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#### A slimmed BBB will pass through reconciliation – Manchin is on board but the window for passage is narrow – its key to deficit reduction, inflation relief, and preventing future rate hikes

-solves climate

-solves prescription drug prices

Kahn 6/20

Thomas, Staff Director of the House Budget Committee from 1997-2016, now distinguished fellow at American University’s Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies, “Congress must act fast to pass bill on deficits and inflation,” The Hill, 6/20/22 https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/3529625-congress-must-act-fast-to-pass-bill-on-deficits-and-inflation/dmr

Congress must move quickly to pass a bill cutting the deficit and helping Americans struggling with rising prices. The Congressional calendar is very short, and soon the opportunity will be lost. The Congressional Budget Office, (CBO) recently released its annual budget report with much more bad news about government debt. Although the deficit temporarily drops for two years, the debt picture over the next decade and beyond is very bleak. According to the CBO, in just five years, our national debt will reach the size of our entire economy, and by 2032 our net debt will grow to an astronomical $37 trillion — something that’s only happened once in our history, at the end of World War II. Meanwhile, inflation is over 8 percent, its highest point in 40 years, with gas prices at record levels. But finally, there is hope Congress will begin to address both the debt crisis and high prices. Congressional Democrats are crafting a deficit cut package without imposing the large cuts to vital domestic benefits many others have long demanded. By raising revenue and cutting the deficit, it would also bring some relief to Americans battling inflation. Such a bill must pass as a budget reconciliation measure to avoid an almost certain Republican filibuster — and the opportunity to use the reconciliation process expires on Sept. 30. But there’s even less time than that to get it done. With members of Congress home for August and much of the fall because it’s election season, Democrats really need to finish work by the end of July. Kicking the can down the road to a post-election lame duck is not an option since reconciliation at that point will be unavailable without a new budget resolution, which is not in the cards. Recent Democratic efforts to pass a budget package collapsed because the White House, progressives and two moderate Senate Democrats including Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) could not reach a deal. But this time, Sen. Manchin is engaged with Senate Democratic leaders in talks supported by the Biden administration. The talks have dragged on for several weeks and need to conclude soon before the clock runs out. Every American should be concerned about our ever-growing deficits and debt. Large deficits, going back to Ronald Reagan, can fuel inflation and slow economic growth by boosting interest rates. Higher rates, in turn, can discourage businesses from borrowing to create new jobs and hurt consumers using credit cards. High debt also risks our national security because it makes us vulnerable to foreign lenders. China alone holds $1 trillion in U.S. bonds. Our mounting debt means taxpayers must shell out $8 trillion over the next decade to bond holders in return for lending us the money. To put that in perspective, that debt service cost is almost 50 percent greater than all federal spending last year. Not a penny of that goes for new schools, struggling seniors or sick veterans. Just the opposite, high debt service squeezes out money to fund those needs. Escalating debt even risks budget cuts for those services. I saw this first-hand as the House Budget Committee Democratic staff director for 20 years. The last legislation to substantially reduce the deficit in 2011 cut discretionary spending targets by $900 billion which threatened essential programs like Head Start, Pell grants for college students, environmental clean-up and veterans’ health care. The Democrats’ budget package would achieve as much as $700 billion in deficit reduction through tax hikes on corporations that have avoided paying their fair share, stricter tax enforcement and Medicare drug cost savings. While it’s a modest step relative to the size of the problem and much more work remains, this new effort represents real progress. The package would also importantly help Americans battling high prices because lower deficits should result in lower consumer demand. The bill would also assist seniors struggling with skyrocketing prescription drug costs. It would also help working families with medical bills by extending subsidies for critical Affordable Care Act insurance premiums slated to sharply increase before the end of the year. Finally, the plan would reduce energy costs and contribute to the battle against climate change by creating tax breaks for clean energy technologies. This new CBO report and the pressing need to address high prices should serve as clarion calls for action. Democrats need to put these talks on a fast track by passing it before time runs out.

#### PC is key – Biden’s leadership is necessary to overcome sticking points and coalescing the caucus

Tankersley and Cochrane 2021, White House correspondent with a focus on economic policy. He has written for more than a decade in Washington about the decline of opportunity for American workers, and is the author of "The Riches of This Land: The Untold, True Story of America's Middle Class." @jimtankersley Emily Cochrane is a reporter in the Washington bureau, covering Congress. She was raised in Miami and graduated from the University of Florida. (Jim and Emily, “Biden, Needing a Win, Enters a Sprint for His Economic Agenda,” *New York Times*, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/25/business/economy/biden-infrastructure-bill.html)

Many steps remain before Mr. Biden can sign both bills into law — but his party has given itself only a few weeks to complete them. The infrastructure bill is written. But the House and Senate must agree on the spending programs, revenue increases and overall cost of the larger bill, balancing the desires of progressives who see a generational chance to expand government to address inequality and curb climate change and moderates who have pushed for a smaller package and resisted some of the tax proposals to pay for it. It is a timeline reminiscent of what Republicans set for themselves in the fall of 2017, when they rushed a nearly $2 trillion package of tax cuts to President Donald J. Trump’s desk without a single Democratic vote. Sticking to it will require sustained support from administration officials both in and out of Washington. In the first three weeks of August, Mr. Biden dispatched cabinet members to 31 states to barnstorm for the infrastructure bill and his broader economic agenda, with events in the districts of moderate and progressive members of Congress, according to internal documents obtained by The New York Times. His secretaries of transportation, labor, interior, energy, commerce and agriculture sat for dozens of local television and radio interviews to promote the bills. Even with those efforts, the initial clash over advancing the budget this week was resolved with a flurry of calls from Mr. Biden, top White House officials and senior Democrats to the competing factions in the House. Congressional leaders say they have spent months laying the groundwork so that their party can move quickly toward consensus. Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California told colleagues in a letter on Wednesday that “we have long had an eye to having the infrastructure bill on the president’s desk by the Oct. 1,” the date when many provisions in the bipartisan package are slated to go into effect. Committee leaders have been instructed to finish their work by Sept. 15, and rank-and-file lawmakers have been told to make their concerns and priorities known quickly as they maneuver through substantive policy disagreements, including whether it should be as much as $3.5 trillion and the scope of Mr. Biden’s proposed tax increases. “I’m sure everybody’s going to try their best,” said Representative John Yarmuth of Kentucky, the House Budget Committee chairman. “Some committees will have it rougher than others.” Senator Ron Wyden of Oregon, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has been releasing discussion drafts of proposals to fund the $3.5 trillion budget reconciliation spending — the larger bill that Democrats plan to move without any Republican support — including raising taxes on high earners and businesses. On Wednesday, he provided granular details of a plan to increase taxes on the profits that multinational companies earn and book overseas. “I’m encouraged by where we are,” Mr. Wyden said in an interview. Democratic leaders and the White House have pushed analyses of their proposals that speak to core liberal priorities; on Wednesday, Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, released a report suggesting the two bills combined would “put our country on the path to meet President Biden’s climate change goals of 80 percent clean electricity and 50 percent economywide carbon emission reduction by 2030.” White House economists released a detailed report this week claiming the spending Mr. Biden supports, like universal prekindergarten and subsidized child care, would expand the productive capacity of the economy and help reduce price pressures in the future. While Republicans are not expected to get on board with the larger spending bill, they are still making their concerns known, labeling the bill socialist and a spending spree and claiming it will stoke inflation and drive jobs overseas. Mr. Biden can pass the entire agenda now with only Democratic votes, but the party’s thin majorities — including no room for even a single defection in the Senate — complicates the task. Ms. Pelosi said on Wednesday that the House would “write a bill with the Senate, because there’s no use our doing a bill that is not going to pass the Senate, in the interest of getting things done.” As part of an agreement to secure the votes needed to approve the $3.5 trillion budget blueprint on Tuesday, Ms. Pelosi gave centrist and conservative Democrats a commitment that she would only take up a reconciliation package that had the support of all 50 Senate Democrats and cleared the strict Senate rules that govern the fast-track process. “I’m not here to pass messaging bills — I’m here to pass bills that will actually become law and help the American people,” said Representative Stephanie Murphy of Florida, one of the Democrats who initially announced that she would not support advancing the budget, but ultimately joined every Democrat in advancing it. For moderates, Ms. Pelosi’s commitment served to shield them from potentially tough votes on provisions that the Senate may reject. It also signaled the political realities that could shape the final legislation. No Democrat will want to vote on a large spending bill doomed for failure. It will be Mr. Biden’s job to lead his coalition to a bill that can pass muster with moderates and progressives alike — and to convince every holdout that failure is not an option.

#### INSERT LINK

#### Unchecked inflation triggers global war and disrupt the international liberal order

-High costs cause political upheaval

-Hikes in IRs disrupt fragile states

-Forces US retrenchment which emboldens rivals

Brands 1-20-2022, Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies (Hal, “Inflation’s Biggest Risk Is Geopolitical Unrest,” Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-01-20/inflation-s-biggest-risk-is-geopolitical-unrest)

Inflation isn’t just a domestic problem. Sure, year-on-year inflation hitting 7%, the highest rate in four decades, is threatening to derail Joe Biden’s presidency. As my Bloomberg colleague John Authers has written, the inflationary trend appears broad and durable. Yet now as before, inflation is a geopolitical phenomenon, which is rooted partly in rising global tensions and could have deeply corrosive effects on the U.S.-led world order. That’s what happened the last time the U.S. faced this problem, from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. “To all Americans,” Ronald Reagan said while running for president in 1980, inflation had become "something as violent as a mugger, as frightening as an armed robber and as deadly as a hit man." The causes were closely tied to global affairs. In the late 1960s, the combined costs of the Vietnam War and President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society programs sent prices rising. In the 1970s, the chief drivers were soaring energy costs and supply disruptions caused by the Yom Kippur War of 1973 and then the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979. It was a vicious cycle: Geopolitical upheaval caused economic upheaval, which then added to the underlying global instability. High oil costs and scarce supplies caused ruptures within the democratic world, as Japan, France and other U.S. allies scrambled to cut bilateral deals with oil producers. Inflation ate away at an American defense budget that was already falling as a result of post-Vietnam retrenchment. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger worried that economic chaos might destabilize the Western world. It certainly contributed to a general malaise in America and other advanced democracies, feeding fears that the Soviet Union — then benefitting from record oil prices — might win the Cold War after all. “Can Capitalism Survive?” Time magazine famously asked in 1975. Only when the Federal Reserve finally broke the inflationary cycle with bone-crushing interest rates did the U.S. regain its geopolitical footing. Today, rising energy costs are again pushing prices higher. The messy divorce of economies between the U.S. and China is disrupting supply chains and generating inflationary pressure. The economic messiness provoked by another geopolitical breakup — Brexit — isn’t helping matters. Not least, the inflation surge has resulted from the massive stimulus that governments pumped into their economies in response to Covid, the greatest global crisis of this century. In countries where there is lots of revolutionary kindling, inflation can provide the fatal spark. Historically, rising prices contributed to political upheavals such as the French Revolution, which touched off a quarter-century of war in Europe, and the Arab Spring, whose effects are still roiling the Middle East. This month, a doubling of fuel prices triggered protests, revolt and then Russian-backed repression in Kazakhstan. There’s probably more of this to come. In late 2021, the Food and Agriculture Organization at the United Nations reported that global food prices had reached their highest point in a decade. Look out for geo-economic turbulence, as well. Argentina, the European Union, Russia and other countries have restricted the export of commodities such as grain to keep domestic food prices manageable. If Washington ratchets up interest rates to tame rising prices, it could unintentionally batter deeply indebted countries that have already lost years, even decades, of economic progress due to Covid. Indeed, when the Fed slayed inflation in the early 1980s, a decade-long Latin American debt crisis was part of the collateral damage. Finally, there is the question of what will happen to the U.S. Biden isn’t entirely wrong to argue that inflation is actually a sign of strength: The U.S. economy rebounded quickly from Covid, fueling demand that is outstripping supply. Yet inflation is rarely a good-news story. Inflation is psychologically demoralizing because it makes growth meaningless, and stagnation crippling, for people whose real wages are in decline. It fosters a sense that the people are victims of forces that their leaders cannot control. It gives credence to arguments that America’s true problems are at home, rather than abroad, and thus threatens to create a more distracted, inward-looking superpower just as global threats are intensifying. The damage isn’t hypothetical: As John Ferrari of the American Enterprise Institute points out, the U.S. defense budget is already at risk of being strangled by the “inflation anaconda.” The 5% bump that Congress approved for the Pentagon this year sounds impressive, but only until one considers that inflation is running at 7% and the military is particularly exposed to rising costs for energy and materials such as steel. As inflation builds up, Pentagon is forced to build down — just as China is racing to expand its military capabilities, Russia is threatening a major conflict in Eastern Europe and relations with Iran deteriorate. The Biden administration appears to be recognizing, perhaps belatedly, that rising prices pose a severe threat to its domestic agenda and political fortunes. Inflation may also have nasty geopolitical effects in a world that hardly seemed stable before.
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#### Biden’s Build Better bill will pass -dems are united and enjoy some GOP support – climate provisions will remain intact

Kessler 6/24

Richard, US Editor at Recharge where he writes on renewables with a focus on wind, and energy politics, Recharge News, “'Not a ton of time left' | Clock ticking louder on Biden's bid to pass key US climate bill,” 24 June 2022 <https://www.rechargenews.com/energy-transition/not-a-ton-of-time-left-clock-ticking-louder-on-bidens-bid-to-pass-key-us-climate-bill/2-1-1243159> dmr

Time waits for no-one. And, when it comes the US environmental agenda, no-one can be hearing the clock ticking louder than US President Joe Biden, who has six weeks and counting to get a slimmed-down version of legislation critical to his ambitious national climate action plans through Congress before members recess and later turn their attention to re-election in November . It won’t be easy and the stakes are high. This is likely Biden’s last chance to get significant traction on addressing the climate crisis that is crafted exclusively by his administration and party and in the process get US leadership on global climate action – a central focus of his presidency – back on track. Early polls show Democrats will lose control of one or both houses of Congress in mid-term elections, an outcome that would reset the balance of power in Washington for Biden’s remaining two years in office. Having Democrats in the minority in the House of Representatives and/or Senate would constrain the US president’s ability to proactively advance the country down a path to meet its 2030 Paris Agreement pledge to slash greenhouse gas emissions 50-52% from 2005 levels. “There is still hope we can get something across the finish line but not a ton of time is left,” said Mike Williams, senior fellow, at the Center for American Progress, the leading progressive Democratic think tank in Washington, DC. “In an election year, it is well-known that the August recess is pretty much the drop-dead time for legislation before the end of Congress. The odds of coming back post-August recess and getting meaty things done between then and the election are low historically,” he said. With Biden’s approval rating lower than any US president of the modern era at this stage of their term and 70% of Americans believing the country is moving ‘in the wrong direction’, the political momentum clearly favours the Republicans. The GOP has no incentive to help an unpopular leader struggling with crises on multiple fronts pass a potentially large partisan spending bill they believe would further stoke 40-year-high inflation – currently the number one concern of US voters. While many, perhaps most, Republicans reject Biden’s contention that climate change is an “existential threat” to US national security, some are open to bipartisan measures that address its more pronounced economic, environmental, and health impacts. A case in point was last year’s $1trn infrastructure law, the first significant US investment in climate resilience and a rare, high-profile political win for Biden. Yet, it is Biden’s open hostility toward the oil and gas industry and his stated policy aim to “get rid of fossil fuels” that limits cooperation with Republicans who favour an all-of-the-above approach with energy. In their view, it is Biden that is artificially creating a national security risk by pushing the energy transition too fast with an overly rosy narrative that the US can replace conventional fuels and thermal resources with relative ease and expense. Senate 'reconciliation' challenge Complicating any push on climate by Biden is the fast-approaching end of the federal fiscal year on 30 September that will close the window for Democrats in the evenly divided 100 seat Senate to use a special parliamentary procedure called reconciliation to pass major legislation. A reconciliation bill that expedited certain budgetary legislation could pass with a party-line majority of 50 votes plus an affirmative tie-breaking vote cast by US Vice President Kamala Harris in her capacity as president of the Senate. The procedure overrides filibuster rules that may otherwise require a supermajority of 60 votes. Reconciliation bills can deal with spending, revenue, and the federal debt limit, and the Senate can pass one bill per year affecting each subject. Policy changes that are extraneous to the budget are limited. In the House of Representatives, where Democrats have a 220-209 majority , the procedure also applies but has minor significance as there is no supermajority requirement. Last December, Democrats sought to use reconciliation to move the $1.75trn Build Back Better bill, half the size of Biden’s original climate and social spending proposal. The House had passed its version the previous month on a party-line vote. The manoeuvre collapsed in spectacular fashion after Joe Manchin, a moderate West Virginia Democrat and swing vote, announced his opposition citing reservations about the cost and potential inflationary impacts. Build Back Better contained about $550bn in climate-related funding including $350bn in new or extended multi-year clean energy-related tax credits, about six times as much as the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the nation’s largest clean energy investment to date. Analysis by independent researcher Rhodium Group showed that passage of both the infrastructure law and Build Back Better (as then written) was critical to the US achieving the interim 2030 emissions goal. Rhodium’s Pathways to Paris argued that measures in both packages could enable and speed up clean technology deployment and on their own cut emissions significantly. As well, they could also reduce consumer and compliance costs of federal and state actions, and when combined with congressional actions, “put the target within reach”. Without the cost reduction assistance of congressional actions, federal and state leaders will face higher technical and political hurdles as they pursue the ambitious policies necessary for Paris compliance, according to the analysis. Smaller bill possible? Climate this year has taken a back seat to mounting challenges that are threatening to submerge Biden’s administration. Soaring food and fuel prices. Supply chain congestion. A wave of nationwide gun violence. Runaway illegal immigration along the southern border. Hundreds of Americans dying each day from a virus in Covid-19 that has already claimed more than 1 million lives. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. “The biggest issue we are seeing with climate legislation is there is a lot of competing priorities,” said Aaron Barr, principal consultant at Wood Mackenzie, speaking at a conference last month. “So many things are taking air out of the room that makes it difficult to pass legislation.” Even Build Back Better, etched in the public mind with signature policy failure by Biden and Democrats in Congress, no longer exists in name. The White House has now recast it as Building a Better America. “I think it really hinges on can a deal around a smaller reconciliation bill get put together in the next month or two,” said Sasha Mackler, energy programme director at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, DC, a think-tank focused on bipartisan policy solutions. “It has to be smaller because of inflationary pressures and this desire to focus the bill on a couple of issues where there is broad support and a need for legislation,” he added, noting that all party factions could embrace about $300bn in 10-year clean energy-related tax credits. Whether moderate and progressive Democrats can compromise over the cost, language, and scope of any new bill remains to be seen. After giving a grim judgment of prospects for a climate bill, Manchin now says publicly he will support the tax credits if half the revenue raised from taxes goes to reduce the federal deficit. In May, he told Axios that his early talks with Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer on Building a Better America were “encouraging to a certain extent”, but added, “There could be truly nothing. That’s all I can tell you.”

#### Insiders confirm it’ll pass soon

Bernie Becker, 6/21/2022, Tax Reporter for politico, "Weekly Tax," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-tax//DG

STILL TALKING? STILL TALKING: It hasn’t been a fast-moving process. But Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer haven’t stopped talking about a slighter version of the Build Back Better agenda that Democrats were pushing last year. Manchin and Schumer met twice last week on a potential measure to raise taxes on the rich and corporations, and enact new climate and prescription drug provisions, as our Burgess Everett reported. Democrats also are sounding increasingly confident that a deal can be reached at some point before Congress breaks for the August recess. But as with everything BBB-related, it’s probably not wise to make any grand assumptions yet about whether Democrats will or won’t be able to work something out in the end. This much is clear, though — Democrats still have plenty of hurdles to clear before a slimmer BBB might make it to President Joe Biden’s desk.

