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# Politics DA Neg

## 1NC

### Antitrust Reform Good – 1NC

#### A. Uniqueness – Antitrust reform will pass now – but it’s running out of time

Reardon, CNET senior reporter, 7-1-22

[Marguerite, 7-1-22, CNET, “Congress' Bid to Rein In Big Tech Needs a Push Over the Finish Line”, <https://www.cnet.com/news/politics/congress-bid-to-rein-in-big-tech-needs-a-push-over-the-finish-line/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

What's happening

Congress is on the verge of passing major bipartisan antitrust and privacy legislation to rein in the power of tech giants. But it's running out of time.

Why it matters

The antitrust and privacy laws, which have gotten support from right, left and center politicians, would change how big tech companies do business. But the coalition could fall apart if votes don't happen before the summer recess in a midterm election year.

#### B. Link –

[INSERT]

#### C. Political capital key to antitrust reform

Bordelon, Politico, 22

[Brendan, 2-4-22, Politico, “Under pressure, Biden backs antitrust push”, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2022/02/04/under-pressure-biden-backs-antitrust-push-00005579, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

The Biden team came out in favor of the antitrust measures moving through both houses of Congress late Thursday — but how much public support and political capital the White House aims to spend on reining in giant tech companies remains an open question.

The move, coming hours after the Senate Judiciary Committee advanced a bill to break Apple and Google’s hold on app stores, marks the first time the White House has officially weighed in on the congressional antitrust push, Leah and POLITICO’s Adam Cancryn reported. While the White House held a “listening session” with supporters of tech antitrust reform two weeks ago, it offered a neutral readout afterward, saying only that officials “look forward to working with Congress to make bipartisan progress on the issue.”

But that polite restraint ended this week following the administration’s foray into the European Union’s draft Digital Markets Act — a package of rules designed to rein in the power of tech giants. As Leah and POLITICO EU’s Samuel Stolton and Mark Scott reported, D.C. antitrust advocates weren’t pleased with the policy paper, thinking it could undermine pending congressional legislation targeting the digital giants. The Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue — a group of 75 U.S. and EU consumer groups — called out the Biden administration Thursday for expressing “concern” about the administration’s statements on the DMA.

“The DMA does not target U.S. companies but rather targets companies that are in a position to define how goods, services, and information reach customers and which too often turn this position to their advantage to the detriment of competition and consumers’ interests,” the groups said, urging Biden to “work constructively with the EU” on finalizing the legislation.

Biden was always going to have to make a decision on whether to publicly back the antitrust bills — particularly with congressional Democrats split.

#### D. Impact – Economic Recovery

#### 1. Antitrust reform key to restoring competition

Connor & Simpson, Center for American Progress Technology Policy vice president and director, 22

[Adam & Erin, Center for American Progression, “Evaluating 2 Tech Antitrust Bills to Restore Competition Online, <https://americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/OnlineCompetition-report.pdf>, p. 6, accessed 7-1-22, AFB]

If enacted, the American Innovation and Choice Online Act and the Open App Markets Act will mark a major step forward in restoring competitive markets. The bills would help unlock the potential of Americans to grow successful businesses and build an economy that is more prosperous, equitable, and innovative. They would likewise remove barriers to functional consumer services and introduce competitive incentives for improved quality, innovation, and competitive prices for American consumers.

#### 2. Growth key to global stability – solves existential threats and key to coop

Baird, Markle Foundation CEO & President, 20

[Zoë, “Equitable Economic Recovery Is a National Security Imperative”. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Chapter-13_Baird_Equitable-Economic-Recovery.pdf>, p. 89-90, accessed 7-1-22, AFB]

Broadly shared economic prosperity is a bedrock of America’s economic and political strength—both domestically and in the international arena. A strong and equitable recovery from the economic crisis created by COVID-19 would be a powerful testament to the resilience of the American system and its ability to create prosperity at a time of seismic change and persistent global crisis. Such a recovery could attack the profound economic inequities that have developed over the past several decades. Without bold action to help all workers access good jobs as the economy returns, the United States risks undermining the legitimacy of its institutions and its international standing. The outcome will be a key determinant of America’s national security for years to come.

An equitable recovery requires a national commitment to help all workers obtain good jobs—particularly the two-thirds of adults without a bachelor’s degree and people of color who have been most affected by the crisis and were denied opportunity before it. As the nation engages in a historic debate about how to accelerate economic recovery, ambitious public investment is necessary to put Americans back to work with dignity and opportunity. We need an intentional effort to make sure that the jobs that come back are good jobs with decent wages, benefits, and mobility and to empower workers to access these opportunities in a profoundly changed labor market.

To achieve these goals, American policy makers need to establish job growth strategies that address urgent public needs through major programs in green energy, infrastructure, and health. Alongside these job growth strategies, we need to recognize and develop the talents of workers by creating an adult learning system that meets workers’ needs and develops skills for the digital economy. The national security community must lend its support to this cause. And as it does so, it can bring home the lessons from the advances made in these areas in other countries, particularly our European allies, and consider this a realm of international cooperation and international engagement.

Shared Economic Prosperity Is a National Security Asset

A strong economy is essential to America’s security and diplomatic strategy. Economic strength increases our influence on the global stage, expands markets, and funds a strong and agile military and national defense. Yet it is not enough for America’s economy to be strong for some—prosperity must be broadly shared. Widespread belief in the ability of the American economic system to create economic security and mobility for all—the American Dream— creates credibility and legitimacy for America’s values, governance, and alliances around the world.

After World War II, the United States grew the middle class to historic size and strength. This achievement made America the model of the free world—setting the stage for decades of American political and economic leadership.

Domestically, broad participation in the economy is core to the legitimacy of our democracy and the strength of our political institutions. A belief that the economic system works for millions is an important part of creating trust in a democratic government’s ability to meet the needs of the people.

The COVID-19 Crisis Puts Millions of American Workers at Risk

For the last several decades, the American Dream has been on the wane. Opportunity has been increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small share of workers able to access the knowledge economy. Too many Americans, particularly those without four-year degrees, experienced stagnant wages, less stability, and fewer opportunities for advancement.

Since COVID-19 hit, millions have lost their jobs or income and are struggling to meet their basic needs—including food, housing, and medical care.1 The crisis has impacted sectors like hospitality, leisure, and retail, which employ a large share of America’s most economically vulnerable workers, resulting in alarming disparities in unemployment rates along education and racial lines. In August, the unemployment rate for those with a high school degree or less was more than double the rate for those with a bachelor’s degree.2 Black and Hispanic Americans are experiencing disproportionately high unemployment, with the gulf widening as the crisis continues.3

The experience of the Great Recession shows that without intentional effort to drive an inclusive recovery, inequality may get worse: while workers with a high school education or less experienced the majority of job losses, nearly all new jobs went to workers with postsecondary education. Inequalities across racial lines also increased as workers of color worked in the hardest-hit sectors and were slower to recover earnings and income than White workers.4

The Case for an Inclusive Recovery

A recovery that promotes broad economic participation, renewed opportunity, and equity will strengthen American moral and political authority around the world. It will send a strong message about the strength and resilience of democratic government and the American people’s ability to adapt to a changing global economic landscape.

An inclusive recovery will reaffirm American leadership as core to the success of our most critical international alliances, which are rooted in the notion of shared destiny and interdependence. For example, NATO, which has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and a force of global stability for decades, has suffered from American disengagement in recent years. A strong American recovery—coupled with a renewed openness to international collaboration—is core to NATO’s ability to solve shared geopolitical and security challenges. A renewed partnership with our European allies from a position of economic strength will enable us to address global crises such as climate change, global pandemics, and refugees. Together, the United States and Europe can pursue a commitment to investing in workers for shared economic competitiveness, innovation, and long-term prosperity.

## Uniqueness

### Uniqueness – Antitrust Reform Will Pass Now

#### Antitrust reform will pass now – but focus now is key

Brody, Protocol senior reporter & Chitkara, Protocol reporter, 7-1-22

[Ben & Hirsh, 7-1-22, Protocol, “During recess, tech antitrust is on 'a knife edge', <https://www.protocol.com/newsletters/policy/aicoa-antitrust-lobbying-recess?rebelltitem=10#rebelltitem10>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

Should I stay or should AICOA?

Senators recently headed home for a two-week break without taking action on the tech antitrust bill. That doesn’t mean, though, the moment is any less crucial for the fate of the American Innovation and Choice Online Act. And even if supporters and detractors alike think they’ll win by just staying their courses, they know they have to make the best of the time that lawmakers will spend at July Fourth barbecues.

Those who support AICOA, and claim they have the votes to pass it, were eager to get a vote before the Independence Day recess. But that doomed hope wasn’t just a scheduling preference, like slipping out for lunch at 11:30 a.m. on a summer Friday.

Rather, this recess (or the “state work period,” as it’s called by lawmakers who are sensitive about the notion they’re on the job only half the time) offers Big Tech more time to plead its case, strategize, advertise against the measure, grab attention with stunts, come up with procedural hurdles, etc.

Tech and its friends might be able to mobilize real-life constituents — who are theoretically the people senators most care about — to give a piece of their mind to the lawmakers at cookouts and fireworks shows.

It’s worth watching out for that dynamic: Yes, it gets really hard to do much in Congress after August because of the demands of campaigning, but senators who are facing tough races may start to waver if they’re hearing a lot about voter concerns right now.

Some of that in-person jawboning is surely going on, and is organized by both sides, said Adam Kovacevich, a former Google official who now runs a pro-tech group that’s been highly critical of AICOA.

But, Kovacevich contends, what senators may hear about most are more basic economic concerns or else hotter-button political topics — particularly in the wake of a busy SCOTUS season.

“When a senator is marching in a July Fourth parade, what are the top issues that voters and constituents come up to them and ask them to deal with?” he said. “It’s much more likely to be inflation, abortion, guns, not Amazon Basics.”

So, no, Big Tech hasn’t yet launched some sort of massive protest movement to get everyday users to accost senators.

Companies are still trying to reach senators at the moment, though. Business organizations are sending letters. Think tanks and business-allied groups are writing blog posts. The Big Tech CEOs were even reaching out last week.

These are more or less the things tech was doing before, but it’s important to realize they’re not exactly minimal. Rather, these efforts are backed by literal millions of dollars in ad spending and hot rhetoric about national security and inflation.

Kovacevich also teased that tech allies are “looking at” new ads focused on the content moderation concerns that have threatened to alienate progressives.

Plus, all this keepin’ on, backed up by hefty ad spending, does make good strategic sense if tech really does think it’s already winning.

“Going into July and then into the August recess, our focus is just maintaining where we’re at — still persuading senators that this isn’t the time to do this bill, that there’s issues with this bill,” said Robert Winterton, a spokesperson for the tech trade group NetChoice. “We feel like where we’re at is working.”

On the other hand, even top-level pleas to Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer have only resulted in the CEOs being told personally that he supports the legislation and is working “to get the necessary votes to pass it,” according to the Washington Post.

Meanwhile, pro-AICOA forces are trying to harness their own grassroots and get attention they don’t have to pay quite so much for.

Digital rights group Fight for the Future, for instance, put up video billboards outside Schumer’s D.C. and New York homes that play the John Oliver segment boosting the antitrust bill.

An “independent developer” who just happens also to be named Adam Kovacevich even wrote in Newsweek about his support for the bills.

What this means was actually summed up by a Brit I recently spoke with — Richard Stables, CEO of the Kelkoo Group, a European shopping comparison site that’s pushed tech competition matters on both sides of the Atlantic. After attending “seven or eight” meetings with Capitol staff and lawmakers last week, he told me he was “cautiously optimistic” that AICOA has the votes, though some supporters aren’t ready to admit it. But, he added: “I think it’s on a bit of a knife edge.”

#### Antitrust reform will pass now – each day of delay makes the impact more likely

Zakrzewski et al., Washington Post Technology Policy reporter, 6-27-22

[Cat Zakrzewski, Will Oremus, Washington Post Technology news analysis writer, Gerrit De Vynck, Washington Post Tech reporter covering Google, algorithms and ransomware, and Cristiano Lima. Tech newsletter reporter anchoring The Technology 202, focusing on politics and policy, 6-27-22, Washington Post, “With clock ticking, battle over tech regulation intensifies”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/06/27/antitrust-tech-battle-congress/>, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

The clock is ticking. The legislation has support from the left, right and center, a rare alliance that will likely dissolve after the midterm elections, said William E. Kovacic, former Republican chair of the Federal Trade Commission and a professor at George Washington University Law School who studies antitrust and competition.

“Simply put, this may be the best chance the advocates of new legislation ever get to realize their aims for reform,” Kovacic said.

For more than three years, through a pandemic, two impeachments and an insurrection, lawmakers and their staffs have systematically collected evidence that Amazon, Apple, Google and Facebook engaged in anticompetitive tactics to solidify their dominance across the internet. They’ve hosted high-profile hearings with the companies’ CEOs, and pushed bills through House and Senate committees with bipartisan votes. And they heard from the CEOs of smaller tech firms, including Sonos, Spotify and Tile, who testified that the giants had leveraged the power of their platforms to give their own apps and products unfair advantages over independent rivals.

The congressional probe found that the four companies control essential portals to the digital economy — and increasingly use those platforms to offer their own products and features, competing with the same businesses that rely on them. Critics say that’s a glaring conflict of interest; the tech giants say it’s for their customers’ own good.

Breaking up the companies isn’t on the table in the current antitrust package, which focuses on regulating tech companies’ treatment of rivals. Still, the bills mark the closest Washington has yet come to comprehensive regulation of a U.S. tech industry that includes four of the world’s five most valuable publicly traded companies.

The key bills — the American Innovation and Choice Online Act and the Open App Markets Act — have been languishing in Congress for months, and their chances of becoming law grow dimmer the closer Congress gets to the midterms, when lawmakers’ attention will turn to campaigning. Democrats risk losing control of Congress in that election, and significant tech antitrust bills are viewed as unlikely to pass under Republican leadership.

In an interview Friday, Cicilline said it’s “very important” that the legislation comes to a floor vote before Congress leaves for its August recess.

“Every day we wait, we are doing significant harm to the ability of small businesses to survive,” Cicilline said.

The legislation’s supporters are up against a host of competing political priorities, as Democrats and the Biden administration scramble to address gun control, inflation, climate policy and the Supreme Court’s reversal of Roe v. Wade.

Cicilline says that lawmakers have the votes to pass the legislation, and the tech executives’ recent visits to Washington reflect how worried they are. Pichai also met with Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), who had previously raised concerns that the bills would single out companies in her home state. He also met with Republican lawmakers including Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), Senate Minority Whip John Thune (R-S.D.) and Sen. Steve Daines (R-Mont.), said multiple people familiar with the matter who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss private meetings. Representatives for McConnell, Daines and Thune did not respond to a request for comment.

#### Antitrust reform will pass now – but the window is narrow and closing

Feiner, CNBC, 6-4-22

[Lauren, 6/4/22, CNBC, “Lawmakers are racing to pass tech antitrust reforms before midterms.” <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/06/04/lawmakers-racing-to-pass-tech-antitrust-tech-reforms-before-midterms.html>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

A major piece of legislation that could reshape the tech industry is just a few steps away from becoming federal law. But advocates fear that if congressional leadership doesn’t usher it through before the midterms, or at least the end of the year, it could die.

The American Innovation and Choice Online Act, a Senate bill that closely resembles an earlier House version, advanced out of the Judiciary Committee earlier this year by a wide margin.

Known among staff and lawmakers as the self-preferencing or anti-discrimination bill, the legislation would prohibit dominant tech platforms like Amazon, Apple and Google from giving preferential treatment to their own services in marketplaces they operate. If passed, it could prevent Google from having its own travel recommendations at the top of search results, for example. Or Amazon might have to ensure its own products are ranked by the same criteria as competitors’ products.

The bill has overcome intense lobbying from the tech industry, and there are increasingly signs it will move forward before the August recess.

Advocates feel there’s little time to spare. They cite the probability that with Republican control of the House following the November vote, the party would follow current caucus leaders who have signaled that antitrust reform would be a lower priority. In the digital space, Republican House leaders have been focused more on content moderation and privacy issues.

Given that backdrop, onlookers are wondering: What will it take for Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., or House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., to give the bills time on the floor for a vote?

They’re getting closer, sources tell CNBC. Schumer met about the status of antitrust legislation on May 18 with Sens. Dick Durbin, D-Ill., and Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., chairs of the Judiciary Committee and subcommittee on antitrust, respectively, according to a Democratic source familiar with the conversation. (The source, like others who are not named in this article, spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss behind-the-scenes conversations in Congress.)

#### Antitrust reform will pass now, but bipartisanship is key

Tusk, Tusk Venture Partners co-founder, 6-10-22

[Bradley, 6-10-22, Protocol, “Big Tech regulation is bipartisan.”, <https://www.protocol.com/policy/bipartisan-tech-regulation-tusk>, accessed 6-22-22]

We live in a society where each party instinctively opposes the views of the other. If Democrats say they like ice cream, Republicans say that ice cream has secret microchips that spy for the Chinese. If Republicans say they like apple pie, Democrats say the dessert is a symbol of oppression and must be banned. Sadly, it sometimes does reach levels almost this silly. But there seems to be one issue defying political gravity: tech regulation.

From Congress to the Supreme Court, from states to presidential candidates, from think tanks on the left to those on the right, the stars have aligned far differently around regulating Big Tech than they have for almost any other current issue.

For example, the U.S. Supreme Court recently issued a stay of a Texas law that was designed to ban online platforms from restricting user posts based on political views. The social media companies argued that the Texas law violated their First Amendment rights to control the content on their platforms. So you have what’s meant to be a pro-Republican position on the Texas law — preventing platforms like Twitter from banning people like Trump — against what’s normally a Democratic position, protecting the First Amendment.

But the outcome was surprising. The majority who voted to pause the Texas law — Chief Justice John Roberts (appointed by George W. Bush) and Justices Stephen Breyer (appointed by Bill Clinton), Sonia Sotomayor (appointed by Barack Obama), Brett Kavanaugh and Amy Coney Barrett (both appointed by Donald Trump) — make an unusual set of allies. And on the other side, Justice Elena Kagan (Obama), one of the most liberal members of the court, sided with Justices Samuel Alito (W. Bush), Neil Gorsuch (Trump) and Clarence Thomas (George H.W. Bush) to oppose the stay — not the usual coalition.

But justices aren’t beholden to voters, so maybe it’s easier for them to agree while everyone else still has to toe the party line. Disproving that theory, though, only requires one glance at the American Innovation and Choice Online Act in Congress. The bill prohibits dominant media platforms, defined by their market cap and number of users, from discriminating against other businesses that rely on their services. So for example, Amazon wouldn’t be able to make products from outside vendors far less attractive or easy to find than their own products.

The legislation, led by prominent Democratic Sen. Amy Kloubchar, passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in January with a 16-6 vote, reflecting broad bipartisan support. Republican Sens. Chuck Grassley, Lindsey Graham, Ted Cruz, Josh Hawley and John Kennedy all supported it, with Grassley and Kennedy both serving as co-sponsors. Passing anything in Congress is still akin to a miracle, but if one bill has a shot of passing this year, it may be this one.

The bipartisan trend toward regulating Big Tech even occurred during the 2020 presidential race, one of the ugliest races in history. Trump and Biden didn’t agree on much, but they did agree on one issue: revoking Section 230. Sec. 230 is a federal law that protects platforms like Facebook or Twitter from being sued for content posted by its users. In my view, it is the single biggest contributor to making the internet toxic. And that issue is so much of concern to both sides that Trump publicly called out “the horrendous tech giants,” and argued for repealing Sec. 230 at a rally in Georgia. Biden then said the same thing: “Sec. 230 should be revoked, immediately should be revoked, No. 1. For Zuckerberg and other platforms. It should be revoked because it is not merely an internet company. It is propagating falsehoods they know to be false.”

Now, given Washington’s ineptitude, Sec. 230 is of course still alive and well. But in a world where most issues are automatically doomed because one side’s support immediately prevents the other’s, there’s at least a chance something can get done.

#### Antitrust reform will pass now

Tusk, Tusk Venture Partners co-founder, 6-10-22

[Bradley, 6-10-22, Protocol, “Big Tech regulation is bipartisan.”, <https://www.protocol.com/policy/bipartisan-tech-regulation-tusk>, accessed 6-22-22]

Unlike almost every other issue out there — guns, climate, immigration, education, health care, abortion and so on — regulating Big Tech appeals to elected officials, judges and scholars on both sides of the aisle. Does this mean we should now expect a torrent of bipartisan legislation that finally takes on issues like privacy, antitrust and platform liability? No. We’re still talking about the government; you should always bet on failure and incompetence. But if you wanted to find one issue that at least has a shot in an impending divided government — with a likely Republican-led House and Senate and a Democratic-led White House — regulating Big Tech may be your best bet.

#### Reform has the votes – Klobuchar counting votes

Nelson, New York Post, 6-27-22

[Steven, 6-27-22, New York Post, “Billboards calling for Big Tech antitrust vote sent to Schumer’s home”, <https://nypost.com/2022/06/27/billboards-calling-for-big-tech-antitrust-vote-sent-to-schumers-home/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

But Greer said it was “totally bogus” to say that the votes aren’t there. Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), who is the lead sponsor, said recently she has enough votes for passage.

“We believe that these bills are essential for fighting for a future where technology is a force for good and for empowerment and innovation and upliftment, rather than a force for tyranny and greed,” Greer told The Post.

[NOTE: Greer = Evan Greer, director of Fight for the Future]

### Uniqueness & Internal Link – AT – Schumer Won’t Schedule Vote

#### Schumer will schedule a vote

Reardon, CNET senior reporter, 7-1-22

[Marguerite, 7-1-22, CNET, “Congress' Bid to Rein In Big Tech Needs a Push Over the Finish Line”, <https://www.cnet.com/news/politics/congress-bid-to-rein-in-big-tech-needs-a-push-over-the-finish-line/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

In spite of assurances from Klobuchar that the bills have the votes needed, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer of New York has yet to schedule a vote on the legislation, a fact that comedian John Oliver highlighted earlier this month in a segment for his HBO show Last Week Tonight. Oliver, who is known for bringing attention to complex issues, like net neutrality, focused on Schumer and referenced media reports that have shown that 17 members of Congress have children who either currently work for or have worked at large tech companies. This includes Schumer's daughters who work as a marketing manager at Meta and a registered lobbyist for Amazon.

Schumer has repeatedly stated he supports the legislation and is working with Klobuchar to get the votes to pass it.

#### Schumer will bring it to a vote

Go9ld, Axios tech and policy reporter, 22

[Ashley, 5-19-22, Axios, “Scoop: Schumer seeks tech antitrust bill vote by early summer.” <https://www.axios.com/2022/05/19/scoop-schumer-seeks-tech-antitrust-bill-vote-by-early-summer>, accessed 7-1-22, AFB]

Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) intends to put bipartisan tech antitrust legislation up for a vote by early summer, a Democratic source familiar with the situation tells Axios.

