase threatens to bring down the speculative financial house of cards.

Hence the Biden administration has moved to set up a state-sponsored industrial police force, based on the trade unions, to carry out an organised suppression of the working class in the interests of finance capital.

The rampant speculation of the past year and the accelerated siphoning of wealth to the upper levels of society amid death and economic devastation must be the occasion for the drawing up by the working class of a balance sheet of the experiences through which it has passed.

There is no prospect for reform of the present capitalist socio-economic order towards meeting social need—the illusion peddled by the Democrats and their ardent supporters in the pseudo-left organisations. The past year has demonstrated that everything in society—including the very right to life itself—is subordinated to the insatiable demands of finance capital.

The present speculative bubble, like all others before it, is destined to burst. The financial oligarchs have already prepared their exit plans and golden parachutes as they have done in the past. The working class, however, has no escape. The collapse will bring an even greater economic disaster on top of what has already taken place.

The only viable, realistic solution to the terminal disease that has gripped the capitalist socio-economic order is the fight for a socialist program to wrest the commanding heights of the economy and its financial system out of the hands of the present-day ruling class and begin the economic reconstruction of society to meet social needs.

#### 6 – Hegemony – its unsustainable

Carpenter 14—Senior Fellow for Defense and Foreign Policy Studies at CATO and a PhD in US Diplomatic History at the University of Texas [Ted, “US Security Retrenchment: The First Effects of a Modest Shift, “17 Mar 2014, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/us-security-retrenchment-first-effects-modest-shift>]

There are abundant signs that the halcyon days of US military intervention around the world may be coming to an end. Not only did Washington execute a complete withdrawal of its troops from Iraq, but the seemingly endless war in Afghanistan is drawing to a close, and even the goal of keeping a small residual force in that country appears to be fading. The Obama administration’s latest defense budget proposal ends the robust annual increases in spending that have been the norm since the 9-11 terrorist attacks. Indeed, the projected number of ground forces would be the lowest since the eve of World War II.

Those changes have led politicians and pundits in the United States and in many allied countries to speculate, indeed fret, that America is about to embrace “isolationism.” As various foreign policy scholars have pointed out, however, that term is a vacuous slur that has been used repeatedly over the decades to stifle healthy debate about the nature of America’s role in the world. Contrary to the latest upsurge of such fears and warnings, the United States is not about to become a hermit republic and wall itself off from the rest of the world. A more selective, restrained role, however, is now highly probable, reflecting growing financial constraints on the US government and the wishes of a war-weary public that has learned some hard, painful lessons. That shift will affect various regions of the world in different ways.

One area where the US tendency to intervene militarily is already on the decline is the Middle East/Southwest Asia. Washington’s frustrating and ultimately unsuccessful crusades in Iraq and Afghanistan have had a noticeable impact on the attitudes of the American people. Public opinion surveys over the past two years indicate that a majority of respondents now believe that both wars were a mistake. That outcome is more surprising and significant regarding Afghanistan than Iraq. Once the intelligence reports that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction proved false, Americans soon concluded that the Iraq intervention was a war of choice — and a bad choice at that. But the Afghanistan war was a direct response to the 9-11 attacks. For the American people to turn against that mission suggests not only war weariness, but a growing belief that putting the US military at risk in an attempt to change the Muslim world is a fool’s errand. That same belief drove the overwhelming public opposition to the Obama administration’s proposed intervention in the Syrian civil war.

Just as the disastrous experience in Vietnam inoculated the American republic against similar interventions in Southeast Asia, the Iraq and Afghanistan debacles will likely make both the public and future administrations wary of extended missions in the Muslim world. Short, sharp punitive expeditions in response to terrorist attacks will remain an option, but extended deployments, much less amorphous nation-building missions, will be increasingly improbable. The surge of oil and gas production in the United States is even making the “petroleum justification” for extensive US involvement in the Middle East far less compelling than it seemed in the past.

Before the onset of the Ukraine crisis, it appeared likely that Europe was another arena where the US security role would shrink. Except for the turmoil in the former Yugoslavia and the brief dust up between Russia and Georgia in 2008, Europe’s security environment has been gratifyingly quiescent since the end of the Cold War. With the demise of the Soviet Union there certainly was no credible great power expansionist threat. In response to the changed conditions, Washington reduced its troop presence from some 300,000 in the late 1980s to fewer than 70,000. Calls from US leaders for the European allies to take more responsibility for the region’s security and bear a greater share of NATO’s collective defense obligations grew more insistent.

At a meeting of NATO defense ministers on February 26, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel warned his counterparts that they must step up their commitment to the Alliance or watch it become irrelevant. Rebalancing NATO’s “burden-sharing and capabilities,” Hagel stressed, “is mandatory, not elective.” And lest his colleagues miss the unsubtle hint that the United States intended to shift much of the collective security burden to Europe, he added: “America’s contributions in NATO remain starkly disproportionate, so adjustments [i.e. reductions] in the US defense budget cannot become an excuse for further cuts in European defense spending.”

Moscow’s drive to annex Crimea, and the Kremlin’s overall menacing posture toward Ukraine, has altered the European security dynamic to some extent, but the long-term change in US policy may prove less dramatic than one might anticipate. It is a stretch to portray Russia with its aging, declining population, a military with many antiquated components, and possessing merely the world’s eighth largest economy as posing a security threat equivalent to one the Soviet Union could muster in its heyday.

Furthermore, although political and policy elites in the United States are agitated by recent developments and focus on ways to punish Russia for its actions, the American public shows no eagerness to embark on a new Cold War. Senator John McCain thunders that the United States should provide “massive” military aid to Kiev, and even more moderate political figures insist on the need to impose punishing economic sanctions and possibly make a show of military force in Eastern Europe and the Black Sea. But a new Pew Research poll reveals a very different public attitude. Most Americans, including majorities in all three major political factions — Republicans, Democrats, and independents — believe that the United States should stay out of the Ukraine crisis. Since a whopping 61% of independents adopt that view, office seekers ignore that perspective at their peril.

While there is likely to be a more limited, restrained US military role in both Europe and the Muslim world, there is one region where there are few signs of even a modest retrenchment: East Asia. Indeed, that is one area of the world where Washington’s security presence may even increase modestly. The Obama administration’s announced “rebalancing” or strategic pivot to East Asia in 2009 reflected uneasiness about China’s growing military capabilities and overall regional influence. China remains a crucial US economic partner, and few American opinion leaders favor an openly confrontational policy toward Beijing. At the same time, there is little sentiment for even a limited appeasement policy, and none at all for a willingness to let China become the hegemon of East Asia. American public opinion seems in accord with elite preferences on this issue. Some 53% of Americans in a February 2014 Gallup poll viewed China unfavorably, while only 43% had a favorable view of that country. An earlier Pew survey found that 53% of respondents considered China’s emergence as a great power to be a “major threat” to the United States.

The combination of those various factors suggests that there will be little or no US security retrenchment in East Asia. The outcomes in Europe and the Muslim world are likely to be quite different; Washington’s role may well be far more modest and selective in the coming years. That probability places a special responsibility on the European Union, especially its leading members. European nations will need to become more serious about

the continent’s security affairs, including taking steps to counter Russia in the unlikely event that its territorial ambitions extend beyond Ukraine and other countries directly on its borders. Europe also will need to become more proactive in dealing with both problems and opportunities in the Middle East and North Africa, where it has significant security and economic interests at stake.

Retrenchment does not mean that the United States is sliding into isolationism. America’s own extensive global economic interests preclude adopting a course that even faintly resembles that emotional stereotype. But the days of America being the global policeman, much less the global armed social worker, appear to be coming to an end. That change will require adjustments, perhaps even painful adjustments, on the part of the European powers and other nations.

#### It’s reciprocal – fiatting attitudinal, durable enforcement of antitrust despite lack of political will and the ongoing effects of Republican court packing is utopian – we get the equal right to test desirability, not feasibility.

Paul Mason 7-17-15. Writer of Live Working or Die Fighting: How the Working Class Went Global and [PostCapitalism: A Guide to our Future](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PostCapitalism:_A_Guide_to_our_Future). Culture and Digital Editor of Channel 4 News. Visiting Professor at the University of Wolverhampton. Bachelors in Music and Politics from the University of Sheffield. "The end of capitalism has begun," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun

The power of imagination will become critical. In an information society, no thought, debate or dream is wasted – whether conceived in a tent camp, prison cell or the table football space of a startup company. As with virtual manufacturing, in the transition to postcapitalism the work done at the design stage can reduce mistakes in the implementation stage. And the design of the postcapitalist world, as with software, can be modular. Different people can work on it in different places, at different speeds, with relative autonomy from each other. If I could summon one thing into existence for free it would be a global institution that modelled capitalism correctly: an open source model of the whole economy; official, grey and black. Every experiment run through it would enrich it; it would be open source and with as many datapoints as the most complex climate models. The main contradiction today is between the possibility of free, abundant goods and information; and a system of monopolies, banks and governments trying to keep things private, scarce and commercial. Everything comes down to the struggle between the network and the hierarchy: between old forms of society moulded around capitalism and new forms of society that prefigure what comes next. ... Is it utopian to believe we’re on the verge of an evolution beyond capitalism? We live in a world in which gay men and women can marry, and in which contraception has, within the space of 50 years, made the average working-class woman freer than the craziest libertine of the Bloomsbury era. Why do we, then, find it so hard to imagine economic freedom? It is the elites, cut off in their dark-limo world, whose project looks forlorn It is the elites – cut off in their dark-limo world – whose project looks as forlorn as that of the millennial sects of the 19th century. The democracy of riot squads, corrupt politicians, magnate-controlled newspapers and the surveillance state looks as phoney and fragile as East Germany did 30 years ago. All readings of human history have to allow for the possibility of a negative outcome. It haunts us in the zombie movie, the disaster movie, in the post-apocalytic wasteland of films such as [*The Road*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/movie/131971/road) or [*Elysium*](https://www.theguardian.com/film/2013/aug/22/elysium-review). But why should we not form a picture of the ideal life, built out of abundant information, non-hierarchical work and the dissociation of work from wages? Millions of people are beginning to realise they have been sold a dream at odds with what reality can deliver. Their response is anger – and retreat towards national forms of capitalism that can only tear the world apart. Watching these emerge, from the pro-Grexit left factions in Syriza to the [Front National](https://www.theguardian.com/world/marine-le-pen) and the isolationism of the American right has been like watching the nightmares we had during the [Lehman Brothers](https://www.theguardian.com/business/lehmanbrothers) crisis come true. We need more than just a bunch of utopian dreams and small-scale horizontal projects. We need a project based on reason, evidence and testable designs, that cuts with the grain of history and is sustainable by the planet. And we need to get on with it.

