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#### Military framing K2 avoid Chinese AI dominance – triggers great power wars

Allison 20 **–** Professor of Government, Harvard Kennedy School

Graham Allison, August 2020, "Is China Beating the U.S. to AI Supremacy?," Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/china-beating-us-ai-supremacy>

An AI Arms Race?

During the Cold War, the stakes in the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union were obvious. In today’s Thucydidean rivalry between a meteorically rising China and a colossal ruling United States, what are the risks of an escalating AI arms race?

Like it or not, future war will be AI-driven. As Secretary of Defense Mark Esper recently noted at the conference of the National Security Commission on AI, “Advances in AI have the potential to change the character of warfare for generations to come. Whichever nation harnesses AI first will have a decisive advantage on the battlefield for many, many years.” AI’s ability to accelerate decision cycles in conflict will compel militaries to adopt it. In air-to-air combat, pilots begin with an ooda loop: observe, orient, decide, act. If A can “get inside B’s OODA loop,” A wins—since he can maneuver to escape A’s fire and attack where he calculates B’s path will leave him when A’s missile arrives. Because AI can observe, orient, decide and act at multiples of a human pilot, it will become irresponsible to send a human pilot into battle with an AI piloted aircraft.51 As former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joeseph Dunford put it: “Whoever has the competitive advantage in artificial intelligence and can field systems informed by artificial intelligence, could very well have an overall competitive advantage.”52

The demonstrated success of AlphaGo, and more recently, AlphaStar, in defeating all competitors in one of the world’s most complex real-time strategy video games suggests that in any structured contest between offense and defense, AI will dominate humans. The company, country or team with the best AI will win. As an example, consider American football. In what commentators often discuss as a “chess match,” the offense and defense coordinators know that if the defense guesses correctly whether the next play will be a pass or a run, most nfl teams’ defenses can successfully stop most opponents’ offense. Reading all the variables in a situation, AI should be able to tilt the scales on the field—or in analogous military competitions on land, sea, and in the air and space.

The domain’s leader will also be the first to know which of today’s military mainstays AI will upend. Germany discovered the power of submarines before World War I because it led in their development. British admirals did not wake up to their deadly efficiency until a lone German U-boat in 1914 sank three armored cruisers on a single morning. By then, it was too late—the British had already invested their treasure in building battle fleet that had become largely obsolete. The coordination of drones and cruise missiles that successfully attacked Saudi Arabia’s most valuable target and cut its oil exports by half is suggestive. Will AI-empowered drone swarms make aircraft carriers equally obsolete, all for one one-thousandth of the cost? Will AI analysis of data from all sources pierce the invisibility of stealthy systems like the F-35 in which the United States has invested so substantially? The first country to know will be the one driving the research and development frontier.

#### Can distinguish military framing from “militarism”

Barkawi, Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics, is a historian of war and empire. His scholarship uses interdisciplinary approaches to imperial and military archives to re-imagine relations between war, armed forces, and society in modern times, ‘19

(Tarak, “Between the militarized and the martial,” in Can we really “forget” militarization? A conversation on Alison Howell’s martial politics, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Volume 21)

Alison Howell (2018) insightfully critiques the notion of “militarization” for presuming an original state of civility. War and armed force relate co-constitutively to society; society has always already been shaped by war. There is no pristine, original moment in which society, or the universities, or the police, or technology, or gender relations, were untouched by war and the constitution and use of force. I find much to agree with in Howell’s (2018, abstract) corrective of martial politics, signaling that society and politics are “shot-through with war-like relations.” But if everything is war, we need to make distinctions anew. Here, Howell’s account of militarization as a concept risks undermining her important call for “careful historical work” (Howell 2018, 131). Crucially, war and militarization are different objects of analysis. The former concerns reciprocal organized violence. The latter refers to the specifically military, a rationalized form of life that valorizes a variable, but archetypally Western, set of values putatively associated with the profession of arms. The histories and sociologies of war, and those of the military and militarization, however interrelated, are not the same. This is a significant distinction for critical analysis of both war and of militarization.

Armed forces generate, and are sites of, cultural production in their wider social contexts. They, and the histories and myths of the wars they fight, spawn social imaginaries that do all manner of cultural and political work. All of this is “martial” in Howell’s sense, but much of it diverges considerably from what goes on in actual militaries or wars. Militarized culture is often fantastical in contemporary and historical contexts, militarily and otherwise. One need only think of Sylvester Stallone’s Rambo or the con- temporary revival of Greco-Roman martial mythology. Conversely, war, as Howell is well aware, often travels through society in mufti. Being able to distinguish militarization from war enables greater clarity about the very topic that Howell wants most to bring to our attention, war’s covert presence in our putatively civil institutions. It also lets us see how the two might be intertwined. Classically, of course, militarized popular culture makes war and military service attractive and desirable. War entails the more or less tragic, but always ironic, denouement of such desires, and sets in train its own processes.

Consider Howell’s (2018, 129) excellent example of nursing: “warfare and nursing were both modernized and professionalized through their mutual encounter.” She emphasizes that the “story here is not one of the military encroachment on nursing; rather, nursing became a discipline and profession through war, and subsequently through war-like relations with the poor” (Howell 2018, 129). From here, for example, we can begin to see how nursing in “civil” contexts might be akin to counter-insurgency (cf. Owens 2015). That is all to the good for martial politics as a concept. Nonetheless, it seems to me that two things, however related with one another, risk being mixed up. One is a story about how war informs nursing as a historical vocation and institution, shaping it in cortical ways, not least gender. The second is the role of militarized imaginaries in the organization of Victorian workhouses, in the subjectivities of their nurses, and in other sites of the social welfare state. Those imaginaries derive from popular, possibly fantastic, images of the military and not necessarily from war as a social and historic practice. Martinets and Colonel Blimps are certainly found in armies, but they are primarily civilian images of what soldiers are like and play their own roles in processes of militarization in civilian society.

David Edgerton (2013) helps to make the inverse point, in which relations of war take civil form in society. Britain’s interwar aircraft industry appears as a liberal and technological space populated by eccentric boffins and colorful entrepreneurs, who gave birth to civil aviation and modern tourism. It was in fact a military-industrial complex preparing to obliterate enemy civilians. This complex was politically efficacious, playing a starring role in the myths surrounding the Battle of Britain and the Blitz (Calder 1992), precisely because it was not overtly militarized. Despite this civil cloaking, it produced enormously effective, and deadly, instruments of war. Later, in the run-up to the Falklands and Iraq wars, it was the Blitz myth’s image of Britain as an unmilitarized civil space (until justly roused) that made it useful for war mobilization. Recognizing what war is, and what it does in and to historical and contemporary societies, requires distinguishing it from the militarized, while remaining cognizant of the work of histories of militarization.

#### Private-gvot coop good – govt alone picks more losers than winners

Thierer 8/18 – Adam Thierer is a Senior Research Fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. He specializes in innovation, entrepreneurialism, Internet, and free-speech issues, with a particular focus on the public policy concerns surrounding emerging technologies.  
Adam Thierer, August 18 2021, “Government Planning and Spending Won’t Replicate Silicon Valley,” Discourse, <https://www.discoursemagazine.com/economics/2021/08/18/government-planning-and-spending-wont-replicate-silicon-valley/>

Unfortunately, the “if you build it, they will come” mentality surrounding tech clusters and regional innovation hubs doesn’t take into account many economic, political, cultural and geographic challenges. Indeed, the history of previous efforts proves that these things cannot simply be willed into existence through top-down industrial policies, big bureaucracies and a lot of new spending programs. Clusters tend to grow more organically, and efforts by the government to force them are unlikely to meet with any more success than past experiments.

Wishful Thinking About Economic Development Subsidies

“Economic theory offers little reason to think that targeted economic development subsidies benefit the broader communities that ultimately pay for them,” concluded a recent Mercatus Center study on “[The Economics of a Targeted Economic Development Subsidy](https://www.mercatus.org/publications/government-spending/economics-targeted-economic-development-subsidy).” The authors highlighted the extensive economic literature that finds that “the net effect of targeted economic development subsidies is likely to be negative” because “the taxes funding the subsidies will discourage more economic activity than will be encouraged by the subsidies themselves.”

That points to the first problem with governments trying to pick winners: There is no free lunch. Economic development and industrial policy efforts always sound great in theory, but in the end they rely on government-granted privileges—discriminatory tax or regulatory relief, cash subsidies, loans and loan guarantees, in-kind donations and the provision of other valuable goods and services. The costs of these targeted privileges are passed along to those firms and economic sectors without the political clout to get the favors, or just borne by taxpayers more generally.

The second problem with policymakers trying to pick winners is that they’re just not very good at it. Forecasting future market trends and the evolution of technology has always been notoriously difficult, even in the private sector. Lacking a profit motive and business acumen, governments have a much worse track record than investors, regularly picking more losers than winners. This problem has grown more acute today due to “[the pacing problem](https://www.mercatus.org/bridge/commentary/pacing-problem-and-future-technology-regulation),” which refers to the inability of government policies and programs to keep up with the ever-quickening pace of modern technological innovation.

These realities have not stopped policymakers from repeatedly trying to use both direct and indirect subsidies to attract high-tech sectors and talent to specific destinations. But there is no precise recipe for growing tech clusters. And as economists [William R. Kerr](https://www.hbs.edu/competitiveness/faculty/Pages/faculty-profile-details.aspx?profile=wkerr) and [Frédéric Robert-Nicoud](https://www.unige.ch/gsem/en/research/faculty/all/frederic-robert-nicoud/) [note](https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.34.3.50), “developing even a semi-formal definition is tricky.” Typically, however, a tech cluster includes “an important overall scale of local activity, complemented by spatial density and linkages amongst local firms.”

This is not easily replicated. Indeed, in the U.S. a huge amount of the nation’s high-tech startup activity and venture capital funding is concentrated only in Silicon Valley and eight other big-city areas: New York City, Boston, Los Angeles, Seattle, Washington, D.C., San Diego, Austin and Chicago. Of course, large cities have long possessed many advantages for attracting skilled labor and investors, and they often tend to have a high concentration of universities and research labs, making it far easier for tech clusters to develop in these large urban centers than in rural areas. Fine. But much of the nation is dotted with other large cities. Why can’t they become thriving tech clusters?

This kind of thinking is driving the latest push to create the next great innovation hub. “With federal support, the U.S. can recreate Silicon Valley success nationwide,” [says Steve Case](https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/550262-with-federal-support-the-us-can-recreate-silicon-valley-success-nationwide?rl=1), former head of America Online. [Others argue](https://www.brookings.edu/events/leveraging-regional-tech-hubs-to-advance-racial-equity/) regional tech hubs can help advance economic inclusion and racial equity.

#### Strategic frame is good – its central to emancipatory strategy, a uniquely valuable part of any academic IR framework, and cannot be reduced to simple dichotomies

Vennesson, PhD, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University Singapore, ‘19

(Pascal, “Is Strategic Studies Rationalist, Materialist, and A-Critical? Reconnecting Security and Strategy,” Journal of Global Security Studies, 0(0), 2019, 1–17)

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Cyber securitization is inevitable AND good – recognizing the threat is key to developing necessary protections

**Hersee 19** – PhD in Cyber Security, which focusses on the dispute between digital rights and national security in cyberspace.