Why it matters: Schumer is in charge of the Senate's agenda, and if the bill doesn't pass soon, its prospects in the next Congress look shaky.

The legislation would then have to pass the House, where there is a companion bill.

Driving the news: Per a source familiar with the meeting, Schumer met with Sens. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) and Richard Durbin (D-Ill.) Wednesday to discuss next steps for Klobuchar's bipartisan bill, the American Innovation and Choice Online Act, which passed out of the Senate Judiciary committee earlier this year.

The bill would ban Big Tech companies like Google, Apple, Amazon and Meta from favoring their own services in an anticompetitive way, similar to a House bill approved by the House Judiciary Committee as part of a marathon markup last summer.

Schumer urged Klobuchar to release an edited version of her bill with input from bipartisan members of the Judiciary Committee soon, so members have time to review it before it's put up for a floor vote, per the source.

Schumer told Durbin and Klobuchar he fully supports the antitrust bill, and committed to putting a revised bill on the Senate floor, according to the source.

#### Schumer supports the bill and is working on it

Zakrzewski et al., Washington Post Technology Policy reporter, 6-27-22

[Cat Zakrzewski, Will Oremus, Washington Post Technology news analysis writer, Gerrit De Vynck, Washington Post Tech reporter covering Google, algorithms and ransomware, and Cristiano Lima. Tech newsletter reporter anchoring The Technology 202, focusing on politics and policy, 6-27-22, Washington Post, “With clock ticking, battle over tech regulation intensifies”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/06/27/antitrust-tech-battle-congress/>, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

In recent days, it’s not just proponents of the bills who have sought to sway Schumer. The leaders of Google and Amazon have personally called the Senate majority leader. His office said he tells anyone who calls him to discuss the legislation the same message: “Senator Schumer supports the legislation and is working with Senator [Amy] Klobuchar and others to get the necessary votes to pass it,” said Schumer spokesman Justin Goodman.

### AT – Biden Weak Now/Econ Key

#### Uniqueness and link – Biden doubling down on focus on economy – Plan distracts Biden from vital economic attention and aid

Collins & Liptak, CNN Chief White House Correspondents, 22

[Kaitlan & Kevin, CNN, 5-31-22, CNN, "White House unveils a monthlong focus on the economy as prices rise and poll numbers fall,", https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/31/politics/white-house-inflation-economy-joe-biden/index.html, Accessed 7-13-22, LASA-LR]

Facing rising prices and deep voter dissatisfaction, the White House this week is launching a month-long effort to signal heavy focus on the economy as inflation worries become the top concern for the White House before this fall's midterm elections.

It's not the first time President Joe Biden and his aides have sought to renew attention on the economy. But there remains little Biden can do on his own to bring down prices in the immediate term.

Yet facing near-record low approval ratings five months before the critical congressional contests, the President has determined another concentrated focus on Americans' bottom line is necessary to demonstrate his attention on the issue.

The push began on Monday with an op-ed published in The Wall Street Journal and continues Tuesday with an Oval Office sit-down between Biden, Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell and Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen. At the end of the week, Biden plans a speech on the new jobs report Friday.

#### Biden is attempting to regain popularity now through new inflation mitigation, but the plan’s non-domestic actions could distract Biden

Collins &Liptak, CNN Chief White House Correspondents, 22

[Kaitlan & Kevin, CNN, 5-31-22, CNN, "White House unveils a monthlong focus on the economy as prices rise and poll numbers fall,", https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/31/politics/white-house-inflation-economy-joe-biden/index.html, Accessed 7-13-22, LASA-LR]

Yet Biden's efforts over the past year to highlight an improving economy have not persuaded voters that his plans are working. A majority of voters say the government isn't doing enough to fight inflation, and a Gallup poll released Tuesday showed 14% of US adults rate economic conditions as "excellent" or "good," with 46% calling them "poor" and another 39% rating them as "only fair." That's worse than a month ago, when 20% of Americans rated conditions as good or better and 42% said they were poor.

Early administration descriptions of inflation as "transitory" have not borne out, and opened Biden to criticism that the price spike caught his team by surprise.

The President, meanwhile, has sought to balance taking credit for strong job growth and improving economic indicators with acknowledging the pain many families are feeling from higher prices of gas, groceries, housing and more.

Recently, he has also sought to pin blame for higher prices on Russia's invasion of Ukraine, labeling the sticker shock "Putin's price hike." And he has accused Republicans of resisting his efforts to bring costs down in favor of pursing an "ultra-MAGA" agenda.

An official told CNN to expect to see this effort to focus on the economy to continue for the rest of the month as officials want to convey to voters that Biden is paying attention to their concerns, while also preparing them to see fewer job-creation numbers as the economy stabilizes.

#### Biden is currently working on domestic struggles like, gun control, inflation, infrastructure, health care, and police reform, but the plan distracts Biden and keeps him stuck in international relations

Barrón-López & Lemire, POLITICO White House reporter & White House bureau chief, 22

[Laura & Jonathan, 4-18-22, POLITICO, “Biden’s been consumed by Ukraine. His team wants to bring the focus back home,” https://www.politico.com/news/2022/04/18/biden-domestic-policy-shift-00025862, Accessed 7-13-22, LASA-LR]

As it looks to refocus on domestic issues, the White House is eyeing faster, tangible actions to tackle kitchen table issues, namely inflation. This month, Biden issued executive orders allowing the use of an ethanol blend this summer to lower gas prices and to jumpstart a new regulation fixing the Affordable Care Act’s so-called family glitch, which would lower health insurance costs for millions. And late last week, the administration announced plans to resume the sale of leases for oil and gas drilling on federal lands.

Having gone overseas to address the conflict in Ukraine, Biden, for the first time in weeks, boarded Air Force One to promote the steps he’s taken to battle inflation and the economic impact of that war. Last week, he traveled to Iowa to promote an effort to lower gas prices and North Carolina to tout measures to ease supply chain bottlenecks.

He also unveiled a finalized regulation to curb the rise in gun violence across the country, an event that came roughly a week after a mass shooting in Sacramento, Calif., and one day before a man opened fire on a Brooklyn subway, injuring 10. This week, Biden will hit the road again, visiting New Hampshire, Oregon and Washington to highlight new infrastructure projects and cost-saving efforts for families.

He’s also expected to unveil a police reform executive action and take another shot at passing a revamped version of his Build Back Better proposal aimed at combating climate change and cutting health care costs.

Biden refocusing from Russian threat to domestic issues, the plan steers Biden’s focus back to Russia and away from domestic issues and hurts his political popularity

Liptak &Mattingly, CNN White House correspondents, 22

[Kevin & Phil, 4-9-22, CNN, "Biden turns his focus from Ukraine war to kitchen table issues at home as midterms loom,", https://www.cnn.com/2022/04/09/politics/biden-domestic-issues-ukraine-war/index.html, Accessed 7-13-22, LASA-LR]

Since Biden returned from a last-minute diplomatic outing to Europe last month, he's held no scheduled events about Russia's invasion -- a stark contrast to the previous weeks, when the President emerged regularly to update Americans on new sanctions, intelligence and Western military assistance.

Even as the atrocities of Bucha played out on television screens across the world this week — including in the West Wing, where an outraged Biden and his team watched with horror — there were no specific events to address the grim footage.

Instead, Biden's focus has been squarely at home. From the cost of health care to supply chain bottlenecks to prices at the pump and a robust economic recovery — one that officials believe simply hasn't broken through — Biden's public focus has lately been guided entirely by domestic issues.

The shift comes as Biden and his team assess a concerning political landscape complicated by the ripple effect of severe economic sanctions imposed on Moscow. Other recent developments -- including a decision to lift pandemic-era restrictions on the border -- have contributed to growing unease among Democrats about November's elections. And a recent surge of Covid-19 cases among Biden's circle has acted as a reminder of the virus' continued presence.

Biden's response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine has done little to boost his sagging political standing, despite generating unprecedented unity among Western allies. As the White House settles in for what officials believe will be a prolonged conflict, there has been a clear effort to try and break through wall-to-wall war coverage with Biden's domestic priorities.

"We can do more than one thing at a time," a senior administration official told CNN. "We have a story to tell at home and it's only natural that we would focus on that as much as possible."

## Links

### Link – NATO Cost/Prioritization

#### Supporting NATO will trigger debate over priorities

Maitra, Center for the National Interest National Security Fellow, 7-6-22

(Sumantra, 7-6-22, The Federalist, "Biden Doubles Down On Forcing Americans To Fund Europe's Security", https://thefederalist.com/2022/07/06/biden-doubles-down-on-forcing-americans-to-fund-europes-security/, accessed on 7-12-22, SR)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s secretary general confirmed NATO is boosting its forces in Europe to “well over 300,000” from the current 40,000, a [650 percent increase](https://www.forbes.com/sites/brianbushard/2022/06/27/nato-pledges-300000-troops-in-biggest-defense-overhaul-since-cold-war-as-ukraine-war-enters-fourth-month/?sh=6d56ff5a3cb7). NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg claims it’s to respond to the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Setting aside the obvious ridiculousness of NATO boosting a deterrence force, however, at the very same time Russia is failing to conquer even Ukraine and is increasingly bogged down, such euphemisms from NATO are jarring. Everyone understands this means [U.S. taxpayers will carry an additional burden](https://www.ft.com/content/bc3ace5b-95d0-4f76-af58-33554399005a) for European security.

Consider [the details](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/biden-seeks-united-front-nato-summit-deal-add-finland-sweden-rcna35718): President Biden will deploy additional troops to Romaniand air defenses to Germany and Italy, and increase the number of destroyers stationed in Spain from four to six.

The new additions are so bizarrely out of proportion to the threat that it provoked one of the most hawkish Republicans, Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, to question why Biden is reinforcing Europe at the cost of the Pacific: “Russia’s military is in no condition to invade anyone else right now and its China & North Korea who are threatening military aggression,” [Rubio tweeted](https://twitter.com/marcorubio/status/1542215006686773252).

In a time of inflation and with a rapid Chinese military build-up in the Indo-Pacific, Biden is doubling down on providing security for Europe when the United States should be “burden-shifting,” especially with relatively finite naval assets and as rich European economic powerhouses like Germany already free-ride on American taxpayers.

The [question of Germany is crucial](https://nationalinterest.org/feature/what-biden-gets-wrong-about-european-defense-203116) in this regard. As former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Elbridge Colby recently [tweeted](https://twitter.com/ElbridgeColby/status/1541803108354990086), “It’s a commonplace in American discussion that German foreign policy has been ‘naive.’ Well, Germany spends almost nothing on defense and has peacefully become the economic hegemon of Europe. Meantime we’ve had failed Middle East wars and enabled China’s rise. Who’s naive?”

Colby is, of course, correct. The idea that German foreign policy is derived from pacifism and war guilt, not one of the cleverest instances of strategic “[buck passing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buck_passing#In_international_relations),” is perhaps the most debilitating assumption of Anglo-American grand strategies. It’s a misjudgment that [German strategists are more than happy to see continue](https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/02/07/the-gold-medal-for-foreign-policy-goes-to-germany/), because they are smart.

Only nine countries reach the required defense spending within NATO, even after four years of President Trump pushing and an invasion of Ukraine.

When the richest countries in the richest continent can make two other external maritime great powers such as the United Kingdom and the United States, neither part of the mainland, pay for their security, it can be considered a major win—for the continent.

A recent paper titled “[Woke Imperium](https://peacediplomacy.org/2022/06/27/woke-imperium-the-coming-confluence-between-social-justice-and-neoconservatism/)” helps explain this development. In a normal world, a decimated Russian invasion force bogged down in Ukraine would be an opportunity for further retrenchment from Europe, letting the rich Europeans share their own security burden, it observes. Instead, we see a doubling down on rhetoric about the “liberal international order,” promoted by the same NGOcracy that led to wasting trillions in Afghanistan to allegedly ensure girl’s schools and democratic institutions, as the paper notes:

“The rise of a ‘woke’ activist-driven, social justice-oriented politics—particularly among the members of academia, media, and the professional managerial class—has provided the latest ideological justification for interventionism, and it has become readily adopted by the U.S. foreign policy establishment. These groups now have an even greater level of symbiotic relationship with state actors,” the paper states, adding, “the emerging hegemonic posture and its moral imperialism are at odds with a sober and realistic appraisal of U.S. interests on the world stage, as they create untenable, maximalist, and utopian goals that clash with the concrete realities on which U.S. grand strategy must be based.”

The paper goes on to argue that the “liberal Atlanticist tendency” to drive “moralism and social engineering” may well create a backlash around the world, creating “new forms of anti-Westernism.” Put simply, U.S. foreign policy is now completely utopian, disregarding geography and interests and betting trillions on amorphous aims such as ensuring rights in Ukraine and further subsidizing Europe, all to maintain some mythical liberal international order that was never very orderly nor international to begin with.

Whether and how long Americans are willing to accept this bipartisan internationalist edifice, at the cost of declining living standards and rising crime at home, remains to be seen.

### Link – NATO Coop – GOP

#### Plan will trigger GOP backlash – opposition to NATO growing

Blake, Washington Post senior political reporter, 4-6-22

[Aaron, 4-6-22, Washington Post, “Why 30 percent of the House GOP voted against reaffirming NATO support”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/06/house-gop-nato-support/>, accessed 7-3-22, AFB]

A quarter-century ago, the U.S. Senate was faced with a major question: whether to ratify expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, which would bring the alliance closer to Russia’s border. The public generally supported NATO expansion, as did both President Bill Clinton and his 1996 GOP opponent, Bob Dole. Still, one foreign policy expert at the time said the ratification would require a “feat of magic”: Support for NATO expansion was shallow, and senators had hugely varied priorities.

Complicating matters, a Republican-controlled Senate had never joined with a Democratic president to expand NATO. Indeed, that partisan dynamic resulted in the defeat of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.

In the end, though, Republicans provided the bulk of the votes to make it happen. The ratification passed in “strikingly bipartisan” fashion, as The Washington Post recounted at the time. It reached the required two-thirds threshold with plenty of votes to spare; 45 of the 80 “yes” votes came from Republicans.

Times have certainly changed.

On Tuesday, 63 House Republicans voted against a symbolic resolution reaffirming support for NATO and its principles, amid Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. The “no” votes comprised more than 30 percent of the party’s conference.

As with any such symbolic resolution, it’s worth parsing exactly what it contains. Oftentimes, these resolutions are crafted to force the other party into a politically difficult vote by including smaller provisions or loaded language they might object to, then accusing them of opposing the overall (and often popular) thrust of the bill.

But even accounting for those details, this vote marks the latest shift away from what was once a bipartisan, consensus view in Congress — supporting NATO and its importance in keeping Russia in check. And the shift continues apace.

Few Republicans have commented on their reasons for opposing the resolution, but writer Will Saletan previewed the vote Tuesday by noting a number of ways in which the party has drifted in a more Russia-ambivalent and even NATO-skeptical direction. Among the emerging views he isolated: that NATO was at fault for provoking Vladimir Putin, that we should focus instead on our own Southern border, and that the United States has no business defending European allies, whether in NATO or otherwise.

Among the few Republicans to comment on their vote was one of the party’s most anti-NATO voices, Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.). He called NATO “a relic of the Cold War” and asked, “Why should Americans pay for Europe’s defense?”

But while that view exists in some corners of the party, it’s one of the most extreme expressions of the party’s posture toward NATO. Rep. Warren Davidson (R-Ohio), another of the 63 “no” votes, articulated a more nuanced position on Wednesday morning.

Davidson noted that, apart from the bill’s main provision — reaffirming “unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance founded on democratic principles” — the bill contains two other provisions. It calls on President Biden to:

“Adopt a new Strategic Concept for NATO that is clear about its support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO’s capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries.”

“Use the voice and vote of the United States to establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters.”

Of these provisions, Davidson said, “America’s sovereignty is nonnegotiable. I suspect other countries feel the same. … We should be strengthening the alliance, not reimagining it as a tool to interfere in one another’s domestic politics.”

Some have gone so far as to suggest the provisions will provoke Hungary, where recently reelected Prime Minister Viktor Orban has taken the country in an increasingly undemocratic direction. Rep. Andy Harris (R-Md.) made that case Tuesday, also referencing Poland, which has been accused of democratic backsliding in recent years.

But Davidson also made clear he didn’t like even the main provision of the bill. He suggested affirming our “unequivocal support” was tantamount to lending our support unconditionally. That is highly debatable, but it reinforces that today’s NATO debate is not just over the finer details — people are also calling into question just how far our support for NATO and its core principles goes. And it’s not just Massie walking down that road.

But the road is being walked down, and that has continued after a presidency in which Donald Trump called our NATO commitments into question and Republicans, for the most part, kept him in check. During his presidency, Trump reportedly sought to leave the alliance entirely — but back then, Congress repeatedly responded with a united voice.

The Senate in 2018 passed a bill reaffirming support for NATO 97-2 — a pretty direct rebuke to Trump given that he was, at that precise time, traveling to a NATO summit in Brussels (and would later go to Helsinki, the site of his infamous news conference with Putin). Weeks later, a bipartisan group of senators introduced a bill that would have prevented Trump from withdrawing from NATO. By 2019, the House passed a bill dubbed the “NATO Support Act,” which would have prevented using any funds “to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty.” Again, the vote was overwhelmingly bipartisan; just 22 Republicans opposed it — a who’s who of the most extreme members of the party. (The bill was not taken up by the Senate.)

GOP opposition to the latest resolution in support of NATO is significantly higher. And that’s despite the new measure being entirely symbolic and its predecessor having been seen, very logically, as a rebuke to Trump. The 2019 measure had also called for supporting “robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.”

One wonders how those same House Republicans would vote on such a measure today. Regardless, all of it suggests the party is still evolving on this issue — and certainly not in a pro-NATO direction.

#### NATO coop sparks debate – America First Republicans will fight the plan

Parker, MSNBC Senior Political Analyst, 22

[Ashley Parker, 4-29-2022, Washington Post, "Inside the Republican drift away from supporting the NATO alliance,", https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/29/nato-republicans-trump/, Accessed 7-13-2022, LASA-LR]

But this month, when a similar bill in support of NATO during the Russian invasion of Ukraine again faced a vote in the House, the support was far more polarized, with 63 Republicans — 30 percent of the party’s conference — voting against it.

The vote underscores the Republican Party’s remarkable drift away from NATO in recent years, as positions once considered part of a libertarian fringe have become doctrine for a growing portion of the party.

The isolationist posture of some Republicans is in line with the “America First” ethos of Trump, the GOP’s de facto leader, who has long railed against NATO. Last week, speaking at a Heritage Foundation event in Florida, Trump implied that as president he had threatened not to defend NATO allies from Russian attacks as a negotiating tactic to pressure them to contribute more money toward the organization’s shared defense.

The vote also comes against the backdrop of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, which has catapulted NATO to its most prominent role in decades. And it comes as some hawkish Republicans seek to cast themselves as stronger opponents of Russia than Democrats.

#### Plan will trigger debate – vocal Republicans oppose NATO coop

Parker, MSNBC Senior Political Analyst, 22

[Ashley Parker, 4-29-2022, Washington Post, "Inside the Republican drift away from supporting the NATO alliance,", https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/29/nato-republicans-trump/, Accessed 7-13-2022, LASA-LR]

Flash points are already coming into view. In 2020, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg started a working group aimed at strengthening NATO. The group’s final product, “NATO 2030: United for a New Era,” included proposals, such as the creation of a Center for Democratic Resilience, that have been scorned by pro-Trump Republicans, including many of the 63 Republicans who recently voted against the House resolution affirming support for NATO.

The outcome of that vote surprised even Trump’s former ambassador to NATO, Kay Bailey Hutchison, who argued that the U.S. commitment to the alliance has remained ironclad across administrations, despite bellicose rhetoric.

#### The plan causes backlash from GOP and a greater rift in bipartisan

Parker, MSNBC Senior Political Analyst, 22

[Ashley Parker, 4-29-2022, Washington Post, "Inside the Republican drift away from supporting the NATO alliance,", https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/29/nato-republicans-trump/, Accessed 7-13-2022, LASA-LR]

Some two dozen House GOP lawmakers who voted for the 2019 NATO Support Act voted against the similar resolution this month, which reaffirmed support for the alliance and its principles. But in interviews, several of those House Republicans said they still support the organization and simply objected to what they viewed as problematic provisions that Democrats had added to the bill for perceived political purposes.

Several who switched their votes since 2019 objected to measures they said did not specifically address strengthening NATO to help Ukraine. Rep. Barry Loudermilk (R-Ga.) found it particularly problematic that the resolution instructed NATO to be involved when a country has “internal threats from proponents on illiberalism,” which he says could be interpreted as conservatism.

“I am a huge supporter of NATO — I served in the Air Force during the Cold War, worked with NATO during that time period,” he said. “These issues should be left to those individual nations.”

Loudermilk argued that Democrats had inserted “poison pills” into the symbolic resolution, which could be used against Republicans in the 2022 midterms. “It was the Democrats trying to politicize something and add things in there that we have no business working on,” he said, explaining his vote against the bill.

But Aderholt said he worried that the resolution “had some language in that I thought went on the political side. And I don’t want to see NATO go political. I want to see NATO stand up for, you know, what’s going on in Ukraine — stand up for Ukraine against Russia.”

### Link – Alliance Cooperation

#### Plan will cost political capital – spending resources on alliances saps political strength

Kupchan, Georgetown International Relations professor, 21

[Charles A., 3-2-21, Foreign Affairs, “Colossus Constrained”,  <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-03-02/colossus-constrained>, accessed 6-2-22, AFB]

The most formidable constraint on Biden’s foreign policy is domestic politics. Trump may have been a hapless statesman, but he correctly sensed that a sizable portion of the U.S. electorate had grown weary of seemingly unlimited foreign entanglements. Many Americans believe that Washington devotes too many resources to solving the problems of other nations and not enough to solving its own. It has pursued too many wars, too much free trade and immigration, and too many costly alliances and international pacts that, in Trump’s words, “tie us up and bring America down.” Biden needs to remain mindful of the nation’s inward turn if he is to maintain his political strength, keep hold of Congress in the 2022 midterms, and sustain the domestic investments needed to tame the discontent that led to Trump’s rise.

Biden seems to realize as much, asserting in a February 4 speech that “there’s no longer a bright line between foreign and domestic policy. Every action we take in our conduct abroad, we must take with American working families in mind. Advancing a foreign policy for the middle class demands urgent focus on our domestic economic renewal.” Still, there will be tough choices in the months ahead.

Although most Americans welcome the return of a president who stands up for human rights and democratic allies, public support for an ambitious and expensive foreign policy will be much harder to come by. A recent survey showed that around three-quarters of the U.S. electorate favor a withdrawal from Afghanistan and Iraq, and roughly half want the country to be less engaged militarily around the world. Another poll revealed that a majority of Americans believe the two main threats to the nation come from within: the pandemic and domestic violent extremism. Among Democrats, the top five perceived dangers for the United States are the pandemic, climate change, racial inequality, foreign interference in U.S. elections, and economic inequity at home. Younger Americans, a key demographic for Biden, care much more about climate change and human rights than they do about traditional security issues. Geopolitical threats no longer occupy the American mind as they once did.