#### 2 – Fragmentation is our solvency – creates leftist experimentation for more buy-in

Chris Wright 21. Professor of History, Florida International University. “Marxism and the Solidarity Economy: Toward a New Theory of Revolution” *Class, Race and Corporate Power* 9(1). https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1173&context=classracecorporatepower.]

From one perspective, the fragmentation of the contemporary left isn’t even a terrible thing. For it arises, in part, from the fragmentation of society itself, the dissolution of an integral capitalist civil society and the nation-state. A decaying social fabric—and a decaying national state—signifies, in the long run, a decaying corporate capitalism, a doomed civilization. It was different during the Great Depression, though: then, it was clear very quickly to far-seeing liberals that what was necessary to save capitalism was a stronger state, more state intervention in the economy, and stronger labor unions to bargain for high wages and so keep demand high and the economy running. With the strengthening of the state and unions would come a repairing of the social fabric and, in fact, the heyday of the nation-state system. Now, ninety years later, no one has a clear idea of how to save society (neoliberal globalization having made Keynesian nationalism impracticable)—which, in a sense, is a good thing for radicals, because it suggests that we really are approaching the end of the capitalist epoch. Systems and institutions are floundering; the left, for now, is floundering, as is the center, as is (in some cases) the right. But all this floundering opens up space for “decentralized” innovation, grassroots experimentation, localism and regionalism, under-the-radar moves toward cooperativism. This slow, semi-interstitial process is the natural way in which social (economic) systems yield to their successors.

Another respect in which the present has promise is that its transnational framework militates against fascism. Whatever revolutionary potential the 1930s had was vitiated by the consolidation of state capitalism, which in this early phase was easily susceptible to fascism, or “palingenetic ultra-nationalism.”105 Fascist movements marched all over Europe in the 1930s, and in some cases they achieved total or partial control of the state. After all, they were useful to certain sections of the ruling class in their struggle to beat back the labor movement, Socialists, and Communists. At present, the same goal exists among similar reactionary entities of beating back the labor movement and progressivism of whatever form, and, as we have seen with business support of the Tea Party and Donald Trump, some of these entities are even willing to bankroll proto-fascist movements for this purpose. It is also true that as the middle class declines, one can expect many of the aggrieved to have sympathy with right-wing causes and organizations. This fact presents clear dangers for the left.

Nevertheless, the dangers are surely not what they were in the 1930s. The point, again, is that the world is simply too interconnected now, and transnational corporations have too much power, for a return to the era of sovereign and autonomous nations to occur. In the thirties it was easier to assemble and consolidate the political apparatus of reactionary ultra-nationalism than it is in an age of advanced globalization, unparalleled access to information from global sources, widespread higher education, and greater political sophistication among the elite than when they allowed outright fascist leaders to achieve total power in the early twentieth century. Nor should we discount the lessons that people and institutions have learned from the experiences with Italian Fascism and German Nazism. Historical memory is not always acute, but in this case its power is not insignificant. Proto-fascist movements can do enormous damage, but the possibility seems minimal that they will decisively take over many national governments and start World War III. Worldwide, it is likely that far more people will join progressive movements than fascist ones.

As for the much-discussed decline of the middle class, there are silver linings in this. One would be a fool to deny it is causing untold human suffering and is a fundamental manifestation, even a cause, of the horrors that are wrecking society.106 A Marxian, “dialectical” standpoint, however, which sees the good in the bad and vice versa, can complicate the narrative of unmitigated catastrophe. For the “middle class”—by no means a monolithic entity—has tended to be the bastion of centrist conservatism, the ballast that has steadied the course of capitalism (or, frequently, turned it to the right). No transition to post-capitalism could have occurred as long as the middle class was stable and intact, because few people whose material circumstances are satisfactory would ever give that up to fight for the mere hope, and the very risky prospect, of a completely different social system.107 That is to say, as long as traditional labor unionism was strong, thus keeping the middle class strong, revolutionary hopes were doomed. Unions and collective bargaining had to decline—as did the welfare state—in order for radical possibilities to open up. This is an unpleasant and ironic truth that many leftists prefer to deny, but it is true. As I have argued, a post-capitalist order never could have happened within the corporatist framework of the nation-state; and industrial unionism and the welfare state were essential components of the mature Western nation-state. So they had to go. (And they were bound to go sooner or later, given capital’s aggressiveness and its increasing mobility on a global scale.) In any case, capitalism cannot end except in the context of economic crisis, as Marx sensibly argued. And crisis on the scale necessary is incompatible with the existence of a large and protected middle class. So the decline of this “class,” while presenting dangers in the form of proto-fascism, is a necessary prerequisite to a transition out of capitalism.108

The old question remains: is such a transition “inevitable,” as many Marxists have thought? Is corporate capitalism necessarily going to succumb to its own contradictions and to the crises, and resistance, it engenders? On this question, too, I’m an optimist, as I indicated above. For one thing, no social system is permanent; everything in history is transitory and in flux. More substantively, I agree with István Mészáros: “The fraudulence and domination of capital and the exploitation of the working class cannot go on forever. The producers cannot be kept constantly and forever under control.”109 Indeed, the inevitability of the current social order’s demise seems so obvious to me I can scarcely argue for it. The facts speak for themselves: no civilization can possibly weather all the crises that are in their infancy now. Radical reforms are inevitable.

One way the future may play out is that such reforms, eventually supported by much of the elite, continue to spread globally for many decades as social instability increases. They build up a constituency that acquires a vested interest in their maintenance and expansion. Since national governments and bureaucracies are simultaneously becoming ever more dysfunctional and inadequate to the task of ensuring social order, the “reforms” frequently amount to a partial ceding of powers to the regional, local, and international scales. Military and police repression of far-left movements continues in many places, and such movements or parties are rarely permitted to capture national governments (because they’re too important), but on less visible scales, such as the local and regional, “the people” do have more and more say in governance—because the elite finds it necessary to make some concessions, and it is less dangerous to do so on lower levels of governance than on higher levels. Nevertheless, even on the level of national governments one can predict that the left makes slow progress—simply because the right can’t control things forever, otherwise society would completely collapse. The left’s increasing success is partly a result, too, of the fact that the ranks of the hyper-elite are thinning due to the repeated bursting of economic bubbles, the protraction of economic crisis, and the consequent colossal destruction of wealth.

As the centers of global capitalism become more preoccupied with internal problems while having fewer resources to devote to policing world politics on behalf of corporate interests, left-wing movements in the global South have greater success against their governments. Quite possibly, democratic initiatives such as have been pursued in Kerala, India become more common, as do participatory budgeting, public banking, and comparable experiments. This gives more resources to the left, which therefore grows. Social and physical infrastructure continues to decay in places where the right still has control and improves where the left does—but, because the left is growing, the long-term trends are largely positive. Environmental destruction and economic stagnation counteract these trends, but in many regions governments are able to alleviate the effects of these negative forces by, for instance, establishing cooperatives, coordinating the distribution of resources to where they’re needed most, and perhaps nationalizing industries. Regarding the natural environment, the severity of the crises and the clamoring of the people finally force governments to take substantive measures against global warming and other forms of ecological destruction—although for centuries to come, environmental disasters are doubtless frequent and devastating. Indeed, billions of people in the next century are, surely, severely affected by global warming and associated calamities, so that innumerable interand intra-governmental organizations are established to address these problems (through geoengineering, for example). On local levels, governments tolerate and even encourage the proliferation of “solidarity institutions” we cannot presently foresee to mitigate the impact of extreme weather patterns.

#### 2 – State power will back off. Desperation for public legitimacy and support fueled by social protests has left politicians open to concede market failures.

Silke Helfrich & David Bollier 19. Helfrich studied romance languages and pedagogy at the Karl-Marx-University in Leipzig, served as head of Heinrich Böll Foundation Thuringia and head of the regional office of Heinrich Böll Foundation for Central America, Cuba and Mexico. Bollier worked in policy advocacy with a Member of Congress, the auto safety regulatory agency, and public-interest organizations, and co-founded Public Knowledge, a Washington advocacy organization for the public’s stake in the Internet, telecom and copyright policy.“ Free, Fair, and Alive : The Insurgent Power of the Commons” July 2019.

