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### T

#### The aff must be topical---they violate:

#### The “United States federal government” is the three branches.

U.S. Legal ’16 [U.S. Legal; 2016; Organization offering legal assistance and attorney access; U.S. Legal, “United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition,” <https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/>; RP]

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

#### ‘Antitrust laws’ are statutes.

Grimes ’20 [Charles W; 2020; editor of this Licensing Update and Law Professor at Ava Maria Law School; Wolters Kluwer, “Licensing Update,” https://www.crowell.com/files/20200401-Licensing-Update-Chapter-13.pdf]

§13.02 ANTITRUST LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

U.S. antitrust law is defined by federal and state statutes, as interpreted by the courts. The core federal statutes are the Sherman Act,1 passed by Congress in 1890, and the Federal Trade Commission2 and Clayton Acts,3 both passed in 1914. The United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”) (together the “agencies”) share enforcement of most areas of federal antitrust law but with some differences in the scope of their authority. The FTC has sole authority to enforce Section 5 of FTC Act, which prohibits (1) unfair methods of competition and (2) unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The FTC almost always pursues claims for anticompetitive conduct as unfair methods of competition and reserves charges of unfair or deceptive acts or practices for consumer protection violations. Though the FTC's authority to challenge unfair methods of competition goes beyond conduct prohibited by the Sherman and Clayton Acts, in practice the FTC brings most unfair methods of competition cases under the same standards that courts apply to Sherman Act claims. The most prominent exception is the invitation to collude offense, which falls outside the scope of the Sherman Act (if the invitation is not accepted, there is no agreement). The FTC challenges invitations to collude as so-called “standalone” violations of Section 5.4 The DOJ has sole authority to pursue criminal violations of the antitrust laws. Most states have their own state antitrust and unfair competition statutes. State law follows federal law to some extent, though as discussed below, may differ from federal law in meaningful ways that vary state to state. State attorneys general and private parties can also typically file suit to enforce both federal and state antitrust law.

#### Their ‘scope’ is defined by government.

Sagers ’15 [Christopher L; 2015; the James A. Thomas Distinguished Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Cleveland-Marshall Solo Practice Incubator; Handbook on the Scope of Antitrust, “Introduction,” Ch. 1, p. 9]

B. Sources of the Scope of Antitrust Law

The scope of federal antitrust law is governed by three separate authorities: (1) the U.S. Constitution, (2) the language of the antitrust statutes themselves, and (3) the language of other federal statutes and regulations.

#### ‘Prohibitions’ are laws.

Collins ’12 [Collins English Dictionary; carbon dated April 23, 2012; “prohibition,” https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/prohibition]

1. COUNTABLE NOUN

A prohibition is a law or rule forbidding something.

A prohibition is a law or rule forbidding something.

That’s key to ensure negative contestability---alternative frameworks crush limits by deviating from the resolutional agent and mechanism, make affirmative content unpredictable, AND selectively erase negative ground by reclarifying their advocacy. They’re extra-T, allowing infinite mechanisms to get to antitrust links even more to all of our offense.

#### There’s 2 impacts---

#### 1) Fairness---Predictability of the resolution ensures an equal chance to win 50% of debates on the negative---non-resolutional aff choice overstretches the research burden which puts them structurally ahead. It also decreases the viability of pre-tournament prep which unbalances the game. That’s an impact since debate is inherently a competitive space and the ability to win each individual debate matters---especially true considering the ballot can only resolve our procedural impacts.

#### 2) Iteration---resolutional stasis is key to refute the aff rigorously---their interpretation encourages AFF conditionality and shielding links since their advocacy isn’t tied to a predictable stasis---that encourages teams to craft the trickiest 1AC which prevents testing over essential truth-claims and solvency---instead prefer debates against well-prepared opponents that make us better advocates---that fosters the best disagreement and ensures we have the ability to persuade people who hold dissenting opinions.

Default to competing interpretations---winning the 1AC was good doesn’t prove their counterinterpretation is. Neg framework ballots pick a winner but no ballot solves structural impacts. Any “net benefit” to their interp that isn’t about the types of debates it encourages is not offense---you can vote neg and agree with claims like “the 1AC was good” or “some topical debates could be bad”.

### Antitrust CP

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices conducted within the healthcare sector.

#### Legal Antitrust is good---two impacts:

#### 1---Health consolidation spikes health care costs and drastically lowers quality of care---antitrust is reverse causal

Numerof 20, PhD @ Bryn Mawr, internationally recognized consultant and author with over 25 years of experience in the field of strategy development and execution, business model design, and market analysis (Rita, “Covid-Induced Hospital Consolidation: What Are The Impacts On Consumers, And Potentially The President,” *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ritanumerof/2020/11/11/covid-induced-hospital-consolidation-what-are-the-impacts-on-consumers-and-potentially-the-president/?sh=692d6fc94da0>)

Covid-19 has initiated yet another wave: A wave of hospital mergers and acquisitions that will have devastating consequences for public health if industry doesn’t soon execute an about-face. Whether because they’re on the brink of bankruptcy and have subscribed to the half-truth that size is protective, or because they think they can score some good deals and believe scale and success are synonymous, the financial fallout of Covid-19 has caused many hospital executives to make consolidation a core part of their future plans. With the intent of increasing care quality and decreasing consumer costs despite these challenging times, the merger between Shannon Medical Center and Community Hospital and partnership between Intermountain and Sanford Health are just two examples. There are multiple reasons why consumers absolutely cannot afford for industry to bulk up in an effort to weather this storm. The first is that the positive efforts executives claim consolidation will help them accomplish often prove to be futile. Research shows that wherever market concentration is high, there are also higher prices for both consumers and the employers who provide their healthcare coverage. In the absence of competition, costs increase and quality deteriorates. That’s the opposite of progress. Second, generally speaking, the union of two institutions with operational shortcomings only creates one larger institution with even more operational shortcomings! That’s not progress either. Third, Covid-induced consolidation will only make future progress many times more difficult. The larger an organization is, the more it will struggle to rapidly adapt to healthcare disruptions like we’re seeing today. Retail giants like Walmart, Walgreens, Amazon and CVS are pivoting to cater to healthcare consumer demands for affordability and accessibility. Right now, they’re still a blip on the radar relative to mainstream healthcare delivery, but they are looking to eventually corner the market and drive the industry forward. And as they continue down this path, consolidated healthcare systems will be left behind, potentially at the expense of the consumers in that area. The potential impact of continued consolidation on rural patients is especially concerning. Rural communities may have a limited number of the big-box retailers mentioned above. And the unfortunate fact of the matter is that when a larger hospital or health system purchases a smaller, rural hospital, it’s usually only a matter of time before the purchasing system realizes that unless they drastically pare down and reconfigure operations, the acquired hospital will never be profitable. Many eventually decide to close up shop, in some instances reducing or even eliminating rural patients’ options for care delivery. In the absolute worst-case scenario, this is exactly the reality all consumers could face if consolidation continues at its current pace. In theory and if left unchecked, all of the hospitals in the United States could be owned by only a handful of mammoth systems that then lack incentive to continually deliver quality services at lower total cost of care.

#### Health care antitrust is a premier vehicle for social change and solves the disproportionate racial impact of rising health costs.

Kritter 21, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law, (Dani, March 2021, “Antitrust as Antiracist”, <https://www.californialawreview.org/antitrust-as-antiracist/>)

The [federal antitrust laws](https://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/antitrust-laws)—three statutes enacted over a century ago—are in the spotlight. The year 2020 brought a [new reckoning with corporate power](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/dec/18/google-facebook-antitrust-lawsuits-big-tech) and a [resurgent interest in using antitrust law](https://newrepublic.com/article/160646/biden-antitrust-blueprint-monopoly-busting) as a force for populist change. The “hipster antitrust” movement argues that the focus of antitrust policy should not be limited to market power and consumer welfare. Rather, antitrust can and should be a remedy for a suite of societal ills, from workers’ rights to campaign finance and income inequality. The year 2020 also marked an awakening to [racial injustice](https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/09/22/racial-justice-in-america-a-deeper-look/) in America. The deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery sparked nationwide outrage and demands to reform institutions built on systemic racism. Yet the recent plans for [antitrust reform](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/117th-congress-takes-early-steps-6904745/)—which primarily focus on monopolies in tech—ignore the fact that the antitrust status quo perpetuates [racial injustice](https://theappeal.org/how-antitrust-perpetuates-structural-racism/). But it doesn’t have to be this way. This blog identifies consolidation in healthcare and vertical restraints in franchising as two examples of how lax antitrust enforcement has disproportionately harmed people of color. It also argues that by dusting off existing antitrust tools, antitrust enforcement can be [antiracist](https://nmaahc.si.edu/learn/talking-about-race/topics/being-antiracist). Background: The Antitrust Toolbox Congress enacted the federal antitrust laws to check the power of massive corporations run amuck. These laws—the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act, and the Clayton Act—were originally designed to control corporate power, protect individual economic freedom, and ensure a fair and equal society. But beginning in the 1970s when Robert Bork published the still-influential “[Antitrust Paradox](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/12/20/antitrust-was-defined-by-robert-bork-i-cannot-overstate-his-influence/),” courts slowly narrowed the focus of antitrust law to protecting consumer welfare. Today, antitrust enforcement prioritizes preventing the anticompetitive acquisition, exercise, or maintenance of market power that threatens consumer welfare and competition—a much narrower goal than its populist origins. Dusting Off the Tools Recent years have seen [bipartisan](https://www.axios.com/exclusive-poll-shows-bipartisan-support-for-tech-antitrust-action-c3794ff5-120d-44d8-bac1-58b033efbd8a.html) interest in reining in powerful corporations with more aggressive antitrust enforcement. One of the few agency voices calling for an antiracist approach to antitrust is Rebecca Slaughter, the acting chair of the FTC. Slaughter [has recently spoken out](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1583714/slaughter_remarks_at_gcr_interactive_women_in_antitrust.pdf) about using antitrust enforcement to “right the wrongs of systemic racism.” She challenges what she views to be a faulty premise of antitrust law: “that antitrust can and should be value-neutral, and therefore social justice problems like racism do not have a role in antitrust enforcement.” Slaughter argues that antitrust has never been and never will be value-neutral. Antitrust addresses market structures, and racism is entrenched in the historic and current market structures in the United States. When agencies make decisions about how to deploy antitrust tools, they can choose whether to reinforce these structural inequities or to dismantle them. Healthcare and franchising are two examples of how a shift in antitrust enforcement from “value-neutral” to antiracist can break down market structures that perpetuate racial injustice. Honing in on Healthcare Monopolies Consolidation in the healthcare industry is a driving force behind the sky-high cost of medical care and pharmaceutical drugs. Due to a wave of healthcare mergers, most hospital markets in the United States are dominated by a single corporate entity. The lack of competition means the dominant hospital is free to exercise market power by raising prices and restricting output. [Recent studies](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/18/health/covid-hospitals-medicare-rates.html) of prices for hospital and outpatient treatment report that healthcare mergers have resulted in large networks charging private insurers 2.5 to 3 times more than Medicare rates for the same patient care. These rising costs lead to higher insurance premiums paid by employers and individuals. Artificially inflated healthcare costs disproportionately burden people of color and create a barrier to accessing quality care. Black families spend a greater share of their household income on health care premiums and out-of-pocket costs than the average American family. And of the thirty million [uninsured](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/usc-brookings-schaeffer-on-health-policy/2020/02/19/there-are-clear-race-based-inequalities-in-health-insurance-and-health-outcomes/) individuals in the United States, half are people of color. The [COVID-19 pandemic](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/racial-ethnic-disparities/index.html) has put this health inequity in sharp focus: racial and ethnic minority groups are more likely to contract the virus, get severely ill, and die from coronavirus infections. What can antitrust do? First, antitrust merger review can be antiracist. Mergers between competitors are scrutinized under Section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits mergers that may substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. When determining whether a merger lessens competition, the FTC, Department of Justice (DOJ), and courts consider the likelihood of anticompetitive effects. An antiracist application of the Clayton Act would consider racially disparate outcomes like health care costs, insurance premiums, and the quality of care provided as anticompetitive effects. Business practices that perpetuate systemic racism are anticompetitive because they exclude people of color from full participation in the market. And this exclusion is expensive: a study by Citigroup estimates that discrimination cost the U.S. economy [$16 trillion](https://www.npr.org/sections/live-updates-protests-for-racial-justice/2020/09/23/916022472/cost-of-racism-u-s-economy-lost-16-trillion-because-of-discrimination-bank-says) since 2000. Moreover, there is precedent for applying a broad conception of anticompetitive effects in merger review. In [Brown Shoe Co. Inc. v. United States](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/20/technology/tech-giants-antitrust-law.html), the Supreme Court held that a meager 7.2 percent combined market share of two merging shoe manufacturers was unhealthy market concentration under the Clayton Act. Chief Justice Earl Warren acknowledged that concentration in the shoe industry might offer some efficiencies and lower prices for consumers, but “the protection of viable, small, locally owned businesses” was a priority. Therefore, agencies can and should argue that mergers that reinforce racial inequity substantially lessen competition. Second, antitrust enforcement actions can hone in on industries like healthcare where the anticompetitive effects are acutely felt by people of color. As California attorney general from 2011 to 2017, [Vice President Kamala Harris](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/06/health/kamala-harris-health-care.html) prioritized taking on healthcare prices through antitrust. Her investigation laid the groundwork for California’s suit against [Sutter Health](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/03/health/sutter-hospitals-medical-bills.html) for using its market power to raise prices and extort better deals from insurers, which resulted in a $575 million settlement. The DOJ and FTC should follow in California and Vice President Harris’s footsteps and crack down on healthcare, utilizing an antiracist approach.