### Link – NATO – Russian Disinfo

#### Support for NATO is costly – and Russian disinfo magnifies divisiveness

Cole, Newsweek Senior Reporter, 7-2-22

(Brendan Cole, Senior Reporter, Newsweek, 7-2-22, "Putin to exploit U.S. economic pain to bring Biden midterms misery—experts," https://www.newsweek.com/russia-united-states-putin-midterm-elections-interference-1719935, accessed 7-9-22) SS:/

The intelligence community has already raised concerns that Vladimir Putin will draw on the playbook of cyber attacks and propaganda which evidence shows impacted the 2016 and 2020 U.S. elections.

But costly U.S. support for Ukraine as Americans battle soaring inflation, which Biden blames on Putin, as well as a possible recession, could give the Kremlin ample opportunity to exploit division as voters go to the polls in November.

"Anything Putin can do to sow doubt in Americans' minds about the moral necessity, economic cost and practical impact of our support for Ukraine's sovereignty, he surely will attempt," Stephen Hanson, vice provost for academic and international affairs at Virginia's College of William & Mary told Newsweek.

The concerns come as former U.S. intelligence officials have warned that Putin will try to get Americans to question their support for Ukraine and promote politicians who can reverse sanctions.

Homeland and national security officials told CNN that Russia might be considering staging hacks of local election authorities, with the deliberate purpose of being noticed. They could then use that to promote more conspiracies about the integrity of American elections, which could be amplified on Facebook and Twitter.

A declassified report by the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Office of Intelligence and Analysis warned that Russia would likely depress voting and undermine the midterms in revenge for the U.S.-led response to the invasion of Ukraine.

The DHS report, which also described threats coming from China and Iran, said that Moscow would view this as an "equitable response" to U.S. actions over Ukraine.

These include tough sanctions on Russia as well as Washington providing $1.4 billion in a security aid package to Kyiv that included High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems, or HIMARS.

But with inflation in the U.S. at 11 percent and Biden repeatedly connecting Putin's name with the economic turmoil they are feeling right now, Americans might balk in the coming months at their support for Ukraine, which the Kremlin could tap into.

"They can exploit a number of existing realities. One of those realities is the economic toll that the war is taking on the United States, especially as we see in inflation and gas prices. That creates an enormous political vulnerability, a political opportunity," said Ken Osgood, humanities professor at Colorado School of Mines.

"People will start asking 'is this war really worth all the economic pain or suffering?' and Russia will almost certainly exacerbate those concerns," he told Newsweek.

"It has a tremendous power of amplifying messages," he said, "It can take the voices that are already out there and add more, make them louder, through Twitter feeds and bots and things of that nature."

Osgood said Moscow does not need to push a linear argument that the war is directly causing inflation but instead exploit how people "see the connections between parallel arguments." He said conservative outlets like Fox News might pin inflation on Biden, noting the war in Ukraine, while hosts like Tucker Carlson might "put out the message, raising doubts about our framing of Russia, and 'is Putin really all that bad?'"

"Russia doesn't necessarily need to connect the dots. It just needs to put those fears out there. And then other people connect the dots and then those voices get amplified," Osgood said.

Polling in June on the Russia-Ukraine crisis tracker showed a dip in support for U.S. financial help for Ukraine. Less than a half (46 percent) of U.S. voters say their government should impose sanctions on Russian oil, even if it causes prices to rise, down 9 percentage points since April.

Andrea Molle, assistant political science professor, at Chapman University, California said that Russia and other hostile foreign interests "would try and frame the financial and military efforts in support of Ukraine as a waste of resources that should be used domestically instead."

"The focus will be on increasing polarization and criticism towards President Biden and the democratic majority," he told Newsweek.

"The U.S. is traditionally a country with a very short attention span for all things international, coupled with what I call 'conspiracy theory epidemics.' Linking the narrative of the alleged inability to face the current economic crisis to the efforts and involvement in Ukraine would catch two birds with one stone."

"On the one hand, it will hinder the current administration's chances of maintaining control of Congress. On the other hand, it will force the president, and his majority, to reconsider the U.S. involvement in the war, potentially jeopardizing Ukraine's chances of effectively resisting the invasion. All this, in the long term, could also weaken NATO."

The Kremlin's actions leading up to the midterms would be the latest chapter in its attempts to sow discord in U.S. politics.

Influence operations linked to the Russian government Internet Research Agency (IRA), which was at the center of U.S. election meddling claims, exploited vaccination debates even before the COVID pandemic.

### AT – NATO Popular

#### Budget constraints limit how much support there is for NATO

Bergmann, Center for Strategic and International Strategies European Director, 21

[Max Bergmann, 1-13-21, Center for American Progress, "NATO’s Financing Gap,", https://www.americanprogress.org/article/natos-financing-gap/, Accessed 7-10-2022, LASA-LR]

The European Deterrence Initiative provided tens of billions of dollars to bolster NATO’s capacity to deter Russia. It invested in modernizing and expanding military facilities, provided training assistance to forces, and funded the development of military capabilities.19 This American effort has been significant in bolstering NATO’s overall strength. Once again, it was an example of the United States stepping in financially to fill a gap in the alliance.

Yet this investment initiative was also limited. U.S. funding has recently focused on encouraging the modernization of Eastern European militaries, but this U.S.-dependent effort is limited in scope, particularly given current budgetary constraints. For instance, although the U.S. State Department will likely continue to provide some funds to strengthen the security and resilience of Eastern NATO members, this is not enough to finance the large acquisitions needed to modernize their forces.20

### AT – NATO/Democracy Popular

#### Plan will spark GOP backlash – even over NATO’s core values

Blake, Washington Post The Fix Senior Political Reporter, 22

(Aaron, 4-6-22, The Washington Post, "Why 30 percent of the House GOP voted against reaffirming NATO support", https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/06/house-gop-nato-support/, accessed on 7-12-22, SR)

A quarter-century ago, the U.S. Senate was faced with a major question: whether to ratify expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, which would bring the alliance closer to Russia’s border. The public generally supported NATO expansion, as did both President Bill Clinton and his 1996 GOP opponent, Bob Dole. Still, one foreign policy expert at the time said the ratification would require a “feat of magic”: Support for NATO expansion was shallow, and senators had hugely varied priorities.

Complicating matters, a Republican-controlled Senate had never joined with a Democratic president to expand NATO. Indeed, that partisan dynamic resulted in the defeat of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.

In the end, though, Republicans provided the bulk of the votes to make it happen. The ratification passed in “strikingly bipartisan” fashion, as The Washington Post recounted at the time. It reached the required two-thirds threshold with plenty of votes to spare; 45 of the 80 “yes” votes came from Republicans.

**Times have certainly changed.**

On Tuesday, 63 House Republicans voted against a symbolic resolution reaffirming support for NATO and its principles, amid Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. The “no” votes comprised more than 30 percent of the party’s conference.

As with any such symbolic resolution, it’s worth parsing exactly what it contains. Oftentimes, these resolutions are crafted to force the other party into a politically difficult vote by including smaller provisions or loaded language they might object to, then accusing them of opposing the overall (and often popular) thrust of the bill.

But even accounting for those details, this vote marks the latest shift away from what was once a bipartisan, consensus view in Congress — supporting NATO and its importance in keeping Russia in check**. And the shift continues apace.**

Few Republicans have commented on their reasons for opposing the resolution, but writer Will Saletan previewed the vote Tuesday by noting a number of ways in which the party has drifted in a more Russia-ambivalent and even NATO-skeptical direction. Among the emerging views he isolated: **that NATO was at fault for provoking Vladimir Putin, that we should focus instead on our own Southern border, and that the United States has no business defending European allies, whether in NATO or otherwise.**

Among the few Republicans to comment on their vote was one of the party’s most anti-NATO voices, Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.). He called NATO “a relic of the Cold War” and asked, “**Why should Americans pay for Europe’s defense?”**

But while that view exists in some corners of the party, it’s one of the most extreme expressions of the party’s posture toward NATO. Rep. Warren Davidson (R-Ohio), another of the 63 “no” votes, articulated a more nuanced position on Wednesday morning.

Davidson noted that, apart from the bill’s main provision — reaffirming “unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance founded on democratic principles” — the bill contains two other provisions. It calls on President Biden to:

to:

1. “Adopt a new Strategic Concept for NATO that is clear about its support for shared democratic values and committed to enhancing NATO’s capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries.”
2. “Use the voice and vote of the United States to establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within NATO headquarters.”

Of these provisions, Davidson said, “America’s sovereignty is nonnegotiable. I suspect other countries feel the same. … We should be strengthening the alliance, not reimagining it as a tool to interfere in one another’s domestic politics.”

Some have gone so far as to suggest the provisions will provoke Hungary, where recently reelected Prime Minister Viktor Orban has taken the country in an increasingly undemocratic direction. Rep. Andy Harris (R-Md.) made that case Tuesday, also referencing Poland, which has been accused of democratic backsliding in recent years.

But Davidson also made clear he didn’t like even the main provision of the bill. He suggested affirming our “unequivocal support” was tantamount to lending our support unconditionally. That is highly debatable, but it reinforces that today’s NATO debate is not just over the finer details — people are also calling into question just how far our support for NATO and its core principles goes. And it’s not just Massie walking down that road.

But the road is being walked down, and that has continued after a presidency in which Donald Trump called our NATO commitments into question and Republicans, for the most part, kept him in check. During his presidency, Trump reportedly sought to leave the alliance entirely — but back then, Congress repeatedly responded with a united voice.

The Senate in 2018 passed a bill reaffirming support for NATO 97-2 — a pretty direct rebuke to Trump given that he was, at that precise time, traveling to a NATO summit in Brussels (and would later go to Helsinki, the site of his infamous news conference with Putin). Weeks later, a bipartisan group of senators introduced a bill that would have prevented Trump from withdrawing from NATO. By 2019, the House passed a bill dubbed the “NATO Support Act,” which would have prevented using any funds “to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty.” Again, the vote was overwhelmingly bipartisan; just 22 Republicans opposed it — a who’s who of the most extreme members of the party. (The bill was not taken up by the Senate.)

GOP opposition to the latest resolution in support of NATO is significantly higher. And that’s despite the new measure being entirely symbolic and its predecessor having been seen, very logically, as a rebuke to Trump. The 2019 measure had also called for supporting “robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.”

One wonders how those same House Republicans would vote on such a measure today. Regardless, **all of it suggests the party is still evolving on this issue — and certainly not in a pro-NATO direction.**

### AT – Ukraine Spin

#### No link turn – unending war in Ukraine is exhausting American military resources and support

**Baker, The New York Times White House Chief Correspondent, and Sanger, The New York Times White House National Security Correspondent, 7-9-22**

(Peter and David E., 7-9-22, The New York Times, "How the U.S. and Its Allies Continue to Shape the War in Ukraine", https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/09/us/politics/ukraine-strategy-biden.html, accessed on 7-13-22, SR)

WASHINGTON — Another day, another weapons shipment: On Friday, the Pentagon announced a new transfer of precision-guided shells and multiple rocket launchers to Ukraine, the latest armaments heading east. **But will there come a day when that system begins to slow?**

More than four months after Russia invaded Ukraine, a war that was expected to be a Russian blitzkrieg only to turn into a debacle for Moscow has now evolved into a battle of inches with no end in sight, a geopolitical stamina contest in which President Vladimir V. Putin is gambling that he can outlast a fickle, impatient West.

President Biden has vowed to stand with Ukraine for “as long as it takes,” but neither he nor anyone else can say how long that will be or how much more the United States and its allies can do over that distance, short of direct military intervention. At some point, officials acknowledge, U.S. and European stocks of weapons will run low; while the United States has authorized $54 billion in military and other assistance, no one expects another $54 billion check when that runs out.

So Mr. Biden and his team are searching for a long-term strategy at a time when the White House sees the dangers of escalation increasing, the prospect for a negotiated settlement still far-off and public weariness beginning to set in at home and abroad.

“I worry about the fatigue factor of the public in a wide range of countries because of the economic costs and because there are other pressing concerns,” said Senator Chris Coons, Democrat of Delaware and a close ally of Mr. Biden’s who attended the NATO summit meeting in Madrid last week.

“I think we need to be determined and continue to support Ukraine,” said Mr. Coons, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. “Exactly how long this will go, exactly what the trajectory will be, we don’t know right now. But we know if we don’t continue to support Ukraine, the outcome for the U.S. will be much worse.”

While the fighting lately has focused mainly on a crescent in eastern and southern Ukraine, the White House worries it could easily spiral out of control. A recent missile strike on a shopping center in central Ukraine suggested that Moscow was running low on precision weaponry and increasingly turning to less sophisticated armaments that could hit unintended targets — potentially even across the border, in NATO allies like Poland or Romania. And American officials worry that Mr. Putin may resort to tactical nuclear weapons to break out of the box he faces on the battlefield.

Indeed, the Biden administration has concluded that the Russian leader still wants to widen the war and try again to seize Kyiv, the Ukrainian capital. “We think he has effectively the same political goals that we had previously, which is to say that he wants to take most of Ukraine,” Avril D. Haines, the director of national intelligence, said at a conference last week.

Mr. Putin almost seemed to confirm that on Thursday, when he warned that he had more expansive options available. “Everybody should know that, largely speaking, we haven’t even yet started anything in earnest,” he told parliamentary leaders in Moscow.

**“We are hearing that they want to defeat us on the battlefield,” Mr. Putin added. “Let them try.”**

U.S. officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss strategy deliberations, are urging the Ukrainians to consolidate their forces at the front. But Ukraine’s leaders want to go further and mass enough personnel to mount a counteroffensive to retake territory, a goal that American officials support in theory even if they are dubious about the Ukrainians’ capacity to dislodge the Russians. President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine told Group of 7 leaders last week that he wanted the war over by the end of the year. **But there are serious doubts in Washington about whether that is possible militarily.**

Better Understand the Russia-Ukraine War

The Biden administration does not want to be seen pressuring Mr. Zelensky to negotiate a deal with the Kremlin at the risk of rewarding armed aggression, **but officials and analysts said it would be hard to sustain the same level of material support as war fatigue grows on both sides of the Atlantic.** Military aid passed by Congress is expected to last into the second quarter of next year, by some estimates, but the question is how long current supplies of weapons and ammunition can last without degrading the military readiness of the United States.

American officials have encouraged other countries to provide leftover stores of Soviet-made weaponry that Ukrainians are more familiar with — an item on Mr. Biden’s agenda for a trip to the Middle East next week, when he is scheduled to meet with leaders of Arab states that were once clients of Moscow.

“There is a lot of running room, but clearly there is this sense that the next six months are really critical,” said Ivo H. Daalder, the president of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs and a former U.S. ambassador to NATO. **“In the next six months, we’re going to find out one or both sides are too exhausted**, and they’re going to look for a way out.”

#### GOP support for Ukraine is fracturing – ensuring debate about the plan

**Martin and Schmidt,**NPR All Things Considered Host, MSNBC and NBC News political analyst, , 22

(Michel and Steve, 2-19-2022, National Public Radio, All Things Considered, "Why Republicans are divided on support for Ukraine", https://www.npr.org/2022/02/19/1081987370/why-republicans-are-divided-on-support-for-ukraine, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

NPR's Michel Martin discusses why the Republican Party has had a warmer posture towards Russia in recent years with former Republican strategist Steve Schmidt.

MICHEL MARTIN, HOST:

If you're a student of history and if you keep up with international affairs now, here's something that you might have found particularly jarring in recent weeks and months - an array of conservative pundits and lawmakers downplaying, even dismissing Russia's pressure campaign against Ukraine.

JOSH HAWLEY: And right now, we've got to put American security interests first. And that means we've got to focus on China, and we've got to focus on our own borders. We need to ask our European allies to do more.

MARTIN: That was U.S. Senator Josh Hawley speaking with Fox News host Tucker Carlson. One of the ideas once unifying the Republican Party was opposition to Russia's communist influence around the world. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, there was hope for a new era of international cooperation or at least detente. But now with the threat of a Russian invasion of Ukraine, Republicans aren't just divided. Some are actively working against support for the only nation-state with a functional democracy. So how did that happen?

We called Steve Schmidt to get his take on this. He is a former Republican strategist. He worked on President George W. Bush's reelection campaign, Arnold Schwarzenegger's campaign for governor of California and the late Senator John McCain's 2008 presidential run. He left the Republican Party after the election of Donald Trump and co-founded a group formed to oppose him. And he's with us now. Steve Schmidt, welcome. Thanks so much for joining us.

STEVE SCHMIDT: It's a real pleasure to be with you.

MARTIN: So until you left the Republican Party, you spent pretty much your adult life in Republican politics and policy. So how important was anti-communism as a core value of the GOP at that time?

SCHMIDT: Well, it wasn't just a core value of the Republican Party. It was a core value of national politics, manifested, you know, by the presidencies of Truman, Eisenhower, John Kennedy, who was a giant foe of communism. And the Cold War ended essentially on Ronald Reagan and George Bush 41's watches. And this U.S.-led, rules-based world that the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights exists in, free trade, the idea that borders are not breakable or movable by a greater power invading - and what the Russians are asserting regarding Ukraine, which is a giant country with 40 million people, is that we can invade and shatter an international boundary and border because we are the stronger nation. And that's the hour the world stands upon.

MARTIN: I think people will remember, you know, even now, even people who didn't live through that era, that sort of - that's kind of one of those iconic Ronald Reagan moments of President Reagan famously telling the then-Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall. I mean, to this day, if you don't know any other moment from the Reagan presidency, then you probably know that one. So how did it get to some members downplaying Russian actions and actually criticizing efforts to defend and support Ukraine? How did that happen?

SCHMIDT: It means something when Tucker Carlson goes to Hungary and fetishizes Viktor Orban. It means something when the largest grassroots organization in the Republican Party says that we will hold our conference in Hungary, a country teeming with anti-Semitism with an autocratic-ish leader who's taken control mostly of the nation's media. And you look at Turkey, where 35,000 people have been locked up in recent years for insulting the president, right? This is the vision that they like, right? This is the autocratic fetish - right? - that they have. This new fascism is ascendant in countries all over the world to subvert as much as they can this idea of the U.S.-led liberal global order, which has worked pretty well, in my estimation, for the last 75 years.

MARTIN: What is the vision of someone like one of the - you mentioned Tucker Carlson. He's a major voice in conservative media at Fox News. As you mentioned over the last couple of months, he's repeatedly questioned U.S. support for Ukraine, attacked Republicans who disagree with him, even making a visit to sort of Hungary. But, like, what's his vision? What's the idea here? What's the endgame here?

SCHMIDT: If you made me guess, I would say he wants power and money. But I think it's important to historically understand - Colonel Robert McCormick, who ran The Chicago Tribune, I think, they published the codes or the fact that the United States had broken the Japanese codes, and that was why we had been successful in Midway. And he did it because he hated Roosevelt. This was one of the most important secrets of the war. We have always had no shortage of people in this country that are susceptible to this type of stuff. And so we're seeing right now a political philosophy forming.

It means a great deal when you have a Republican National Committee, one of only two major political parties in the country, embrace the chaos and murderous insurrection and the violence, the defecation in the hallways of the Capitol, the urinating on the walls as legitimate political discourse, right? So all of this - right? - is part of a movement in this country, an ongoing event, a worsening situation, a growing hostility to the basic covenant between us around how we apportion and share power lawfully, not in a world where it's just taken by the strong, who could do whatever they want to the weak. That's what's on the table here, both internationally and domestically.

MARTIN: So before we let you go, do you think that not just the Biden administration but those remaining within the Republican Party who see the world as you do, who see the sort of post-Cold War world order in jeopardy here - are they doing enough to make that case to the American people, who, for whatever reason, whether it's the skeptics in Congress, whether it's their, you know, Fox News, whatever - do you think they're doing enough to sort of make the case to the American people?

SCHMIDT: My personal view is that the answer to that question is no. That being said, I think that President Biden, who has come out now twice to brief the nation about these momentous events, has been superb in explaining and explicating what's happening. And at a personal level, I would, you know, hope to see him do more of that, to walk out behind the presidential podium every day and, I would hope also, at every opportunity, address the Russian people. That - here in the United States, we have millions of Russians, tens of millions who've built lives in this land. The Russian people are our friends. We don't wish suffering for Russian mothers and the death of their children in a war caused by Vladimir Putin. I hope the president will explain that to the Russian people and remember that he speaks to the entire world every time he appears from behind the presidential podium. And so we are at the edge of a momentous event that is entirely within the control of Vladimir Putin to trigger into a momentous tragedy or to de-escalate it. And we will see what happens in these next days as Russian forces continue to congregate and surround Ukraine ready for offensive military action. They are in an offensive posture. Make no mistake about that. And I think the world hangs on the edge of witnessing the first major war of the 21st century.

MARTIN: Well, those are sobering words. That's Steve Schmidt. He's a former Republican strategist who worked for President George W. Bush, the late Senator John McCain. And he's the co-founder of the Lincoln Project, which was formed to oppose former President Donald Trump and his influence on the Republican Party. Steve Schmidt, thanks so much for talking with us.

#### Plan can’t help Biden – he doesn’t get credit – only blame – on Ukraine policy

Rose, NPR National Desk Correspondent, 22

[Joel Rose, 3-24-2022, NPR, "Most Americans don't like Biden's Ukraine response and worry about inflation ,", https://www.npr.org/2022/03/24/1088568802/russia-ukraine-biden-approval-rating-poll-numbers-inflation, Accessed 7-11-2022, LASA-LR]

More than 6 in 10 Americans want the U.S. to give Ukraine some of the support it wants, while still trying to avoid a larger military conflict with Russia. Fewer than 2 in 10 say the U.S. should give Ukraine everything it wants, even if it risks a wider war.

Those responses were remarkably consistent across the political spectrum with strong majorities of Republicans, Democrats and independents all in agreement. But when Americans are asked to assess President Biden's performance, that bipartisan consensus breaks down.

"What he's doing is fundamentally what the American people want," Jackson said. "But even if Biden is doing everything that people want to do, he's not going to get a lot of credit for it."

Disapproval is highest among Republicans

Overall, only 36% of Americans say Biden is doing a good job in response to the war in Ukraine, while 52% say he's not. That disapproval is driven largely by the GOP: 81% of Republicans rated Biden's response as fair or poor. On the other hand, 62% of Democrats described the president's response as good or excellent.

And 45% of respondents say President Biden has been too cautious in supporting Ukraine. Only 7% think the U.S. should be doing less in Ukraine, compared with 39% who think it should be doing more.

