### 2AC---T-Across Board

#### W/M : Plan alters the scope of antitrust by repealing AmEx decision---that alters EVERY SECTOR.

#### C/I: “Expand the scope of its core antitrust laws” requires modifying the applicability of the antitrust laws by a part of the private sector

Kovacic et al. 03 – Professor at George Washington University Law School

William E. Kovacic, Theodore B. Olson, R. Hewitt Pate, Paul D. Clement, Jeffrey A. Lamken, Catherine G. O’Sullivan, Nancy C. Garrison, David Seidman, Brief for the United States and the Federal Trade Commission as Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioner, Verizon Communs. Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis v. Trinko, 2003 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 513, Supreme Court of the United States, May 2003, LexisNexis

Conversely, the 1996 Act does not expand the scope of the antitrust laws to outlaw conduct that, but for the 1996 Act, would not violate the antitrust laws. Such an expansion of Sherman Act duties would "modify \* \* \* the applicability of \* \* \* the antitrust laws" in contravention of 47 U.S.C. 152 note. Violations of the duties imposed by the 1996 Act are just that--violations of the 1996 Act, subject to the sanctions and penalties imposed by that Act. They do not automatically amount to treble-damages antitrust claims. The courts of appeals are again in accord. Pet. App. 29a; Covad, 299 F.3d at 1283 ("We agree with Goldwasser that merely pleading violations of the 1996 Act alone will not suffice to plead Sherman Act violations."); Goldwasser, 222 F.3d at 400 (It is "both illogical and undesirable to equate a failure to comply with the 1996 Act with a failure to comply with the antitrust laws."); Cavalier Tel. Co., 2003 WL 21153305, at \*11-\*12 (similar).

#### C/I: The core antitrust laws just means Sherman Act and Clayton Act.

The Antitrust Division 07 – Law enforcement agency that enforces the U.S. antitrust laws

“Antitrust Division Statement Regarding the Release of the Antitrust Modernization Commission Report,” The Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, April 2007, https://www.justice.gov/archive/atr/public/press\_releases/2007/222344.htm

The AMC has made many specific recommendations in its report, and the Division is in the process of reviewing all of them. The Division commends the AMC for its three primary conclusions:

Free-market competition should remain the touchstone of United States' economic policy. The Commission's conclusion in this regard is a fundamental starting point for policy makers. Over a century of experience has shown that robust competition among businesses, each striving to be increasingly successful, leads to better quality products and services, lower prices, and higher levels of innovation.

The core antitrust laws—Sherman Act sections 1 and 2 and Clayton Act section 7—and their application by the courts and federal enforcement agencies are sound and appropriately safeguard the competitiveness of the U.S. economy.

New or different rules are not needed for industries in which innovation, intellectual property, and technological innovation are central features. Unlike some other areas of the law, the core antitrust laws are general in nature and have been applied to many different industries to protect free-market competition successfully over a long period of time despite changes in the economy and the increasing pace of technological advancement. One of the great benefits of the Sherman and Clayton Acts is their adaptability to new economic conditions without sacrificing their ability to protect competition.

#### Prefer ---

#### Overlimiting—their interp arbitrarily excludes every core aff on the topic – undermines AFF innovation and causes unbeatable pics.

#### Precision—only we have ev in the legal antitrust context – private sector entirely alternations is not how it worked

#### Reasonability – good is good enough, competing interpretations cause a race to the bottom, crowd out substance, and arbitrarily exclude the aff

### 2AC---T-Immunities

#### We meet—changing plaintiff’s burden increases “scope”

Orbach, Professor of Law and the Director of the Business Law Program, the University of Arizona College of Law, ‘15

(Barak, “The Durability of Formalism in Antitrust,” 100 Iowa L. Rev. 2197)

In other dimensions, the Supreme Court has developed formalistic rules and categories. For example, in the late 1970s, when the Court started blurring the distinction between per se and rule of reason, it also introduced the “direct purchaser” doctrine as a standing requirement. This rule bars indirect purchasers from bringing antitrust lawsuits, regardless of the circumstances. Also in the late 1970s, the Court began drawing a categorical distinction between horizontal and vertical restraints. The distinction is exceptionally important for the understanding of economic relationships but it does not necessarily define competitive effects as some suggested. Likewise, since the late 1970s, the Supreme Court has been using procedure—namely by applying formalism—to narrow the scope of antitrust through rules that disfavor plaintiffs.

#### CI—prohibitions are implemented via legal tests—the threshold of the test determines how much or how little conduct is prohibited

Mark S. Popofsky, Antitrust Partner at Ropes and Gray, Served as Senior Counsel to DOJ Antitrust Division, Adjunct Professor of Advanced Antitrust Law and Economics at Harvard Law School and the Georgetown University Law Center, 2016, Section 2 and the Rule of Reason: Report from the Front, CPI Antitrust Chronicle March 2016 (1)

Courts remain, in the words of one observer, mired in an “exclusionary conduct ‘definition’ war.”2 Applying Section 2’s broad prohibition on “monopolizing” conduct requires courts to select a governing legal test. Section 2 legal tests run the spectrum from rules of per se legality to rules of near per se illegality.3 Courts, nonetheless, largely apply two dominant paradigms. The first consists of legal tests based on bright-line rules or safe harbors. Familiar examples include the Brooke Group4 below-cost price test for analyzing predatory pricing claims and the Aspen/Trinko5 “profit sacrifice” test for refusals to deal. Developing bright-line rules for Section 2, proponents argue, promotes business certainty and reduces the risk of chilling otherwise procompetitive conduct. The second paradigm is rule of reason balancing. Arguably the default Section 2 legal test,6 courts and commentators have described Section 2’s rule of reason in various ways: as mandating a step-wise approach, as requiring a balancing of pro- and anticompetitive effects, or (to borrow from Section 1) a framework for generating the enquiry “meet for the case.”7 However the rule of reason is expressed, its champions contend, its flexibility and fact-intensive approach permits courts to identify anticompetitive conduct without the under-inclusion that is an admitted feature of safe harbors and other bright-line rules.

#### Prefer our interp:

#### 1---Overlimiting--- only immunities destroys AFF strategic angles---eviscerates quantity and quality of 1ACs that beat core NEG generics.

#### 2---Predictability---our ev. uses resolutional phrasing contextually AND has intent to define---key to pre-tournament prep.

#### 3---Functional limits---states, non-antitrust and enforcement CPs, topic Ks.

#### 4---Reasonability---alternative visions encourage a race to the bottom in lieu of substantive debate.

### 2AC---States CP

#### Perm do both---shields the link.

#### Perm do the CP---replicates the function of the federal government.

#### CP is a de facto patchwork—majority of states bound by federal precedent

Richard A. Duncan is a partner in the Minneapolis office of Faegre & Benson LLP, and Alison K. Guernsey is presently a third-year law student at the University of Iowa College of Law and Editor-in-Chief of the Iowa Law Review, 2008, Waiting for the Other Shoe to Drop:

Will State Courts Follow Leegin? https://www.faegredrinker.com/webfiles/leegin\_article.pdf

This article explores yet another barrier to widespread adoption of RPM programs, one that is particularly applicable to franchisors seeking to negotiate national account pricing or to establish nationwide minimum pricing: state antitrust laws. Nearly all states have antitrust statutes, and those few that do not have such laws regulate anticompetitive conduct through consumer protection statutes or common law theories. The good news, at least for those who favor uniform national economic regulation, is that most state courts follow federal antitrust precedent, either because of statutory command or a decisional preference for uniform operation of state and federal antitrust laws. However, a significant minority of states feel themselves relatively unbound by federal precedent, and even those that do follow federal decisional law generally leave themselves an escape route if federal law varies from state statute or putative state policy goals.

This article reviews the current statutory and decisional law on RPM in the fifty states and the District of Columbia, and offers some predictions on which are likely to continue to prohibit RPM. Because this area of the law is now rapidly changing, it is also foreseeable that state legislatures will attempt to pass new statutes prohibiting RPM in reaction to Leegin. Twenty-five states did just that to permit “indirect purchasers” to sue for monetary damages after the Supreme Court held in Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois that such purchasers lacked standing to sue under federal antitrust law. 7 Ultimately, Leegin does offer significantly greater leeway to suppliers to regulate their customers’ pricing behavior and for national account pricing programs in particular to flourish. However, during the transition to the post-Leegin world, franchisors must still take care when designing sales and distribution programs to assess the likely response of individual states to restraints on resale prices.

State Levels of Adherence

Most states have antitrust statutes containing provisions analogous to, or the same as, Section 1 of the Sherman Act. In fact, only four states—Arkansas, Vermont, Georgia, and Pennsylvania—do not. 8 Consistent with the manner in which many state statutes parallel the language of federal antitrust provisions, the majority of states also give deference to federal decisional law when interpreting their state antitrust statutes. There are exceptions for instances in which the state statutory language differs significantly from that of the Sherman Act or when the state legislature has expressed a policy interest at odds with federal precedent.

#### Rogue state DA—CP creates mass uncertainty that chills all business

Robert W Hahn Is Executive Director of the American Enterprise Institute, Brookings Joint Center, which focuses on antitrust and regulatory policy, and Anne Layne-Farrar is a Senior Consultant with NERA Economic Consulting, 2003, Federalism in Antitrust, 26 Harv. J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 877

When states file antitrust cases under state statutes rather than under the Clayton or Sherman Acts, the likelihood of inconsistent and conflicting antitrust precedent is even higher. As a result, state action affects not only current cases, but can also affect future firm behavior. With mergers, the possibility of a challenge from any of the fifty states, each with its own standard of evaluation, could prevent companies from even attempting a beneficial transaction. As Lande points out, "it is confounding enough for antitrust counselors to have to contend with two potential federal enforcement agencies.

Even if state laws were identical, the interpretation and application of those laws would differ "since enforcers with divergent philosophies necessarily will interpret ambiguous terms differently in various factual contexts." Philosophical differences in approaches to antitrust enforcement are likely to stem from many sources, such as political affiliation, educational training, and personal experience. The National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) Merger Guidelines for the states explicitly allow for this, noting that the general policy can be supplemented or varied in light of differing precedents, and "in the exercise of [the AGs'] individual prosecutorial ... discretion." While differing views can be helpful in some areas of law, such as when different states provide a testing ground for new regulations appropriate for federal adoption, this kind of experimentation is likely to be wasteful in the antitrust arena.

#### CP impliedly preempted—conflicts with federal precedent

Victoria Graham, Bloomberg Law, Ohio Rethinks State Antitrust Laws to Confront Facebook, Google (1), October 17, 2019, <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/antitrust/ohio-rethinks-state-antitrust-laws-to-confront-facebook-google>

Ohio Rethinks State Antitrust Laws to Confront Facebook, Google (1)

Ohio legislators are considering whether to rewrite antitrust laws to reflect the growth of big tech in the latest sign of growing bipartisan state-level interest in confronting Alphabet Inc.’s Google and Facebook Inc.

Most state antitrust laws directly mirror U.S. competition law and Ohio could only go so far with antitrust revisions before they potentially conflict with federal law or interfere with how companies do business.

“Given the global and national footprints for the digital technology companies, state legislative carve-outs for the sector could affect companies’ ability to do commerce across states and regions,” said Diana Moss, president of the American Antitrust Institute.

States do have some room to maneuver in areas where the U.S. Congress hasn’t expressly enacted legislation, similar to how California enacted its own privacy law in the absence of a federal statute.

“Just because certain conduct is legal under federal law doesn’t mean the state couldn’t outlaw it,” Ralph Breitfeller, of counsel at Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter Co. in Columbus, Ohio, said.

State Scrutiny

Ohio lawmakers discussed a possible rethink of the state’s antitrust laws Oct. 17 during a legislative hearing in Cleveland examining the impact of Google and Facebook. The hearing featured several academics and Yelp Inc. executive, Luther Lowe, who has emerged as an outspoken critic of Google’s power to control the internet.

Legislators should consider changing state antitrust laws to allow regulators to assess factors other than price, such how much data one firm controls, when reviewing a merger, Dennis Hirsch, a professor at The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, said during the hearing.

Current merger analysis, at both the state and federal level, doesn’t factor in data aggregation since it’s mostly concerned on how consumer prices are impacted by a merger.

A second hearing will follow in Cincinnati on Oct. 28.

The probe—the first of its kind by any U.S. state legislature—is led by state Sen. John Eklund, a Republican who represents a district east of Cleveland and practiced competition law for more than 40 years.

Ohio’s Attorney General Dave Yost (R) is among state attorneys general in both parties that have emerged as some of the most vocal critics of big tech’s power. Multi-state investigations into Facebook and Google’s dominant market power have positioned the states as potentially more aggressive enforcers than federal regulators.

At the federal level, Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission officials have been hesitant to call for new antitrust legislation, while Congress contemplates whether modifications need to be made to address the unique challenges of big tech.

The antitrust laws that date back as late as 1890 during the breakup of Standard Oil don’t need major changes since they are flexible enough to deal with new technology changes, such as the rise of Amazon.com Inc. and Apple Inc., most federal enforcers argue.

Yost, who is involved in both a Google and Facebook multi-state antitrust investigation, said during a September press conference that these hearings will “help inform” the state’s investigation and the discovery it conducts into both tech companies.

Ohio has played a pivotal role in shaping the history of U.S. antitrust law.

The nation’s first antitrust legislation which is still the current federal statute that prohibits monopolistic conduct, the Sherman Antitrust Act, was introduced by Senator John Sherman (R-Ohio).

After the Sherman Act’s passage, it was then Ohio’s Attorney General David Watson who first sued Standard Oil, which eventually lead the U.S. Supreme Court to force a breakup of the corporate trust in 1911.

Workarounds

States have to ensure that any new antitrust statutes don’t directly conflict with existing federal law since courts generally strike state laws as invalid if they clash with the federal government, John Newman, a former attorney at the DOJ’s antitrust division, who is now an antitrust professor at The University of Miami School of Law, said.