#### 2---The disappearance of antitrust law from public discourse has cemented corporate power.

David Dayen 15, author of *Monopolized: Life in the Age of Corporate Power (2020)* and *Chain of Title: How Three Ordinary Americans Uncovered Wall Street's Great Foreclosure Fraud*, “Bring Back Antitrust,” The American Prospect, Vol. 26, No. 4, Fall 2015, lexis.

In 1964, historian Richard Hofstadter gave a speech at the University of California, Berkeley, titled "What Happened to the Antitrust Movement?" He wondered why anti-monopoly sentiment ceased to become the subject of public agitation. "Once the United States had an antitrust movement without antitrust prosecutions," Hofstadter said. "In our time, there have been antitrust prosecutions without an antitrust movement."

Now we have lost both the movement and the prosecutions. When we talk about banks that are too big to fail, we're talking about antitrust. When we talk about the high cost of health care, we're talking about antitrust. So many of our key domestic issues are fundamentally questions about whether we should tolerate monopolies, or dismantle them. But this formulation-a centerpiece of public debate in the last robberbaron era between the 1880s and 1910s-has all but disappeared from popular discourse.

Can anti-monopoly sentiment be revived? When New York's Working Families Party first recruited Zephyr Teachout to run for governor, she said she would only do it if she could talk about monopolies. "They polled it, and they were correct that nobody knew what I was talking about," Teachout says. But when she eventually ran an insurgent campaign against incumbent Andrew Cuomo, she was determined to talk about it anyway.

"The minute you got past the sound-bite level, people responded to the concentration of power," Teachout says. They did campaign events at places where people paid their cable bills, using the pending Comcast-Time Warner merger, eventually abandoned, as the hook. She engaged farmers in upstate New York about monopsony power, and discussed Amazon and big banks on the stump. And it resonated. After only one month of campaigning, Teachout won 35 percent of the vote, with particular strength in upstate counties where farming issues were prominent.

"The Tea Party talks to people and says, 'You're out of power because government is taking it away from you,"' Teachout says. "Far too often, Democrats say, 'You're wrong, you're not out of power.' That's dissonant with our lived experience. You're out of power ... because your priorities don't matter and JPMorgan's do."

Beyond Teachout, you can see through the haze the stirrings of a grassroots antitrust agenda. The greatest anti-monopoly victory of the modern age, the Federal Communications Commission's net-neutrality rules, owed much to a smart, tech-savvy movement that leveraged big protest platforms. Web-native activists fought for the decentralized power of the Internet, without gatekeepers collecting tolls along the way. And they made the connection to things like the Comcast-Time Warner merger, which failed amid public outcry.

"After this existential threat to the Web, you see the same groups becoming interested in the deep history of anti-monopoly laws," Teachout says. "It's kind of an exciting intellectual moment, a fusion between old-school farmers who have been complaining for 30 years and new net-neutrality dreamers."

Monopolists have long used technological advances to consolidate power, from Gilded Age tycoons leveraging control of railroads and telegraphs to Amazon using its first-mover status in e-commerce to squeeze book producers, or Google harvesting traffic to their market-leading search engine to serve ads. It's easy to translate the need for a neutral platform for websites into the same need for book sales or car ride-sharing.

The European Union, in fact, did file formal antitrust charges against Google, accusing it of forcing search engine users into its own shopping platforms, and bundling Android phones with their own apps, to prevent competitors from performing the same functions. The FTC shut down its own investigation into Google over the same concerns in 2013. But an inadvertent disclosure revealed that the agency's Bureau of Competition recommended bringing a lawsuit, arguing that Google's conduct "has resulted-and will result-in real harm to consumers and to innovation in the online search and advertising markets." The political leadership ignored the recommendation.

The next administration must show "leadership that has a certain intellectual curiosity," says Maurice Stucke, pointing to the Google case as a missed opportunity. An alteration in posture would make enforcement far more vigorous, and bringing more cases will give litigators more experience and confidence to negotiate the judicial barriers. The American Antitrust Institute plans to create a transition document for the incoming administration, as they did for the Obama transition.

But at a time of political disempowerment, teaching about the dangers of monopolies and how we have the laws on the books to fight them, and creating upward pressure to do it, offers great potential for a paradigm shift. Connecting Senator Elizabeth Warren's fight against a rigged financial system and Al Franken's fight against media concentration can spark broader political energy.

You could see this potential in Washington, D.C., where in August, the city's Public Service Commission rejected a merger between energy firms Exelon and Pepco, citing "more active participation by parties and interested persons than any other proceeding in the Commission's more than a century of operations." Activists argued a giant Exelon conglomerate would fail to devote resources to the city's clean-energy goals, connecting anti-monopolization with fighting climate change.

There are a lot of reasons for runaway monopolies: an intellectual hijacking by Chicago-school conservative economists, the over-financialization of the economy, a failure of federal antitrust enforcement. But perhaps the biggest reason is that antitrust policy has become divorced from politics, confined to specialized lawyers and mathematicians instead of citizens and activists. Without grassroots momentum, politicians and enforcement agencies can safely ignore the issue. That's the challenge for a small band of academics, think-tank fellows, and activists: to make monopolies a vital issue again, connecting with the severe economic anxiety Americans feel.

### Regulated Cap CP

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its regulation of the private sector, including expansion of economic welfare, expanded educational funding, increase regulation on decentralized finance, and fund and deploy carbon capture and storage technology

#### Regulation more effectively combats the excesses of capitalism than attempted transition.

Teixeira and Judis, 17—senior fellow at both The Century Foundation and American Progress AND editor-at-large at Talking Points Memo, former senior writer at The National Journal and a former senior editor at The New Republic (Ruy and John, “Why The Left Will (Eventually) Triumph: An Interview With Ruy Teixeira,” <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/cafe/why-left-will-eventually-win-ruy-teixeira>, dml)

Judis: In your book, you explain at several points that you are no longer a socialist and instead support a reformed capitalism. When we met many years ago, we were in a socialist organization. When did this transformation occur?

Teixeira: What happened is that I began to think a lot about how economies actually work. When I was a socialist, I didn’t think very carefully and long about what actually a socialist economy would look like. I had this general idea that the capitalist system was inefficient and prone to crisis and that one should somehow tamp down the profit motive and limit the freedom of action of capitalists. But the more I thought about how economies worked, it was hard to gainsay that the market was absolutely essential for the efficient delivery of goods and services. And the more I read, the more I realized my viewpoint was closer to social democrats than to socialists. Capitalism needs to be regulated, it needs to be pointed in the right direction, you need to have a big safety net, but you can’t replace it.

Judis: Was there something that happened, a book you read, that changed your mind?

Teixeira: I would say it was an obscure book by Alec Nove called “The Economics of Feasible Socialism.”

Judis: That’s amazing. I was deeply influenced by the same book.

Teixeira: Nove was a historian of the Soviet Union. He came from a Menshevik family, and he basically laid out the way the standard conceptions of socialism that a lot of people on the left had couldn’t work. If you wanted to think rationally about what’s feasible, the way economies and people tend to work, you had to have a market.

The goal as I see it is a mixed economy that works as well as possible, and of course you have not gotten that in the West for the last several decades. The mixed economy just needs improvement and modification.

Judis: And what kind of improvements would that be?

Teixeira; I favor what economists are calling a model of equitable growth. It would mean substantial government investment in creating new opportunities for the middle and aspirational classes. It could include a dramatic expansion of the educational system and a Manhattan-style investment in bringing down the price of clean energy and building the infrastructure to match. Granted, these kind of proposals would not get through Congress now, but it is the kind of agenda that I am optimistic that the Democrats will endorse and that the country will eventually embrace.

The Left Prospers in Prosperity

Judis: Your book is titled “The Optimistic Leftist,” but if you look at the terrain of politics today, the center-left or left of center parties are decimated. The Democrats haven’t been in such bad shape nationally and in the states since the 1920s. The Dutch Labor Party got less than 10 percent in the recent election. Jeremy Corbyn and British Labor may be routed in June. The French Socialist candidate came in fifth with 6 percent. Why is this happening? And given that this is happening, what grounds do you have for thinking that the left will suddenly find itself on top?

Teixeira: The way I look at it we are going through a long transition from an industrial capitalist system to a post-industrial services-based capitalist system. So far this transition has not gone well. It hasn’t had the outcomes that people want. We have slow productivity growth and rising inequality. The central point I’d make is that by and large, poor economic times are not good for the left. They make people reactive, pessimistic, trying to hold onto their own, and not supportive of collective endeavors to help the way society functions. And we’ve seen all that in spades in the last decade.

Really that kind of situation is best for the right, and the left has had a very difficult time figuring out a way forward. The Democrats have their problems, but in Europe, you see the problems crystallized. Europe’s mainstream left was based in the industrial working class and has had a terrible time adjusting to the transition to post-industrial capitalism and figuring out what a new model of capitalism and capitalist growth would look like.

They have thrown in their lot with a much more right-wing approach, beginning with the Third Way in the ’90s. The idea behind it was that capitalism can pretty well function on its own and we just have to let it rip. We’re still coming out of that phase, and I think the mainstream social democrats with their collaboration with austerity in places like France and the Netherlands are reaping the whirlwind.

But if you look at other parts of the left, they are actually doing relatively well. If you look at the Netherlands election, the green left did very well, and if you add up the votes of the Socialist Party (a left-socialist party), the greens, Democrats 66 (a left social-liberal party) and the social democrats, the left hasn’t been totally decimated. What has really been decimated is the Party of Labor, as the social democrats in the Netherlands are called. We are seeing the same thing in France where the Socialist Party (the French social democrats) candidate did terribly, but [independent socialist Jean-Luc] Melenchon did quite well. The left still has strength, but it is divided up among different political tendencies. It is going to have to reorganize itself around an economic program that is going to deliver what people want, which is better growth and better distribution. Until that happens, the left will be in a quagmire.

Judis: I want to look more closely at your argument that the left does better in good times and the right in bad times. Bill Clinton got elected in the wake of a recession in 1992, Barack Obama might not have won the presidency in 2008 if the financial crash hadn’t happened that September. The Populists came out of the farm crisis in 1880s and early 1890s; the New Deal out of the Great Depression. I am not saying that bad times is better for the left, but only that there isn’t a necessary connection in either case and that you are making too facile an assumption about which times promote which politics.

Teixeira: Bad times do propel people into motion and produce protest and reaction, but looked at from when you can accomplish the goals of the left of making society better and implementing important reforms, I think it is typically easier when the economy is expanding fairly rapidly and living standards are going up than when the reverse is true. It is not a perfect relationship, but by and large I think it’s true. So yeah, Obama can get elected in a situation where he was aided by an economic downturn, but his ability to put together a progressive coalition that could stick together for a long time and continue to implement reforms was very much undermined by the economic situation.

Judis: Let’s turn it around and look at the connection between the right and good and bad times. In America, the 1920s were relatively good times, and the Republicans controlled the government the whole decade.

Teixeira: The 1920s were not nearly as good a time people think it was. It was a time of relatively slow per capita income growth. It was very unequally distributed, the industrial working class did somewhat well, but the rural areas did poorly, and there were four recessions between 1918 and 1929. It was not such a great time. It was relatively poor compared to the Progressive Era.

Judis: So the Republicans did well in the 1920s because they were really bad times?

Teixeira: There was a sense of real uncertainty, real economic paranoia.