#### Biden has the votes – he’s in advanced talks with congressional leaders and Manchin

Jacobs 6/17

Jennifer and Josh Wingrove, Bloomberg News, “Biden Team Negotiates Fresh Economic Plan as Inflation Antidote” June 17, 2022 <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-06-17/biden-team-negotiates-fresh-economic-plan-as-inflation-antidote> dmr

The White House and congressional Democrats are in advanced talks on legislation that aims to fight inflation, rein in the deficit and revive parts of President Joe Biden’s stalled economic agenda. The contours of a potential deal remain under negotiation, but the package would likely include capping the price of insulin -- a key medicine for diabetics -- and federal investments in both clean energy and fossil fuels, according to people briefed on the talks. It would also further reduce the budget deficit and boost taxes on the wealthy, corporations or both, they said. An agreement could come together as soon as next week, two people said, though others were more cautious, noting many details remain to be resolved. Climate provisions are a particularly tricky area, and differences could still scotch a deal, one person said. The people familiar with the talks asked not to be identified because of the sensitivity of the negotiations, in which Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia plays a central role. The president has hinted at a coming agreement, framing the legislation primarily as a move to cool consumer-price increases, which unexpectedly accelerated to an annual 8.6% in May. Not Everything “I believe I have the votes to do a number of things,” Biden said Thursday in an interview with the Associated Press, citing capping insulin costs as an example. “We can reduce it to 35 bucks a month and get it done. We have the votes to do it. We’re going to get that done. I can’t get it all done.” Democrats are desperate for a policy response to inflation, which is at a four-decade high and, unless curbed, is all but certain to cost them control of the House, Senate or both in November’s midterm elections. Gasoline, a critical component of the American household budget, costs $5 a gallon on average nationwide, according to the AAA motor club, and hit a record earlier this month. Seeking to quell the surge in living costs, the Federal Reserve accelerated its monetary-tightening campaign this week, executing the biggest interest-rate hike since 1994. The moves have driven fresh losses on Wall Street and increased the odds of a recession that would only compound Biden’s political troubles. Biden ordered a record release from the nation’s oil reserves earlier this year to try to curb gasoline prices, but to little effect. Now, he’s looking to help households save money on everyday needs like drugs, utilities and internet access, and by cutting the government’s budget deficit, which reached a record $3.13 trillion in fiscal 2020, during the pandemic. The president sought to cut drug prices and raise taxes on the wealthy in last year’s economic plan, called Build Back Better, which Manchin killed in December by saying he’d vote against it. Democrats need all 50 of their Senate caucus members to pass legislation in the 100-seat chamber under the so-called budget-reconciliation process, which can bypass a Republican filibuster. The White House for months has refused to publicly comment on any talks with Manchin. The West Virginia senator bristled at White House statements late last year as he, other Democrats and the president’s aides negotiated. The relationship between the White House and Manchin was so damaged in the aftermath of that chapter that some White House officials still avoid saying his name aloud. Other Elements “The president remains engaged with Congress. This is an important part of his economic agenda,” Cecilia Rouse, chair of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, said Friday at the White House. Along with the new legislation, Biden has recently touted a provision of the infrastructure law enacted last year that offers full rebates for some home-internet plans for low-income households. He’s also urged Congress to pass separate legislation that would encourage domestic manufacturing of semiconductors to help ease global shortages that have contributed to rising prices for cars and consumer electronics. Together, he argues the measures would provide Americans a counterbalance for higher food and gasoline prices. The administration is also clamoring for new Covid funding from Congress, but as of now there are no plans to roll that into any reconciliation deal, two of the people said. Senate Duo Biden met Wednesday with Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, with the trio discussing next steps on a fresh bill to pass through the reconciliation process. The White House called the measure their “shared agenda of tackling inflation and lowering prices and transitioning from a historic economic recovery to stable, steady growth” in a statement on the meeting. The talks have largely narrowed to two men: Schumer and Manchin. The basis for their discussions is legislation the House passed last year that would raise federal revenue by $1.5 trillion over a decade, one person said. White House spokespeople didn’t immediately respond to a request for comment on the talks. A person familiar with Manchin’s thinking said he is continuing to negotiate with Schumer, and hasn’t set a July 4 deadline for reaching a deal. The person said energy and climate is just one of the issues still being worked on. The House bill included a surtax on wealthy Americans, expanded levies on investments, had a 15% minimum rate for corporations and a tax on stock buybacks. Savings in drug costs could push so-called pay-fors in the bill to $1.8 trillion over a decade. Manchin has insisted that at least half of the new tax revenue in the bill go to reducing the deficit. Energy Components Senator Kyrsten Sinema, however, has signaled objections to many tax increases, leaving unclear which revenue measures might make a final agreement. The Arizona Democrat this week said she’s focused on talks on new gun-safety legislation. Energy provisions remain among the sticking points in the negotiations on the reconciliation bill, with Manchin -- whose state still produces much of the nation’s coal supply -- advocating for fossil-fuel suppliers. Proponents of the legislation are aiming for a deal soon that can pass before members of Congress leave for their annual August recess.

After that, lawmakers will have little time to legislate as they focus on their re-election campaigns.

#### It’s TOA – Biden’s working to ensure key provisions are included and the bill passes in the coming weeks

Schonfeld 6/19

Zach, The Hill, “Deese says new legislation is White House’s ‘single most impactful’ avenue on inflation” 06/19/22 https://thehill.com/homenews/sunday-talk-shows/3529030-deese-says-new-legislation-is-white-houses-single-most-impactful-avenue-on-inflation/dmr

National Economic Council Director Brian Deese on Sunday said the White House is hoping to make progress on legislation to lower prescription drug prices and other costs “in the coming weeks.” Deese stressed to CBS “Face the Nation” moderator Margaret Brennan that combating high inflation levels remains the White House’s top economic priority. “Our focus is on what are the steps, what are the policies, that we can take,” Deese said. “And the single most impactful thing that we could do right now is to work with Congress to pass legislation that would lower the costs of things that families are facing right now.” Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) have been meeting in recent weeks to negotiate over potential legislation to bring down prescription drug costs, a provision originally included as part of President Biden’s Build Back Better agenda that ultimately failed when Manchin voiced opposition. But Democrats are now looking to pass narrower legislation that is politically feasible with the party’s razor-thin majorities in Congress as the midterm elections approach. Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said on Thursday that negotiations over a slimmed-down social spending package, which would also potentially include climate provisions, are “alive” after meeting with Biden and Schumer. Biden suggested in a sit-down interview with The Associated Press last week that he believed he had the votes to reduce prescription drug costs and provide tax incentives for winterizing homes, which would help lower utility bills amid rising energy costs. “I believe I have the votes to do a number of things,” Biden said. “One, prescription drugs. Reduce utility bills by providing for — I think we’ll be able to get the ability to have a tax incentive for winterization.” When Brennan pressed Deese on Sunday over why a vote had not been called if Biden has enough political support to pass the legislation, Deese declined to provide a firm timeline. “We’re working very closely with congressional leadership, with Senate leadership, on that,” he said. “Sen. Schumer is working with his caucus to try to get a final package in place, and we’re hopeful that we’ll see progress on that in the coming weeks.”

### No Thumpers – TOA

#### He is focused exclusively on inflation reduction

Carolan and Crisp 6/22

Kelsy and Elizabeth, The Hill, “NotedDC — Inflation looms over Biden as he pushes to tout wins” 06/22/22 https://thehill.com/homenews/noteddc/3533583-noteddc-inflation-looms-over-biden-as-he-pushes-to-tout-wins/

President Biden appears on track to secure major anti-gun violence victories in the coming weeks, but high inflation threatens to overshadow them. The Senate broke nearly 30 years of gridlock when it advanced a bipartisan gun safety bill Tuesday. It’s also set to confirm what would be the first permanent director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) in seven years. It will give Democrats accomplishments to tout as the midterms get closer, but activists note the president largely remained on the sidelines in public on both the bill and the push for Steve Dettelbach’s confirmation as ATF director. “As activists, we barely heard from the White House in the week since the shooting, and the president made one prime-time speech and seemed to call it a day,” Zeenat Yahya of March for our Lives told The Hill’s Alex Gangitano and Brett Samuels. Biden’s focus has largely been on solving record levels of inflation and high gas prices, and there are few signs that he will pivot to other issues as the White House continues to take heat over rising prices. Some Democrats like Rep. Ro Khanna (Calif.) are criticizing Biden for not doing enough to solve inflation, though the president is also facing opposition from key members when attempting to pass measures like a three-month gas tax holiday. Congress is likely to reject the gas tax suspension as a way to lower costs, with Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) among those who have previously expressed concerns, The Hill’s Rachel Frazin reports.

#### It's the top focus – productive advanced talks are underway

Deese 6/19

Brian, Director of the National Economic Council, former fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former research assistant at the Center for Global Development also worked as a senior policy analyst for economic policy at the Center for American Progress, “Biden Aide Says Inflation Fight Can Advance If Congress Helps” June 19, 2022, https://time.com/6189130/biden-inflation/dmr

A top economic adviser to President Joe Biden said he’s hopeful that Congress will pass measures the administration says will help fight inflation in the coming weeks. “Prices are unacceptably high right now,” National Economic Council Director Brian Deese said in an interview for CBS’s “Face the Nation” on Sunday. “That’s why the president has said we need to make this our top economic focus and do everything that we can to get them down.” He cited measures to lower the cost of prescription drugs, tax incentives for energy and a “long-overdue tax reform” as ways to help US households deal with the fastest inflation in 40 years and signal to markets that the US is “deadly serious” about curbing rising prices. The White House and congressional Democrats are in advanced talks on legislation that seeks to fight inflation, rein in the US budget deficit and revive parts of Biden’s stalled economic agenda, people briefed on the talks said last week. Deese on Sunday held out the prospect of results, though he declined to set a specific timeline ahead of midterm elections due in November. “We’re working very closely with congressional leadership, with Senate leadership on that,” and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer is working with his caucus on, Deese said. “And we’re hopeful that we will see progress on that in the coming weeks.” “The single most impactful thing that we could do right now is to work with Congress to pass legislation that would lower the costs of things that families are facing right now,” he said.

### AT No PC

#### Biden has the PC with Dems – his constructive engagement and bipartisan overtures are boosting is ability to maintain dem unity

Yglesias 6/19

Matthew Yglesias is a columnist for Bloomberg Opinion. A co-founder of and former columnist for Vox, he writes the Slow Boring blog and newsletter, “Biden Is Delivering on His Bipartisan Promise” June 19, 2022 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/biden-is-deliveringon-hisbipartisan-promise/2022/06/19/8ad8331a-efd0-11ec-ac16-8fbf7194cd78_story.html> dmr

For all his many political struggles, President Joe Biden is quietly delivering on one of the central — and most implausible — promises of his campaign: restoring a sense of normalcy and bipartisanship to the legislative process. The latest example is an apparent bipartisan deal on gun regulation, which finally puts vague Republican rhetoric on school security and mental health into action while also embracing modest Democratic proposals on such matters as background checks and red-flag laws. The bill will probably not dramatically alter the level of gun violence in the US. But it should do some good, and re-establishes the idea that Congress can act in response to dramatic events. Before the gun deal, of course, Biden worked with Congress to deliver the kind of bipartisan infrastructure legislation that both his predecessors only talked about. There have also been many more obscure bills, ranging from legislation changing the regulation of ocean shipping to a major overhaul of the US Postal Service. Bipartisan science funding legislation has been languishing for months now, but that’s due to boring House-Senate disagreements that are being worked out by a conference committee — a process so old-school it had become basically forgotten in Washington. Progress is also being made on bipartisan bills about such thorny issues as Chinese investment in US companies and antitrust scrutiny of big technology companies. Much of this work is happening through a process I like to call the Secret Congress: Members quietly working together while allowing the political press to focus on Hunter Biden’s laptop, which books are in which school libraries, the latest Marjorie Taylor Greene tweet or any of the million other controversies that engage the body politic. The Secret Congress dynamic, of course, is one reason why it’s difficult for Biden to secure credit for delivering on this promise. During Barack Obama’s presidency, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell was open about the fact that he was reluctant for Republicans to engage constructively on any topic lest the passage of bills come to reflect positively on an incumbent president he hoped to defeat. Biden has a much lower public profile than his recent predecessors. And while his team has been constructively engaged on all these issues, it’s been a quiet form of engagement that aims to be helpful without hogging the spotlight or preventing the members themselves from owning the process. Conservative firebrands found plenty of (real and fake) controversies with which to fill the air and maintain a sense of combat even as they collaborated on policy. Meanwhile, quite apart from Biden’s efforts, there is the fact that Donald Trump’s presidency helped break down the doors of ideological dogmatism on the right. Republicans don’t talk about it much these days, but the Trump administration’s willingness — led by Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin — to work with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer on the CARES Act is the only reason the 2020 elections didn’t turn into a party-destroying landslide. A free-market approach that devastated consumer spending power and led to liquidated many businesses would have ruined the economy, ruined Trump’s political standing, and driven the GOP into the ground. Trump lack of ideological purity, and Democrats’ willingness to bargain in good faith, saved the economy and the Republican Party — and perhaps opened the doors to further rounds of creativity. Alas, Biden has not had nearly such good fortune with his economic management. The multiple inflationary shocks — first a fiscal stimulus that spent too much too quickly, then a central bank that was probably too slow to react, then a war in Ukraine that’s ravaged the supply side of the global economy — have wrecked Biden’s public standing. When a president is unpopular due to bad economic news, the public doesn’t give him credit for anything. And columnists of all stripes are wont to criticize an unpopular leader. But the fact remains that important elements of Biden’s agenda have succeeded, notably including a Russia policy that has secured strong bipartisan and even international support despite the economic cost. The cloak of unpopularity, meanwhile, makes it even easier for bipartisanship to continue. In his current state, Biden is not politically threatening to Republicans, so they have no reason to avoid collaborating on bills they happen to like. A new proposal from Republican senators Mitt Romney, Richard Burr and Steve Daines to consolidate and simplify various family support programs in a way that would cut poverty and reduce marriage penalties has earned some cautious praise from Democratic Senator Michael Bennet and could be the basis for more bipartisan work. At the end of the day, life as a legislator is more fun if you get to legislate. Sheer exhaustion with the tedium of obstruction has helped make Biden’s approach work.

#### Biden has PC on inflation – his outside game is securing traction

Weissert & Miller 6-18-22 [Will Weissert is an AP National Political Reporter, Zeke Miller is a past President of the White House Correspondents Association and a White House reporter for the Associated Press. "Biden's optimism collides with mounting political challenges", AP NEWS, https://apnews.com/20fc7ddf3789332c914da0709b3db3a7] GBS-HW

WASHINGTON (AP) — Democrats are going to hold onto the House after November’s midterm elections. They will pick up as many as four seats in the Senate, expanding their majority and Overcoming internal dissent that has helped stifle their agenda. As the challenges confronting President Joe Biden intensify, his predictions of a rosy political future for the Democratic Party are growing bolder. The assessments, delivered in speeches, fundraisers and conversations with friends and allies, seem at odds with a country that he acknowledged this week was “really, really down,” burdened by a pandemic, surging gas prices and spiking inflation. Biden’s hopeful outlook tracks with a sense of optimism that has coursed through his nearly five-decade career and was at the center of his 2020 presidential campaign, which he said was built around restoring the “soul of America.” In a lengthy Oval Office interview with The Associated Press on Thursday, Biden said part of his job as president is to “be confident.” “Because I am confident,” he said. “We are better positioned than any country in the world to own the second quarter of the 21st century. That’s not hyperbole. That’s a fact.” While presidents often try to emphasize the positive, there is a risk in this moment that Biden contributes to a dissonance between Washington and people across the country who are confronting genuine and growing economic pain. Few of Biden’s closest political advisers are as bullish about the party’s prospects as the president. In interviews with a half-dozen people in and close to the White House, there is a broad sense that Democrats will lose control of Congress and that many of the party’s leading candidates in down-ballot races and contests for governor will be defeated, with Biden unable to offer much help. The seeming disconnect between Biden’s view and the political reality has some in the party worried the White House has not fully grasped just how bad this election year may be for Democrats. “I don’t expect any president to go out and say, ’You know what, ‘We’re going to lose the next election,’” said Will Marshall, president and founder of the Progressive Policy Institute, which is in regular contact with the White House’s policy team. What might serve Biden well instead, Marshall said, would be “a sober sense of, ’Look, we’re probably in for a rough night in November and our strategy should be to remind the country what’s at stake.’” The White House is hardly ignoring the problem. After years in which Democrats have operated in political silos, there is a greater focus on marshaling resources. Jen O’Malley Dillon, Biden’s 2020 campaign manager who now serves as one of his deputy chiefs of staff, runs the political team from the West Wing along with Emmy Ruiz, a longtime Texas-based Democratic political consultant. O’Malley Dillon coordinates strategy among the White House, the Democratic National Committee and an array of outside party groups. Cedric Richmond, a former Louisiana congressman who co-chaired Biden’s 2020 campaign and was one of his closest White House advisers, left for a job with the DNC in April. He characterized the move as underscoring the administration’s full grasp of the importance of the midterms. “We understand that you cannot govern if you can’t win,” Richmond said in an interview. “We are treating it with that sense of urgency.” The president’s political message is being honed by Mike Donilon, a longtime Biden aide who is a protector of Biden’s public image, and veteran party strategist Anita Dunn, who is returning to the White House for a second stint. Richmond praised Dunn’s political instincts and said he believes she will team with O’Malley Dillion, White House chief of staff Ron Klain and others to promote messaging that many in their own party may underestimate. “If I had a penny for every time Democrats counted Joe Biden or Kamala Harris out, I’d be independently wealthy,” Richmond said. Biden turned to Dunn during an especially low political moment in February 2020, giving her broad control of his then-cash strapped presidential campaign as it appeared on the brink of collapse after a disastrous fourth-place showing in the Iowa caucus. Barely a week later, Biden left New Hampshire before its primary polls had even closed, ultimately finishing fifth. But he took second in Nevada, won South Carolina handily and saw the Democratic establishment rally around him at breakneck speed in mere days after that. O’Malley Dillon then joined the campaign and oversaw Biden’s general election victory. A similar reversal of political fortune may be necessary now. But where White House officials last year harbored hopes that voters could be convinced of Biden’s accomplishments and reverse their dismal outlook on the national direction, aides now acknowledge that such an uphill battle is no longer worth fighting. Instead, they have pushed the president to be more open about his own frustrations — particularly on inflation — to show voters that he shares their concerns and to cast Republicans and their policies as obstacles to addressing these issues. Though he has increasingly expressed anger about inflation, Biden has publicly betrayed few concerns about his party’s fortunes this fall. opting instead for relentlessly positivity. “I think there are at least four seats that are up for grabs that we could pick up in the Senate,” the president told a recent gathering of donors in Maryland. “And we’re going to keep the House.” Biden meant Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, with potential longer shots in North Carolina or Florida possibly representing No. 4. Some aides admit that assessment is too optimistic. They say the president is simply seeking to fire up his base with such predictions. One openly laughed when asked if it was possible that Democrats could pick up four Senate seats. The party’s chances of maintaining House control may be bleaker. Still, Tim Persico, executive director of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, which is charged with defending the party’s narrow majority, said Biden remains an asset. “We love when the president is speaking to the country,” Persico said. “There’ll always be frustrations. I totally get that. But I think he’s his own best messenger.”

### AT No PC –*Roe*

#### The Roe overturning reinvigorates Biden PC

Kestler-D'Amours et al. 6/24 – Al Jazeera reporters (Jillian, Usaid Siddiqui and Brian Osgood, “Latest news: US Supreme Court overturns Roe v Wade,” Al Jazeera, 6-24-22, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/6/24/us-supreme-court-overturns-roe-v-wade-abortion-ruling-liveblog>) //sg

Al Jazeera’s Kimberley Halkett, reporting from Washington, has said the striking down of Roe could **prove to be a “political gift”** for the Biden administration amid low approval ratings. “He’s got low marks because of the economy. **Americans are angry** for record-high inflation. In a way, this is a bit of a political gift,” Halkett said.