Revamping State Power to Support Commoning We have outlined a general stance towards the state in moving forward, but we have not burrowed into the deeper questions: In what specific ways can state power itself be altered to support commoning? What openings in law and bureaucratic behavior, or in politics and local action, might be exploited to secure stable beachheads for commoning? The first priority is to convince state institutions to back off. Recall Elinor Ostrom’s wisdom in her seventh design principle for successful commons. She asserted that state authorities must recognize the right of commoners to govern themselves.42 External governmental authorities must not challenge the right of the users of common resources (or “appropriators,” in Ostrom’s language) to devise their own rules and governance regimes. This is our starting point and a minimal requirement. We could derive a principle of noninterference from it. The state must get out of the way so that commoners can engage in the value-generating activities that only they can do. Given the realities, however, commons may find that they need legal recognition to grow and flourish. In instances where state institutions regard sharing as a crime — e.g., seed sharing, software collaborations, information sharing — commoning must be decriminalized. This is part of normalizing commons and acknowledging that the moral and political legitimacy of commoning exists prior to and independent of modern states.43 Consider how state power has been used to let investors form corporations and limit their liability, ostensibly because such organizational forms serve the public good. Monarchs and, later, legislatures saw corporations as a way to encourage activities that the state itself could not or did not want to undertake. Early ventures such as the investor-owned British East India Company, for example, developed colonial trade regimes, extracted natural resources, exploited cheap labor, and built railroads and waterways. Why shouldn’t state power also recognize the immense value generated by commoners by granting their institutions legal standing? Such recognition will not come easily, of course. Political leaders and bureaucrats who bow down before the standard economic narrative have trouble seeing other modes of value. Moreover, some state institutions themselves are designed to depend on market revenues. For example, the European Patent Office — an interstate governance body that grants patents under the European Patent Convention — is designed to finance most of its one billion euro budget by collecting fees from patent applicants. Since the more patents it grants, the more money it collects, the Patent Office has a strong incentive to make more scientific and technical knowledge proprietary. While it is understandable to charge patent holders for services provided — and not, say, the general taxpayer — this mechanism is a disincentive to support a world in which we Share Knowledge Generously. Such a societal ideal tends to be regarded as aberrant, if not faintly ridiculous. So are any ambitions to achieve social harmony and intergenerational continuity and protect cultural heritage. As for the potential contributions that subsistence communities and nomadic tribes make to eco-sensitive choices, many moderns continue to depict them as primitive, uncivilized, and hopelessly backward.44 Thus, we are imprisoned within a progress narrative validated and reproduced by state institutions. We are told the economy must grow (to fulfill targets contrived by corporations) so that we can compete successfully on the global market. World leaders urge us not to fall behind. Being outpaced in technological innovation is considered by the business and political communities to be the worst fate of all. One innovation after another — driverless cars, synthetic biology, nanotechnology — is pushed through regulatory procedures, at times with too little time to consider the full societal costs and benefits. All this makes it difficult for people to embrace a shift to the commons. Moreover, guardians of state power understandably think: why should the state cede any authority to nonmarket, decentralized activities or provide funding support to things that have no market value? It would only enrage elites and disrupt internal political arrangements. In addition, letting people withdraw from the circuitry of the market/state system will only embolden the yearning for self-determination, goes the thinking … and that could be dangerous. It would only encourage unregulated activity, amateur experimentation, and perhaps demands for greater autonomy. The guardians of state power may understandably fear that if people decommodify their everyday lives and wean themselves away from dependencies on market/state systems, it will reduce the state’s moral standing, political authority, and tax revenues. Thus the challenge: if the commons is going to evolve as an alternative matrix of governance and provisioning, it must somehow overcome a deep-seated skepticism about commoning among many bureaucrats, politicians, and governments. This does not mean that no workarounds are possible. As stated earlier, the state is not a monolithic institution. State decision makers, despite their zeal in defending their authority, could find it advantageous to authorize and support commoning under the right circumstances. At the local level, this means: allocating land for community gardens and co-housing; facilitating the formation of community land banks and trusts; encouraging local agriculture and food systems; using open source software in public administration; providing free community Wi-Fi everywhere; using open educational resources (OER) in classrooms; providing space and support for timebanks, repair cafés, hackerspaces, and much more. This is not a quixotic agenda. Those who wield state power are mindful of the need for public support and legitimacy. Many politicians, feeling the heat from fierce social protests against extractivism and the international trade regime, are looking for credible ways to escape the iron cage of neoliberal capitalism. Some political leaders are willing to concede the failures of the market/progress narrative to address climate breakdown, inequality, poverty, and hunger; but on the other hand, they are also fearful of breaking from dogmas about free markets and national identity. Around the world, many authoritarians have seized upon the many failures of the market/state system to promote various forms of nationalism. Although a complicated and varied process, much of this political trend is fueled by a search for meaning, purpose, and belonging that the market/state is incapable of fulfilling. The political left and center, meanwhile, cling to conventional vehicles for change: new laws, policies, programs, and procedural reform. While sometimes significant, these approaches generally are carried out in distant state venues (courts, legislatures, government agencies) and fail to engage people personally. In the end, many liberals and social democrats remain tethered to the dominant narrative of progress and show little interest in bottom-up empowerment or social transformation. The cultural dimensions of commons-based initiatives such as agroecology, community land trusts, platform cooperatives, and cosmo-local production, are generally ignored or seen as too small and inconsequential to be taken seriously. Businesses, for their part, generally see them as threats to their market share and profits.

## Heg

#### I’ll go card by card:

#### 1 – Beckley evidence – China’s not revisinoist

Jalil, 19 [Ghazala Yasmin, Research fellow at the Institute of Strategic Studies, 2019, "China’s Rise: Offensive or Defensive Realism,” <https://search-proquest-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/docview/2217797444/A6FF9547873245A2PQ/1?accountid=10747>, JDi]