Judis: I don’t think you could call the 1920s bad times. You could call it uneven times. “Bad times” is stretching it. In addition, you have the real bad times of the Depression staring you in your face which is the time of the greatest advance in terms of a left and social democracy in our history.

Teixeira: Desperate times make for desperate measure sometimes. There is no guarantee they will help the left rather than the right. I think that’s what we saw in the U.S. Obviously it didn’t work out so well in Europe. When I make the general analysis that the left is better off in a period of economic expansion and rising living standards, it doesn’t correspond exactly to the political outcomes you’ll have in those different periods. I am saying that in a general sense, the left has the easiest time making advances and improving society when things are going well rather than when are going poorly.

Judis: Let’s look at Europe. In some of the countries in Northern Europe that are doing well, the center-right parties are in charge.

Teixeira: Yes, but I think you can make the case the center-right parties aren’t exactly in charge in Europe. They also have their problems. The rise of populism in Europe is blowing apart the party system.

Judis: You have got Holland, Denmark, Germany, and Austria. Those are all countries that are doing pretty well compared to the rest of the EU and that have center-right governments.

Teixeira: The Netherlands is not doing that well. It’s all relative. Their recovery has been somewhat better. Their employment level has been high compared to other European countries, but there are a number of cuts in social services, wages haven’t been going up much, there is a lot more insecurity.

Judis: Isn’t Germany doing well?

Teixeira:. Germany is doing relatively well, but it hasn’t been a period of expansive growth for them either. There is a lot of wage stagnation and compression there. I never meant to imply that you can perfectly predict social reform from economic outcomes. But I think it provides an important lens on when the left does well and when the left does poorly. By and large when you look at Europe, you see the ~~straitjacket~~ [dilemma] that the Eurozone has created in the economies. People are fearful, they are pessimistic, they are passive. This is very bad for the left. Until you break out of that [dilemma] ~~straitjacket~~, the left is not going to be able to do that well, and the right is going to continue to do relatively well compared to them, and you’ll see the continued rise in populism because people have no faith in the system. So what I am trying to do is to get the left to focus on getting to a new stage of capitalist growth and being able actually to deliver rising incomes.

There is No Alternative to the Left

Judis: So let’s talk about how this political change will come about. What I took from your book is that we are currently suffering from secular stagnation, and that to get to a new stage of growth, we will have to implement the kind of left program that you describe. I worry that this argument contains a contradiction. On the one hand, the left can’t get its program enacted as long as times are bad. On the other hand, the only way to get out of bad times is for the left to get its program enacted.

Teixeira: I see what you are asking. I think it is going to be two steps forward, one step back. We are sort of slouching toward the next stage of capitalism. I don’t think it’s going to be pretty. Political and economic factors are going to propel us in that direction. Ultimately, people want things to work better, they want their problems to be solved. And the only way we are going to get there is along the road I have described. I think this equitable growth approach that the Democrats united around is the future. The level of growth is going to vary over time, but I think the Democrats are the ones who are going to put us there and I think they are going to be rewarded for it.

Judis:. But how does that happen? Isn’t there a crisis scenario implicit in your account? At some time, the current Third Way or neoliberal approach results in another Great Recession and at that point people will buy into a left-wing approach, the left-wing approach will create prosperity and at that time we will have an enduring left-wing or Democratic majority. Isn’t a step like this missing from your argument?

Teixeira:. That certainly could be the way it goes down, but it’s not clear we are required to have a recession on the level we did in 2007 and 2008, or whether this sort of rolling crisis we have combined with other political events might do it. I don’t know, it’s hard to predict, but I think the great economist Herbert Stein said, if something cannot go on forever, it will stop.

Judis: The great socialist Rosa Luxembourg said the choice was socialism or barbarism. I am not saying we are heading toward barbarism, but I think there is a determinism in your argument. I think you are saying that people will eventually choose a politics that will best help them. Reason will prevail. And I am not sure if that holds up historically. When you talk about the EU, you say eventually they will consolidate into a fiscal monetary union. I am not sure that is going to happen. It’s also possible that the Eurozone could break up and that there could be a lot of chaos. We have periods in history where things don’t happen in the best of all possible ways.

Teixeira: The trajectory is ultimately going to take us to a different and better place. I think eventually we will adapt and we will get something better than we have because it is the only solution to the ongoing problems. There is no alternative.

Judis: Countries are sometime structurally unable to do what is in their best interest. In the U.S., we have this strong anti-statist tradition going back to the revolution that seems to get in the way every time we want to do something like what you are proposing. It is possible that contrary to Hegel, the rational won’t turn out to be the real.

Teixeira: Of course it is possible, but if you look at the history of the United States, despite the anti-statist bias and despite all the other political problems, the way the country has evolved over time is toward a larger government that does more and provides more for people. And we obviously have evolved tremendously in the social realm as well. Governments don’t do what is rational in the short term, at least rational in the sense you are describing it, but political systems evolve over time in a way that is consistent with the values and priorities of the left, and I expect that to continue over time.

The 2016 Election

Judis: Let’s talk about the 2016 election. Why did Clinton lose to such a weak opponent?

Teixeira: The Democrats have an evolving majority that consists of groups like minorities, professionals, young people, single women and what have you, and that’s a true fact. It’s growing over time and it will continue to grow, but it was always mathematically true that if you take the declining group, the white non-college voters, and they move sufficiently in the direction of the other party, that will be enough to undermine your coalition. You won’t win. That’s exactly what happened in 2016. These voters moved rapidly away from the Democrats both in local and state races and in the presidential election.

Judis: Why did they move?

Teixeira: They do not have any faith that the Democrats share their values and are going to deliver a better life for them and their kids, and I think Hillary Clinton was a very efficient bearer of that meme. Whether she wanted to or not, the message she sent to these voters is that you are really not that important and I don’t take your problems seriously, and frankly I don’t have much to offer you. And that’s despite the fact that her economic program and policies would have actually been very good for these people. There was a study of campaign advertising in 2016 that showed Hillary outspent Trump significantly and that almost none of her advertising was about what she would actually do. Almost all of it was about how he was a bad dude.

Voters were fed up with stagnation and with the Democrats and they turned to someone who thought could blow up the system. The way the Democrats and the left could mitigate that problem is to show these voters that they take their problems seriously and have their interests in mind, and could improve their lives. I don’t think there is any way of doing that without a new model of economic growth.

### DA

#### Antitrust chills innovation and investment across all economic sectors.

Geoffrey A. Manne 20, president and founder of the International Center for Law and Economics, “Error Costs in Digital Markets,” November 2020, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3733662

Legal decision-making and enforcement under uncertainty are always difficult and always potentially costly. The risk of error is always present given the limits of knowledge, but it is magnified by the precedential nature of judicial decisions: an erroneous outcome affects not only the parties to a particular case, but also all subsequent economic actors operating in “the shadow of the law.”2 The inherent uncertainty in judicial decision-making is further exacerbated in the antitrust context where liability turns on the difficult-to-discern economic effects of challenged conduct. And this difficulty is still further magnified when antitrust decisions are made in innovative, fastmoving, poorly-understood, or novel market settings—attributes that aptly describe today’s digital economy.

Rational decision-makers will undertake enforcement and adjudication decisions with an eye toward maximizing social welfare (or, at the very least, ensuring that nominal benefits outweigh costs).3 But “[i]n many contexts, we simply do not know what the consequences of our choices will be. Smart people can make guesses based on the best science, data, and models, but they cannot eliminate the uncertainty.”4 Because uncertainty is pervasive, we have developed certain heuristics to help mitigate both the direct and indirect costs of decision-making under uncertainty, in order to increase the likelihood of reaching enforcement and judicial decisions that are on net beneficial for society. One of these is the error-cost framework.

In simple terms, the objective of the error-cost framework is to ensure that regulatory rules, enforcement decisions, and judicial outcomes minimize the expected cost of (1) erroneous condemnation and deterrence of beneficial conduct (“false positives,” or “Type I errors”); (2) erroneous allowance and under-deterrence of harmful conduct (“false negatives,” or “Type II errors”); and (3) the costs of administering the system (including the cost of making and enforcing rules and judicial decisions, the costs of obtaining and evaluating information and evidence relevant to decision-making, and the costs of compliance).

In the antitrust context, a further premise of the error-cost approach is commonly (although not uncontroversially5 ) identified: the assumption that, all else equal, Type I errors are relatively more costly than Type II errors. “Mistaken inferences and the resulting false condemnations ‘are especially costly, because they chill the very conduct the antitrust laws are designed to protect.’”6 Thus the error-cost approach in antitrust typically takes on a more normative objective: a heightened concern with avoiding the over-deterrence of procompetitive activity through the erroneous condemnation of beneficial conduct in precedent-setting judicial decisions. Various aspects of antitrust doctrine—ranging from antitrust pleading standards to the market definition exercise to the assignment of evidentiary burdens—have evolved in significant part to constrain the discretion of judges (and thus to limit the incentives of antitrust enforcers) to condemn uncertain, unfamiliar, or nonstandard conduct, lest “uncertain” be erroneously identified as “anticompetitive.”

The concern with avoiding Type I errors is even more significant in the enforcement of antitrust in the digital economy because the “twin problems of likelihood and costs of erroneous antitrust enforcement are magnified in the face of innovation.”7 Because erroneous interventions against innovation and the business models used to deploy it threaten to deter subsequent innovation and the deployment of innovation in novel settings, both the likelihood and social cost of false positives are increased in digital and other innovative markets. Thus the avoidance of error costs in these markets also raises the related question of the proper implementation of dynamic analysis in antitrust.8

#### Global war AND existential terror, prolif, disease, and pollution are inevitable unless the U.S. maintains economic strength.

Dr. Richard Haass 20, Master’s and Doctorate of Philosophy Degrees from Oxford University, Former Director of Policy Planning for the Department of State, Veteran Diplomat Under 4 Presidential Administrations, Awarded the Presidential Citizens Medal, Rhodes Scholar, “International Relations In The COVID-19 Era: Richard Haass On What Comes After A Pandemic”, Interview with Meghna Chakrabarti and Jack Beatty on NPR’s On Point, 4/22/2020, <https://www.wbur.org/onpoint/2020/04/22/international-relations-coronavirus-richard-haass> [Transcribed by Otter.ai, Grammatical transcription edits by Casey Harrigan]

So suddenly, the world is being left on its own. And what we're seeing is the world is not on autopilot. It doesn't self-organize. And that's the most worrisome thing going forward that this pandemic is both a reflection, but also an accelerant of that because the United States has not rallied the world to meet the challenge posed by this pandemic. And instead, we've pulled back we become much more national, kind of an island power, the rest of the world, it's on its own, it's not doing very well. And this is this is the reason I'm so worried that a lot of the trends that were in place, including them on America, much less involved in the world, nationalism, populism, the breakdown of international collaboration, all those things were in train before this pandemic, and now we're seeing them double down.

MEGHNA: So is the you're saying the world is not self-organizing right now, perhaps, at this moment? And at the same time, it doesn't? Is it feeling the loss of the centrality of American leadership? Because, I think we could argue that the way that, for example, international leaders do talk about the United States right now, at times, they're not necessarily feeling the loss of American influence.

HAASS: Well should I think they're feeling the loss of American leadership in the American example, that they had grown accustomed to your foreign policies about what our diplomats say and do what our military does, but it's also the example we set at home, the quality of our democracy, the strength of our economy, the response say to a pandemic, so they're looking at this United States and a lot of leaders and I speak to them all the time are essentially saying we don't recognize this America. This is not the America we thought we knew. So, they're in a very difficult position where now they have to essentially get on without us. But they don't really have the capability. There's no one who has the power that we have, the influence they we have. So no one can fill our shoes. So everybody's on their own, and no one does better on his or her own than they do, again, in a collective effort where the United States leads, so they're not happy about the situation. They're increasingly reconciled to it. But they very much miss the United States that for decades had help organize the world to meet a whole range of challenges.

MEGHNA: Jack, do you want to respond to that?

BEATTY: Well, I think that's very well said. And sometimes that did lead to overreach I mean, Vietnam, Iraq. But on the other hand, it also led to, you know, arms control treaties and efforts to combat threats to the environment that that stretched across, administration's I, you know, I'm struck with this, and I put it to you, Richard, it's as if, you know, the, the greatest generation ratified their experience, they looked at their experience, and they accepted America's new role in the world. Were a different people today. And it's inconceivable that in the post war, someone like Donald Trump could have gotten within, you know, hailing distance of the presidency just wouldn't have happened. For one thing, he wasn't a veteran. And I was just gonna say, the people that voted for Trump or no, go vote for him again, and then not voting for anything like the foreign policy, the security policy, that the times demand, and that our past has mandated. They're the people who feel left behind from the post-Cold War world of globalization and so on. And they're still there. They're a different people from those after World War Two

MEGHNA: Jack, if I just can just dovetail what you're saying. And then Richard I’ll, off back to you. I would actually say that that is not limited to the supporters of the President, that there is, in a sense amongst people a bipartisan agreement about feeling left behind, it's just that perhaps their preferred policy angles on how to solve that problem might be different. But your point is, is well taken, jack and, Richard, you want to respond to that? So go ahead.