## \*\*I/L\*\*

### PC k/

#### Generating a bill with politically feasible provisions is key – Biden’s pc ensures everyone is on the same page – overwhelming empirics prove

Siewert 18, PhD, dissertation to obtain the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University to Frankfurt am Main (Markus, “"It’s Never Easy for the President to Get Exactly What He Wants,” [https://d-nb.info/1164077325/34)](https://d-nb.info/1164077325/34)//BB)

One of the most important presidential strategies in the legislative arena is (trying) to set the agenda of Congress (see Wood 2009 for an extensive overview; Cohen 2012; Edwards and Wood 1999; Light 1999). The reasoning behind this is straightforward: Since presidents have only few tools at hand to sway lawmakers on how they cast their ballot, the focus of the White House is set at an earlier stage: by already influencing what is considered in the first place. Compared with the legislative prevalence of executives in parliamentarian democracies, presidents in the United States are clearly less able to dominate the agenda space. Yet based on his constitutional right to recommend legislation deemed necessary and appropriate (Art. II, Sec 3, U.S. Constitution), it is primarily the resources of the executive branch - i.e., the departmental bureaucracies, and the Executive Office of the President - which put the president into the position to exert policy leadership via drafting legislative proposals. Unmatched by any other single legislators or even Congress as a whole, John W. Kingdon is right to argue that “[…] no other single actor in the political system has quite the capability of the president to set agendas.” (Kingdon 2003, 24). Previous research has shown that defining the agenda is a promising strategy for the White House. Presidential initiatives, both major and minor ones, almost always find their way into the legislative hopper (Cameron and Park 2008, 51f; Cohen 2012, 24ff; Edwards and Barrett 2000, 116ff). Accordingly, legislation proposed by the administration makes up between 30% and 50% of the congressional calendar, while the remaining proportion is initiated by members of Congress, is based on recurring pieces of legislation, and are reaction to external events or imminent crises (Edwards and Barrett 2000, 112ff; Taylor 1998, 377ff; Theriault 2002). While this indeed makes the president the single most important agenda-setter, it also demonstrates that he does not dominate the legislative agenda of Congress (Sinclair 2006, 255–63). We can mainly identify three mechanisms how presidential agenda-setting affects the lawmaking process in Congress. First, it enables the president to define the boundaries of policies under consideration, and in this way to structure the following deliberation. In this sense, agenda setting is first and foremost about obtaining the Deutungshoheit - i.e., the prerogative of interpretation - over the policy debate through setting the terms of the debate, moving first on certain policy aspects, and via framing and priming of core arguments (Edwards and Wood 1999; Eshbaugh-Soha and Peake 2005). George W. Bush, for instance, during his 2000 presidential campaign advertised his plans for massive across the board tax breaks which, at that time, were perceived as a mere “pipe dream” on both sides of the political spectrum (Milbank 2001). Cutting taxes, and especially to this extent, did not rank high among the priorities of lawmakers nor the American public. The arrival of Bush in the White House, however, completely changed the dynamics of debate. It put the tax cut proposal upfront of the legislative agenda during his first half year as president, and Democrats in the end had to accept an amount of tax breaks which came up to more than double of what they called reasonable six months before during the election campaign. Bill Clinton, on the other hand, was largely rolled by the issue dynamics in the debates regarding the overhaul of the Internal Revenue Service in 1997. Favoring only minor reforms, he had to concede early on to pressures from the public and Congress who, fueled by several major scandals, thirsted for a largescale reorganization of the IRS instead of a fine-tuning approach preferred by Clinton (Broder 1997). Of course, these are only two illustrations highlighting how presidents can succeed but also fail in setting the tone of the debate from early stages and through this pre-structure the outcome of the lawmaking process. Second, presidential leadership at the agenda-setting stage helps to overcome collective action problems within Congress and among its 535 legislators by providing a focal point around which other political actors’ policy positions can crystalize (Cameron and Park 2008; Cohen 2012; Neustadt 1991, 8f). The USA PATRIOT Act can serve as a prime example in this regard, on which the New York Times stressed that “[b]y and large, the House and Senate bills both use as a starting point a proposal sent to Capitol Hill nearly two weeks ago by the White House.” (Lewis and Pear 2001). Since lawmakers in Congress today only have scarce resources to draft their own bills, presidential input from the beginning is often highly appreciated. Yet, a proposal from the White House furthermore fulfills the role of first mover draft upon which the subsequent debate can be structured. In this sense, it both offers a distinct policy outline upfront and provides guiding posts for the further deliberation process. Third, agenda-setting offers the White House the opportunity to highlight its priorities, how they are distributed across various policy issues, and in which way policies should be packaged (Rudalevige 2005, 437ff; Wayne 2009b, 317ff). Because the resources of any administration to lobby Congress are not infinite and the multiple political arenas are usually heavily crowded with myriad policy items and problems striving to be solved, the White House needs to prioritize its policy agenda. This involves, among other things, to select some issues over others, decide about their sequencing, how to pursue them, and how much political capital it wants or needs to spend on any given item. Therefore, the administration will focus on certain policies with more attention, on others with less, depending on the prioritization by the president but also upon other considerations, such as the overall density of the policy agenda or imminent pressures of the time. The trick is to not overwhelm Congress with the president’s initiatives. As Lyndon B. Johnson famously quipped, “Congress is like a Whiskey drinker. You can put an awful lot of whiskey into a man if you just let him sip it. But if you try to force the whole bottle down his throat at one time, he’ll throw it up.” (cited in Rudalevige 2002, 113). Thus, the failure to prioritize easily leads to overload of Pennsylvania Avenue with Congress at the one end, and to excessive demands and exhaustion for the White House at the other end. The rocky start of the Clinton administration underlines this argument: since the White House did not pursue a ‘rifle-approach’ to define clear policy priorities for its initial months and then execute them, it got lost in numerous legislative battles and mine-fields early on in its first year. Instead it followed a ‘shotgun-approach’ by addressing as many issues as possible at once leading to an overkill and chaos (Rockman 1996; Sinclair 2000b).

#### Multiple Studies confirm that a presidents’ influence can switch votes

Beckmann and Kumar 11

Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, Profs in Department of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine; “How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking”; 2011; Journal of Theoretical Politics 23(1) 3–20

Fortunately for those inside the West Wing, some researchers paint a more optimistic picture regarding presidents’ potential for passing important planks of their legislative agenda. Covington et al. (1995), Barrett and Eshbaugh-Soha (2007), Edwards III and Barrett (2000), Kellerman (1984), Light (1982), Peterson (1990), and Rudalevige (2002) all [seven books/articles] observe that presidents secure greater support for their ‘priority’ items, and when they exert ‘effort’ pushing them. In addition, Covington (1987) concludes that White House officials can occasionally win greater support among legislators by working behind the scenes, while Canes-Wrone (2001, 2005) shows that presidents can induce support from a recalcitrant Congress by strategically ‘going public’ when advocating popular proposals (see also Kernell (1993)). Sullivan (1987, 1988) finds that presidents can amass winning congressional coalitions by changing members’ positions as a bill moves through the legislative process.

### PC Works – Biden

#### Number of legislative successes prove Biden’s PC works

Yglesias 6/19

Matthew Yglesias is a columnist for Bloomberg Opinion. A co-founder of and former columnist for Vox, he writes the Slow Boring blog and newsletter, “Biden Is Delivering on His Bipartisan Promise” June 19, 2022 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/biden-is-deliveringon-hisbipartisan-promise/2022/06/19/8ad8331a-efd0-11ec-ac16-8fbf7194cd78_story.html> dmr

For all his many political struggles, President Joe Biden is quietly delivering on one of the central — and most implausible — promises of his campaign: restoring a sense of normalcy and bipartisanship to the legislative process. The latest example is an apparent bipartisan deal on gun regulation, which finally puts vague Republican rhetoric on school security and mental health into action while also embracing modest Democratic proposals on such matters as background checks and red-flag laws. The bill will probably not dramatically alter the level of gun violence in the US. But it should do some good, and re-establishes the idea that Congress can act in response to dramatic events. Before the gun deal, of course, Biden worked with Congress to deliver the kind of bipartisan infrastructure legislation that both his predecessors only talked about. There have also been many more obscure bills, ranging from legislation changing the regulation of ocean shipping to a major overhaul of the US Postal Service. Bipartisan science funding legislation has been languishing for months now, but that’s due to boring House-Senate disagreements that are being worked out by a conference committee — a process so old-school it had become basically forgotten in Washington. Progress is also being made on bipartisan bills about such thorny issues as Chinese investment in US companies and antitrust scrutiny of big technology companies. Much of this work is happening through a process I like to call the Secret Congress: Members quietly working together while allowing the political press to focus on Hunter Biden’s laptop, which books are in which school libraries, the latest Marjorie Taylor Greene tweet or any of the million other controversies that engage the body politic. The Secret Congress dynamic, of course, is one reason why it’s difficult for Biden to secure credit for delivering on this promise. During Barack Obama’s presidency, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell was open about the fact that he was reluctant for Republicans to engage constructively on any topic lest the passage of bills come to reflect positively on an incumbent president he hoped to defeat. Biden has a much lower public profile than his recent predecessors. And while his team has been constructively engaged on all these issues, it’s been a quiet form of engagement that aims to be helpful without hogging the spotlight or preventing the members themselves from owning the process. Conservative firebrands found plenty of (real and fake) controversies with which to fill the air and maintain a sense of combat even as they collaborated on policy. Meanwhile, quite apart from Biden’s efforts, there is the fact that Donald Trump’s presidency helped break down the doors of ideological dogmatism on the right. Republicans don’t talk about it much these days, but the Trump administration’s willingness — led by Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin — to work with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer on the CARES Act is the only reason the 2020 elections didn’t turn into a party-destroying landslide. A free-market approach that devastated consumer spending power and led to liquidated many businesses would have ruined the economy, ruined Trump’s political standing, and driven the GOP into the ground. Trump lack of ideological purity, and Democrats’ willingness to bargain in good faith, saved the economy and the Republican Party — and perhaps opened the doors to further rounds of creativity. Alas, Biden has not had nearly such good fortune with his economic management. The multiple inflationary shocks — first a fiscal stimulus that spent too much too quickly, then a central bank that was probably too slow to react, then a war in Ukraine that’s ravaged the supply side of the global economy — have wrecked Biden’s public standing. When a president is unpopular due to bad economic news, the public doesn’t give him credit for anything. And columnists of all stripes are wont to criticize an unpopular leader. But the fact remains that important elements of Biden’s agenda have succeeded, notably including a Russia policy that has secured strong bipartisan and even international support despite the economic cost. The cloak of unpopularity, meanwhile, makes it even easier for bipartisanship to continue. In his current state, Biden is not politically threatening to Republicans, so they have no reason to avoid collaborating on bills they happen to like. A new proposal from Republican senators Mitt Romney, Richard Burr and Steve Daines to consolidate and simplify various family support programs in a way that would cut poverty and reduce marriage penalties has earned some cautious praise from Democratic Senator Michael Bennet and could be the basis for more bipartisan work. At the end of the day, life as a legislator is more fun if you get to legislate. Sheer exhaustion with the tedium of obstruction has helped make Biden’s approach work.

### AT Polarization Broke Congress

#### Bipartisan passage of major legislation disproves

Zelizer 6/16

Julian E., CNN Political Analyst, “Opinion: Democrats shouldn't be so quick to throw Biden overboard” June 16, 2022 <https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/16/opinions/biden-reelection-2024-democrats-zelizer/index.html> dmr

The American Rescue Plan and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act are two major initiatives that passed despite intense polarization and the Democrats' narrow majorities in Congress. And both pieces of legislation have been integral to the nation's recovery from the pandemic. The Biden administration also oversaw the swift rollout of the Covid-19 vaccines, which have been key to protecting the country against the damage caused by new variants. On foreign policy, Biden has enjoyed considerable success strengthening NATO and ratcheting up economic sanctions against Russia while providing critical aid to Ukraine. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman wrote about his off-the-record lunch with the President, "What I felt afterward was this: For all you knuckleheads on Fox who say that Biden can't put two sentences together, here's a news flash: He just put NATO together, Europe together and the whole Western alliance together—stretching from Canada up to Finland and all the way to Japan—to help Ukraine protect its fledgling democracy from Vladimir Putin's fascist assault." None of this erases the significant challenge global inflation has on American families. To be sure, the President has taken steps to address this by shoring up key ports to alleviate supply chain problems. The Federal Reserve has just instituted the largest rate hike since 1994 to curb inflation and the administration has committed itself to focusing on this problem without undermining the strong jobs numbers that the country has enjoyed.

### AT Winners Win: PC Finite – Biden

#### Biden’s pc is finite – he has limited opportunities to pass recession solutions

Smith 2021

Noah, Prof @Stony Brook University, “Biden Must Avoid Obama's Mistake When Setting His Agenda; Stick to the crisis at hand or risk spurring a backlash that could slow economic reforms and hurt Democrats in 2022,” January 13, 2021, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-01-13/biden-must-avoid-obama-s-mistake-when-setting-his-agenda>

The universe of possibilities for the Biden administration radically expanded after the Democrats clinched the Senate majority, but the increase in political capital isn’t infinite. When deciding which problems to tackle first, President Joe Biden should prioritize initiatives that address the pandemic while moving the nation toward long-term goals for public health and green-energy stimulus. Biden can learn from the experience of Barack Obama, whose focus on health-insurance reform provoked a midterm backlash and probably forfeited a chance to boost the country out of the Great Recession sooner. He should heed the words of Winston Churchill who urged, “never let a good crisis go to waste.” Because crises are times when the public understands that change is necessary, it’s possible to make deep and lasting reforms. President Franklin D. Roosevelt understood this when he focused parts of his New Deal on long-term alterations to America’s economic structure, such as Social Security and the National Labor Relations Board. These policies not only contributed to the recovery from the Great Depression — the reason for Roosevelt's election — but created a more equal and stable economy in which workers had more bargaining power and old people didn’t have to live in penury. The U.S. was in the depths of the Great Recession when Obama took office in 2009. With the benefit of unified Democratic control of Congress, he passed a fairly substantial stimulus. But it was still too small to make more than a modest dent in the recession. It was too weighted toward tax cuts and it didn’t include much of a bailout for underwater homeowners. Instead, Obama spent much of his political capital on passing the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as Obamacare. Now, it’s true that health insurance was, and is, one of the country’s biggest problems. And it’s also true that Obamacare substantially reduced the ranks of the uninsured, which was a big, important victory. But the system Obama crafted was a compromise, which left the problem of ruinously high costs mostly unaddressed. The legislation failed to satisfy many on the left, with a few now even labeling it as mass murder for not making deeper reforms. Meanwhile, Obamacare remained unpopular throughout Obama’s term in office and may have substantially contributed to the Democrats’ catastrophic midterm election losses in 2010. Alternate histories are difficult to imagine, but it seems likely that had Obama spent his 2009 political capital on things more directly related to the recession — such as more infrastructure spending, a bigger bailout for underwater homeowners and a stronger welfare state — he'd have realized a higher return on that political capital. In other words, a crisis does present an opportunity for long-term reforms, but it’s best to use that opportunity for reforms that address the immediate crisis. The Democratic victories in the Georgia Senate runoffs have given Biden an unexpected opportunity to pass major legislation in the first year of his presidency, instead of relying on executive action and the faint hope of bipartisan compromise. The left will be clamoring for major action on health care and a variety of other momumental issues, but Biden needs to spend his political capital on reforms that are also tied to the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting recession. The first priority is public health. COVID-19 exposed deep and catastrophic weaknesses in the U.S. public health institutions. Right now, vaccination is proceeding at a glacial pace due to an uncoordinated rollout that dumped vaccines in the lap of state public health agencies utterly unequipped to rapidly inoculate the entire populace. Biden needs to come right out of the gate with a coordinated, well-funded vaccination plan that reaches maximum vaccination rates as fast as possible. In doing so, he also needs to bolster public health agencies and revitalize and reform both the Centers for Disease Control and the Food and Drug Administration after years of neglect. This will be a bigger challenge than is popularly realized because of the possibility that vaccine-resistant virus strains will emerge. Biden will need to reorient much of the U.S. economy toward vaccine production and distribution until COVID-19 has been decisively beaten all around the world. It will take a lot of money and a lot of will. After the virus is beaten, the U.S. economy will still linger in recession unless the government acts decisively to boost demand. The best tool for doing this, as usual, is infrastructure investment. And the rapid progress in solar power and batteries means that Biden has a unique opportunity to address the climate crisis at the same time. A huge build-out of solar power and electric-car charging stations, including subsidies to rapidly replace fossil fuel plants and gasoline vehicles, will ensure that the U.S. economy comes roaring back while making huge steps toward decarbonization. Public health and green infrastructure should be the top priorities for Biden in 2021 and 2022. Yes, there are lots of other things in America that need reform, including health care. But the realities of the political system mean these will have to wait. Reforms must fit the crisis of the day; Biden can’t afford to get sidetracked on a quixotic quest to fix everything that’s wrong with the American economy.

#### Winners don’t win in this political climate

Subramanian 3-7-2021 (Courtney and Joey Garrison, “'Dinner table' politics: Why Joe Biden ditched bipartisan dealmaking to pass his COVID-19 relief bill,” USA Today, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/03/07/covid-19-bill-biden-chooses-dinner-table-politics-over-bipartisanship/6892438002/)

Despite the relief plan's popularity outside the Beltway, it is unlikely that momentum from its passage will hurtle Biden into future legislative wins, Howell said. “The idea that a legislative win begets a subsequent legislative win in this environment is probably asking for too much,” he said, noting the prospect of passing COVID-19 relief was higher than more hot-button issues like immigration or health care. A legislative defeat would have raised questions about Biden’s ability to pass any meaningful legislation, but its passage won’t be a “springboard to the production of all kinds of landmark legislation – far from it," Howell said.

#### Biden won’t get credit for solving problems---negativity bias

Drezner 21, PhD, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and a regular contributor to PostEverything. (Daniel, “Biden’s brand of bipartisanship,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/30/bidens-brand-bipartisanship/)

The paradox for Biden is that the more successful he is at addressing the pandemic and the economy, the more difficulty he could encounter in building bipartisan coalitions to address other problems. Political Science 101 would suggest that if Biden gets credit for ending the pandemic and restoring a strong economy, that popularity should translate into greater political capital for other problems in the queue. Political Science 301 offers a cautionary warning: Solved problems fade from view. Biden is appropriately addressing the issues voters care about. But if the pandemic and the economy evolve as expected, voters will quickly bank those successes and focus on thornier problems — like immigration.

### AT Winners Win: PC Finite – Theory

#### Winners win false – political capital is finite

Bennister and Worthy 12 - Mark Bennister was a Senior Lecturer in Politics, Ben Worthy is a lecturer in Politics at Birkbeck College. 4-12-2012, "Getting it, Spending it, Losing it: Exploring Political Capital by Mark Bennister, Ben Worthy :: SSRN," No Publication, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2480548

Political capital is frequently used as a short hand for the diverse range of attributes and advantages a leader brings with them to power and develops in office. Compared to other forms of ‘capital’ it remains under theorised. Since Pierre Bourdieu first outlined it, scholars have viewed political capital either as being synonymous with personal skills or a description of wider contextual attributes, particularly the link between leader and public. It is frequently seen as analogous to financial capital: a political leader has a fixed stock of capital that they can spend, hoard, fritter or gamble. This paper takes a first look at the literature and applies it to ‘t Hart’s approaches to leadership study, drawing on examples predominantly from US and UK politics. Following Lopez (2002) it takes the view that political capital is both ‘personal’ (in terms of their own skills) and ‘political’ (in terms of events, institutional resources and context). A politician with skills and attributes can use this to shape the context in which they operate, creating a ‘positive multiplier’ as the personal and political reinforce each other. Where events can also overwhelm leaders and expose flaws and personality weaknesses, a ‘negative multiplier’ takes effect. However, unlike money in the bank, political capital is finite and subject to depreciation as part of ‘a natural trajectory’ whereby support and power is lost over time. Yet this trajectory is not always uniform. The loss is inevitable but the rate and shape may not be.

### AT Winners Win: PC Finite – Time to Regenerate

#### Win doesn’t spill over fast enough

Silber 07 [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, What Makes a President Quack? Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, Understanding Lame Duck Status Through the Eyes of the Media and Politicians]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but only to a limited extent. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be developed.

## \*\*Links\*\*

## AI Ethics Links

### L – Restrictions Cost PC

#### Lack of political willpower, confusion, and pervasive lobbying ensure emerging tech regulation depletes Biden PC

Kang 22 – NYT tech policy reporter (Cecilia, “As Europe Approves New Tech Laws, the U.S. Falls Further Behind,” New York Times, 4-22-22, <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/22/technology/tech-regulation-europe-us.html>) //sg

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. 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.”**

#### The plan’s visibility sets off disputes with entrenched lobbies AND is independently controversial

1ac Stanley-Lockman, 2021 - Center for Security and Emerging Technology [Zoe CSET Issue Brief August “Responsible and Ethical Military AI Allies and Allied Perspectives” https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/responsible-and-ethical-military-ai/ /DG

While jumping straight to implementation can mean a more pragmatic focus on tools, tracking how different AI stakeholders use those tools may be more difficult. In this way, principles can be seen as a helpful organizing force, as is the case for DOD. This said, the scale of the U.S. military bureaucracy and national security innovation base may require higher visibility relative to allied counterparts. Still, another key difference is precisely this visibility. The analysis here is based on information in the public domain, which may also partially explain its transatlantic tilt. The U.S. approach to responsible and ethical AI for defense also differs from other Center for Security and Emerging Technology | 52 countries in that the consultation and process that led to its principles is far more transparent than is true for most allies. A possible Catch-22 could be at play here, with allies reticent to publicize approaches to such controversial issues, despite the fact that offering such inroads can build trust and confidence that governments are handling these high-stakes questions responsibly.