#### Even if the CP results in uniform LAW, patchwork ENFORCEMENT kills solvency

Robert W Hahn Is Executive Director of the American Enterprise Institute, Brookings Joint Center, which focuses on antitrust and regulatory policy, and Anne Layne-Farrar is a Senior Consultant with NERA Economic Consulting, 2004, The Case for Federal Preemption in Antitrust Enforcement, 18 Antitrust 79

State-to-State Conflicts

When states file antitrust cases under their own statutes, rather than under the Clayton or Sherman Acts, the likelihood the cases will be governed by Inconsistent or even conflicting antitrust precedents runs high. Even if state laws were uniform, with enforcers in each state coming from different backgrounds and holding divergent philosophies, legal Interpretations are bound to differ. While diverse views can be helpful in some areas of law-for example, varying state rules can provide a natural test for the efficacy of new regulations at the federal level-this kind of experimentation is likely to be wasteful in the antitrust arena.

A Case Study

The problems cataloged above are not mere theoretical possibilities, United Stales v. Microsoft provides a real-world example. Throughout the course of the lawsuit, the parties lobbied state attorneys general, federal antitrust authorities, and even the courts ." Thus, California Attorney General Bill Lockyor chose to reject an early settlement attempt, noting that "his resolve was hardened after listening over the weekend to advice from technical technical experts and officials from Microsoft's competitors, such as IBM, AOL Time Warner Inc., Sun Microsystems Inc., and Novell Inc. "24 California subsequently took the lead in continuing the litigation on behalf of the non-settling states and even provided the bulk of the funding."

Comments made by officials at the Justice Department suggest that federal authorities are a much tougher sell for lobbyists. Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust Charles James emphasized his concern over special Interests. "The number of requests for meetings with me immediately after my nomination but before my confirmation became so daunting," he wrote, "that I adopted the posture of refusing to meet personally with any third parties in the Microsoft case. . ."?n While lobbying on Individual antitrust cases certainly occurs at the federal level, the magnitude of Issues and the probability that competing views will neutralize arguments make it far more costly to gain influence.

In addition to derailing early settlement talks,;" the states created uncertainty that the settlement finally reached by the Department of Justice would stick. Nine states agreed to settle along with the DOJ, but nine others proposed a radically different remedy. Those nine states, which included California and Massachusetts are home of some of Microsoft's most vocal rivals,'6 Not surprisingly, their remedy proposal neatly dovetailed with the Interests of Microsoft's competitors.

For example, the states that refused to settle demanded that Microsoft license large amounts of valuable intellectual property for little or no compensation." The Initial effect of weakening the protection of intellectual property after It has been developed Is always positive for consun'ers, who need not compensate the innovator to get the benefit. The long-term effects, however, are decidedly negative, even for consumers: Innovation could decline because firms will have less Incentive to Invest in R&D if they cannot prevent others from using the fruits of their efforts and will not receive any compensation for the expropriation." Under the litigating states' remedy, competitors would have gained access to Microsoft's software code at no cost, but consumers could have suffered In the long term because the disclosure requirements would have left Microsoft with little incentive to improve Windows or many of the company's software applications.

One of the litigating states' requirements would have forced Microsoft to auction off the right to adapt its Office business applications suite to three non Windows operating systems. In return, Microsoft would have received only the one-time auction fees and no royalty payments. As part of the auction, Microsoft would have had to provide the winning bidders with code for any future upgrades to Office, plus access to any Windows source code (the program's "blueprints") at no charge.

Another of the litigating states' proposals would have required Microsoft to release its Web browser software (Internet Explorer and MSN Explorer) under "open source" licenses. To comply, Microsoft would have had to publish the underlying source code, making it available at no charge to all (that is, not just to three winners of the Office auction). Indeed, most of the Intellectual property disclosure rules proposed by the litigating states seemed designed to prevent Microsoft from recouping the value of R&D investments through licensing. Thus, under the states' alternative remedy, technology companies stood to gain a great deal of Microsoft's Intellectual property at little or no cost. Still other provisions would have raised Microsoft's costs with little apparent benefit to consumers.

#### Thousand cuts DA—too many state suits overwhelm companies—harms marginal small firms that can’t pay up

Peterson Director of Technology and Innovation, Pelican Institute, and Bolema Executive Director, Institute for the Study of Economic Growth, W. Frank Barton School of Business, Wichita State University, ‘21

(Eric and Ted, “The Proper Role for States in Antitrust Lawsuits,” https://www.sugarsync.com/pf/D7911054\_09969505\_9958002)

For novel cases of national import, states should limit their involvement to supplementing federal resources. This approach seems to have worked well in the Microsoft lawsuit and other matters, such as the merger of T-Mobile and Sprint, where five states partnered successfully with the Justice Department to find a pro-consumer settlement with the firms. States have not fared well when they bring these types of novel lawsuits on their own.

Moreover, the current wave of tech cases suggests another reason to worry about overly active state antitrust enforcement. Specifically, due to the high number of states that can bring lawsuits, the states could overwhelm a company, even with little or no evidence of harm to consumers. Google is one of the largest companies in the world and can afford the compliance and legal expense of defending its business practices. This is not true of every company facing the threat of antitrust suits, however. Twitter, for example, has often been thrown in as “big tech” despite its relatively meager value compared to Facebook, Amazon and Google. Could it survive the flurry of lawsuits Google is facing now?

Lawsuits can be costly beyond a profit and loss statement. Every case presents an opportunity to lose in court, potentially forcing a restructure or major change to part of the business. Facing too many lawsuits, any company might choose to settle with the government rather than fight it out in court, regardless of the merits. Such lawsuits may show displeasure with the actions of big tech companies, but run the risk of diverting attention from innovation that would have benefited consumers.

#### FTC essential to predictability and business signaling—states destroy it

Wilks, Professor in the School of Public Policy and Administration Carleton University and Joint Research Chair in Public Policy in the Politics Department, ‘96

(Stephen, *Comparative Competition Policy: National Institutions in a Global Market*, Clarendon Press)

We will be concentrating on the formal role of the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission in enforcing competition law, but there is an important informal element as well. Most issues in competition policy never reach the courts or these agencies, but are instead self-enforced through corporate attorneys who advise their clients what is possible under law and practice and what is not. Therefore, the signals that the two government institutions send to the corporate and legal communities are important for determining what will happen. For example, the 'nonenforcement rhetoric' during the l980s was important in defining how the corporate community would proceed with its merger and pricing acrivities.3  Further, the use of guidelines and formal rules from the FTC can give to private attorneys additional guidance concerning what actions are likely to trigger the interests of regulators.

As noted above, the federal nature of US politics brings into play other actors concerned with competition policy. In some ways this statement may appear unlikely, given the apparent federal monopoly over the regulation of interstate commerce. The federal government certainly does have a dominant position in this area, but the states have managed to a,ct also. In fact, the level of state activity in antitrust has been increasing. This is in part a function of the populist appeal of this activity and the political capital it can build for state attorneys general (elective officials in almost all states). These public officials have begun to file cases of potential national significance in state courts, a practice that could fragment national policy and make the environment of business very uncertain.

The states have been acting to limit competition at least as often as they have acted to promote it. For example, states (and counties and cities) often have laws requiring giving preference on public contracts to vendors coming from inside their political unit. It is not uncommon for these policies to create local monopolies or oligopolies, and perhaps also to create higher costs for the government imposing the policy. These policies do, of course, preserve local employment opportunities. Businesses can also gain protection from federal antitrust competition by accepting more friendly state regulation. On the other hand, through state corporation commissions and similar regulatory bodies, state governments also exercise some sub-national control over concentrations of commerdal power, although in a limited geographical area and subject to local pressures tnat are often not as pro-competitive as national policies tend to be.31

#### Fifty state fiat is a voting issue---

#### a) Justifies no illegitimate NEG counterplans---opens the floodgates to private actors and foreign countries.

#### b) Divorces debate from core topic controversies to fringe fed key warrants---ruins pedagogical value of rez.

### 2AC---Neolib K

#### The AFF wins if they win that their political paradigm is good---anything else lets the NEG moot 8 minutes of 1AC offense and places unfair and unpredictable burdens upon the AFF that weaken content retention and discourages future research.

#### Socialism is terrible and the AFF is an impact turn---state control destroys the profit incentive that small and big firms use to compete on creating new AI and FinTech technologies. China has more people AND state control, which means government sponsored initiatives will always be behind. Only open-market innovation is our comparative advantage. That’s Wheeler.

#### Government sponsored tech innovation fails---empirics.

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/

Politicians used to promise a chicken in every pot. Today, it’s a Silicon Valley in every state.

The computing and internet revolutions gave rise to prominent tech clusters in Silicon Valley, Seattle, Boston, Austin and elsewhere. This has left many pundits and policymakers wondering how America might [spread the wealth](https://itif.org/publications/2019/12/09/case-growth-centers-how-spread-tech-innovation-across-america), so to speak, by reproducing these successes in other parts of the country.

A major effort is afoot to do just that. While promoting “innovation hubs” and “science parks” has been a long-standing priority for many state and local officials, a more concerted effort is now underway that marries traditional state and local economic development efforts with a renewed bipartisan interest in [comprehensive industrial policy planning](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352259022_Does_the_US_Need_a_More_Targeted_Industrial_Policy_for_AI_High-Tech) at the federal level.

Earlier this summer, the Senate passed a 2,300-page industrial policy bill, the “[United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/1260/text),” that included almost $10 billion over four years for a Department of Commerce-led effort to fund 20 new regional technology hubs, “in a manner that ensures geographic diversity and representation from communities of differing populations.” A similar proposal that is moving in the House, the “[Regional Innovation Act of 2021](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/4588/text),” proposes almost $7 billion over five years for 10 regional tech hubs.

Meanwhile, the Biden administration also is pitching ideas for new high-tech hubs. In late July, the Commerce Department’s Economic Development Administration [announced plans](https://www.aip.org/fyi/2021/commerce-department-dedicating-1-billion-spur-%E2%80%98regional-industry-clusters%E2%80%99) to allocate $1 billion in pandemic recovery funds to create or expand “regional industry clusters” as part of the administration’s new [Build Back Better Regional Challenge](https://eda.gov/arpa/build-back-better/). Among the possible ideas the agency said might win funding are an “artificial intelligence corridor,” an “agriculture-technology cluster” in rural coal counties, a “blue economy cluster” in coastal regions, and a “climate-friendly electric vehicle cluster.”

Efforts to geographically diversify tech clusters are rooted in an understandable desire to extend the benefits of technological innovation beyond major cities. It is hard to fault state and local policymakers for wanting government to do more to attract new investment, firms and jobs to their communities.

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.

#### Perm do both---utilize limited neoliberal competition policy while rejecting broader structures of capitalism.

#### The AFF outweighs AND the ALT fails:

#### ---Only tech markets can aggregate information and distribute the resources to develop the AI and Fintech innovations necessary.

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?

#### ---We need market competition in narrow industries like tech to beat China, BUT that doesn’t mean the logic of competition should structure everything.

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

#### ---Antitrust is the ONLY effective tool. Apple and Facebook’s dominance are proof that we AGREE that left alone markets trend towards monopolies. BUT intervention can recalibrate the tech industry to allow new players to compete.

#### Empirics prove competition policy works.

Maximiano and Volpin 20 – Ruben Maximiano is a Senior Competition Expert at the OECD and a lecturer at Lille Catholic University, where he teaches EU competition law. Cristina is a Competition Law & Policy Expert at the OECD

Ruben Maximiano and Cristina Volpin, December 2 2020, “The Role of Competition Policy in Promoting Economic Recovery,” OECD, https://one.oecd.org/document/DAF/COMP(2020)6/en/pdf

A significant array of empirical evidence shows that competition delivers many benefits at both macro and micro-economic levels. At the macro-economic level competition promotes the optimal use of scarce economic resources, drives economic growth, boosts firms’ productivity and production levels, multiplies business opportunities and can help reduce inequality and create more and better jobs (OECD, 2014[34]). At the micro level, competition leads to better prices, greater choice and higher quality of goods and services. Competition also accelerates the adoption of new technologies and encourages innovation. This works as a virtuous circle, since a competitive and innovative firms will spur its competitors to compete and innovate. It is this mechanism that then leads to the macro economic benefits boost of growth, benefits that accumulate over time, increasing prosperity in the long run. When the variety of innovation is not protected, consumers are more exposed and more severely affected by demand or supply shocks. This is particularly relevant in a pandemic and post-pandemic world. Using the example of the US market for medical ventilators during the Covid-19 pandemic, Scott Morton (2020[35]) underlines the importance of competition as a key driver of quality, choice and innovation and, in particular, in preserving the variety of innovation. Competition can help ensure more stable distribution of essential goods. Even when disruption occurs, in competitive supply chains, these may be corrected by competitors’ entry. Moss and Alexander (2020[36]) have argued that competition can help ensure that food systems (including agricultural inputs, processing, manufacturing, and distribution) are more resilient. The authors state that, while shocks such as extreme weather conditions, diseases and conflict regularly affect food supply chains, those economies where competition is vigorous are less likely to suffer disruptions.

#### Cap’s good AND sustainable:

#### The “imminent collapse unless alt” narrative is wrong—enough time to address existential risk without discarding capitalism

Wade, Professor of Global Political Economy at the Department of International Development, London School of Economics, ‘21

(Robert H., “What is the Harm in Forecasting Catastrophe due to Man-Made Global Warming?” July 22, <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/22/07/2021/what-harm-forecasting-catastrophe-due-man-made-global-warming>)

When parts of western Germany, Belgium and Netherlands have just experienced catastrophic floods and the Pacific northwest has recently broken heat records, it is counter-intuitive to challenge the prevailing pessimism about global warming – captured for example by the Financial Times columnist Martin Wolf who says, “Given this signal failure [to vaccinate against Covid in line with the global interest], it is impossible to imagine we will do much more than fiddle while the planet burns.”