HAASS: No, absolutely. I think it's exactly right. And it's really interesting to ask, why is this the case? And I think you're right Meghna, it is bipartisan, it crosses party lines. I think there's a sense that foreign policy has costs more than its benefited us people look at Iraq, they look at the World War, also in Afghanistan. And they simply, correctly I would say, don't think in any way either was worth it. These issues are not taught in our schools, or if they are taught, they're not required. So, you can graduate from Harvard, or Stanford or Princeton, and have no background whatsoever in international relations or in history. Our media, for the most part doesn't cover these issues. Over the last 20-30 years, there's been a real reduction in the degree of international coverage. So, most Americans simply don't see the connection between what goes on in the world and what goes on here in the United States.

So, you know, here was this place called Wuhan where a virus broke out. And what we've learned in an extraordinarily expensive way, is that nothing stays local for long. What happens in Wuhan doesn't stay in Wuhan, but it travels. And this has cost us trillions of dollars. And already what more than 40,000 lives and the toll keeps mounting by the hour. This is an expensive lesson in why isolationism is not an option in a global world. And the real question is, will we learn that lesson? Will we learn the right lesson? Will we basically say we have got to get more involved in the world to prepare for the next pandemic? To do something about climate change? To do something about structuring the world, the digital world so it's positive and not negative? Are we still going to deal say with the threat of terrorism or proliferation? The real question, for me, is coming out of this, do we have the bandwidth Do we have the resources to have we learned the lesson that we can't isolate ourselves from what goes on in the world and to do that safely?

MEGHNA: I think that's a good question, Richard, because it seems to me that for there's a generation of Americans out there who most often see the effects of US foreign policy through the instruments of failed wars. I'm just going to put it like that. There have not been enough examples of the positive benefits of American foreign policy or American leaders and that is part of what is causing people to doubt right now. And on that point, I would like to actually take a caller who has something to say about this. So let's go to Jeremy, who's calling from Racine, Wisconsin. Jeremy, what's your thoughts?

JEREMY: Alright, thanks for taking my call. I believe that we're coming into a point in our history. That is it's more of like an institutional crisis within our government and its inability to function with each other to have a clear intent, and to come together with all the resources to accomplish that. That intent clearly and to our desirable outcomes, given the fact what we did in Afghanistan and Iraq. We went in Iraq, we hosted Saddam Hussein, and then we kind of sat around and said, “now what”?. We just wasted incredible amount of lives, resources and money to to exert our foreign policy in an inefficient way. We just we have to restructure how we go about our foreign policy, how do we interact with other nations, instead of sending the big stick every time something goes wrong, we need to start working on better diplomacy and things like that. And Donald Trump is probably what I would consider, he is like, the fox in the henhouse. The American people just sent him into the henhouse, and he's just wreaking havoc all over the federal government. And that's pretty much what a lot of people feel right now. They just are tired with inability to come together and actually fix something and make it coherent, that everybody can understand. Yeah.

MEGHNA: Well, Jeremy, thank you for that thought. Richard Haass, did you want to respond to him?

HAASS: Sure. Let me react to Jeremy. I think he's right, that we've overused the military tool, and we've underused other tools, including diplomacy, foreign aid, and so forth. He points to the dangers of overreach in Iraq, Afghanistan, Jack before mentioned Vietnam, but I also think there's a real danger of underreach of the United States does too little. And you said Meghna, that people don't see the benefits. Well, think about it, the first half of the century, we had two enormous world wars, when the United States was detached from the world. We've avoided a world war between or among the great powers for the last 75 years, in large part because the United States has been involved. We've seen an enormous growth in the number of people who live in democracies and the degree of freedom. We've seen enormous improvements in the standard of living and the extension of lifespans. So, the last 70-75 years have actually been the most successful era of human history ever. Ever.

MEGHNA: Some would say it's anomalous. Yeah. Someone say it's an anomalous 70 years.

HAASS: Well, that's, to me, that's the big question. Were the last 70-75 years? Or are they the Can we make them the new normal? Can we extend them? Or did they become something of an aberration? And do we go back to the kind of world that for centuries before were we you know, that was the norm, World War One, World War Two constant wars in Europe? And that's where we are I actually think we're at one of those crossroads in history. And the issue for us. Another way to think about it: are we the United States, after World War One that's going to retreat from the world and let it and let it unravel? Or are we the United States after World War Two, that's going to have a creative surge, and try to restructure the world to deal with the challenges of this generation? And I think that is the fundamental question.

MEGHNA: And it is a very compelling one. Jack, did you do you have some I know, you have some thoughts on that?

BEATTY: Well, I mean, that frames it will weigh and, and, you know, to be more specific will the election, even touch on this, you know, in in 2016, we had a Secretary of State running for president and she lost to a man who said, I know more about war than the generals and I alone can fix it. And I get my ideas about foreign policy from the Sunday shows. That showed what at least, you know, a decisive Electoral College majority thought about foreign policy. And Trump isn't going to run as the leader of the free world. He's going to run as ‘America First’, ‘America alone’, ‘America, The Wall’ is his metaphor. And I don't see how it keeps out. dizzy, but nevermind. In other words, that's going to be on the ballot and America's role in the world and his will Joe Biden who you know, can seem like yesterday's man in so many ways. Will Joe Biden rise to that and say no, even though it's difficult for Americans in theu may have to spend money in foreign places to deal with threats. We have to do it. Will he argue that it will he just simply let Trump American first carry that.

MEGHNA: Well, when we come back, we're going to talk about what the possibilities are in this moment. So Richard Haass and Jack Beatty standby for just a moment. This is On Point.

MEGHNA: This is On Point. I'm Meghna Chakrabarti, we're talking with Richard Haass. He's President of the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also a veteran diplomat who served under four presidents. His recent essay in Foreign Affairs magazine is headlined, The Pandemic Will Accelerate History, Rather Than Reshape It. And we have a link to it at onpointradio.org. He has a forthcoming book due out in May called *The World A Brief Introduction*. And Jack Beatty On Point news analyst joins us as well. Richard, I wanted to talk with you and Jack about, you know about specific possibilities also that present themselves in this moment, and let's get very granular. I mean, let's talk about North Korea right now. Because even in the midst of this pandemic, we could be at a turning point there with, you know, questions around the health of Kim Jong Un. I mean, is the US positioned right now to take advantage of whatever possibility might be emerging on the Korean peninsula?

HAASS: Well, you're right. Anytime there's a crisis there, there are inevitably possibilities. One obvious one is in the area of improving global health governance. How do we increase the odds that the next outbreak of a disease does not lead to a global pandemic. In the case of North Korea, it's a little bit hard to read, it's in some ways the most closed country in the world. But, this could lead to a degree of instability, which on one hand, would be threatening, given their dozens of nuclear weapons could lead to significant refugee flows. But it could also, possibly, set in motion trends that would end the division of the Korean Peninsula. This is one of last holdout of the post World War Two situation, you still have a divided peninsula between a closed communist north and a democratic open south. It's the most armed border in the world. So it's just possible that this could set in motion trends. So I would very much hope the United States was talking to the government in Seoul and South Korea, and to Chinese about how we will manage a situation if there is a instability in North Korea. This could become a moment to at a minimum deal with the nuclear challenge in the North, and possibly even the, again, the fundamental division of the Peninsula.

MEGHNA: In fact, you tweeted just yesterday that it's in fact essential for the US, China and South Korea to stay in close contact right now about this?

HAASS: Oh, absolutely. Because you can imagine you have a situation where you suddenly have hundreds of thousands of refugees, going from North Korea, either into South Korea, or into China. China might be tempted to intervene well, so might South Korea, so might the United States. Well, we don't want to have a situation where suddenly you have a chaos and various armies moving forward. So, we've got to manage this at a minimum to avoid a bad situation becoming something incomparably worse. But also to see if we can steer the situation to a lasting outcome that would also be better. This really requires intimate choreography among Beijing, Seoul and Washington.

MEGHNA: But let me ask you, though, honestly, given the trend that you write about in your, in your Foreign Affairs article that we've been watching over the past 15 years or so. Do you have any faith that that cooperation would actually happen?

HAASS: I have very little faith, though, on the ground, the military they are is quite significant. And it's a US/UN force and they are in close touch with the South Koreans. We have some connections to the Chinese, but I worry about it, quite honestly, I'm not gonna sugarcoat it. People are so distracted for good reason. By the COVID-19. The US/Chinese relationship was in bad shape before this crisis, is now in worse shape. The US South Korean relationship hasn't been great. The President has been attacking the alliance trying to get the South Koreans to pay much more. So, I am not sure that we are up to the challenge. And again, North Korea is an extraordinarily difficult country to try to act in simply again, because it's the most shut off from the rest of the world. You know, we're sitting here talking about this and quite honestly, we do not know, either what the health reality is facing the North Korean leader or what, if anything, planning might be in place for succession.

MEGHNA: Right. I also feel like it's a very good example about the choice that you and Jack have been talking about that the United States is on the cusp of having to make about what kind of nation it's going to be because the issue of North Korea and the Korean Peninsula cannot be solved without the direct involvement of the United States and China. So that brings me back to this underlying question. Richard, can you can you imagine, imagine a new model of American national security, a new paradigm of American national security, that doesn't have American primacy on the world stage at its heart?

HAASS: Primacy can be understood as a fact of life or a goal. I don't think our goal ought to be one of primacy. We can't control that, because primacy is about relative strength. Right now, that the United States is still the world's most powerful military, we are the world's largest single economy. But the fact is, for all of our strength, we can't tackle the emerging problems in the world on our own. We can't maintain global health unilaterally, we obviously can't deal with climate change by ourselves. We can't control proliferation or terrorism, or set the rules for cyberspace on our own. So unilateralism, no matter how strong we are, is simply not a viable foreign policy strategy. We have got to partner with others. And the challenge with a country like China is: how do we selectively partner with China, given our profound disagreements, the difference between our systems and the fact that we, for example, have real foreign policy differences, say over the fate of Taiwan. And that that to me, is going to be one of the real foreign policy challenges going forward.

MEGHNA: Jack, did you want to respond to that?

BEATTY: Undoubtedly, it is going to be but you know, look at it. I mean, one of the one of the faults, I think of the of the current administration is the President sees things in a zero sum way, you know, we win, they lose even his view of trade, which is, you know, since Adam Smith, we accept that it's, you know, when comparative advantage and all that he sees that as No, I win, you lose, he was talking about the trade deficit with China just yesterday, and he said, Look, they ripped us off. They didn't rip us off. We got all that cheap goods that we wanted from China. That's, that's called trick, he doesn't seem to understand that basic fundamental of, of international economy. And he doesn't seem to, to look at foreign relations that way, either. Although you have to give him a lot of credit for trying to warm relations with North Korea at the top.

MEGHNA: Well, Richard, I wonder: it sounds like you are lamenting the death of a sort of liberal world order that, as you pointed out, the United States has been the beneficiary of and the leader of for the past 75 years. But if you had a magic wand, and you could you could wave it over Planet Earth right now, what would you change? I guess what I'm asking you is what would you do to, to set up the United States of the global community for success, as we come through this pandemic?

HAASS: I would look in two directions. Domestically, I would try to make the case to Americans about why foreign policy was in our national interest, why our involvement in the world would improve the quality of life here at home. At the same time, we would also need to attend to our many challenges and shortcomings here at home. I once wrote a book called Foreign Policy Begins At Home. And the whole idea was we needed to establish a greater domestic base if we were going to be capable of acting in the world and Americans were going to be willing to support it. I also made clear something the President might have missed in the book was the argument that foreign policy doesn't end at home, we've got to stay involved in the world. It's we now circling back to where we began the conversation. We've got to take into account this new global agenda and we've got to we've got to figure out how to narrow the gap between these emerging global challenges, like global health, like climate change, like terrorism, like proliferation, and global arrangements. One of the phrases you constantly hear from people in my businesses international community. Well, the fact is, there isn't one. And our goal should be to better build one where we take into account this newest security agenda. So that's what I would focus on, I wouldn't let go of the old agenda. I'm still worried about Russia, what they're doing in Europe. I'm worried about Iran. I'm worried about North Korea, worried to some extent about China. But I would put much greater emphasis on building global arrangements to deal with this new set of challenges that, as we've seen over the last few months, has the ability to fundamentally turn life here upside down.