Steven Hersee, “THE CYBER SECURITY DILEMMA AND THE SECURITISATION OF CYBERSPACE,” Royal Holloway University of London, 2019, https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/the-cyber-security-dilemma-and-the-securitisation-of-cyberspace(dcf65dd5-c75d-40ce-8994-6da979eaa1e7).html

5.2 SHOULD CYBERSPACE BE DESECURITISED?

Desecuritisation is the process by which an issue is removed from the security sphere and is no longer considered to be an urgent threat, requiring exceptional measures to counter. For the Copenhagen School, ‘it means not to have issues phrased as “threats against which me have countermeasures” but to move them out of this threat-defense sequence and into the ordinary public sphere’ (Busan, et al., 1998, p. 29).

But desecuritisation is difficult to achieve once an issue has been accepted as threatening and desecuritisation does not guarantee than an issue will become re- politicised and re-open to public debate. If securitising moves are rejected forcefully enough, then issues can become both de-securitised and de-politicised (See Figure 5.1). This means that not only are the issues considered non- threatening, but they are also closed for discussion. Islamic extremism and immigration are issues that are often difficult to discuss in a political environment because they are either securitised as existentially threatening or de-politicised because the responses to them are considered threatening, racist or intolerant.

Cyberspace scholars are in general agreement that cyberspace securitisation has mainly negative consequences. Kingsmith, for example, discusses the negative consequences that emerge from moves by states to securitise internet content.

Considering these securitising moves ... the more that filtering practices are withheld from public scrutiny and accountability, the more tempting it is for framing authorities to employ these tools for illegitimate reasons such as the stifling of both opposition and civil society networks (Kingsmith, 2013, p. 1).

Deibert also highlights the negative consequences of the securitisation of cyberspace, including the resultant threats to basic freedoms.

There has been a growing recognition of serious risks in cyberspace. The need to manage these risks has led to a wave of securitization efforts that have potentially serious implications for basic freedoms (Deibert & Rohozinski, 2010, p. 49).

Whilst arguing that the securitisation of cyberspace is negative and inevitable, Deibert also contends that the form of this securitisation can be influenced. ‘The securitization of cyberspace may be inevitable, but what form that security takes is not’ (Deibert, 2012, p. 274). He suggests that it is better to securitise threats to human rights than to securitise threats to national security. Mariya Georgieva takes this further, citing the Snowden disclosures as an example of the securitisation of digital rights, arguing that Snowden had ‘successfully shifted the focus of the securitisation of cyberspace from values such as the survival of the state and effective national security to the survival of privacy and personal choice’ (Georgieva, 2015, p. 44). Whilst she celebrates this shift she does not explain why it is better to securitise privacy rather than national security. Helen Nissenbaum is one author who does take a more consequentialist approach to cyberspace securitisation, arguing that it might be justified when the threat is as extreme as its proponents claim.

If those who subscribe to a conception of security as cybersecurity are right, particularly if the magnitude of threat is as great as those on the extremes claim, then an extraordinary response is warranted despite its chilling effects (Nissenbaum, 2005, p. 73).

However, this approach is rare and most literature is either critical of state surveillance and the securitisation of cyberspace, or is complimentary of Edward Snowden and supportive of the securitisation of individual privacy. Given that a narrow majority of the British public support greater efforts to protect national security it is surprising that academic literature is weighted so strongly towards criticisms of state surveillance and the securitisation of national security (Pew Research Centre, 2016). Even when cyberspace securitisation by non-state actors is addressed, such as in Georgieva’s work on Snowden as an alternative securitizing actor, these forms of securitisation are considered positive because they support human rights. In the US and UK, academics have also been politically active in opposing state surveillance. In 2014 over one thousand scholars from a wide range of disciplines formed the ‘academics against surveillance’ campaign, which published an open letter criticising state surveillance (Electronic Frontier Foundation, 2014).

Whilst there is disagreement over whether desecuritisation is always best and what types of securitisation should be reversed, there are a variety of means through which desecuritisation can be achieved.

## Beller K

#### Theory is too totalizing – 1AC says in SOME contexts the govt’s role is to facilitate markets, but that’s not how EVERYTHING should be handled

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

The implication of the foregoing is that the most pressing task for competition policymakers may not involve a rethinking of first principles. The principles of neoliberal competition policy may have ultimately been proven justified by an unprecedented period of economic growth, technological progress and reductions in poverty, and should presumably remain operative as long as they remain the best framework for bringing about these ends. Neither, as we have suggested, must the capitalist entrepreneur be lost in the process. The totalitarian temptation to submit to general state control of the economy-whether it be in the form of communism from below or fascism from above should be resisted so as to preserve and build upon the great prosperity Western Civilization has managed to achieve.

This statement will no doubt be highly unsatisfactory to many critics of neoliberalism who seek more fundamental and revolutionary changes. Surely, they suggest, there must be some principled basis for critiquing the neoliberal status quo with which so many are frustrated. Indeed, there very well may be, and none of the arguments in this article should be understood to the contrary. The goal of this article has been limited to a tailored defense of neoliberal principles only as they relate to competition policy, broadly understood. It does not suggest that neoliberal monetary, trade, and fiscal policies are also sound-let alone a neoliberal social order, where all the core institutions within society are organized according to the neoliberal principles of wealthmaximization, empiricism, and the rest.129 This is to say that even if neoliberalism is a sound theory as applied to the area of competition policy, neoliberal monetary policy, for example, may be problematic and a just target for contemporary critics. Similarly, claiming that competition policy should be enforced using a consumer welfare standard does not mean that all the organs of law and civil society should be oriented to maximize wealth or consumer welfare, even if this economic inquiry is nonetheless informative. 30 It is well known that several prominent neoliberals have expanded the neoliberal policy apparatus beyond the regulation of market capitalism with which antitrust is concerned to domains typically understood to be beyond a purely utilitarian purview.' 3 ' However, whatever the merits of these broader neoliberal policy programs, the competition policy baby, so to speak, should not be thrown out with the bathwater.

Consider the charge that neoliberal policies have increased wealth inequality in the United States. Some commentators attempt to link this increased inequality with a decline in competition'3 2 and, by implication, consumer welfare competition policy. Notwithstanding the interest such theories appeared to have garnered from highly distinguished economists and policymakers, such as Nobel Laureate Joe Stiglitz,133 one might alternatively consider whether increasing wealth inequality and the resultant social strife are far more a result of policies in other areas, such as monetary policy. 134 At the same time as Chicago School antitrust policy took root, the American economy began to undergo sustained expansions in the money supply and reductions in interest rates that, at least in theory, disproportionately reward the owners of financial assets, who are more likely to be wealthy. 135

Indeed, after the financial crisis, monetary policy engaged in a truly unprecedented expansion, with the Federal Reserve lowering interest rates to zero and increasing its balance sheet from approximately $900 billion before the crisis to $4.5 trillion after, most of which constituted either troublesome mortgage-backed securities or treasury bonds. 36 The share of wealth of the world's richest people roughly doubled. 37 At the same time, however, one would seem to look in vain for any shift toward an increased laissez faire competition policy during the Obama administration. Indeed, antitrust enforcement under the Obama administration arguably increased relative to the George W. Bush administration, even if only at the margins and not in the area of monopolization. 3

#### Our theory is compatible with theirs – we can do things like social insurance and public utilities, which solves the K

**Rahman 17** – Associate professor of law at Brooklyn Law School and former visiting professor of law at Harvard Law School.

K. Sabeel Rahman, “Ch. 1: Democracy, Domination, and the Challenge of Economic Governance,” *Democracy Against Domination*, Oxford University Press 2017, pp. 3.

First, I argue here that the fundamental problem of the modern economy is best understood not as a matter of income inequality or distributive justice, but rather as a broader problem of power and domination—manifesting in the concentration of economic power in large corporations, or the power relationships baked into the very structure of the diffuse market economy. Corporations, economic elites, and even market forces themselves all exercise a kind of unchecked power over others in the economy. The purpose of governance in this view is to curtail such forms of economic power, subjecting these seemingly powerful and diffuse economic forces to democratic oversight and control.

This focus on domination points to the need for a range of structural, power-shifting reforms to our economy—for example through measures to undo concentrations of power such as antitrust limits on mega-corporations, social insurance schemes to insulate individuals from market pressures, or the creation of public utilities to ensure public oversight over critical industries. The idea of domination suggests economic regulation that, rather than prioritizing growth or efficiency, instead highlights the central moral and political challenge of reforming the basic structure and distribution of economic power to limit the ability of some actors—whether they are mega-corporations or more diffuse “market forces”—to arbitrarily interfere with the life chances of others.

#### Markets are a computational necessity – we should make them more democratic instead of rejecting them

Posner and Weyl 18 – Eric A. Posner is Kirkland and Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Arthur and Esther Kane Research Chair at the University of Chicago. E. Glen Weyl is an economist and researcher at Microsoft Research New England.

Eric A. Posner and E. Glen Weyl, “Epilogue: After Markets?” *Radical Markets: Uprooting Capitalism and Democracy for a Just Society*, Princeton University Press 2018, Epub (email [arg5180@gmail.com](mailto:arg5180@gmail.com) for relevant text).

Markets as Miracles

As we saw in chapter 1, many economists who were committed to the market economy also considered themselves “socialists.” Yet in the early twentieth century, socialism became identified with central planning, thanks to the role of Marxism and the French Revolution in inspiring and justifying the economic policies of the Soviet Union. Central planning also received a boost from World War I, where national control of the economy for the purpose of war production was more successful than advocates of laissez-faire could ever have imagined. This led to a heated debate about whether central planning should be used in peacetime as well.

In the popular imagination, central planning could not succeed because it provided individuals with no incentives to work. People needed the prospect of riches, or at least wages, to get them out of bed in the morning. Yet incentives were quite strong in the Soviet Union, stronger, in many ways, than they are in capitalist countries. While there was less chance under Communism to grow rich, any prisoner of the Gulag knew the fate of those who “malingered.”

Another popular argument against central planning was advanced by Nobel Laureate Friedrich Hayek in 1945. Hayek argued that no central planner could obtain information about people’s tastes and productivity necessary to allocate resources efficiently.1 The genius of the market was the way that the price system could, in disaggregated fashion, collect this information from everyone and supply it to those who needed to know it, without the involvement of a government planning board.

A related version of this argument, less well-known than Hayek’s but actually more compelling, was made a few decades earlier. The brilliant economist Ludwig von Mises argued that the fundamental problem facing socialism was not incentives or knowledge in the abstract but communication and computation.2 To see what Mises meant, consider an illustrative parable proposed by Leonard Read in his 1958 essay, “I, Pencil.” 3

Read tells the “life story” of a pencil. Such a simple thing, one would at first think. And yet as you begin to reflect, you realize the enormously complex layers of thought and planning it would require to make a pencil from scratch. The wood must be chopped, cut, shaped, polished, and honed. The graphite must be mined, chiseled, and shaped. The ferrule—the collar that connects the wood shaft and the eraser—is an alloy of dozens of metals, each of which must be mined, melted, combined, and reformed. And so forth.

Yet what is most remarkable about the pencil is not its complexity but the complete lack of understanding that anyone involved in the manufacture of the eventual pencil has about any of these steps in the process. The lumberjack knows only that there is a market for his wood and some price that induces her to buy the needed tools, cut down trees, and sell lumber down the line of production. The lumberjack may never even know that the wood is used for a pencil. The pencil factory owner knows only where to purchase the needed intermediate materials and how to run a line assembling them. The knowledge and planning of the pencil’s creation emerge organically from the process of market relations.