The danger of this mindset is that it encourages inflation of the threat-language far beyond the credible science, so that the future cannot be discussed except in terms of a choice between “disaster”, “catastrophe”, “planetary extinction” on the one hand or impossibly fast reforms to how humanity lives, works and governs, on the other.

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions. What could be called the “mainstream view” of climate change goes much further, onto uncertain epistemological ground: (3) man-made global warming is the main cause of all kinds of disagreeable events – including extreme weather, rising seas, and much more; (4) humanity faces impending catastrophe unless we undertake far-reaching changes to how we live, work and govern in order to cut CO2 emissions and dematerialize economies (“net zero by 2050”).

This essay identifies some of the weaknesses in the evidence presented in support of the mainstream view, including weaknesses in the claim that 97% of climate scientists believe in anthropogenic global warming, in the claim that global temperatures will rise much faster than they have been rising, and in the (implicit) claim that the horrifying worst-case scenario presented by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change represents the likely scenario to 2100 in the absence of radical actions starting now. It identifies the incentive mechanisms that produce the exaggerations and sustain wide credence in them. At the end it considers the question: does highlighting the doomsday exaggerations serve to reduce the political and public pressures for necessary ameliorative action, in a world where powerful fossil lobbies seek to block or delay such action for reasons independent of “evidence”? To what extent must mass publics be “panicked” in order to induce enough collective political, business and family action to substantially slow the growth of greenhouse gas emissions?

Policy Recommendations

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions.

But too much policy discussion about global warming is polarized and locked into a “syndrome of exaggeration”. The mainstream view talks of coming disaster, catastrophe, even extinction, short of urgent and massive action on a global scale. But it is easy to question the empirical basis of this forecast – not least the long history of repeated wild exaggerations of disaster relative to what later transpired. In response an active but small “sceptical” community exaggerates its scepticism. The two sides make a syndrome in that the behaviour of each confirms the negative expectations of the other.

What is now strangely urgent is to calm down the present climate hysteria so that safety-first resource allocation and consumption decisions can be made without “climate” being the touchstone of the very future of humanity, the current idol of the ancient human longing for Salvation in anxious times, the pathway for all the ingredients of a better world.

The essay suggests changes in the budget and mandate of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; more action by learned societies in calling to account the wild exaggerators; beefing up the Loss and Damage pillar of the Paris Agreement; boosting investment in “clean coal” technologies as well as renewables, and linking coal-power retirement to the coming on stream of attractive alternatives; creating central planning capacity at national and international levels (eg in multilateral development banks) to integrate investment decisions in energy, transport, buildings, industry and agriculture; and last but not least, respecting the principle of free speech while maintaining the standards of civil discourse.

Every sensible person agrees that (1) global warming has been happening over most of the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty first, and (2) most of it to date is due to greenhouse gas emissions. Many go on to say that (3) global warming is the cause of all kinds of disagreeable events – including extreme weather, rising seas, and much more; and that (4) humanity faces impending catastrophe short of far-reaching changes to how we live, work and govern in order to cut CO2 emissions and dematerialize economies. This could now be described – with only a little exaggeration – as the mainstream view.

The Impending Catastrophe

Here are examples of people and organizations claiming that catastrophe for humanity and the biosphere lies ahead if the people of developed and developing countries alike do not make radical changes soon.

The New York Times reported after the G7 Summit in June 2021 that “Mr Biden was once again part of a unanimous consensus that the world needs to take drastic action to prevent a climate disaster”. The report explains that “… the world needs to urgently cut emissions if it has any chance of keeping average global temperatures from rising above 1.5C compared with preindustrial levels. That’s the threshold beyond which experts say the planet will experience catastrophic, irreversible damage.”

US climate envoy John Kerry delivered a dire warning on 12 May 2021 on “the mounting costs … of global warming and of a more volatile climate”. 2020’s tally of “22 hurricanes, floods, droughts and wildfires shattered the previous annual record of 16 such events, and that was set only 4 years ago…. You don’t have to be a scientist to begin to feel that we’re looking at a trend line.”

Christiana Figueres, former executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and pivotal figure in the Paris Agreement, declared in 2020, “It is only over the next 10 years from here to 2030 that we can influence what is going to happen. The scary thing is that after 2030 it basically doesn’t really matter what humans do. We will be in danger of those tipping points having a domino effect on each other and we will lose total control.” (1)

Some more examples:

Kevin Drun, 2019: “[The Green New Deal] would only change the dates for planetary suicide by a decade or so. It’s nowhere near enough even if we do it ”.

Professor Frank Fenner, microbiologist, ANU, 2010: “We’re going to become extinct. Whatever we do now is too late”

John Davies, geophysicist, senior researcher at the Cold Climate Housing Research Center, 2014: “With business as usual life on earth is largely doomed”.

James Hansen, former Director, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, testifying at a Congressional hearing on global warming in 2008: “We’re toast if we don’t get on to a very different path. This is the last chance” to avoid mass extinctions, ecosystem collapse and dramatic sea level rises. “We [scientists] see a tipping point occurring right before our eyes. The Arctic is the first tipping point and it’s occurring exactly the way we said it would.” In five to 10 years [by 2013-2018], the Arctic will be free of ice in the summer.

James Hansen, testimony at Congressional hearing, 1988: “world's leading climate expert [Hansen] predicts lower Manhattan underwater by 2018”

Dr Michael Mann, Penn State: “We’re talking about literally giving up on our coastal cities of the world and moving inland”

United Nations Environment Programme, 2005: “Fifty million climate refugees by 2010.” (2)

United Nations Environment Programme, 2011: “60 million environmental refugees by 2020”

The Guardian carried a front-page story in 2004 headlined, “Now the Pentagon tells Bush: climate change will destroy us”. The by-line reads: “Secret report warns of rioting and nuclear war. Britain will be ‘Siberian’ in less than 20 years. Threat to the world is greater than terrorism”. The text continues, “A secret report, suppressed by US defence chiefs…, warns that major European cities will be sunk beneath rising seas as Britain is plunged into a ‘Siberian’ climate by 2020. Nuclear conflict, mega-droughts, famine and widespread rioting will erupt across the world.” (Emphases added).

Remember that in the 1960s and 1970s many experts forecast an immanent Ice Age. For example, 1970: “Ice age by 2000”. 1971: “New Ice Age coming by 2020 or 2030.” 1976: “Scientific consensus planet cooling famines imminent”. 1978: “No end in sight to 30 year cooling trend”.

The Climate Change Consensus

The diagnoses and prescriptions in the above statements express an underlying consensus.

Human actions (mainly burning fossil fuels and changing land use) are causing rising concentration of atmospheric CO2 (and other greenhouse gases, GHG),

Rises in man-made GHG are causing rising global temperatures in atmosphere and seas, and

This temperature rise poses not just a serious threat to humanity and the whole biosphere, but an existential threat.

In other words, the existence of humans and many other species is at stake if we do not succeed in drastically cutting CO2 emissions as the way to reduce the atmospheric concentration of GHG and thereby slow or reverse the rise in global temperature. In the oft used phrase, humanity faces an “existential crisis” induced by climate change caused by human actions. Implied but not normally stated, there are no benefits from higher concentrations of CO2 or higher temperature to be weighed against costs. Also implied but not normally stated, we must act to stop climate change regardless of cost, because the costs might include deep disruption of human civilization or even extinction.

We have to think of avoiding climate change as the global equivalent of avoiding explosions at nuclear power plants (Chernobyl, Fukushima). We invest heavily in safety-first measures in order to reduce the probability of a nuclear explosion to a very low level because the costs of a nuclear explosion are so huge. The same logic applies at the level of climate, in terms of the costs of average temperature rising by more than ~ 1.5 C from “pre-industrial”.

This is the Anthropogenic Global Warming Consensus, or Climate Change Consensus (CCC) for short. I use “consensus” in the same sense as “the Washington Consensus” about best policy for developing countries, the phrase coined by John Williamson in 1990.

The CCC is now well anchored into international agreements (such as the Paris Declaration), national policy, and increasingly corporate strategy too. The periodic Assessment Reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reaffirm it, particularly in the Summary for Policymakers. Financial Times journalist Pilita Clark observed, “The world has rarely seen any environmental idea take off like the push to cut greenhouse gas emissions to net zero. A fringe concept six years ago, it has gone mainstream so quickly that more than 60 percent of countries now have some sort of net zero goal, along with investors managing nearly $37tn and at least 20 percent of the 2,000 largest publicly listed companies. The International Energy Agency [IEA] warns in a striking net zero report today that all new oil, gas and coal projects and exploration must stop if global warming is to stay below 1.5C.”

Scientific support comes from the fact that 97% of climate scientists agree that man-made greenhouse gases have been responsible for “most” of the warming of the Earth’s average temperature over the second half of the twentieth century. The 3% who are sceptical are not highly regarded scientists and some are in the pay of fossil fuel interests.

In the face of this scientific, interstate, and corporate agreement about the necessity of a global Big Push to cut CO2 emissions fast, developing countries and China carry a heavy responsibility, because they are the major source of global CO2 emissions, mainly from their consumption of fossil fuels. They must quickly follow the developed countries in investing on a massive scale in sources of renewable energy, whose prices are falling fast. Developed countries will offer large-scale financing and technical assistance for them to make the switch – in the developed countries’ self-interest.

It is true that developed countries put up most of the stock of greenhouse gases now in the atmosphere as they used fossil fuels to power their ascent to the top of the global hierarchy of income and wealth over the past two centuries. But that gives developing countries, even though they remain well down the income hierarchy, no justification for saying that they therefore have the right to carbon space for powering their economic development – because continuing to use relatively accessible, cheap and reliable fossil-fuel energy to power their growth pushes all humanity and the biosphere towards ruin.

Do Virtually all Climate Scientists Agree with the CCC?

It is widely cited that “97% of climate scientists agree warming is man-made”; or more exactly, “97% of science papers taking a position on climate change say it is man-made”. The conclusion is frequently amped up to “a 97% consensus that ‘humans are causing a global warming crisis’”.

Note that this last statement – with “crisis” – is not the same as the previous two, but all three statements tend to be conflated, so that people agreeing with “most recent warming is man-made” tend to be scored as agreeing that global warming is a crisis, which commonly gets inflated into agreeing that it is an existential crisis or the existential crisis.

Note that these statements of “consensus” do not specify the time period.

Note also that “high consensus” in science is only a weak criterion of “truth” in science – but the 97% figure is often deployed as evidence of the “truth” that warming is man-made. Of course, it is worth knowing to what extent there are “widely accepted truths” in any field. But problems come when the “fact” of consensus is established in a clearly tendentious way.

A standard source of the claim that 97% of climate scientists agree that global warming is man-made is the study by John Cook et al. (2013). The study rated about 12,000 abstracts of peer-reviewed papers published between 1991 and 2011. The rating was done by 12 volunteers, each abstract was rated by two people, making 24,000 ratings. The ratings were in three categories: (1) implicit or explicit endorsement of human-caused global warming; (2) no opinion; (3) implicit or explicit rejection or minimization of the human influence. About 4,000 abstracts took a position on the cause of global warming, 97.1% of which endorsed human-caused global warming.

Notice that this should not be, but commonly is translated as “97% of climate scientists endorse …”. Notice too that the abstracts were not rated as to whether they stressed greenhouse gases or man-made changes in land use and land cover; the implicit assumption is, man-made greenhouse gases are the cause of warming. Finally, notice that the abstracts were not rated as to whether they endorsed the idea of a global warming crisis or catastrophe; only as to whether they endorsed the idea of human causes of global warming.

A Wikipedia essay describes the study as “a landmark climate research paper [which] found that 97.1% of climate scientists supported the hypothesis of anthropogenic global warming (AGW). As of March 2021, the paper has received at least 1,270,076 downloads.”

There is an obvious question. Does “endorsement of human-caused global warming” mean warming caused 100% by human actions, or 75%, or 50%, or 25%? Any of these may be consistent with “climate change is man-made”. By leaving the degree of causation by humans open, thumbs can be put on the scales to yield the conclusion that virtually all well-qualified scientists believe that global warming of the past several decades is caused almost entirely by human action (would not be occurring in the absence of that action).

Professor Mike Hulme, professor of Human Geography at the University of Cambridge, concludes: “The ‘97% consensus’ article is poorly conceived, poorly designed and poorly executed.” Analysis by David Legates et al (2015) found that only 0.3% of the sampled papers “endorsed the standard definition of consensus: that most warming since 1950 is anthropogenic”. Research physicist Nicola Scafetta: “Cook et al (2013) is based on a straw man argument because it does not correctly define the IPCC AGW [anthropogenic global warming ] theory, which is NOT that human emissions have contributed 50%+ of the global warming since 1900 but that almost 90-100% of the observed global warming was induced by human emission”. (3)

It is testimony to the apocalyptic emotion behind people’s response to “climate change” and “global warming” that the Cook et al. paper, and others with similar methods, have commanded such credence in the face of evident flaws – notably (1) in fudging the distinction between agreeing that human actions have some role in global warming and agreeing that human actions explain most global warming; (2) in not asking whether – extent to which -- the scientists’ papers identified global warming as a problem, a crisis, an existential crisis, over what time period. (4)

By keeping it vague what the “consensus” agrees on, authors and users of the studies have given the impression that endorsement of “humans are causing global warming” means endorsement that “humans’ enhancement of the greenhouse effect will be dangerous enough to be ‘catastrophic’”, and therefore also means endorsement of the imperative for urgent, radical action on a global scale by governments, firms and families.

It is testimony to the pervasive anxiety of the zeitgeist that such surveys are routinely cited as demonstrating a near-unanimous scientific consensus in favor of radical, far-reaching climate policy (including for energy, food and materials), when the surveys do not even ask the question as to whether the respondent considers that (a) the anthropogenic component of recent warming is dangerous, and (b) dangerous enough to require a global climate policy. The surveys are almost valueless scientifically, but valuable politically.