**Domestic issues outweigh foreign policy in the eyes of the public – won’t stick as a win**

**Stokols** veteran reporter of Politico and the Wall Street Journal **and Subramanian** graduate of Miami University of Ohio and Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism**, 22**

(Eli and Courtney, 6-13-22, Los Angeles Times, "Biden foreign policy prioritizes alliances, with little success", https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-13/la-pol-biden-alliances-analysis accessed on 7-13-22, hooch//cs)

The G-7 and NATO summits, which will take place this month in Germany and Spain, respectively, will focus largely on the war in eastern Ukraine and ensuring that the alliance holds together. The NATO summit, in particular, is likely to be historic, with Finland and Sweden, after decades of strategic neutrality, likely to join the defense pact. That move is a reflection of how Putin’s invasion of Ukraine has changed security considerations across Europe and strengthened the alliance he sought to test.

Despite the transatlantic unity, Russia’s war continues to ravage eastern Ukraine, and its outcome remains uncertain. The Western triumphalism of the conflict’s early months may be fading as the U.S. and its allies grapple with the war’s effects on inflation, food and energy supplies and leaders’ poll numbers. Americans, riveted early on by live coverage of the conflict, are paying less attention, focusing more on high gas prices, a shortage of baby formula and mass shootings — issues that, with the midterm elections fast approaching, Biden and Democrats will be highlighting as well.

“Despite knowing how much is at stake, we may lose focus because of all the domestic challenges,” said Constanze Stelzenmüller, an expert on European security issues at the Brookings Institution. “We have limits and constraints on power and on the costs we are willing to inflict on our own citizens, and Putin does not. We have a democratic handicap that Putin is completely free from.”

In short, the president’s primary foreign policy accomplishment may not hold.

### Link – Tech Backlash

**Technology policy sparks vocal backlash – ensures it will be divisive**

**Atkinson, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation president, 14**

[Robert Atkinson, a Canadian-American economist, 3-26-14, InformationWeek, "Tech Fear-Mongering Must Stop", <https://www.informationweek.com/executive-insights-and-innovation/tech-fear-mongering-must-stop>, accessed on 7-9-22, MG]

Since the first Industrial Revolution, technological change has brought disruption and progress, with the disrupted often rejecting that change. Most famously, in the early 1800s a group of Englishmen called Luddites destroyed textile machines that were replacing hand-operated looms. But if progress has sometimes been a dubious, if not rejected, value in nations, America was always different. Founded by risk-takers and optimists, Americans have long thought that newer is better and that you can't stand in the way of progress. Other nations, constrained by the shackles of the past and the resisters of the present, have viewed that American spirit as simply extraordinary. Even Joseph Stalin proclaimed: "American efficiency is that indomitable spirit which neither knows nor will be deterred by any obstacle... that simply must go through with a job once it has been tackled." Today, however, increasingly vocal neo-Luddites in this country argue that progress is a force to be stopped, not encouraged. They want a world in which a worker never loses a job, even when the new technology behind it leads to higher employment; a world in which consumer rights trump all other considerations, even lower prices; a world in which no personal information is shared, even if sharing benefits individuals and companies alike. In short, they want to slow advancement at all costs, even when those costs ultimately hurt the public they're trying to protect.

We can forgive the average American for believing this narrative, given the many influential advocacy groups, media outlets, and academics that promote this view of the world. "60 Minutes" and the Associated Press have featured stories on the perils of automation, and prominent academics, including MIT's Andrew McAfee and Eric Brynjolfsson, are telling us that machines kill jobs, despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Numerous media outlets have also taken up the false argument that genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are dangerous and should be curbed or banned. One example is the "balanced" PBS documentary "Seeds of Death." And almost all coverage of new information technology comes with the obligatory "this is the end of privacy as we know it" warning.

What has changed? At least three things:

First, we're seeing the spread of foundation-funded advocacy groups -- the likes of the Sierra Club, Free Press, and the ridiculously misnamed Center for Food Safety -- whose mission is to challenge technological progress on behalf of those purportedly hurt by it. These groups rely on fear-mongering to retain their foundation funding and drum up their grassroots donations. Even technologies as straightforward and benign as smart electric meters now mobilize neo-Luddite opposition from groups such as the cleverly named stopsmartmeters.org, in the name of protecting consumers' privacy.

Second, academics realize that the key to making a name for themselves is to write the "dog bites man" article or book that tells us why Google is making us stupid, why we are losing the war against machines, how we are now a "captive audience" to broadband providers, and why we need to fear what the Internet is doing to our brains.

I risk sounding old-fashioned, but when I received my PhD in the 1980s, academics were expected to leave bias and advocacy to the amateurs. Their job was to strive for objectivity. But objectivity no longer sells or gets you that coveted TED Talk.

Third, the media face the same market pressures as civil society groups and academics. They maximize the number of eyeballs on their content when they portray technology as fearsome and imposed by powerful, impersonal governments and corporations.

As the neo-Luddites drown out the voices of progress, the ability of true progressives (i.e., those individuals and organizations advancing progress) to drive development is diminished. It is unlikely, for example, that America will ever again lead the world in funding science and technology. We now rank 24th out of 39 nations in government-funded university research, behind the likes of South Korea, France, and Estonia. It is also unlikely that we will be able to enact sophisticated national innovation policies, such as those created by Denmark and Germany. There's too much mistrust of government in the US for that. Where we could still trump other nations is in our unalloyed embrace of progress, but we're at risk of losing our American exceptionalism as we become cautious and fearful. Ned Ludd would be proud.

### Link – Tech Lobby Backlash

#### Plan will drain capital – Big Tech vigorously challenges regulation

Kang, New York Times technology regulation reporter, 22

[Cecilia Kang, 4-22-22, The New York Times, "As Europe Approves New Tech Laws, the U.S. Falls Further Behind", <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/22/technology/tech-regulation-europe-us.html>, accessed on 7-11-22, MG]

In just the last few years, Europe has seen a sweeping law for online privacy take effect, approved far-reaching regulations to curb the dominance of the tech giants and on Saturday reached a deal on new legislation to protect its citizens from harmful online content.

For those keeping score, that’s Europe: three. United States: zero.

The United States may be the birthplace of the iPhone and the most widely used search engine and social network, and it could also bring the world into the so-called metaverse. But global leadership on tech regulations is taking place more than 3,000 miles from Washington, by European leaders representing 27 nations with 24 languages, who have nonetheless been able to agree on basic online protections for their 450 million or so citizens.

In the United States, Congress has not passed a single piece of comprehensive regulation to protect internet consumers and to rein in the power of its technology giants.

It’s not for lack of trying. Over 25 years, dozens of federal privacy bills have been proposed and then ultimately dropped without bipartisan support. With every major hack of a bank or retailer, lawmakers have introduced data breach and security bills, all of which have withered on the vine. A flurry of speech bills have sunk into the quicksand of partisan disagreements over freedoms of expression. And antitrust bills to curtail the power of Apple, Amazon, Google and Meta, the owner of Facebook and Instagram, have sat in limbo amid fierce lobbying opposition.

Only two narrow federal tech laws have been enacted — one for children’s privacy and the other for ridding sites of sex-trafficking content — in the past 25 years.

“Inertia is too kind of a word to describe what’s happened in the United States; there’s been a lack of will, courage and understanding of the problem and technologies,” said Jeffrey Chester, the executive director of the Center for Digital Democracy, a public interest group. “And consumers are left with no protections here and lots of confusion.”

The prospects that any legislation will pass imminently are dim, though regulations at some point are almost inevitable because of the way tech touches so many aspects of life. Of all the proposals currently in front of Congress, an antitrust bill that would bar Apple, Alphabet and Amazon from boosting their own products on their marketplaces and app stores over those of their rivals has the best shot.

A co-author of the bill, Senator Amy Klobuchar, Democrat of Minnesota, said Democratic leaders had promised it would go to a vote by this summer. But even that bill, with bipartisan support, faces an uphill climb amid so many other priorities in Congress and a fierce tech lobbying effort to defeat it.

If history is a guide, the path toward U.S. tech regulation will be long. It took decades of public anger to regulate the railroads through the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887. It took nearly 50 years from the first medical reports on the dangers of cigarettes to the regulation of tobacco.

There’s no single reason for the sludge of progress in Congress. Proposals have been caught in the age-old partisan divide over how to protect consumers while also encouraging the growth of business. Then there are the hundreds of tech lobbyists who block legislation that could dampen their profits. Lawmakers have also at times failed to grasp the technologies they are trying to regulate, turning their public foibles over tech into internet memes.

Tech companies have taken advantage of that knowledge blind spot, said Tom Wheeler, a former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

“It’s what I call the ‘big con,’ where the tech companies spin a story that they are doing magic and that if Washington touches their companies with regulations they’ll be responsible for breaking that magic,” he said.

In the vacuum of federal regulations, states have created a patchwork of tech rules instead. California, Virginia, Utah and Colorado have adopted their own privacy laws. Florida and Texas have passed social media laws aimed at punishing internet platforms for censoring conservative views.

Amazon, Alphabet, Apple, Meta and Microsoft said they supported federal regulations. But when pressed, some of them have fought for the most permissive versions of the laws that have been under consideration. Meta, for instance, has pushed for weaker federal privacy legislation that would override stronger laws in the states.

Tech’s lobbying power is now on full display in Washington with the threat of the antitrust bill from Ms. Klobuchar and Senator Charles E. Grassley, a Republican of Iowa. The proposal passed its first hurdle of votes in January, much to the tech industry’s surprise.

In response, many of the tech companies mobilized an extensive lobbying and marketing campaign to defeat the bill. Through a trade group, Amazon claimed in television and newspaper ads that the bill would effectively end its Prime membership program. Kent Walker, Google’s chief legal officer, wrote in a blog post that the legislation would “break” popular products and prevent the company from displaying Google maps in search results.

Ms. Klobuchar said the companies’ claims were hyperbole. She warned that by fighting the proposal, tech companies might be choosing the worse of two difficult options.

“They are letting Europe set the agenda on internet regulation,” Ms. Klobuchar said. “At least we listened to everyone’s concerns and modified our bill.”

The inaction may appear surprising given that Republicans and Democrats are ostensibly in lock step over how tech companies have morphed into global powerhouses.

“Consumers need confidence that their data is being protected, and businesses need to know they can keep innovating while complying with a strong, workable national privacy standard,” said Senator Roger Wicker, Republican of Mississippi. “The U.S. cannot afford to cede leadership on this issue.”

Lawmakers have also forced many tech chief executives — including Jeff Bezos of Amazon, Tim Cook of Apple, Sundar Pichai of Google and Mark Zuckerberg of Meta — to testify multiple times before Congress in recent years. In some of those televised hearings, lawmakers of both parties have told the executives that their companies — with a combined $6.4 trillion in market value — aren’t above government or public accountability.

“Some of these companies are countries, not companies,” Senator John Kennedy, Republican of Louisiana, said in a January antitrust hearing, adding that they are “killing fields for the truth.”

But so far, the talk has not translated into new laws. The path to privacy regulations provides the clearest case study on that record of inaction.

Since 1995, Senator Edward J. Markey, Democrat of Massachusetts, has introduced a dozen privacy bills for internet service providers, drones and third-party data brokers. In 2018, the year Europe’s General Data Protection Regulation took effect, he proposed a bill to require a consumer’s permission to share or sell data.

Mr. Markey also tried twice to update and strengthen privacy legislation for youths following his 1998 law, the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act.

With every effort, industry lobbying groups have denounced the bills as harmful to innovation. Many Republican lawmakers have opposed the proposals, saying they don’t balance the needs of businesses.

“Big Tech sees data as dollar signs, so for decades they’ve bankrolled industry lobbyists to help them evade accountability,” Mr. Markey said. “We’ve reached a breaking point.”

#### Big Tech has the power to fight the plan

Chung, Public Citizen's Big Tech Accountability Advocate, 21

(Jane, 3-24-21, Public Citizen, "Big Tech, Big Cash: Washington’s New Power Players," https://www.citizen.org/article/big-tech-lobbying-update/, accessed 7-13-22) jiu

In recent years, Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google have all come under increased scrutiny for threatening our privacy, democracy, small businesses, and workers.

In the race to amass monopoly power in their respective markets, these corporations have developed predatory business practices that harvest user data for profit[1] and facilitated discrimination by race, religion, national origin,[2] age,[3] and gender.[4] Facebook and Google have wielded unprecedented influence over our democratic process.[5] Amazon has been accused of subjecting workers to unsafe working conditions during COVID-19,[6] while the plurality of its workforce is Black, brown, and/or non-white.[7] All of these companies have killed, rather than fostered innovation.[8]

Increased investments in Washington have allowed these monopolists to harm consumers, workers, and other businesses alike, with relatively little accountability to date. A [report Public Citizen released in 2019](https://www.citizen.org/article/new-economy-titans-old-school-tactics/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eId=5d62d87d-0456-4903-a47d-19602d1e1ad8) (covering up to the 2018 election cycle) detailed how Big Tech corporations have blanketed Capitol Hill with lobbyists and lavished members of Congress with campaign contributions.

This is an update of that report, based on data provided by the [Center for Responsive Politics](https://www.opensecrets.org/). Since the 2020 election cycle has ended, Public Citizen reevaluated Big Tech’s influence over the government by analyzing the tech companies’ lobbying spending and campaign contributions.

Here are the key findings of this report:

Facebook and Amazon are now the two biggest corporate lobbying spenders in the country.[9]

Big Tech has eclipsed yesterday’s big lobbying spenders, Big Oil and Big Tobacco. In 2020, Amazon and Facebook spent nearly twice as much as Exxon and Philip Morris on lobbying.

During the 2020 election cycle, Big Tech spent $124 million in lobbying and campaign contributions –– breaking its own records from past election cycles.

Amazon and Facebook drove most of this growth. From the years of 2018-2020, Amazon increased spending by 30% while Facebook added an astounding 56% to its Washington investment.

The four Big Tech companies recruited more lobbyists into their army, increasing its ranks by 40 new lobbyists, from 293 in 2018 to 333 in 2020.[10]

Big Tech PACs, lobbyists, and employees contributed over 33% more in the 2020 election cycle than they did in the 2018 cycle, for an increase of over $4 million in funds, and a total of nearly $16.5 million in contributions to the election cycle. This marks the greatest cycle-over-cycle increase in campaign contributions from Big Tech in the ten-year span Public Citizen reviewed.

Big Tech’s lobbyists are not just numerous, they are also among the most influential in Washington. Among the 10 lobbyists who were the biggest contributors to the 2020 election cycle, half lobby on behalf of at least one of the four Big Tech companies. Together, just these five lobbyists contributed over $2 million to the 2020 elections.

Nearly all (94%) members of Congress with jurisdiction over privacy and antitrust issues have received money from a Big Tech corporate PAC or lobbyist. In total, just in 2020, Big Tech PACs and lobbyists have contributed about $3.2 million to lawmakers tasked with regulating them.

Introduction

[Previous research](https://www.citizen.org/article/new-economy-titans-old-school-tactics/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eId=5d62d87d-0456-4903-a47d-19602d1e1ad8) from Public Citizen revealed how Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google (now organized as a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc.) had each dramatically increased their lobbying spending and presence in Washington, D.C. from 2010 to 2018. In the 2010 election cycle, these four companies spent $19.2 million lobbying Congress. In just eight years, their spending grew to $118 million. This trend also held true for political contributions, which grew by more than 400 percent from the 2010 cycle to the 2018 cycle.

Although all four companies pushed staggering amounts of money into D.C., Amazon increased its spending the fastest. From 2016 to 2018, Amazon nearly doubled its number of lobbyists, and for the first time matched the size of Google’s ranks.

### Link – Cyber Debate

#### Cyber triggers debate – multiple aspects of policy are subject to dispute and evolving interpretation based on tech advances

Vinik, POLITICO The Agenda Assistant Editor, 15

(Danny Vinik, assistant editor for The Agenda at Politico, POLITICO, 12-9-15, "America’s secret arsenal," The Agenda, https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2015/12/defense-department-cyber-offense-strategy-000331/, accessed 7-13-22) SS:/

WHILE THE DEBATE over U.S. offensive cyber strategy may be happening quietly in the federal government, it’s playing out quite publicly among outside experts. In early November, Himes and four other lawmakers sent a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry and National Security Adviser Susan Rice proposing a cyber convention like the Geneva Convention, to lay out rules of the road for cyber.

“Now is the time for the international community to seriously respond again with a binding set of international rules for cyberwarfare: an E-Neva Convention,” they wrote.

One key concern they have is what actually constitutes an act of war in the digital realm, versus a smaller crime or nuisance. “What is cyber war?” Rep. Lynn Westmoreland (R-Ga.), the chair of the House Intelligence subcommittee on NSA and Cybersecurity who also signed the letter, said in an interview. “What is it?”

“What if Iran melted down one server at Florida Power and Light? They do $5,000 worth of damage. That sounds to me like a crime,” Himes said. “But what if they melt down a whole bunch of servers, a network goes down and a bunch of people die? That feels to me like an act of war.” He added: “But these lines aren’t drawn. Because they're not drawn, is our response to have the FBI investigate and file a diplomatic démarche? Or is our response to do a cyber reprisal? Or is our response to do a kinetic reprisal? We don't know. I think that's a real problem.”

Another key question in the cyber realm is if any specific infrastructure is off limits, the way hospitals are supposed to be off-limits in kinetic war. Is an electrical grid a valid target? Knocking out the Internet or the power can cause immense damage to civilians, particularly in advanced countries like the United States whose economies depend heavily on the Internet.

Forging consensus on these questions is hard but not impossible. Already, the international community is coalescing around an agreement that states cannot conduct cyber espionage for commercial purposes. Whether countries such as China will actually abide by that is unclear, but countries have at least agreed on that norm in principle.

Even among cyber experts, crafting a cohesive rules of engagement is proving to be a challenge. “I don’t know if you could come up with a set policy,” Westmoreland said. “I think it would have to be some type of living document that would allow it to change when technology changes.”

Daniel said that coming out with a specific case-by-case framework was not possible. "The idea that we are going to be able to spell out in detail exactly how we would respond to any particular incident or activity, I think doesn’t fully account for how we are going to have to act in the real world," he said.

When I asked Himes how the U.S. government should craft a cyber strategy if it can’t prepare for every possible scenario, he responded: “The laws of war, if you will, aren’t about describing every possible scenario. They are about articulating principles.”

This top-level guidance needs to come not from cyber experts but from elected leaders—and, observers say, so far that direction has not been forthcoming.

“Part of the problem is that there are so many senior people in the government, especially coming out of the political world, that just don’t understand enough about the technology,” Borg said. “They really are remarkably uninformed.”

You can see this in New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie’s comments about cyber in the last Republican debate. “If the Chinese commit cyberwarfare against us, they are going to see cyberwarfare like they have never seen before,” he said. Saber-rattling against the Chinese is nothing new for a U.S. presidential election, but it’s hard to imagine Christie making a similar claim about conventional war.

In one sense, that’s because it’s hard to imagine Christie ever being confronted with that scenario. No one is foreseeing an imminent kinetic attack from China. But that’s precisely what makes cyber so difficult: What exactly would qualify as cyberwarfare? And what type of Chinese cyber attack would result in “cyberwarfare like [China has] never seen before”?

It seems superfluous to mention, perhaps, but cyberwar with China is war with China. And a war that starts out in the cyber realm can quickly migrate to other realms.

“I consider the current state of affairs to be extremely volatile and unstable because one could escalate a cyberwar pretty quickly,” said Sami Saydjari, the founder of the Cyber Defense Agency consulting firm, who has been working on cyber issues for more than three decades. “You can imagine a scenario where a country instigates a cyberwarfare-like event but does it in such a way to blame another country, which causes an escalation between those countries, which accidentally causes a kinetic escalation, which accidentally reaches the nuclear level. This is not an implausible scenario.”

Not implausible, but perhaps not likely either. At the moment, cyber experts say, the world is at a tenuous moment of cyber peace. For all the constant theft and hacking, nobody is waging overt attacks on infrastructure and assets. But they also say this relative stability masks the underlying threats in the cyber world.

“I would say we’re in a cold war, not a peace,” Alexander said. “If you paint a picture of the world above, people are shaking hands. And then below the water, they’re kicking like crazy. I think in cyber there’s so much going on in cyber that it’s invisible to most people.”

If a major cyber incident occurred in the U.S.—one that actually hurt or even killed Americans—the public would quickly want some answers, and likely a plan for defense and retaliation. In the absence of more specific rules of engagement, it’s clear to many experts what’s going to happen at this point: We’re going to improvise.

“If there were a cyber incident in the United States, we’d do it from scratch,” said Martin Libicki, a senior scientist and cyberwarfare expert at the RAND Corporation. “I don't care what's been written. That's just the nature of the beast.”

#### Plan triggers massive fight over cooperation on cybersecurity – concerns about sharing intelligence undermine political support for the plan and undermine the alliance

Porter, Atlantic Council nonresident senior fellow & Jordan, Atlantic Council Cyber Statecraft Initiative assistant director, 19

[Christopher & Klara, 2-14-19, Lawfare, “Don’t Let Cyber Attribution Debates Tear Apart the NATO Alliance,” <https://www.lawfareblog.com/dont-let-cyber-attribution-debates-tear-apart-nato-alliance>, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

NATO’s cyber-defense mandate has evolved over time to update its collective defense commitment under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty for the era of cyberattacks. In the latest effort to collectively impose costs on adversaries, the 2018 NATO Summit saw a commitment from heads of state and government “to integrate sovereign cyber effects, provided voluntarily by Allies, into Alliance operations and missions, in the framework of strong political oversight.” The newly updated White House National Cyber Strategy likewise envisions working together with a “coalition of like-minded states” to “ensure adversaries understand the consequences of their malicious cyber behavior.”

Therein lies the rub. Both formal alliances, such as NATO, and more ad hoc arrangements, such as what the Cyber Deterrence Initiative imagines, will require members to share intelligence and eventually, to the best of their ability and perhaps in different domains, contribute to joint action against a presumably well-armed foreign aggressor. States including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Estonia, and Denmark have publicly declared their willingness to lend sovereign offensive cyber effects to deter, defend against and counter the full spectrum of threats.

Sharing intelligence and information is a key element of NATO’s core decision-making process enshrined in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty. Political consultations are part of the preventive diplomacy between member states, but they are also an avenue to discuss concerns related to the security threats member states face. These consultations can be a catalyst for reaching a consensus on policies to be adopted or actions to be taken—including those on the use of sovereign cyber effects to support a NATO operation.

The alliance has a track record of collective action and cooperative security measures. For example, Operation Active Endeavour helped to deter, disrupt and protect against terrorist activity in the Mediterranean in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, in solidarity with the United States. For the seventh time, the Atlantic Council’s Cyber Statecraft Initiative will be among the organizations privileged to organize an event on the sidelines of the Feb. 15–17 Munich Security Conference. This year in particular, the Atlantic Council’s event, “Defending Human Dignity: Limiting Malicious Cyber Activity Through Diplomacy,” will complement the topics high on the agenda of the main conference, such as transatlantic collaboration, the consequences of a resurgence of great power competition and the future of arms control.