## Case

#### What happens when dispossessed groups disagree – their notion of collectives against capitalism devolves into violent democratic representation which excludes minority voices in the movement

Rees 11 (John Rees – co-founder of the Stop the War Coalition. “Strategy and Tactics: How the left can organise to transform society” <https://www.counterfire.org/images/documents/strategy_and_tactics.pdf>, DOA: 5/6/20, kbb)

The party does not and cannot make a revolution. This must be the act of the majority of the working class, not just its most advanced section. At the very moment of the October Revolution in 1917, the leaders of the Bolshevik Party military organisation argued that it should be this party body that organised the seizure of power. Lenin opposed them. He insisted that it could not be a party organisation that made the revolution. He was absolutely clear that it must be the military organisation of the Workers’ Council that should accomplish the task. The party represented only part of the working class, whereas the Workers’ Council included representatives from the broadest swathes of the class. Lenin’s reasoning was clear: the Bolsheviks may have been able to provide political leadership at decisive moments but it is only when this lead was taken up and acted on by a majority of the working class that such action was effective. In the old phrase, ‘Man proposes, God disposes’; in revolutionary politics, the party may propose, but the working class disposes. In any case, any organisation’s ideas, and its role as a vanguard, can only be sustained if it learns from working class struggle. The claim to be a vanguard rests on the revolutionary minority’s ability to condense and express the best experiences of working class struggle. This is not achieved in a single moment at the time of the organisation’s formation and assumed to remain the case ever after. It must be constantly renewed. Frederick Engels made the point that all really innovative military tactics were discovered by rank-and file soldiers under the impact of emergency conditions in the heat of warfare. The job of a good military leadership was to recognise such advances, even if they conflicted with established theory and practice, and to generalise them throughout the army. Lukacs makes the same point: ‘in no sense is the party’s role to impose any kind of abstract, cleverly devised tactics on the masses. On the contrary, it must continuously learn from their struggle and…unite the spontaneous discoveries…with the totality of the revolutionary struggle, and bring them to consciousness.’

#### Tactical planning requires investment into how to get those tactics off the ground

Stalin 21 (Joseph Stalin – yes that one. “Concerning the Question of the Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists[”](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1923/03/14.htm" \l "1) <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1923/03/14.htm>, DOA: 5/6/20, kbb)

Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinated to and serving it. Tactics are not concerned with the war as a whole, but with its individual episodes, with battles and engagements. Strategy strives to win the war, or to carry through the struggle, against tsarism let us say, to the end; tactics, on the contrary, strive to win particular engagements and battles, to conduct particular campaigns successfully, or particular operations, that are more or less appropriate to the concrete situation of the struggle at each given moment. A most important function of tactics is to determine the ways and means, the forms and methods of fighting that are most appropriate to the concrete situation at the given moment and are most certain to prepare the way for strategic success. Consequently, the operation and results of tactics must be regarded not in isolation, not from the point of view of their immediate effect, but from the point of view of the aims and possibilities of strategy. There are times when tactical successes facilitate the achievement of strategic aims. Such was the case, for instance, on the Denikin front at the end of 1919, when our troops liberated Orel and Voronezh, when the successes of our cavalry at Voronezh and of our infantry at Orel created a situation favourable for delivering the blow at Rostov. Such was the case in August 1917 in Russia, when the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets came over to the side of the Bolsheviks and thereby created a new political situation, which subsequently facilitated the blow delivered by our Party in October. There are also times when tactical successes, brilliant from the point of view of their immediate effect but not corresponding to the strategic possibilities, create an "unexpected" situation, fatal to the whole campaign. Such was the case with Denikin at the end of 1919 when, carried away by the easy success of a rapid and striking advance on Moscow, he stretched his front from the Volga to the Dnieper, and thereby prepared the way for the defeat of his armies. Such was the case in 1920, during the war against the Poles, when, under-estimating the strength of the national factor in Poland, and carried away by the easy success of a striking advance, we undertook a task that was beyond our strength, the task of breaking into Europe via Warsaw, which rallied the vast majority of the Polish population against the Soviet forces and so created a situation which nullified the successes of the Soviet forces at Minsk and Zhitomir and damaged the Soviet Government's prestige in the West. Lastly, there are also times when a tactical success must be ignored and when tactical losses and reverses must be deliberately incurred in order to ensure future strategic gains. This often happens in time of war, when one side, wishing to save its army cadres and to withdraw them from the onslaught of superior enemy forces, begins a systematic retreat and surrenders whole cities and regions without a fight in order to gain time and to muster its forces for new decisive battles in the future. Such was the case in Russia in 1918, during the German offensive, when our Party was forced to accept the Brest Peace, which was a tremendous setback from the point of view of the immediate political effect at that moment, in order to preserve the alliance with the peasants, who were thirsting for peace, to obtain a respite, to create a new army and thereby ensure strategic gains in the future. In other words, tactics must not be subordinated to the transient interests of the moment, they must not be guided by considerations of immediate political effect, still less must they desert firm ground and build castles in the air. Tactics must be devised in accordance with the aims and possibilities of strategy. The function of tactics is primarily to determine— in accordance with the requirements of strategy, and taking into account the experience of the workers' revolutionary struggle in all countries—the forms and methods of fighting most appropriate to the concrete situation of the struggle at each given moment.

**The aff fails---it cannot change minds and crackdown.**

Thomas **Wiedmann et al. 20**, Sustainability Assessment Program, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, UNSW Sydney; Manfred Lenzen, ISA, School of Physics, The University of Sydney; Lorenz T. KeyßEr, Institute for Environmental Decisions, Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zürich; Julia K. Steinberger, Sustainability Research Institute (SRI), School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, "Scientists’ Warning on Affluence," Nature Communications, Vol. 11, 06/19/2020, Springer.

Growth imperatives are active at **multiple levels**, making the **pursuit** of economic growth (net investment, i.e. investment above depreciation) a **necessity** for **different** actors and leading to **social** and **economic** instability in the absence of it7,52,60. Following a Marxian perspective as put forward by Pirgmaier and Steinberger61, growth imperatives can be attributed to capitalism as the currently dominant socio-economic system in affluent countries7,51,62, although this is debated by other scholars52. To structure this topic, we will discuss different affected actors separately, namely corporations, states and individuals, following Richters and Siemoneit60. Most importantly, we address the role of the super-affluent consumers within a society, which overlap with **powerful fractions** of the capitalist class. From a Marxian perspective, this social class is **structurally** defined by its position in the capitalist production process, as **financially tied with the function of capital**63. In capitalism, workers are separated from the means of production, implying that they must compete in labour markets to sell their labour power to capitalists in order to earn a living.

Even though some small- and medium-sized businesses manage to refrain from pursuing growth, e.g. due to a low competition intensity in niche markets, or lack of financial debt imperatives, this cannot be said for most firms64. In capitalism, firms need to **compete** in the market, leading to a **necessity to reinvest profits** into more efficient production processes to minimise costs (e.g. through replacing human labour power with machines and positive returns to scale), **innovation** of new products and/or **advertising** to convince consumers to buy more7,61,62. As a result, the average energy intensity of labour is now twice as high as in 195060. As long as a firm has a competitive **advantage**, there is a strong incentive to sell as much as possible. Financial markets are **crucial to enable this constant expansion** by providing (interest-bearing) capital and channelling it where it is most profitable58,61,63. If a firm fails to stay competitive, it either goes bankrupt or is taken over by a more successful business. Under normal economic conditions, this capitalist competition is expected to lead to aggregate growth dynamics7,62,63,65.

However, two factors exist that further **strengthen** this growth dynamic60. Firstly, if labour productivity continuously rises, then **aggregate economic growth** becomes **necessary** to keep employment constant, otherwise technological unemployment results. This creates one of the imperatives for capitalist states to **foster** aggregate growth, since with **worsening** economic conditions and high unemployment, tax revenues shrink, e.g. from labour and value-added taxes, while **social security** expenditures rise60,62. Adding to this, states compete with other states **geopolitically** and in providing **favourable** conditions for capital, while capitalists have the resources to influence political decisions in their favour. If economic conditions are expected to deteriorate, e.g. due to unplanned recession or progressive political change, firms can threaten capital **flight**, financial markets **react** and investor as well as consumer confidence shrink51,58,60. Secondly, consumers usually **increase** their consumption in tune with increasing production60. This process can be at least in part explained by substantial advertising efforts by firms47,52,66. However, further mechanisms are at play as explained further below.

Following this analysis, it is not surprising that the growth paradigm is **hegemonic**, i.e. the perception that economic growth solves **all kinds of societal problems**, that it equals **progress**, **power** and **welfare** and that it can be made practically endless through some form of supposedly **green or sustainable** growth59. Taken together, the described dynamics create **multiple** dependencies of workers, firms and states on a well-functioning capital accumulation and thus wield more **material**, **institutional** and **discursive** power (e.g. for political lobbying) to capitalists who are usually the most affluent consumers61,67. Even if different fractions of the capitalist class have manifold and competing interests which need to be constantly renegotiated, there is a **common interest in maintaining** the capitalist system and favourable conditions for capital accumulation, e.g. through aggregate growth and high consumption51,62. How this **political corruption** by the super-affluent plays out in practice is **well documented**, e.g. for the meat industry in Denmark6.

Super-affluent consumers drive consumption norms

Growth imperatives and drivers (with the latter describing less coercive mechanisms to increase consumption) can also be active at the **individual level**. In this case, the level of consumption can **serve** as a proxy47,60,68. To start with, individual consumption decisions are not **made in a vacuum**, but are shaped by **surrounding** (physical and social) structures and provisioning systems47,61,69. Sanne66 and Alexander47 discuss several **structural barriers to sufficiency-oriented lifestyles**, locking in **high** consumption. These include lack of **suitable housing**, insufficient options for **socialising**, **employment**, **transport** and **information**, as well as high exposure to **consumer temptations**. Often, these conditions are **deliberately** fostered by states and also capitalists (the latter overlapping with super-affluent consumers and having disproportionate influence on states) to increase consumption61,66.

Further active mechanisms to spur growth include positional and efficiency consumption, which contribute to an increase in consumption overall52,60,68,70. After basic material needs are satisfied, an increasing proportion of consumption is directed at positional goods52,70. The defining feature of these goods is that they are expensive and signify social status. Access to them depends on the income relative to others. **Status matters**, since **empirical** studies show that currently relative income is one of the strongest determinants of individual happiness52. In the aggregate however, the pursuit of positional consumption, driven by super-affluent consumers and high inequalities, likely resembles a zero-sum game with respect to societal wellbeing70,71. With every actor striving to increase their position relative to their peers, the average consumption level rises and thus even **more expensive positional goods** become necessary, while the societal wellbeing level stagnates42,71. This is supported by a large body of **empirical research**, showing that an individual’s happiness correlates positively with their own income but negatively with the peer group’s income71 and that **unequal** access to positional goods fosters rising consumption52. This endless process is a core part of capitalism as it keeps **social momentum** and **consumption** high with affluent consumers driving aspirations and hopes of social ascent in low-affluence segments70,72. The positional consumption behaviour of the super-affluent thus drives consumption norms across the population, for instance through their excessive air travel, as documented by Gössling73.

Lastly, in capitalism, workers must **compete** against each other in the labour market in order to earn a living from capitalists7,63. Following Siemoneit68, this can lead to a similar **imperative to net invest** (increase the level of consumption/investment) as is observed with capitalists. In order to stay competitive, individuals are pushed to increase **time** and **cost efficiency** by investing in cars, kitchen appliances, computers and smartphones, by using social media and online trade etc. This efficiency consumption—effectively another facet of the rebound effect38,47,68—helps to manage high workloads, thus **securing an income**, while maintaining private life. This is often accompanied by trends of **commodification**61, understood as the marketisation of products and services which used to be provisioned through more time-intensive commons or reciprocal social arrangements, e.g. convenience food vs. cooking together. As in the food example74, this replacement of human labour with energy- and material-intensive industrial production typically increases environmental pressures47,75. Through these economic pressures, positive feedback loops and lock-ins are expected to emerge, since other consumers need to keep up with these investments or face disadvantages, e.g. when car or smartphone ownership become presupposed. Taken together with **positional consumption**, structural barriers to **sufficiency** and the substantial **advertising efforts** by capitalists, these mechanisms explain to a large extent why consumers seem so willing to increase their consumption in accordance with increasing production60.