Now suppose that we were to try to replicate the market relationships with a central planning board. The board would determine how much wood to chop and when, the number of workers to employ at each stage of production, the correct places and times to produce, ship, and build. Yet, to do this effectively the board would have to understand a great many things. It would have to learn from each of these specialized producers the unique knowledge of her domain of expertise that allows her to earn a living—for example, whether the lumber would have a more valuable use elsewhere in the economy (to build houses or ships or children’s toys) than as an input for pencils. Absorbing all this information and constantly receiving and processing the necessary updates to keep abreast of evolving conditions in each of these steps of the process, would overwhelm the capacity of even the most skilled managers.

And even if the board somehow had an unlimited capacity to absorb this information, it would still have the unmanageable problem of trying to act on this sea of data. Prices, supply and demand, and production relations in markets arise through a complex interplay of individuals each helping to optimize a tiny part of a broad social process. If, instead, a single board had to plan this entire dance, it would force a small number of individuals to contemplate an endless sequence of choices and plans. Such elaborate calculations are beyond the capacity of even the most brilliant group of engineers.

Mises wrote decades before the rise of the fields of computer science and information theory and lacked any way to formalize these intuitive ideas. Many of Mises’s arguments were dismissed by mainstream economists, whose increasingly narrow mathematical approach to the field Mises disdained. Mises’s critics, including Oskar Lange, Fred Taylor, and Abba Lerner, argued that the market mechanism was but one of many ways (and far from the most efficient way) to organize an economy. They viewed the economy purely mathematically, rather than computationally, and saw no difficulty in principle with solving a (very large) system of equations relating the supply and demand of various goods, resources, and services.

In a simplified picture of the economy, ordinary people perform dual functions as producers (workers, suppliers of capital, etc.) and consumers. As consumers, people have preferences regarding different goods and services. Some people like chocolate, others like vanilla. As producers, they have different talents and capacities. Some people are good at doing math, others at mollifying angry customers. In principle, all we need to do is figure out people’s preferences and their talents, and assign jobs to people who do them best, while distributing the value created by production in the form of goods and services that people really want. Rewards and penalties need to be determined to give people incentives to reveal their preferences and talents, and to ensure that they actually do what they are supposed to do. All of this can be represented mathematically and solved. That’s why socialist economists viewed the economy as a math problem the solution of which only required a computer.

Yet the later development of the theory of computational and communication complexity vindicated Mises’s insights. What computational scientists later realized is that even if managing the economy were “merely” a problem of solving a large system of equations, finding such solutions is far from the easy task that socialist economists believed. In an incisive computational analysis of central planning, statistician and computer scientist Cosma Shalizi illustrates how utterly impossible “solving” a modern economy would be for a central planning board. As Shalizi notes in his essay, “In the Soviet Union, Optimization Problem Solves You,” the computer power it takes to solve an economic allocation problem increases more than proportionately in the number of commodities in the economy.4 In practical terms, this means that in any large economy, central planning by a single computer is impossible.

To make these abstract mathematical relationships concrete, Shalizi considers an estimate by Soviet planners that, at the height of Soviet economic power in the 1950s, there were about 12 million commodities tracked in Soviet economic plans. To make matters worse, this figure does not even account for the fact that a ripe banana in Moscow is not the same as a ripe banana in Leningrad, and moving it from one place to the other must also be part of the plan. But even were there “merely” 12 million commodities, the most efficient known algorithms for optimization, running on the most efficient computers available today, would take roughly a thousand years to solve such a problem exactly once. It can even be proven that a modern computer could not achieve even a reasonably “approximate” solution—and, of course, today there are far more goods, services, transport choices, and other factors that would go into the problem than there were in the Soviet Union in the 1950s. Yet somehow the market miraculously cuts through this computational nightmare.

Markets as Parallel Processors

But all of this raises a question. If the problem is so hard to solve, how is it possible for the market to solve it? Consider Lange’s quote from our epigraph.5 The market is just a set of rules enforced by the government—not much different from a computer algorithm, although a very complex one. It’s true that no single person invented the market. Yet the rules of the market are well understood, and economists are constantly telling people to implement them. Imagine that a new country is created, and its leaders ask a western economist how best to create an economy. The economist will tell them how to set up a market—the rules of contract and property law, for example. (Indeed, economists have been running around the halls of government of developing countries and the floors of start-ups for decades doing just this.) Aren’t the economists just supplying a kind of computer program to the leaders, who by implementing it are engaging in a style of centralized planning?

To understand how the market solves the “very large system of equations,” you need to know the key ideas of distributed computing and parallel processing. In these systems, complicated calculations that no one computer could perform are divided into small parts that can be performed in parallel by a large number of computers distributed across different geographic locations. Distributed computing and parallel processing are best known for their role in the development of “cloud computing,” but their greatest application has gone unnoticed: the market economy itself.

While the human brain is wired differently from a computer, computational scientists estimate that a single human mind has a computational capacity roughly ten times greater than the most powerful single supercomputer at the time of this writing.6 The combined capacity of all human minds is therefore tens of billions of times greater than this most powerful present-day computer. The “market” is then in some sense a giant computer composed of these smaller but still very powerful computers. If it allocates resources efficiently, it does so by harnessing and combining their separate capacities.

Adopting this perspective, we must ask how the market is “programmed” to achieve this outcome. The economy consists of a variety of resources and human capacities at a range of locations, along with a system for transmitting data about these resources among individual human beings. A standard approach in parallel processing is to take information local to one location in, say, a picture or puzzle and assign this to one processor, integrating these inputs on still other processors in a hierarchical fashion. Now apply this image to the economy. In every place, we take one of the computers (humans) available to us and assign it to collect information about that location’s needs and resources and report some parsimonious “compressed” summary of all that data to other computers. For example, there might be a hierarchical arrangement of computers, with those responsible for particular locations on the ground reporting to a higher “layer” that integrates local areas and then upward from there.

Consider the following example. A person works on a farm and is in charge of ensuring that the farm is productive and that her family is happy. This person sends information about the farm and her family, not in its full richness and complexity, but in broad strokes, to district managers. One manager specializes in understanding the resources that farms need to operate—seeds, fertilizer— while another understands the resources that people living on farms need in order to be happy, including food and clothing. These managers would then aggregate these data and convey them to the next layer, perhaps a national wheat distributor or a regional supplier of products for use on farms. At every level of this chain, some information would need to be lost for the parallel processing to remain parallel and tractable: the farm manager could not detail every way in which a slightly better paved road would help in conveying goods to market or how slightly cleaner water would protect her crops. But at least she could report the largest and most important needs and hope that the loss of information only slightly reduces the efficiency of the resulting solution.

This arrangement has a flavor of central planning but also resembles a market economy. People specialize in different parts of the production chain and operate under limited information, yet are able to coordinate their behavior because the information takes a certain form. While people are experts on local conditions, they know little about economic conditions elsewhere. They know that grain prices are high and tractor prices are low, but not why this is the case. When they buy a tractor or sell grain, they don’t tell the vendor or purchaser their life story, all the conditions on their farm, and so forth. They just place an order or offer so much grain at the going price.

This “price system” thus greatly simplifies communication between different parts of the economy. In fact, economists have shown that prices are the minimum information that a farmer needs to plan her operations effectively. So long as every important way that the farm could benefit or draw down resources from the outside world has a price attached to it, this is all the information the farmer needs to make economic decisions. Any greater information would be a waste, from a purely economic efficiency perspective, though it might be interesting from time to time to develop personal relationships. Conversely, if these prices were not available, there would be no way for a farmer to know whether it pays to use new tractors or rely instead on more labor, nor would she know how many seeds to plant for next season. The farmer without such prices could easily produce too little or waste resources on a tractor that could be better used for more labor, seed, or even consumption.

In this sense, prices are the “minimum” information necessary for rational economic decision-making.7 No other system of distributed computing can be equally productive and yet require less communication.

Markets elegantly exploit distributed human computational capacity. In doing so they allocate resources in ways that no present computer could match. Von Mises was right that central planning by a group of experts cannot replace the market system. But his argument was mistakenly taken as implying that the market is “natural” rather than a human-created program for managing economic resources. In fact, there is nothing natural about market institutions. Human beings create markets—in their capacity as judges, legislators, administrators, and even private business people who frequently set up organizations that create and manage markets.

Markets are powerful computers, but whether they produce the greatest good or not depends on how they are programmed. We advocate “Radical Markets” because we believe that in the present stage of technological and economic development, when cooperation has grown too large to be managed by moral economies, the market is the appropriate computer to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number. If we see it as such, we can fix the bugs in the market’s code and enable it to generate more wealth that is distributed more fairly.

By sharpening our understanding of the role and value of markets, the computational analogy clarifies our claim that the solutions we propose are based on extending the reach of markets. The COST on wealth radicalizes markets as it puts greater responsibility on individuals to articulate their values and gives them greater ability to claim things they value highly. QV does the same in the political sphere. Our ideas on migration give individuals more scope for determining the best path for where they live and work. Our proposals on antitrust and data valuation break up centralized power and place greater responsibility on individuals and small firms to compete, innovate, and make rational economic choices to allow for the distributed computation of optimal economic allocations. But all these proposals raise the question: if the market is just a computer program that harnesses the power of individual human intellects, will it still be necessary as computer power increases?

#### Totalization DA—complete rejection of neoliberal competition policy fails and creates international instability

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

Progressivism, by contrast, sees powerful administrative and welfare states as necessary to protect the interests of the working classes, and is hostile to the existence of both plutocratic and concentrated corporate power. In the United States, the paradigmatic progressive political program was the New Deal. Whereas the first part of the New Deal included a host of regulations empowering the administrative state and placing regulatory obligations on business, the second part of the New Deal included Social Security and tax increases.77 Even though progressivism might therefore provide an adequate check against the imposition of fascism by an alliance of private power, the elimination of any substantial checks against the abuse of public power risks progressive institutions being utilized by intellectual elites rousing the working classes to bring about, and achieve power in,78 a socialist political economy.79

In addition to this risk aversion to totalitarian political economy, a certain realism about the present historical moment represents another basis for critiquing some of the theories of competition policy discussed above. While Burke's "age of chivalry" may be lost and utopia never to come, humanity lives better than it once did, and that should count for something. This is to say that, in lieu of believing that a liberal and democratic end of history remains the birthright of all mankind, or attempting to turn back globalization, policymakers should be concerned about losing what unprecedented but fragile progress modernity has actually made in improving the lives of many, many millions who were once in poverty both in the West and around the world.

The hyper-neoliberal approach-namely, that increased technological progress will prove a sufficient condition for sustaining the neoliberal order-can be faulted on these realist grounds, as the full implications of the New Economy and on liberal economic order are not yet fully understood. It may be that the golden age of technological progress and economic growth is already gone and therefore of little promise toward continued middle class expansion. ° It may be that the social consequences of rapid innovation in the Internet economy are in large part increased group polarization and extremism that, in a heterogeneous society, ultimately leads to fragmentation, violence, and the breakdown of liberal economic order.8' Finally, it may be that even notwithstanding a liberal effect of democratizing access to ideas, goods, and people, a reinvigorated bureaucracy concerned about me- quality chills continued technological progress.82 All of these possibilities, and still many more, make the hyper-neoliberal paradigm too speculative for policymakers to stake the future of liberal economic order on.