In the United States, the greatest failures of response and deterrence to foreign aggression in cyberspace have not been caused by a lack of intelligence, capability or imagination. Rather, U.S. policy has been serviceable in theory but impotent in practice because of an inability to translate technical findings and intelligence into public support for sufficiently tough responses ordered by elected political leaders. North Korea’s repeated operations targeting U.S. companies and critical infrastructure have been met with public skepticism over their culpability, limiting the strength of retaliatory options needed to deter further events. Chinese cyber economic espionage continued for years despite widespread knowledge of China’s activities because political leaders found it difficult to confront Beijing without undermining U.S. companies in return. Russian information operations did not sow enough doubt to mislead experts, but they succeeded in exacerbating the partisan polarization of an already-divided electorate and its leaders.

That inability to translate the findings of cyber experts into public sentiment and therefore political action has sidelined America’s cyberwarriors, by far the most technologically advanced and well-resourced in the world. Imagine the political response of an ally that is asked to burden-share in response to cyber aggression but is probably much closer to any resulting kinetic fight than the United States.

Now imagine the response of that ally when it’s being asked to take causus belli on faith: The United States is presenting attribution for a cyberattack elsewhere in the world, but perhaps is depending on the ally lacking critical details due to classification, and is presenting that information alongside a request for help that might well put the ally in the crosshairs of its own cyberattack or lethal action. How can allies with different capabilities to collect, analyze and understand intelligence be part of a consensus on using sovereign cyber effects to support a NATO operation? How can a commander achieve a common operational picture to authorize the use of sovereign effects in a NATO operation if all the allies are not on the same page with respect to critical attribution and other technical information needed for a use of effect in an operation? We all know what a tank looks like on a shared satellite image, but if you ask three cyber experts to interpret the attribution for a set of indicators, you are likely to get at least four answers.

For most U.S. allies in Europe and elsewhere, there is simply a dearth of technical know-how within the government when it comes to cyber attribution and operations. This is already a challenge for the United States, with a massive defense budget, Silicon Valley innovation and an educated workforce to pull into government service. But for many U.S. allies, tech-savvy public servants will have long fled for the private sector, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and academia before reaching ministerial positions.

To its credit, the U.S. National Cyber Strategy does propose capacity-building measures to support allies. This means building up law enforcement, intelligence, and military operational and investigative capability. But even with successful capacity-building programs, many nations could, in a crisis, end up in the same place the United States is—with good options stuck on the shelf while political leaders and their electorates lack a critical mass of informed voters to trust, understand and act on expert findings.

For countries weighing whether to risk their own blood and treasure in support of an ally’s cyber attribution findings, this hurdle could well prove insurmountable if not addressed well before a crisis emerges. Many such countries will no doubt recall being burned when placing too much confidence in U.S. technical and human sources without an ability to evaluate the evidence for themselves, as with the Iraq weapons of mass destruction findings.

The private sector will probably play a crucial role in providing intelligence to support alliance responses to cyberattacks, especially as a stopgap over the next few years. FireEye and its peer competitors and partners regularly produce analyses of major world cyber events—many that fly below the radar of Western leadership, in fact—sometimes at a near-government quality and often covering much of the same “classified” evidence.

More important, private-sector analysts are accustomed to writing for impact with both their technical counterparts, like chief information security officers (CISOs) and threat hunters, and nontechnical stakeholders such as boards of directors, CEOs and other persons controlling the purse strings. In this sense, unclassified, private-sector and NGO-driven cyber threat intelligence can become the lingua franca of discussions. Relying on commercial reporting generated by international teams, rather than declassified government-generated reports, both broadens the audience enough to make alliance discussions feasible and mitigates against disparities in terminology across national lines—the tendency of even closely integrated allies to describe cyber “attack,” “information operations,” and attribution findings with different implicit assumptions or implications.

Long-Term Thinking In the long run, though, the U.S. and its more technologically advanced allies—such as its fellow Five Eyes (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the U.K.), France and Japan—will have to make important policy changes in the interests of furthering alliance cooperation in cyberspace: a willingness to sometimes risk sensitive sources and methods in order to get cyber threat intelligence into the hands of other countries better positioned to take policy action, an end to classifying public information like IP addresses solely because of their acquisition via classified means, and greater transparency on their own decision-making.

### Link – Cyber – GOP

#### The GOP will push back on increased funding for cyber security and anything that targets industry or election disinformation but will continue bipartisan cooperation

Sabin, POLITICO Weekly Cybersecurity Reporter, 7-11-22

(Sam Sabin, POLITICO Pro Reporter, POLITICO, 7-11-2022, "How the midterms could change cyber policy," https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-cybersecurity/2022/07/11/how-the-midterms-could-change-cyber-policy-00044981, accessed 7-11-2022) SS:/

CHANGING OF THE GUARD — Cybersecurity is poised to become a significantly more confrontational issue if Republicans take power on Capitol Hill in this fall’s midterm elections, especially with the retirements of the moderate GOP ranking members of both homeland security committees.

As Eric reports in a story out this morning for Pros, newly empowered Republicans would likely closely scrutinize critical infrastructure regulations from CISA, the SEC, the TSA and other agencies for signs that they’re overly burdensome to industry, push back on continued increases in CISA’s budget as part of their overall debt-and-deficit messaging, and cast a skeptical eye on election security activities, especially efforts to combat right-wing election-fraud disinformation.

Rep. John Katko (N.Y.), the retiring House Homeland Security ranking member who’s supported two CISA budget increases and its election security work, said he expects Republicans to pursue “some battles that I wouldn’t engage in … if very conservative people get appointed to lead roles with respect to cybersecurity.” But despite new partisanship on the issue “because of rabble-rousers within our party,” he said, there will still be “a lot of very good legislation.”

### Link – Disinfo Controversial

**Plan will spark a debate – trust in news and media is low – and the issue is politically divisive**

**Ravenelle, et al. University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Sociology Professor, 21**

[Alexandrea Ravenelle, Abigail Newell, and Ken Cai Kowalski, 6-18-21, Sage Journals , “The Looming, Crazy Stalker Coronavirus”: Fear Mongering, Fake News, and the Diffusion of Distrust", <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/23780231211024776>, accessed on 7-9-2022, MG]

Americans have become increasingly skeptical of the media since the 1970s (Lee and Hosam 2020; Tsfati and Cohen 2012). Many question the credibility of sources, citing partisan slant or network profits for their distrust (Ladd 2012; Lee and Hosam 2020). Media distrust increasingly echoes political divides, with self-described Democrats trusting network news, NPR, and the New York Times, whereas most Republicans trust only Fox News (Jurkowitz et al. 2020; Stroud 2011). Additionally, “differences in trust and distrust of news outlets [are] often wider among the ideological wings of each party—conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats” (Jurkowitz et al. 2020:22).

Yet when the novel coronavirus outbreak began in the United States, millions of Americans turned to media coverage of the pandemic, seeking answers and reassurance. In March 2020, the week after former President Donald Trump declared a national emergency, cable news viewership increased exponentially: CNN viewership jumped 193 percent, MSNBC increased by 56 percent, and Fox experienced an 89 percent climb in ratings (Bond 2020). Nielsen found that individuals in the United States spent 215 percent more time reading news online than they had during the same month of 2019 (Oxford Business Group 2020). Social media use also increased, with a Harris Poll survey conducted between late March and early May showing that between 46 percent and 51 percent of U.S. adults were using social media more since the outbreak began (Harris Poll 2020); the New York Times reported that Facebook use was up 27 percent and YouTube visits were up 15.3 percent (Koeze and Popper 2020). Indeed, as noted by the Pew Foundation, early in the pandemic, Americans were more positive than negative about COVID-19 news coverage (Gottfried, Walker, and Mitchell 2020).

In light of this increase of media use, how has COVID-19 affected the perceptions of low-income, liberal adults regarding the media? Focusing on New York City, an early epicenter of the virus in the United States, we ask, how has the lived experience of residents in New York affected respondents’ opinions of the media during a rapidly changing public health crisis? Did increased media use during these unsettled times (Swidler 1986) build trust?

In this article, we draw on surveys and in-depth remote interviews conducted from April 2020 through June 2020 with nearly 200 gig and precarious workers. Contrary to work by Gauchat (2012) and Evans and Hargittai (2020) suggesting that conservatives and moderates are “collectively different” from liberals and Democrats, we find that left-leaning or liberal-identified participants also complained of media sensationalism, fake news, and conflicting narratives in COVID-19 coverage. Additionally, although Shepherd, MacKendrick and Mora (2020) found that existing political polarization and attitudes about Trump affected the public’s understanding of COVID-19, our in-depth interviews suggest that these perspectives may be more nuanced than survey research has previously found.

We draw upon Swidler’s (1986) theory of strategic cultural action to conceptualize liberal respondent’s claims of “fake news.” We argue that the pandemic constitutes “unsettled times,” in which social reality is actively undergoing transformation (Swidler 1986:279). Grappling with conflicting reports on the source of the virus, how it spreads, and how to protect themselves and loved ones (Sanger et al. 2020), respondents repurposed a readily available cultural tool: claims of “fake news.” As a result, these unsettled times have resulted in a “diffusion of distrust,” in which an elite conservative discourse of skepticism toward the media has become a popular form of compensatory control (Kay et al. 2009) used by conservatives and liberals alike to make sense of the contradictory, continuous coverage of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Furthermore, perceiving media sensationalism and “fake news” as “not good” for their mental health, respondents reported experiencing media burnout and physical and emotional responses to media that resulted in a withdrawal from media consumption. Given the importance of an informed electorate, we suggest that this media withdrawal may have long-term consequences for American democracy and that postpandemic media coverage will require a rebuilding of trust with members of the American public across the political landscape. In the following section, we outline the theoretical premise of our article within the literature on media distrust, populism, and prevailing cultural logic.

Theoretical Framing

Distrust of Media and Expertise

Americans have grown increasingly distrustful of news media over the past 40 years (Jurkowitz et al. 2020; Ladd 2012). Distrust in media has spread as confidence in other institutions and in the impartiality of science has dwindled (Citrin and Stoker 2018; Evans and Hargittai 2020). Prior research has cast these anti-institutional trends in terms of populist backlash against racial minorities and elites (Bonikowski and Gidron 2016; Mudde 2004), but the prevalence of this distrust suggests the need for additional explanation. Following World War II, Western democracies increasingly relied on a technocratic discourse of expertise to legitimate government policies (Eyal 2019; Mudge 2018), replacing religious, moral, and legal justifications with apolitical appeals to technical knowledge (Ezrahi 2004:254). Although scientific authority initially lent these governments a sheen of credibility, the reduction of politics to expert management eroded democratic responsiveness by isolating policy making from popular will (Mounk 2018).

A crowded field of political actors claiming expertise further undermined public confidence. Competitive pressures, disciplinary specialization, and the complexity of socioeconomic forecasting led a glut of experts to assert contradictory claims that appeared increasingly arbitrary and politically biased, a dynamic Eyal (2019) neatly summarized: “The ‘scientization of politics’ inadvertently causes the ‘politicization of science’” (p. 97). Ultimately, public perception of expertise as self-interested has shaken the credibility of institutions ranging from government to science and mass media (Antonio 2000; Beck 1992).

**Disinfo playbook ensures the plan will provoke debate – with villainization, ensuring resources spent defending the plan, and high risk fight undermines efficacy of the plan**

**Lorenz,  Washington Post Technology Columnist, 22**

(Taylor, 5-18-2022, The Washington Post, "How the Biden administration let right-wing attacks derail its disinformation efforts", https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/05/18/disinformation-board-dhs-nina-jankowicz/, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

Experts say that right-wing disinformation and smear campaigns regularly follow the same playbook and that it’s crucial that the public and leaders of institutions, especially in the government, the media and educational bodies, understand more fully how these cycles operate.

The campaigns invariably start with identifying a person to characterize as a villain. Attacking faceless institutions is difficult, so a figurehead (almost always a woman or person of color) is found to serve as its face. Whether that person has actual power within that institution is often immaterial. By discrediting those made to represent institutions they seek to bring down, they discredit the institution itself.

Harassment and reputational harm is core to the attack strategy. Institutions often treat reputational harm and online attacks as a personnel matter, one that unlucky employees should simply endure quietly.

Jankowicz’s case is a perfect example of this system at work, said Emerson T. Brooking, a resident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Research Lab. “They try to define people by these single, decontextualized moments,” Brooking said. “In Nina’s case it’s a few TikTok videos, or one or two comments out of thousands of public appearances. They fixate on these small instances and they define this villain.”

The worst thing any institution can do in the face of such attacks is remain quiet, several disinformation researchers said.

“You never want to be silent, because then the people putting out the disinformation own the narrative,” said Mark Jacobson, assistant dean at Syracuse University’s Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, who has researched propaganda, political warfare and disinformation for over 30 years. “You need to have a factual and equally emotional counternarrative. A fact sheet is not a narrative.”

Not responding with a highly compelling counternarrative, or not getting out ahead of these campaigns to begin with, Jacobson explained, can “give them an air of legitimacy.” He said he was frustrated by the Biden administration’s lack of a loud and vocal response to what Jankowicz was going through. “Saying it’s amateur hour is cliche, but it’s amateur hour,” he said of the administration’s inaction.

The fallout from the campaign against Jankowicz can be seen in the escalating attacks. Violent threats against her are flourishing online, according to Advance Democracy. Users on far-right social media platforms continue to use misogynistic and bigoted language in posts about Jankowicz, with many users calling for violence.

In response to one post on Gab featuring a video of Tucker Carlson discussing Jankowicz, users commented: “Time to kill them all.” Another post featuring Carlson’s coverage of Jankowicz was shared to a right-wing forum with the caption “This is the point where we have to draw the line.” Comments said Jankowicz should be “greeted with Mr. 12 Gauge Slugs.” An April 30 post on Gab featuring a tweet by Rep. Lauren Boebert (R-Colo.) telling her followers “this is the hill to die on” sparked replies that were flooded with threats to Jankowicz’s life. “It’d be easier if we had a large group of trained assassins to take a lot of the [government] bastards out first,” one user wrote.

“The irony is that Nina’s role was to come up with strategies for the department to counter this type of campaign, and now they’ve just succumbed to it themselves,” said one Hill staffer with knowledge of the situation who spoke on the condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to speak on the issue. “They didn’t even fight, they just rolled over.”

DHS staffers worried that the way Jankowicz’s situation was mishandled could hurt their ability to recruit talent at a time when white nationalist violence is thriving and the midterm elections are approaching.

“We’re going to need another Nina down the road,” said one DHS staffer who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not at liberty to comment. “And anyone who takes that position is going to be vulnerable to a disinformation campaign or attack.”

#### No political appetite for the plan – Congress doesn't want to regulate fake news on the account they might do it wrong

Shaban, BuzzFeed News Reporter, 16

[Hamza, 12-14-2016, Rep. Lieu Press Release, “No One In Congress Wants To Regulate Fake News”, <https://lieu.house.gov/media-center/in-the-news/no-one-congress-wants-regulate-fake-news>, accessed on 7-9-2022, MG]

Despite the rampant conspiracies that were shared widely during the presidential election and the subsequent uproar over fake news, disinformation, and propaganda, Congress is highly unlikely to take steps to regulate Facebook, even as the platform-titan presides over the distribution of news.

“I don’t think regulating them is the answer,” Rep. Anna Eshoo told BuzzFeed News. “Who is going to be sitting with a federal spyglass to vet each word that comes off of a platform? That doesn't seem feasible to me.”

Nearly half of American adults get news from Facebook. That figure becomes somewhat more distressing paired with data that suggests people who rely heavily on the social network for their news are prone to getting duped. The Pope himself recently likened the consumption of fake news to eating human waste.

“We have more and more of the population that believes that they are reading news that is authentic and vetted, when it is the opposite,” Eshoo said. “It’s one thing to say that the New York Times reported inaccurately, and they have to make good on it, but there isn’t any such thing on the internet.”

Eshoo, who cofounded the Congressional Internet Caucus, and represents a tech-friendly stronghold outside of San Francisco, praised communication platforms as tools that can serve democracy, even as she acknowledged their capacity to mislead citizens.

She added, “News and its viability is one of the sacred ingredients of a democracy, it’s not something to be toyed with. I don't think I have the answer. I think I have a strong sense of what’s important.”

Following widespread criticism that Facebook, through complacency and a social scheme that rewards sensationalist engagement-chasing, may have influenced the election, CEO Mark Zuckerberg dismissed the charges as “pretty crazy.” Days later he softened his stance to “extremely unlikely,” even as some employees within the company have challenged Zuckerberg on this issue, forming an unofficial task force to examine Facebook’s role in promoting fake news.

“I absolutely believe Facebook should do more internally to regulate fake news and point out fake news,” Rep. Ted Lieu told BuzzFeed News. “I also oppose any governmental efforts to make any private sector company do that.” He continued, “I’m a strong believer in the First Amendment and I don’t believe it’s government’s role to force companies to take that action, although I would hope that companies do so.”

Lieu’s comments echo those of legal experts, who see editorial and procedural improvements to social platforms as the way forward, rather than Congress imposing potentially unconstitutional remedies through new laws.

“I don’t think there is a way to regulate them in a way that’s consistent with the First Amendment,” David Greene, the civil liberties director of the Electronic Frontier Foundation told BuzzFeed News. “We don’t regulate the press in this country. Even if it were possible to define fake news, there’s still a lot of very strong First Amendment protection for false speech.”

Unlike defamation or libel, malicious lies that harm individuals, Greene said it would be difficult for Congress to shape a law that would protect the public at large from published falsehoods, since no single group or person could convincingly show they were harmed. “There has to be some kind of recognized injury,” he said, beyond the public feeling misled.

Online intermediaries like Facebook and Twitter, Youtube and Yelp, are generally shielded from what users say on their networks. A provision in existing law, known as Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, gives internet platforms broad protections from liability stemming from objectionable content. These web companies, which include both internet service providers (like Comcast) and “interactive computer services” (like Google) aren’t considered publishers or speakers themselves, but hosts of other people’s expression. “If Facebook did not create the content, then Facebook can bear no liability,” Greene explained.

Eugene Volokh, a law professor at UCLA and founder of the legal blog Volokh Conspiracy, told BuzzFeed News that a law targeting the publication of knowingly false statements of fact would not be a “radical departure from American First Amendment traditions.” The danger, he said, would come from its implementation.

“In principle it sounds great not to have fake news, but the problem is someone is going to have to figure out what’s true and what’s a lie,” he said. “Especially when it gets to political stories, or stories about history, science, or current events, that somebody — the government, the prosecutor — is going to have his own preconceptions and political agendas.”

“That’s a perilous power to give to the government,” he said. For Volokh, a prohibition on fake news would chill free speech and journalistic endeavours, since even true statements on controversial topics might be punishable.

“I hope that social media platforms continue to work their algorithms to give more weight and balance to stories coming from credible news source,” Rep. Katherine Clark told BuzzFeed News. But the bigger challenge, she said, is the spread of misinformation coming from President-elect Donald Trump, and those close to him.

**Proactive disinformation frameworks are torn apart by the far-right**

**Lorenz, Washington Post Technology Columnist, 22**

(Taylor, 5-18-2022, The Washington Post, "How the Biden administration let right-wing attacks derail its disinformation efforts", https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/05/18/disinformation-board-dhs-nina-jankowicz/, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

On the morning of April 27, the Department of Homeland Security announced the creation of the first Disinformation Governance Board with the stated goal to “coordinate countering misinformation related to homeland security.” The Biden administration tapped Nina Jankowicz, a well-known figure in the field of fighting disinformation and extremism, as the board’s executive director.

In naming the 33-year-old Jankowicz to run the newly created board, the administration chose someone with extensive experience in the field of disinformation, which has emerged as an urgent and important issue. The author of the books “How to Be a Woman Online” and “How to Lose the Information War,” her career also featured stints at multiple nonpartisan think tanks and nonprofits and included work that focused on strengthening democratic institutions. Within the small community of disinformation researchers, her work was well-regarded.

But within hours of news of her appointment, Jankowicz was thrust into the spotlight by the very forces she dedicated her career to combating. The board itself and DHS received criticism for both its somewhat ominous name and scant details of specific mission (Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas said it “could have done a better job of communicating what it is and what it isn’t”), but Jankowicz was on the receiving end of the harshest attacks, with her role mischaracterized as she became a primary target on the right-wing Internet. She has been subject to an unrelenting barrage of harassment and abuse while unchecked misrepresentations of her work continue to go viral.

Now, just three weeks after its announcement, the Disinformation Governance Board is being “paused,” according to multiple employees at DHS, capping a back-and-forth week of decisions that changed during the course of reporting of this story. On Monday, DHS decided to shut down the board, according to multiple people with knowledge of the situation. By Tuesday morning, Jankowicz had drafted a resignation letter in response to the board’s dissolution.

But Tuesday night, Jankowicz was pulled into an urgent call with DHS officials who gave her the choice to stay on, even as the department’s work was put on hold because of the backlash it faced, according to multiple people with knowledge of the call. Working groups within DHS focused on mis-, dis- and mal-information have been suspended. The board could still be shut down pending a review from the Homeland Security Advisory Council. On Wednesday morning, Jankowicz officially resigned from her role within the department.

“Nina Jankowicz has been subjected to unjustified and vile personal attacks and physical threats,” a DHS spokesperson told The Washington Post in a statement. “In congressional hearings and in media interviews, the Secretary has repeatedly defended her as eminently qualified and underscored the importance of the Department’s disinformation work, and he will continue to do so.”

Jankowicz has not spoken publicly about her position since the day it was announced.

Jankowicz’s experience is a prime example of how the right-wing Internet apparatus operates, **where far-right influencers attempt to identify a target, present a narrative and then repeat mischaracterizations across social media and websites with the aim of discrediting and attacking anyone who seeks to challenge them.** It also shows what happens when institutions, when confronted with these attacks, don’t respond effectively.

Those familiar with the board’s inner workings, including DHS employees and Capitol Hill staffers, along with experts on disinformation, say Jankowicz was set up to fail by an administration that was unsure of its messaging and unprepared to counteract a coordinated online campaign against her.

Just hours after Jankowicz tweeted about her new job, far-right influencer Jack Posobiec posted tweets accusing the Biden administration of creating a “Ministry of Truth.” Posobiec’s 1.7 million followers quickly sprung into action. By the end of the day, there were at least 53,235 posts on Twitter mentioning “Disinformation Governance Board,” many referencing Jankowicz by name, according to a report by Advance Democracy, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that conducts public-interest research. In the days following, that number skyrocketed.

The board was created to study best practices in combating the harmful effects of disinformation and to help DHS counter viral lies and propaganda that could threaten domestic security. Unlike the “Ministry of Truth” in George Orwell’s “1984” that became a derogatory comparison point, neither the board nor Jankowicz had any power or ability to declare what is true or false, or compel Internet providers, social media platforms or public schools to take action against certain types of speech. In fact, the board itself had no power or authority to make any operational decisions.

“The Board’s purpose has been grossly mischaracterized; it will not police speech,” the DHS spokesperson said. “Quite the opposite, its focus is to ensure that freedom of speech is protected.”