China has grown tremendously in economic terms in the last 30 years. At the same time, it has also gained enormous political, military and economic clout. The engine behind China’s rise has been its enormous economic growth. It has a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth of nearly 10 per cent per annum, which is one of the major sustained expansions in the history of world economies. As a result, it has been able to lift more than 800 million people out of poverty.22 In just 30 years, China has risen as the second-largest economy in the world. It has a world economic output of 14.8 per cent and an economy worth US$11 trillion.23 China has also been playing an increasingly vital role in the issues affecting international security like North Korea, Iran, Sudan to HIV/AIDS and energy security. Moreover, China is among the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and has a right to veto. It has a nuclear arsenal and is pursuing a military modernisation programme. China’s growing economy has also meant that it has an increasingly large and diverse defence force. It has a large army and an increasingly large naval force. China’s defence spending is an indicator of China’s growing defence force. While it had only a defence budget of US$58.8 billion in 2008, it has a US$215 billion budget in 2016. Its defence budget has increased nearly four times in just eight years. In comparison, the US had military spending of US$611 billion in 2016, which is almost thrice that of the Chinese military spending,24 it is significant that the latter has become the country with second highest military spending. China is estimated to have a nuclear arsenal of 260 weapons, the fourth largest in the world after Russia, US and France.25 It has an impressive array of ballistic missiles with ranges from 600 km to 11000 km. It has nearly 150 land-based ballistic missiles, 48 sea-based ballistic missiles and bombers.26 China also has a nuclear-powered submarine fleet of JIN (Type 094) that provides it with an assured second strike capability. China’s military strength is ranked third largest after the US and Russia.27 All these factors definitely provide the making of a great power. Also, in light of Mearsheimer’s theory, China has both latent power and military power. China’s latent power is its national wealth and the size of the population, both of which are very strong. This qualified China as a great power according to Mearsheimer’s theory. China is definitely a rising power, possibly a great power. What remains to be seen is what it means for China and the region. Offensive or Defensive Realism The test of the offensive realism theory would be to determine whether China displays the revisionist tendencies, acts aggressively towards its neighbours and shows power maximising behaviour. In sum, it would entail determining whether China displays revisionist tendencies or acts like a status quo power. Under Mao (1949-1976), China had the policy of overturning all the imperialist regimes in Asia and the world. During this period, China actively supported revolutions in many developing countries that it considered imperialist or saw them as imperialist proxies. This threatened China’s neighbouring states especially the US allies.28 China essentially wanted to export its socialist ideology to other states. During this time, China’s policy can be described as operating under the principles of offensive realism. At the same time, during this era, China was operating with limited capabilities in an international environment characterised by bipolarity. It was operating within an environment where global politics was driven by the intense Cold War rivalry of the two great powers ─ the US and the former Soviet Union.29 However, since the 1970s China’s policies have shown less revisionist tendencies. The country has increasingly become a state that is embracing defensive realism. One thread of this evidence is that China has toned-down its revolutionary rhetoric. It is also not supporting insurgencies in other countries. The second thread of evidence is that since the late 1970s China has increasingly pursued a cooperative security approach in its relations with regional neighbours and in the international arena. By and large, China has tried to forge friendly relations with its neighbours. It includes ameliorating relations with states like India which is traditionally a rival. Their relations did become strained in 2017 when there was a standoff between the Indian and the Chinese forces on the Doklam plateau. Dhoklam is a territory claimed both by Bhutan (aligned with India) and China. However, Indo-China relations improved as the two countries held an informal summit in China in April 2018.30 The two countries even held a joint military exercise in December 2018, called Hand-in-Hand.31 Over the years, China has also managed to resolve border issues with so many neighbouring states. It has settled border disputes with countries like Myanmar, Nepal and Pakistan initially and recently with Russia, bordering the Central Asian States and Vietnam.32 Moreover, China has territorial disputes with India and Japan but it has never made these disputes a hurdle in forging friendly ties with these two countries. Avery Goldstein dubs it a neo-Bismarckian grand strategy of China whereby it is pursuing its interests by reassuring those who may feel threatened and may form anti-China alliances.33 This, in his opinion, has resulted in a security environment that is conducive for China as well as for the region as a whole. Another indication that China does not show aggressive behaviour in its policies is that China has increasingly engaged and integrated with the international community. Over the past 30 years, China has amply demonstrated this by its increasing membership of international organisations and institutions as well as membership of treaties since the 1980s. China has increasingly participated in the regional multilateral institutions over the years. In the last few decades, East Asia has seen a number of regional institutions being formed. Topmost among those are the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC); the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF); ASEAN plus 3 and the East Asia Summit. China is part of most of these multilateral institutions as well as an active member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO). China was also a key player in the sixparty-talks in getting North Korea to halt and roll back its nuclear and missile programmes. On the global front, China sought participation in global institutions like the World Trade Organisation (WTO). China is also playing a very active role in the UN. According to one figure, China’s membership of international governmental organisations doubled (from 21 to 52) during the years 1977-1997. In the same time period, its membership of International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) increased from mere 71 to an impressive 1,163.34 Similarly, according to another account, China signed less than 30 per cent of the arms control accords it was eligible to join in the 1970s compared to 80 per cent by mid-1990s. 35 China has actively taken part in the treaties of the nuclear non-proliferation regime as well as those of aimed at non-proliferation of biological and chemical weapons. It has also become a part of the voluntary non-proliferation groups like the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) in 2004 and exercises strict export control policies. Since 2004, China has also shown interest in joining the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). This is an indicator of China’s willingness to participate in international institutes and regimes, increasing comfort towards norms of interdependent behaviour among states. It has also exhibited the desire to somewhat shape the rules of the game for regional cooperation. This is definitely an indication of its tendency towards the status quo. It also advances China’s national interests and helps dispel concerns about its increasing economic and military power.36 This is also an indicator that China is willing to work in the existing Western-dominated systems of international institution and regimes rather than challenge the system or seek to break it up. Moreover, China consciously pursued a good neighbour policy. The pursuit of good relations with its neighbour is the foundation of its strategy for economic development. It has the dual benefit of attracting foreign trade and investment while, at the same time, it reassures its neighbours that it does not present a threat for them. Deng Xiaoping laid two paths for China’s foreign policy in 1990 ─ anti-hegemonism and establishment of a new multi-polar international order of politics and economics. This meant that China adopted a policy of active defence of China’s interest ─ of minding its own business and be neither a leader nor a challenger but a participant or co-builder of the westerns international order.37 This remains the foundation of China’s foreign policy today. Many analysts, however, argue that participation in the international institutions is not an adequate indicator but compliance with the norms, rules and goals of these institutions is a better indicator of whether a country is a status quo state or not. Along these lines, Alastair Johnston considers China’s compliance with five global normative regimes: these include sovereignty, free trade, non-proliferation and arms control, national selfdetermination and human rights.38 As far as sovereignty is concerned he writes: “Today China is one of the strongest defenders of a more traditional absolutist concept (of sovereignty).”39 Similarly, free trade is another international norm that is seen as an indicator of status quo behaviour. China has moved to support the norms of global free trade. China’s membership of WTO in 2001 is a testament to its support for free trade. China’s tariff rates have declined from over 40 per cent in 1992 to less than 20 per cent in 1997.40 In 2015, the tariff rate was 3.4 per cent.41 China has gradually embraced global capitalist institutions and system. In the Belt and Road Forum that China held in May 2017, hosting 30 world leaders, it released a communiqué, which was signed by all 30 world leaders present on the occasion that emphasised the need to “build an open economy, ensure free and inclusive trade (and) oppose all forms of protectionism.”42 However, the ongoing trade war with the US has forced China to increase its tariffs. Since 2017, the US had imposed three rounds of tariff on the Chinese products worth US$250 billion. China has retaliated by imposing US$110 billion on the US goods. Beijing has accused the US of starting the “largest trade war in economic history.” 43 This damages the global free trade regime. China has gone even a step further and initiated projects like the ChinaPakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), which is envisaged as a journey towards economic regionalisation. The CPEC is a framework of regional connectivity which is expected to be beneficial for China and Pakistan as well as the regional states like India, Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia. Its primary aim is to promote geographical linkages and improve infrastructure connectivity. It would also result in a higher flow of trade and businesses in the region.44 Its ultimate aim is to have a well-connected region, promote harmony and accelerate economic development. This is also a clear indication that China is focused on economic development and regionalisation instead of displaying aggressive hegemonic behaviour. As far as China’s non-proliferation record is concerned, it has a fair record, with no blatant violations of international nuclear non-proliferation norms. The prevailing concerns mostly centred on the transfer of missile technology and components to Pakistan in the 1980s and early 1990s. However, China has not signed the 1987 MTCR, so it does not amount to any violations of China’s treaty obligations. On the positive side, in 1996, China signed the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which a major nuclear non-proliferation proponent like the US has not done till date.45 It has been cooperating with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO) and has installed four new International Monitoring System (IMS) stations, bringing the total number of certified stations in China, to five. Furthermore, it is also a part of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) since the time that it was signed. Moreover, along with Russia, China has long been trying to get a treaty negotiated to ban the stationing of offensive weapons in outer-space. For nearly two decades, now there have been the Chinese and Russian efforts to negotiate a treaty for Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS). Many proposals have been put forward including the two Chinese working papers and a joint China-Russia working paper in the Conference on Disarmament (CD). However, PAROS remains blocked due to the US refusal to negotiate any such treaty because it goes against its missile defence and space plans.46 China has also played a stabilising role in the North Korean nuclear issue. It acted as a lynchpin in hosting and conducting the six-party talks, which were meant to solve the North Korean nuclear issue. Even after the breakdown of the six-party talks in 2009 and the recent high tensions on the Korean Peninsula in 2017 with the US, China played the role of a stabiliser, urging both sides to show restraint and emphasising that war was not an option for any country. China has, thus, helped strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation norms. Also, China’s growing soft power47 or its “charm offensive” in Southeast Asia and elsewhere is another indicator that it is not an aggressive, power maximising state. Its economic progress has been accompanied by its increasing cultural and diplomatic influence around the globe. Its growing soft power is not only evident in Southeast Asia but also in Beijing’s economic partnerships in Latin America and Africa.48 The fact that China is able to attract and appeal the states in the region through its soft power is an indicator that its neighbours are increasingly viewing China as less of a threat. However, this has stirred the concerns of waning the US influence in the region. In many parts of Asia, Africa and the Latin America, the “Beijing Consensus” which advocates a mix of authoritarian government and market economy, is overtaking the “Washington Consensus” of market economics and democratic government which was popular in the past.49 With signs that the US is placing emphasis on hard power under President Donald Trump, China seems to be positioning itself as a champion of globalisation and economic integration. It seems to be placing an emphasis on soft power. Taiwan issue is one instance where China’s policies are viewed by the West as a non-status quo. However, the issue can be seen in terms of a security dilemma between the US and China. In the last few decades, America continued selling advanced weapons to Taiwan,50 mainland China considers these developments to encourage Taiwan’s independence and a threat to its interests. According to Yiwei Wang, “on the Taiwan issue, America’s logic is that peace comes from “balance of power.” China has time and again protested the matter of arms sales to Taiwan with the US but to no avail. China sees these moves as an effort to change the distribution of power in the region. In turn, China has threatened Taiwan against moves for independence and deployed missiles on the mainland as well. Consequently, this makes the US suspicious of China’s revisionist intentions towards Taiwan – locking the two powers in a security dilemma. Another area where China has been accused of displaying revisionist tendencies is in the South China Sea. The dispute centres on territorial claims over two island chains the Paracels and the Spratlys and surrounding oceans. The area provides valuable trade passage and fishing ground, as well as holds hydrocarbon resources ranging from 25,000 Mboe to 260,000 Mboe.51 China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia and Brunei all have competing claims. The dispute has existed for centuries but things got tense in the last few years. China has been island-building since 2014 and has also increased naval patrols. It can be argued that China’s actions are defensive in nature. The US has had increased interference in the area. Under the garb of “freedom of navigation” operations, the US sent planes and ships in the disputed area to keep access to key shipping and air routes.52 In February 2017, the US deployed the aircraft carrier, Carl Vinson, strike force to the South China Sea