An unabashed program of industrial policy, by contrast, suffers from a more subtle form of idealism. On the one hand, the recognition of nation states as self-interested actors in competition with one another within a sovereignty-based framework has long been a dominant view for thinking about international order in "realist" terms.83 Over the neoliberal period, however, the immersion of the contemporary nation state within a globalized economy of ideas, goods, people and supply chains has resulted in not only unprecedented economic growth and prosperity around the world, but relative peace.84 A turn toward industrial policy, even in the limited case of antitrust, risks contributing to the undermining of not only economic growth and neutral rules-based legal frameworks-such as antitrust as an apolitical, value neutral, and technocratic enterprise 8 5 -but also global peace and stability, with potentially destructive consequences for humanity similar to those that obtained prior to the advent of the liberal international order.

#### Cap is sustainable – emissions peaked in 2019

Hausfather 21 – Climate scientist and energy systems analyst. Director of Climate and Energy at The Breakthrough Institute. Master’s in environmental science from Yale and from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and a PhD in climate science from UC Berkeley.

Zeke Hausfather, “Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries,” *The Breakthrough Institute*, 6 April 2021, https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/absolute-decoupling-of-economic-growth-and-emissions-in-32-countries.

Over the past 15 years, however, something has begun to change. Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, peak oil is upon us — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles.

The world has long been experiencing a relative decoupling between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP falling for the past 60 years. This is the case even in countries like India and China that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2 emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets.

Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production.

In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people have absolutely decoupled emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red).

To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries.

There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO2 emissions.

One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore leakage. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries has actually declined over the past 15 years.

This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) have jointly declined. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019.

There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019.

Absolute decoupling is possible. There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).

This is not to say that infinite economic growth is desirable (or even possible), particularly given that the global population is expected to start to shrink by the end of the 21st century (and well before that in most currently wealthy countries). There will be some tradeoffs between economic growth and climate mitigation — particularly if the world is to meet ambitious mitigation targets. But it is possible to envision a world that is prosperous, equal, and at net-zero emissions; indeed, all of the future emissions scenarios used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) do just that.

It is also useful to look at a few specific cases of larger countries that have absolutely decoupled emissions and GDP over the past 15 years.

Emissions reductions in the US have been a result of a wide variety of factors; this includes the switch from coal generation to lower-carbon natural gas, the rapid expansion of wind and solar generation, reduced industrial energy consumption, reduced electricity use in buildings, and reductions in transportation emissions — particularly as a result of increased vehicle fuel economy and reduced miles driven per-capita. Since 2005, US territorial emissions have fallen around 15%, with consumption emissions falling around 18% (much larger reductions were seen in 2020, and some of this is expected to persist). At the same time, GDP has increased by around 29%.

In the UK, territorial emissions have fallen by nearly 40% and consumption emissions have fallen by around 30%, while GDP has increased by 22%. Similar to the US, there are a wide variety of drivers of UK emissions reductions, though renewable energy generation, reductions in electricity use, and reductions in industrial and residential energy use are the largest contributors.

In Germany, territorial emissions have fallen around 15%, and consumption emissions have fallen by around 20%, while GDP has increased by 24%.

In France, territorial emissions have fallen by around 25%, and consumption emissions have fallen by a similar amount, while GDP has increased by 16%. It is a bit notable that France has seen larger emission reductions — as a percentage of total emissions — than Germany over this period, likely due in part to Germany’s choice to prioritize shutting down nuclear power plants over coal ones.

The Japanese emissions trajectory has been a bit more variable since 2005 than the prior countries we have examined, decreasing during the financial crisis, rebounding during the recovery and in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster as a sizable portion of its clean electricity generation was shut down, before decreasing in more recent years. Over the full period, territorial emissions have fallen by a bit over 10%, while consumption emissions have fallen by around 13%

These 32 countries show that it is possible to have economic growth at the same time that CO2 emissions decline, even accounting for embodied emissions in goods imported from overseas. However, these are mostly relatively wealthy countries whose economies tend to be increasingly driven by lower-energy information technology and service sectors. We have relatively few examples of low- or middle-income countries with a focus on energy-intensive manufacturing experiencing absolute decoupling to date.

That said, with the rapid cost reductions of clean energy and an expected peak in Chinese emissions in the next five to ten years, it is only a matter of time before absolute decoupling becomes the norm. The extent to which this will occur rapidly enough to avoid dangerous levels of warming depends on both the degree of technological progress and the willingness of governments worldwide to invest in mitigating climate change.

#### Competition in the private sector is key to drive down costs in space exploration – spurs innovation

Weinzierl and Sarang ’21 - Joseph And Jacqueline Elbling Professor Of Business Administration, Chair, Mba Required Curriculum, Business, Government And The International Economy, Research Associate at HBS | MIT Space Exploration Intitiative

Harvard Business Review, 2-12-2021, "The Commercial Space Age Is Here," <https://hbr.org/2021/02/the-commercial-space-age-is-here>

There’s no shortage of hype surrounding the commercial space industry. But while tech leaders promise us moon bases and settlements on Mars, the space economy has thus far remained distinctly local — at least in a cosmic sense. Last year, however, we crossed an important threshold: For the first time in human history, humans accessed space via a vehicle built and owned not by any government, but by a private corporation with its sights set on affordable space settlement. It was the first significant step towards building an economy both in space and for space. The implications — for business, policy, and society at large — are hard to overstate.

In 2019, [95%](https://brycetech.com/reports) of the estimated $366 billion in revenue earned in the space sector was from the space-for-earth economy: that is, goods or services produced in space for use on earth. The space-for-earth economy includes telecommunications and internet infrastructure, earth observation capabilities, national security satellites, and more. This economy is booming, and though [research shows](https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/716037-PDF-ENG) that it faces the challenges of overcrowding and monopolization that tend to arise whenever companies compete for a scarce natural resource, [projections for its future](https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/720027-PDF-ENG) are optimistic. Decreasing costs for launch and space hardware in general have enticed new entrants into this market, and companies in a variety of industries have already begun leveraging satellite technology and access to space to drive innovation and efficiency in their earthbound products and services.

In contrast, the space-for-space economy — that is, goods and services produced in space for use in space, such as mining the Moon or asteroids for material with which to construct in-space habitats or supply refueling depots — has struggled to get off the ground. As far back as the 1970s, [research](https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19780004167) commissioned by NASA predicted the rise of a space-based economy that would supply the demands of hundreds, thousands, even millions of humans living in space, dwarfing the space-for-earth economy (and, eventually, the entire terrestrial economy as well). The realization of such a vision would change how all of us do business, live our lives, and govern our societies — but to date, we’ve never even had more than [13 people](https://www.space.com/6503-population-space-historic-high-13.html) in space at one time, leaving that dream as little more than science fiction.

Today, however, there is reason to think that we may finally be reaching the first stages of a true space-for-space economy. SpaceX’s [recent achievements](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-s-spacex-crew-1-astronauts-headed-to-international-space-station/) (in cooperation with NASA), as well as upcoming efforts by [Boeing](https://www.nasa.gov/feature/boeing-s-starliner-makes-progress-ahead-of-flight-test-with-astronauts), [Blue Origin](https://www.blueorigin.com/news/nasa-selects-blue-origin-national-team-to-return-humans-to-the-moon), and [Virgin Galactic](https://spacenews.com/virgin-galactic-prepares-to-transition-to-operations) to put people in space sustainably and at scale, mark the opening of a new chapter of spaceflight led by private firms. These firms have both the intention and capability to bring private citizens to space as passengers, tourists, and — eventually — settlers, opening the door for businesses to start meeting the demand those people create over the next several decades with an array of space-for-space goods and services.

Welcome to the (Commercial) Space Age

In our [recent research](https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/jep.32.2.173_Space,%20the%20Final%20Economic%20Frontier_413bf24d-42e6-4cea-8cc5-a0d2f6fc6a70.pdf), we examined how the model of centralized, government-directed human space activity born in the 1960s has, over the last two decades, made way for a new model, in which public initiatives in space increasingly share the stage with private priorities. Centralized, government-led space programs will inevitably focus on space-for-earth activities that are in the public interest, such as national security, basic science, and national pride. This is only natural, as expenditures for these programs must be justified by demonstrating benefits for citizens — and the citizens these governments represent are (nearly) all on earth.

In contrast to governments, the private sector is eager to put people in space to pursue their own personal interests, not the state’s — and then supply the demand they create. This is the vision driving SpaceX, which in its first twenty years has entirely upended the rocket launch industry, securing 60% of the global commercial launch market and building ever-larger spacecraft designed to ferry passengers not just to the International Space Station (ISS), but also to its own promised [settlement on Mars](https://www.spacex.com/media/making_life_multiplanetary_transcript_2017.pdf).

Today, the space-for-space market is limited to supplying the people who are already in space: that is, the handful of astronauts employed by NASA and other government programs. While SpaceX has grand visions of supporting large numbers of private space travelers, their current space-for-space activities have all been in response to demand from government customers (i.e., NASA). But as decreasing launch costs enable companies like SpaceX to leverage economies of scale and put more people into space, growing private sector demand (that is, tourists and settlers, rather than government employees) could turn these proof-of-concept initiatives into a sustainable, large-scale industry.

This model — of selling to NASA with the hopes of eventually creating and expanding into a larger private market — is exemplified by SpaceX, but the company is by no means the only player taking this approach. For instance, while SpaceX is focused on space-for-space transportation, another key component of this burgeoning industry will be manufacturing.

[Made In Space, Inc.](https://madeinspace.us/capabilities-and-technology/archinaut/) has been at the forefront of manufacturing “in space, for space” since 2014, when it 3D-printed a wrench onboard the ISS. Today, the company is exploring other products, such as high-quality fiber-optic cable, that terrestrial customers may be willing to pay to have manufactured in zero-gravity. But the company also recently received a [$74 million contract](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-funds-demo-of-3d-printed-spacecraft-parts-made-assembled-in-orbit) to 3D-print large metal beams in space for use on NASA spacecraft, and future private sector spacecraft will certainly have similar manufacturing needs which Made In Space hopes to be well-positioned to fulfill. Just as SpaceX has begun by supplying NASA but hopes to eventually serve a much larger, private-sector market, Made In Space’s current work with NASA could be the first step along a path towards supporting a variety of private-sector manufacturing applications for which the costs of manufacturing on earth and transporting into space would be prohibitive.

Another major area of space-for-space investment is in building and operating space infrastructure such as habitats, laboratories, and factories. Axiom Space, a current leader in this field, recently [announced](https://www.theverge.com/2021/1/26/22250327/space-tourists-axiom-private-crew-iss-price) that it would be flying the “first fully private commercial mission to space” in 2022 onboard SpaceX’s Crew Dragon Capsule. Axiom was also [awarded](https://spacenews.com/nasa-selects-axiom-space-to-build-commercial-space-station-module/) a contract for exclusive access to a module of the ISS, facilitating its plans to develop modules for commercial activity on the station (and eventually, beyond it).

This infrastructure is likely to spur investment in a wide array of complementary services to supply the demand of the people living and working within it. For example, in February 2020, Maxar Technologies was awarded a [$142 million contract](https://www.builtincolorado.com/2020/02/03/maxar-technologies-142m-nasa-contract) from NASA to develop a robotic construction tool that would be assembled in space for use on low-Earth orbit spacecraft. Private sector spacecraft or settlements will no doubt have need for a variety of similar construction and repair tools.