### L – Ban LAWS – Congress Backlash

#### LAWs regulation invites political controversy – drastic pushback from tech, political, and military leaders

De Vynck 21 [Gerrit De Vynck is a tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society, "The U.S. says humans will always be in control of AI weapons. But the age of autonomous war is already here,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/07/07/ai-weapons-us-military/] GBS-HW

Drones have been a key part of warfare for years, but they’ve generally been remotely controlled by humans. Now, by cobbling together readily available image-recognition and autopilot software, autonomous drones can be mass-produced on the cheap. Today, efforts to enact a total ban on lethal autonomous weapons, long demanded by human rights activists, are now being supported by 30 countries. But the world’s leading military powers insist that isn’t necessary. The U.S. military says concerns are overblown, and humans can effectively control autonomous weapons, while Russia’s government says true AI weapons can’t be banned because they don’t exist yet. But the facts on the ground show that technological advancements, coupled with complex conflicts like the Syrian and Libyan civil wars, have created a reality where weapons that make their own decisions are already killing people. “The debate is very much still oriented towards the future,” said Ingvild Bode, an autonomous weapons researcher at the University of Southern Denmark. “We should take a much closer look at what is already going on.” Libya wasn’t the only place drones that can kill autonomously were used last year. Turkey has used the same quadcopters to patrol its border with Syria. When Azerbaijan invaded Armenian-occupied territory in September, it sent in both Turkish- and Israeli-made “loitering munitions” — drones that can autonomously patrol an area and automatically divebomb enemy radar signals. These weapons look like smaller versions of the remote-controlled drones that have been used extensively by the U.S. military in Iraq, Afghanistan and other conflicts. Instead of launching missiles through remote control, though, loitering munitions have a built-in explosive and destroy themselves on impact with their target. Since they have both remote-control and autonomous capability, it’s impossible to know from the outside whether humans made the final call to bomb individual targets. Either way, the drones devastated Armenia’s army, and the war ended two months later with Azerbaijan gaining huge swaths of territory. These kinds of weapons are moving firmly into the mainstream. Today, there are dozens of projects by multiple governments to develop loitering munitions. Even as countries like the United States, China and Russia participate in discussions about a treaty limiting autonomous weapons, they’re racing ahead to develop them. “The advanced militaries are pushing the envelope of these technologies,” said Peter Asaro, a professor at the New School in New York and a co-founder of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control, which advocates for stricter rules around lethal autonomous weapons. “They will proliferate rapidly.” Over the past decade, cheaper access to computers that can crunch massive data sets in a short time has allowed researchers to make huge breakthroughs in designing computer programs that pull insights from large amounts of information. AI advances have led to machines that can write poetry, accurately translate languages and potentially help scientists develop new medicines. But debates about the dangers of relying more on computers to make decisions are raging. AI algorithms are only as good as the data sets they were trained on, and studies have shown facial recognition AI programs are better at identifying White faces than Black and Brown ones. European lawmakers recently proposed strict new rules regulating the use of AI. Companies including Google, Amazon, Apple and Tesla have poured billions of dollars into developing the technology, and critics say AI programs are sometimes being deployed without full knowledge of how they work and what the consequences of widespread use could be. Some countries, such as Austria, have joined the call for a global ban on autonomous weapons, but U.S. tech and political leaders are pushing back. In March, a panel of tech luminaries including former Google chief executive Eric Schmidt, then-chief of Web services, now chief executive of Amazon Andy Jassy and Microsoft chief scientist Eric Horvitz released a study on the impact of AI on national security. The 756-page final report, commissioned by Congress, argued that Washington should oppose a ban on autonomous weapons because it would be difficult to enforce, and could stop the United States from using weapons it already has in its arsenal. In a first, Air Force uses AI on military jet “It may be impossible to define the category of systems to be restricted in such a way that provides adequate clarity while not overly constraining existing U.S. military capabilities,” the report said.

#### Prefer empirics – the US rejected global LAWs regulation in 2021

The Guardian 21 [The Guardian, "US rejects calls for regulating or banning ‘killer robots’", https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/dec/02/us-rejects-calls-regulating-banning-killer-robots] GBS-HW

The US has rejected calls for a binding agreement regulating or banning the use of “killer robots”, instead proposing a “code of conduct” at the United Nations. Speaking at a meeting in Geneva focused on finding common ground on the use of such so-called lethal autonomous weapons, a US official balked at the idea of regulating their use through a “legally-binding instrument”. The meeting saw government experts preparing for high-level talks at a review conference on the Convention of Certain Conventional Weapons from 13 to 17 December. “In our view, the best way to make progress ... would be through the development of a non-binding code of conduct,” US official Josh Dorosin told the meeting. The United Nations has been hosting diplomatic talks in Geneva since 2017 aimed at reaching an agreement on how to address the use of killer robots. Activists and a number of countries have called for an all-out ban on any weapons that could use lethal force without a human overseeing the process and making the final kill order. In November 2018, the UN chief, António Guterres, joined the call for a ban, but so far countries do not even agree on whether there is a need to regulate the weapons. During Thursday’s debate, a number of countries, including India and the United States, criticised the idea of a legally binding agreement. Dorosin insisted a code of conduct “would help states promote responsible behaviour and compliance with international law”.Campaigners disagreed.

### L – Ban LAWS – DOD backlash

#### Military leaders are in favor of LAWS – DoD will oppose the plan

Congressional Research Service 21 – (“Defense Primer: U.S. Policy on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems,” Congressional Research Service Reports, 11-17-21, https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11150) //sg

Lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS) are a special class of weapon systems that use sensor suites and computer algorithms to independently identify a target and employ an onboard weapon system to engage and destroy the target without manual human control of the system. Although these systems are not yet in widespread development, it is **believed they would enable military operations** in communications-degraded or -denied environments in which traditional systems may not be able to operate. Contrary to a number of news reports, U.S. policy **does not prohibit the development or employment** of LAWS. Although the United States does not currently have LAWS in its inventory, some **senior military and defense leaders** have stated that the United States may be compelled to develop LAWS in the future if U.S. competitors choose to do so. At the same time, a growing number of states and nongovernmental organizations are appealing to the international community for regulation of or a ban on LAWS due to ethical concerns.

## AI Logistics Links

### L – Big Tech Backlash

#### Big tech backlashes to military-led AI operations

Lin-Greenberg 20, postdoctoral fellow at the University of Pennsylvania’s Perry World House (Erik, “Allies and Artificial Intelligence: Obstacles to Operations and Decision-Making,” Vol 3, Issue 2)//BB

https://tnsr.org/2020/03/allies-and-artificial-intelligence-obstacles-to-operations-and-decision-making/

Tepid public support at home and abroad can stymie alliance military operations in two ways. First, public opposition to the use of AI among allied populations may lead policymakers to restrict the use of AI-enabled technologies for military operations. In the event of future hostilities, for example, the South Korean or German governments might oppose an ally’s use of AI-enabled lethal weapon systems on their territory.60 Indeed, advocacy from the public and activist groups has led a growing number of states — including U.S. allies like Pakistan and Jordan — to call for bans on the use of lethal autonomous weapon systems.61

Second, civilian engineers and researchers that develop AI technology may refuse to work on military AI contracts. Disruptions to AI development can hinder the fielding of new capabilities and generate mistrust between the government and civilian firms. Google employees, for instance, protested their involvement in Project Maven, a Defense Department program that uses AI to analyze video collected by military drones.62 In a letter to their CEO, the employees argued that “Google should not be in the business of war,” explaining that the company should not “outsource the moral responsibility of [its] technologies to third parties,” and that work on Defense Department-backed AI would “irreparably damage Google’s brand.”63 The resistance ultimately led Google to terminate its involvement in the contract and generated public criticism of the Defense Department’s AI efforts.64

#### Big tech is the most powerful lobby

Chung 21, big tech accountability advocate (Jane, “Big Tech, Big Cash: Washington’s New Power Players,” *Citizen*, <https://www.citizen.org/article/big-tech-lobbying-update/>)

“I can tell you [political spending] plays an important role. Not because the checks are big, but because the way the political process works. Politicians in the United States have events, they have weekend retreats, you have to write a check and then you’re invited and participate. “So if you work in the government affairs team in the United States, you spend your weekends going to these events; you spend your evenings going to these dinners, and the reason you go is because the PAC writes a check. “But out of that ongoing effort a relationship evolves and emerges and solidifies … I’m sometimes calling members and asking for their help on green cards, or on visa issues … Or the issues around national security, or privacy … “There are times when I call people who I don’t personally know, and somebody will say ‘you know, your folks have always shown up for me at my events. And we have a good relationship. Let me see what I can do to help you.’” – Brad Smith, President and Chief Legal Officer, Microsoft –––– “Microsoft’s quiet pursuit to buy TikTok suddenly appeared dead a month ago … so Brad Smith, the tech giant’s president, went to work. He called two dozen lawmakers, telling them that TikTok would be safe in Microsoft’s hands. Within 48 hours, he had what he needed.” – New York Times “We had a hierarchy in my office in Congress. If you’re a lobbyist who never gave us money, I didn’t talk to you. If you’re a lobbyist who gave us money, I might talk to you.” – Mick Mulvaney, former U.S. Representative Executive Summary 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 (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. 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.

### L – Cooperation Costs PC

#### Bureaucratic and political barriers associated with military AI:

Margarita 1ac Konaev & Husanjot Chahal 21, Research Fellow & Research Analyst, Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Georgetown University. "The Path of Least Resistance Multinational Collaboration on AI for Military Logistics and Sustainment" April. <https://cset.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/CSET-Path-of-Least-Resistance.pdf> //DG

While there are notable technical, bureaucratic, and political barriers to multinational cooperation in AI, especially for military purposes, AI applications for logistics and sustainment represent both a promising and critical area for collaboration between the United States and its allies. There are many ways allies can work together in this space, including by developing joint standards for data sharing, investing in collaborative R&D programs, advancing multinational public-private partnerships, and integrating AI- enabled logistics and sustainment technologies into joint military exercises.

#### Significant cooperation encounters substantial hurdles:

Ulrike Esther 1ac Franke 21, senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR). She leads ECFR’s Technology and European Power initiative. Her areas of focus include German and European security and defence, the future of warfare, and the impact of new technologies such as drones and artificial intelligence on geopolitics and warfare. PhD in International Relations from the University of Oxford. Franke is a policy affiliate at the Governance of AI project at Oxford University’s Future of Humanity Institute. "Artificial divide: How Europe and America could clash over AI" – ECFR/367 2. January. <https://ecfr.eu/wp-content/uploads/Artificial-divide-How-Europe-and-America-could-clash-over-AI.pdf> //DG

This paper has discussed the rationale for transatlantic cooperation on AI. It has shown that both Europe and the US have reasons for wanting to cooperate with each other. But substantial hurdles may prevent the transatlantic partners from cooperating in a significant way. However, they can still look to ramp up their cooperation. And non-combat military AI, in particular, may be low-hanging fruit for AI cooperation within NATO. Europeans should reach out to their American allies, so that a new, third phase of Europe’s policy efforts in this AI spring can indeed become a phase of international – and particularly transatlantic – cooperation.

#### Economic and political concerns block cooperation

Ulrike Esther 1ac Franke 21, senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR). She leads ECFR’s Technology and European Power initiative. Her areas of focus include German and European security and defence, the future of warfare, and the impact of new technologies such as drones and artificial intelligence on geopolitics and warfare. PhD in International Relations from the University of Oxford. Franke is a policy affiliate at the Governance of AI project at Oxford University’s Future of Humanity Institute. "Artificial divide: How Europe and America could clash over AI" – ECFR/367 2. January. <https://ecfr.eu/wp-content/uploads/Artificial-divide-How-Europe-and-America-could-clash-over-AI.pdf> //DG

This paper examines the reasons European states may want to work with the US on AI, and why the US may want to reach out to Europe on the issue. It also identifies the points of disagreement that may stop the allies from fully fleshing out transatlantic AI cooperation. The paper shows that, while both sides are interested in working together, their rationales for doing so differ. Furthermore, economic and political factors may stand in the way of cooperation, even though such cooperation could have a positive impact on the way AI develops. The paper also argues that transatlantic cooperation in the area of military AI could be a good first step – here, Europe and the US should build on existing collaboration within NATO. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the different forums that have been created or proposed for transatlantic and broader Western cooperation on AI.

### L —AT Agency Shields

#### No “agency shields”---AI integration is whole-of-government,

E.H. 1ac Christie 22, Senior Research Fellow, Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Arkadiankatu. Former liaison between the NATO Innovation Unit and the Commission’s staff. March 31. "Defence cooperation in artificial intelligence: Bridging the transatlantic gap for a stronger Europe" Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies. European View, 1-9. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/17816858221089372> //DG

Much has already been achieved in terms of new structures, new initiatives and new policy developments to support the collaborative adoption of AI among NATO Allies and EU member states. In addition to pre-existing structures and mechanisms at both the NATO and EU levels, which have ensured that nations are not starting from scratch, national defence institutions are already able to refer to common policy commitments and to options, whether through NATO or the EDA, for research or capability-development activ-ities. At the same time, ensuring a competitive edge in AI is a truly whole-of-government effort which requires considerable cross-over between the military and civilian realms. Large gaps remain between the US and the EU on certain key indicators. At the same time, the gaps pertaining to research are far smaller. To ensure greater European perfor- mance and relevance in AI in general, and its defence applications in particular, it seems desirable to focus on two strategic priorities: investment volumes, both public and pri- vate, which need to be significantly increased; and the full use of collaborative mecha- nisms involving the US.

## Biotech Links

### L – Biotech Investment

#### Biotech investment draws political controversy – picking favorites perceived as undermine public efforts and a corporate handout

Servick 19 [Kelly Servick is a staff writer at Science, "Controversial U.S. bill would lift Supreme Court ban on patenting human genes", Science, https://www.science.org/content/article/controversial-us-bill-would-lift-supreme-court-ban-patenting-human-genes] GBS-HW

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."

#### Biotech investment---congress has backed off BECAUSE of fears of inflation and price controls

Alex Keown, 6-15-2022, Keown is a journalist for Biospace with 20 years of experience in the field of biotechnology "Biotech Industry Seeks Congressional Greenlight for NOL Sales," BioSpace, https://www.biospace.com/article/biotech-industry-seeks-congressional-greenlight-for-nol-sales-as-source-of-income//DG

The San Francisco Business Times reported that industry lobbyists are [urging Congress to approve a plan](https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2022/06/14/net-operating-losses-nol-tax-credit-biotech.html) that will allow companies that are not yet generating revenue from the sales of their assets to be allowed to sell net operating loss carryforwards to larger companies. In other words, the biotech companies are looking to sell their losses to larger companies to provide them with a tax credit that would allow them to lower their tax burden.   Currently, net operating loss (NOL) carryforwards allow businesses that have suffered financial losses within a fiscal year to deduct them from profits in future years. This will enable businesses to be taxed on average profitability. The plan floated by biotech leaders would certainly be appealing to some of the larger companies. As the Business Times explained, NOL carryforwards are attractive to merger and acquisition specialists because of their practical applications in decreasing tax burdens. But, those are NOLs that are gained through an acquisition. The current plan seeks to give small companies the ability to sell those losses on the open market without going through the M&A process.  If a company gains a commercial revenue stream, it can take up to a decade and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue that can offset those net operating losses.  While the sale of NOLs is not an option across the country as a whole, there are places where the practice is already in place. For years, the state of New Jersey has allowed tech and life sciences companies to sell up to $20 million in state net operating losses or R&D tax credits to buyers, which the purchasers can use to reduce taxable income. California has also reinstated the sale of NOLs as the state faced a budget deficit of $34 billion. It appears to have been successful as the state is now projected to have a surplus. But, at the federal level, the idea of NOL sales has not seen much movement.  This plan would allow early-stage companies with a new source of capital, mainly if they have been unsuccessful at finding significant funding from venture capitalists. The Business Times report comes the same day that Third Rock Ventures announced a new $1.1 billion fund aimed at supporting startup companies. The approach would provide a new source of funding for these early-stage companies. The supporters of the plan also noted that larger companies would benefit through a new tax-reduction tool.  The Business Times speculated that these NOLs are worth hundreds of millions of dollars. If the carryforward sale is allowed, the biotech industry hopes this could also serve as a catalyst for investors to return to supporting these early-stage companies to drive the development of new therapies, diagnostics and medical devices.  Investors have largely backed away from biotech and pharma over the past year due to market uncertainty caused by inflation, supply chain disruptions, the ongoing war in Ukraine and continuing talks about drug price controls. Since the start of the year, the Nasdaq Biotechnology Index has been down nearly 30%.

### L – Industry Scandals

#### Biotech projects get associated with pricing scandals---politicians love bashing the industry

Jackson Moses, 10-19-2016, Moses is a venture capitalist and head of partnerships at MainStreet "Biotech Bashing: Pills, Politics, & Endless Potential," No Publication, https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/biotech-bashing-pills-politics-endless-potential-jackson-moses//DG

The Blame Game: How Tit-For-Tat Thinking Is Sinking Biotech Long the ire of Clinton, Warren, Sanders, and (now) Trump, Mylan's EpiPen pricing scandal provided politicians a prime excuse to attack the biotech sector for all healthcare-related problems. After news broke of Mylan's 500% EpiPen price hike, seasoned politicians (Democrat and Republican) took to [Twitter](http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/followers-dilemma-how-game-theory-explains-twitters-most-moses), bashing the biotech industry for egregious price-gouging practices. As such, in an attempt to curb her impending PR nightmare, Mylan CEO Heather Bresch responded to media accusations by stating annual EpiPen price hikes were justified due to ongoing R&D costs (strike one), discounted public school rates (strike two), and Obamacare's failed incentive structure (strike three). Unsurprisingly, the aforementioned rationale didn't resonate with middle-class voters. The American public had quickly reached a populous conclusion, which also established a dangerous precedent: corporate greed is a punishable offense. The message was clear, if U.S. Representatives wanted to remain employed, Congress would hold "greedy" executives accountable for their private sector "crimes." Rightfully realizing the rare opportunity to acquire significant political capital, Hillary Clinton [Tweeted](http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/followers-dilemma-how-game-theory-explains-twitters-most-moses) the following: "EpiPens can be the difference between life and death. There's no justification for these price hikes." She then released an official follow-up statement and demanded "Mylan immediately reduce the price of EpiPens." Market participants responded by dumping Mylan stock to the tune of 10%.

### L – GMOs Backlash

#### GMO investment gets massive backlash---it tanks industries AND catalyzes backlash by appealing to public fears

Kojo Ahiakpa, 6-6-2018, Ahjakpa is an agribusiness advisor and a data analyst "THE POLITICS OF GMOs," No Publication, https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/politics-gmos-kojo-ahiakpa?trk=portfolio\_article-card\_title//DG

Opposition to GMOs and science in general across the world has hitherto been a matter of political interests, usually led by corporate, religious and political actors. Journalist Marc Gunther has highlighted the conspiratorial narrative about GMO technology favoured by some corporate supported anti-GMO activists. Marc Gunther has recounted the extent to which corporate and political sponsorship for anti-GMO activism has driven most of the campaigns across the world. Nonetheless, the introduction of GMOs into any country has its own political and business implications. Those supplying fertilisers to governments, suppliers of pesticides, weedicides and insecticides will be taken out of business. Political actors who may be hunting for avenues to make some political capital, may take advantage of such issues and join the protest without necessarily pointing out cogent reasons for their oppositions.

#### GMO development requires heavy PC expenditure---debates are ferocious

Nathaniel Johnson 1-24-2014, Johnson is a senior staff writer at Grist"OK, GMOs matter," https://grist.org/food/ok-gmos-matter-but-the-noisy-fight-over-them-is-a-distraction//DG

I’ll confess to some sensationalism in claiming in the title of my last piece on the GMO controversy that “none of it matters.” Of course it does matter to some degree, and it matters very much to those who have dedicated their lives to the issue. It would have been more punctilious (and less fun) to instead title the piece: “The ferocity of the GMO debate makes it seem much more important than it really is.” It’s not that we should all resign ourselves to apathy. I’m simply suggesting that — whether your primary concern is the environment, or health, or poverty, or feeding the world — heavy expenditure of political capital on GMOs isn’t going to move you all that far toward your goal. Both Ramez Naam and Tom Philpott take me to task for underplaying the importance of GMOs, and I actually agree with almost all of what they’ve written here. I agree with Naam that we should be pursuing moonshot technologies like C4 and self-fertilization. But we shouldn’t be counting on those big breakthroughs to solve our problems: They may not ever come. I agree with Philpott that GMO crops have been overhyped and that discussion should stick to the facts on the ground.

#### GMOs---proposals are partisan, dividing industries and the public

Adam Chandler, 3-8-2016, Staff Writer at The Atlantic "How the GMO Debate Became a National Nightmare," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/03/gmo-debate-congress/473664//DG

The battle over GMOs encompasses some of our worst political instincts. The public overwhelmingly fears GMOs and supports labeling. Owing to its partisan nature, the bill to be debated has been given two names: the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (SAFE), by those against mandatory labeling, and Deny Americans the Right to Know Act (DARK), by those who support labeling. (Making matters worse, there is also a competing bill that would try to split the difference between supporting state-mandated labeling and attempting to limit label confusion on the national level.)An informal consortium of government organizations and science academies say that genetically modified foods pose no health threat to consumers and yet their interests are associated with pernicious-seeming big agricultural stalwarts like Monsanto and ConAgra. Meanwhile, the FDA isn’t so sure about the environmental impact of genetically engineered crops, which is a different issue altogether that is being lumped within the conversation.