under the garb of “freedom of navigation.”53 In December 2018, there was a trilateral anti-submarine warfare exercise by the US, Britain and Japanese forces. Another week-long US and British Naval exercise took place in January 2019.54 These are meant to send a signal to China to rescind claims over the disputed area. These exercises have angered China. The US has also been sending hundreds of Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) missions to the South China Sea every year that have caused friction between the US and China and, which the latter sees as a threat to its security. This clearly amounts to the US interference in China’s area of influence. This has heightened China’s threat perceptions and it is bound to act more assertively to defend its interests in the region. As a result, the area is becoming a flashpoint, with growing tension between China and the US over control of the disputed waterway. China does not have expansionist or hegemonic designs in the South China Sea. It claims over the two island chains are not something new. Beijing has adjusted its strategy to safeguard its interests, as it becomes increasingly powerful. However, a military conflict over the dispute is not an option. Moreover, the US influence over other claimants of the territory complicates matters for China. This has resulted in China acting more assertively in the South China Sea in order to defend its interests. In fact, the US would act more aggressively if any country was to interfere in matters close to its borders. Overall, from the above analysis, it can be summarised that China has so far behaved more as a status quo power rather than as an aggressive revisionist power. This is apparent in China’s engagement with its neighbours, its participation in the regional and international institutions, it is in compliance with most of the international norms as well as its emphasis on projecting its soft power. Alternate Theory of China’s Rise ─ Defensive Realism The claims of Mearsheimer’s offensive realism are in contrast with Waltz’s defensive realism on several points. While Mearsheimer claims that great powers act aggressively and aim to gain so much power that they are the ultimate hegemons in the system, Waltz’s defensive realism sees the states as acting defensively to maintain rather than upset the balance of power. For Waltz, the states are primarily concerned with maintaining “their position in the system.”55 Defensive realists argue that offence-defence balance favours the defence. 56 Therefore, a robust defence and careful balancing should deter any aggressive impulses from great powers. Defensive realism argues that great powers are concerned with maintaining the status quo rather than maximising their power because often the cost of expansion outweighs the benefits. Defensive realism sees security dilemmas as a problem where an increase in the power of one state increases the insecurity of the other causing the latter to increase its power. Under the conditions of defensive realism, great powers would try to alleviate any security dilemmas rather than exacerbate it. China’s current policy seems to be firmly rooted in defensive realism. Its policy seems to be aimed at maintaining the balance of power rather than upsetting it. As the earlier section has argued, China is not a revisionist power but a status quo one. The analysts like Shiping Tang are convinced that China’s security strategy flows out of its realisation of the security dilemma whereby the Chinese leaders have understood that an aggressive expansionist strategy would just lead to counterbalancing alliances. “This recognition has led China to adopt a defensive realism-rooted security strategy emphasising moderation, self-restraint and security cooperation.”57 Moreover, China’s military modernisation, its Taiwan policy and its increased policies in the South China Sea also make more sense if seen through the lens of defensive realism. China’s Taiwan policy may be more geared towards preventing redistribution of power in the region. Since the US is providing arms assistance to Taiwan, China may be averse to the US aiding Taiwan’s independence ─ the latter issue is one where China has made clear that independence is not acceptable to China. Similarly, there is good evidence that China’s military modernisation programmes and training exercises since the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1996 are aimed partially at dealing with the issue of the Taiwanese separation.58 On the question of whether China is balancing against the US, Johnston says, “There seems to be little doubt that China’s military modernisation programme since the mid-1990s has been aimed in large measure at developing capabilities to deter or slow the application of the US military power in the region.”59 It would then seem that China is not concerned with gaining power or projecting its powers but with balancing against a predominance of the US power in the region. China has not shown any signs of hegemonic behaviour as a lot of Western analysts feared. Instead of guided by offensive realism, China’s policies seem to be guided by defensive realism where it is concerned with survival and with maintaining its position in the system. Just as the US fears China’s hegemonic rise, China also fears the increase of the US influence in the region and its talk of containing China. China’s policy may change in the future to display hegemonic tendencies. However, at present, there is not much evidence to support the theory of offensive realism.

#### Their defense of unipolarity is plagued by conceptual confusion and methodological laziness.

Yang 10—Ph.D Candidate in the Politics & International Relations Program @ University of Southern California [Xiangfeng Yang, The Unipolar Challenge: Power, Culture and Authority and the Advent of War, March 25, 2010, pg. <http://www.stockholm.sgir.eu/uploads/The%20Unipolar%20Challenge,%203rd%20Draft.pdf>]

Turning the conventional wisdom on its head, the positivist intellectual enterprise on unipolarity is seriously impeded by not just conceptual confusion but also the lack of methodological rigor. Conceptually, most researchers, many realists included, are slow to realize that the character of unipolarity is fundamentally different phenomenon from bipolarity and multipolarity and that the study of unipolarity presupposes a new set of analytical assumptions most of the time, if not always. Methodologically and theoretically, the obsession with contemporary US hegemony gives the impression that unipolarity is historically unprecedented, such that scholars use the evidence based on which their hypotheses are developed to test their theoretical propositions, a huge taboo in positivist research (King, Keohane, & Verba, 1994). The upshot is often that their policy projections leap far ahead of their theoretical and empirical analyses: the same evidence can be interpreted in rather divergent ways, or that the falsification of their theory still awaits what China or the United States will do in the future.8 pg. 13

#### 1 – Global coop solves

Bostrom 11—Director of the Future of Humanity Institute and the Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology [Nick Bostrom (Professor of Philosophy @ Oxford University), EXISTENTIAL RISK PREVENTION AS THE MOST IMPORTANT TASK FOR HUMANITY, 2011, pg. http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf]

We thus want to reach a state in which we have (a) far greater intelligence, knowledge, and sounder judgment than we currently do; (b) far greater ability to solve global-coordination problems; (c) far greater technological capabilities and physical resources; and such that (d) our values and preferences are not corrupted in the process of getting there (but rather, if possible, improved). Factors b and c expand the option set available to humanity. Factor a increases humanity’s ability to predict the outcomes of the available options and understand what each outcome would entail in terms of the realization of human values. Factor d, finally, makes humanity more likely to want to realize human values.

How we, from our current situation, might best achieve these ends is not obvious (figure 5). While we ultimately need more technology, insight, and coordination, it is not clear that the shortest path to the goal is the best one.

It could turn out, for example, that attaining certain technological capabilities before attaining sufficient insight and coordination invariably spells doom for a civilization. One can readily imagine a class of existential-catastrophe scenarios in which some technology is discovered that puts immense destructive power into the hands of a large number of individuals. If there is no effective defense against this destructive power, and no way to prevent individuals from having access to it, then civilization cannot last, since in a sufficiently large population there are bound to be some individuals who will use any destructive power available to them. The discovery of the atomic bomb could have turned out to be like this, except for the fortunate fact that the construction of nuclear weapons requires a special ingredient—weapons-grade fissile material—that is rare and expensive to manufacture. Even so, if we continually sample from the urn of possible technological discoveries before implementing effective means of global coordination, surveillance, and/or restriction of potentially hazardous information, then we risk eventually drawing a black ball: an easy-to-make intervention that causes extremely widespread harm and against which effective defense is infeasible.28 Pg. 24-25

#### 2 – Our framework for cooperation will successfully regulate emerging tech.

Abbott et al. 6—Professor of Law and Faculty Fellow of the Center for the Study of Law, Science, and Technology @ Arizona State University [Kenneth W. Abbott, Gary E. Marchant (Professor of Emerging Technologies, Law, and Ethics, Executive Director of the Center for the Study of Law, Science, and Technology and Professor of Life Sciences @ ASU) & Douglas J. Sylvester (Professor of Law and Faculty Fellow of the Center for the Study of Law, Science, and Technology @ ASU), A Framework Convention for Nanotechnology?. Environmental Law Reporter, Vol. 36, 2006. Pg. http://ssrn.com/abstract=946777]

While the concept of an FC for nanotechnology may seem far-fetched on first impression, such an agreement has much to offer. In fact, because of the early development status of nanotechnology, with no obvious problems to date, this technology may be easier to regulate at the international level than other environmental problems. For example, international regulation of global warming represents a more controversial challenge than nanotechnology because it requires substantial costs and changes in a broad range of regulated industries, involves nations with very different interests and incentives—for example, oil-producing nations versus low-lying island nations—and requires allocating responsibility for past actions such as carbon emissions.120

Similarly, GATT required nations to sacrifice protected and entrenched economic activities to the global playing field of trade, creating strong domestic opposition to freer trade by affected interests. In contrast, because nanotechnology is so new, regulation would be primarily prospective and would not require changes in long-established activities or any allocation of responsibility for past actions. Moreover, while developing and developed countries may have some differences in priorities and goals with respect to nanotechnology, the differences among nations will not be as stark as in the global warming context, as all nations generally favor the goal of developing nanotec

hnology in a safe and beneficial manner.

V. Conclusion - An international framework convention for nanotechnology holds much promise for addressing the unique set of attributes and regulatory challenges associated with nanotechnology. By providing for an adaptive, innovative, international, and official framework for addressing nanotechnology risks as they arise, such an agreement could play an important facilitating role in the effective, safe, and equitable global development of nanotechnology. The key to the success of such an endeavor is to establish the institutional and procedural framework before problems arise. For nanotechnology, then, the time to act is now.

#### 1 – Deterrence isn’t stable.

Krieger 2k—President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Hawaii [2000, David Krieger, “The Irrationality of Deterrence: A Modern Zen Koan,” Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, April 7, Available Online at http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2000/04/ 07\_krieger\_irrationality.htm]

The concept of deterrence, which underlies the nuclear weapons policies of the United States and other nuclear weapons states, presupposes human rationality in all cases. It is based upon the proposition that a rational person will not attack you if he understands that his country will be subject to unacceptable damage by retaliation. What rational person would want his country to be exposed to unacceptable damage? Perhaps one who miscalculates. A rational person could believe that he could take action X, and that would not be sufficient for you to retaliate. Saddam Hussein, for example, believed that he could invade Kuwait without retaliation from the United States. He miscalculated, in part because he had been misled by the American Ambassador to Iraq who informed him that the US would not retaliate. Misinformation, misunderstanding, or misconstruing information could lead a rational person to miscalculate. We don't always get our information straight, and we seldom have all of the facts
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#### 3---Only accessible literature base.

Commissioner Noah J. Phillips 18. Before the Federal Trade Commission. “Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century”. https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public\_events/1415284/ftc\_hearings\_session\_5\_transcript\_11-1-18\_0.pdf

So, today, we take on the very modest task of looking both at vertical mergers and the consumer welfare standard. Both have made headlines of late, which is not always true in the antitrust world. The Department of Justice’s ongoing litigation regarding the mergers of AT&T and Time Warner has drawn a great bit of attention, in particular, to vertical merger law and the economic theories surrounding it.