#### A slew of black swans make extinction inevitable. Moral hedging necessitates space habituation
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Space or bust: Why we must reach for the stars

Why should we pursue space colonization in the first place? Don’t we have more pressing problems today, on Earth?

Yes, we do have many problems on Earth today, and we should try to solve them. But space colonization is just that: A strategy for dealing with certain problems. An the problems that space colonization would be dealing with are, arguably, among the greatest problems of them all: Existential risks; risks that might lead to the extinction of humankind [1]. Currently, all of our proverbial existential eggs are in the same basket. If a natural existential risk strikes (for example, a large asteroid colliding with Earth) or if a man-made existential risk results in a catastrophic outcome (for example, runaway global warming [2, 3]), all of humankind is at risk because humankind is currently limited to planet Earth. If, however, there are self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth, then the probability of an irreversibly catastrophic outcome for all of humankind is drastically reduced.

Investing in space colonization today could therefore have immense future benefits. Using resources today in order to make space colonization possible in the medium-term future is not a waste, but a very profitable investment. If humankind stays limited to Earth and if we go extinct as a consequence of doing so, then we will all the billions of life years and billions of humans who might have come to exist — and who would have experienced happiness and contributed to humankind’s continued epistemic and moral progress.

#### Liberalism is inevitable and self-correcting – internal mechanisms maintain global stability and raise global standards of living – the alternative risks global catastrophe

Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry ’18, \*Deudney: Associate Professor of political science, international relations and political theory at Johns Hopkins University, received the Alumni Distinguished Teaching Award at Johns Hopkins University, former senior research fellow at the TransAtlantic Academy at the German Marshall Fund, \*\*Ikenberry: Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, Co-Director of Princeton’s Center for International Security Studies, served as a member of the Policy Planning Staff in 1991-92, as a member of an advisory group at the State Department in 2003-04, and as a member of the Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on U.S.-European relations, “Liberal World: The Resilient Order,” *Foreign Affairs* 2018, Issue 4, pgs. 18-22

In many respects, today's liberal democratic malaise is a byproduct of the liberal world order's success. After the Cold War, that order became a global system, expanding beyond its birthplace in the West. But as free markets spread, problems began to crop up: economic inequality grew, old political bargains between capital and labor broke down, and social supports eroded. The benefits of globalization and economic expansion were distributed disproportionately to elites. Oligarchic power bloomed. A modulated form of capitalism morphed into winnertake- all casino capitalism. Many new democracies turned out to lack the traditions and habits necessary to sustain democratic institutions. And large flows of immigrants triggered a xenophobic backlash. Together, these developments have called into question the legitimacy of liberal democratic life and created openings for opportunistic demagogues.

Just as the causes of this malaise are clear, so is its solution: a return to the fundamentals of liberal democracy. Rather than deeply challenging the first principles of liberal democracy, the current problems call for reforms to better realize them. To reduce inequality, political leaders will need to return to the social democratic policies embodied in the New Deal, pass more progressive taxation, and invest in education and infrastructure. To foster a sense of liberal democratic identity, they will need to emphasize education as a catalyst for assimilation and promote national and public service. In other words, the remedy for the problems of liberal democracy is more liberal democracy; liberalism contains the seeds of its own salvation.

Indeed, liberal democracies have repeatedly recovered from crises resulting from their own excesses. In the 1930s, overproduction and the integration of financial markets brought about an economic depression, which triggered the rise of fascism. But it also triggered the New Deal and social democracy, leading to a more stable form of capitalism. In the 1950s, the success of the Manhattan Project, combined with the emerging U.S.-Soviet rivalry, created the novel threat of a worldwide nuclear holocaust. That threat gave rise to arms control pacts and agreements concerning the governance of global spaces, deals forged by the United States in collaboration with the Soviet Union. In the 1970s, rising middle-class consumption led to oil shortages, economic stagnation, and environmental decay. In response, the advanced industrial democracies established oil coordination agreements, invested in clean energy, and struck numerous international environmental accords aimed at reducing pollutants. The problems that liberal democracies face today, while great, are certainly not more challenging than those that they have faced and overcome in these historically recent decades. Of course, there is no guarantee that liberal democracies will successfully rise to the occasion, but to count them out would fly in the face of repeated historical experiences.

Today's dire predictions ignore these past successes. They suffer from a blinding presentism. Taking what is new and threatening as the master pattern is an understandable reflex in the face of change, but it is almost never a very good guide to the future. Large-scale human arrangements such as liberal democracy rarely change as rapidly or as radically as they seem to in the moment. If history is any guide, today's illiberal populists and authoritarians will evoke resistance and countermovements.

THE RESILIENT ORDER

After World War II, liberal democracies joined together to create an international order that reflected their shared interests. And as is the case with liberal democracy itself, the order that emerged to accompany it cannot be easily undone. For one thing, it is deeply embedded. Hundreds of millions, if not billions, of people have geared their activities and expectations to the order's institutions and incentives, from farmers to microchip makers. However unappealing aspects of it may be, replacing the liberal order with something significantly different would be extremely difficult. Despite the high expectations they generate, revolutionary moments often fail to make enduring changes. It is unrealistic today to think that a few years of nationalist demagoguery will dramatically undo liberalism.

Growing interdependence makes the order especially difficult to overturn. Ever since its inception in the eighteenth century, liberalism has been deeply committed to the progressive improvement of the human condition through scientific discovery and technological advancements. This Enlightenment project began to bear practical fruits on a large scale in the nineteenth century, transforming virtually every aspect of human life. New techniques for production, communication, transportation, and destruction poured forth. The liberal system has been at the forefront not just of stoking those fires of innovation but also of addressing the negative consequences. Adam Smith's case for free trade, for example, was strengthened when it became easier to establish supply chains across global distances. And the age-old case for peace was vastly strengthened when weapons evolved from being simple and limited in their destruction to the city-busting missiles of the nuclear era. Liberal democratic capitalist societies have thrived and expanded because they have been particularly adept at stimulating and exploiting innovation and at coping with their spillover effects and negative externalities. In short, liberal modernity excels at both harvesting the fruits of modern advance and guarding against its dangers.

This dynamic of constant change and ever-increasing interdependence is only accelerating. Human progress has caused grave harm to the planet and its atmosphere, yet climate change will also require unprecedented levels of international cooperation. With the rise of bioweapons and cyberwarfare, the capabilities to wreak mass destruction are getting cheaper and ever more accessible, making the international regulation of these technologies a vital national security imperative for all countries. At the same time, global capitalism has drawn more people and countries into cross-border webs of exchange, thus making virtually everyone dependent on the competent management of international finance and trade. In the age of global interdependence, even a realist must be an internationalist.

The international order is also likely to persist because its survival does not depend on all of its members being liberal democracies. The return of isolationism, the rise of illiberal regimes such as China and Russia, and the general recession of liberal democracy in many parts of the world appear to bode ill for the liberal international order. But contrary to the conventional wisdom, many of its institutions are not uniquely liberal in character. Rather, they are Westphalian, in that they are designed merely to solve problems of sovereign states, whether they be democratic or authoritarian. And many of the key participants in these institutions are anything but liberal or democratic.

Consider the Soviet Union's cooperative efforts during the Cold War. Back then, the liberal world order was primarily an arrangement among liberal democracies in Europe, North America, and East Asia. Even so, the Soviet Union often worked with the democracies to help build international institutions. Moscow's committed antiliberal stance did not stop it from partnering with Washington to create a raft of arms control agreements. Nor did it stop it from cooperating with Washington through the World Health Organization to spearhead a global campaign to eradicate smallpox, which succeeded in completely eliminating the disease by 1979.

More recently, countries of all stripes have crafted global rules to guard against environmental destruction. The signatories to the Paris climate agreement, for example, include such autocracies as China, Iran, and Russia. Westphalian approaches have also thrived when it comes to governing the commons, such as the ocean, the atmosphere, outer space, and Antarctica. To name just one example, the 1987 Montreal Protocol, which has thwarted the destruction of the ozone layer, has been actively supported by democracies and dictatorships alike. Such agreements are not challenges to the sovereignty of the states that create them but collective measures to solve problems they cannot address on their own.

Most institutions in the liberal order do not demand that their backers be liberal democracies; they only require that they be status quo powers and capable of fulfilling their commitments. They do not challenge the Westphalian system; they codify it. The UN, for example, enshrines the principle of state sovereignty and, through the permanent members of the Security Council, the notion of great-power decision-making. All of this makes the order more durable. Because much of international cooperation has nothing at all to do with liberalism or democracy, when politicians who are hostile to all things liberal are in power, they can still retain their international agendas and keep the order alive. The persistence of Westphalian institutions provides a lasting foundation on which distinctively liberal and democratic institutions can be erected in the future.

Another reason to believe that the liberal order will endure involves the return of ideological rivalry. The last two and a half decades have been profoundly anomalous in that liberalism has had no credible competitor. During the rest of its existence, it faced competition that made it stronger. Throughout the nineteenth century, liberal democracies sought to outperform monarchical, hereditary, and aristocratic regimes. During the first half of the twentieth century, autocratic and fascist competitors created strong incentives for the liberal democracies to get their own houses in order and band together. And after World War II, they built the liberal order in part to contain the threat of the Soviet Union and international communism.

The Chinese Communist Party appears increasingly likely to seek to offer an alternative to the components of the existing order that have to do with economic liberalism and human rights. If it ends up competing with the liberal democracies, they will again face pressure to champion their values. As during the Cold War, they will have incentives to undertake domestic reforms and strengthen their international alliances. The collapse of the Soviet Union, although a great milestone in the annals of the advance of liberal democracy, had the ironic effect of eliminating one of its main drivers of solidarity. The bad news of renewed ideological rivalry could be good news for the liberal international order.

#### Blanket opposition to U.S. military force sanctions atrocities – their critique is a conceptual shortcut that forces us to draw dangerous conclusions about war. The solution is pragmatic examination of ethical responses to particular conflicts.

Walzer 14 – Professor emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study and editor emeritus of Dissent Magazine.

Michael Walzer, “A Foreign Policy for the Left,” *Dissent*, Spring 2014, https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/a-foreign-policy-for-the-left.

There are other examples of leftist support for the use of force—even by capitalist countries like the United States. Some Marxist militants argue that any war fought by a capitalist country is, by definition, an imperialist war. But the war in Korea, which was fought by an alliance of capitalist countries, was supported by most people on the American and European democratic left. A war against aggression, approved by the UN, could plausibly be called a just war. Nonetheless, there was left opposition: Michael Harrington (as a Catholic Worker) and David Dellinger (with the War Resisters League) marched against the war; I. F. Stone called it unjust, bravely and (I think) wrongly. The future editors of Dissent (breaking with many of their fellow Shachtmanites) supported the war, no doubt critically, which was the right way to do it.

In his history of the American left, Michael Kazin writes that ever since Woodrow Wilson’s administration, “liberals had ardently promoted wars to preserve and advance democracy. The conflict over Vietnam put an end to that tradition for decades to come.” But by the 1990s, a more minimalist liberal and left defense of war had emerged—heralded by the Black Book on Bosnia produced by the editors of the New Republic in 1995 and given full intellectual legitimacy by Samantha Power’s A Problem from Hell in 2002. The aim of what was called “humanitarian intervention” was not to promote democracy but to stop mass murder, rape, and ethnic cleansing.