Upward Bias in Temperature Forecasting Models

The prospect of a coming catastrophe for humanity and the biosphere rests heavily on outputs of climate forecasting models. But as David Legates and co-authors argue, these models “exhibit a strong exaggeration in their results even when narrowly adopting atmospheric carbon dioxide as the sole driver of climate responses…. [General circulation models, such as those of the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] have consistently overestimated the climate sensitivity to rising atmospheric carbon dioxide.”

Ross McKitrick (2020) begins his assessment, “Two new peer-reviewed papers from independent teams confirm that climate models overstate atmospheric warming, and the problem [of overstatement] has gotten worse over time, not better”. One of the papers (by McKitrick and John Christy) examined 38 models, the other, 48 models, used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the various US “National Assessments”, the EPA’s “Endangerment Finding”, and more.

McKitrick continues, “Both papers looked at ‘hindcasts’, which are reconstructions of recent historical temperatures in response to observed greenhouse gas emissions and other changes (eg aerosols and solar forcing). Across the two papers it emerges that the models overshoot historical warming from the near-surface through the upper troposphere, in the tropics and globally.” The study based on 48 models for 1998 to 2014 found that they warm on average 4 to 5 times faster than the observations.

McKitrick concludes, “modelling the climate is incredibly difficult, and no one faults the scientific community for finding it a tough problem to solve. But we are all living with the consequences of climate modelers stubbornly using generation after generation of models that exhibit too much surface and tropospheric warming, in addition to running grossly exaggerated forcing scenarios (eg RCP8.5).

“[W]hen the models get the tropical troposphere wrong, it drives potential errors in many other features of the model atmosphere. Even if the original problem was confined to excess warming in the tropical mid-troposphere, it has now expanded into a more pervasive warm bias throughout the global troposphere.

“If the discrepancies in the troposphere were evenly split across models between excess warming and cooling we could chalk it up to noise and uncertainty. But that is not the case: it’s all excess warming…. That’s bias, not uncertainty, and until the modelling community finds a way to fix it, the economics and policy making community are justified in assuming future warming projects are overstated, potentially by a great deal….”

The strong upward bias in temperature forecasts relative to observations compromise the models’ forecasting impacts on ecosystems, including agriculture, by exaggerating the probability of catastrophic effects.

The IPCC makes projections of future global temperatures to the end of century based on various models. They range from a low of 1.4 C to a high of 5.6 C over pre-industrial temperature (roughly 1900). The wide range makes them almost meaningless. The IPCC explains that the wide range results from uncertainty about the magnitude of the feedback between warming and increased rates of evaporation – and David Seckler adds, also about the effects of evaporation on clouds and precipitation. (5)

It is astonishing to learn that the climate models miss a critical component of the climate system -- the hydrological cycle, and specifically clouds, which the IPCC calls the “wild card” in the climate system.

The IPCC’s Worst Case Scenario is commonly used as the Business as Usual without a Radical Policy Action’ Scenario

The IPCC’s Assessment Report 5 (AR5), published in 2014, presented a range of forecasts of global climate out to 2050 and 2100, based on different assumptions about radiative forcing (a measure of how much of the sun’s energy the atmosphere traps). The most extreme – the worst case – was called Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5. It assumes ominous reversals in several basic, long-standing trends, all heading in the extremely wrong direction to 2100:

high population growth to reach more than 12 billion people

slow technology development

coal consumption increases by 500 % between 2005 and 2100 (no account taken of supply constraints)

slow GDP growth

fast rise in world poverty

high energy use

high GHG emissions.

temperature forecast: 5 C rise between 2005 and 2100.

RCP 8.5’s vision is horrifying, as worst-case scenarios should be.

A whole wave of literature, in peer-reviewed journals as well as in media, even by IPCC authors, has since presented this worst-case as either “the most likely case” or “the baseline case – busi

ness as usual without policy action”. This misleading assumption provoked a recent paper in Nature subtitled: “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome” (see also, Chrobak, 2020).

The Politics: How has the CCC become so Dominant

How can we understand the present dominance of the CCC in public and political opinion around the world, despite repeated evidence -- over decades -- of wildly exaggerated forecasts of doom when compared against measured outcomes, and despite the real uncertainties (“known unknowns”) in knowledge about basic mechanisms?

We can identify several mutually reinforcing reasons.

1. The public demand for negatively-inflected news, especially on climate

News that fits the CCC plays into a more general logic of “If it bleeds, it leads”, meaning that the media tend to deliver negativity – about climate, health, almost anything – because readers and viewers want negatively-inflected stories. Recent research finds that across all types of articles the most popular stories have high negative content. Surprisingly, politics matters little: there is no difference between conservative and liberal outlets in propensity to deliver negativity. Rather, the difference is between media outlets by size and influence: the bigger and more influential the media brand, the stronger the bias towards the negative – showing how good they are at delivering what people want. According to Matthew Yglesias, several recent research studies find that “the kind of stories people like to consume are compulsive rather than satisfying …. You’re clicking and sharing stories about terrible things and raising alarms and listening to the alarms that are being raised by others, and it all feels very compelling precisely because it’s gloomy and alarming …. People like to get mad, then share the content so that peers can share their outrage.”

Climate lends itself well to this negativity bias. Richard Betts, then the head of climate impacts at the Met Office, explained the demand for negative climate stories (BBC News Channel, 11 January 2010, emphasis added ):

“The focus on climate change is now so huge that everybody seems to need to have some link to climate change if they are to attract attention and funding. Hence the increasing tendency to link everything to climate change – whether scientifically proven or not …. I have quite literally had journalists phone me up during an unusually warm spell of weather and ask ‘is this a result of global warming?’ When I say ‘no, not really, it is just weather’, they’ve thanked me very much and then phoned somebody else, and kept trying until they got someone to say yes it was. Talking up of the problem then gives easy ammunition to those who wish to discredit the science.”

Holman Jenkins, in The Wall St Journal (2018), describes the other side of the exaggeration incentive: “Over the past 15 or 20 years the climate beat has been handed over to reporter-activists who’ve decided that climate science is impenetrable but at least nobody ever got fired for exaggerating the risks of climate change.”

Climate scientist Judith Curry identifies a similar logic in the frequent conflation of extreme weather events and “global warming”. “In 2005 [following Hurricane Katrina] the public found it very hard to care about 1 degree or even 4 degrees of warming – heck, the temperatures varied by that much on a day-to-day basis.… However, arguments that a relatively small amount of global warming (order 1 C) could result in more intense hurricanes, well that got their attention…. The activists now had a new weapon in their arsenal – attributing extreme weather events to manmade climate change. The ‘will to act’ seemed tied to alarmism about extreme weather events. Which provides a key political role for unsupported ‘storylines’ about extreme weather events.” The “heat dome” over the Pacific northwest of the US and Canada in June 2021 was generally treated as yet more evidence of “climate change. You would not know it from the coverage, but in Washington and Oregon, the number of days per decade with temperature above 99 F shows no upward trend from 1911-20 to 2011-20. For example, the number of days above 99 F in 1971-80 was more than in 2011-20. Across the US the 1930s was arguably the hottest decade on record; the time of the deadly “Dust Bowl”, summer 1936, was the hottest summer on record between 1895 and 2020.

An attempt to push the distinction between “weather” and “climate” is unwelcome in this context, because it weakens the motivating, mobilising force of “climate” as the boundless enemy that could destroy humanity, like the Biblical Flood. The Climate Apocalypse is imminent, is the motivational message (also see Adler, 2019).

This is the deeper story behind the wild exaggerations of the forecasts and the continued high credibility of those who make them. The exaggerations express the apocalyptic thinking about climate now sweeping the world, including the financial and corporate world. They express a story of humans damaging Nature, and Nature destroying humans in return. These stories themselves express ancient de-creation stories of humans misbehaving in the eyes of God, and God punishing them. The Biblical flood occurred because God decided the people had become wicked, had stopped respecting God and Nature, so He resolved to wipe life off the face of the earth, saving only a breeding pair of each species in order to recreate the world in His image. Much the same story appeared in Sumerian culture long before the Bible, and later in the Quran, expressing a desperate human wish for Salvation.

In our more secular age, apocalyptic theology can rely on Nature in place of God -- Nature invested with God-like powers of punishment and reward.

2. The “political” science of the IPCC

The IPCC was established to provide a properly scientific center of gravity for discussions about climate, and issue regular balanced assessments of the state of scientific climate knowledge. But there are at least two basic problems with the IPCC process. One is that the mandate of the IPCC says that it is “to assess … the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation” (emphasis added). (6) The mandate does not mention to assess the interaction between human and natural causes. It is as though natural causes do not exist. The IPCC’s whole body of work consequently is slanted towards exaggerating human causes of given climate changes, marginalizing the role of natural causes interacting with human causes. Which among other effects leads it to give undue weight to “mitigating” climate change (by changing human actions) relative to “adapting” to climate changes partly induced by natural forces.

The common justification given by IPCC defenders is: natural causes operate only very slowly; the climate is changing fast; therefore the climate changes must be driven by humans, and humans can change their behaviour fast – when forced and sufficiently motivated to do so ( using all the techniques of Machiavelli). This justification underplays the point that some natural causes – eg the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation – do change fairly quickly, over decades, with far reaching effects (eg Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation and its impacts on the Greenland ice sheet).

The second IPCC problem is that this bias to doomsday forecasts – therefore to urgent and far-reaching action -- is intensified in the process of translating from the technical reports to the summaries for policy makers. The translation – done mostly by non-scientists -- tends to downplay uncertainties and up-play certainties in an alarming, even catastrophizing direction. Hence the tendency to treat worst-case scenarios as likely scenarios. Recall the subtitle to the Nature paper, “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome” (2020).

3. Logic of decision-making and logic of mobilization

The tendency to treat worst-case scenarios as likely scenarios “in the absence of radical changes to how we live, work and govern” can be understood in terms of the distinction between the logic of decision-making and the logic of mobilization or action. To make the best decision about what to do, one needs to explore a range of possible alternative courses of action, weigh up the pros and cons of each, then decide which is best. But having exposed many people to a range of options, there may be action-sapping disagreement as to which is best. To get a great mass of people to move all in one direction one needs to present them with only two alternatives, one of which is crazy, and pretend to be entirely confident of the two outcomes. (7) If they can be convinced that there are only two alternatives and one is crazy, they will follow.

The Climate Change Consensus expresses the logic of mobilization. It presents two alternatives. “Do nothing (or little)”, which leads to catastrophe, extinction, the planet becomes ungovernable, coastal cities must be abandoned, lower Manhattan will be underwater by 2018. Or else, quickly decarbonize the world economy and push towards a broader dematerialization of lifeways. No prizes for guessing which wins. This is how you mobilize people on a vast scale to do what you think must be done. Or as a US senator from the West once put it, “Managing politicians is like herding wild horses. To get them running in the same direction you have to stampede them.” (8)

4. Left and right politics

While the demand for negatively-inflected news cuts across the political spectrum, political ideology certainly shapes people’s beliefs about climate. Climate change “scepticism” is almost a talisman of the center-right and right, and is strongly promoted by fossil fuel interests. Climate “alarmism” is more pronounced on the center-left and left of the ideological spectrum. It is promoted as a sacred unifying mission by a great global phalanx of left-green civic action organizations (Extinction Rebellion is prominent).

A Guardian article describes the right-wing “sceptical” tactic. “Vested interests have long realized [that people-at-large trust climate scientists on the subject of global warming] and have engaged in a campaign to misinform the public about the scientific consensus. For example, a memo from communications strategist Frank Luntz leaked in 2002 advised Republicans, ‘Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate’. This campaign has been successful… The media has assisted in this public misconception, with most climate stories ‘balanced’ with a ‘sceptic’ perspective. However, this results in making the 2-3% seem like 50%... As a result, people believe scientists are still split about what’s causing global warming, and therefore there is not nearly enough public support or motivation to solve the problem.”

Both sides accuse the other of abusing “the science”. Both sides generate expansive pressures to describe more and more trends, issue more and more prescriptions, without ambiguity and shading, and judge more and more of the other’s claims pre-emptively. Individual issues (eg extreme weather) are not discussed in terms of their own evidence but are packaged together in ideological visions, the better to establish clear moral battle lines, disagreement being moral heresy.

This is the playing out of a larger process of polarization common when scientific disagreements become public. As described by sociologist of science Robert K. Merton, each group then responds to stereotyped versions of the other. “They see in the other’s work primarily what the hostile stereotype has alerted them to see, and then promptly mistake the part for the whole. In this process, each group … becomes less and less motivated to study the work of the other, since there is manifestly little point in doing so. They scan the out-group’s writings just enough to find ammunition for new fusillades.” (9)

The result is a “syndrome of exaggeration”: each side exaggerates evidence in its favour and downplays evidence against, which justifies the other in exaggerating evidence in its favour and downplaying evidence against; and back again. It is a syndrome in that the behaviour of each side confirms the negative expectations of the other. They often go at each other ad hominem, like adolescent school boys, including people who regard themselves as serious scientists. In the digital era members of both sides are able to quickly find one another and the enemy. (10)

Yet to talk of “two sides” is misleading, because the side championing the CCC is by far the dominant. Recall the Financial Times journalist Pilita Clark: “The world has rarely seen any environmental idea take off like the push to cut greenhouse gas emissions to net zero.” For political leaders and increasingly business leaders, being seen to give high value to protecting the public against all the ills attributed to “climate change” – including by pledging big changes to be made long after they leave office -- is a way to show foresight, statesmanship, leading on the front foot. Many right-wing politicians and business leaders now wish to present themselves as fighters against climate change, even as they continue to support fossil-fuel industries.