Posobiec’s early tweets shaped the narrative and Jankowicz was positioned as the primary target. Republican lawmakers echoed Posobiec’s framing and amplified it to their audiences. Missouri Attorney General Eric Schmitt, who is a U.S. Senate hopeful, and Rep. Andrew S. Clyde (R-Ga.) both posted tweets similar to Posobiec’s. Former congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard (D-Hawaii) also posted a video repeating Posobiec’s statements.

The week following the announcement, approximately 70 percent of Fox News’s one-hour segments mentioned either Jankowicz or the board, with correspondents frequently deriding the board as a “Ministry of Truth,” according to Advance Democracy. The Fox News coverage was referenced in some of the most popular posts on Facebook and Twitter criticizing Jankowicz.

Dozens of websites including Breitbart, the Post Millennial, the Daily Caller and the New York Post began mining Jankowicz’s past social media posts and publishing articles to generate controversy. Some were simply mocking, making fun of her for parodying a song from “Mary Poppins” to talk about misinformation. In another instance, a performance where Jankowicz sings a popular musical theater song about a person’s desire to become rich and powerful was misrepresented to imply that Jankowicz herself was after money and power and would sleep with men to get it.

As this online campaign played out, DHS and the Biden administration struggled to counter the repeated attacks.

The weekend after her hiring was announced, Mayorkas attempted to clarify the board’s mission and defended Jankowicz’s credentials. He did a round of TV news interviews and testified about the board during House and Senate committee hearings. A forceful defense of Jankowicz was noticeably absent online, where the attacks against her were concentrated. White House press secretary Jen Psaki debunked false claims about the board during two news briefings and touted Jankowicz as “an expert on online disinformation,” but it had little effect on the growing campaign against her.

“These smears leveled by bad-faith, right-wing actors against a deeply qualified expert and against efforts to better combat human smuggling and domestic terrorism are disgusting,” deputy White House press secretary Andrew Bates told The Post on Tuesday.

As she endured the attacks, Jankowicz was told to stay silent. After attempting to defend herself on Twitter April 27, she was told by DHS officials to not issue any further public statements, according to multiple people close to her.

Democratic lawmakers, legislative staff and other administration employees who sought to defend Jankowicz were caught flat-footed. Administration officials did not brief the relevant congressional staff and committees ahead of the board’s launch, and members of Congress who had expressed interest in disinformation weren’t given a detailed explanation about how it would operate. A fact sheet released by DHS on May 2 did nothing to quell the outrage that had been building on the Internet, nor did it clarify much of what the board would actually be doing or Jankowicz’s role in it.

DHS staffers have also grown frustrated. With the department’s suspension of intra-departmental working groups focused on mis-, dis- and mal-information, some officials said it was an overreaction that gave too much credence to bad-faith actors. A 15-year veteran of the department, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to comment publicly, called the DHS response to the controversy “mind-boggling.” “I’ve never seen the department react like this before,” he said.

### Link – Biotech – Reform

#### Biotech reform sparks debate – multiple stakeholders will get involved and litigate every detail

**Servick,**Science **Staff Writer, 19**

[Kelly Servick, studied cognitive science and comparative literature at the University of Georgia, graduate program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, introduced her to science writing., 6-4-19, Science, "Controversial U.S. bill would lift Supreme Court ban on patenting human genes", <https://www.science.org/content/article/controversial-us-bill-would-lift-supreme-court-ban-patenting-human-genes>, accessed on 7-13-2022, MG]

A congressional proposal that would overturn a landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision that barred the patenting of human genes and ease other restrictions on patenting software and biomedical inventions is drawing fierce criticism from some scientific societies and patient advocates. Yesterday, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in Washington, D.C., along with more than 100 other signatories from research institutes and advocacy groups, released a letter to lawmakers arguing the changes would stifle medical research and hinder patients' access to diagnostic tests.

The draft bill "would result in a quagmire of patent claims and legal impediments to the normal scientific exchange," said Harold Varmus, a cancer biologist at Weill Cornell Medicine in New York City and former director of the National Cancer Institute, in a press conference yesterday. "It's in the interest of virtually everyone to keep ideas and basic discoveries about the laws and products of nature in the public domain."

The ACLU letter comes as the Senate Committee on the Judiciary kicks off the first in a series of three hearings that will examine potential changes to U.S. patent law. Today's hearing is expected to include discussion of the draft proposal, released last month by a bipartisan group of lawmakers, which would overturn current restrictions on patenting products and processes that occur in nature, including human genes.

The bill aims to address a complaint that has been brewing for years in the biotechnology and software industries: that recent Supreme Court decisions have created confusing and overly stringent patent eligibility rules. In particular, critics point to three recent rulings:

The 2012 decision in Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories invalidated a patent on adjusting drug dosage based on levels of metabolites in a patient's blood because it relied on a "law of nature."

The landmark 2013 ruling in Association for Molecular Pathology (AMP) v. Myriad Genetics Inc. said that human genes can't be patented because they are a "product of nature."

In 2014, software patents took a blow from the Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International decision, which found a financial trading program to be an unpatentable "abstract idea."

The new bill "makes it clear in no uncertain terms that all the Supreme Court [decisions] are just gone," says Arti Rai, a patent law expert at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina. It says decisions about patent eligibility should not rely on "judicially created exceptions … including ‘abstract ideas,' ‘laws of nature,' or ‘natural phenomena.'"

The bill's sponsors in the Senate, Thom Tillis (R–NC) and Chris Coons (D–DE), have described it as a way to restore incentives for U.S. innovation by making the process for protecting new inventions more predictable. (Competition with China, where no comparable restrictions exist in the patent system, may have motivated the lawmakers, Rai says.)

But opponents say the bill would enable monopolies on discoveries that should be widely available for research and medical use. In the 2013 Myriad case, the diagnostic company Myriad Genetics of Salt Lake City claimed that its broad patents on two human genes gave it exclusive rights to clinical tests for cancer-associated mutations in those genes. In striking down the patents, the Supreme Court allowed other diagnostic companies to offer such tests without fear of infringement lawsuits. Signatories on the new letter—including plaintiffs who challenged the Myriad patents, and ACLU, which represented them—argue that if the proposed law is enacted, "We will again see high prices for tests with no competition in the market."

But Rai notes that the scientific and business landscapes have changed since Myriad. "I don't think anyone is really trying to get single gene patents anymore," she says. Patents that have already been struck down can't be resurrected, she notes, and thanks to extensive research on the human genome, many claims to individual genes would no longer be considered "novel," as U.S. patent law requires. "If the information is already out there—and most of the information about the human genome at a single-gene level is already out there—you can't patent it because it's no longer new."

Still, the proposed bill would also apply to patenting complex methods of estimating a person's risk for disease based on a combination of many genes—so-called polygenic risk scores. Some of these approaches have already won patent protection, Rai says, though it's not clear whether, under the current rules, the existing patents would hold up to a challenge in court.

Even if the draft language gets enacted, the current law's requirement of novelty—and other requirements untouched by the proposed changes—would ensure that "people won't be able to go totally crazy" in trying to patent discoveries based on nature, predicts Dan Burk, a law professor at the University of California, Irvine. But adoption of the change could cause a surge of patent applications for software, and potentially also for biotechnology and medical diagnostics, he says. And even if most human genome sequences remain off limits, previously unexplored genes from many other species—some potentially useful to medicine—would newly become eligible for a patent.

Burk, for one, doubts the exact language in the draft will be enacted, but he does expect changes to the law. "I am pretty confident," he says, "that if we have a conversation in 6 months to a year, the patent statute will look different than it does today."

\*Update, 5 June, 11:30 a.m.: In the first of three patent reform hearings, Senators Coons and Tillis said they didn't intend to upend all restrictions on patenting human genes or other basic research discoveries. "Our proposal would not change the law to allow a company to patent a gene as it exists in the human body," Coons said in his opening statement. "We do not intend to overrule that holding of the 2013 Myriad decision."

But the witnesses at the hearing had different interpretations of the bill's text. The intent to preserve Myriad is "inconsistent with the legislative text that's been put forward," said patent policy researcher Charles Duan of the R Street Institute in Washington, D.C., in his testimony. The proposed language could make it possible to patent many kinds of "pure scientific research," he said. "I don't think that's the intent, but … that's what the language does."

"I think your proposal does overturn the Myriad decision, and I hope it does," Sherry Knowles, an attorney at Knowles Intellectual Property Strategies in Atlanta, told the Senators. The cancer drug adriamycin, which she credited with her own remission from breast cancer, is a compound first discovered in soil microbes, she noted, and it "would never have been developed … without the patent framework we had before Myriad." Since that decision, she said, "There's been a dead stop in research in the United States on isolated natural products."

### Link – Biotech – Regulation

#### Biotech regulations spark intense debate – multiple stakeholders ensure the link, and generates uncertainty, turning the case

**Chakraborty, Kings College PhD in Risk Management, 17**

[Sweta Chakraborty, She is the Key Behavioral Scientist at Resilience Action Partners and worked in the private sector as Chief Scientist for a risk management-consulting firm, has taught at Columbia University as an adjunct professor, 7-11-17, War Room - U.S. Army War College, "PROMISE AND PERIL: THE BIOTECH SECURITY DILEMMA", <https://warroom.armywarcollege.edu/articles/promise-peril-security-dilemma-biotechnology/>, accessed on 7-13-2022, MG]

In addition to public engagement, measures towards increased stakeholder transparency must address concerns over scientists “playing God.” If the public perceives that the academic and industrial research communities are not accountable for their actions, then researchers will be less likely to disclose intended uses of genetic engineering technology, and may remove themselves entirely from the field. Thus, the public relations stigma of biotech can impede the advance of crucial biotechnology products, or limit the applications of existing technology. The net effect can be similar to that of an outright ban, regardless of whether the biotechnology has regulatory approval (e.g., GM salmon). In other words, without effective public engagement and education, the U.S. can get the regulations right and still have a crippled biotech research capability.

Biotech is a dual-use technology that has tremendous potential for both good and bad. If used appropriately, it can dramatically improve the human condition; but it also has the potential for more nefarious outcomes.

Stakeholder transparency and public engagement are not necessarily panaceas for public acceptance. It is the duty of experts and elected officials in democratic states to reduce the burden of technical information and subsequent decision-making requirements for the lay public. Instead of involving the public in potentially complex risk-benefit analyses, public acceptance and challenges related to trust and ethics can also be addressed through better communication efforts. Robust methods developed from the field of cognitive behavioral psychology have proven effective in addressing these types of challenges and need to be more systematically applied to existing and emerging risk perceptions associated with advancing biotechnologies.

Public pushback can have incredible impact. Negative receptions to biotechnology products can result in an overly cautious regulatory approach to biotechnology that could harm the development of innovation in lieu of other countries’ facing fewer restrictions in pursuing innovative and lucrative technologies. From this perspective, the major threat to American national security is losing ground in terms of science and technology innovation capacity to other nations. The Wilson Center reports that the stakes in biosecurity are high, particularly in regards to ownership of various genetic engineering innovations (e.g., gene-editing patents). Losing ownership at early stage technology development can affect upstream knowledge-sharing and collaboration, and can also result in the U.S. having a less competitive edge in attracting research talent and private sector investment. To protect against these outcomes and to achieve the immense potential of genetically-engineered products, there must be acute regulatory efforts to address public perceptions of risks and to encourage the private sector and academia to continue innovating. Adapting ownership models and incentivizing information-sharing for improved biotech research collaborations is the best way to preserve security while maintaining public safety.

Biotech is a dual-use technology that has tremendous potential for both good and bad. If used appropriately, it can dramatically improve the human condition; but it also has the potential for more nefarious outcomes, such as disrupting food supplies and sickening large populations. Regardless, continued advancements in biotechnology are inevitable. We may wish for a world in which food was so abundant and people were so healthy that nobody would be interested in biotechnology. We may also wish for a world in which no one is interested in pursuing technologies with the potential to harm others. But that is not the world we inhabit. The current abundance of food is no guarantee against future scarcity, especially when we consider the risks of climate change. Human beings remain intensely interested in devising new ways to hurt each other. The U.S. cannot afford to absent itself from an area of research with such dire security implications. The combination of progress and prudence is the best that we can do.

### Link Booster – Econ Key

#### Economic issues are top public concern

Schonfeld, The Hill Breaking News Reporter, 5-25-22

[Zach Schonfeld, 5-25-2022, The Hill, "Economic issues top voters’ concerns ahead of midterms: poll,", https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/3501515-economic-issues-top-voters-concerns-ahead-of-midterms-poll/, Accessed 7-9-2022, LASA-LR]

Economic issues topped the list of things that voters are concerned about, according to a new Politico-Morning Consult poll.

Forty-one percent of registered voters polled said economic issues, including wages and taxes, are their top set of issues as they cast their vote for federal offices. Thirteen percent said security was their top issue, while another 11 percent each named seniors and women’s issues.

With the midterm elections less than six months away, voters indicated a slight preference toward voting for Democrats in this year’s congressional elections. Forty-five percent of respondents said they would vote for the Democratic candidate compared to 41 percent favoring a Republican candidate.

But Democrats, who are fighting to save their ultra-narrow majorities in the House and Senate this year, have struggled to combat Republican messaging on economic issues as the country continues to face the highest rate of inflation in decades. Consumer prices climbed 8.3 percent in April compared with a year earlier, marking the fastest increase in roughly 40 years.

### Link Turns the Case

#### The link turns the case – Congress’s actions affect international perceptions and shapes agendas

Sahay, co-winner of the Robert Belfer Award for Best Policy Analysis Exercise in International and Global Affairs, 21

(Usha, September 2021, Harvard Kennedy School: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, "Revitalizing NATO: A Role for the U.S. Congress", https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/files/publication/Revitalizing%20NATO%20-%20A%20Role%20for%20Congress%20-%20Sahay.pdf accessed on 7-13-2022, hooch//cs)

Because Congress confers legitimacy and because its members are (on balance) less active on foreign policy, the legislative branch has a disproportionate impact when it does act. The executive branch and foreign governments pay close attention to what Congress does, which gives members a unique tool for shaping these stakeholders’ agendas.127 Notably, interviewees generally agreed that Congress can have this sort of impact on the executive branch and allies even through low-cost actions like informal conversations with foreign diplomats or statements to the press. Congress’ ability to directly influence foreign governments, in particular, is an interesting finding of this project and an important exception to the overall reality that the legislative branch is less influential than the executive on foreign policy

## Internal Links

### Internal Link – Dems Key

#### No bipartisanship likely – Dems are key

Shephard, The New Republic, 22

[Alex Shephard, 1-21-2022, New Republic, "Bipartisanship Is Dead, and That’s Great News for Joe Biden,", https://newrepublic.com/article/165093/bipartisanship-dead-biden-democrats-obama, Accessed 7-11-2022, LASA-LR]

Biden got lucky once on this score: Bipartisanship produced a flawed infrastructure bill that, to this point, may represent the administration’s most important legislative victory. But the handful of Republicans who had something to gain from appearing “bipartisan” have already gotten their reward; they have no interest in aiding this administration any further, especially with the midterm—and then the presidential—elections rapidly approaching.

This, of course, also means that Biden is stuck with the pamphlet-thin Democratic margins he has in Congress—and with at least two senators, Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema, who have proven to be just as committed to stymying his agenda as their Republican counterparts. But the first step in recovery is admitting you have a problem, and acknowledging the failure of bipartisanship is crucial to righting an administration that has, in recent months, gone badly off the rails. It wasn’t until his second term that Obama fully reckoned with this reality. Biden got there faster. Perhaps that will count for something; for now, it will have to do.

## Impacts

### Antitrust Reform Good – Now Key

#### Now is key – failure to pass antitrust before the break risks collapse of reform

Reardon, CNET senior reporter, 7-1-22

[Marguerite, 7-1-22, CNET, “Congress' Bid to Rein In Big Tech Needs a Push Over the Finish Line”, <https://www.cnet.com/news/politics/congress-bid-to-rein-in-big-tech-needs-a-push-over-the-finish-line/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

It's getting down to the wire for Congress to pass a long-awaited federal privacy law and antitrust reform that could help change how Big Tech companies like Amazon, Apple, Google and Meta do business.

Congress is considering a slate of bills on both the privacy and antitrust fronts, which could result in, for the first time, regulation for major internet technology companies in the US. But even though there is bipartisan support for the legislation in the House and Senate, these bills still face uphill battles in their final push. While negotiations are ongoing, time is running out as Democrats risk losing control of both the House and Senate come the midterm elections in November. While the legislation could be taken up in the next Congress, experts fear that legislative priorities are likely to shift and further delay would likely result in a chipping away of key aspects of both antitrust and privacy legislation.

The next six weeks before the summer recess of Congress are "vital," said Bill Kovacic, former chair of the Federal Trade Commission and now a professor at George Washington University School of Law.

"The hazard is that you're coming out of this year with nothing," he said. "They could try again in the next Congress, but it's much more of a gamble. The prospects for robust legislation for privacy or for the regulation of digital platforms diminishes greatly."

This all comes after nearly five years of lawmakers on both sides of the aisle promising to rein in the power and influence of Big Tech with very little to show for their efforts so far. Increasingly alarmed by the power that giants like Amazon, Apple, Google, Meta and Twitter wield, they've targeted how these companies harm consumers by allegedly choking competition from smaller players, exploiting personal data for profit or controlling what is shared and consumed online.

#### Now is key – failure to pass antitrust reform will embolden anticompetitive behaviors

Reardon, CNET senior reporter, 7-1-22

[Marguerite, 7-1-22, CNET, “Congress' Bid to Rein In Big Tech Needs a Push Over the Finish Line”, <https://www.cnet.com/news/politics/congress-bid-to-rein-in-big-tech-needs-a-push-over-the-finish-line/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

Two pieces of antitrust legislation are teed up for Senate votes. If passed and signed into law, the legislation would mark the most meaningful change to antitrust law in decades. The stakes are high, Rep. David Cicilline, a Democrat from Rhode Island who chairs the House Judiciary subcommittee on antitrust, said during a webinar on antitrust Thursday. The big tech companies have already proven that they will behave badly without changes to the law and strict antitrust law enforcement, he contends.

"If we aren't successful in prohibiting the most pernicious behavior of these companies, they're going to be emboldened," he said. "Their conduct is going to get worse," which, he added, will "crush innovation" and leave less competition and fewer choices for consumers.

The American Innovation and Choice Online Act, which was introduced last October by Sens. Amy Klobuchar, a Democrat from Minnesota, and Chuck Grassley, a Republican from Iowa, would ban companies from preferencing their own products on their platforms over those of their competitors. It would end, for instance, Google's practice of highlighting its own products in search results over its competitors' sites and services. It would also prohibit Amazon from listing its own products on its e-commerce site at the top of its page before products sold from third-party competitors.

The Open App Markets Act, introduced in February by Sens. Richard Blumenthal, a Democrat from Connecticut, and Marsha Blackburn, a Republican from Tennessee, would prohibit companies, namely Apple or Google, from requiring app developers to pay app store commissions when their customers make in-app purchases. Currently, Apple and Google, which essentially control the app market, require all apps that allow in-app purchases to use their payment processors and to pay a commission on sales.

Both bills have been passed by the House on a bipartisan basis. The legislation also passed through committee earlier this year with strong bipartisan support, but senators from both parties say they still have concerns to be hammered out before a floor vote.

# Politics DA Aff Answers

## Antitrust Uniqueness Answers

### Won’t Pass Now – No Vote

#### No vote now – Schumer hasn’t scheduled a vote

Zakrzewski et al., Washington Post Technology Policy reporter, 6-27-22

[Cat Zakrzewski, Will Oremus, Washington Post Technology news analysis writer, Gerrit De Vynck, Washington Post Tech reporter covering Google, algorithms and ransomware, and Cristiano Lima. Tech newsletter reporter anchoring The Technology 202, focusing on politics and policy, 6-27-22, Washington Post, “With clock ticking, battle over tech regulation intensifies”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/06/27/antitrust-tech-battle-congress/>, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

The focus on Schumer has intensified after the segment on Oliver’s show, which is known for bringing mainstream attention to complex policy issues. In the segment, Oliver zeroed in on Schumer particularly, noting that he has not yet brought the bills for a floor vote. He also mentions previous media reports that show that 17 members of Congress have children who work or recently have worked at large tech companies, including Schumer’s daughters who work as a marketing manager at Meta and a registered lobbyist for Amazon.

Yet there are key holdouts in both parties. Though two key tech antitrust bills passed through committee earlier this year with strong bipartisan support, members of both parties indicated they had outstanding concerns that would need to be addressed before a floor vote. Schumer’s resolve to pass them is in question amid a bevy of competing priorities.

#### Plan not key – Schumer hasn’t scheduled the vote

Nelson, New York Post, 6-27-22

[Steven, 6-27-22, New York Post, “Billboards calling for Big Tech antitrust vote sent to Schumer’s home”, <https://nypost.com/2022/06/27/billboards-calling-for-big-tech-antitrust-vote-sent-to-schumers-home/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

An advocacy group has sent mobile billboards to Chuck Schumer’s DC and Brooklyn homes to convince the Senate majority leader to schedule a vote on bipartisan antitrust legislation that would curb the power of Big Tech platforms.

The truck-mounted ads arrived at the Democrat’s residences on Saturday promoting MakeSchumerWatchJohnOliver.com, which hosts a 26-minute clip of the HBO host John Oliver promoting the legislation.

“Everyone knows that Democrats are facing a tight election year, and I just don’t think that he can afford to fumble another major effort like this,” said Evan Greer, director of Fight for the Future, which paid for the ads.

“He needs to start acting like a majority leader, not a minority leader,” Greer told The Post. “Chuck Schumer is the only thing standing between these bills and passage.”

There are two major pending antitrust bills that would rein in anti-competitive practices by companies like Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Google.

One of the bills — the American Innovation and Choice Online Act — passed the Senate Judiciary Committee in January in a 16-6 vote. The bill was supported by all of the panel’s Democrats and five Republicans.

A related bill, the Open App Markets Act, is expected to be considered at the same time.

Most bills in the Senate need 60 votes to proceed. However, advocates note that many Republicans are sponsors, suggesting they might be able to pass.

“He could drop them on the floor tomorrow and they would pass,” Greer said.

### Won’t Pass Now – Dem Divisions

#### Won’t pass now – Dem divisions and no vote

Nelson, New York Post, 6-27-22

[Steven, 6-27-22, New York Post, “Billboards calling for Big Tech antitrust vote sent to Schumer’s home”, <https://nypost.com/2022/06/27/billboards-calling-for-big-tech-antitrust-vote-sent-to-schumers-home/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

“You have to start looking at ‘why might Chuck Schumer be so interested in protecting these Big Tech companies from commonsense bipartisan regulation?'” Greer said. “Our hope is that it’s just a timing thing and he’s going to get the message and stop stalling and put these bills on the floor, because everyone knows when these bills hit the floor, they’re going to pass.”