#### Gene drives---they lack any type of institutional support AND require political tradeoffs

Jesse Reynolds, 11-21-2020 Jesse Reynolds is an expert in international environmental policy. He researches and advises on how norms, rules, procedures, and institutions can help manage environmental opportunities and challenges, particularly those involving emerging technologies. “Engineering biological diversity: the international governance of synthetic biology, gene drives, and de-extinction for conservation," No Publication, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343520300890//DG

The emerging technologies of conservationist synthetic biology present high-stakes risk-risk tradeoffs, with sub-stantial potentials to further sustainability and to cause environmental harm. Governance is vital, but existing mechanisms, institutions, and processes have gaps. The further development of governance is a political process. Although critics often frame emerging technologies as being hyped by firms and boosters, this is not the case with conservationist synthetic biology. Those who advo-cate for its research and development seem to do so despondently [3,19] and emphasize caution over speed [12]. Furthermore, few to no business interests are pro- moting the endeavors. This is likely a consequence of these biotechnologies’ largely nonexcludable character, in which their effects cannot be limited to those who payfor the services [46]. Consequently, there is little poten- tial for profit in providing such public goods (in the economic meaning, not the normative one).

## Cyber Security Links

### L – Partisan Fights

#### Cybersecurity policy links---massive partisan divide regarding means AND enforcement

Mariam Baksh, 4-6-2022, Cybersecurity Policy reporter for nextgov "Partisan Rift Stalls Efforts to Secure Critical Infrastructure from Cyberattack," Nextgov, https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2022/04/partisan-rift-stalls-efforts-secure-critical-infrastructure-cyberattack/364120//DG

Senior House Democrats and Republicans disagree on legislation Rep. John Katko, R-N.Y., has proposed that calls on the Department of Homeland Security to identify “systemically important critical infrastructure”—SICI—for prioritizing the government’s efforts to improve the nation’s cybersecurity.    “It is not enough to simply identify these most critical entities, nor is it consistent with what the solarium Commission proposed,” Rep. Yvette Clarke, D-N.Y., chair of the House Homeland Security Committee’s panel on cybersecurity, infrastructure protection and innovation, said during a hearing Wednesday. “We need to be able to answer the question, ‘what do these companies need to do as a result of their designation?’ And ‘what does the federal government need to do for them?’”  The [Katko bill](https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2021/10/national-cyber-adviser-lays-out-goals-upcoming-30-nation-meeting-ransomware/185867/), and identical legislation proposed by Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, in the upper chamber, draws from a recommendation of the congressionally mandated Cyberspace Solarium Commission. The commission, which was composed of members of Congress from across the political spectrum, executive-branch officials and major private-sector representatives, proposed that entities designated systemically important critical infrastructure be allowed some protection from liability and access to information in exchange for implementing appropriate cybersecurity controls.  Katko is ranking member of the House Homeland Security Committee. His legislation, which has [a Democratic co-sponsor](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5491/cosponsors?r=39&s=1)–Rep. Abigail Spanberger, D-Va.—who has not been active on cybersecurity policy, covers the first part of the Solarium Commission’s bargain by calling on DHS to identify the entities and outlining benefits they would receive. But it does not approach a discussion of appropriate security controls companies should be required to implement.  CISA, meanwhile, has made a point of noting the agency is taking on the work of identifying the entities in question, regardless of whether there is legislation instructing them to do so.  “It's clear that CISA's Systemically Important Entities effort is engaged in a rigorous identification process, but the next steps of what to do with the list appear less clear to me than the Solarium Commission's vision of SICI, which calls for specific benefits and obligations to SICI entities,” Rep. Jim Langevin, D-R.I., said. Langevin chairs a key cybersecurity panel on the House Armed Services Committee and is co-chair of the House Cybersecurity Caucus. He and King were both members of the Solarium Commission.     Agreement also broke down along partisan lines regarding the use of regulatory enforcement versus the voluntary approach that has been at the center of cybersecurity policy over the last decade.

## OCO Links

### L – OCOs 1nc

Plan costs pc – Intelligence hasn’t been shared for a reason – NGOs, big tech, and the military backlash to the plan

Jacobsen 2021

Jeppe T., Ph.D. candidate at the Danish Institute for International Studies and the Center for War Studies at the University of Southern Denmark, “Cyber offense in NATO: challenges and opportunities,” 12 May 2021 https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/97/3/703/6205395 by 81695661 dmr

This does not mean that states that face hostile hybrid activities below the threshold of armed conflict will be left alone. Intelligence cooperation between allied countries does exist, and threat information is occasionally shared. In addition to the current political collaboration facilitated by NATO to improve network security and resilience, the EU is engaging in similar civilian activities, as well as developing and implementing a cyber-diplomatic toolbox to create a common basis for responding to a variety of malicious activities against member states. Further strengthening the political partnership between the EU and NATO is thus the most appropriate way forward to avoid further militarization of cyberspace. Sustaining the intelligence norm as the dominant norm is not without potential problems. Openly embracing the fact that cyberspace is a domain in which intelligence agencies are constrained only by domestic laws, and where takedowns of servers in foreign countries are not necessarily perceived as serious breaches of sovereignty, is likely to lead to an increase in the exploitation of IT vulnerabilities in commercial software used in both enemy and allied networks. For smaller states, this could increase the risk of retaliation by larger adversaries, and it could increase the risk of divisions between allies—divisions that are not aligned with the United States’ political ambition to use cyber coordination in NATO as part of its attempt to ‘defend forward’.74 More exploitation could also ultimately make cyberspace less free, less open and less secure, rendering civilian populations more susceptible to cybercrime, surveillance and disruptions of everyday services.75 This is why some states, NGOs and private corporations such as Microsoft continue to promote norms that emphasize restraint on the part of states’ intelligence agencies and militaries in cyberspace, and why other states promote more sovereign control of cyberspace.76

### L – OCOs 2nc/1nr

#### Extend 1nc Jacobsen – big tech, the DOD, and ngos will vociferously object to the plan – every attempt at intelligence sharing has been blocked by and well-funded, politically influential lobby

#### The link is massive and outweighs the link turns – their ev is that development of OCOs is politically popular – that is our argument – the plan’s sharing of those highly coveted mechanisms guarantees the backlash is substantial – a host of other political obstacles magnify the link – interoperability, sovereignty, and attribution requirements mean the link alone turns the case – these fights doom standardization and cohesion

Blessing 2021

Jason Blessing is a Jeane Kirkpatrick Visiting Research Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. During the 2020-2021 academic year, he served as a DAAD Post-Doctoral Fellow in the Program on “The United States, Europe, and World Order” at the Foreign Policy Institute of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). Blessing has previously worked as a Consulting Fellow for the Cyber, Space and Future Conflict Programme at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and was a USIP-Minerva Peace and Security Scholar with the United States Institute of Peace. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs at Syracuse University, an MA in Political Science from Virginia Tech, and a BA in Government from The College of William & Mary. “Fail-Deadly, Fail-Safe, and Safe-to-Fail: The Strategic Necessity of Resilience in the Cyber Domain,” NATO 2030: Towards a New Strategic Concept and Beyond, (172-191) 2021. <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=4oBaEAAAQBAJ&pg=GBS.PT171&hl=en> dmr

Attribution difficulties present further challenges to the ‘who’ of deterrence. Adversaries with rapidly changing tactics, techniques, and procedures—along with the ability to easily conceal an operation’s origin and perpetrator—can pose hurdles to technical attribution.41 Technical difficulties can weaken deterrent postures by delaying the timeliness of retaliatory punishment. Moreover, the effects of an operation that a defender notices may actually be second- or third-order effects. This can add additional time between attribution and punishment.42 The larger attribution issues, however, are political. NATO lacks common standards or guidance for attributing cyber operations in either a technical or political sense. Indeed, attribution remains a member state prerogative. Not only are the targeted member states responsible for attribution, but those members looking to contribute to collective defense must perform independent attribution assessments, and the political decision for a collective defense response must come from the NAC.43 Reaching a consensus decision to trigger collective defense in response to cyberspace operations is likely to be politically contentious, and member states will have few incentives to risk revealing the intelligence sources and methods that underlie attribution decisions. These dynamics are likely to intensify when additional links in the attribution chain are required, such as when a perpetrator is encouraged or sponsored by an adversarial state but lacks direct ties. Attribution is less likely to be politically controversial across the Alliance once a conventional conflict is underway as contextual clues from kinetic attacks can reduce uncertainty. This discussion points to a greater role for deterrence-by-denial. Deterring an adversary by taking measures to deny potential gains does not hinge on attribution and thus possesses a potentially wider scope of application.44 A second and related hurdle for cyber deterrence is determining which actions the Alliance seeks to deter. Much of the activity in cyberspace falls below the physical effects thresholds associated with the disruption, degradation, or destruction of computers and networks. Such considerations complicate decisions to invoke Article 5—specifically, the types of cyberattacks to which Article 5 should apply. Indeed, cyber operations targeting military assets or critical civilian infrastructure can be incredibly costly but may not reach damage levels associated with conventional attacks.45 Moreover, espionage via network exploitation is widespread, varied, and falls well below the threshold of armed conflict.46 Problematically, such exploitation can be nearly indistinguishable from operations that eventually seek to attack computers or networks and produce effects. Network exploitation can even be precursor to conventional military operations.47 Determining how to deter presents a third obstacle to NATO’s cyber deterrence efforts. Threatening conventional military means in response to cyber operations poses dilemmas of proportionality and can risk unintended escalation.48 Retaliation with cyber tools carry their own problems. First, the Alliance faces issues of political reliability, particularly in the context of the SCEPVA framework. Legally, Allies retain different constitutional restraints on offensive cyber operations that can hamper the ability to volunteer sovereign effects. Strategically, states may be hesitant to volunteer their ‘best’ cyber effects for fear of burning an exploit that could have had a greater payoff when used in a national context. Volunteering sovereign effects can also inadvertently give unwanted insight to an adversary regarding an Ally’s techniques, tactics, and procedures. Second, the temporary and transient nature of cyber capabilities makes it incredibly difficult to establish repeatable and predictable effects required of deterrent threats.49 Finally, signaling in cyberspace is generally ambiguous and rarely straightforward.50 For instance, an adversary may not even recognize a signal, believing it instead to be a technical glitch. Even if a costly signal is received, there is no way to ensure that it has interpreted as intended. In addition to deterrence, NATO’s fail-safe cyber defense efforts face political and technical challenges. Because NATO will not undertake any active defense measures, actions to mitigate the effects of a cyberattack are limited to NATO networks or to individual member state networks when requested. This forecloses the possibility of developing an institutional strategy to mitigate the costs of a cyberattack upstream by disrupting the source of an attack, much like US Cyber Command does with its “defend forward” posture.51 More problematically, Allies have and will continue to have different legal, strategic, doctrinal, and threat frameworks for cyberspace that complicate defensive measures for the Alliance. Most immediately this means that Allies will locate resources to different aspects of cyber defense based on individual country circumstances. Different strategic focuses have the potential to intensify disparate threat perceptions, capabilities, and skillsets. This can also exacerbate interoperability problems; for example, during an operation or crisis, some systems will be controlled by NATO while others will be controlled by an ally or a group of allies with different skill and knowledge levels. In the longer term, disparate legal understandings, particularly regarding sovereignty in cyberspace, will become more impactful as a greater number of allied nations develop forward defense strategies and the requisite capabilities for out-of-network operations. An out-of-network operation can in and of itself cause operational friction. However, differing definitions of sovereignty in cyberspace—and what violates it—inevitably create political friction between Allies as some look to operate and produce effects on other Allies’ networks.52 This political friction will contribute to even greater hesitancy over cyber-intelligence sharing and complicate the coordination of defensive mitigation measures across the Alliance.

### L – Secrecy Concerns 🡪 Backlash

#### US cyber capabilities are kept top secret – any systems sharing will spark backlash from the NSA

**Vinik 15** – former assistant editor of The Agenda (Danny, “America’s secret arsenal, The Agenda, 12-9-15, “https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2015/12/defense-department-cyber-offense-strategy-000331/) //sg

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**."

#### Intell sharing concerns deck political and public support

Porter ’19 [Christopher and Klara Tothova Jordan; Feb 14; nonresident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council; assistant director of the Atlantic Council’s Cyber Statecraft Initiative; 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]

The United States still struggles to find effective policies for deterring cyberattacks. Suggestions run the gamut from more widespread use of indictments and economic sanctions, despite their lackluster record of success, to less traditional but more risky policies that emphasize the asymmetric advantage America has in conventional military power. Most of the discussion of cyber deterrence focuses on preventing a single catastrophic or cascading cyberattack that would threaten lives (like disruptions to electricity transmission or clean water)—or our way of life—altering election outcomes or grinding global finance to a halt. Yet the reality is that in the event of such an attack, the response would likely not come from the U.S. alone but from the NATO alliance in concert. 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. Government cyber leaders within the alliance should consider taking another page out of the private-sector playbook as well: running cyber-crisis exercises that involve more than the IT department. In the commercial world, the more successful practice runs involve leaders at both the CISO level and some presence from nontechnical teams that would weigh in during a crisis, such as communications and legal. The best exercises involve executives, too, who despite their busy schedules must see for themselves how their companies would survive and respond during a potentially ruinous cyberattack, and work through the minutiae of leading a response themselves. The experience and confidence is invaluable if ever called on during a real-life crisis, and the organizational introspection by involving decision-makers at all levels is irreplaceable. Military-to-military cyber training as part of cross-country force standardization and joint operational planning could pull in more senior national leadership, beyond battlefield commanders, and be coupled with increased funding for foreign affairs-led training for nontechnical leaders. The private sector could also meaningfully contribute during NATO consultations when developing Allied Joint Publications to make sure that definitions and requirements for threat intelligence incorporate the best practices of NATO member countries’ private sectors. If a U.S. diplomat reaches out to his or her counterpart in an allied country to ask for assistance responding to malware that’s damaging critical infrastructure, and that counterpart has to ask what malware is, the response isn’t going to happen. \*\*\* NATO’s essential and enduring purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Tolerating cyberattacks, especially those deliberately targeting civilians and the political legitimacy of governments—without the alliance having the capability to jointly discuss attribution and have the confidence to act and assist one another—undermines this core purpose of the alliance. Likewise, pursuing only deterrence and response without an active role for the alliance in reaching peaceful diplomatic agreements with potential adversaries abrogates member responsibilities to their citizens but is impossible without a common language and operational picture to discuss enforcement of such agreements. The U.S. is stronger with allies, and with attention to these issues its cybersecurity can be too.

### L – AT Plan Secret

#### Number of agencies involved ensures broad congressional oversight

**Chalfant 18** – White House reporter for The Hill (Morgan, “Federal ‘turf war’ complicates cybersecurity efforts,” The Hill, 4-29-18, <https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/385272-federal-turf-war-complicates-cybersecurity-efforts/>) //sg

Lawmakers are concerned that bureaucratic turf wars are complicating the federal response to cyber threats. The issue took center stage this week, as senators on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee fretted that they had been unable to pass key cyber legislation requested by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) because of a disagreement with the Senate Intelligence Committee. {mosads}“The reality of the situation is there is conflict here,” said Chairman Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) at a hearing Wednesday. “This threat is too significant to allow turf wars to get in the way of as efficient an operation as possible in terms of dealing with a very complex and serious problem.” The dust-up illuminates the broader issue of turf wars over cybersecurity in the federal government. The executive branch has no one single agency assigned to handle cyber. Instead, authorities are spread out over various agencies, including the Justice Department, which investigates and prosecutes cyber crime, and the Pentagon and broader intelligence community, both of which handle what is considered “offensive” cyber activity. While Homeland Security is broadly recognized as the main agency defending federal networks and critical national assets from cyberattacks, individual agencies also play a major role in guarding their own networks and personnel from malicious cyber actors. The set-up means that virtually every congressional committee has a say in the federal government’s cybersecurity efforts.

#### Congressional authorization necessary – Title 50 to Title 10 transfer

Chesney 18 - Charles I. Francis Professor in Law and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the University of Texas School of Law (Robert, “Title 10 and Title 50 Issues When Computer Network Operations Impact Third Countries, Lawfare, 4-12-18, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/title-10-and-title-50-issues-when-computer-network-operations-impact-third-countries>) //sg

From a legal perspective, the issue this highlights is that operations abroad implicate the UN Charter and related claims about international law protection of sovereignty. So how does this become part of the Title 10/Title 50 debate? Intelligence agencies can more easily act in this setting when operating under Title 50 authority, as **covert action** status carries with it a statutory obligation to comply with the U.S. Constitution and U.S. statutes—but **no more than that**. Title 10, in contrast, **carries with it no such implicit statutory shield against international law objections,** and of course there is a general Defense Department policy of international law compliance. Thus **CYBERCOM operating under Title 10 would run into the full thicket of international law concerns**. There may be good and sufficient answers to those concerns in particular cases—so this should not be understood as an absolute bar—but it does make sense to say that the legal friction is greater in that setting (that is, operations with effects on servers in third countries and without consent from those countries) than it would be for an entity acting under color of Title 50.

### L —Turf War (NSA)

#### Offensive cyber action sparks turf wars – the plan guarantees backlash from non-DoD agencies and committees

**Chalfant 18** – White House reporter for The Hill (Morgan, “Federal ‘turf war’ complicates cybersecurity efforts,” The Hill, 4-29-18, <https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/385272-federal-turf-war-complicates-cybersecurity-efforts/>) //sg

Lawmakers are concerned that bureaucratic turf wars are complicating the federal response to cyber threats. The issue took center stage this week, as senators on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee fretted that they had been unable to pass key cyber legislation requested by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) because of a disagreement with the Senate Intelligence Committee. {mosads}“The reality of the situation is there is conflict here,” said Chairman Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) at a hearing Wednesday. “This threat is too significant to allow turf wars to get in the way of as efficient an operation as possible in terms of dealing with a very complex and serious problem.” The dust-up illuminates the broader issue of turf wars over cybersecurity in the federal government. The executive branchhas **no one single agency assigned to handle cyber**. Instead, authorities are spread out over various agencies, including the Justice Department, which investigates and prosecutes cyber crime, and the Pentagon and broader intelligence community, both of which handle what is considered “offensive” cyber activity. While Homeland Security is broadly recognized as the main agency defending federal networks and critical national assets from cyberattacks, individual agencies also play a major role in guarding their own networks and personnel from malicious cyber actors. The set-up means that **virtually every congressional committee** has a say in the federal government’s cybersecurity efforts.