5. Finance and business interests

There are now powerful industrial interest groups promoting climate alarmism for profit-seeking reasons, including those invested in the switch from fossil fuels to renewables and those invested in the switch from combustion to electrical engines. The CEO of the electric vehicle car company Lucid (a former Tesla engineer) said recently that the transition to an EV world will happen faster than anyone expects, driven by the environmental imperative. He said, “The environment is in crisis. The world needs millions of electric cars tomorrow”. He did not suggest where all the electricity will come from.

Many big players in finance see opportunities for speculative profits by playing up climate dangers. Goldman-Sachs in 2005 authored the firm’s environmental policy, which said “voluntary action alone cannot solve the climate change problem”, from a firm that has consistently opposed government regulation. It and other financial firms supported what Matt Taibbi called “a new commodities bubble disguised as an ‘environmental plan’” – a carbon credit market in the form of cap-and-trade. Coal plants, utilities, natural gas distributors and some other industries are assigned carbon emission limits. To exceed the limits they must buy credits from those who emit less than their limit. As of 2010, the volume of the market in the US was estimated as $1 trillion annually. Goldman and the others were making themselves central actors in the market. The best thing about it is that the emission limits keep being lowered, implying that the price is guaranteed to keep rising, to the benefit of the intermediaries.

On top of all this, the whole “sustainable investing” movement provides opportunities for big profits at the intersection of the already thick alphabet soup of sustainability disclosure regulations (TCFD, SASB, GRI, CDSB among others, in the case of the EU) and the lack of meaningful, reliable data. “At the moment, the risk is that it is ‘garbage in, garbage out’”, says the head of sustainable finance at S&P Global Ratings.

So the fact that the financial sector is “worried” about climate change could be taken to be part of the problem, underlining the need for public authorities to take charge and frame parameters within which private operations produce public benefits. (11)

Conclusion

I have argued that the “plausible” risks of climate change are commonly exaggerated within the climate community. Recall for example, Christiana Figueres, 2020, “The scary thing is that after 2030 it basically doesn’t really matter what humans do”; Kevin Drum, 2019, “[The Green New Deal] would only change the dates for planetary suicide by a decade or so”; Frank Fenner, 2010, “We’re going to become extinct. Whatever we do now is too late.” Many more in the same doomsday vein.

We have seen that the standard global warming models have a powerful built-in bias to exaggerate the rate of future temperature rise, as seen in (most of) them “hindcasting” temperature rises several times faster than actually observed. We have seen that forecasters commonly take “worst-case scenarios” as “likely scenarios in the absence of radical action” (eg reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2050), to the point where Nature recently published a paper sub-titled, “Stop using the worst-case scenario for climate warming as the most likely outcome”.

The dismaying thing is that scientists and advocates have been making catastrophising global warming forecasts of this kind for decades past, normally dated some 10 to 30 years into the future. The due date comes without catastrophe, but never a retrospective holding to account. Rather, on to the next catastrophising forecast another 10 to 30 years ahead. Scientists-writers-activists know the catastrophe forecasts get the attention, the clicks, the research funding. We saw the exaggeration mechanism spelled out by Richard Betts of the BBC, Holman Jenkins of the Wall St Journal, and climate scientist Judith Curry.

The built-in exaggeration of the costs of climate change blunts the parallel with nuclear power plants. We know with high certainty the costs of nuclear explosions. We know the costs of global temperature going above 1.5 C above “pre-industrial” much less certainly, and we can see the mechanisms by which the likely costs are being systematically exaggerated.

On the other hand, there is abundant evidence that even without the doomsday exaggerations the plausible risks of climate change could be very serious, in particular because of the inherent political economy difficulty of getting needed global or regional cooperation when political action is mostly at the level of sovereign nation states (see the G20).

Coal power generation is the single biggest source of GHG emissions, and emissions from coal consumption will probably not fall fast, whatever the promises. First, coal is cheap, accessible and generates reliable power for many developing countries; in Asia, coal alone generates 40 percent of energy consumption, much higher than the world average of 29 percent. (12) Second, developing countries, including China, assert a strong claim on carbon space to power their economic development. They see it partly as a matter of fundamental justice, since developed countries emitted most of the CO2 that is already in the atmosphere and seas as the necessary condition for them becoming developed. Developed countries promise finance and technical assistance on a massive scale to accelerate the energy transition in developing countries – and have a long track record of leaving promises as promises. (See the global distribution of Covid vaccines. See the results of vaunted “voting reform” in the World Bank, leaving the US with 17% and China with 6%.) What is more, the Japanese government plans up to 22 new coal power plants, as it closes nuclear plants in the wake of Fukushima.

Then comes a question: does drawing attention to the doomsday exaggerations of the CCC – “disaster”, “catastrophe”, “extinction”, “fiddling while the planet burns” - serve to reduce the political and public pressures for necessary ameliorative action, in a world where powerful fossil lobbies seek to block or delay such action for reasons independent of “evidence”? Should “Third Way” essays like this one not be published, because “give them (deniers, sceptics) an inch and they will take a mile”? To what extent must mass publics be “panicked” in order to induce enough collective political and business action – national, international – to substantially slow the growth of GHG emissions? If we can sustain emission- and temperature-curbing action only by holding up the certainty of disaster, catastrophe, extinction, then better to let the doomsday exaggerations continue as the necessary condition for that ameliorative action. What is the harm, when the alternative is ruin for humanity and the biosphere?

The danger is that the repeated wild exaggerations produce a public backlash, a discrediting, and a strengthening of the many “deniers” who see “leftists, governments, and the United Nations” as the source of malevolence in the world. A more accurate accounting of the evidence would (hopefully) produce a more calibrated and sustained public and business response.

What to do? (13)

The IPCC should allocate some 10% of its budget to a Red Team, dedicated to independent scrutiny of its evidence and conclusions (especially the Summary for Policymakers). (14) The IPCC should revise its mandate to require it explicitly to focus on interactions between natural forces and human actions, as it is now almost required not to, biassing its assessment of the state of scientific knowledge towards “man-made global warming” as an almost separate system.

Learned societies should more actively seek to understand and publicize the reasons for repeated large-scale discrepancies between “hindcasts” and “forecasts” on the one hand and actual observations on the other, discrepancies strongly biased towards “disaster”.

It is particularly important that the knee-jerk attribution of extreme weather events to global warming be challenged with reference to evidence. Judith Curry explained – quoted earlier -- why CCC advocates have a powerful incentive to attribute cases of extreme weather to global warming, tout court. She has recently written, “Apart from the reduced frequency of the coldest temperatures, the signal of global warming in the statistics of extreme weather events remains much smaller than that from natural climate variability, and is expected to remain so at least until the second half of the 21rst century.” She goes on to amplify a point made earlier about the limits of the climate models used for the IPCC assessment reports: they are driven mainly by predictions of future GHG emissions. They do not include predictions of natural climate variability arising from solar output, volcanic eruptions or evolution of large-scale multi-decadal ocean circulations. They do a particularly poor job of simulating regional and decadal-scale climate variability. (15)

Participants on both sides have to learn the art of respecting the principle of free speech while maintaining the standards of civil discourse.

While I have stressed the CCC’s support for urgent and radical changes to the way we live, work and govern, some CCC champions argue that the world economy could continue on a largely unchanged growth trajectory provided that we switch fast from fossil fuels to renewables. Indeed, this switch is beginning to happen fast, with coal and nuclear energy production unable to compete without subsidies in areas where natural gas, wind and solar resources are readily available.

But to say that life can continue as before provided we substitute renewables for fossil fuels obscures the huge difficulties for many developing countries of getting out of fossil fuels while growing fast enough to reduce the income gap with developed countries.

We must give high priority to investments in “clean coal” technologies, such as carbon capture, storage and use, to make the dirtier coal cleaner in existing and new coal-power plants; and link coal-power retirement to the coming on-stream of attractive alternatives. The multilateral development banks have recently or will soon announce bans on coal power. The G7 leaders meeting in mid 2021 promised to stop using government funds to finance new international coal power plants by the end of 2021. China’s Belt and Road Initiative should increase its pressure on host countries to cut back on dirty coal and boost clean coal and renewables.

A high and immediate priority is to build a robust financing and technical assistance mechanism for help from developed to developing countries. The Paris Agreement instituted a Mitigation pillar and an Adaptation pillar. Intense debate took place around the third, Loss and Damage, the name of a mechanism to compensate for the destruction that Mitigation and Adaptation cannot prevent. Developed countries by and large have sought to marginalize the Loss and Damage pillar, as they have long sought to marginalize Special and Differential Treatment for developing countries in trade and investment agreements. “Finance is something that really rich countries, particularly the US, have made sure that there is no progress and not even discussion on”, remarked Harjeet Singh, senior advisor at Climate Action Network International. (16)

My “forecast” is that in the next two to three decades to midcentury we will make rapid progress in scientific knowledge about weather and climate, helped by longer and more accurate satellite and ocean records and by a new generation of climate models that operate at one to ten kilometers scale (as distinct from the current models’ 50 kilometer scale). We will probably continue to make rapid progress in decoupling GHG from GDP growth, with a combination of state direction-setting and private innovation focused on transformations in energy, transport, buildings, industry and agriculture, using incentives like research and development subsidies and tax credits for technology investment, and penalties for carbon-intensive activities. (17) In transport, this entails coordination across urban planning decisions, public transport investment, future of remote working, infrastructures for electric charging and hydrogen loading. (18) Transformations in these systems are already underway, and the prospect of vast new green investments, supported and under-written by the state, will intensify them. These green investments will open productive investment opportunities previously limited by stagnant wages and rising debt, which have driven investment into increasingly speculative ventures. If by two or three decades ahead it looks as though the second half of this century could well experience globally extreme climate and ocean events, we will be much more knowledgeable about what to do than we are today. (19)

#### No resource shortages – tech prevents every scenario

Bailey ’18 – Warren T. Brookes Fellow in Environmental Journalism at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine

Ronald. February 16. “Is Degrowth the Only Way to Save the World?” <https://reason.com/blog/2018/02/16/is-degrowth-the-only-way-to-save-the-wor>

Unless us folks in rich countries drastically reduce our material living standards and distribute most of what we have to people living in poor countries, the world will come to an end. Or at least that's the stark conclusion of a study published earlier this month in the journal Nature Sustainability. The researchers who wrote it, led by the Leeds University ecological economist Dan O'Neill, think the way to prevent the apocalypse is "degrowth."

Vice, pestilence, war, and "gigantic inevitable famine" were the planetary boundaries set on human population by the 18th-century economist Robert Thomas Malthus. The new study gussies up old-fashioned Malthusianism by devising a set of seven biophysical indicators of national environmental pressure, which they then link to 11 indicators of social outcomes. The aim of the exercise is to concoct a "safe and just space" for humanity.

Using data from 2011, the researchers calculate that the annual per capita boundaries for the world's 7 billion people consist of the emission of 1.6 tons of carbon dioxide per year and the annual consumption of 0.9 kilograms of phosphorus, 8.9 kilograms of nitrogen, 574 cubic meters of water, 2.6 tons of biomass (crops and wood), plus the ecological services of 1.7 hectares of land and 7.2 tons of material per person.

On the social side, meanwhile, the researchers say that life satisfaction in each country should exceed 6.5 on the 10-point Cantril scale, that healthy life expectancy should average at least 65 years, and that nutrition should be over 2,700 calories per day. At least 95 percent of each country's citizens must have access to good sanitation, earn more than $1.90 per day, and pass through secondary school. Ninety percent of citizens must have friends and family they can depend on. The threshold for democratic quality must exceed 0.8 on an index scale stretching from -1 to +1, while the threshold for equality is set at no higher than 70 on a Gini Index where 0 represents perfect equality and 100 implies perfect inequality. They set the threshold for percent of labor force employed at 94 percent.

So how does the U.S. do with regard to their biophysical boundaries and social outcomes measures? We Americans transgress all seven of the biophysical boundaries. Carbon dioxide emissions stand at 21.2 tons per person; we each use an average of 7 kilograms of phosphorus, 59.1 kilograms of nitrogen, 611 cubic meters of water, and 3.7 tons of biomass; we rely on the ecological services of 6.8 hectares of land and 27.2 tons of material. Although the researchers urge us to move "beyond the pursuit of GDP growth to embrace new measures of progress," it is worth noting that U.S. GDP is $59,609 per capita.

On the other hand, those transgressions have provided a pretty good life for Americans. For example, life satisfaction is 7.1; healthy life expectancy is 69.7 years; and democratic quality stands at 0.8 points. The only two social indicators we just missed on were employment (91 percent) and secondary education (94.7 percent).

On the other hand, our hemisphere is home to one paragon of sustainability—Haiti. Haitians breach none of the researchers' biophysical boundaries. But the Caribbean country performs abysmally on all 11 social indicators. Life satisfaction scores at 4.8; healthy life expectancy is 52.3 years; and Haitians average 2,105 calories per day. The country tallies -0.9 on the democratic quality index. Haiti's GDP is $719 per capita.

Other near-sustainability champions include Malawi, Nepal, Myanmar, and Nicaragua. All of them score dismally on the social indicators, and their GDPs per capita are $322, $799, $1,375, and $2,208, respectively.

The country that currently comes closest to the researchers' ideal of remaining within its biophysical boundaries while sufficient social indicators is...Vietnam. For the record, Vietnam's per capita GDP is $2,306.

"Countries with higher levels of life satisfaction and healthy life expectancy also tend to transgress more biophysical boundaries," the researchers note. A better way to put this relationship is that more wealth and technology tend to make people happier, healthier, and freer.

O'Neill and his unhappy team fail drastically to understand how human ingenuity unleashed in markets is already well on the way toward making their supposed planetary boundaries irrelevant. Take carbon dioxide emissions: Supporters of renewable energy technologies say that their costs are already or will soon be lower than those of fossil fuels. Boosters of advanced nuclear reactors similarly argue that they can supply all of the carbon-free energy the world will need. There's a good chance that fleets of battery-powered self-driving vehicles will largely replace private cars and mass transit later in this century.