Schumer spokesman Angelo Roefaro told The Post, “Senator Schumer supports this bill and is working with Senator Klobuchar to get the votes.”

A Capitol Hill Democratic source said that the bill may not currently have the votes to pass either chamber of Congress, despite broad bipartisan support in committee.

Among the issues are tweaks demanded this month by four Democrats — Sens. Brian Schatz of Hawaii, Ron Wyden of Oregon, Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico and Tammy Baldwin of Wisconsin — to prevent the legislation from curbing content moderation practices. Many conservatives accuse Big Tech platforms of engaging in politically motivated censorship.

In May, a top aide to another Democrat, Sen. Maggie Hassan of New Hampshire, reportedly raised objections to the legislation on a conference call.

[NOTE: Greer = Evan Greer, director of Fight for the Future]

## Biden Uniqueness Answers

### Uniqueness & Link Answer – Dem Problems Now & Foreign Policy Not Key

#### No unique link – Biden unpopular, Democrats are divided, and domestic issues are key

Bambino, The Guardian Political Correspondent, 6-6-22

[Lauren Bambino, 6-6-22, The Guardian, "Biden entered office facing daunting crises – only to be hit with more crises,", https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/jun/06/joe-biden-entered-faces-daunting-crises, Accessed 7-9-22, LASA-LR]

“All presidents suffer a decline in their popularity midway through their first term and it’s often due to the fact that they cannot deliver on all of the promises that they make,” said Todd Belt, the director of the political management program at the George Washington University and co-author of The Post-Heroic Presidency. “This is particularly acute for Biden because he did make a lot of promises and he hasn’t been able to follow through on them.”

Even when the president is powerless to act unilaterally, Belt added, “he at least has to look like he’s trying”.

Democrats, with their slim control of Congress at risk, have grown frustrated with the president.

Progressives want to see him throw all his energy and political capital into issues like climate change, votings rights, immigration and abortion – and where this fails to push for rule-changes in the Senate to overcome Republican opposition. They also want to see him take more executive action, like on student-debt forgiveness. Meanwhile, many moderates in his party are upset that he promised bipartisanship and then put forward proposals that failed to win over their most conservative members, much less a single Republican.

### Econ Issues Hurt Biden Now

**Economic issues hurting Biden now**

Schnell, The Hill Congressional Reporter & Trudo, The Hill Senior Political Correspondent, 7-11-22 (Mychael and Hanna, 7-11-22, The Hill, "Doomsday political scenario takes shape for Democrats", https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/3553898-doomsday-political-scenario-takes-shape-for-democrats/?email=520ea953dc178f0b806be04939d36a974d09935e&emaila=b07d336abbbb12d6c745f3d915731b7e&emailb=abfc8154c4b60ce3c8f2113e96b5e3181dd3cb5a7eafa002087e7168a75536c2&utm\_source=Sailthru&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=New%20Campaign&utm\_term=News%20Alerts accessed on 7-12-22 hooch//cs)

The midterm election doomsday scenario for Democrats is becoming clearer, scarier, and more real as inflation and gas prices remain stubbornly high and dissatisfaction with President Biden is through the roof.

Democrats are seeing their chances of retaining the House slimmer than ever, with both history and the dreary political environment working against them. In the Senate, where the party had hoped strong swing state candidates could help save the majority, fears are also growing.

It seems that wherever voters look, things are bad in Biden’s Washington — and getting worse.

“Democrats haven’t done things they promised,” said Connor Farrell, a strategist who founded the progressive consultancy Left Rising. “In this environment, the best general election candidates will be bold [ones] that can distinguish themselves from what we’re getting from the White House.”

The high national anxiety — which many lawmakers, operatives, and activists are now openly acknowledging as problematic — was further laid bare when a poll released by the New York Times found that just 13 percent of voters surveyed think the country is on the right path. More strikingly, 64 percent of Democratic voters want someone other than Biden as their nominee in 2024.

The high prices of daily essentials, a gloomy appraisal of what’s happening around the country, and the prospect of more impending losses are leaving Democrats more concerned than ever about their odds in November.

“Democratic leadership should look no further than the fact that they need to wake up and step up to the plate,” said Jon Reinish, managing director at the political strategy firm Mercury.

While the idea that Democrats need to brace for a potential fall wipeout is not new, Monday’s poll highlights a trend that many see as particularly damning — a majority of registered Democratic voters are not happy with the overall direction of the U.S. under Biden’s leadership and they are not on board with another four years of it.

Sixty-three percent of Democrats polled said the country is headed in the wrong direction, while only 27 percent said it is on the right track.

“They’re not just losing Independents or you know, Never-Trump Republicans,” said Reinish, referencing two blocs that helped Biden establish a diverse coalition in 2020. “They’re losing their own voters. Democrats’ own voters don’t feel as if their leaders hear their concerns.”

That mindset is adding to what many already fear is an uphill midterm battle. A Politico/Morning Consult poll conducted last month did, however, find that registered voters are evenly split on the generic congressional ballot if the election were held that day.

But the party does not appear concerned, arguing that Biden’s waning approval will not jeopardize down-ballot candidates.

### Biden Weak Now

#### Biden can't do anything right now, his authority is gone

Nicholas, NBC News political reporter, 7-5-22

[Peter, 7-5-22, NBC News, "With pressures mounting, Biden thinks GOP will make his midterm case for him", <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2022-election/pressures-mounting-biden-thinks-gop-will-make-midterm-case-rcna36514>, accessed on 7-9-22, MG]

Little is going President Joe Biden’s way as the summer lull sets in before the crush of midterm elections.

Gas prices are up; his approval rating is down. A conservative Supreme Court majority is hacking away at his agenda by abolishing federal abortion rights and undermining environmental protections meant to curb climate change. His own party is losing patience, fearing that any chance of consequential change while Democrats control Congress is vanishing.

“There needs to be urgency and action,” said Rebecca Kirszner Katz, who was an aide to the late Senate Democratic leader Harry Reid. “Folks have been saying since the day Joe Biden was elected that we need to move fast. There are a lot of things we need to get done for the American people.”

Biden has been rolling out plans to cope with the mounting crises. He has a three-part plan to reduce inflation. Another plan to suspend the gas tax in hopes of bringing prices down. Then there’s his long-shot plan to enshrine abortion rights into law by suspending the Senate filibuster rule requiring 60-vote supermajorities.

Inside the White House, though, advisers grasp that what’s required aren’t just plans, but votes. The 50-50 split in the Senate between the parties has proved an insurmountable obstacle for Biden’s grandest ambitions — to expand the social safety net in ways that insulate the most vulnerable Americans from economic shocks.

“He has to change course,” said a Democratic congressman, speaking on condition of anonymity for fear of upsetting the White House. “His numbers are in the toilet. Whatever he’s doing is not working.”

A perennial complaint from Biden’s Democratic critics is that he hasn’t capitalized on the platform he commands as president.

“There’s a benefit to having the president out there every day using his executive power to show the country you’re fighting for them,” the Democratic lawmaker said. “And it’s almost like he’s hiding. He has the bully pulpit, and he’s either hiding behind it or under it. I don’t know where he is.”

### Uniqueness & Internal Link Answer

#### No unique link or internal link – Biden getting terrible media coverage now – so did Reagan – and he will bounce back

**Waldman, Washington Post Plum Line Writer, 22**

(Paul, 7-12-22, The Washington Post, "Joe Biden’s bad news problem", https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/07/12/biden-bad-news-problem/, accessed on 7-13-22, SR)

If you want to understand President Biden’s troubles, just look at all the news about gas prices.

Or to be more specific, look at the lack of media coverage, now that gas prices are falling precipitously, dropping 35 cents just in the last month. Yet the news does not lead every night with stories in which producers scour the country for the least expensive gas so they can put up one picture after another of signs showing how low the price has gotten.

Biden had very little to do with that price decline, just as he had very little to do with the increase that preceded it. Yet the increase was given maximum attention, with lots of discussion of how it would hurt him; the decline is essentially ignored.

It’s just one example that shows how the political and media system in which we all reside is built to make every president look like a failure — right up until they win reelection.

Right now Biden is in an approval trough, one many prior presidents experienced around the same time. The initial honeymoon, driven by all the hope and possibility of a new era, wears off once the difficult work of governing begins.

Legislative successes may come in the first year of a presidency, but then they get harder to come by. The president’s supporters, realizing he’s unable to wave a wand and bring about the paradise he promised during the campaign, begin to feel dissatisfied. Since almost every president sees their party suffer a brutal midterm loss, the news is full of discussion of his coming defeat.

Perhaps most importantly, bad news is always treated as more important than good news, so everything that is bad for the president gets amplified. That applies to gas prices and inflation, and it applies to the president himself: A new poll showing him with surprisingly high approval ratings will get a fraction of the coverage of one showing him with surprisingly low approval.

So you probably saw extensive media coverage of a New York Times poll that came out Monday, showing a majority of Democrats saying they want another presidential nominee in 2024. While no one would say it doesn’t show weakness for Biden, it’s an old story; here’s an article in The Post from September of 1982 about a poll showing a majority of voters saying Ronald Reagan shouldn’t run again in 1984. You may remember how that election turned out.

It’s a good reminder of how presidential approval tends to ebb and flow. Obviously, real-world events make a big difference, whether it’s the economy or foreign crises or natural disasters. But what we often see is that after the first midterm defeat, presidents slowly recover the public’s esteem, and everything changes once the public is presented with a binary choice between the president and a challenger.

That isn’t to deny Biden could have done plenty of things better. Like other liberals, I’ve been critical of some of his choices and his handling of a number of issues. I worry that he has been unable to manage his party’s base to keep them engaged and energized. And there are legitimate questions about his age (he’d be 86 at the end of his second term).

But we should also be careful when we discern a causal connection between whatever substantive or stylistic critique we have of the president and his low approval ratings.

Here’s an example: One criticism Biden’s supporters make is that he can be too downbeat, that to demonstrate sympathy with people’s struggles only reinforces the idea that things are bad. It’s a reasonable point, but it’s also sometimes accompanied by the observation that if Donald Trump were in the same situation, he’d say that even the most incremental improvement anywhere is the greatest thing that ever happened in world history and we should all be down on our knees thanking him.

Whenever there’s a good jobs report or even a decline in gas prices, some liberals will say, “If this was Trump he’d be on the news taking credit for it!” Which indeed he would. But people often forget that it didn’t actually work.

Trump never convinced most Americans he was doing a great job; he was the only president in the history of polling never to crack 50 percent approval, not even for a single day. His party was blown out in the 2018 midterms, and then he lost his reelection bid.

You may believe that in a just and rational world, Trump’s approval would have never been higher than 5 or 10 percent, but even so, all his preening and bragging clearly failed. And while it might not hurt for Biden to have a more relentlessly positive message, there isn’t much reason to think doing so would have an enormous effect on how voters think of him.

None of this means Biden is a secret political genius. But other presidents — Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, Barack Obama — found themselves in similar situations and recovered to win reelection and leave office in the glow of public affection. The same could happen to Biden, and the good news for him is that if there’s a story the media loves almost as much as the one that says everything is terrible, it’s the one about a dramatic comeback.

## Link Answers

### No Unique Link – Fights About Ukraine Aid Now

#### No link - Pelosi is threatening bipartisan support for Ukraine by linking aid to COVID politics

Thiessen, The Washington Post Foreign and Domestic Policy Columnist, 22

(Marc A., 5-3-2022, The Washington Post, "Pelosi’s partisan politics on Ukraine could have deadly consequences", https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/05/03/pelosi-kyiv-trip-playing-partisan-politics-on-ukraine/, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) deserves credit for leading a congressional delegation to Kyiv to meet with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky — a trip, she tweeted, that sent “an unmistakable and resounding message to the entire world: America stands firmly with Ukraine.”

It would have been a much more resounding message had it been bipartisan.

The speaker’s all-Democrat delegation included House Intelligence Committee Chairman Adam B. Schiff (D-Calif.), but the committee’s ranking Republican, Rep. Michael R. Turner (Ohio), was not invited, according to congressional sources. Neither was Rep. Mike D. Rogers (Ala.), the ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Committee, which is responsible for the $33 billion military aid package President Biden has requested for Ukraine. Yet a Democratic member of the committee, Rep. Jason Crow (Colo.), was included. Pelosi’s counterpart, House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.), also was not invited — because of bad blood between them, a Pelosi spokesman told me. The only ranking Republican on a committee with jurisdiction over Ukraine policy to be invited was Rep. Michael McCaul (Tex.), the top Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who had just returned from his third trip to the region and could not go.

After McCaul told Pelosi he could not go, he recommended she ask Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick (Pa.), the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Europe. Fitzpatrick is also co-chairman of the bipartisan Congressional Ukraine Caucus and a former FBI agent whose last assignment before entering Congress was in Kyiv. He had a prior commitment, Fitzpatrick told me, but “I would have canceled in a second if I had been invited.” But he wasn’t. Why didn’t Pelosi include him? Perhaps, he says, it’s because he is on the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee’s target list of 22 Republican or open seats it hopes to win in November. McCaul also recommended that Pelosi invite Rep. Dan Meuser (R-Pa.), another member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He also did not receive an invitation.

The Pelosi spokesman told me that “numerous” GOP House members were invited, though he declined to offer names, and that “none of the Republicans accepted the invitation.” He said that “given the security precautions for this trip,” members could not be told the destination was Kyiv and were instead “told this was a codel to Poland.” But McCaul was told that the congressional delegation planned to go to Ukraine. And the idea that Pelosi could not tell the destination to senior members of Congress’s national security committees — who have access to our nation’s most highly classified intelligence — is absurd. If she had wanted to bring senior Republicans with her to meet with Zelensky, she could have. Including Republicans who have been critical of her would have sent a powerful message: Whatever our differences at home, we are united in support of Ukraine. But she chose not to do so.

Ultimately, what matters more than the photo op is the military aid package that Congress approves. But instead of calling the House back into session upon her return to pass the $33 billion in military and humanitarian support immediately, Pelosi is linking the Ukraine aid to a controversial package of billions in additional covid relief. Asked about tying the two priorities together, Pelosi told reporters on Friday: “I’m all for that,” adding that “we need to have the covid money.”

Pelosi knows full well that many Republicans have legitimate concerns about additional pandemic spending after Democrats wasted on non-covid projects much of the $1.9 trillion they approved on a party-line vote last year. She also knows that Senate Republicans are rightly linking a vote on covid relief to a vote on bipartisan legislation to keep Title 42 — the public health order that allows border officials to turn away migrants in an effort to minimize virus spread — in place until 60 days after the surgeon general announces the end of the pandemic public health emergency. So, linking Ukraine aid to covid relief necessarily entangles it in the divisive politics of the southern border.

Pelosi might think she can get Republicans to back down on Title 42 by blaming any delays in Ukraine aid on them. “This is called legislating,” Pelosi said. Ukrainians are fighting for their lives — they don’t have time to wait for Congress to “legislate” on extraneous issues.

Rep. Michael Waltz (R-Fla.) — who also was not invited to Kyiv by Pelosi but tells me he gladly would have gone to meet Zelensky — tweeted: “If Speaker Pelosi’s tough talk in Ukraine is serious, she should immediately call the House back into session to vote on additional weapons for Ukraine that is NOT paired with COVID spending. We are in a race against time with the Russians.”

He’s right. Not bringing any Republicans to Kyiv was a lost opportunity. But playing political brinkmanship with aid to Ukraine that enjoys broad bipartisan support would be a scandal with deadly consequences.

### Link Answer – NATO Bipartisan

#### No link – NATO has strong bipartisan support now

Langfitt, NPR international correspondent, 7-2-22

[Frank, 7-2-22, NPR Weekend Edition Saturday, “NATO commits to focusing on Russia and China”, <https://www.npr.org/2022/07/02/1109558003/nato-commits-to-focusing-on-russia-and-china>, accessed 7-2-22, AFB]

LANGFITT: Many in Europe were deeply worried about America's staying power following the election of President Donald Trump. Trump frequently bashed NATO, saw some allies as freeloaders who relied on America to finance their protection. Biden's reassured Europeans, but they worry about the next president. At the summit, I moderated a panel with two U.S. senators. I read out this audience question.

President Trump had previously discussed withdrawing from NATO. What is your message to the transatlantic community about the U.S. commitment to NATO after the 2024 presidential election?

Senator Thom Tillis, the North Carolina Republican, is co-chair of the Senate NATO Observer Group.

THOM TILLIS: The Congress is solidly behind this historic and transformational alliance - the greatest alliance that's ever existed.

LANGFITT: Tillis's Democratic co-chair, Senator Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire, agreed and added this.

JEANNE SHAHEEN: We actually have a bill right now in the Senate that would require congressional approval or Senate approval to withdraw from NATO right now.

LANGFITT: In an intensely polarized Washington, it was a rarity - Democrats and Republicans agreeing. There's always been bipartisan support for NATO and, since World War II, for a strong American role in the world. That support endures, an encouraging sign for European allies in an otherwise divided America.

### Link Answer – Ukraine

#### No link – Americans support foreign policy especially against Russia - Ukraine proves

**Telhami, Foreign Policy Center for Middle East Policy Nonresident Senior Fellow, 7-5-22**

(Shibley, 7-5-22, Brookings, "Americans’ preparedness to pay a price for supporting Ukraine remains robust", https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/07/05/americans-preparedness-to-pay-a-price-for-supporting-ukraine-remains-robust/, accessed on 7-13-22, SR)

In May, a University of Maryland Critical Issues Poll found a drop in the American public’s expressed preparedness to pay a price for supporting Ukraine in its war with Russia, compared to the levels expressed in March, on three dimensions: increased energy costs, rising inflation, and preparedness to pay a price in American lives. The latest edition of the Critical Issues Poll, which I lead with Professor Stella Rouse, finds that the drop in May has not become a trend — and in fact the expressed public preparedness to pay a price has increased slightly since May, though it remains lower than it was in March. The poll of 2,208 respondents was fielded by Nielsen-Scarborough June 22-28, with a margin of error of +/- 2.09%. The finding is especially notable given the increase in oil prices and rising inflation that Americans have endured since the start of the war — and should be music to President Joe Biden’s ears as his administration has invested heavily in backing Ukraine, strengthening and expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and confronting Russia. Here are four key findings from the latest poll:

Americans are still prepared to support Ukraine even if this means higher energy costs and increased inflation, with an uptick from May, but below the level of support expressed in March. In the June poll, 62% of respondents said they were prepared to endure higher energy costs, up from 59% in May but down from 73% in March. Similarly, 58% expressed preparedness for increased inflation, up from 52% in May but down from 65% in March. Americans’ preparedness for the loss of U.S. troops remains low at 32% but rose back to March levels after a dip in May.

There are substantial differences in the degree of preparedness to pay a price for supporting Ukraine between Democrats and Republicans, and the gap between the two is slowly growing, with Democrats expressing much greater willingness to pay a price. While 78% percent of Democrats are prepared to see higher energy costs, only 44% of Republicans say the same; while 72% of Democrats are prepared to pay with higher inflation, only 39% of Republicans say the same.

The gap in preparedness to pay higher energy prices between Democrats and Republicans has grown from 30 percentage points in March to 32 points in May to 34 in June. Similarly, on preparedness to see increased inflation, the gap has grown from 28 percentage point in March to 31 points in May to 34 in June. On preparedness for loss of U.S. troops, the gap between Democrats and Republicans grew in June from 5 percentage points in March to 9 in May to 15 in June. Among Republicans, 22% are prepared to risk American soldiers’ lives compared to 37% of Democrats.

While a plurality of respondents says that both Russia and Ukraine are neither succeeding nor failing in their war efforts (37% and 40% respectively), they see Ukraine as more succeeding than failing (27% to 20%), while they see Russia as more failing than succeeding (29% to 20%). This holds for both Democrats and Republicans.

Even though the Biden administration has opposed imposing a no-fly zone (NFZ) over Ukraine, there is a growing public support for doing so, despite the concern about confrontation with Russia. Support for NFZ grew from 56% in March to 59% in May and 65% June. This trend transcended party lines, with a growing number of Republicans (52% to 54% to 57%) and Democrats (61% to 64% to 72%) supporting enforcing a NFZ should the war persist. As we noted in our article in May, an experiment we conducted in the May poll showed that respondents are more reluctant to impose a NFZ when informed of the potential direct conflict with Russia inherent in the act, but are more supportive when there is no mention of a direct connection. The trend could be a result of the public not making a direct connection to confrontation with Russia, possibly coupled with public wish for more decisive NATO support for Ukraine.

**The findings suggest that the drop in American public preparedness to pay a price for supporting Ukraine and confronting Russia has not become a trend; in fact, there is a slight uptick in the expressed preparedness to pay a price, compared to a month earlier, though slightly lower preparedness to pay a price than in March.** This is good news for the Biden administration which has prioritized support for Ukraine. If fatigue grows, it would be music to Russian President Vladimir Putin’s ears. Aside from the heavy price Ukrainians are paying for the war fought on their territory, the Russian people are paying the second-highest cost — much more than the cost born by Americans in their support role for Ukraine. But Putin could count on this if American fatigue grows: Over time, public fatigue in democracies is more likely to be politically consequential than in autocracies, as leaders in democracies tend to be more sensitive to the attitudes of their publics.

It is also notable that few Americans see Russia as winning the war, something that almost always affects the calculus for staying the course. Our poll finds that respondents who say Russia is failing are more likely to be prepared to pay a price for supporting Ukraine than those who say Russia is succeeding. i/L -

#### i/L - Support for Ukraine has bipartisan support, any many policy makers see it as the main threat

**Clark, Washington Times National Security and Congress Reporter, 22** (Joseph, 7-7-2022, The Washington Times, "Ukrainian-born member of U.S. House blasts Biden, Zelenskyy for Ukraine war politicking", https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2022/jul/7/ukrainian-born-member-us-house-blasts-biden-zelens/, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

The first and only Ukrainian-born member of the U.S. House accused President Biden and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy of “playing politics with people’s lives” as the war in Ukraine rages with no clear end in sight.

Republican Rep. Victoria Spartz, who was among the first members of Congress to visit post-invasion Ukraine, signaled the limits of unbridled support from Capitol Hill for an aimless war in a scathing statement Wednesday.

“President Biden has to stop playing politics, have a clear strategy and align security assistance with our strategy,” Ms. Spartz, Indiana Republican, said in her statement in which she listed “urgent action items needed to get the situation under control.”

She said Mr. Zelenskyy “has to stop playing politics and theater, and start governing to better support his military and local governments,” **and called on Congress to “establish proper oversight of critical infrastructure and delivery of weapons.”**

Ms. Spartz has introduced several measures in support of Ukraine since Russia’s invasion of her homeland in late February including a bill to allow U.S. citizens to fight for Ukraine and legislation to remove red tape from U.S. aid shipments to the country.

She offered a resolution in early March expressing “unequivocal support for Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.”

In May, Ms. Spartz voted in favor of the $40 billion supplemental aid package for Ukraine which 57 of her Republican House colleagues voted against.

Her recent criticism, however, suggests that she does not offer her support for Ukraine blindly.