#### Capitalism is inevitable.

Wiedmann et al. 20, \*Thomas Wiedmann, PhD, Associate Professor of Sustainability Research at the University of New South Wales. \*Manfred Lenzen. PhD, Professor of Sustainability Research at Integrated Sustainability Analysis (ISA) in the School of Physics at the University of Sydney. \*Lorenz T. Keyßer, Institute for Environmental Decisions, Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zürich. \*Julia K. Steinberger, PhD, Professor of Ecological Economics at the University of Lausanne. (6-19-2020, "Scientists’ warning on affluence", *Nature Communications*, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-16941-y?fbclid=IwAR0AG6Lz\_CcR2XY0uxVvKNmjnlWP0YLXl6iBcUfl8gcZmTjR7-ZVb3W3oes)

Super-affluent consumers and growth imperatives

Growth imperatives are active at multiple levels, making the pursuit of economic growth (net investment, i.e. investment above depreciation) a necessity for different actors and leading to social and economic instability in the absence of it7,52,60. Following a Marxian perspective as put forward by Pirgmaier and Steinberger61, growth imperatives can be attributed to capitalism as the currently dominant socio-economic system in affluent countries7,51,62, although this is debated by other scholars52. To structure this topic, we will discuss different affected actors separately, namely corporations, states and individuals, following Richters and Siemoneit60. Most importantly, we address the role of the super-affluent consumers within a society, which overlap with powerful fractions of the capitalist class. From a Marxian perspective, this social class is structurally defined by its position in the capitalist production process, as financially tied with the function of capital63. In capitalism, workers are separated from the means of production, implying that they must compete in labour markets to sell their labour power to capitalists in order to earn a living.

Even though some small- and medium-sized businesses manage to refrain from pursuing growth, e.g. due to a low competition intensity in niche markets, or lack of financial debt imperatives, this cannot be said for most firms64. In capitalism, firms need to compete in the market, leading to a necessity to reinvest profits into more efficient production processes to minimise costs (e.g. through replacing human labour power with machines and positive returns to scale), innovation of new products and/or advertising to convince consumers to buy more7,61,62. As a result, the average energy intensity of labour is now twice as high as in 195060. As long as a firm has a competitive advantage, there is a strong incentive to sell as much as possible. Financial markets are crucial to enable this constant expansion by providing (interest-bearing) capital and channelling it where it is most profitable58,61,63. If a firm fails to stay competitive, it either goes bankrupt or is taken over by a more successful business. Under normal economic conditions, this capitalist competition is expected to lead to aggregate growth dynamics7,62,63,65.

However, two factors exist that further strengthen this growth dynamic60. Firstly, if labour productivity continuously rises, then aggregate economic growth becomes necessary to keep employment constant, otherwise technological unemployment results. This creates one of the imperatives for capitalist states to foster aggregate growth, since with worsening economic conditions and high unemployment, tax revenues shrink, e.g. from labour and value-added taxes, while social security expenditures rise60,62. Adding to this, states compete with other states geopolitically and in providing favourable conditions for capital, while capitalists have the resources to influence political decisions in their favour. If economic conditions are expected to deteriorate, e.g. due to unplanned recession or progressive political change, firms can threaten capital flight, financial markets react and investor as well as consumer confidence shrink51,58,60. Secondly, consumers usually increase their consumption in tune with increasing production60. This process can be at least in part explained by substantial advertising efforts by firms47,52,66. However, further mechanisms are at play as explained further below.

Following this analysis, it is not surprising that the growth paradigm is hegemonic, i.e. the perception that economic growth solves all kinds of societal problems, that it equals progress, power and welfare and that it can be made practically endless through some form of supposedly green or sustainable growth59. Taken together, the described dynamics create multiple dependencies of workers, firms and states on a well-functioning capital accumulation and thus wield more material, institutional and discursive power (e.g. for political lobbying) to capitalists who are usually the most affluent consumers61,67. Even if different fractions of the capitalist class have manifold and competing interests which need to be constantly renegotiated, there is a common interest in maintaining the capitalist system and favourable conditions for capital accumulation, e.g. through aggregate growth and high consumption51,62. How this political corruption by the super-affluent plays out in practice is well documented, e.g. for the meat industry in Denmark6.

#### Globalization is immensely beneficial for improving quality of life in the Global South---it’s also widely supported which proves their epistemic skepticism is from an ivory tower.

Horner et al. 18 (Rory, Global Development Institute, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK, “Globalisation, uneven development and the North–South ‘big switch’,” Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2018, 11, 17–33 doi:10.1093/cjres/rsx026)

Citizen surveys further reveal dramatic changes in attitudes to globalisation across and within the global North and South. While such surveys have methodological limitations,1 the results indicate distinctive trends that support the thesis of the ‘big switch’. Among people in the global South, polls have consistently found quite positive attitudes towards globalisation. In 2007, the Times of India claimed that ‘Indians believe globalisation benefits their country’, citing a poll by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs and World Public Opinion that 54% of Indians answered ‘good’ compared to 30% ‘bad’ to the question of whether increasing economic connections ‘with others around the world is mostly good or bad’. More recently, Stokes (2016) reported on Pew Research Surveys from 2016 which found that 60% of Chinese think their country’s involvement in the global economy is good (compared to 23% who think it is bad), while 52% of Indians surveyed thought it was good compared to 25% who said it was a problem. A recent YouGov survey of 20,000 people across 19 countries found a majority believed that globalisation has been a force for good. That survey found the most enthusiasm for globalisation in East and South-East Asia, where over 70% in all countries believed it has been a force for good. The highest approval, 91%, was in Vietnam, a relative latecomer to globalisation (Smith, 2017).

By contrast, public support for globalisation in the global North has plummeted. Bhagwati (2004) cited an Environics International Survey presented at the 2002 World Economic Forum Meetings to argue that disillusionment with globalisation was not universal; ‘anti-globalisation sentiments are more prevalent in the rich countries of the North, while pluralities of policy makers and the public in the poor countries of the South see globalisation instead as a positive force’ (2004, 8). Although Bhagwati suggested this was an ‘ironic reversal’, it proved to be in line with a 2007 BBC World Service poll that found 57% of people in G7 countries thought the pace of globalisation was too rapid, whereas the majority of those in ~~developing~~ countries surveyed thought it was just right or too slow (e.g. IMF, 2008; Pieterse, 2012). A 2007 Pew Global Poll similarly found a decline in the percentage of people in many Northern countries who believed trade had a positive impact. In its analysis of the survey results, Kohut and Wilke (2008, 6–7) commented that ‘it is in economically stagnant Western countries that we see the most trepidation about globalisation’. Almost 10 years later, The Economist (2016) reported on a YouGov survey of 19 countries, which found that fewer than half of people in the USA, UK and France believed that globalisation is a ‘force for good’ in the world. This broad change in attitude toward globalisation is playing out in national electoral politics as well as gatherings such as the World Economic Forum and the meeting of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation.

The ‘big switch’ and the geography of uneven development

The ‘big switch’ seemingly confounds the predictions of the most vocal proponents and critics of globalisation alike. Uneven development is dynamic and relates to differences both within and among countries (Sheppard, 2016). Naïve claims that the world is flat or that economic globalisation is ‘win-win’ have rightly been dismissed (Baldwin, 2016; Christopherson et al., 2008; Turok et al., 2017), yet it is also insufficient to suggest that globalisation simply leads to a reproduction of existing inequalities, overlooking how that unevenness may be changing as a result of new macroeconomic geographies (Peck, 2016). While trade theory could predict that there would be ‘losers’ in the global North from international economic integration, proponents of economic globalisation have asserted that they would be few in number and could be compensated. More recently, it appears that a large group of people feel more forsaken than compensated. Similarly, for those who embraced Marxian political economy, and warned of its negative consequences in the South, the apparent optimism and support for globalisation in the South may have been unexpected. The sceptical internationalists (e.g. Evans, 2008; Kaplinsky, 2001; Stiglitz, 2006) should be acknowledged, however, for forecasting downsides in the global North. As we outline below, many people in the global North have experienced relative stagnation, whereas, albeit from a very low starting point and amidst considerable inequality, many people (but not all) have experienced improved development outcomes in the global South. We then explore what this apparent ‘big switch’ may tell us about contemporary economic globalisation.

The new geography of global uneven development

Significant portions of the population in the USA and other countries in the global North have experienced limited, if any, income gains in an era of globalisation. Milanovic’s (2016) ‘elephant graph’ (Figure 1) has quickly become a popular way to demonstrate the relative stagnation experienced in North America and Europe in recent decades. Exploring changes in real incomes between 1988 and 2008, he showed that those who particularly lost out on any relative gain in income were the global upper middle class (those between the 75th and 90th percentiles on the global income distribution) and the poorest 5% of the world population. Of these least successful percentiles, 86% of the population were from mature economies in the global North (Lakner and Milanovic, 2016, 23). Considering these contrasts more widely, a growing body of evidence shows that the global North’s dominance in the global economy is receding, with the share of high-income countries in global GDP having fallen from 76.8% in 2000 to 65.2% in 2015 (see Figure 1).

A different picture emerges in the global South. In Figure 1, it was Asians who comprised 90% of the population in the percentiles which did best in terms of relative income gains from 1988 to 2008 (Lakner and Milanovic, 2016, 223). The UNDP has remarked that

A striking feature of the world scene in recent years is the transformation of many ~~developing~~ countries into dynamic economies…doing well in economic growth and trade … they are collectively bolstering world economic growth, lifting other ~~developing~~ economies, reducing poverty and increasing wealth on a grand scale. (UNDP, 2013, 43)

The share of global GDP of low and middle income countries increased from 22.5% in 2000 to 34.1% in 2015 (Figure 2). Much of this increase is accounted for by China, as well as India and Brazil. Their share of global GDP, only 4.6% in 1960, 6.6% in 1990 and 9.3% in 2000, had almost doubled in the 21st century to 18% by 2015.

The development context of the global South has changed significantly since the turn of the Millennium, across a variety of important indicators. The total number of people in the world living on less than $1.90 per day (i.e. extreme poverty) has more than halved from 1.69 billion in 1999 to 766 million in 2013. At least by official estimates, the share of the population in the global South who are living in extreme poverty has fallen considerably this century. Whereas the percentage of the population in the global South with a daily consumption level of less than $1.90 was 33.4% in 1999, it was just 13.4% in 2013.2 The percentage of the world’s countries classified by the World Bank as low-income, albeit a very low threshold, more than halved within the first 15 years of the 21st century. Moreover, the total number of countries which are highly dependent on aid (having a net ODA > 9% of GNI) has fallen considerably, from 42 in 2000 to 29 in 2015, or from 34.1% to 23.2% of all low and middle-income countries with data available over that period.3

Considered overall, in comparison with the 1990s, the global South, in aggregate, now earns a much larger share of world GDP, has more middle-income countries, more middleclass people, less aid dependency, considerably greater life expectancy and lower child and maternal mortality. Table 1 provides some summary indicators for high-income countries (HICs) and low and middle-income countries (L&MICs), as somewhat imperfect approximations for global North and South.

After two hundred years of a ‘divergence, big time’ (Pritchett, 1997) between developed and ~~developing~~ countries following the Industrial Revolution, recent measurements suggest a change in the pattern of global inequality across a number of indicators (Horner and Hulme, 2017). The Global GINI of income distribution across all individuals in the world has fallen from 69.7 in 1988 to 66.8 in 2008 and 62.5 in 2013 (World Bank, 2016, 81). Analysis presented in the World Bank’s Taking on Inequality (2016) suggests that, in 1998, 26% of global income inequality was related to differences within countries, with the remaining 74% relating to differences among countries. By 2013, these shares were 35 and 65%. Two hundred years of a great divergence between global North and South now seems to have had some reversal, although more than half of an individual’s income can be accounted for by the country where he/she lives or was born (Milanovic, 2013). Inter-country inequality, rather than intra-country inequality, is still dominant, but it accounts for a diminished share of income-based and other inequalities (World Bank, 2016).