## Disinformation

### L – Partisan Fights

#### Russian disinfo works because of political backlash---congress likes weaponization against opponents

Elena Yi-Ching Ho et al Hillary Mansour, Khwezi Nkwanyana and Matthew Page 3-24-2021, Policy and research officer for purpose.com, "The threat spectrum," No Publication, https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/document/teaserdocument/?pdmfid=1516831&amp;crid=879788ba-2422-4dc9-a484-2d4eca77b5f8&amp;pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A628T-WDJ1-JCMN-Y55M-00000-00&amp;pddocid=urn%3AcontentItem%3A628T-WDJ1-JCMN-Y55M-00000-00&amp;pdcontentcomponentid=299488&amp;pdteaserkey=h1&amp;pditab=allpods&amp;ecomp=szznk&amp;earg=sr0&amp;prid=60e8dd36-47cb-430b-a826-b436479ac40f//DG

And if low-lying islands are abandoned, the UNCLOS framework would reclassify them as uninhabitable 'rocks', nullifying EEZ claims and opening these areas up for international use. This issue exposes limitations in UNCLOS[2]'s ability to respond to the impacts of climate change on territorial jurisdiction. The intersection of climatic, economic and maritime territorial issues has consequences for coastal regions globally as sea levels continue to rise. Democracy watch People across the US have gathered to protest[3] against anti-Asian hate crimes, following the Atlanta spa shootings on 16 March and an assault on a 75-year-old Asian American woman the following day. Racially motivated hate crimes have been more common since the outbreak of Covid-19. The US Asian community has been increasingly targeted[4] over the past year, in part as a consequence of President Donald Trump's framing of the pandemic as the 'China virus'[5]. The recent attacks and ongoing harassment of Asian Americans have once again highlighted the handling of racial discrimination in America and renewed awareness[6] of race-based conflict. Information operations A report[7] declassified by the US National Intelligence Council has assessed foreign threats to last year's election. The report identifies several nations that considered or attempted online influence campaigns, but pays particular attention to Russian intelligence operatives' use of US media organisations and people linked to the Trump administration to promote damaging narratives about presidential candidate Joe Biden and his family to US officials. Writing for The Atlantic[8], Anne Applebaum notes that the report highlights broader issues beyond the political climate created by Trump. It shows that Russian disinformation succeeds because of the willingness of many Americans to accept sensational information when it suits their partisan frames and can be used against their opponents, and an unwillingness of institutions like the FBI, the Department of Justice and the US Congress to investigate and prosecute Americans linked to disinformation attempts for fear of political backlash. Unless accountability for Americans involved in election influence and disinformation bridges the partisan political divide, Russian influence operations will continue to pose a serious threat to democracy in the US. Follow the money The UK parliament's Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee has urged[9] the government to amend the 2015 Modern Slavery Act to protect ethnic minorities in Xinjiang. This action comes after an ASPI report[10] on Uyghur forced labour in supply chains used by companies in the technology, fashion, media and cotton industries. The committee asked[11] a number of corporations to clarify their relationships with forced-labour supply chains in Xinjiang. Most companies claimed to have strong protections on human rights but failed to prove that their supply chains weren't involved in forced labour. Nike and H&#38;M, for example, said that, while they couldn't identify connections to forced labour, they would strive to improve their practices. The committee also recommended[12] that the government put the onus on companies to prove that they have no ties to forced labour. And despite global attention on human rights violations in Xinjiang—which China denies—real progress to end forced labour has yet to be seen. Terror byte Last week, ASIO Director-General Mike Burgess announced that his agency will use different terminology to identify violent extremist threats[13]. Instead of labelling terror groups as 'right-wing' or 'Islamic', ASIO will now classify threats as 'ideologically motivated' or 'religiously motivated' violent extremism. In delivering his annual threat assessment, Burgess said 'language needs to evolve' to include extremist groups that recruit members online and do not typically fit within the parameters of the previous terms. Some have welcomed the change[14] in the hope that it will decrease prejudicial language directed at Muslim communities. Others have described the decision as part of a continued political effort[15] to avoid using terms like 'right-wing' or 'far-right' to describe the groups that now account for 40% of ASIO's counterterrorism cases[16]

#### Massive backlash to disinformation policy---Biden’s disinfo board was literally shut down over this exact issue

Konner Mcintire and Courtney Rau, 3-15-2022, Reporter at Sinclair and political journalist at M3 "Fact Check Team: The Biden administration's new disinformation task force," WPDE, https://wpde.com/news/nation-world/fact-check-team-the-biden-administrations-new-disinformation-board-vice-president-kamala-harris-white-house-task-force-to-address-online-harassment-and-abuse-disinformation-governance-board-department-of-homeland-security-dhs-task-force-president-biden//DG

The new disinformation board has six months to submit a plan so right now, these would only be recommendations. But we’ve seen this before: the president's disinformation board with the Department of Homeland Security was been put on pause because of all the backlash it received. According to the Biden administration, that board was intended to crack down on disinformation that threatened homeland security but Republicans were skeptical that the term “disinformation” was too broad and would be used as a vehicle to censor conservatives or any kind of speech that did not align with the administration’s agenda.

### L —Sovereignty Concerns

#### Plan’s perceived as deputizing broad surveillance---backlash to fighting illiberalism

Abby Livingston, 4-6-2022 Washington Bureau Chief, Texas Tribune"Texas Republicans who opposed resolution supporting NATO criticize and question its language," Texas Tribune, https://www.texastribune.org/2022/04/06/congress-nato-support-texas-representatives//DG

U.S. Rep. [Kay Granger](https://www.texastribune.org/directory/kay-granger/) of Fort Worth said the resolution’s language about such a center was vague and she criticized Democratic leadership for rushing the vote before members could understand it better. “Some of the things they’re asking us to vote on now seemed to be hurried up so much that there seemed to be very little presentation and very little time to really analyze it and know how important those things are,” she said. “I could’ve made a mistake on that one. It was a call.” U.S. Rep. [Chip Roy](https://www.texastribune.org/directory/chip-roy/) of Austin in a statement described the center as a “distraction to NATO’s mission.” He argued the “center will be weaponized against member countries — such as the United States — who enact policies contrary to the leftist orthodoxy that now unfortunately permeates most of Western Europe.” Roy didn’t elaborate on how he thought the center would be used in such a way. He said in his statement that “it is imperative for the United States to stand side by side with our NATO allies” rather than “passing toothless resolutions.” “NATO should be focused on military strength — not on empowering international organizations to target the internal activities of sovereign nations under the vague guise of illiberalism or human rights,” he said. The resolution was a show of moral support and did not include any funding mechanisms or measures that would have sent aid to NATO or Ukraine.

### L – GOP Backlash

#### Can’t build consensus---right-wing politicans are in on it!

Peter Stone, 4-6-2022, Investigative journalist at the Guardian "US rightwing figures in step with Kremlin over Ukraine disinformation, experts say," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/apr/06/us-right-wing-republicans-russia-ukraine-disinformation//DG

Disinformation specialists say that the phoney narratives by the US right and the Kremlin during the war have displayed some new twists that have increased the flow of conspiracy-heavy news, but also spurred more criticism from experts for being patently false. “We often see a two-way flow of conspiratorial narratives moving from the rightwing American information ecosystem to the Kremlin and back again, in a way that creates a feedback loop that reinforces and bolsters messaging from both groups,” said Bret Schafer, who leads the Alliance for Securing Democracy’s information manipulation team. We often see a flow of narratives from the rightwing US information ecosystem to the Kremlin and back Schafer noted the feedback loop seems “best evidenced by the recent effort to connect Hunter Biden to a US-led bioweapons program in Ukraine, where one can clearly see the merging of a favored domestic narrative into a foreign disinformation campaign that makes it feel more familiar, and therefore more plausible, to certain target audiences”. Schafer added that “influential American pundits and conspiracy theorists first pushed the narrative, only to then have it amplified and legitimized at the highest levels of the Russian government”. Some members of Congress likewise see a crossover effect between elements of the American right and Moscow. “Putin and his oligarchs are well aware of the dark channels of influence in rightwing American politics today, and they exploit them whenever they can – just as corporations and rightwing billionaires do here at home,” the Democratic senator Sheldon Whitehouse told the Guardian.

## Humanitarian Assistance

### L – Aid Unpopular

#### Assistance sparks fights---Ukraine was the absolute brink, new budgets include cuts to avoid drawing funding-related backlash---plan reverses that

Rachel Oswald, 3-15-2022, Staffwriter at Roll Call "Congress cuts humanitarian spending despite billions for Ukraine," Roll Call, https://rollcall.com/2022/03/15/congress-cuts-humanitarian-spending-despite-billions-for-ukraine//DG

While fiscal 2022 defense spending saw an increase of 5.6 percent over last year’s levels, the nondefense spending accounts got a boost of 6.7 percent — but not the foreign aid portfolio. Multiple lawmakers have pointed to the over $4 billion in emergency humanitarian funding for the Ukraine crisis to argue Congress has provided ample taxpayer assistance this year for foreign aid. Still, budget experts do not believe the Russia-Ukraine war, which has dominated Capitol Hill’s attention in recent weeks, is the reason other humanitarian disasters did not see a funding injection. For one thing, Appropriations subcommittee spending levels, known as 302(b)s, were set in early February, weeks before Putin ordered the invasion of Ukraine. Even as appropriators like Coons have pledged to push for higher foreign aid spending levels in fiscal 2023, advocates are nervous about those prospects. Considering that Democrats might lose unified control of the White House and Congress after the November midterm elections, the fiscal 2022 appropriations levels were viewed as the high-water mark for Democrats to lock in robust spending increases. That would help cushion the blow of probable GOP pushes for cuts to foreign aid, which remains unpopular with an outspoken minority of Republican fiscal hardliners. Any supplemental aid for Ukraine, and possibly for the global coronavirus pandemic, will likely have a fleeting impact on the overall budget, experts say. “At the end of the day, we all know that an emergency supplemental is exactly what it says it is. It is an emergency supplemental that is not part of the regular budget and so there is an artificially low baseline for humanitarian assistance moving forward, just looking at the numbers, and that is concerning for conversations around what is needed for the coming fiscal year,” said one foreign aid professional, who did not have authorization to speak candidly about the budget.

## NATO Links

### L – Costs PC

#### NATO engagement drains Biden’s pc

WPR, 6-22-2022, Editorial Staff for the World Politics Report "U.S. Security Policy Under Biden," No Publication, https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/insights/29564/for-biden-s-security-policy-look-beyond-us-defense-budget//DG

Upon taking office, President Joe Biden made it a priority to repair the damage his predecessor, Donald Trump, had done to relationships with the United States’ long-standing allies and partners, including South Korea and Japan, but particularly in Europe. Early on, Biden reassured European allies of Washington’s commitment to their security, promising them, “America is back. The trans-Atlantic alliance is back.” Despite some missteps along the way, the political capital Biden invested in shoring up ties with Europe, in particular, has paid off during the current standoff with Russia over Ukraine. NATO’s cohesion in the runup to the invasion and the robustness of the U.S.-led economic and security response in its aftermath are testament to the alliance’s value to the U.S.—as well as the importance of U.S. leadership in times of crisis.

### L – Domestic Focus k/

#### The plan ruins Biden’s domestic focus---appeal to crucial portions of the electorate is contingent on perception of refocusing away from Europe

Laura BarrÓN-LÓPez, 4-18-2022, Lopez is Politico’s white house correspondant "Biden’s been consumed by Ukraine. His team wants to bring the focus back home.," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/04/18/biden-domestic-policy-shift-00025862//DG

The rest of the world might not allow it. But Joe Biden wants to return his focus to matters happening at home. With the war in Ukraine entering its second month and continuing to dominate global headlines, White House allies are expressing concern that voters may see the president as more consumed by international affairs than domestic ones. The White House itself is keenly aware that voters’ perceptions about the economy are still likely to determine the outcome of November’s midterm elections. And as they warily watch the president’s poor poll numbers, two senior administration officials said a concerted effort is being launched to reemphasize to Americans that the president understands their pain and is trying to help. In the coming weeks, Biden will travel more inside the country and further stress that Russia’s invasion isn’t some far-off crisis but one with deep economic ramifications in the United States “Voters, as sympathetic as they are to Ukraine, are getting a little fatigued,” said Celinda Lake, a veteran Democratic pollster. “And they’re wondering: We’re spending all this money abroad, but what are we spending here at home?” Lake said it was imperative that the president spend the seven months remaining before the midterms explaining his record and promising to do more. “Half of voters,” she suggested, still don’t know what Biden has accomplished to date. “They don’t know what’s in the infrastructure package. They don’t know the full extent of the rescue package. They don’t know the executive orders that he’s taken on inflation,” she said, referring to the coronavirus stimulus money sent to states, and the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure law to rebuild roads, bridges and more. The scope of Biden’s presidency will be impacted by Democrats’ ability to keep control of at least one, if not both, chambers of Congress this November. And the White House knows it needs to both hammer home Biden’s accomplishments and show Americans it is trying to do more, even at the margins. The war in Europe will continue to dominate Biden’s time, but aides do not want it to occupy all of his attention. In fact, some of Biden’s advisers believe they only need to look across the Atlantic to find a warning sign of a president perceived to be focused too much on global diplomacy and not enough on domestic pocketbook issues. Many French voters believe that French President Emmanuel Macron prioritized trying to negotiate with Russian President Vladimir Putin and that he neglected domestic issues, leading to tight poll numbers heading into the presidential runoff election later this month. 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.

#### Biden’s trying to direct focus away from the war---plan goes the opposite direction

Kevin Liptak and Phil Mattingly, Cnn white house reporter/correspondants, 4-9-2022, "Biden turns his focus from Ukraine war to kitchen table issues at home as midterms loom," CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2022/04/09/politics/biden-domestic-issues-ukraine-war/index.html//DG

(CNN)[President Joe Biden](https://www.cnn.com/specials/politics/joe-biden-news) and his aides are actively working to refocus on the litany of domestic issues threatening Democrats' prospects in the midterm elections following weeks of the President's days being [consumed by the war in Ukraine.](https://www.cnn.com/europe/live-news/ukraine-russia-putin-news-04-08-22/index.html) Since Biden returned from[a last-minute diplomatic outing to Europe last month](https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/26/politics/biden-warsaw-saturday/index.html), 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.](https://www.cnn.com/2022/04/07/politics/republican-red-wave-house-majority-midterm/index.html) 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.

#### Domestic focus is Biden’s top priority---he’s actively avoiding international concerns

Kaitlan Collins and Kevin Liptak, Cnn, 5-31-2022, "White House unveils a monthlong focus on the economy as prices rise and poll numbers fall," CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/31/politics/white-house-inflation-economy-joe-biden/index.html//DG

"It's ambitious. It reflects the fact the President has made fighting inflation his top economic priority," National Economic Council director Brian Deese said in an appearance on CNN. "We can do that from a position of economic strength because of the historic recovery that we have seen, strongest job market rebound in modern history, most small businesses created ever during a recovery and household balance sheets have improved." "Now," Deese said, "the question is how do we make progress?" The new push is another attempt by the White House to show voters Biden is working to address higher prices. He delivered a speech earlier this month where he went on the defensive over rising gas and food costs and criticized Republicans at length. Recently, in between meetings with world leaders during his first trip to Asia since taking office, Biden also spent a considerable amount of time focused on the economy back at home, visiting a semiconductor facility to underscore the importance of repairing the supply chain and touting a massive new electric vehicle plant to be built by Hyundai near Savannah, Georgia. 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.
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### L –GOP Fight NATO

#### The GOP are growing increasingly anti-NATO as Ukraine conflict unfolds

Blake 4/6

Aaron, “Why 30 percent of the House GOP voted against reaffirming NATO support,” April 6, 2022 https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/06/house-gop-nato-support/dmr

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.

#### Ukraine sparked more, not less, anti-nato sentiment---plan draws backlash from America first lobby

Jonathan Bernstein, 4-7-2022, Opinion columnist for bloomberg "Analysis," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/are-republicans-turning-against-nato/2022/04/07/46c1e36e-b66f-11ec-8358-20aa16355fb4\_story.html//DG

Indeed, that commitment outlasted the Cold War. Trump didn’t care much about public policy when he was president. But he did undermine this internationalist consensus, even using the old “America First” slogan from an isolationist (and anti-Semitic) movement from the 1930s. And while he had little success actually implementing his foreign-policy preferences — as he was repeatedly rolled by Congress, the bureaucracy and allied nations — it’s quite possible he could have the last laugh. Earlier this week, an astonishing 63 House Republicans opposed a resolution supporting NATO. That’s still not a full third of the Republican conference, but it’s not exactly a tiny fringe, either. To be fair, some of those objecting claimed to oppose the non-binding, symbolic resolution because of some of its specific wording rather than because they opposed the alliance — but quite a few seem to be wary of the whole concept of an alliance of democracies against authoritarianism.These lawmakers are only reflecting where their party appears to be heading. In two recent polls, strong minorities of Republicans — 40% of respondents in one survey — supported leaving the alliance altogether.If a Republican committed to the old consensus wins the 2024 nomination and is elected president, I’d expect all of that to dissipate pretty rapidly. Both parties will once again be strong supporters of NATO in particular and of the general overarching direction of U.S. foreign policy since the 1940s. But if Trump is nominated, and especially if he wins the presidency, it’s hard to see the party working as hard to constrain his foreign-policy choices as it once did. And if Democrats remain in the White House for another four years (or more)? It’s easy to imagine partisan polarization extending into this area, as it has so many others, with Republicans automatically opposing whatever it is that Democratic presidents are doing — including participation in the alliances that Eisenhower, Nixon, Gerald Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush all strongly supported. Preventing that result would require strong, responsible leadership from Republican politicians. I’m not optimistic that will happen.

#### Trump has made NATO controversial – his congressional allies will follow the example

Benitez 19 [Jorge Benitez is a nonresident senior fellow in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security. He specializes in NATO and transatlantic relations, European politics, and US national security, "U.S. NATO Policy in the Age of Trump: Controversy and Consistency", The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, pg. ProQuest] GBS-HW

Relations between the United States and its European allies are at an unprecedented stage in transatlantic history. President Donald Trump has privately and publicly expressed a very negative view of NATO and the behavior of U.S. allies toward the United States. According to NATO's former highest military commander, retired Admiral James Stavridis, "The alliance is at a moment of high tension.... Something is new and dangerous."2

The tone of Trump's criticisms of NATO is new and much more divisive than the disagreements between previous presidents and U.S. allies. They sometimes exchanged sharp words, but these were usually in private . and directed at specific allies rather than NATO itself. Trump's approach to NATO is dangerous because no other president has questioned NATO's key role as a fundamental part of U.S. national security.

Nevertheless, Trump is not alone in his disappointment with the way allies have treated the United States. Earlier presidents and senior officials may not have been as blunt or threatening, but there is consistent evidence of a loss of U.S. patience for what is perceived as feeble attempts by NATO allies to meet their defense commitments to the Alliance. Therefore, it is important to properly understand what is new about Trump's NATO policy and what is part of a larger trend of changing U.S. expectations about the Alliance.

#### GOP support for NATO has wavered – supporting NATO has become politically partisan

Parker 22 [Ashley Parker is the White House Bureau Chief, Marianna Sotomayor is a Congressional reporter covering the House of Representatives, and Isaac Stanley-Becker is a National political reporter, "Inside the Republican drift away from supporting the NATO alliance", Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/29/nato-republicans-trump/] GBS-HW

In early 2019, several months after President Donald Trump threatened to upend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during a trip to Brussels for the alliance’s annual summit, House lawmakers passed the NATO Support Act amid overwhelming bipartisan support, with only 22 Republicans voting against the measure.

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.

Metin Hakverdi, a German lawmaker who chairs the North America working group within the ruling Social Democratic Party, said the question that preoccupies him is, “Was Donald Trump the exception, or will Joe Biden be the exception?”

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.

Similarly, from Rep. Robert B. Aderholt (R-Ala.): “I am wholeheartedly, unequivocally, without reservation, supportive on NATO.”

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.”

The two bills are not exactly the same. The legislation in 2019 reaffirmed that federal money should not be used to remove the United States from NATO — which Trump was threatening at the time — while the bill from this month called on the government to “uphold the founding democratic principles of NATO,” as well for NATO “to continue to provide unwavering support to the people of Ukraine as they fight for their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and a democratic future.”

Another sign of the party’s isolationist wing emerged Thursday, as the House passed an update to a World War II-era military bill creating a lend-lease program intended to make it easier for the United States to supply Ukraine with military aid. Only 10 lawmakers — all Republicans — voted against the measure.

In an exchange earlier in the week between Secretary of State Antony Blinken, who was testifying before Congress, and Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.), Paul pushed back on Blinken’s assertion that over the years Russia has shown a willingness to attack countries like Georgia that are not part of NATO, while giving wider berth to countries that are members of the alliance.

Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) on April 26 said while there was no “justification” for Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, there were “reasons” for the invasion. (Video: Reuters)

“You could also argue the countries they’ve attacked were part of Russia, or were part of the Soviet Union,” said Paul, who was one of just two senators who voted against a 2018 bill reaffirming support for a NATO, in what was at the time a pointed rebuke of Trump.

“Yes, and I firmly disagree with that proposition,” Blinken responded.

For some foreign policy experts and international allies, the mere fact that nearly one-third of the Republican conference voted against a bill that fundamentally seeks to support both NATO and Ukraine highlights a marked foreign policy evolution in the Republican Party.

“We now are really seeing the true impact of deep, deep political polarization, where it is better to harm the other side than do what’s right for the country,” said Heather Conley, president of the German Marshall Fund. “This deep domestic polarization has now crept into foreign and security policy. There has always been strong bipartisan support for NATO, but everything now has become polarized and can be weaponized against the other side, even if it supports U.S. national security interests.”