Are we about to run out of phosphorous to fertilize our crops? Peak phosphorus is not at hand. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) reports that at current rates of mining, the world's known reserves will last 266 years. The estimated total resources of phosphate rock would last over 1,140 years. "There are no imminent shortages of phosphate rock," notes the USGS. With respect to the deleterious effects that using phosphorus to fertilize crops might have outside of farm fields, researchers are working on ways to endow crops with traits that enable them to use less while maintaining yields.

O'Neill and his colleagues are also concerned that farmers are using too much nitrogen fertilizer, which runs off fields into the natural environment and contributes to deoxygenated dead zones in the oceans, among other ill effects. This is a problem, but one that plant breeders are already working to solve. For example, researchers at Arcadia Biosciences have used biotechnology to create nitrogen-efficient varieties of staples like rice and wheat that enable farmers to increase yields while significantly reducing fertilizer use. Meanwhile, other researchers are moving on projects to engineer the nitrogen fixation trait from legumes into cereal crops. In other words, the crops would make their own fertilizer from air.

Water? Most water is devoted to the irrigation of crops; the ongoing development of drought-resistant and saline-tolerant crops will help with that. Hectares per capita? Humanity has probably already reached peak farmland, and nearly 400 million hectares will be restored to nature by 2060—an area almost double the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River. In fact, it is entirely possible that most animal farming will be replaced by resource-sparing lab-grown steaks, chops, and milk. Such developments in food production undermine the researchers' worries about overconsumption of biomass.

And humanity's material footprint is likely to get smaller too as trends toward further dematerialization take hold. The price system is a superb mechanism for encouraging innovators to find ways to wring ever more value out less and less stuff. Rockefeller University researcher Jesse Ausubel has shown that this process of absolute dematerialization has already taken off for many commodities.

After cranking their way through their models of doom, O'Neill and his colleagues lugubriously conclude: "If all people are to lead a good life within planetary boundaries, then the level of resource use associated with meeting basic needs must be dramatically reduced." They are right, but they are entirely backward with regard to how to achieve those goals. Economic growth provides the wealth and technologies needed to lift people from poverty while simultaneously lightening humanity's footprint on the natural world. Rather than degrowth, the planet—and especially its poor people—need more and faster economic growth.

#### Massive disjuncture between link and impact---the preservation of tech market competition IS good for beating China BUT does not implicate their broad structural impacts about poverty or environment. The ALT is a totalizing solution that puts every market under state control, which undoes centuries of progress.

#### The ALT fails---

#### Movements fail to overcome opposition and undermines centuries of progress.

Hovenkamp, James G. Dinan University Professor, University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Wharton School, ‘18

(Herbert, “Whatever Did Happen to the Antitrust Movement?” Faculty Scholarship at Penn Law. 1964)

As a movement, antitrust often succeeds at capturing political attention and engaging at least some voters, but it fails at making effective or even coherent policy. The result is goals that are unmeasurable and fundamentally inconsistent, although with their contradictions rarely exposed. Among the most problematic contradictions is the one between small business protection and consumer welfare. In a nutshell, consumers benefit from low prices, high output, and high quality and variety of products and services. But when a firm or a technology is able to offer these things they invariably injure rivals, typically those who are smaller or heavily invested in older technologies. Although movement antitrust rhetoric is often opaque about specifics, its general effect is invariably to encourage higher prices or reduced output or innovation, mainly for the protection of small business or those whose technology or other investments have become obsolete. Indeed, that has been a predominant feature of movement antitrust ever since the Sherman Act was passed, and it remains a prominent feature of movement antitrust today. Indeed, some spokespersons for movement antitrust write, as Louis Brandeis did, as if low prices are the evil that antitrust law should be combatting.17

Nevertheless, mantras such as “industrial concentration” or “big business” have great political force. These terms provide almost nothing in the way of administrable rules while yet evoking an image of something big, bad, and powerful that government must bring under control. For example, here is the plank of the 2016 Democratic Party’s platform on antitrust:

Large corporations have concentrated their control over markets to a greater degree than Americans have seen in decades—further evidence that the deck is stacked for those at the top. Democrats will take steps to stop corporate concentration in any industry where it is unfairly limiting competition. We will make competition policy and antitrust stronger and more responsive to our economy today, enhance the antitrust enforcement arms of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and encourage other agencies to police anti-competitive practices in their areas of jurisdiction.

We support the historic purpose of the antitrust laws to protect competition and prevent excessively consolidated economic and political power, which can be corrosive to a healthy democracy. We support reinvigorating DOJ and FTC enforcement of antitrust laws to prevent abusive behavior by dominant companies, and protecting the public interest against abusive, discriminatory, and unfair methods of commerce. We support President Obama’s recent Executive Order, directing all agencies to identify specific actions they can take in their areas of jurisdiction to detect anticompetitive practices—such as tying arrangements, price fixing, and exclusionary conduct—and to refer practices that appear to violate federal antitrust law to the DOJ and FTC.18

The antitrust plank never references low consumer prices, or anything having to do with product quality. That is not because Democrats are not interested in low consumer prices.19 Rather, they apparently believe that antitrust has little to do with it. The references to prices occur in other sections of the platform, devoted to such subjects as health and safety and the high price of pharmaceutical drugs. Those sections make no reference to antitrust law.20 The only references to “consumers” occur in planks pertaining to unionization, affordable housing, Wall Street, banks and Dodd-Frank, and clean energy.21 So according to the platform, while legal policy generally is concerned with high consumer prices, antitrust policy apparently is not. By contrast, the 2016 Republican platform never references antitrust, although it does contain a plank promoting a “competitive America,” but focused entirely on lowering tax rates.22

The antitrust plank in the 2016 Democrat platform is actually one of the most detailed to appear in any platform by a major political party.23 The catchphrases that it uses, however—“corporate concentration,” “unfairly limiting competition,” or “abusive behavior by dominant companies”—can mean practically anything depending on assumptions. The platform is peppered with references to “fair” or “fairness,” including the antitrust plank, but with no reference point indicating how fairness should be assessed. Is it “fair” that consumers be asked to pay high prices in order to accommodate the shortcomings of some businesses; or conversely, is it “fair” that small businesses suffer simply because they are not able to compete with larger firms on price or quality; or is it “fair” that firms heavily invested in old brick-andmortar distribution lose out to more technologically entrepreneurial firms? “Fairness” as an antitrust concern means nothing without a reference point or set of measurement tools.

As for specific practices, the antitrust plank in the Democrat platform singles out “tying arrangements, price fixing, and exclusionary conduct,” saying nothing about mergers, other vertical restraints, or anticompetitive patent practices. In fact, the platform never mentions patents, although it makes frequent references to innovation, largely in the context of proposed government intervention to stimulate production24 or to finance research and development and educate people for more technically demanding jobs.25 Of the three anticompetitive practices that it singles out, “price fixing” is completely uncontroversial and has always been a central focus of nearly every articulation of antitrust policy, left, center, and right—including in Bork’s The Antitrust Paradox. 26 The term “exclusionary conduct” is so vague that it is meaningless. Both socially harmful and socially beneficial conduct can be “exclusionary.” The inclusion of “tying arrangements” is mystifying. Tying is ubiquitous in modern economies and is an essential characteristic of networks and technology.27 Further, the vast majority of it is procompetitive because it increases output without excluding anyone. Finally, the number of antitrust tying cases is small in comparison with merger cases, which make up a large portion of antitrust enforcement activity. A major party platform that identifies “tying arrangements” but not “mergers” as a fundamental concern requires an explanation. Most importantly, it seems to miss the whole point of competitive markets, which is to produce a high output of quality, competitively priced goods.

At least in part, the Democratic Party platform reflects the reappearance of movement antitrust. While it is hardly the only expression, and certainly not the most extreme, it represents a troublesome development—namely, the idea that America needs higher prices in order to give smaller firms a fair chance. The platform also gives a reader the strong impression that its slogans were selected in order to achieve maximum political traction with the illiterati, and perhaps that is all that can be expected of a political platform. In the process, however, it does antitrust policy a great disservice by making its legitimate targets almost impossible to define and not providing ammunition for attacking them when they are defined. Its supporters generally disparage the use of economics, sometimes suggesting that antitrust policy should be governed by political theory instead.28 Exactly how political theory gets one to specific antitrust rules is not completely clear, but it involves excluding the opinions of antitrust experts concerning the public’s interest.29

Movement antitrust argues variously for abandoning the measurement of competition by reference to output and price,30 or even abandoning consumer welfare as an antitrust proscription altogether.31 It accuses retailers such as Amazon of engaging in “predatory pricing” without providing a coherent definition of the practice.32 It never explains how a nonmanufacturing retailer such as Amazon could ever recover its investment in belowcost pricing by later raising prices, and even disputes that raising prices to higher levels ever needs to be a part of the strategy, thus indicating that it is confusing predation with investment.33 Charging low but profitable prices indefinitely is not unlawful “predatory pricing”‘ nor is forcing suppliers to price competitively.

The movement antitrust attack on “consumer welfare” reflects both a misunderstanding of that term, and an exaggeration of its influence on recent antitrust jurisprudence. This point is critical because much of movement antitrust blames the consumer welfare principle for the current state of antitrust law. Consumer welfare as it is properly used today refers to the welfare of consumers as consumers, pure and simple.34 Speaking objectively, consumer welfare is improved by high output and low prices, as well as high quality. Under this definition the welfare of producers, competitors, or anyone other than consumers who might be affected by a practice is ignored. In addition to its substantive advantages, this principle has a powerful administrative advantage: it does not require courts to compute welfare “tradeoffs,” because there is nothing to trade off.35

In sharp contrast, Robert Bork very famously used the term “consumer welfare” when he was really referring to the combined welfare of both producers and consumers.36 He observed that an economic tradeoff occurs when a supplier practice causes monopolistic increases in consumer prices but also reduces the supplier’s costs.37 Most peculiarly, for Bork the word “consumer” referred to suppliers as well as customers.38 For Bork, a practice that generated one hundred dollars in seller profits but buyer losses of sixty dollars would be counted as a net improvement of “consumer welfare.” Bork also believed, however, that actual computation of welfare tradeoffs in individual cases would be too difficult. Further, an attempt to do so would overlook important efficiencies. Rather, efficiencies should be presumed, even when the challenged practice creates market power.39 That presumption of efficiency without proof is one of the most controversial aspects of Bork’s approach to the welfare question.

These two understandings of consumer welfare have produced a troublesome ambiguity in antitrust law ever since. For example, some of those who write in movement antitrust today attribute the consumer welfare principle to Bork,40 and as a result blame it for higher prices that accrue to producers. But the important thing is that high producer profits for Bork was part of the consumer welfare that antitrust law should produce.

This ambiguity about definition has also affected Supreme Court usage of “consumer welfare.” The Supreme Court has never categorically embraced any particular definition of consumer welfare, even though it has used the term several times. Six majority opinions speak of consumer welfare. Two were quotations from Bork’s The Antitrust Paradox, suggesting that the Court was either speaking of producer welfare as well, or else that it did not appreciate the difference between Bork’s definition and true consumer welfare.41 Plaintiffs won both cases, however, and the holdings are consistent with true consumer welfare. Indeed, in one of them, Reiter v. Sonotone Corp., the Supreme Court held that end-use consumers had standing to pursue price fixing, making it an important consumer welfare decision.42

Of the remaining four uses, two involved predatory pricing cases observing that consumer welfare would be enhanced by a period of below-cost pricing that was not followed by recoupment of losses through subsequent higher prices.43 That would very likely be true. An unsuccessful attempt at predatory pricing would result in lower consumer prices temporarily, but no subsequent period of high prices. The final uses of consumer welfare are related to the Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS, Inc. decision holding that some instances of resale price maintenance may promote consumer welfare. The first was Leegin itself44 and the second was Ohio v. American Express Co., making essentially the same observation.45 That could also be true under either definition of consumer welfare.

Four additional usages of the term are in dissents.46 Finally, the term appeared in Justice Brennan’s concurring opinion in the Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde tying case. Justice Brennan observed that some ties could impair horizontal competition, injuring consumer welfare.47 A few other cases never use the phrase “consumer welfare” but do speak more generally about benefits to consumers.48 None of these Supreme Court decisions distinguish the Bork definition of consumer welfare from the true consumer welfare position. Beyond the Supreme Court, the strongest case for application of a consumer welfare principle is in merger law under the Horizontal Merger Guidelines, which embrace a consumer welfare principle to the extent that they tie merger policy to the effect on output and consumer prices.49

One of the most disturbing things about movement antitrust is its indifference or even disparagement of low consumer prices. Without citing any evidence, some of its protagonists proclaim that most Americans are not concerned with high prices that might result from monopoly, but rather with “loss of their properties, hence their independence, even their dignity.”50 They recommend harsh rules against vertical integration without ever stating a test, other than a very general suggestion that vertical integration leads to leveraging and foreclosure.51 They call for a return to the merger enforcement standards expressed in the 1968 Merger Guidelines—for example, blocking any merger between a firm with fifteen percent of a market and any other firm whose market share is one percent or more. The relevance of these numbers is not apparent, other than their suggestion that firms are

currently too big.52

Clearly, high prices are not the target. The movement’s proponents denigrate the importance of prices to merger analysis—for example, objecting to the fact that, while the 1968 Merger Guidelines were not particularly focused on consumer prices, guidelines issued in the 1980s and after were. Indeed, low prices appear to be the enemy that antitrust must combat.53 Movement protagonists argue in favor of resale price maintenance, not in order to promote lower cost distribution, but rather to protect less efficient retailers’ higher margins from predatory pricing—without any evidence of a type of predatory pricing that resale price maintenance could combat.54 They enthusiastically embrace Louis Brandeis’s repeated arguments that “price-cutting” is in fact “the most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rival.”55 Much of the resale price maintenance that Brandeis supported occurred at the behest of dealer cartels who forced suppliers to use resale price maintenance as a way of disciplining price cutters.56

Certainly, big business can cause harm to the lives of Americans in other ways than through competitive pricing. But these ways need to be articulated, supported by evidence, and then sorted into those things that are conceivably within the domain of antitrust and those that are not. Promiscuous application of the antitrust laws so as to make big firms smaller and prices higher could cause irreparable harm, not only to consumers, but to the entire economy.