NATO’s Kosovo war of 1999, driven in part by the Srebrenica massacre, was a near-left war: the Labour Party was in power in Britain, the Socialists in France, a coalition of Social Democrats and Greens in Germany, and the Democratic Left in Italy. The Clinton administration was a weak version of this left politics, but it provided the leadership essential to the war effort. Military intervention in Kosovo was opposed by people on the farther left, who could not credit its humanitarian motive. I remember being told by a “reconstructed” communist at the Gramsci Institute in Turin, Italy in March 1999 that NATO “must be” aiming to seize control of the Black Sea from the Russians. There was no other explanation for the “imperialist” war.

The more persuasive far left critique came later: that left interventionism in Kosovo made the war in Iraq easier to plan and defend. But that can’t be an argument against the use of force for urgent humanitarian reasons. It is rather an argument for making distinctions, which is always necessary in politics. The Iraq War was not a humanitarian intervention; it was (according to one of its justifications) a war to overthrow a brutal dictator and promote democracy. There were left arguments and precedents for a war of that sort, as I’ve already suggested, but there was also a very strong left argument against it—an argument made, perhaps for the first time, by the Socialist Party in 1917: “Democracy can never be imposed upon any country by a foreign power by force of arms.”

The Labour Party’s David Miliband was right when he said in 2008 that during the previous decades “the neoconservative movement seemed more certain about spreading democracy around the world” than the left did. The left, he argued, was “conflicted between the desirability of the goal and its qualms about the use of military means.” The qualms are reasonable when it comes to democracy promotion, but not, I think, when it comes to stopping a massacre. The campaign for intervention in Darfur, not the invasion of Iraq, was the closest continuation of the near-left’s Kosovo war.

5. National Liberation

Left internationalists don’t only argue about whether “we” should use force, but also about whether other people should do so. With regard to imperial powers, the answer is generally negative, which is generally right. Wars of national liberation, by contrast, are almost always supported, which, again, is almost always right. It is hard to remember, but in the 1940s the Zionist struggle for a Jewish state in Palestine was enthusiastically supported by most American and even most European leftists. W.E.B. Du Bois, for example, argued in 1944 for a post-imperial Middle East where the Jewish people would be able “to achieve its own national liberation in its own way and in line with its own culture and traditions.” Leftists also supported the partition of Palestine, when the UN voted for it in 1947—this was the first version of the “two-state solution.” For different reasons, British imperialists and Trotskyists everywhere were hostile to the idea.

But the best case with which to think about national liberation is the Algerian war for independence, where the struggle was led by the National Liberation Front (FLN), a secular left political movement whose militants had defeated other liberation movements, mostly by killing their members. The FLN’s war was just, but it was fought in murderous ways, which many French leftists defended—though these same people rightly condemned the murderous ways of the French oppressors. The oppressed, not for the first or last time, were awarded a right to be murderous. This is a typical leftist award, though I believe that it cannot be justified.

Consider Jean-Paul Sartre’s defense of FLN terrorism: “To shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time: there remains a dead man and a free man.” As I argued in Just and Unjust Wars, the claim that it takes one dead European to produce one free Algerian is ominous. There weren’t enough Europeans in Algeria in the late 1950s; more would have had to be brought over if the Algerians were to liberate themselves by Sartrean means. Needless to say, Sartre himself did not volunteer to be the bird that gets killed so that the other can be reborn. Arguments of this sort suggest a manipulative view of morality, which is fairly common among right-wing “realists” but clearly has its left-wing version.

6. Shortcuts

Arguments about the use of force for humanitarian or liberationist purposes are complicated; they require close attention to local circumstance and particular histories. We have to think hard about the relation of means to ends. All this is difficult, and doing it right will produce judgments that seem, though they are not, radically inconsistent—like supporting Algerian independence but rejecting FLN terrorism. So ideological shortcuts have been worked out to make the judgments easier, shortcuts that are popular among many leftists and that require a left critique.

I have already alluded to one common shortcut, which is to support oppressed men and women, whatever they do. The difficulty is that the phrase “the oppressed” does not name an actual agent politically engaged in the world. The agents we encounter are organizations and movements that claim to be acting on behalf of the oppressed. Sometimes that claim is justified, but sometimes it isn’t; sometimes these groups are simply a new elite, the future oppressors of the oppressed. What is going on is a replacement at the top, not an uprising from below. Solidarity with oppressed men and women requires us to figure out what these people really want and need and then to look critically at the groups that claim to be acting in their name: Are they representative? Are they responsive? But there is no shortcut for doing that; it takes hard work and intellectual honesty.

The second shortcut, perhaps even more popular than the first, is to stand up always against “imperialism”—or, a shortcut inside the shortcut, always to oppose American policies abroad. Anti-Americanism is a common left politics, which, again, sometimes gets things right, and sometimes doesn’t. I believe that it got things right in Vietnam in 1967; it mostly got things right from the beginning of the twentieth century to the end in Central and South America; it got Iran right in 1953 (when leftists criticized the anti-Mossadegh coup), and Iraq in 2003; it gets NAFTA right, and the IMF, too. But that’s still not enough to make it a reliable shortcut. Remember that the defeat of Nazism and Stalinism, the two most brutal political regimes in world history, was in significant ways American work. This was work that many people on the left supported, as we should have.

In 1967 Dwight Macdonald wrote to Mary McCarthy that the American war in Vietnam proved “that despite all the good things about our internal political-social-cultural life, we have become an imperialist power, and one that, partly because of these domestic virtues, is a most inept one.” We have continued to be inept: in December 2005, with 100,000 American soldiers in Iraq, we organized an election—and our man came in third. This is a result, I think, without precedent in imperial history. Macdonald’s understanding of U.S. imperialism reflects a political intelligence and a moral balance that is mostly missing in contemporary anti-American writing.

The anti-American shortcut sometimes produces a short-circuited politics—as in the Syrian case where leftist writers predicted terrible consequences if the Americans intervened on the side of the anti-Assad forces. The predictions have come true even though the United States didn’t intervene, but once it was clear that the awfulness was not America’s fault, many leftists simply lost interest—except for an ongoing but not very effective engagement on behalf of the war’s victims.

Who was responsible for the ongoing war, for the killing, the terror, and the refugee crisis; what social forces were involved; what should we (on the left) make of them and how should we respond to them? This kind of analysis, standard in left critiques of imperialism, has mostly been missing. One reason for its absence is that it offers no opportunity to criticize America; a second reason is that it would require a close reading and sharp critique of Islamist politics.

Another much-used shortcut (though it doesn’t work in the Syrian case) is to oppose everything Israel does and to blame it for much that it hasn’t done, since it is the “lackey” of American imperialism or, alternatively, the dominant force in shaping American foreign policy. The policies of the current Israeli government require radical criticism—the occupation, the settlements, the refusal to suppress Jewish hooliganism on the West Bank. Nonetheless, the anti-Israel shortcut is an example, to paraphrase August Bebel, of the leftism of fools.

The last shortcut is simply to support every government that calls itself leftist or anti-imperialist and sets itself against American interests. This is different from the old Stalinist shortcut: support the Soviet Union whatever it does because it is the first proletarian dictatorship and the first workers’ paradise. That kind of politics is, I think, definitively finished, though it had a brief afterlife, focused on China and then, with very few believers, on Albania and North Korea. The more recent version celebrates Maximal Leaders like Nasser, Castro, or Hugo Chávez—along with occasional short-lived infatuations, as in the case of Michel Foucault and the future Ayatollah Khomeini. Leftist enthusiasm for populist dictatorships is one of our sad stories, which ends when resources run out, the failure to build the economy is suddenly apparent, and the military takes over. But often the Maximal Leader is a military man himself, and the repressive role of the army simply becomes more obvious over time. In Latin America today, the better left is represented by socialists and social democrats who reject demagogic populism and struggle to produce economic growth, greater equality, and a stronger welfare state—and who attract less enthusiasm from American leftists than they deserve.

7. The Politics of Pretending

Most leftists are idealists, and so we tend to idealize other people and to imagine that the world is more hospitable to our ideas than it actually is. At the same time, we know better; so I call this the politics of pretending. Consider the response of many leftists to the al Qaeda attack of 9/11. They argued that the United States should call the attack a crime and look to the UN and the International Criminal Court to deal with the criminals. That was the “Dial 911” response to 9/11 (it has been repeated again and again in response to later terrorist attacks), and it would have made sense if we lived in a world that was actually run by the UN and the ICC. But, as I argued in Dissent at the time, there was no one answering the phone at 911. Self-help isn’t, indeed, the only effective and justified response to criminal attacks; different forms of mutual assistance and collective security are possible, and the left should take a forward position in exploring them. But self-help has to be part of the story, given the world we live in, and it isn’t a good idea to pretend otherwise.

Another example: some leftists who opposed the Kosovo intervention argued that it didn’t have what every legal and justified use of force requires: UN authorization. Indeed, it didn’t. The UN Security Council is incapable, almost all the time, of acting in a timely way. Think of the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia to shut down the killing fields; or the Indian invasion of East Pakistan, now Bangladesh, to end the terror there; or the Tanzanian invasion of Uganda to overthrow the murderous regime of Idi Amin. None of these had or could have gotten UN approval. Many leftists opposed each of these interventions, pretending that the UN was already what leftists want it to be, an effective political agent. It isn’t that, and so the unilateral use of force is often, as Jürgen Habermas said of the Kosovo case, “illegal but morally necessary.”

The best and last example of leftist pretending is the insistence on the reasonableness of people who give no sign of being reasonable. Paul Berman writes of the large numbers of French socialists who supported the Munich Agreement that “they gazed across the Rhine and simply refused to believe that millions of upstanding Germans had enlisted in a political movement whose animating principles were paranoid conspiracy theories [and] blood-curdling hatreds. . . .” In the same spirit, many leftists were eager to describe the Chinese communists as “agrarian reformers.” And many today have been quick to grant the legitimacy of Islamist opposition to American bases in Saudi Arabia, say, or to the existence of Israel—and to ignore the demand for a shari’a state and the radical subordination of women. I am fairly sure that most of the people involved in all these cases knew, deep down, that they were pretending.

#### Militarism can’t be reduced to a single cause – only pragmatic checks on excessive violence solves

Bacevich, George McGovern fellow at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs, ‘13

(Andrew J., *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War*, pg. 205-212)

There is, wrote H. L. Mencken, “always a well-known solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong.”1 Mencken’s aphorism applies in spades to the subject of this account. To imagine that there exists a simple antidote **to the “military metaphysic**” to which the people and government of the United States have fallen prey is to misconstrue the problem. As the foregoing chapters make plain, the origins of America’s present-day infatuation with military power are **anything but simple**. American militarism is not the invention of a cabal nursing fantasies of global empire and manipulating an unsuspecting people frightened by the events of 9/11. Further, it is counterproductive to think in these terms— to assign culpability to a particular president or administration and to imagine that throwing the bums out will put things right. Yet neither does the present-day status of the United States as sole superpower reveal an essential truth, whether positive or negative, about the American project. Enthusiasts (mostly on the right) who interpret America’s possession of unrivaled and unprecedented armed might as proof that the United States enjoys the mandate of heaven are deluded. But so too are those (mostly on the left) who see in the far-flung doings of today’s U.S. military establishment substantiation of Major General Smedley Butler’s old chestnut that “war is just a racket” **and the American soldier “a gangster for capitalism”** sent abroad to do the bidding of Big Business or Big Oil.2 **Neither the will of God nor the venality of Wall Street suffices to explain how the United States managed to become stuck in World War IV.** Rather, the new American militarism is a little like pollution—the perhaps unintended, but foreseeable by-product of prior choices and decisions made without taking fully into account the full range of costs likely to be incurred.