## SC Links

### L – Congressional Oversight

#### Prior Pentagon secrecy ensures the plan’s attempt to skirt oversight magnifies the link

**Berger 19** Rick Berger, 7-16-2019, "The Pentagon should treat Congress as a partner, not an obstacle," Defense News, <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2019/07/16/the-pentagon-should-treat-congress-as-a-partner-not-an-obstacle/> *Rick Berger is a research fellow with the American Enterprise Institute. He previously served as a staff member on the Senate Budget Committee.*

A strong U.S. military rests upon broad, bipartisan support among the American people translated through their representatives in Congress. Yet, amid the onset of great power competition and a generational conflict against jihadis, the Pentagon’s atrophied outreach to Congress has undermined support for the U.S. military. Although the Pentagon’s “[Year Without a Briefing](https://thehill.com/policy/defense/446363-pentagon-reaches-one-year-without-on-camera-briefing-from-top-spokesperson)” has rightly garnered a great deal of attention, the American public isn’t the only audience getting the cold shoulder from the Department of Defense. The Pentagon has failed to treat Congress as a partner in executing America’s defense strategy. In explanations both of budget choices and policy decisions, senior defense leaders have repeatedly neglected to invest in relationship building with Capitol Hill or to provide sufficient information to lawmakers and senior staff. This administration’s penchant for secrecy at the Pentagon further strains an already dysfunctional relationship based on mutual distrust. If Congress believes it hasn’t received sufficient answers to its oversight questions, it responds with public excoriations, punishments and regulatory actions that levy inefficiency on the daily operations of the Pentagon. The building, fearing such outcomes, refuses to share adequate information with Congress, hoping that such information can be kept secret, or that congressional complaints will blow over in time. If nothing else, the silence emanating from the building engenders mistrust and cynicism about the choices the military makes. Clearly, Congress understands that some of these strategic messaging and outreach snafus stem from the White House. In particular, anemic information flow about the president’s decision to [launder](https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2019/05/15/in_building_the_wall_white_house_digs_deeper_hole_for_the_military_114427.html) border wall funding through the military or the Office of Management and Budget’s abuse of the overseas contingency operations account cannot be laid at the Pentagon’s feet. But Capitol Hill has proven much less forgiving of the Pentagon’s failures of communication and lack of outreach. The department [struggled](https://warontherocks.com/2019/05/hard-choices-and-strategic-insolvency-where-the-national-defense-strategy-falls-short/) even to provide a basic account of how the 2020 military budget request matched the new defense strategy. This year’s congressional defense legislation is [filled with pages and pages](https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2019/05/28/a-flat-budget-will-prove-fatal-for-military-transformation/) expressing severe bipartisan displeasure over the Pentagon’s lack of documentation and insufficient justifications for important acquisition decisions. In early March, Congress learned of the plan to decommission the aircraft carrier Harry S. Truman from the press, and the rationale behind the decision remained opaque for weeks.

### L – Defense Unpopular Public

#### Distrust and polarization of the military ensures no DoD action can go undetected by the public

Schogol 21 - senior Pentagon reporter with Task & Purpose (Jeff, “Americans used to trust the military more than the rest of the government, but now even that’s fading,” Task & Purpose, 12-3-21, <https://taskandpurpose.com/news/military-americans-losing-trust/>) //sg

Americans are **quickly losing trust and confidence** in the U.S. military, according to the staggering results of a recent survey conducted by the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation and Institute. The survey found that the number of Americans who said they have a lot of confidence and trust in the military has **dropped from 70% to 45%** in just the past three years, and that includes a steep 11 percentage point drop since February, a Reagan Institute news release says. Roughly 2,500 people took part in the survey, which was conducted between Oct. 25 and Nov. 7. The precipitous drop in Americans’ confidence in the military comes amid debates about how to deal with extremism in the ranks, criticisms from lawmakers that the military is becoming too “woke,” fierce arguments about whether troops should be required to get vaccinated for the novel coronavirus (COVID-19), and the fall of Afghanistan. However, it’s clear that the survey is not a sign that Americans are turning against the troops. Of those respondents who said they have a “great deal” of confidence in the military, 29% cited troops and enlisted service members as their reason why they felt that way and 15% said their confidence stems from the military’s ability to keep them safe, according to data provided by the Reagan Institute. “Affection for the rank and file has been a hallmark of the AVF [all-volunteer force] ever since the Reagan years – think his ‘The Boys of Pointe du Hoc’ speech and the revival of interest in the ‘greatest generation,’” said Peter Feaver, a political science professor at Duke University in North Carolina. “This survey shows that that still persists.” It is more likely that the survey results indicate that **Americans are increasingly viewing the military** — as an institution — through the **lens of partisan politics**. Among the people who indicated they have a low degree of confidence in the U.S. military, **13% cited “political leadership” as a reason**; 9% said “scandals/sexual assault/lies/cover-ups”; and 8% said they felt the military was too expensive and had the wrong priorities, according to the data. Another 15% provided other reasons that were not specified in the data and 8% said they didn’t know why they were not very confident in the military. “The fact that ‘political leadership’ was the plurality response among those with low confidence (albeit only a 13% plurality) may be an indication of the corrosive effects of **political polarization** in the body politic generally **bleeding over into attitudes towards the military**,” Feaver said. The survey indicates that **Republicans in particular** are losing confidence in the military. For the Reagan Institute’s 2018 survey, 87% of Republican respondents said they had a great deal of confidence in the military, compared with **53% in 2021**.

## Link Mechanics

### AT No Congress/Plan Covert

#### SC requires statutory authority

Quinn 19, judge Advocate, United States Army. Presently assigned as Assistant General Counsel, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency; LL.M., 2019, The Judge Advocate General's School, United States Army; J.D., 2009, George Mason University School of Law; B.S., 2005, University of Northern Colorado. Previous assignments include Deputy Staff Judge Advocate, Special Operations Command Europe, Stuttgart, Germany, 2016-2018; Contracts Attorney, 409th Contracting Support Brigade, Kaiserslautern, Germany, 2014-2016; Chief, Administrative Law, 4th Infantry Division and Regional Command (South), Kandahar Airfield, Afghanistan, 2013-2014; Chief, Contract and Fiscal Law, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, Colorado 2012-2013; Trial Counsel, 43d Sustainment Brigade, Fort Carson, Colorado, 2011-2012; Tax Center OIC, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, Colorado, 2010-2011; Administrative Law Attorney, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, Colorado. 2010. (Jason, “OTHER SECURITY FORCES TOO: TRADITIONAL COMBATANT COMMANDER ACTIVITIES BETWEEN U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AND FOREIGN NON-MILITARY FORCES,” 227 Mil. L. Rev. 336, Lexis)

Pre-crisis, pre-conflict CT shaping activities are deliberately broken into two categories: (1) security cooperation and (2) military engagement. 118 Security cooperation is focused on building partner capacity and capabilities 119 and typically requires express statutory authority, regardless of whether the security cooperation activity is being conducted with a military or non-military force. 120 Military engagement, [\*359] on the other hand, is a "routine" activity "to build trust and confidence, share information, coordinate mutual activities, maintain influence, build defense relationships, and develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations." 121Critically, as part of overall military engagement efforts, joint doctrine calls for CT forces to engage with military and with other security forces. 122

#### DoD required to keep lawmakers in the loop about SC

Department of Defense 16 – (“DoD Directive 5132.03: DoD Policy and Responsibilities Relating to Security Cooperation,” DoD Open Government, 12-29-16, https://open.defense.gov/portals/23/Documents/foreignasst/DoDD\_513203\_on\_Security\_Cooperation.pdf) //sg

f. DoD will maintain a **robust program of assessment, monitoring, and evaluation** of security cooperation to provide **policymakers, planners, program managers, and implementers** the information necessary to evaluate outcomes, identify challenges, make appropriate corrections, and maximize effectiveness of future security cooperation activities

### AT No Congress – Export Control

#### Export Control Act requires congressional reauthorization for the plan

INS, Impact News Service, 5-13-2019"Analyst in Security Cooperation and Assistance and the Global Arms Trade". https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:5W3T-25M1-JDG9-Y12Y-00000-00&context=1516831.

Applicants must be able to execute analytical research projects to address congressional requests in the areas of U.S security cooperation and assistance policies/programs, including Title 10 and Title 22 “train and equip” programs and authorities, arms transfers, and end-use monitoring, among other issues. The position requires knowledge of security assistance and arms transfer issues from end to end-- from policy issues related to the U.S defense industrial base to those associated with foreign recipients. This position also focuses on the respective roles of the Departments of State and Defense and the Intelligence Community in the conception and implementation of such policies/programs. It further includes knowledge of Congress’ role in authorizing, appropriating funding for, and overseeing U.S security cooperation and assistance, including under the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, and annual national defense authorization measures, as well as U.S defense-related technology transfer policies.

#### Anything perceived as loosening standards sparks a massive controversy over national security concerns

Kate O’Keeffe, 10-25-2021, WSJ reporter that writes about U.S-China issues "House Republicans Call for Tougher Controls to Keep U.S. Tech From China," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/house-republicans-call-for-tougher-controls-to-keep-u-s-tech-from-china-11635159601//DG

Republican China hawks in Congress are pressuring the Commerce Department to fortify export controls to keep critical American technology from falling into Beijing’s hands. Republicans on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a letter to Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo last week, urged action to address 10 issues of “immediate concern”—from strengthening [export controls on semiconductors](https://archive.ph/o/IuP5o/https:/www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-europe-join-forces-to-address-chip-shortage-tech-issues-11632945611?mod=article_inline) and jet engines to updating the list of technologies earmarked for protection from foreign rivals. The letter, from the committee’s top Republican, Rep. Michael McCaul of Texas, and signed by 16 other Republicans, follows a move this month by Republican Sens. Tom Cotton of Arkansas and Bill Hagerty of Tennessee to hold up confirmation of Alan Estevez, President Biden’s nominee to lead the Commerce unit [in charge of export controls](https://archive.ph/o/IuP5o/https:/www.wsj.com/articles/commerce-department-to-tap-former-pentagon-official-for-export-control-post-11626146930?mod=article_inline). A spokeswoman for the Commerce Department said it is dedicated to “promoting U.S. exports and technology leadership for the benefit of U.S. companies and workers.” She also said the agency seeks to protect U.S. national security and promote democratic values. Under the Biden administration, it has put export controls on [seven Chinese supercomputing entities](https://archive.ph/o/IuP5o/https:/www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2021/04/commerce-adds-seven-chinese-supercomputing-entities-entity-list-their) for their support of China’s military, and 14 other Chinese entities that have enabled the country’s human-rights abuses, she added. Commerce’s policies toward China—and Mr. Estevez’s nomination—are emerging as tests for Republicans who want the Biden administration to maintain a hard-nosed approach to China. The House Republicans in their letter backed the hold on Mr. Estevez until, they said, Ms. Raimondo acts on their requests because “these actions are critical to stemming the flow of technology into our foremost foreign adversary.”

### AT Plan is Agency

#### Congress will pin it on the president

Sitaraman 19, Chancellor’s Faculty Fellow and Professor of Law at the Vanderbilt Law School, and Ariel Dobkin, Associate at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, Postgraduate Research Fellow at MIT’s Internet Policy Research Initiative, JD from Yale Law School (Ganesh, “The Choice Between Single Director Agencies and Multimember Commissions,” *Administrative Law Review, 71 Admin. L. Rev. 719*)

B. Unity, Responsibility, and Accountability

Every agency is subject to some level of "control" or oversight from the Legislative and Judicial Branches of government, in addition to the general public. But to the extent one is worried about holding agencies accountable for their actions, single-director agencies are generally superior. First, in their very design, single-director agencies provide a focal point for praising, critiquing, or attempting to alter agency action. As the Supreme Court noted in Free Enterprise Fund, "diffusion of power carries with it a diffusion of accountability. . . . Without a clear and effective chain of command, the public cannot 'determine on whom the blame or the punishment of a pernicious measure, or series of pernicious measures ought really to fall.'" Unified power, on the other hand, "permits unified accountability" and enables "streamlined, decisive leadership and decisionmaking." A single director has power, and as a result, cannot place blame on others. [\*733] In contrast, multimember commissions diffuse responsibility for actions among commissioners, making it more difficult for the various branches--and the public--to know who should be held accountable for particular actions or inactions. "A gang of commissioners," one scholar notes, "can always avoid responsibility by pointing to the other four people who make up the commission." If a particular rule is slowed down at a commission, for example, it is difficult to know whose fault the delay is. This is not just a problem from the standpoint of public accountability; it also has tangible effects on the government's ability to function. The President may not be fully aware of who should be removed from a commissioner position, and Congress's oversight function is hampered because it is unable to focus its energy at hearings on commissioner-specific issues. As a 1971 report concluded, commissions are "not sufficiently accountable to either Congress or the executive branch." And even where presidential removal of a director is not permissible, the broad public can mobilize for or against an agency director. This public pressure is likely to be simpler and more effective in the case of a single-director agency than a multimember commission. There is literature in behavioral psychology that suggests people have an easier time focusing when directed toward a specific individual over groups of people. Single-director agencies offer a personified hero or villain for public interest groups, industry associations, journalists, and commentators to praise or blame for the agency's actions--and to push members of Congress to celebrate or attack those leaders. Thus, conservatives and industry groups could attack Gina McCarthy, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under President Obama, while liberals and environmental groups could organize [\*734] around opposing Scott Pruitt, the head of the EPA under President Trump. Personified praise and blame against the single directors of the CFPB and Department of Education are similar. Even aside from partisan opposition, public pressure against a single director can lead to a director's resignation or removal when unfit for the role. One could argue that blaming a director might be a mistake, given that the director could simply be responding to the President's policy preferences. But in such cases, the line of accountability runs through the President and the President would also take some of the blame for her appointee's decisions. In other words, public preferences might be directed at the agency head or the President, but in both cases accountability values are served by single-director agencies.

### AT Plan is Executive

#### Executive action magnifies the link

Christenson 15, Associate Professor of Political Science and the Director of Advanced Programs @ Boston U (Dino, “Political Constraints on Unilateral Executive Action,” *Case Western Law Review*, 65.4)//BB

Moreover, other institutions, particularly Congress, may play an∂ important role—even when presidents know that efforts to overturn an∂ executive action will fail—by engaging in the political debate and∂ mobilizing public pressure against the president should he act unilaterally∂ contra congressional preferences. Decades of political science scholarship∂ have demonstrated that the public lacks systematic knowledge∂ of politics and therefore relies heavily on heuristics when forming their∂ political judgments.48 Political elites thus become key cue-givers who∂ help inform and shape public opinion.49 Finally, citizens acquire most∂ of their knowledge about politics from the mass media. Scholars have∂ long noted that the media depend on official Washington sources for∂ information. However, a robust literature in political communications∂ goes further and argues that the media tend “to ‘index’ the range of∂ voices and viewpoints in both news and editorials according to the∂ range of views expressed in mainstream government debate about a∂ given topic.”50 When other political actors, particularly members of∂ Congress, object and criticize presidential actions in the public sphere,∂ they are all but assured of receiving considerable media coverage, and∂ they are well-positioned to influence public opinion against the∂ executive branch.51∂ In essence, we argue that while the statutory and legal constraints∂ on presidential unilateral power are weak, the political constraints are∂ quite robust.52 Unilateral actions that could provoke public ire and∂ erode the president’s political capital, thereby undermining later efforts∂ to pursue other aspects of the president’s programmatic agenda, may∂ fail a simple cost-benefit calculation. The informal political costs of∂ acting—even when Congress and the courts are almost certainly∂ unwilling or unable to strike down the action—may outweigh the policy∂ benefits of acting unilaterally. These political costs, which are not∂ accounted for in most extant models of unilateral politics, are tangible∂ and substantial; indeed, they may explain why presidents fail to act∂ unilaterally as aggressively and on as many issues across the gamut of∂ policy as formal models suggest they should.

#### Unilateral action ensures backlash from both sides of the aisle

Sensiba 20 -- Jennifer Sensiba, journalist. [Don’t Encourage Biden To Waste Political Capital, 11-6-20, https://cleantechnica.com/2020/11/06/dont-encourage-biden-to-waste-political-capital/]

Executive Power Is Expensive While Trump abused executive power frequently, don’t be tempted by calls for Biden to take revenge and do the same thing. The short term gains may be enticing, but the longer term costs are much bigger than they might appear to be at first. Trump found out the hard way that pushing for things like the border wall, fights against LGBT rights, and attempts to prop up the failing coal industry alienates reasonable people. It’s easy to say “Trump did it! We can too!”, but don’t forget that was part of his undoing. The worst thing a President Biden could do is use unconstitutional executive orders for something divisive like gun control. Yes, Trump actually did this, because he thought it would make him look good after the Las Vegas shooting, but it divided his own supporters. Loyalists made excuses or claimed it was part of some elaborate game to “beat the libs,” while people who really believed in gun rights deeply lost trust in Trump. Make no mistake, a Democratic president doing this would quickly earn the hostilities of both camps and suffer a deeper cost than Trump did. That’s just one example. There are many other little regulatory things a President Biden could do to put the screws to Republicans, but in most cases it simply isn’t worth it when we need real legislation to get the job done.

#### Biden gets the blame for agency action

Kovacs 18, Professor at the University of Rutgers School of Law, JD from Georgetown University Law Center, BA in Psychology from Yale University (Kathryn E., “Rules About Rulemaking and The Rise of the Unitary Executive,” *Administrative Law Review, 70 Admin. L. Rev. 515*, Lexis)

Clearly, there are other reasons for this phenomenon: among them, the President's desire to take political credit or, on the flip side, his recognition that, whatever the outcome, he will be saddled with the political blame. The American public seems to equate the President with the Fourth Branch. Advances in technology and media may be exacerbating this effect. This phenomenon, however, cuts both ways. The President may be inclined to make policy decisions himself so that he can take the credit if the outcome is politically popular, but he may prefer to leave policymaking to his subordinates so that he can distance himself if the outcome is not politically popular. This does not, therefore, account fully for the dramatic [\*557] rise in presidential direct action described below.

[FOOTNOTE]

Daniel A. Farber, Presidential Administration Under Trump 23 (Aug. 9, 2017) (unpublished manuscript), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3015591 (envisioning a "feedback cycle in which presidents take control of major agency decisions, fortifying the public's tendency to assign blame to the president for unpopular outcomes, which in turn strengthens the pressure on the president to assert control"); see also COOPER, supra note 333, at 65, 95; Cary Coglianese & Kristin Firth, Separation of Powers Legitimacy: An Empirical Inquiry into Norms About Power, 164 U. PA. L. REV. 1869, 1900 (2016) (finding that people are more likely to blame the President for poor agency outcomes than they are to credit him for positive agency outcomes); Kagan, supra note 1, at 2310; Stack, supra note 334, at 264, 317.

#### XO’s link to politics---encourage Congressional budget battles

Christenson 15, Associate Professor of Political Science and the Director of Advanced Programs @ Boston U (Dino, “Political Constraints on Unilateral Executive Action,” *Case Western Law Review*, 65.4)//BB

Here, we take a different tack and emphasize the informal political∂ costs of unilateral action. Specifically, we argue that presidents consider∂ more than just whether Congress or the courts will act affirmatively to∂ overturn a unilateral presidential order. Rather, presidents consider the∂ longer-term political costs that unilateral action may entail. These∂ political costs can take many forms, two of which are particularly∂ important. First, when presidents act unilaterally, they may burn∂ bridges with members of Congress opposed to the action on political,∂ ideological, or even constitutional grounds. To be sure, in almost all∂ circumstances, presidents will be able to carry the day and beat back∂ any legislative effort to undo what they have done unilaterally.∂ However, the ill will so generated on Capitol Hill may prove politically∂ costly the next time the president’s policy wishes require action that∂ only Congress can take. For example, despite being a rather blunt∂ instrument, Congress retains the power of the purse and therefore,∂ ultimately, the power to support or de-fund most policies that∂ presidents begin unilaterally.40 This echoes Neustadt’s moral from the∂ “three cases of command”—Truman’s firing of General Douglas∂ MacArthur and seizure of the steel mills during the Korean War, and∂ Eisenhower federalizing the Arkansas National Guard to integrate∂ Central High School. In each case, the president succeeded in achieving∂ his immediate policy objective. Yet, in each case, Neustadt argues the∂ victory was a pyrrhic one, coming at a high political cost. Truman’s∂ actions, in particular, only intensified ongoing battles with Congress on∂ both the foreign and domestic fronts and likely hindered Truman’s∂ efforts to extract concessions from Congress on other key elements of∂ his legislative agenda.41

### L – Including Turkey

#### Blowback link---ferocious advocacy against cooperation and tech/resource transfers driven by fears of Turkey-Russia and Turkey-China collaboration

Laura Kelly, 5-13-2022, Staff Writer for The Hill "Advocacy groups press Congress to reject Biden weapons sale to Turkey," Hill, https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/3487453-advocacy-groups-press-congress-to-reject-biden-weapons-sale-to-turkey//DG

More than half a dozen organizations advocating American interests in the Middle East, Mediterranean and Caucasus are pressing Congress to overturn the [Biden](https://thehill.com/people/biden/)administration’s planned sale of weapons and military equipment to Turkey. The Biden administration last month asked Congress to approve the sale of advanced weapons and other equipment for Turkey’s fleet of F-16 fighter jets, The Wall Street Journal reported this week.  But seven advocacy organizations are raising alarm that Congress should apply strict scrutiny and oversight to any potential sales or transfer of fighter jets or major weapons systems to Turkey, which is an ally of the United States in NATO.  Separate letters were sent Friday to Senate and House lawmakers by the Hellenic American Leadership Council; Armenian National Committee of America; the American Jewish Committee; In Defense of Christians, the Middle East Forum; American Friends of Kurdistan and the International Coordinating Committee — Justice for Cyprus (PSEKA). The letters were sent to the chairs and ranking members of the House Foreign Affairs and Armed Services committees, and the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees. The organizations raised “alarm” over the Biden administration’s request that Congress approve the sale of 80 modernization kits for its existing warplanes, air-to-air missiles and radar/avionics upgrades. “We ask that you ensure that any American arms sales to Ankara come with narrowly defined statutory conditions and bilaterally agreed upon restrictions, including guarantees that U.S. weapons will never be deployed against Armenians, Syriac-Assyrians, Greeks, Cypriot, the Kurds or domestic civilian populations,” read the letter from the Armenian National Committee of America. President Biden has sought to normalize relations between Washington and Ankara that have been strained for years over a number of crises. Biden met with Turkish President [Recep Tayyip Erdoğan](https://thehill.com/people/recep-tayyip-erdogan/)in Europe in June 2021 in [what was described as](https://thehill.com/policy/international/558335-biden-and-erdogan-exchange-smiles-elbow-bumps-in-first-meeting/) a “positive and productive meeting.”  Administration officials have publicly praised Turkey’s role in opposing Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. It has buttressed security in the Black Sea, provided key weapons to Kyiv and served as a strategic intermediary with Moscow. “Turkey is proving itself to be a key, helpful and strategic ally of the U.S.,” Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Eurasia Affairs Karen Donfried told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during a hearing on Thursday.  But Erdoğan on Friday voiced opposition to expanding NATO to allow Finland and Sweden to join. Both are being welcomed as future members by the U.S. and other NATO allies.  Washington and Ankara have had tense relations for years. The U.S. kicked Turkey out of its F-35 fighter jet program in 2019 following Ankara’s purchase of the Russian S-400 missile defense system. The U.S. also imposed sanctions on Turkey in 2020 under a federal law, called CAATSA, for the continued possession of the Russian missile defense system.  The American Jewish Committee in its letter urged Congress to prevent the weapons sales unless Turkey can be proven to be in compliance with CAATSA and “assurances can be made that advanced American technology will not be left vulnerable to Russian and Chinese systems.”