“My understanding of the situation in Ukraine is not from books or theories or surveillance reports and analytics, but from seeing and hearing what’s actually happening with my own eyes,” she said.

Ms. Spartz’s critique could signal added challenges for President Biden in the coming months.

The White House has not ruled out needing to ask Congress for additional aid as Russia’s unrelenting assault drags on.

The U.S. has provided $6.9 billion in security assistance to Ukraine since the invasion, and each new weapons shipment chips away at the last $40 billion package approved by Congress last month.

National Security Council spokesman John Kirby told reporters last month that it is impossible to predict how long the war will last and said it is too early to tell whether the administration will need additional funding.

“President Biden has made it clear that we’re going to continue to support Ukraine as much as we can, as fast as we can,” he said. “And we’re doing that. We’ll see where this goes going forward.”

**Members of Congress from both parties overwhelmingly supported the last package, which included economic and humanitarian assistance along with military aid.** The House approved the package by a 368 to 57 margin, and the Senate voted 86 to 11 to send the bill to the president’s desk.

Although support for the last package was overwhelming in Congress, it was not unanimous.

A group of 57 Republicans in the House and 11 Republicans in the Senate voted against the measure. Some of the lawmakers objected to what they said was a lack of accountability for the lethal aid after a measure to specifically fund the Department of Defense Inspector General to oversee the assistance.

Some of the lawmakers also objected to sending aid to Ukraine while America faces growing problems on its Southwest border, supply chain snags and rising costs from inflation.

Other lawmakers’ objections to the aid aligned with Ms. Spartz‘s more recent criticism of President Biden’s lack of a clear strategy in Ukraine, which they said should direct the aid.

The administration has been wary to define the contours of the war and has pledged that Ukraine alone will define its victory, but a small group of lawmakers has begun asking how the war ends and how much it will cost.

“I will not go into many problems at this time and there are plenty of them, but will just list three urgent action items needed to get the situation under control,” she said before listing her grievances with Messrs. Biden and Zelenskyy’s leadership and Congress’ lack of oversight.

#### Link – Ukraine bipartisan support high now, aff takes away focus, polarizing policymakers

**Borger, The Guardian World Affairs Editor, 22** (Julian, 5-5-2022, the Guardian, "Why the Ukrainian war is also a domestic political issue for Biden", https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/may/05/ukrainian-war-biden-policy-polling, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

The visit of the [House speaker, Nancy Pelosi](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/may/01/biden-request-33bn-ukraine-aid-michael-mccaul-republican), to Kyiv at the head of a congressional delegation this week was a reminder that in Washington the Ukraine war is not just an issue of national security but is an increasingly important domestic political issue too.

In his approach to the conflict, [Joe Biden](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/joebiden), has the wind at his back in terms of US public opinion and Democratic party sentiment which is encouraging him to be ever more forward-leaning.

In a new poll conducted by the [Washington Post](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/05/02/poll-ukraine-support-biden/)and ABC News, 37% of Americans questioned said his administration was not doing enough to support the Ukrainians, fractionally more than the 36% who said he was doing the right amount. Only 14% suggested he was doing too much.

Late last month, the administration [broadened US objectives](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/apr/25/russia-weakedend-lloyd-austin-ukraine) in the conflict, to not just support Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity but also to weaken Russia, with the aim of preventing a repeat of Moscow’s aggression against other countries.

A European diplomat suggested that one of the factors behind that shift was impatience in the higher levels of the party with the administration’s posture.

“It’s fundamentally about trying to get on the front foot in this crisis. There’s a lot of domestic criticism of the administration for being so passive,” the official said.

“The Hill [Congress] are cross and a lot of the big Democratic donors think it’s not being as forthright as America should be … Biden thinks he’s treading a careful path between intervention in its broader sense and keeping the focus on domestic concerns – and some Democrats are starting to think that balance isn’t right.”

Senator Chris Coons, a senior figure in Democratic foreign policy circles, has criticised Biden for taking direct military intervention off the table as an option. On the other side of the party, there has been little pushback from the progressive wing, which is normally sceptical about sending large quantities of military hardware into foreign conflicts.

And for once in Washington, the Republicans are pushing in the same direction.

“This is one of the few areas where Democrats and Republicans are reasonably well united and that makes it pretty easy for a president to move in that direction. He’s not making enemies,” said Larry Sabato, politics professor at the University of Virginia.

“The umbrella over all of this is the moral issue and the powerful video of Ukrainians being slaughtered and dislocated,” John Zogby, a pollster and political consultant, said. “Americans are moved by that and overwhelmingly support the Ukrainian people.”

It is nonetheless a political wedge issue. Support is more uniform among Democrats than Republicans. Donald Trump transferred his personal admiration for Vladimir Putin to at least some of his followers and the Fox News commentator Tucker Carlson, who has [consistently raised pro-Moscow talking points on his show](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2022/feb/25/tucker-carlson-fox-news-russia-putin).

Democratic support is deepened by the important role of Ukrainian-Americans, thought to represent about 1 million people (Zogby thinks that is an underestimate) and who are influential on the party’s ethnic coordinating council. They have all the more sway because they are concentrated in swing states.

“You’ve got a decent number of Ukrainians in Ohio, and you have a Senate race in Ohio. There are Ukrainians in Pennsylvania and you have a Senate race in Pennsylvania,” said Wendy Schiller, political science professor at Brown University.

In Wisconsin, Democrats have been running ads against the incumbent Senator Ron Johnson, focusing on his 2018 visit to Moscow.

“It’s not an accident that Nancy Pelosi went to [Ukraine](https://www.theguardian.com/world/ukraine),” Schiller said. “To have the speaker go, it says this is going to be an issue that the national party is going to take into the midterm elections.”

With state-level and national politics, moral outrage among the public and Biden’s own foreign policy instincts, all pointing in the same direction, the administration has sharply raised its stake in the Ukraine conflict, asking Congress for an extraordinary $33bn in military, economic and humanitarian support for Kyiv.

Public support, however, dies away dramatically when it comes to the question of sending US troops. Only 21% asked in this week’s poll backed such direct intervention, and concern about Ukraine escalating into a nuclear conflict is significantly higher among Democrats than Republicans.

Biden, who has made extricating the US from “forever wars” his signature foreign policy, has repeatedly said he will not send US troops into Ukraine, and has cancelled routine missile tests to reduce any risk of misunderstanding and miscalculation between the two nuclear superpowers.

“Boots on the ground may very well be a very different story,” Zogby said. “I don’t think world war three polls very well.”

#### Link - Because Ukraine aid is so popular, Biden is scrapping other plans to save bipartisanship - Covid proves

**Schwarz, Deseret News National politics writer, 22** (D. Hunter, 5-11-2022, Deseret News, "Aid to Ukraine is bridging the political divide", https://www.deseret.com/2022/5/11/23067303/support-for-aid-to-ukraine-is-wildly-bipartisan, accessed on 7-13-2022, SR)

Anna Shevchenko, 35, reacts next to her home in Irpin, near Kyiv, Ukraine, Tuesday, May 3, 2022. The house, built by Shevchenko’s grandparents, was nearly completely destroyed by bombing in late March during the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In her beloved flowerbed, some roses, lilies, peonies and daffodils survived. “It is new life. So I tried to save my flowers,” she said.

Emilio Morenatti, Associated Press

Congress is passing measures to support Ukraine on a wide, bipartisan basis, and fast, and they have the support of a majority of the U.S.

President Joe Biden signed a lend-lease program to get military aid to Ukraine on Monday, which passed on Monday the Senate by unanimous consent, and on Tuesday, the House passed $40 billion in emergency funding to Ukraine on a 368-to-5 vote. Biden previously hoped to pass the supplemental Ukrainian aid simultaneously with new COVID relief ahead of a possible fall surge of the virus, **but scrapped the plan to win over Republicans, saying Monday “we cannot afford delay.”**

The $40 aid bill now heads to the Senate, where Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said “time is of the essence.”

“President Biden has made clear that the aid provided by Congress a few months ago is now near its end,” Schumer said Wednesday on the Senate floor. “As we acted quickly and decisively a few months ago, we must do so again very, very soon, and I will make sure this is a priority for the Senate.”

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell called the war in Ukraine **“the most important thing going on in the world right now.”**

New polling shows Congress has majority support across both major political parties. Two-thirds of U.S. adults support strict economic sanctions on Russia, according to a Pew Research Center poll released Tuesday. The poll also found 71% support sending military equipment and weapons to Ukraine and 64% support stationing U.S. forces in NATO countries.

And while Democrats and Democratic leaners are more likely to support these measures, 60% of Republicans and Republican leaners still back U.S. troops in NATO countries, and 73% support sanctions.

**Ukraine is a relative bright spot for Biden’s approval.** The Pew poll found more U.S. adults approve his administration’s response to Russia’s invasion than disapprove, 45% to 34%, including a growing minority of Republicans. Between March and May, the percentage of Republicans and Republican leaners who approve of Biden’s handling of the situation in Ukraine has grown from 21% to 26%.

The percentage of Americans who believe the U.S. hasn’t done enough for Ukraine has fallen from 42% in March to 31% in May. About a third believe U.S. support is about right, 22% aren’t sure, and 12% say it’s too much.

The poll was conducted between April 25 and May 1, 2022 with a panel of 5,074 respondents with a sampling error of plus or minus 2 percentage points.

### Link Answer – Ukraine/Humanitarian Spin

#### Politicians can’t afford to look indifferent to humanitarian crises

Raine, International Institute for Strategic Studies Geopolitical Due Diligence Senior advisor, 22

[John Raine, 3-11-22, International Institute for Strategic Studies, “Time for NATO to find a way out of the escalation trap in Ukraine,”, https://www.iiss.org/blogs/analysis/2022/03/time-for-nato-to-find-a-way-out-of-the-escalation-trap-in-ukraine, Accessed 7-11-22, LASA-LR]

Why should NATO want to stop Russia, or anyone, fighting wars on its border? The obvious answer is to prevent the humanitarian suffering it causes, now seen graphically in Ukraine. This responsibility to protect life is keenly felt by member states, for many of whom it is central to their foreign policy. To be reduced to well-informed bystanders will be for them morally if not politically untenable.

But, secondly, being unable to stop Russian expansion on its borders damages the credibility of NATO as a bulwark against aggression, and Russian aggression in particular. For Russia’s military command, there will not only be no evidence that NATO was prepared to fight Russia, but also a consistent line that it will always avoid escalation and direct conflict. Russia will feel licensed to repeat its expansionist operations elsewhere.

Thirdly, if Russia’s wars are successful, it will convert the territory it acquires into forward military and intelligence bases, as it did in Syria, the principal purpose of which will be to give it strategic advantage over NATO. Doing that in Ukraine will allow Putin to eat away, at his leisure, at the softer edges of NATO.

### Link Answer – Cybersecurity Bipartisan

#### No link – Congress supports bolstering NATO cybersecurity

Alemany, Washington Post Congressional Investigations Reporter & Meyer, Washington Post national political reporter, 3-8-22

[Jacqueline & Theodoric, 3-8-22, Washington Post, “Lamwakers wonder whether NATO is ready to robustly defend against a cyberattack against one of its own”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/08/lawmakers-wonder-whether-nato-is-ready-robustly-defend-cyber-attack-against-one-if-its-own/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

The other battlefield: It isn't only Russia's military might that has some U.S. lawmakers and experts concerned about what's next in the conflict with Ukraine. They're also worried about a stealthy but possibly just as damaging enemy: cyber warfare.

They believe that as Russian President Vladimir Putin is pressed on the battlefield and continues to be squeezed by the sharp bite of U.S. and European sanctions, NATO's newly evolved cyber policy might not be prepared to respond.

Over the past decade, NATO — like most organizations and entities — has modernized its cyber defensive posture and practices, prompting NATO to say last year that it would “weigh ‘on a case-by-case basis’ whether a cyberattack would trigger its Article 5 collective defense principle, which establishes that an attack against one ally is an attack against all allies,” our colleagues Cat Zakrzewski and Joseph Menn reported last month.

“We will not speculate on how serious a cyberattack would have to be in order to trigger a collective response,” a NATO official told reporters month. “Any response could include diplomatic and economic sanctions, cyber measures, or even conventional forces, depending on the nature of the attack,” the official added.

The updated policy, according to former U.S. ambassadors to NATO and experts who work closely with the organization, has come a long way since Russian-based attackers launched massive cyberattacks on Estonia over the removal of a Soviet war memorial in the small Baltic country in 2007.

As it currently stands, NATO leaders were deliberately ambiguous in defining what would qualify as an Article 5 attack when revising the group's cyber policy, “so as not to create a clear-cut threshold beneath which an opponent could operate freely,” said Douglas Lute, a former U.S. ambassador to NATO. But there is some concern the ambiguity might muddle a potential response to a cyberattack.

Key quote: “If you have a catastrophic cyberattack that shuts down your [power] grids or shuts down your ability to keep your people warm in the winter or fed or what have you, we've got to figure that out. I think NATO needs to get together and have those very difficult [discussions] because it is a component of war, as I said before, and I think it needs to be viewed as such,” Rep. John Katko (R-N.Y.), the top Republican on the House Homeland Security panel, told The Washington Post in an interview last week.

“I think it's evolving. Do they have more to go? Absolutely,” Katko added of NATO.

#### No link – cybersecurity has broad bipartisan support

Patel, Signal Group Advocacy senior manager, 22

[Pooja, 4-21-22, Signal Group, “Cyber policy isn’t going away anytime soon,” <https://signaldc.com/cyber-policy-isnt-going-away-anytime-soon/>, accessed 7-1-22, AFB]

Throughout the 117th Congress, there continues to be strong bipartisan, bicameral momentum to coalesce around key cybersecurity initiatives. This has been all the more enhanced by the Biden Administration’s prioritization of this issue. Especially in an increasingly tense and partisan atmosphere, where policymakers will continue to diverge from bipartisan agreements with an election on the horizon, cybersecurity issues will continue to be a strong opportunity for lawmakers to facilitate real impact through efforts that cross party lines.

Thus far in the 117th Congress, cybersecurity policies and funding have garnered attention in nearly every major funding package. This includes large funding infusions within the 2021 American Rescue Plan, the 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, and the FY 2022 omnibus package. Beyond inclusion in these broader packages, there has also been significant traction to move smaller, less controversial bills that can quickly move through the legislative process, which has been supplemented by strong advocacy efforts from influential cybersecurity leaders on both sides of the aisle.

Over the next few months when very little policy will get done due to the upcoming elections, cybersecurity policy remains one of the few areas where policy changes could occur – ranging from large funding opportunities to policy implications concerning jurisdiction of federal cybersecurity programs, and more. Cybersecurity remains well-positioned to receive strong attention over the next several months, and policymakers from both sides of the aisle will continue to act on opportunities to secure wins in this policy space.

### Link Answer – Cyber Not Perceived

#### No link – Cyber exploits are secretive, one-time use, and obfuscate responsibility avoiding congressional oversight

Vinik, POLITICO The Agenda assistant editor, 15

(Danny Vinik, assistant editor for The Agenda at Politico, POLITICO, 12-9-15, "America’s secret arsenal," The Agenda, https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2015/12/defense-department-cyber-offense-strategy-000331/, accessed 7-13-22) SS:/

WHEN I SET out to examine the U.S.’s offensive cyber capabilities, the first question I asked experts was what type of cyber weapons the U.S. possesses, expecting a range of answers. With kinetic weapons, Americans are well aware of the power of our military arsenal and have some sense of the consequences of our traditional and nuclear capacities. I expected to learn something similar from cyber experts.

That’s not what happened. In fact, cyber weapons exist in a realm not unlike the early days of the nuclear program, shrouded in secrecy, with plenty of curiosity but very little public information. In part this secrecy is integral to the whole concept: a cyberattack is useful insofar as the enemy is unaware of it. The more the government reveals about what’s in its arsenal, the more our adversaries can do to protect themselves.

"If you know much about it, [cyber is] very easy to defend against," said Michael Daniel, a special assistant to the president and cybersecurity coordinator at the National Security Council. "Therefore, that’s why we keep a lot of those capabilities very closely guarded."

One thing everyone I spoke to agreed on: The U.S. has the most powerful cyber arsenal in the world. Brandon Valeriano, a lecturer at the University of Glasgow who focuses on cyber conflict, used the example of the North Korean Internet interruption in December 2014, when the nation’s fledgling Internet went out for a few hours, just a few days after the White House blamed the Sony hack on Pyongyang. “If America wanted to take down North Korea’s Internet,” he said, “it wouldn’t be two to three hours. It would be devastating.”

A cyber weapon, called a “capability” in the field, is a piece of malicious code that exploits a flaw in an enemy’s software; the point is to manipulate, disrupt or destroy computers, information systems, networks or physical infrastructure controlled by computer systems. An attacker could use a cyber weapon to take down another country’s financial systems or electrical systems.

“Anything that has a computer anywhere on earth can be stopped or taken over,” said Jason Healey, the head of the Atlantic Council’s Cyber Statecraft Initiative and former director for cyber infrastructure protection in the George W. Bush White House from 2003 to 2005.

The most powerful cyber capabilities, called “zero-days,” exploit software vulnerabilities unknown even to the author of the software itself—for example, a security hole in the Windows operating system that even Microsoft doesn’t know is there. They’re called zero-days because once discovered, the author has zero days to fix them—people can immediately use them to cause damage.

As weapons, cyber capabilities differ in a few key ways from traditional weapons like missiles and bombs. First, they cause damage that’s less overt but more widespread than a physical attack—a cyber weapon could cripple a local economy by attacking a country’s financial or communication systems. Second, an attack can occur almost instantaneously against any target in the world. The Internet makes physical distance between enemies all but irrelevant, making it both easier for enemies to launch cyberattacks and harder for the government to monitor for them. Third, the use of a cyber capability is often a one-time deal: If the government has a piece of malicious software and uses it to exploit a flaw in an enemy’s code, it could render future uses of that capability ineffective, since the adversary could just patch it. It could also compromise intelligence-collection activities that use the same exploit.

Furthermore, the line between a military attack and an espionage operation is far blurrier in the cyber realm. A cyberattack generally doesn’t involve the movement of physical objects and does not put the attacker’s soldiers at risk. “All of the potential red flags that would pop up and get congressional attention don't,” said Peter Singer, a renowned cyber expert and author of “Cybersecurity and Cyberwar: What Everyone Needs To Know.” The same exploit might be used by intelligence agencies to spy on an enemy, or as an offensive weapon to mount a sudden attack.

That blurriness can be used to cloak responsibility, many observers think. For example, analysts have pointed out that if Stuxnet were indeed a U.S. operation—as is widely believed by now—the administration could avoid taking public responsibility for it by classifying it as an intelligence operation, rather than military.

### AT – GOP Backlash on Cyber

#### GOP won’t prevent cooperation on cyber

Sabin, POLITICO Weekly Cybersecurity Reporter, 7-11-22

(Sam Sabin, POLITICO Pro Reporter, POLITICO, 7-11-2022, "How the midterms could change cyber policy," https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-cybersecurity/2022/07/11/how-the-midterms-could-change-cyber-policy-00044981, accessed 7-11-2022) SS:/

— A note of optimism: One cyber-focused Republican who’s sticking around predicts continued cooperation on cybersecurity no matter what wing of the GOP holds sway. “We’ve got members that are part of every caucus” on the House Homeland Security cyber subcommittee, said Rep. Andrew Garbarino (N.Y.), the subcommittee’s ranking member. That includes the center-right Tuesday Group, GOP members of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus and lawmakers in the right-wing Freedom Caucus. “Nobody has given major pushback on anything,” Garbarino said.

## Impact Answers

### Impact Defense – Reform Won’t Help The Economy

#### No impact solvency – Klobuchar antitrust reform will not boost competition

Garst, Center for Freedom and Prosperity vice president, 6-21-22

[Brian, 6-21-22, Washington Times, <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2022/jun/21/the-progressive-antitrust-trojan-horse/>, accessed 7-4-22, AFB]

Progressives have a plan to expand antitrust law that would effectively nationalize America’s most successful companies. They even hope to get conservatives on board. The bill most likely to get consideration this Congress would, according to Ryan Bourne and Brad Subramaniam of the Cato Institute, “generally make it unlawful for major online platforms to engage in conduct that has produced tech products that consumers enjoy.”

This proposal, if enacted, would prevent Apple from preloading FaceTime and iMessage into your apps and Google would have to remove Google Maps. Amazon Prime would be “de facto banned.”

If this sounds to you like a bad deal for consumers, you are spot on. This is nothing more than a Trojan Horse bill intended to expand federal power over the private sector.

Conservatives have a long history of embracing free-market economics. It wasn’t so long ago that the Republican Party was known for encouraging entrepreneurship and celebrating success. Now, there is an emerging split between the populist wing and the traditional free marketeers of the Republican Party that endangers the economy. Because this fight is over Big Tech, some on the right are willing to toss aside small, limited government first principles for short-term political gain.

One Republican has dug in for the fight and is willing to take on Big Government ideas coming from both progressive Democrats and populist Republicans. For Fox News, Republican Sen. Rand Paul wrote on June 13, 2022, that he shares a degree of anger with Big Tech companies, yet he will not toss aside his love of “free-market principles” for legislation that would “deprive consumers of the technological innovation that only free-market competition can provide.”

Mr. Paul criticized Democrat Sen. Amy Klobuchar’s bill, the American Innovation and Choice Online Act (S. 2992), as creating a presumption that mergers are a violation of antitrust law. Mr. Paul remains critical of Republican Sen. Josh Hawley’s bill, the Trust-Busting for the Twenty-First Century Act (S. 1074), that would forward the progressive goal of “preventing mergers” and ignoring “the welfare of the consumer.” The Hawley bill bans all mergers and acquisitions by companies with a market capitalization exceeding $100 billion. The Klobuchar bill is an attempt to empower government bureaucrats’ control over private enterprise, while the Hawley bill is a direct attack on success. Both would lead to pain for consumers and stagnation for a struggling American economy.

Ms. Klobuchar’s legislation would expand the power of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice over private enterprise. President Biden’s pick to run the FTC, Lina Khan, actually wrote an early version of this legislation. Politico reported in May, “Lina Khan, President Joe Biden’s Federal Trade Commission chair, helped write the House version of the American Innovation and Choice Online Act when she was a staffer on the Judiciary Committee.” The Politico story cited heartburn from moderate Democrats who fear the radical legislation will cause even more economic headwinds and weaken the party’s electoral prospects. Progressive Democrats intend on rushing this legislation through the Senate because they worry that a potential Republican majority following an election dominated by economic concerns would be less apt to beat up on successful technology companies.

These words from President Ronald Reagan are as true today as they were in 1981: “We who live in free-market societies believe that growth, prosperity, and ultimately human fulfillment, are created from the bottom up, not the government down.” Brilliant entrepreneurs are far better at driving the economy than unelected government bureaucrats.

American consumers and voters don’t want a federal government that has racked up over $30 trillion in debt to run our nation’s most innovative corporations into the ground.