#### And it’s necessary to reduce the effects of catastrophic Climate change

Smith 19 – (Noah Smith, assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University; “Dumping Capitalism Won’t Save the Planet”; Bloomberg; D.A. August 25th 2020, [Published April 5th 2019]; <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-04-05/capitalism-is-more-likely-to-limit-climate-change-than-socialism>) //LFS—JCM

The climate threat is certainly dire, and carbon taxes [are unlikely](http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/10/a-carbon-tax-cant-solve-climate-change-but-we-should-do-it.html) to be enough to solve the problem. But eco-socialism is probably not going to be an effective method of addressing that threat. Dismantling an entire economic system is never easy, and probably would touch off armed conflict and major political upheaval. In the scramble to win those battles, even the socialists would almost certainly abandon their limitation on fossil-fuel use — either to support military efforts, or to keep the population from turning against them. The precedent here is the Soviet Union, whose multidecade effort to reshape its economy by force amid confrontation with the West led to profound environmental degradation. The world's climate does not have several decades to spare. Even without international conflict, there’s little guarantee that moving away from capitalism would mitigate our impact on the environment. Since socialist leader Evo Morales took power in Bolivia, living standards [have improved](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-02-22/bolivia-s-problem-is-macroeconomics-not-socialism) substantially for the average Bolivian, which is great. But this has come at the cost of higher emissions. Meanwhile, the capitalist U.S managed to decrease its per capita emissions a bit during this same period (though since the U.S. is a rich country, its absolute level of emissions is much higher). In other words, in terms of economic growth and carbon emissions, Bolivia looks similar to more capitalist developing countries. That suggests that faced with a choice of enriching their people or helping to save the climate, even socialist leaders will often choose the former. And that same political calculus will probably hold in China and the U.S., the world’s top carbon emitters — leaders who demand draconian cuts in living standards in pursuit of environmental goals will have trouble staying in power. The best hope for the climate therefore lies in reducing the tradeoff between material prosperity and carbon emissions. That requires technology — solar, wind and nuclear power, energy storage, electric cars and other vehicles, carbon-free [cement](https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy/news/worlds-first-zero-emission-cement-plant-takes-shape-in-norway/) production and so on. The best [climate](https://techcrunch.com/2019/02/15/how-to-decarbonize-america-and-the-world/) policy [plans](https://www.dataforprogress.org/green-new-deal) all involve technological improvement as a key feature. Recent developments show that the technology-centered approach can work. A [recent report](https://about.bnef.com/blog/battery-powers-latest-plunge-costs-threatens-coal-gas/) by Bloomberg New Energy Finance analyzed about 7000 projects in 46 countries, and found that large drops in the cost of solar power from photovoltaic systems, wind power and lithium-ion batteries have made utility-scale renewable electricity competitive with fossil fuels. A 76 percent decline in the cost of energy for short-term battery storage since 2012 is especially important. In a blog post, futurist and energy writer Ramez Naam [underscores](http://rameznaam.com/2019/04/02/the-third-phase-of-clean-energy-will-be-the-most-disruptive-yet/) the significance of these developments. Naam notes the important difference between renewables being cheap enough to outprice new fossil-fuel plants, and being inexpensive enough to undercut existing plants. The former is already the case across much of the world, which is among the reasons for an 84 percent [decrease](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/mar/28/global-collapse-in-number-of-new-coal-fired-power-plants) in the number of new coal-fired plants worldwide since 2015. But when it becomes cheaper to scrap existing fossil-fuel plants and build renewables in their place, it will allow renewables to start replacing coal and gas much more quickly. Naam cites examples from Florida and [Indiana](https://www.utilitydive.com/news/even-in-indiana-new-renewables-are-cheaper-than-existing-coal-plants/540242/) where this is already being done. He cites industry predictions that replacing existing fossil-fuel plants with renewables will be economically efficient almost everywhere at some point in the next decade. Electricity is far from the only source of carbon emissions — there’s also transportation, manufacturing (especially of steel and cement), home and office heating, and agriculture to worry about. But the rapid advance of solar technology is a huge victory in the struggle against climate change, because it will allow people all over the world to have electricity without cooking the planet. And how was this victory achieved? A combination of smart government policy and private industry. Massachusetts Institute of Technology researchers Goksin Kavlak, James McNerney and Jessika Trancik in a [recent paper](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421518305196?via%253Dihub) evaluated the factors behind the solar-price decline from 1980 to 2012. They concluded that from 1980 to 2001, government-funded research and development was the main factor in bringing down costs, but from 2001 to 2012, the biggest factor was economies of scale. These economies of scale were driven by private industry increasing output, but with government subsidies helping to increase the incentive to ramp up production. It’s apparent, therefore, that both government and profit-seeking enterprises have their roles to play. Government funds the development of early-stage technology and then helps push the private sector toward adopting those technologies, while private companies compete to find ever-cheaper methods of implementation. Instead of eco-socialism, it’s eco-industrialism. If there’s any system that can beat climate change, this looks like it.

#### Their info sharing tactics gets sabotaged

Schepers 17 (Emily Schepers, veteran civil and immigrant rights activist, doctorate in cultural anthropology from Northwestern University, September 18, 2017. “Agents provocateurs and the manipulation of the radical left.” https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/agents-provocateurs-and-the-manipulation-of-the-radical-left/)