And we have heard a great deal, almost every week, on op-ed pages, on television and so forth, regarding the consumer welfare standard. So this is an important time, it is an appropriate time for the FTC to be convening a hearing on these two topics.

#### 4---It strikes a middle ground with both sides’ offense. Tons of proposals and disad scenarios.

Ariel Ezrachi 18. Slaughter and May Professor of Competition Law, The University of Oxford. Director, Oxford University Centre for Competition Law and Policy. EU Competition Law Goals and The Digital Economy. “Ezrachi - Goals and the digital economy - Working paper.pdf” https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/57115872/Ezrachi\_-\_Goals\_-\_Aug\_2018-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1638214770&Signature=Mpj92d9khmpS0HyzF3CslPfb5dW85lbsqJCFgU7D3GFTj70U5Gmz8RSwdhVHuxhj9i9BowILCRURtQhqIJ7K04JEI63btRTbEl8KxIr46OUPivr09yML6cP3LePcVM91a6QIQCxZHlvD-CWrhFPrhKwhltMKdr2MAeQwKl~C8BcVvhWta42~SbQV5rolyiYlJSdi-Ud4-RMCW6ezyaWhgw3yaulQnnIBg7BvfT04pXgG9Ljo9ZfYx1Y1rJA8B7S~WqSCszmjSrZUoQSPjD8sxw9RuBoJVxBWrXAYIYyF9Fa-df-uhBY24PMlRIMzpOK~xHfcyxo7AQ1pGVd-3rg8QA\_\_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA

In this respect, it is interesting to consider the enforcement approach in the US and its relevance to EU competition regime. This is particularly so in light on current debate in the US on the need and desirability of changing the benchmark for antitrust assessment, the efficacy of US antitrust law, and its ability to deal with increased concentration and market power.145 That debate stems from the evolution of US antitrust law which has seen it being narrowed in scope over the years,146 and the rise of voices which argue in favour of widening the notion of consumer welfare and the realm of US antitrust. The alleged decline in competitiveness of US markets has led to an array of proposals (which range from moderate intervention to condemnation of bigness) and to numerous counter arguments.147

---FOOTNOTE 147 STARTS---

147 On the US debate on ‘Hipster Antitrust’ (or ‘New Brandeis Movement’) see for example: Carl Shapiro ‘Antitrust in a Time of Populism’ [2018] International Journal of Industrial Organization (forthcoming); Lina Khan ‘The New Brandeis Movement: America’s Antimonopoly Debate’ [2018] Journal of European Competition Law & Practice 131; Daniel A Crane, ‘Four questions for the neo-brandeisians’ [2018] CPI Antitrust Chronicle 63; Harry First ‘Woodstock antitrust’ [2018] CPI Antitrust Chronicle 57 ; Philip Marsden ‘Who should trust-bust? Hippocrates, not hipsters’ [2018] CPI Antitrust Chronicle 34; Howard A Shelanski, ‘Information, Innovation, and Competition Policy for the Internet [2013] U Pa LRev 1663; Herbert Hovenkamp ‘Whatever Did Happen to the Antitrust Movement?’ [2018] Notre Dame LRev (forthcoming).

---FOOTNOTE 147 ENDS---

#### Economic changes outpace the aff---only the counterplan solves.

AMC 07. Antitrust Modernization Commission. Deborah A. Garza, Chair. Bobby R. Burchfield ,Commissioner. W. Stephen Cannon, Commissioner. Dennis W. Carlton, Commissioner. Makan Delrahim, Commissioner. Jonathan M. Jacobson, Commissioner. Jonathan R. Yarowsky, Vice-Chair. Donald G. Kempf, Jr., Commissioner. Sanford M. Litvack, Commissioner. John H. Shenefield, Commissioner. Debra A. Valentine, Commissioner. John L. Warden, Commissioner. “Report and Recommendations.” https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/amc/report\_recommendation/amc\_final\_report.pdf

Indeed, the evolution of antitrust law—both through case law and agency guidelines—has shown that new or improved economic learning can be incorporated into antitrust analysis as appropriate. Allowing the ongoing incorporation of economic learning into antitrust case law and agency guidelines is preferable to attempts at legislative change to specify different antitrust analyses for industries characterized by innovation, intellectual property, and technological change. Industries that fall into those categories will keep changing over time; attempts to define them would likely be difficult and impermanent at best. Furthermore, economic learning continues to evolve, and antitrust law needs to be able to incorporate this new learning as appropriate. It is important that antitrust develops through mechanisms, such as case law development in the courts and agency guidelines, that allow ongoing reassessments of existing law and economic principles relevant to antitrust analysis.

#### Solves the case better---the net benefit is effective foreign policy.

Gideon Rose 21. Editor of Foreign Affairs. March/April 2021. “Foreign Policy for Pragmatists How Biden Can Learn From History in Real Time”. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-02-16/foreign-policy-pragmatists

Theories of history, fundamental beliefs about how the world works, are usually assumed rather than argued and rarely get subjected to serious scrutiny. Yet these general ideas set the parameters for all the specific policy choices an administration makes. Know an administration’s theory of history, and much of the rest is easy to fill in.

There are a lot of possible theories of history, but they tend to fall, like Bush’s and Trump’s, into two main camps: optimistic and pessimistic. Thus, the Clinton administration followed its own version of happy directionality—think of it as Bush with less muscular Christianity. And there have been earlier believers in Trump’s dark and stormy night, as well.

Unfortunately, given the stakes of the question, no one really knows whether the optimists or the pessimists have the better case. Political theorists have fought about that for centuries, with neither side winning. A few generations ago, modern social scientists joined in, generating and testing lots of theories in lots of ways, but still, neither camp bested the other. And then, in the last few years, history got interesting again and erased some of the few things the scholars thought they had learned.

As individuals, presidents have had strong views on these matters. As a group, they have not. American foreign policy is notorious for its internal tensions. Its fits and starts and reversals do not fit easily into any single theoretical framework. Yet this pluralism has proved to be a feature, not a bug. Precisely because it has not embraced any one approach to foreign policy consistently, Washington has managed to avoid the worst aspects of all. Blessed with geopolitical privilege, it has slowly stumbled forward, moving over the centuries from peripheral obscurity to global hegemony. Its genius has been less strategic insight than an ability to cut losses.

By now, it seems fair to say that the debate between the optimists and the pessimists will never be settled conclusively, since each perspective knows something big about international politics. Instead of choosing between them, the new administration should keep both truths in its pocket, taking each out as appropriate.

Learning in U.S. foreign policy has come largely across administrations. President Joe Biden’s goal should be to speed up the process, allowing it to happen within an administration. Call it the Bayesian Doctrine: rather than being wedded to its priors, the administration should constantly update them.

The way to do so is to make theorists, not principals, the administration’s true team of rivals, forcing them to make real-world predictions, and to offer testable practical advice, and then seeing whose turn out to be better in real time. In this approach, searching intellectual honesty is more important than ideology; what people think matters less than whether they can change their minds. Constantly calculating implied odds won’t always win pots. But it will help the administration fold bad hands early, increasing its winnings over time.

THE RISE AND FALL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

The canonical modern statements of the pessimistic and optimistic visions were set out by the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the seventeenth century. Hobbes argued that states in the international system were like individuals in a hypothetical state of nature, before the invention of government. Living under anarchy, with no sovereign above them to provide order and security, they were at perpetual risk, trapped in a permanent war of all against all, doomed to spend eternity jockeying for power. Locke’s view was less bleak, and his version of the state of nature was more permissive. He didn’t think anarchy necessarily forced states into inevitable conflict. If they wanted, they could avoid war through cooperation, gaining security and protection by association.

Hobbes’s world and Locke’s world looked quite different, so it was clearly important for policymakers to determine which one corresponded better to reality. If war was inevitable and any stretch of international quiet was just the calm before another storm, states would be suckers for ever letting their guard down. But if sustained peaceful cooperation was possible, they would be fools for not trying to achieve it. For 300 years, the argument raged without end. Pessimists tended to follow Hobbes, and became known as “realists.” Optimists were drawn to Locke, and became known as “liberals.” And history piled up data higher and higher.

After World War II, scholars of international relations tackled the problem. They imposed order on the discussion and refined its concepts. They showed how one could operationalize realist and liberal theories in many ways, using different variables and processes to produce different outcomes. They tested the theories with sophisticated methods and hoped that eventually their collective efforts would yield greater understanding. Studies proliferated, researchers got better, and work became more rigorous. But the anticipated knowledge failed to materialize, and it was hard to tell what, if any, intellectual ground had really been gained. Because of this conspicuous failure, by the twenty-first century, the status claims of realism, liberalism, and rationalistic theorizing in general were being called into question within the discipline. Competing theoretical perspectives crept back into serious discussion, and scholars increasingly abandoned big questions altogether. Journals published articles on “the end of international relations theory.” And then the world started to go off the rails.

Where do things stand now? Liberals are on the defensive. They argued that globalization would build on itself and increasingly tie the world together, but instead it provoked a massive backlash, and states are weaponizing interdependence. They saw democracy as improving at its core and marching forward on the periphery, but it is now regressing and retreating. They saw Chinese authoritarianism as doomed to fail, but it has succeeded beyond all expectations. They preached cosmopolitanism, but it turns out that everybody’s a little bit nationalist (and gets more so under stress). They claimed that norms constrained behavior, but the reality is that shameless people can break them without consequence. These setbacks may be temporary, and the world may get back on the upward track it seemed to be traveling. But maybe not.