#### The ALT fails---it cannot change mindsets.

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

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

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

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

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

Super-affluent consumers drive consumption norms

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

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

Lastly, in capitalism, workers must compete against each other in the labour market in order to earn a living from capitalists7,63. Following Siemoneit68, this can lead to a similar imperative to net invest (increase the level of consumption/investment) as is observed with capitalists. In order to stay competitive, individuals are pushed to increase time and cost efficiency by investing in cars, kitchen appliances, computers and smartphones, by using social media and online trade etc. This efficiency consumption—effectively another facet of the rebound effect38,47,68—helps to manage high workloads, thus securing an income, while maintaining private life. This is often accompanied by trends of commodification61, understood as the marketisation of products and services which used to be provisioned through more time-intensive commons or reciprocal social arrangements, e.g. convenience food vs. cooking together. As in the food example74, this replacement of human labour with energy- and material-intensive industrial production typically increases environmental pressures47,75. Through these economic pressures, positive feedback loops and lock-ins are expected to emerge, since other consumers need to keep up with these investments or face disadvantages, e.g. when car or smartphone ownership become presupposed. Taken together with positional consumption, structural barriers to sufficiency and the substantial advertising efforts by capitalists, these mechanisms explain to a large extent why consumers seem so willing to increase their consumption in accordance with increasing production60.

#### Utopian alts are a voting issue---there’s no comparative literature and makes it impossible to be NEG

### 2AC---Process CP

#### Perm: do both.

#### Perm: do the CP---‘should’ isn’t mandatory.

Duarte 19. Development Code of the City of Duarte, California, Municipal Code, “ARTICLE 1 - ENACTMENT, APPLICABILITY, AND ENFORCEMENT”, 1/10/2019, https://library.municode.com/ca/duarte/codes/development\_code?nodeId=ART1ENAPEN\_CH19.02PUAPDECO

B. *Terminology*. When used in this title, the following rules apply to all provisions of this Development Code: 1. *Language*. When used in this Development Code, the words "shall," "must," "will," "is to," and "are to" are always mandatory. "Should" is not mandatory but is strongly recommended; and "may" is permissive.

#### 3. Perm: do the plan through the CPs process. Doesn’t sever certainty, and requiring immediacy is bad: allows the delay CP and shoehorns the aff into indefensible political processes, killing ground.

#### 4. Perm do the plan and should establish a framework for contingent international cooperation.It’s all of the AFF and some of the CP---BUT forces the NEG to have an AFF key warrant for the net ben.

**5. Counterplans that fiat the AFF is illegitimate---advocating the entire plan undermines core AFF offense AND hurts topic education by shifting the debate to trivial process questions---potential to fiat the plan plus NEG research asymmetry irreparably skews the debate.**

#### 6. Doesn’t solve---

#### a) Uncertainty. It introduces a new, unpredictable process over antitrust out of the blue. Best studies prove it wrecks R&D investment.

**Lin et al. 21** --- School of Law, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, Chengdu.

Yuchen, Daxin Dong, Jiaxin Wang, “The Negative Impact of Uncertainty on R&D Investment: International Evidence,” International Evidence, Sustainability 2021, 13, 2746. https://doi.org/10.3390/ su13052746

In summary, in this study, we reported a significantly negative impact of uncertainty on R&D investment at the country level. The analyses were based on a sample covering 109 countries from 1996 to 2018. It was also found that uncertainty reduced the number of annual new patent applications. The adverse impact of uncertainty on R&D was not only significant statistically, but also economically. According to the estimation results, if the uncertainty index rises by one unit (one standard deviation), the scale of R&D investment and the number of patent applications will decline by 15.6% (2.1372%) and 22.7% (3.1099%), respectively. Further analyses demonstrated that the effect of uncertainty was not uniform across all countries. In some country groups, the effect was strong and statistically significant. However, in several country groups, the effect was moderate and insignificant. However, we always observed a negative effect. Overall, Hypothesis 1 in our study is verified, and Hypothesis 2 is contradicted.

The study results provided strong support to some previous studies which reported a negative impact of uncertainty on R&D investment, including Arif Khan et al. [5], Cho and Lee [11], Czarnitzki and Toole [8], Goel and Ram [12], Ivus and Wajda [1], Jung and Kwak [15], Nan and Han [17], Wang et al. [4], and Xu [20]. The results did not support several studies that reported a positive effect of uncertainty, such as Atanassov et al. [3], Gu et al. [13], Han et al. [14], Jiang and Liu [6], Meng and Shi [16], Ross et al. [9], Stein and Stone [18], Tajaddini and Gholipour [7], and Vo and Le [19]. Our study utilized a wide sample of more than 100 countries and examined the country-level aggregate R&D investment. This feature enabled our study to better depict the overall situation in the world, compared to most of the extant studies, which have only focused on the R&D of business corporations within one country.

The findings in this study have important policy implications. First, in order to keep abreast of the R&D investment dynamics, governments and economic agents should pay attention to the degree of uncertainty in the economy. The negative impact of uncertainty on R&D is a phenomenon that widely exists in different countries over the world, as shown by our analyses on the full sample, as well as various subsamples. If governments can effectively monitor the variations in uncertainty and evaluate the relevant market responses, they will be able to understand the current situation and forecast future tendency of aggregate R&D investment in a better way. Being more informed will facilitate governments to make proper public policies if necessary. After understanding the link between uncertainty and R&D, firms can reasonably expect that other enterprises in the industry will adjust investment accordingly when uncertainty changes. During the procedure of making their own R&D investment plans, firms should not neglect the potential responses of the competitors and partners to varying uncertainty.

Second, given the importance of innovation and technological advancement for sustainable economic and social development, it is necessary to reduce the degree of macro uncertainty. Governments should avoid frequent variations of economic policies and the abrupt implementation of substantial reforms. The communication and information sharing among governments and private sectors should be reinforced to reduce noises, mitigate misunderstanding, and enhance trust and confidence. Countries should also improve their institutional and economic infrastructure—for example, by reducing frictions in financial markets and strengthening governmental effectiveness—in order to increase the resistibility of economic system to unexpected shocks. In the case that the major origins of the uncertainty can be identified—such as the coronavirus pandemic in the current period—urgent actions should be carried out to deal with the problems

### 2AC---Agency Trade-Off

#### Non-unique and turn—defense-friendly standards increases cost and reduces impact of agency enforcement

Alison Jones, Professor of Law at King's and a solicitor at Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, and William E. Kovacic, George Mason University Foundation Professor at the George Mason University School of Law, former FTC Commissioner, 2020, Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy, The Antitrust Bulletin 2020, Vol. 65(2) 227-255

Measures to expand federal antitrust intervention dramatically—through the prosecution of lawsuits or the promulgation of trade regulation rules—will face arduous opposition from the affected businesses. Assuming that litigation will provide the main method in the coming few years to attack positions of single-firm or collective dominance, the targets of big antitrust cases will marshal the best talent that private law firms, economic consultancies, and academic bodies can offer to oppose the government in court. The defense will benefit from doctrinal principles that generally are sympathetic to dominant firms (again, we assume that legislation to change the doctrinal status quo will not be immediately forthcoming). Beyond a certain point, the addition of new, high stakes cases to the litigation portfolio of public antitrust agencies will create a serious gap between the teams assembled for the prosecution and defense, respectively. Although therefore the public agencies can match the private sector punch for the punch when prosecuting several major de-monopolization cases, when the volume of such cases rises from several to many, the government agencies may have to rely on personnel with considerably less experience to develop and prosecute difficult antitrust cases, seeking powerful remedies upon global giants.

#### No link---no ev. connects AFF to redirection of resources NOR establishes a direct correlation.

#### No uniqueness---FTC attacking tech NOW---only question of relative probability of success.

**Carpenter 12/3** – journalist

Jacob Carpenter, "Lina Khan targets low-hanging fruit for first big antitrust move," Fortune, 12-3-2021, https://fortune.com/2021/12/03/nvidia-arm-lina-khan-antitrust/

Like any smart newbie looking to make a good first impression, Federal Trade Commission Chair Lina Khan is beginning her antitrust campaign with an easy case.

The FTC moved Thursday to block semiconductor maker Nvidia’s planned $40 billion acquisition of chip designer Arm, jumping ahead of counterparts in Europe who have all-but-guaranteed they would try to scuttle the largest-ever semiconductor deal. FTC officials argue that California-based Nvidia could undermine its competitors if it takes over Arm’s technology, which it licenses to Apple, Samsung, Intel, and dozens more of the industry’s largest manufacturers.

“This proposed deal would distort Arm’s incentives in chip markets and allow the combined firm to unfairly undermine Nvidia’s rivals,” FTC Bureau of Competition Director Holly Vedova said in a statement. “The FTC’s lawsuit should send a strong signal that we will act aggressively to protect our critical infrastructure markets from illegal vertical mergers that have far-reaching and damaging effects on future innovations.”

In a statement, a Nvidia spokesperson told Fortune that the company “will continue to work to demonstrate that this transaction will benefit the industry and promote competition.”

The FTC filing has, understandably, been cast as Khan’s opening salvo in her promised crusade to increase enforcement of antitrust law, which she and many Democrats argue has been ignored amid rapid Big Tech consolidation.

But Khan, perhaps smartly, isn’t exactly taking a big swing here.

From the moment that Nvidia announced its planned acquisition in September 2020, analysts and competitors have been skeptical the deal would go through. In subsequent months, some of the U.S.’ most prominent tech companies cried foul about the merger, including Google parent Alphabet, Microsoft, and Qualcomm, Bloomberg reported early this year.

Khan also has momentum at her back, with European Union and United Kingdom regulators already lining up an antitrust case. A top UK official teed up Thursday’s announcement by telling Bloomberg last month that “there is a lot of collaboration” on each side of the Atlantic with regard to Nvidia and Arm.

In addition, the FTC’s case has bipartisan support, with the organization’s two Republican commissioners joining their two Democratic counterparts in support of the case.

The true test of Kahn’s mettle lies farther down the road, as the FTC ponders whether to throw its weight behind challenges to acquisitions with more divided support and more complicated facts.

Among those cases: Amazon’s proposed $8.5-billion deal to buy Hollywood’s MGM Studios; defense giant Lockheed Martin’s looming $4.4 billion acquisition of Aerojet Rocketdyne; and the $43 billion merger of AT&T’s WarnerMedia division with Discovery.

#### Turn—*Amex* requirement eats up agency resources

Ben Brody, Bloomberg, U.S. Google Monopoly Case Could Hit Supreme Court AmEx Hurdle, August 28, 2020, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-08-28/u-s-google-monopoly-case-could-hit-supreme-court-amex-hurdle>

Google’s lucrative search ad business sells advertising space to brands around the results it provides to consumers. It also plays a key intermediary role connecting buyers and sellers of digital display ads across the web, and as a seller of display ad space for its YouTube video unit. Investigators have looked into all three, Bloomberg has reported.

Antitrust experts said that one reason for the delay in the Google lawsuit, which was expected in July, could be that government lawyers needed more time to construct the case to meet the standards in the AmEx ruling.

“That’s a complex, lengthy complaint to draft, and that takes time,” said Spencer Weber Waller, director of the Institute for Consumer Antitrust Studies at Loyola University Chicago. The government would probably have to create a “a belt-and-suspenders approach” that says why it would win under two kinds of market definitions, he said.

#### No internal link—agency resources ineffective b/c they drive away the best talent

Alison Jones, Professor of Law at King's and a solicitor at Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, and William E. Kovacic, George Mason University Foundation Professor at the George Mason University School of Law, former FTC Commissioner, 2020, Antitrust’s Implementation Blind Side: Challenges to Major Expansion of U.S. Competition Policy, The Antitrust Bulletin 2020, Vol. 65(2) 227-255

The modern critique of the U.S. system often describes the federal agencies as captured by the business community or beholden to ideas that disfavor robust intervention.143 Advocates of change suggest that the execution of their reform program at the federal antitrust agencies will require the appointment of senior managers and new staff who repudiate the consumer welfare standard, or at least embrace a vision for expanded enforcement under the consumer welfare, and embrace the multidimensional conception of the proper goals of competition law. Those already employed by the enforcement agencies as managers and staff will be expected to accept the expanded (goals) framework or they will find their duties reduced and their roles marginalized. New appointees to top leadership positions will not be tainted by substantial previous experience in the private sector, nor will they have spent too much time as civil servants in a government enforcement culture that assumed the primacy of consumer welfare as the aim of antitrust law and accepted norms that tilted toward underenforcement. The concern about compromised motives is also likely to disqualify many academics who, though sympathetic to some expansion of antitrust enforcement, remain excessively beholden to some notion of a consumer (rather than citizen) welfare standard, or have engaged in consulting on behalf of large corporate interests.

One consequence of the acute anxiety about capture is to slam the revolving door shut, or at least to slow the rate at which it spins. We offer two cautions about this approach. First, the modern experience of the FTC raises reasons to question the strength of the theory. For example, if business perspectives dominate the FTC, why did the agency persist in its efforts to challenge reverse payment agreements involving leading pharmaceutical producers?144 Was it because the pharmaceutical firms weren’t as good at lobbying as, say, the information services giants? And what explains the FTC’s decision to sue Qualcomm for monopolization early in 2017?145 Is this simply attributable to the inadequacy of Qualcomm’s Washington, DC, lobbyists, or is the capture explanation for the behavior of the federal antitrust agencies not entirely airtight?