In making the industrial revolution, the captains of American enterprise did not consciously set out to foul the environment, but as they harnessed the waters, crisscrossed the nation with rails, and built their mills and refineries, negative consequences ensued. Lakes and rivers became choked with refuse, the soil contaminated, and the air in American cities filthy.

By the time that the industrial age approached its zenith in the middle of the twentieth century, most Americans had come to take this for granted; a degraded environment seemed the price you had to pay in exchange for material abundance and by extension for freedom and opportunity. Americans might not like pollution, but there seemed to be no choice except to put up with it.

To appreciate that this was, in fact, not the case, Americans needed a different consciousness. This is where the environmental movement, beginning more or less in the 1960s, made its essential contribution. Environmentalists enabled Americans to see the natural world and their relationship to that world in a different light. They argued that the obvious deterioration in the environment was unacceptable and not at all inevitable. Alternatives did exist. Different policies and practices could stanch and even reverse the damage.

Purists in that movement insisted upon the primacy of environmental needs, everywhere and in all cases. Theirs was (and is) a principled position deserving to be heard. To act on their recommendations, however, would likely mean shutting down the economy, an impractical and politically infeasible course of action.

Pragmatists advanced a different argument. They suggested that it was possible to negotiate a compromise between economic needs and environmental imperatives. This compromise might oblige Americans to curtail certain bad habits, but it did not require changing the fundamentals of how they lived their lives. Americans could keep their cars and continue their love affair with consumption; but at the same time they could also have cleaner air and cleaner water. Implementing this compromise has produced an outcome that environmental radicals (and on the other side, believers in laissez-faire capitalism) today find unsatisfactory. In practice, it turns out, once begun negotiations never end. Bargaining is continuous, contentious, and deeply politicized. Participants in the process seldom come away with everything they want. Settling for half a loaf when you covet the whole is inevitably frustrating. But the results are self-evident. Environmental conditions in the United States today are palpably better than they were a half century ago. Pollution has not been vanquished, but it has become more manageable. Furthermore, the nation has achieved those improvements without imposing on citizens undue burdens and without preventing its entrepreneurs from innovating, creating, and turning a profit.

Restoring a semblance of balance and good sense to the way that Americans think about military power will require a similarly pragmatic approach. Undoing all of the negative effects that result from having been seduced by war may **lie beyond reach**, but Americans can at least make them more manageable and thereby salvage their democracy. In explaining the origins of the new American militarism, this account has not sought to assign or to impute blame. None of the protagonists in this story sat down after Vietnam and consciously plotted to propagate perverse attitudes toward military power any more than Andrew Carnegie or John D. Rockefeller plotted to despoil the nineteenth-century American landscape. The clamor after Vietnam to rebuild the American arsenal and to restore American self-confidence, the celebration of soldierly values, the search for ways to make force more usable: all of these came about because groups of Americans thought that they glimpsed in the realm of military affairs the solution to vexing problems. The soldiers who sought to rehabilitate their profession, the intellectuals who feared that America might share the fate of Weimar, the strategists wrestling with the implications of nuclear weapons, the conservative Christians appalled by the apparent collapse of traditional morality: none of these acted out of motives that were inherently dishonorable. To the extent that we may find fault with the results of their efforts, that fault is more appropriately attributable to **human fallibility than to malicious intent**. And yet **in the end it is** not motive that matters but outcome. Several decades after Vietnam, in the aftermath of a century filled to overflowing with evidence pointing to the limited utility of armed force and the dangers inherent in relying excessively on military power, the American people have persuaded themselves that their best prospect for safety and salvation lies with the sword. Told that despite all of their past martial exertions, treasure expended, and lives sacrificed, the world they inhabit is today more dangerous than ever and that they must redouble those exertions, they dutifully assent. Much as dumping raw sewage into American lakes and streams was once deemed unremarkable, so today “global power projection”—a phrase whose sharp edges we have worn down through casual use, but which implies military activism without apparent limit—has become standard practice, a normal condition, one to which no plausible alternatives seem to exist. All of this Americans have come to take for granted: it’s who we are and what we do.

Such a definition of normalcy cries out for a close and critical reexamination. Surely, the surprises, disappointments, painful losses, and woeful, even shameful failures of the Iraq War make clear the need to rethink the fundamentals of U.S. military policy. Yet a meaningful reexamination will require first a change of consciousness, seeing war and America’s relationship to war in a fundamentally different way.

Of course, **dissenting views already exist.** A rich tradition of American pacifism abhors the resort to violence as always and in every case wrong. Advocates of disarmament argue that by their very existence weapons are an incitement to violence. In the former camp, there can never be a justification for war. In the latter camp, **the shortest road to peace begins with the beating of swords into ploughshares**. These are principled views that deserve a hearing, more so today than ever. By discomfiting the majority, advocates of such views serve the common good. But to make full-fledged pacifism or comprehensive disarmament the basis for policy in an intrinsically disordered world would be to open the United States to grave danger.

#### They oversimplify intervention policy – it isn’t about liberalism or imposing modes of subjectivity, but managing complexity

David Chandler, Professor of International Relations at the University of Westminster, “The uncritical critique of ‘liberal peace’,” Review of International Studies (‘10), 36, 137–155

It would appear that the assumptions held to be driving liberal peace approaches are very much in **the eye of their critical beholders**. The most obvious empirical difficulty is that international policy regarding intervention and statebuilding seems to have little transformative aspiration: **far from assumptions of liberal universalism**, **it** **would appear** that, with the failure of post-colonial development, especially from the 1970s onwards, **international policymakers have developed** historically low **expectations about what can be achieved through external intervention** and assistance. The lack of transformative belief is highlighted by one of the key concerns of the policy critics of the liberal peace – the focus on capacity-building state institutions and intervening to construct ‘civil’ societies. The focus on institutional solutions (at both the formal and informal levels) to the problems of conflict and transition is indicative of the **narrowing** down **of aspirations** **from** **transforming society** **to merely** regulating or **managing it** – often understood critically as the ‘securitising’ of policymaking. This is a long way from the promise of liberal transformation and the discourse of ‘liberating’ societies economically and politically. In fact, it is the **consensus of opinion** on the dangers of democracy, which has informed the focus on human rights and good governance. For the policy and radical critics of liberal peace, liberal rights frameworks are often considered problematic in terms of the dangers of exclusion and extremism. Today’s ‘illiberal’ peace approaches do not argue for the export of democracy – the freeing up of the political sphere on the basis of support for popular autonomy. The language of illiberal institutionalist approaches is that of democratisation: **the** problematisationof the liberal subject, held to be incapable of moral, rational choices at the ballot box, unless tutored by international experts concerned to promote civil society and pluralist values. In these frameworks, the holding of elections serves as an examination of the population and the behaviour of electoral candidates, rather than as a process for the judgement or construction of policy (which it is assumed needs external or international frameworks for its production). The focus on institutionalism does not stem from a critique of liberal peace programmes; institutionalist approaches developed from the 1970s onwards and were rapidly mainstreamed with the end of the Cold War.36 From 1989 onwards, Western governments and donors have stressed that policy interventions cannot just rely on promoting the freedoms of the market and democracy, but need to put institutional reform and ‘good governance’ at the core.37 Even in relation to Central and Eastern Europe it was regularly stressed that the people and elected representatives were not ready for freedom and that it would take a number of generations before it could be said that democracy was ‘consolidated’.38 The transitology literature was based on the critique of liberal assumptions – this was why a transitional period was necessary. Transition implied that markets and democracy could not work without external institutional intervention to prevent instability. While markets needed to be carefully managed through government policymaking it was held that civil society was necessary to ensure that the population learnt civic values to make democracy viable.39 It was through the engagement with ‘transition’ and the problematic negotiation of EU enlargement that the discursive framework of liberal institutionalism – where human rights, the ‘rule of law’, civil society, and anti-corruption are privileged over democracy – was programmatically cohered. It was also through the discussion of ‘transition’ that the concept of sovereign autonomy was increasingly problematised, initially in relation to the protections for minority rights and then increasingly expanded to cover other areas of domestic policymaking.40 It would appear that the key concepts and values of the ‘liberal peace’ held to have been promoted with vigour with the ‘victory of liberalism’ at the end of the Cold War **were never as dominant a framing as their radical and policy critics have claimed**.41 Rather than attempting to transform non-Western societies into the liberal self-image of the West, it would appear that external interveners have had **much more status quo aspirations**, **concerned with regulatory stability and** regional and domestic **security**, rather than transformation. Rather than imposing or ‘exporting’ alleged liberal Western models, international policy making has revolved around the promotion of regulatory and administrative measures which suggest the problems are not the lack of markets or democracy but rather the culture of society or the mechanisms of governance. Rather than promoting democracy and liberal freedoms, **the discussion has been how to** keep the lid on or to **manage the ‘complexity’ of non-Western societies**, usually perceived in terms of fixed ethnic and regional divisions. The solution to the complexity of the non-liberal state and society has been the internationalisation of the mechanisms of governance, removing substantive autonomy rather than promoting it.
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#### Cap is sustainable – emissions peaked in 2019

Hausfather 21 – Climate scientist and energy systems analyst. Director of Climate and Energy at The Breakthrough Institute. Master’s in environmental science from Yale and from Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and a PhD in climate science from UC Berkeley.

Zeke Hausfather, “Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries,” *The Breakthrough Institute*, 6 April 2021, https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/absolute-decoupling-of-economic-growth-and-emissions-in-32-countries.

Over the past 15 years, however, something has begun to change. Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, peak oil is upon us — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles.

The world has long been experiencing a relative decoupling between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP falling for the past 60 years. This is the case even in countries like India and China that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2 emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets.

Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production.

In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people have absolutely decoupled emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red).

To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries.

There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO
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2 emissions.

One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore leakage. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries has actually declined over the past 15 years.

This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) have jointly declined. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019.

There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019.

Absolute decoupling is possible. There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).

This is not to say that infinite economic growth is desirable (or even possible), particularly given that the global population is expected to start to shrink by the end of the 21st century (and well before that in most currently wealthy countries). There will be some tradeoffs between economic growth and climate mitigation — particularly if the world is to meet ambitious mitigation targets. But it is possible to envision a world that is prosperous, equal, and at net-zero emissions; indeed, all of the future emissions scenarios used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) do just that.

It is also useful to look at a few specific cases of larger countries that have absolutely decoupled emissions and GDP over the past 15 years.

Emissions reductions in the US have been a result of a wide variety of factors; this includes the switch from coal generation to lower-carbon natural gas, the rapid expansion of wind and solar generation, reduced industrial energy consumption, reduced electricity use in buildings, and reductions in transportation emissions — particularly as a result of increased vehicle fuel economy and reduced miles driven per-capita. Since 2005, US territorial emissions have fallen around 15%, with consumption emissions falling around 18% (much larger reductions were seen in 2020, and some of this is expected to persist). At the same time, GDP has increased by around 29%.

In the UK, territorial emissions have fallen by nearly 40% and consumption emissions have fallen by around 30%, while GDP has increased by 22%. Similar to the US, there are a wide variety of drivers of UK emissions reductions, though renewable energy generation, reductions in electricity use, and reductions in industrial and residential energy use are the largest contributors.