Realists, meanwhile, having taken the other side of those bets, are feeling validated. Relations between the United States and China are playing out like a classic security dilemma. The Trump administration’s most notable foreign policy accomplishment, its Arab-Israeli peace deals, emerged from classic realpolitik. In practice, liberal hegemony looks a lot like . . . hegemony.

Nevertheless, the picture is problematic here, too. Realism emphasizes states’ relative power, and that matters. But so do leaders, publics, nonstate actors, ideas, institutions, and everything else. War, meanwhile, can no longer be automatically considered the greatest danger countries face. The pandemic has caused more death and economic destruction than anything short of nuclear war or a world war, and climate change will be even more significant. Global issues such as these do not fit well into the realist paradigm.

The problems go deeper still. “International relations scholars,” the political scientist Daniel Drezner has written, “are certain about two facts: power is the defining concept of the discipline and there is no consensus about what that concept means.”

Consider the question of how a declining United States should respond to a rising China. But first, explain just what is rising and falling about each. Military strength? Economic potential? Perceptions about the long-term trends of those? Perceptions about the willingness to deploy them? The worth of each country’s alliances? Their national cohesiveness and institutional performance? Power obviously comes in multiple forms and depends on context. This means that the apparently straightforward question about the U.S.-Chinese power differential is actually quite complicated.

For all the realists’ ominous predictions about recurring conflict, finally, great-power war has not occurred for generations. Nobody knows for sure what has driven this so-called long peace or how much longer it will endure. Suggestions include luck, nuclear weapons, historical memory, U.S. power and policy, economic interdependence, changing value systems, and more. But whatever the cause, until this unprecedented stretch of great-power peace is broken, it is a bit rich for pessimistic realists to claim that optimistic liberals are obviously naive.

Interestingly, the dissidents in international relations—sociologists, psychologists, constructivists, critical theorists, cultural theorists, Marxists, feminists, network theorists, and others outside the U.S. mainstream—have weathered recent decades better. This is not because their own findings have cumulated; they haven’t. But scholars drawn to those approaches made wiser bets than the rationalists, both realist and liberal, on what ultimately mattered in political life. They focused on hierarchy as well as anarchy, making them better at seeing domination when it was occurring. They were more attuned to social relationships. And they started from better assumptions about their basic unit of analysis.

We now know that humans are cognitively biased against reason. Our brains are hardwired to make us emotional, volatile, and tribal. We act according to personal webs of meaning that do not necessarily overlap with those of others. The dissidents in international relations took those factors as starting points, not afterthoughts. They looked at political actors from the inside as well as out, focused on identity, and appreciated culture and contingency. Their approaches were better suited for a world in which identity politics is central to everything and small numbers of people can wreak vast amounts of damage—not to mention a world in which those people increasingly live through social media, the addicted customers of private companies with business models based on custom-tailoring reality, inflaming emotional volatility, and stoking group conflict.

THE DRAMA AT THE CAPITOL

Studying these strange particles is difficult. It’s hard to count the irrational numbers. Humans’ multiple cognitive deficiencies, for example, make them susceptible to lies, which play a major but understudied role in politics.

Ordinary lying, knowingly telling untruths, is common. Big lying, peddling a full-fledged alternative reality akin to the Marvel Universe, is not.

Big lies are the territory of prophets and demagogues, people who hear divine voices themselves or play a divinity for others. They are self-contained intellectual paradigms immune from scientific falsification. As the scholar Nina Khrushcheva notes, the big lie “covers everything and redefines reality. There are no holes in it. You . . . either accept the whole thing or everything collapses.” The bigger the lie, the further it is from reality, the more psychic potential energy builds up in between. And when the collapse comes, the energy gets released in a sudden burst. It was that kind of cathartic explosion that blew over the U.S. Capitol on January 6.

Was the riot a political protest that got out of hand? An attempted putsch? A heroic defense of the republic against satanic pedophiles? It was all of these and more, because the event was streaming on several platforms simultaneously—not just the conventional tv networks but also the inner mental channels of the deluded rioters. This was history as tragedy and farce combined; the casualties included a woman who was reportedly trampled to death while carrying a flag saying “Don’t Tread on Me.”

The most persuasive reading of the day is as immersive theater, and not just because the marchers came in costume. It played like a mass live production of Euripides’s Bacchae, the tale of a mysterious cult leader who wreaks vengeance on a city that disrespects him by whipping its citizens into a frenzied nihilistic rampage. Some men just want to watch the world burn. And some crowds just like the way it hurts.

The riot’s practical implications are deeply disturbing. But its theoretical implications are more so. For example, one leading proponent of the big lie in question, Peter Navarro, was a crucial architect of the Trump administration’s trade policy. It will be interesting to see how mainstream scholarship on international political economy incorporates conspiracy theorizing into the heart of its analysis.

Once they seized the Capitol, meanwhile, these terrorists took selfies rather than hostages. Like most of their predecessors in the 1970s, they wanted a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead. But what if among them had been an even prouder boy, one like Timothy McVeigh, the 1995 Oklahoma City bomber? Then, the entire U.S. Congress could easily have been wiped out, along with the vice president. It will be interesting to see how the episode affects risk assessments of all kinds. Clearly, it isn’t so hard to decapitate the United States. Just as clearly, it hasn’t happened recently not because anybody prevented it but because almost nobody was trying.

Most disturbing is what the incident revealed about Trump. As Bob Corker, a former Republican senator from Tennessee, put it: “The one plus that comes out of this [is] people have been able to see firsthand what all of us have known, just who he really is.” With that in mind, imagine a scenario in which a few hundred thousand votes went the other way last November, letting Trump win the presidency and the Republicans keep the Senate, fair and square.

In that branch of the multiverse, January 6 in Washington plays out rather differently. The same crowd comes, but it is much, much larger. They don’t want to hang Vice President Mike Pence; they want to hug him. They don’t storm the Capitol; they stand outside cheering as he certifies the president’s reelection. Trump is happy, too. And why not? He gets to be the supreme leader of the world’s most powerful military, in unquestioned control of his party and all three branches of government, with an official propaganda network and a cult of personality that has millions of members who will literally believe him over their own eyes. For four more years.

It didn’t happen. But it could have, easily, with all the consequences one might spin out for everything from foreign policy and trade, to American ideals and institutions, to the future course of international politics. Democracy didn’t prevail. It lucked out. One does not come away from the thought experiment struck by some larger pattern of history, optimistic or pessimistic. One comes away struck by its radical contingency.

FOREIGN POLICY AS ORIENTEERING

Some call for abandoning the search for a larger theoretical framework for foreign policy altogether. “Grand strategy is dead,” claimed Drezner and two other political scientists, Ronald Krebs and Randall Schweller, in these pages last year. They argued:

The world today is one of interaction and complexity, wherein the most direct path between two points is not a straight line. A disordered, cluttered, and fluid realm is precisely one that does not recognize grand strategy’s supposed virtue: a practical, durable, and consistent plan for the long term.

To debate grand strategy, they wrote, “is to indulge in navel-gazing while the world burns. So it is time to operate without one.” They want an administration’s agenda to emerge piece by piece, bottom up from departments and the field, rather than spring from the head of some scribbler in Washington who thinks he knows where history is going. In place of overarching theoretical frameworks, they propose flexibility and incremental experimentation.

Drezner, Krebs, and Schweller are correct when they argue that simplistic road maps are not very helpful in dealing with today’s complex international landscape, and both convinced optimists and convinced pessimists seem fated to produce crude and incomplete surveys. But that is not an argument for throwing the maps away. It is an argument for figuring out how to use two bad maps simultaneously.

Foreign policy, after all, is not cartography. It’s orienteering—racing madly through dangerous, unknown territory. And theorists aren’t mapmakers, they’re coaches: their job is to help players race better. Maps provide crucial information, but the players have to use them out in the field, trying to move as fast as possible relative to others without getting hurt. Offered two bad maps, smart players wouldn’t pick one or toss both. They’d take both along and put them to use. Policymakers should do the same, carrying both realist and liberal maps of the world with them as they go, filtering and combining them as possible.

The first thing a player with two bad maps would learn was not to trust either completely. The learning would show itself over time primarily through the avoidance of extreme failure. Interestingly, this is just what Drezner and his co-authors find in the history of American foreign policy—which is precisely why they suggest listening to the inductive, experiential wisdom of practical policymakers: “The push and pull between the establishment and its critics and between the executive branch and Congress eventually reined in the worst excesses of American activism and prevented the overembrace of restraint.” The pattern is there, but miscoded. The United States has not succeeded because it has operated without theory. It has succeeded because it has relied on multiple theories.

The process works like this. An optimistic administration, believing the world can be improved, invades a developing country (Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, etc.) and tries to make it look like Nebraska. After many years of futile, costly effort, the administration is kicked out and replaced with a pessimistic successor that withdraws. It can go the other way, too. A pessimistic administration, thinking cooperation is for suckers, tries to go it alone in the world—only to achieve little and be swapped out for optimistic successors able to work better with others. The motor of U.S. diplomatic success has been the combination of multiple foreign policy traditions, multiple dogmatic administrations, and regular political turnover.

American foreign policy has always involved flying blind, making mistakes, and slowly, painfully learning what not to do. But the process has played out unconsciously, across administrations and eras rather than within them. By recognizing and surfacing the pattern, by becoming aware of itself, the country could own its behavior and more consciously control and direct it.