Our second caution is that severe restrictions on the revolving door could deny the federal agencies access to skills they will need to carry out a major expansion of anti

trust enforcement. Recruiting attorneys, economists, and other specialists from the private sector can give the agencies a vital infusion of talent which, when combined with agency careerists, permit the creation of project teams that can equal the capability of the best teams that the defense can mount in major litigation matters. We also are wary of the idea that an attorney or economist coming from the private sector will discourage effective intervention during the period of public service as a way to pave the road to a better private sector position upon leaving the agency. Rather, there is evidence to suggest that creating a reputation for aggressiveness and toughness as an enforcer increases one’s post-agency employment options. More than a few individuals have development prosperous careers based on piloting businesses through navigational hazards that they helped create while they were senior officials in public agencies.

#### No tradeoff – newest resolution creates more capacity

Gehl 9-24 (Kate, Senior Counsel for Foley and Lardner LLP, Elizabeth A. N. Haas, Partner, Alan D. Rutenberg, Partner, H. Holden Brooks, Partner, Benjamin R. Dryden, Partner, Foley and Lardner LLP“A Divided FTC Approves Omnibus Resolutions to Step Up Enforcement Actions and Votes to Withdraw the 2020 Vertical Merger Guidelines” [https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions Published 9-24-2021](https://www.foley.com/en/insights/publications/2021/09/divided-ftc-approves-omnibus-resolutions%20Published%209-24-2021), MSU-MJS)

According to the FTC’s press release, the resolutions are aimed at broadening its ability “to obtain evidence in critical investigations on key areas where the FTC’s work can make the most impact.” The resolutions also will purportedly permit the FTC to “better utilize its limited resources” to quickly investigate potential misconduct. The FTC views the resolutions as one method to increase efficiency at the FTC, which certain Commissioners believe has become necessary due to the “increased volume of investigatory work” caused by a “surge” in merger filings in recent months.

In practice, these resolutions allow a single Commissioner, instead of a majority of sitting Commissioners, to approve compulsory process requests in

any investigation within the scope of the resolution for the next 10 years. What practical effect these resolutions will have remains to be seen; however, businesses engaged in conduct that may be implicated by the resolutions should be aware that FTC staff will now have an expedited ability to carry out compulsory process requests, which will very likely increase the number and scope of investigations conducted by the FTC.

#### Funding is normal means – AND boosts are coming

Byers 21 (Dylan Byers, senior media reporter for NBC News; **internally citing George Washington University professor and former FTC chair William Kovacic**; “Is Facebook untouchable? It's complicated,” NBC News, 7-1-2021, https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/facebook-untouchable-complicated-rcna1323)

The House Judiciary Committee recently advanced six bills that would bolster the government's ability to regulate Big Tech. They range from simple budgeting measures — one would give more funding to the FTC and the Department of Justice for their antitrust enforcement efforts — to profound reforms — one that would stop platform companies from preferencing their products over those of their competitors and another that would make it illegal for companies to eliminate competitors through acquisitions.

This legislative package faces an arduous road ahead. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, who sets the House floor schedule, has said none of the six bills are ready for a vote, which suggests they don't have broad bipartisan support. If and when they do make it through the House, they face an even harder battle in the Senate.

"It's hard to imagine that the larger legislative package is accomplished this year," Kovacic said, though he predicted a few of the less-threatening bills — budgeting, for example — are likely to pass on their own.

"The funding for the FTC and DOJ antitrust divisions, it's nearly 100 percent likely that Congress will pass that law," he said. He said another bill, which would block the tech firms from moving court hearings to more favorable states, was also likely to pass.

#### Pounder—FTCs new rulemaking agenda overstretches the agency—merger review + tons of new rules

Wilson, FTC Commissioner, ‘12/10/21

(Christine S., Dissenting Statement of Commissioner Christine S. Wilson

Annual Regulatory Plan and Semi-Annual Regulatory Agenda, <https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1598839/annual_regulatory_plan_and_semi-annual_regulatory_agenda_wilson_final.pdf>)

The context in which the Commission announces this ambitious and resource-intensive rulemaking agenda gives independent cause for concern. The “surge in merger filings” has been a central focus of Chair Khan since her arrival at the agency.2 To address the uptick in merger filings, staff from many non-merger divisions throughout the agency have been commandeered to review pre-merger notification materials.3 These filings are subject to statutory timeframes, but the FTC has struggled to meet its timing obligations.4 Consequently, the FTC’s Bureau of Competition is now sending warning letters to merging parties whose statutory timeframes have expired, warning that the agency’s investigations continue and threatening that if they proceed to consummate their transactions, they do so at their own peril.5 It is puzzling that we would unleash an avalanche of rulemakings while also confronting a tsunami of merger filings.

Merger wave or no merger wave, my Democrat colleagues have long aspired to a more expansive rulemaking agenda for the agency.6 This year, they began taking steps to implement that goal. Acting Chairwoman Slaughter created a new rulemaking group within the FTC’s Office of General Counsel to “help build [the] Commission’s rulemaking capacity and agenda for unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition.”7 She also launched a review of the Commission’s Rules of Practice to “streamline” rulemaking procedures under Section 18 of the FTC Act.8 Chair Khan then ushered those changes across the finish line.9 While the Annual Regulatory Plan and Semi-Regulatory Agenda characterize those changes to our Rules of Practice as “eliminating extra bureaucratic steps and unnecessary formalities,” in reality those changes fast-track regulation at the expense of public input, objectivity, and a full evidentiary record.10 The Statement of the Commission issued in conjunction with those rule changes confirmed a desire for an ambitious rulemaking agenda,11 which predictably is reflected in this plan.

The regulatory plan identifies many rulemakings that will be launched in the coming months, including a trade regulation rule on commercial surveillance “to curb lax security practices, limit privacy abuses, and ensure that algorithmic decision making does not result in unlawful discrimination.”12 This rule may implicate competition as well as consumer protection issues, as the Statement of Regulatory Priorities notes that “surveillance-based business models” impact not just consumers but competition.13

And taking a big step into uncharted waters, the plan states that “the Commission will also explore whether rules defining certain ‘unfair methods of competition’ prohibited by Section 5 of the FTC Act would promote competition and provide greater clarity to the market.”14 In deference to President Biden’s recent Executive Order,15 the Commission may consider competition rulemakings relating to “non-compete clauses, surveillance, the right to repair, payfor-delay pharmaceutical agreements, unfair competition in online marketplaces, occupational licensing, real-estate listing and brokerage, and industry-specific practices that substantially inhibit competition.”16 As if this list is insufficiently lengthy, the plan observes that “[t]he Commission will explore the benefits and costs of these and other competition rulemaking ideas.”17 In the absence of further detail, the reader is left to daydream about the additional rulemaking adventures that await.

### 2AC---Populism DA

#### No link – no one cares about court antitrust.

Baum and Devins 10 – Lawrence Baum is a professor emeritus in the Department of Political Science at Ohio State University; his primary research focus is judges’ behavior in decision making. Neal Devins is Sandra Day O’Connor Professor of Law and Professor of Government at William and Mary Law School.

Lawrence Baum and Neal Devins, “Why the Supreme Court Cares About Elites, Not the American People,” *The Georgetown Law Journal*, vol. 98, 2010, pp. 1549-1550, https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2149&context=facpubs.

It is worth underlining the point that a great deal of the Court’s work is essentially invisible to the public. Decisions in fields such as antitrust and patent law may be highly consequential, but it seems unlikely that there are strong public feelings about those decisions. Even if Justices seek to maintain the Court’s legitimacy, they have no reason to worry that public outrage in decisions in those fields will damage this legitimacy.170 More telling, the Rehnquist Court’s federalism revival was unnoticed by most of the mass public. During the period from 1992 to 2006, the Court invalidated eleven federal statutes on federalism grounds,171 thereby shifting the balance between the federal government and the states substantially. Nevertheless, these decisions (although prompting significant law review commentary) appeared to have low political salience.172 Of 229 Gallup Poll questions that explicitly referenced the Supreme Court during this period, there was not a single question concerning these decisions or any other Supreme Court invalidations of federal statutes.173

#### Tons of new antitrust now

Jon Swartz 12-28, Senior Reporter for MarketWatch, “Big Tech Heads for ‘A Year of Thousands of Tiny Tech Papercuts,’ But What Antitrust Efforts Could Make Them Bleed?”, MarketWatch, 12/28/2021, https://www.marketwatch.com/story/big-tech-heads-for-a-year-of-thousands-of-tiny-tech-papercuts-but-what-antitrust-efforts-could-make-them-bleed-11640640776

Antitrust enforcement of Big Tech is expected to take place on a scale never before seen in 2022, following years of escalating rhetoric from Washington.

So far, Wall Street has shrugged as the five companies under the microscope — Google parent Alphabet Inc. GOOGL, -0.92% GOOG, -0.91%, Facebook parent Meta Platforms Inc. FB, -2.33%, Apple Inc. AAPL, -0.35%, Amazon.com Inc. AMZN, -1.14%, and, yes, Microsoft Corp. MSFT, -0.88% — have been targeted by governments and rivals across the globe. Despite a steady drumbeat of negative headlines, tech’s quintet of heavy hitters boasted a cumulative market value of nearly $10 trillion as 2021 neared an end, after producing a collective $2.4 trillion in revenue over the past two years of pandemic misery.

The stock prices of tech companies have only been “minorly impacted because investors do not tend to make decisions based on the mere possibility of legislation,” Ashley Baker, director of public policy at the Committee for Justice, told MarketWatch.

Many investors have simply looked back on history and shrugged, according to one Silicon Valley venture capitalist.

“There is more antitrust noise, but investment people remember the Microsoft and IBM IBM, -0.19% [antitrust investigations] in which waves of innovation followed those investigations and proved they did not own the industry,” Alexandra Sasha Johnson, president of Global Tech Symposium, a Silicon Valley investment conference, told MarketWatch. “Until the Big Tech companies buy each other, this is not a problem.”

For more: Big Tech was built by the same type of antitrust actions that could now tear it down
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This could finally change in 2022 as it did in the late 1990s, when some tech companies struck a cautious stance during the Justice Department’s investigation of Microsoft for monopolistic practices, Syed said.

“The difference is that we’re talking about interconnected companies that own an industry versus just one company [with Microsoft],” she said. “And there is bipartisan support, which makes it easier politically.”

More on the antitrust challenges facing Big Tech in 2022

Amazon has mostly avoided antitrust scrutiny, but that may change in 2022

Possible Justice Department lawsuit looms over Apple, which is facing scrutiny worldwide

Google enters 2022 battling antitrust actions on multiple fronts — with more likely to come

Facebook’s acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp are antitrust targets, but its metaverse mergers may be the victims

Microsoft has avoided U.S. antitrust scrutiny, but Europe is a different matter

With more than a dozen pieces of anti-tech legislation, a plethora of lawsuits and regulatory fines escalating in the U.S. and abroad, as well as the Biden administration rounding out Big Tech’s nightmare team of government agency heads, 2022 is shaping up as a seminal year for tech regulation after decades of inaction.

In rapid succession this year, Biden named and nominated an antitrust team of Tim Wu (to the newly created position of head of competition policy at the National Economic Council), Lina Khan (chair of the Federal Trade Commission) and Jonathan Kanter (head of the antitrust division of the Justice Department). Each is a heralded anti-monopolist advocate who has written extensively on the topic or represented companies making antitrust claims against Big Tech.

The trio have been referred to as members of a “New Brandeis movement,” named after Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, whose decisions limited the power of big business in the early 20th century. With the New Brandeis trifecta in place, and Congress evaluating more than dozen possible anti-tech bills, next year is “shaping up to be the year of Tech Takedown,” Bhaskar Chakravorti, dean of global business at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, told MarketWatch.

More troubling for tech CEOs, he said, are the “many tiny actions at the FTC, Justice Department and Congress that will continue to keep feeding the news cycles with a steady stream of actions” that add up to a “a year of thousands of tiny tech papercuts.”

Big Tech’s treacherous path to antitrust enforcement has three potentially damaging roads: federal agencies challenging acquisitions and mergers; legislation tailored to stimulate competition and curtail the influence of tech’s dominant platforms; and federal and state lawsuits.

Closer scrutiny of M&A activity

The biggest immediate impact from the Biden administration’s all-out assault could be a cooling-off period of frenzied mergers and acquisitions by the biggest players. Regulators have been empowered with examining past deals and more strenuously inspecting tech’s latest purchases.

Major movement is already happening on the M&A front because, as lawyers and executives told MarketWatch, the FTC and Justice Department have new leadership empowered to more closely review and approve mergers while they await legislation and court actions. A non-binding presidential executive order largely seen as aimed at Big Tech announced a policy of greater scrutiny of mergers over the summer, and the FTC and Justice Department each would receive $500 million in new funding to boost staff working on antitrust enforcement as part of the House-passed reconciliation bill awaiting Senate action.

The FTC is signaling greater oversight over deals, requiring affirmative consent on certain transactions, which may prolong uncertainty on merger agreements. The agency has already sued to block the largest semiconductor deal ever — Nvidia Corp.’s NVDA, -0.59% proposed $40 billion acquisition of U.K.-based chip-design provider Arm Ltd., saying the deal would “distort Arm’s incentives in chip markets and allow the combined firm to unfairly undermine Nvidia’s rivals.”

Another FTC antitrust probe, into Meta’s plan to acquire VR fitness app Supernatural for $400 million, is underway, according to a report by The Information.

The Justice Department’s direction is less clear at this point, but signals from Kanter’s confirmation hearing point to “vigorous enforcement” of antitrust laws.

“Personnel is policy. With the trifecta of Khan, Kanter and Wu, there is a new sheriff in town,” Luther Lowe, senior vice president of public policy at Yelp Inc. YELP, -0.66%, told MarketWatch. “Efforts by Amazon and Facebook to recuse Khan, and Google’s attempt to recuse Kanter, is like arsonists asking for firefighters to be removed from a fire.”