In Germany, territorial emissions have fallen around 15%, and consumption emissions have fallen by around 20%, while GDP has increased by 24%.

In France, territorial emissions have fallen by around 25%, and consumption emissions have fallen by a similar amount, while GDP has increased by 16%. It is a bit notable that France has seen larger emission reductions — as a percentage of total emissions — than Germany over this period, likely due in part to Germany’s choice to prioritize shutting down nuclear power plants over coal ones.

The Japanese emissions trajectory has been a bit more variable since 2005 than the prior countries we have examined, decreasing during the financial crisis, rebounding during the recovery and in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster as a sizable portion of its clean electricity generation was shut down, before decreasing in more recent years. Over the full period, territorial emissions have fallen by a bit over 10%, while consumption emissions have fallen by around 13%

These 32 countries show that it is possible to have economic growth at the same time that CO2 emissions decline, even accounting for embodied emissions in goods imported from overseas. However, these are mostly relatively wealthy countries whose economies tend to be increasingly driven by lower-energy information technology and service sectors. We have relatively few examples of low- or middle-income countries with a focus on energy-intensive manufacturing experiencing absolute decoupling to date.

That said, with the rapid cost reductions of clean energy and an expected peak in Chinese emissions in the next five to ten years, it is only a matter of time before absolute decoupling becomes the norm. The extent to which this will occur rapidly enough to avoid dangerous levels of warming depends on both the degree of technological progress and the willingness of governments worldwide to invest in mitigating climate change.

#### Markets are key to innovation – Innovations develop over time through experimental searches and unpredictable breakthroughs stemming from market competition. It’s impossible for the state to aggregate enough data to effectively allocate resources.

**Karlson et al. 20** --- Ratio Institute, Linköping University, Stockholm, Sweden.

Nils, Christian Sandström, & Karl Wennberg, 2020, “Bureaucrats or Markets in Innovation Policy? – a critique of the entrepreneurial state,” The Review of Austrian Economics, vol. 34, pg. 81–95.

Information problems concern the difficulty a public actor face in collecting the information and acquiring the knowledge enabling correct decision-making regarding, for example, the allocation of resources. As Hayek (1945) showed, it is practically impossible to aggregate information and knowledge about production conditions, business opportunities, customer preferences, etc. to any central unit in society. Such information is dispersed, local, and time-bound in character, even in today’s modern digital economy. With regard to innovation policy and the results reviewed above, there are numerous implications of Hayek’s argument.

First, the existence of a market failure is empirically difficult to prove, or measure. The original argument by Arrow (1962) was of a theoretical nature and has not been validated. One could expect the potential size of such a market failure to vary greatly depending upon institutional characteristics, industrial context, regional and national setting. Such differences along with the fact that it is a very methodologically challenging task to locate and compute the size of a market failure means that policymakers are put in the awkward position of trying to solve a problem that is unknown both in terms of its existence, size and location. Needless to say, such a situation is almost bound to result in malinvestments.

The second implication concerns that a market economy is more compatible with the notion of dispersed knowledge than a public policy intervention. Industrial development in a market economy characterized by innovations is often described as a complex evolutionary process (Nelson and Winter 1982). Through experimental search characterized by failures and unpredictable breakthroughs, the economy develops over time (
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Aldrich 1999). Individual market actors make mistakes and invest in the wrong technical solution or the wrong business model for a new technology (Delmar et al. 2011). If the actors themselves who operate in a market are unable to know which technology or business model is optimal, there is reason to question how a public actor in the form of a government agency or a policymaker can perform this task satisfactorily. Government involvement in the form of “picking winners,” that is, attempts to generate growth through government selection of technologies or firms, risks becoming expensive for taxpayers (Lerner 2009). Previous research has shown that venture capital investments tend to be highly spatial and build on social networks (Hochberg et al. 2007). The price mechanism provides aggregate information about customers’ demand, and the firms’ profits and losses. Information and knowledge are thus conveyed and generated among market actors in competitive markets who are nested together through social, economic and technological interdependencies, and this information is hard to extract from its origin and locate in a central policy unit.

#### Information gaps – centralized authorities cannot mirror the distributed form of knowledge required to invest right

**Karlson et al 21** – Ratio Institute, Linköping University, Stockholm, Sweden. Science and Technology Studies, Jönköping International Business School, Ratio institute and Chalmers University of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. Division of Business Administration, Linköping University, Ratio institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

[Nils Karlson](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#auth-Nils-Karlson), [Christian Sandström](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#auth-Christian-Sandstr_m) & [Karl Wennberg](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#auth-Karl-Wennberg), 2021, “Bureaucrats or Markets in Innovation Policy? – a critique of the entrepreneurial state,” The Review of Austrian Economics, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#auth-Nils-Karlson>

Information problems concern the difficulty a public actor face in collecting the information and acquiring the knowledge enabling correct decision-making regarding, for example, the allocation of resources. As Hayek ([1945](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR34)) showed, it is practically impossible to aggregate information and knowledge about production conditions, business opportunities, customer preferences, etc. to any central unit in society. Such information is dispersed, local, and time-bound in character, even in today’s modern digital economy. With regard to innovation policy and the results reviewed above, there are numerous implications of Hayek’s argument.

**First, the existence of a market failure is empirically difficult to prove, or measure**. The original argument by Arrow ([1962](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR5)) was of a theoretical nature and has not been validated. One could expect the potential size of such a market failure to vary greatly depending upon institutional characteristics, industrial context, regional and national setting. Such differences along with the fact that it is a very methodologically challenging task to locate and compute the size of a market failure means that policymakers are put in the awkward position of trying to solve a problem that is unknown both in terms of its existence, size and location. Needless to say, such a situation is almost bound to result in malinvestments.

The second **implication concerns that a market economy is more compatible with the notion of dispersed knowledge than a public policy intervention.** Industrial development in a market economy characterized by innovations is often described as a complex evolutionary process (Nelson and Winter [1982](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR49)). Through experimental search characterized by failures and unpredictable breakthroughs, the economy develops over time (Aldrich [1999](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR2)). Individual market actors make mistakes and invest in the wrong technical solution or the wrong business model for a new technology (Delmar et al. [2011](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR23)). If the actors themselves who operate in a market are unable to know which technology or business model is optimal, there is reason to question how a public actor in the form of a government agency or a policymaker can perform this task satisfactorily. Government involvement in the form of “picking winners,” that is, attempts to generate growth through government selection of technologies or firms**, risks becoming expensive for taxpayers** (Lerner [2009](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR44)). Previous research has shown that venture capital investments tend to be highly spatial and build on social networks (Hochberg et al. [2007](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11138-020-00508-7#ref-CR35)). The price mechanism provides aggregate information about customers’ demand, and the firms’ profits and losses. Information and knowledge are thus conveyed and generated among market actors in competitive markets who are **nested together through social, economic and technological interdependencies, and this information is hard to extract from its origin and locate in a central policy unit.**

#### For example, single payer healthcare is good, and education shouldn’t be a market, and the government should do climate regulation. Using the government to make some markets more competitive does NOT mean the government should always be oriented in that way!

Coniglio, antitrust attorney in the Washington, DC office of Sidley Austin LLP, ‘20

(Joseph V., “Economizing the Totalitarian Temptation: A Risk-Averse Liberal

Realism for Political Economy and Competition Policy in a Post-Neoliberal Society,” 59

Santa Clara L. Rev. 703)

The justification for a consumer welfare standard, as well as for neoliberal political economy more generally, should be distinguished from a defense of this sense of neoliberalism as a comprehensive social order which, like its Marxist rival, shares in this totalitarianizing of the economic. 150 Put simply, notwithstanding its fruits, neoliberalism should not become the very sort of utopian and totalitarian ideology that it was designed to replace. The existence of a justification for neoliberal competition policy does not mean that the wealth maximizing logic of the market should be the organizing principle for society writ large' 5 ' -or even law, as a general matter. 52 To paraphrase Schum- peter, it is the higher order question of "Meaning," upon which the indictment of neoliberalism is likely most sound and most neededhowever difficult that may be to articulate.

MARK

VI. CONCLUSION

The United States has been the preeminent embodiment of capitalism and democracy around the world. As it transitioned through what we have understood as the classical liberal, progressive, and neoliberal phases of its political economy, it played a leading role in overcoming the greatest authoritarian and totalitarian forces in modem history: the last of the monarchies of the Old Order in World War I, national socialism in World War II, and communism in the Cold War. But rather than herald a liberal and democratic end of history,'53 the current crisis of the neoliberal order is an occasion for policymakers to reflect upon precisely where things may have went wrong.

The stakes are high.

But for the United States' unique achievements in republican government, victory in two world wars, and technological and economic progress, Schumpeter may very well have been proven right that the great revolution of capitalist democracy, which preceded over a hundred and fifty years of inter-Western wars, civil strife, and the resultant loss of hundreds of millions of lives, could have been merely a precursor'5 4 to a far more barbaric and inhumane system of government than what came before it,'55 and which would put to death by the tens of millions the very masses it claimed it would liberate. 156 The United States, with its unrivaled system of free enterprise, commitment to the rule of law, and inheritance of the Western tradition remains the best hope to prevent, in solidarity with its allies, the final triumph of such a totalitarian tragedy.

The competition policy community, which during the neoliberal period accustomed itself to a comfortable and technocratic discourse about which conduct rules will maximize consumer welfare, 157 must adapt its thinking by considering changes to antitrust law within the context of a broader debate that questions not only the consumer welfare consensus, but also the neoliberal principles upon which contemporary antitrust is premised. In this debate, competition policymakers should remain steadfast in their conviction that history has justified a consumer welfare standard as the lodestar of antitrust law158 --even if incremental changes are appropriate in some areas. Simply put, the inability for antitrust law to operate as an economic, social, or political panacea does not mean it isn't working.

Rather, what is good policy for antitrust law may not be good policy for all organs of society, and the fundamental problem with neoliberalism may not so much as involve what has been gained, but what has been lost-that is, so to speak, Burke's "chivalry" or Schumpeter's "holy grail"-within neoliberalism's broader program to generalize the market form across society. 159 Seeking to use antitrust or other market tools as a means to understand, let alone solve, larger social problems fundamentally fails to grasp the deeper forms of which societies have historically been constituted. 60 Even if man is a homo economicus- as he always has been' 6 '-that is certainly not all he is, and his economic nature need not and should not come at the expense of the higher rational faculties that ground moral and political order. These questions, as uncomfortable as they may be, far outstrip the search of the New Brandeisians and others for a golden mean in the Herfindal- Hirschman index that balances the interests of capitalism and democracy in a given market. They are also more important.

The hope lies not, moreover, in a return to either Jeffersonian democracy or New Deal progressivism. 162 Just as the analysis of the problem may be better found on the classical "anthropological' 163 analysis, to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of tyranny and ochlocracy, a path forward for America and the West lies in its unique and millennia- old tradition of republican government. In particular, if liberal capitalist democracy continues to falter,164 the United States can take the lead in looking back to the cosmopolitan and meritocratic model of republican Rome1 65 that inspired Presidents166 and abolitionists167 -even if America ultimately chartered a different course. 68 The West's ability to once again renew its civilization around a rightful heir-lest imposters claim the title-to its great tradition of right order, individual liberty, and progress in the condition of man may hang in the balance.