An excellent way to do just this in practice emerges from the forecasting research

of Philip Tetlock, an expert in political psychology. Tetlock began with a simple experiment: he asked supposed experts to make specific predictions about future political events and then checked to see how they did. The results showed that Yeats was right: the best lacked all conviction, while the worst were full of passionate intensity. As the international security scholar Peter Scoblic and Tetlock wrote in these pages last year:

Those who were surest that they understood the forces driving the political system (“hedgehogs,” in the philosopher Isaiah Berlin’s terminology) fared significantly worse than their humbler colleagues, who did not shy from complexity, approaching problems with greater curiosity and open-mindedness (“foxes”).

More experiments followed, including tournaments with large numbers of experts and amateurs, repeating and elaborating on the findings. Out of the whole, a picture emerged of what the most successful forecasters did: they kept an open mind and thought flexibly. The essence of successful forecasting, Tetlock decided, was combining multiple maps with good decision rules for choosing among them—which meant incorporating the two basic approaches to prediction, scenario planning and probabilistic forecasting, into a unified framework. As Scoblic and Tetlock put it:

The answer lies in developing clusters of questions that give early, forecastable indications of which envisioned future is likely to emerge, thus allowing policymakers to place smarter bets sooner. Instead of evaluating the likelihood of a long-term scenario as a whole, question clusters allow analysts to break down potential futures into a series of clear and forecastable signposts that are observable in the short run.

The Biden administration, in short, does not face a tragic choice of pessimism, optimism, or just winging it. Instead of embracing realism or liberalism, it can choose pragmatism, the true American ideology. The key is to draw on diverse theoretical traditions to develop plausible scenarios of many alternative futures, design and track multiple indicators to see which of those scenarios is becoming more likely, and follow the evidence honestly where it goes.

Such an approach to foreign policy would not change the world. But it would allow the United States to see the world clearly and operate in it more effectively. Which would be nice for a change.

#### Adding durability is bad---revision is key to policy accuracy.

Jeffrey A. Friedman et al. 18. Assistant Professor of Government at Dartmouth College. Joshua D. Baker is a Ph.D Candidate in Psychology & Marketing at the University of Pennsylvania. Barbara A. Millers is the I. George Heyman University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. Philip E. Tetlock is the Leonore Annenberg University Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. Richard Zeckhauser is the Frank P. Ramsey Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University. “The Value of Precision in Probability Assessment: Evidence from a Large-Scale Geopolitical Forecasting Tournament”. International Studies Quarterly, Volume 62, Issue 2, June 2018, Pages 410–422, https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx078

We also find that respondents’ experience making forecasts and their willingness to revise those forecasts consistently predict higher returns to precision (though the latter finding fell short of the p < 0.05 threshold in some models). These findings provide additional grounds for optimism that professional forecasters could replicate and potentially exceed the returns to precision shown in GJP's data. Many national security professionals assess uncertainty on a daily basis over many years. Professional foreign policy analysts also have much more opportunity and incentive to refine and revise their forecasts in light of new information than did GJP respondents, who revised their forecasts less than twice per question, on average.

#### Reversion key to superforecasting.

Brad Keywell 17. Uptake Technologies, Founder & CEO. "What Makes a Good Forecaster? ". 7-12-2017. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/what-makes-good-forecaster-brad-keywell

They admit when they’re wrong: When accused of being inconsistent, the legendary British economist John Maynard Keynes is said to have once quipped back: “When the facts change, I change my mind. What do you do, Sir?” Many people (who are not superforecasters) do not change their mind when the facts change. Instead, they fall into a downward spiral of defensiveness and stubbornness. This is dangerous! Opinions in any organization or business must be open to discussion, distillment, disagreement, and, dissent and discard. Opinions may be ours, but they are not us, and they do not define us. Facts are meant to be discovered. They are not screaming out at us. Rather, we must be diligent explorers and searchers to find those relevant facts that matter most. And if we find a fact that makes our opinion wrong, embrace it! Be wrong – being disproven by a new fact is excellent. It’s normal, and it’s valued in a fact-driven drama-free environment. Doing this serves us well as forecasters.

I believe that intellectual curiosity is at the core of a purpose-driven life. The authors of Superforecasting illustrate intellectual curiosity with a simple example: Do you take the question “Who will win the presidential election in Ghana?” as pointless, or as an opportunity to learn something about Ghana?

This may sound corny, but I constantly try to remind the people who work at Uptake, the company I run—as well as, myself—to “be super”: super in our efforts to tenaciously learn and discover the unarguable facts; super in our refusal to rush to judgement about the quality of our opinions or the quality of the opinions of others; super in seeing both the outside and the inside; super in our refusal to allow the easy big ideas to define our actions in how we pursue the complicated small steps; and super in seeing when we’re right, or super in admitting when we’re wrong, and then gracefully transitioning to the more probable path of success.

#### GJP Super-forecasters will get it right---40% better than other teams.

Philip E. Tetlock et al. 14. Barbara A. Mellers, Nick Rohrbaugh and Eva Chen “Forecasting Tournaments: Tools for Increasing Transparency and Improving the Quality of Debate”. Current Directions in Psychological Science. August 2014, Vol. 23, No. 4 (August 2014), pp. 290-295. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/44318787.pdf?casa\_token=wfbfNUGCPzIAAAAA:q6nZlMF41JAuqZ8MAmDMeGSDCcyVWSW0oY3Qlxa6ETEzu6sFTPU3WiMF9Kw-wU6KeTxhUbUuQvm8Sq6pV1TJPZ4nH6227\_OLmBvkQRfAqEKICJL3H4xP

The Good Judgment Project (GJP)1 won the IARPA tournament: Its best wisdom-of-the-crowd algorithms were on the right side of 50/50 on 86.2% of all daily forecasts, outperforming the simple average of the control group (forecasters randomly assigned to a working-alone, no- training condition) by 60% and other teams by 40%. The tournament was not, however, just a horse race. GJP randomly assigned its forecasters to cells in factorial designs that tested hypotheses about the psychological drivers of accuracy. We discovered four such drivers: (a) recruitment and retention of better forecasters (accounting for roughly 10% of the advantage of GJP forecasters over those in other research programs); (b) cognitive-debiasing training (accounting for about a 10% advantage of the training con- dition over the no-training condition); (c) more engaging work environments, in the form of collaborative teamwork and prediction markets (accounting for a roughly 10% boost relative to forecasters working alone); and (d) better statistical methods of distilling the wisdom of the crowd - and winnowing out the madness (the log-odds-extremiz- ing algorithm of Satopää, Baron, et al., 2014, Satopää, Jensen, Meilers, Tetlock, & Ungar, in press, and Baron, Ungar, Meilers, and Tetlock, 2014, which contributed an additional 35% boost above unweighted averaging of forecasts).

GJP also added a controversial twist to its winning strategy. It created "super-forecaster" teams by skimming off the top 2% of forecasters each year of the tournament and assigning them to elite teams. We say "controversial" because GJP informally surveyed experts and found flatly contradictory opinions on the wisdom of this strategy, from the bearish "Expect nothing. Your lucky 'supers' will soon regress toward the mean" (e.g., in the spirit of Hartzmark, 1991) and "The 'super' label will swell their heads" (e.g., Levitt & March, 1988) to the bullish "Expect good things. The best predictors of future performance are past performance and IQ - and your supers have both factors going for them" (e.g., in the spirit of Hunter & Hunter, 1984) and "Supers will also get a self-fulfilling- prophecy boost - and derive the benefits that tracking confers on high-ability students" (i.e., stimulation from peers; e.g., Betts & Shkolnik, 2000).

The experts were divided, but the data were unequivocal: Super forecasters performed superbly. Averaged forecasts of GJP's super forecasters (five teams of 12 fore- casters each) in Year 2 handily beat the Brier-score goals

that the IARPA set for Year 4, and all other research pro- grams. They showed no regression toward the mean from one year to the next, and they improved on all the standard psychometric indices of judgmental accuracy, including calibration, discrimination, and area under the curve (Meilers, Ungar, et al., 2014).

#### It competes---the counterplan is a regulation not prohibition.

James Broaddus 50. February 6; Judge on the Kansas City Court of Appeals, Missouri; Westlaw, “City of Meadville v. Caselman,” 240 Mo. App. 1220. https://casetext.com/case/city-of-meadville-v-caselman-1

"Under power conferred on cities of the fourth class `to regulate and license' dramshops, there is no authority to wholly prohibit or suppress. Where there is mere power in a municipality to regulate in a state, with a general policy of conducting licensed saloons, authority to prohibit is excluded. The difference between regulation and prohibition is clear and well marked. The former contemplates the continuance of the subject-matter in existence or in activity. The latter implies its entire destruction or cessation.'" (Citing text writers and cases.)

#### It’s most predictable---we have the common and precise definition.

Dictionary.com “Inhibit vs. Prohibit”. https://www.dictionary.com/e/inhibit-vs-prohibit/

Prohibit is a transitive verb that means to forbid or prevent. Unlike inhibit, the word prohibit means that an action is being completely prevented. For example: “Angie’s coat was so tight, it prohibited any arm movement.” In this case, Angie isn’t able to move her arms at all. Prohibit is often used to describe the actions of authority figures. It can explain a rule or law. For example, “School rules prohibit cellphone use during class.” A street sign may say “Parking prohibited,” while a sign in a building lobby might say “Smoking prohibited by law.” All of these cases mean that cell phone use, parking in a certain area, or smoking are completely forbidden by their given authority figures, and can’t be done at all.