Right now, there is considerable discussion going on about the best way to do all these things. Tactics that make us feel good because they are exhilarating are not necessarily the same as effective tactics. They can, in fact, be precisely the opposite. History teaches us is that the ruling class, the state and non-state institutions it controls, as well as the right have learned the political judo whereby the left’s actions may be turned around and used to strengthen the right and weaken the left. Specifically, we should learn from the history of the agent provocateur, a specialist in manipulating conflict so as to benefit our enemies. Agents provocateurs are not merely enemy spies within the people’s movement. The provocateur has an even more sinister mission, which sometimes has deadly results. What the provocateur frequently provokes is actions that either discredit the left or the people’s movement in the eyes of large numbers of people, or which entrap the unwary into acts that will allow police to pounce, accuse activists of plotting violent or other anti-social acts, and then lock them up. Agents provocateurs have been known for well over a century, in many countries; the breed was especially rife in tsarist Russia in the late 1800s and early 1900s. In the United States, agents provocateurs often targeted labor union organizing efforts. Since the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War, there are many accounts of the FBI, other police bodies, the military, and private right-wing vigilante groups sending agents provocateurs into people’s organizations with the purpose of dividing, disrupting, and discrediting them and then laying them open to arrest and prosecution, or worse. More radical than thou In the 1960s and 1970s, there was a great outpouring of grassroots rejection of the policies, domestic and international, of the Cold War. The Civil Rights Movement, plus the movement against the Vietnam War, brought millions into the streets protesting courageously against the many injustices of our society. The Cold Warriors and the ruling class did not like this, as they saw their interests threatened. So they developed open and covert strategies for undermining the new radicalism as well as the “old left” (communists and socialists). The idea was to make sure that the left did not continue to win over the support of the mass of the people of the United States to progressive and ultimately, revolutionary, socialist ideas. The “new left” tendencies that arose at this time included many positive features but had some dangerous flaws also. One flaw was that too often, a fetish was made of the absolute right of anybody involved in an organization to express his or her opinion no matter how divergent from the main goals of the organization, or to engage in any activity which was “radical” regardless of whether it helped or harmed the cause. This extreme liberalism laid many organizations open to manipulation of some of their weakest elements by agents provocateurs. There was also a tendency to compete to see who was most radical. The competition for revolutionary “cred” was a godsend for agents provocateurs, who actively encouraged such competition. The lack of connections, especially among campus-based white radicals, to the working class and its politics exacerbated this trend by eliminating an important reality check. Picking off leaders and undermining public support There also tended to be a cult of leadership within many radical organizations which put their leaders into a vulnerable position in which they could be targeted for neutralization so as to undermine the whole movement. J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI, for instance, put a huge amount of effort into neutralizing leaders. The agents provocateurs were deployed in such a way as to discredit the leaders and their organizations, to create splits in the movement, and in some cases to provoke violence which would lead to physical elimination of leaders plus a societal repudiation of the movement. The 1960s campus-based movement against the Vietnam War was a top target for agents provocateurs. There were several at work, but one, known as “[Tommy the Traveler](https://jeffsharletandvietnamgi.blogspot.com/2011/04/tommy-traveler.html)” was particularly memorable. He, too, concentrated on enticing impressionable young would-be “revolutionaries” to commit acts that would divide the movement while landing them in jail. Hoover, a crusading anti-communist and paranoid racist, paid particular attention to disrupting the [highly-effective](http://www.peoplesworld.org/article/want-to-punch-a-nazi-think-twice/) African American people’s movement, often employing agents provocateurs to create friction within and between liberation organizations. This led to several murders. In 1967, for example, agents provocateurs, especially a certain [William O’Neal](https://www.thenation.com/article/was-fred-hampton-executed/), described in a Nation article as “infatuated with weapons,” played a role in the police murder of Illinois Black Panther Party leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark. Hampton had been suspicious of O’Neal because of his violent talk, but others did not see through him, with tragic results. O’Neal’s promotion of crackpot violent schemes should have been a giveaway. When O’Neal set up Hampton and Clark for a brutal murder by police acting under the orders of Cook County State’s Attorney Ed Hanrahan, the perpetrators were able to convince sectors of the public that the Panthers were prone to violence and shot first, which was untrue. Another example was the crime of Cerro Maravilla, in Puerto Rico, on July 25, 1978. An agent provocateur, [Alejandro González Malavé](https://nacla.org/article/cerro-maravilla-deaths-police-cover-rock-puerto-rico), working undercover for the Puerto Rican police, enticed two idealistic young supporters of independence for Puerto Rico into a reckless act that cost them their lives. One was Carlos Enrique Soto Areví, the son of one of Puerto Rico’s most important literary figures, the novelist Pedro Juan Soto. The second was a self-taught worker, Arnaldo Dario Rosado. Both were on fire with indignation at the colonialist treatment that Puerto Rico received at the hands of the United States (treatment which continues today). They wanted to demonstrate this indignation in some dramatic way. Their lack of practical political experience made them easy prey for González Malavé. He persuaded them that a noble act for their homeland would be to destroy some communications towers on the top of a hill called “Cerro Maravilla.” This was supposed to express solidarity with some imprisoned Puerto Rican independence fighters. The three kidnapped a taxi driver and forced him to drive them up to Cerro Maravilla. But when they arrived, they found they had been led into a police ambush. As the armed police approached, González Malavé identified himself as an agent, but Soto and Rosado were killed, and the “official” story was put out that they had been shot in a firefight with the cops. The right-wing, pro-statehood governor at the time, Carlos Romero Barceló, hailed the police as heroes, and the FBI helpfully pitched in to support the Puerto Rican Justice Department with the cover-up. However, the police had left a “loose end,” namely the taxi driver, who spoke to the press and revealed that in fact González Malavé was a police agent and that the two young men were still alive when he left the place. The police had entrapped the two men, then murdered them after they surrendered. This became a big scandal, and eventually led to prosecutions and the defeat of Romero Barceló’s party in the next elections. But the use of agents provocateurs to divide and isolate the Puerto Rican left has been unrelenting, both before and after that incident. Disrupting today’s movements Such agent provocateur tactics surfaced again during the protests against the Iraq War, and in the “Occupy” movement. In each case, glib charismatic strangers wormed their way into protest organizations, and then entrapped inexperienced young radicals to get involved in plans, which were sometimes really just talk, to engage in violence. A typical case is that of the “[Cleveland bomb plot](http://articles.latimes.com/2012/may/02/nation/la-na-nn-fbi-stings-20120502)” of 2012. Another is the San Francisco [Mission District riot](https://missionlocal.org/2012/05/occupysf-reacts-to-monday-nights-destruction-of-valencia/) of May 2012, when a mysterious black-clad contingent hijacked part of a peaceful “Occupy” demonstration and
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The Pandemic’s Challenges — and Opportunities Capitalism is one of the great inventions of the human race — an unparalleled source of prosperity, opportunity and innovation. We won’t solve the problems that we face without it. To solve inequality, we need good jobs — and lots of them. To solve climate change, we need (among other things) to transform the world’s energy, transportation, and agricultural systems. Only the relentless pressure of the free market can drive this kind of transformative innovation at scale. In this context, the pandemic is both a massive challenge and an opportunity. A challenge because more than a half a million people have died, the global economy has been massively disrupted, and tens of millions of people have lost their jobs. A challenge because the combination of deep economic disadvantage — at the beginning of May nearly 61% percent of Hispanic and 44% of Black households had experienced a job or wage loss due to the corona virus, for example, compared with 38% percent of whites — and the killings of George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, Breona Taylor and countless others have brought anger and calls for justice to our streets. The world will almost certainly be poorer, more divided, and more fearful in 2021 than it was in 2019. It’s an opportunity because it has also shown us so vividly what is wrong. Inequality is no longer simply an abstract idea. It’s a reality that many “essential” workers must show up even when they’re sick because they have no savings and no paid leave. That racism is not something that was solved by the civil rights movement. As the skies clear and early research suggests that the reduction in fossil fuel pollution is saving lives, the costs of continuing to rely on dirty energy have become much more tangible. Watching states bid against each other for vital medical equipment while the federal government fumbles its response to the virus has made the reality of our broken politics very clear. The pandemic has reminded us that we stand and fall as a society and that the welfare of the poorest among us is integral to everyone’s welfare. It has shown us that planning for the future is essential and that, when the chips are down, a capable, responsive government is a necessity, not a dirty word. We’ve learned that when we must do something, we can: Fundamental change no longer seems impossibly out of the reach. We can do better. We already have the resources and the knowledge we need to build a more equitable, sustainable capitalism. But to get there, business will have to change how it understands its role in the world (and in the U.S. in particular) — and how it thinks about government. A New Path Forward While free markets are an unparalleled source of prosperity and freedom, the free market can only take us where we need to go if externalities such as carbon pollution are properly priced, if there is genuine freedom of opportunity, and if the rules of the game are such that competition is free and fair. Markets do not police themselves; they must be balanced by transparent, capable, democratically accountable governments. Today — in large part due to the rise of shareholder primacy, the increasing role of money in politics, and the systematic attack on government as a necessary or effective institution — that balance is largely absent. As a result, one of the fastest routes to profitability is often to persuade politicians to write the rules in your favor. Firms feel free to dump greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, for example, while spending hundreds of millions of dollars to lobby against carbon regulation. We’re even seeing this dynamic in the U.S. government’s response to the pandemic: It’s increasingly clear that an uncomfortably large share of the benefits from the recent stimulus has gone to very large firms and to very wealthy individuals. I’m not suggesting that firms neglect their duty to their shareholders. Focusing on profitability is essential if a company is to thrive in today’s brutally competitive market. But profit maximization has always been a means to an end, justified by the idea that when markets are genuinely free and fair, there’s good reason to believe they lead to both prosperity and freedom. But when markets are no longer held in check by governments that can police the rules of the game, appropriately control externalities, or provide the public goods necessary to support real opportunity, they become too powerful for their own good. The chaotic and uneven pandemic response we are experiencing today flows directly from 30 years of treating government as something that should be “drowned in the bathtub.” Now more than ever, I believe firms have not just a moral duty to contribute to the health of the institutions that keep our society strong and our capitalism genuinely free and genuinely fair, but also an economic interest in doing so. We need to rebuild our democracy, strengthen our public conversation so that it’s firmly based on facts and mutual respect, commit with everything we have to building an inclusive society for everyone, and yes, find ways to rediscover the importance of democratically accountable, capable, responsive government. Why? We cannot decarbonize the world’s energy supply without government regulating fossil fuel emissions and providing positive incentives to embrace low carbon solutions. Yes, individual firms can provide better jobs — paying employees a decent wage and providing ongoing training, among other necessary steps — but we’ll only successfully address inequality and racism at scale through structural reform, if we can do things like: provide quality education and health care to everyone, no matter their parents’ income; raise the minimum wage; and find ways to give employees more power as they negotiate with increasingly powerful firms. Most fundamentally, we’ll only rebuild trust in the political system, and with it a government that is genuinely responsive to ordinary people, if we can get money out of politics and stop tolerating business’s attacks on government. These attacks are often framed in terms of defending the free market, but too often are simply attempts to block the action we need to build a more equitable society. Collective action — a sustained effort by coalitions of firms — could make a huge difference in helping to drive this kind of institutional change. Firms are already working together to solve some of the world’s toughest problems. A third of the world’s invested capital is already committed to insisting that the firms in their portfolios plan for the challenge of climate change. Businesses across the world are increasingly coming to realize that democratically accountable, freely elected, capable governments are critical to long term economic health — and are willing to say so in public. But they need to do more. A “Kodak Moment” for the World I can feel your skepticism as I write. Can business really change — and help government change along with it? Can it embrace a version of capitalism that focuses on the longer term and the common good? Can it help to rebuild the power of the very institutions that are needed to keep it in check? I believe it can. We already know that it is possible to make money by addressing the world’s social and environmental problems. Walmart saved a billion dollars in fuel costs by increasing the efficiency of their trucking fleet. Elon Musk has revolutionized the automotive business and built a company worth more than GM and Ford combined in the process. The most successful $200M+ IPO of the last 20 years was a company that promised to replace beef with a burger made largely from soy. At Unilever, so called “purpose-driven” brands are growing 69% faster than the rest of the portfolio as consumers increasingly vote with their wallets. Change on a broader scale will be much harder. But not impossible. Think of this as a “Kodak moment” for the world. I spent the first 20 years of my career at MIT as a professor of innovation and strategy. For much of it I was quite literally the Eastman Kodak professor of management. My title was a coincidence — but a deeply ironic one, since I spent most of my time trying to understand why large, successful firms like Kodak had so much trouble responding effectively when the world around them changed. By now the company’s story is well-known: Kodak was once one of the world’s most successful firms. The firm invented classic film-based commercial photography and used it to build one of the world’s most iconic brands. As one senior vice president and director of Kodak research noted in a 1985 Wall Street Journal article, “We’re moving into an information-based company…[but] it’s very hard to find anything [with profit margins] like color photography that is legal.” But Kodak went bankrupt in 2012, having failed to master the transition to digital photography. The business community now faces a similar transition. As the Business Roundtable’s historic decision last year to “lead their companies for the benefits of all stakeholders” suggested, the vast majority of the world’s leading firms know that we must tackle the challenge of climate change, that we must find a way to ensure that everyone has a chance to share in the world’s wealth, and that it’s vital that we not let democracy lose out to either oligarchy or tyranny. We know that we need to change. But too often it’s tempting to emulate Kodak, claiming that change will come — but not now. Insisting that it’s more profitable to stick with the old ways, that if it’s really important we’ll get around to doing something new — later. Change is hard. It’s not surprising that we’re struggling to adopt new ways of thinking about the world and business’s role in it. But I am hopeful. Not optimistic, in the sense that I’m sure everything will work out just fine — I’m not sure of that at all. But hopeful. As a species, we have a gift for problem solving. Kodak failed to manage the digital transition, but Nikon, Canon and Fujifilm continue to be billion-dollar companies. Thousands of firms and millions of people are even now exploring ways to solve our common problems — for example, firms are partnering with each other and with governments to search for vaccines and to bring people back to work safely. This kind of cooperation must continue beyond the pandemic. As recent data shows, trust in business has fallen during the pandemic, but trust in government has risen dramatically. There is no better time for business to see government as a partner, not an adversary, in helping to make society work everyone — not just the lucky few. We can learn from the horrors of the pandemic. We must. We don’t need to go back to “normal” — we need to reimagine capitalism instead. We need to find a way to balance the energy of the free market with the power of competent, responsive government. Together, they can help us build a more just and sustainable world.
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‘Locked’ into growth and rising wellbeing expectations? Having set out in the previous sections the discussion about wellbeing in the degrowth discourse so far, we now examine two additional wellbeing related challenges to the political feasibility of degrowth. First, it can be argued that the dominance of growth-based economics has taken on a ‘structural’ quality in current societies. This means that a transition to degrowth that can successfully support wellbeing would need to involve very fundamental social, economic, political, cultural and technological changes – some of which are difficult to achieve through political means. Second, these changes would ideally need to happen very fast, to present a meaningful response to the climate change crisis. We argue here that the process of transition itself is likely to bring about challenges for achieving aspired wellbeing outcomes. Third, and based on the argument that the framework of universal basic needs is most appropriate for discussing wellbeing in a degrowth context, we raise the question how well (or not) applying this framework to think about wellbeing aligns with current societies’ wellbeing expectations. 3.1. Growth ‘lock in’ Economic growth, as an attribute of market capitalism, has structural properties – it is needed to stabilise modern societies as it provides employment, public sector provision through tax revenues, rising wages, and hence social stability ([Petridis et al., 2015: 178](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0375), [Rosa et al., 2017](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0405)). Economic growth is organised around and shapes a range of tightly coupled structures, including institutions, norms, discourses, culture, technologies, competences, identities, etc. Historically speaking, growth is a fairly recent phenomenon which only picked up in the 19th century together with the industrialisation of Western economies. In a co-evolutionary process, a range of institutions developed which are now coupled to a growth-based capitalist economy, including the nation state, representative democracy, the rule of law and current legal, financial, labour market, education, research, and welfare systems. These are based on philosophies which emerged to justify and give meaning to these institutions, for instance on individualism, freedom, justice, sovereignty, or power. The embeddedness of the growth-based capitalistic economic system in these co-evolved institutions and ways of thinking makes it difficult to transition to a degrowth system because the change of the economic system would need to involve a parallel transformation of those coupled systems. In Luhmann’s words, the constitution of the current system “defuturises” ([Luhmann, 1976: 141](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0305)) the future, it reduces the “openness” of the future; “path dependency” or even “lock-in” are related expressions that capture this idea. Two examples which directly link to people’s wellbeing can illustrate this point: the relationship between welfare states and growth, and between growth and people’s mind-sets and identities. The satisfaction of needs is influenced by the character of socio-economic institutions, including the ways in which work, welfare, retirement, health, education and family life are governed; as well as by the structure of the distribution of a range of resources that support health and wellbeing. Welfare state institutions play an important role in these areas in high income economies, and they are closely coupled with economic growth ([Bailey, 2015](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0015)). Rising economic prosperity in the post Second World War period provided the resources for establishing welfare states in Europe and elsewhere, and the funding of current welfare state institutions is closely coupled to economic growth as it largely depends on income-related taxes and [social security contributions](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/social-security-contributions). The positive relationship between economic growth and welfare states in many ways also works the other way round: welfare states support growth by enhancing the population’s health and education levels, providing unemployment and minimum income benefits for people out of work. This helps to increase productivity, maintain consumer demand, and more generally contain and minimise social conflict through redistribution and institutionalised conflict resolution between employers and employees. Evidently, a fundamental [reorganisation](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/reorganization) of the economic and welfare system would be required under degrowth to sustain investments in health, education, and the reduction of poverty and [inequality](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/inequality). This will be crucial in a context of decreasing material and financial resources, because if left unmanaged, this could provide fertile ground for new social conflicts with potentially detrimental implications for wellbeing. Various degrowth authors have made suggestions for alternative welfare institutions and policies, including working time reduction and redistribution as mentioned above ([Victor & Rosenbluth, 2007](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0460)), a basic income ([Gorz, 1980](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0190); [Dietz & O’Neill, 2013: 94](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715#bib0110)), and, from a Marxian perspective, the establishment of a cooperative economy in which businesses will be worker-owned and managed ([Blauwhof, 2012](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0020)). These are all relevant suggestions, however, it should not be underestimated how radical the changes to existing social systems are that these new institutions represent. They challenge deeply entrenched ways of thinking about rights, justice, freedom, private property, individual responsibility, etc. A change of these deeply rooted ‘logics’ on which these institutions are based is not impossible, but very difficult to steer with political means. This point closely links to the idea that economic growth is not only at the core of various socio-economic institutions but is also very deeply anchored in people’s minds, bodies and identities which is likely to make the transition to degrowth additionally challenging. The concept of social practices helps us understand the ways in which agents (and their mind-sets and bodies) and broader social structures are continuously implicated and reproduced in the performance of social life ([Büchs & Koch, 2017: ch. 6](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0060)). From this perspective, economic growth is not just an external premise that actors can decide to act upon or not, but it is a principle with structural properties that is engrained in ways of thinking and acting – for the most part habitually. Growth thus becomes something that is perceived as ‘natural’ by the vast majority of actors. A range of scholars have argued that the growth paradigm is deeply embedded in people’s minds and bodies ([Göpel, 2016](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0185); [Lane, 1991](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0285); [Welzer, 2011](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0475); [Büchs & Koch, 2017: ch. 6](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715#bib0060)). This implies that people’s identities and life goals are closely aligned with the idea of growth – shaped by ideas of social progress, personal status and success through careers, rising income and consumption. Even seemingly alternative goals such as ‘personal fulfilment’ can be infused with ideas that remain tied to the growth paradigm, for instance if fulfilment is sought through high consumption and high emissions practices such as extensive long haul travel or expensive hobbies and gadgets. As [Meadows (1999)](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718300715" \l "bib0325) has pointed out, the most effective, but also the most difficult step in system transformation is the shift of paradigms that underpin the system. Again, since this is difficult to influence politically, it presents a major hurdle for a departure from growth-based systems that also maintains wellbeing.