## \*L T/Case\*

### L T/NATO Solvency

#### The Link alone turns the case –GOP will fight the plan – that undermines US-NATO cooperation

Binnenkijk and Townsend 2021

Hans Binnenkijk, distinguished fellow at the Atlantic Council, former senior official at US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, National Security Council, State Department, and the National Defense University; Jim Townsend Jr. adjunct senior fellow in the CNAS Transatlantic Security Program, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for European and NATO Policy. "The Future US Role in NATO," NATO 2030: Towards a New Strategic Concept and Beyond, (131-156), 2021.dmr

But the populist political force that brought Trump to the presidency was more powerful and ran deeper in the US body politic than those of an earlier period. Organized by social media and fed by conspiracy theories of news outlets, the Trump electoral base was deep and included extremist movements that helped make the current US populist movement strong and active. While the grievances held by US populists are not as focused on US foreign policy as on domestic themes, wary allies see the political power and resilience of the US populist movement and are reluctant to assume the US political storm has blown over and that US internationalism is safe.

#### The Link alone turns the case – Plan sparks burden sharing fights – that divides member states

Kunz 2021

Barbra, senior researcher at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. She specializes in European security and the debates surrounding it, with a special emphasis on France and Germany. “’There is No “Europe’: Disagreements Within NATO Are Not Solely Transatlantic and Pertain to the Fundamentals of European Security”, NATO 2030: Towards a New Strategic Concept and Beyond, (157-176), 2021.dmr

Analyses of transatlantic relations, and security relations in particular, often focus on differences between the United States and its European allies. This clearly is an important factor. Given Europe’s dependence on US security guarantees, the United States’ continued willingness to engage in the continent’s security is the condition sine qua non for NATO’s survival. US dissatisfaction with European engagement and defense spending has consequently been a key item on intra-Alliance agendas since 1949. US concerns about NATO and its European allies’ engagement were indeed voiced openly long before Donald Trump.1 Debates about burden sharing also trickle down to domestic politics in member states and thus contribute to shaping the general climate within the Alliance, as for instance the 2 percent objective that has featured in several German electoral campaigns.

### L T/SC Solvency

#### The Link alone turns the case – political fights empirically doom cooperation solvency

Karlin 2017

Mara, Ph.D., was a nonresident senior fellow with the Center for Security, Strategy, and Technology at the Brookings Institution. She was also the director of strategic studies and an associate professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). Karlin has served in national security roles for five U.S. secretaries of defense, advising on policies spanning strategic planning, defense budgeting, future wars and the evolving security environment, and regional affairs involving the Middle East, Europe, and Asia. She was a commissioner for the congressionally-mandated Syria Study Group and previously worked on the congressionally-mandated National Defense Strategy Commission, “Why military assistance programs disappoint: Minor tools can't solve major problems” November/December 2017, Foreign Affairs, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-military-assistance-programs-disappoint/>dmr

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Another problem with U.S. military assistance concerns divisions on the American side. Washington does not always come to a consensus on the parameters and purpose of its help. This confusion undermines a program’s efficacy and can result in unmitigated disaster.

Again, consider Vietnam. The man the Pentagon put in charge of assisting the South Vietnamese military from 1955 to 1960 was Lieutenant General Samuel Williams, a commander who had received a battlefield demotion during World War II due to incompetence. Williams repeatedly clashed with U.S. embassy officials in Saigon, kowtowed to Diem, and remained committed to building a conventional South Vietnamese military, contrary to the wishes of the White House and the CIA. At a time when there were more than enough problems among its Vietnamese allies, Washington was needlessly undermining its own efforts. It repeated that mistake in Lebanon in the 1980s. In the wake of Israel’s 1982 invasion of the country, the Reagan administration dispatched U.S. troops to serve in a multinational peacekeeping force and to professionalize Lebanon’s military. But Washington failed to establish a consensus on the purpose of its involvement. What began as a 30-day mission to oversee the withdrawal of the Palestine Liberation Organization from Beirut turned into a vague and open-ended commitment to support Lebanese stability and security. Senior U.S. policymakers disagreed sharply over the scope of the U.S. role in Lebanon—in particular, the extent to which the United States should directly support Lebanon’s military in combat operations. Not surprisingly, then, officials sent mixed messages. Although officially speaking, the U.S. government was invested in the stability and security of the Lebanese state, one senior U.S. policymaker broke ranks and encouraged the commander of the armed forces to lead a military coup. This disunity laid the groundwork not only for a convoluted program but also for the deaths of hundreds of U.S. military and diplomatic personnel. Two spectacular attacks in 1983 on the U.S. embassy and marine barracks in Beirut illustrated that at least some actors saw the United States as a combatant in the conflict, despite efforts to characterize itself as playing a supporting role. By early 1984, portions of the Lebanese military had melted away amid increased violence, and the United States withdrew from Lebanon, having failed to make the state more stable or secure.

#### The Link alone turns the case – Politicized fights destroy cooperation effectiveness

Young 2020

Thomas-Durell, phd, Senior Lecturer at the Naval Postgraduate School, “The "Politics" of Security Cooperation and Security Assistance” September 10, 2020, https://www.dasadec.army.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/2344014/the-politics-of-security-cooperation-and-security-assistance/dmr

The objective of this article is to argue that administration officials and Congress face two different political challenges related to improving SC and SA. Unless and until U.S. officials formulate solutions to these political problems, both branches of government will struggle to achieve more effective means of reforming partner nations’ key governmental institutions. First—and perhaps the easiest challenge to address—is that SC and SA have unintended political consequences in the government institutions of recipient countries and are not solely technical tasks. No one has expressed this point better than Mara Karlin, albeit she was speaking in reference to weak states: Past experience offers two key lessons for U.S. officials as they seek to strengthen the security sectors of weak states. First, like all state-building endeavors, these are political, not technical, exercises. Instead of focusing narrowly on training and equipment, U.S. policymakers responsible for implementing such programs must address the purpose and scope of the U.S. role and the mission, leadership, and organizational structure of the partner’s military.9 Second, SC and SA are highly politicized; both are inefficient, because of the lack of coordination between the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of State, and ineffective, because of lack of alignment with national security goals (and/or foreign policy objectives). This important reality needs wider appreciation by these departments, as well as by Congress, if the U.S. Government is to improve its ability to find value for money by improving partner nations’ ability to defend their sovereignty, let alone contribute to expeditionary operations. Recent reforms initiated by Congress, most notably in the fiscal year (FY) 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), constitute a good first effort at addressing these longstanding problems; however, a review of the evidence shows that this legislation should be augmented to define the problem as largely political in nature, as opposed to accepting the traditional default assumption that it is solely technical, which would have enabled it to call for even deeper reforms within these bureaucracies. This article argues that, due to internal DOD politics and the interorganizational politics within the U.S. Government, suboptimal results ensue from the way the United States plans and executes SC and SA. It then suggests legislative and policy changes that might better take this reality into account. The stakes are high. If U.S. strategy is to bring troops home from the so-called endless wars overseas and let others do the fighting, then its success must be a core priority. But only by reforming the way the United States organizes itself to build allies’ and partners’ armed forces are we likely to meet with any greater success than we have in the past.

## \*\*Impact\*\*

### Bill Solves Inflation

Extend 1nc Kahn – several provisions effectively combat inflation:

* raises revenue to reduce the deficit –debt service empirically fuels inflation and slows growth – it also makes US vulnerable to foreign investment and squeezes out public services that offset inflation
* prevents further rate hikes – hikes hurt consumers and discourage business borrowing necessary for wage increases and new jobs
* lowers skyrocketing drug costs and energy costs
* prevents surge in insurance premiums set to kick in this fall

prefer Kahn two decades as a director of congressional budget committee and distinguished politics prof

#### Slim BBB solves inflation and climate

Yglesias 6/5

Matthew, Bloomberg, “Joe Manchin Was Right, and Democrats Should Admit It,” June 5, 2022 https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-06-05/progressive-democrats-should-admit-joe-manchin-was-right

All this time, it’s worth noting, the one piece of the legislation that Democrats made sure to keep permanent was providing tax credits to subsidize the production of zero-carbon energy. This was structured to try to be more neutral between technologies than America’s current climate subsidies, to be permanent rather than temporary, and to be far simpler and more efficient than the current system. This part of the puzzle was well-designed in its parameters, is at least somewhat anti-inflationary in its implications, and is easy to pay for in the context of a package that in the aggregate reduces the deficit by taxing the rich. Manchin has never rejected these ideas outright, and his staff continues to negotiate with other senators about their exact design. Anyone who cares about inflation, climate change or the Biden administration’s legacy should hope that he and his interlocutors can get to yes. A good starting point would be for everyone to admit that this approach isn’t just a second-best alternative to Build Back Better, it’s actually superior — and that the senator from West Virginia has had a point all along.

#### Manchin is on board for a slim BBB – it includes several anti-inflation measures

Newman 6/7

Rick, Yahoo Finance, “Democrats look to revive reconciliation bill to fight inflation,” June 7, 2022 https://finance.yahoo.com/video/democrats-look-revive-reconciliation-bill-145559113.html

Yahoo Finance's Rick Newman explains the outlook for the budget reconciliation bill that Democrats are pushing for ahead of the midterm elections.

- Inflation. Hot topic in DC. Any signs any of this is going to improve anytime soon?

RICK NEWMAN: So obviously President Biden wants to do something about inflation. There's not much he can do. But now we're hearing that-- and this is from Senator Joe Manchin, the scourge of the Democratic Party. We're hearing that there is a chance that Democrats could still pass some kind of so-called reconciliation bill. But instead of being Build Back Better, which became Build Back Lesser, which became Build Back Never, that stuff's all out. This bill would have to be an inflation fighting bill. Now, it's not really clear how they could do that. But there are some programs or proposals that Biden says might help with inflation, such as subsidies for health care and child care and things like that. There's an argument that raising taxes on businesses a little bit could be anti-inflationary.

### I/L Inflation 🡪 Retrenchment

#### Inflation triggers fast retrenchment – lower budget requests, continuing resolution contracts and dramatically reduced purchasing power

**Daniels 6/21** - associate fellow and associate director for Defense Budget Analysis in the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Seamus P., “Worried about inflation and the defense budget? A continuing resolution could make things worse,” Defense News, 6-21-22, <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2022/06/21/worried-about-inflation-and-the-defense-budget-a-continuing-resolution-could-make-things-worse/>) //sg

This high rate of inflation **poses a threat to the department’s purchasing power**. Instead of the real increase in defense spending assumed by DoD, rising prices over 2022 likely means the **requested level of funding represents a cut**. And the administration’s five-year funding projections could mean an even greater loss in purchasing power — potentially over $300 billion between FY23 and FY27 — should high inflation persist.

Unless the Biden administration intends to scale back the demands it places on an already over-stressed military — which appears unlikely given the conflict in Ukraine and the administration’s recent decision to redeploy troops to Somalia for counterterrorism missions — DoD must work with Congress to mitigate the effects of inflation. In May, Deputy Secretary of Defense Kathleen Hicks expressed the department’s willingness to work with legislators on updating inflation estimates to protect DoD’s buying power in the FY23 request.

The ball is firmly in Congress’ court to combat the effects of inflation on the defense budget given its constitutionally-mandated power of the purse. But congressional politics could threaten to exacerbate inflation’s effects on DoD’s purchasing power.

If Congress fails to pass appropriations by the start of the fiscal year on Oct. 1 — a task made more difficult by the administration’s late budget request — DoD will likely be forced to operate under a continuing resolution for months. The department is no stranger to working under continuing resolutions, having started the year under one for 15 of the past 20 fiscal years with an average CR length of over 112 days.

But a **long-term continuing resolution** this year **would have a more severe impact given inflation**. Under a normal continuing resolution, DoD would be funded at the FY22 base funding level of $742 billion (excluding emergency supplemental funding in FY 2022), which would mean a **significant loss in buying power to start the fiscal year**.

### ! Warming

#### Strong renewable investment solves catastrophic warming

Spiegel 21, \*Jeff, Lead of iShares Megatrend and International ETFs; \*\*Karen Schenone, CFA, Fixed Income Product Strategist within BlackRock’s Global Fixed Income Group; \*\*\*Sarah Kjellberg, Director at Blackrock and Head of U.S. iShares Sustainable ETFs at BlackRock. (8-24-2021, "Clean and green investing for a low-carbon economy", *BlackRock*, <https://www.ishares.com/us/insights/clean-and-green-investing-for-a-low-carbon-economy>)

Extreme weather events are calling attention to the costs of climate change and creating urgency around transforming the global economy — a monumental undertaking that could triple annual investment in clean energy by the end of this decade.1 This summer has seen forest fires first sweep across the Western U.S. and Canada, then Southern Europe, while floods inundated parts of Northern Europe and Central China. Recent ecological shocks follow a record year for weather-related damages in 2020.2 The scientific consensus is that the global economy needs to quickly become less carbon-intensive to avoid continued extreme and catastrophic impacts.3 Transitioning away from fossil fuels, which now account for about 80% of the total energy supply, will require major investments in new technologies, infrastructure, and projects designed to reduce the threat.4 By one estimate, meeting current carbon-reduction targets could require installing the equivalent of the world’s current largest solar park every day for the rest of this decade.5 Given the magnitude of the changes we foresee, long-term investors may find opportunities in the technologies and innovations that create renewable energy sources or reduce the carbon intensity of energy production. The role of renewable energy in reaching net zero To help spur the economic transformation, governments and companies are pledging commitments to become “net zero.” Net zero is about reducing greenhouse gas emissions so that over time we can achieve an overall balance between emissions produced, and the emissions removed from the overall atmosphere. So, for every ton of greenhouse gas emitted into the air, a ton needs to be taken out. More than 125 governments around the world and more than 1,000 companies have made or are preparing to make net zero commitments. We expect that number to go up. Attaining net zero will require huge investments, changes in business models, and innovation. Major energy producers say that oil production likely peaked in 2019, and the race is on for cheap, clean ways to produce electricity.6 To reach net zero emissions by midcentury, annual clean energy investment will need to more than triple by 2030 to around $4 trillion.7 Both stocks and bonds will be important to financing the transition to a sustainable, low-carbon economy, and exchange traded funds (ETFs) are a convenient way to target companies and issuers at the forefront of driving the transformation of the energy systems that underpin the global economy. Accessing renewable energy in the stock market We believe more and increasingly restrictive climate-related policies and growing consumer preferences are likely to spark breakthroughs in renewable energy, which should have knock-on effects that enable scaled production and widespread adoption.

#### Extinction.

Kareiva 18, Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al. (Peter, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” *Futures*, 102)

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### I/L – Bill Solves Climate

#### Bill solves climate – RE subsidies are temporary and complex – that discourages innovation

Yglesias 6/5

Matthew, Bloomberg, “Joe Manchin Was Right, and Democrats Should Admit It,” June 5, 2022 https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-06-05/progressive-democrats-should-admit-joe-manchin-was-right

All this time, it’s worth noting, the one piece of the legislation that Democrats made sure to keep permanent was providing tax credits to subsidize the production of zero-carbon energy. This was structured to try to be more neutral between technologies than America’s current climate subsidies, to be permanent rather than temporary, and to be far simpler and more efficient than the current system. This part of the puzzle was well-designed in its parameters, is at least somewhat anti-inflationary in its implications, and is easy to pay for in the context of a package that in the aggregate reduces the deficit by taxing the rich. Manchin has never rejected these ideas outright, and his staff continues to negotiate with other senators about their exact design. Anyone who cares about inflation, climate change or the Biden administration’s legacy should hope that he and his interlocutors can get to yes. A good starting point would be for everyone to admit that this approach isn’t just a second-best alternative to Build Back Better, it’s actually superior — and that the senator from West Virginia has had a point all along.

#### Also solves by averting interest rate hikes which crush renewables and lock in warming

Bornhauser 19, citing Tobias Schmidt, Professor of Energy Politics. (Martin, 9-9-2019, "Interest rates are a decisive factor for competitive renewables", *ETH Zurich*, <https://ethz.ch/en/news-and-events/eth-news/news/2019/09/interest-rates-are-a-decisive-factor-in-the-competitivenessof%20renewable%20energy.html>)

Renewable energy is an essential part of efforts to reduce CO2 emissions. Without it – according to all the climate scenarios – the Paris Agreement’s target of limiting global warming to below 2°C relative to the pre-​industrial age will not be achieved. Policymakers have therefore introduced various support measures for renewable energy, in particular in the EU – and not without success: the generation costs of alternative energy in many European countries today are comparable with the (marginal) costs of existing gas or coal-​fired power stations. The last two years have seen the widespread emergence of photovoltaic plants that can survive and hold their own on the market without subsidies – for example, in Spain and Germany. Green electricity’s new-​found competitiveness is based on more mature technology and higher volumes, which bring down costs. In addition – and this is often overlooked – the low cost of capital has also played its part, as low interest rates boost the economic viability of alternative energy sources. Lower costs thanks to low interest rates But what happens if interest rates rise? ETH researchers have explored this question in two studies. As renewable energy is more capital-​intensive than fossil fuels, the costs rise more sharply with rising interest rates, making it less attractive. “Renewable energy is now very cheap, but that won’t necessarily be the case with higher interest rates,” says Tobias Schmidt, Professor of Energy Politics. According to Schmidt, analysis of 133 photovoltaic and onshore wind projects in Germany over the last 18 years shows that – in the case of wind power, for example – lower financing costs account for about 25% of the savings in electricity-​production costs (see article in Nature Energycall\_made). “Renewable energy has become cheaper – thanks in part to significant improvements in financing conditions,” says Bjarne Steffen, co-​author of the study. Conversely, rising financing costs will lead to disproportionate increases in the price of renewable energy. Less attractive with rising interest rates In a study published today in Nature Sustainability, the ETH researchers calculated various interest rate scenarios in collaboration with a team from the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK). If interest rates were to return to pre-​crisis levels, electricity production costs in Germany would increase by 11% for solar power plants and 25% for wind power projects – with a knock-​on impact on competitiveness. In a scenario involving a moderate rise in interest rates, the lower costs of solar power plants due to advances in knowledge and technology would be offset by higher interest charges. For wind power stations, it is estimated that electricity generation costs would increase by 9% in such a scenario.

#### A slimmed down version solves climate and inflation

Faiz Jamil, John Harwood, 6-20-2022 CNN reporters, covering daily news “5 things” CNN, https://www.cnn.com/audio/static/transcripts/5-things/9-am-et-bbb-comeback-juneteenth-shooting-swimmer-t.e97c76d140a7a9dc9e9237971d870ebb.pdf//DG

Could President Joe Biden’s build back better bill be making a comeback? You might remember the $1.9 trillion spending plan that failed to get the support of Democrats Joe Manchin and Kirsten Cinema last year. Now it’s thought the bill could be broken into parts and passed as part of an inflation fighting plan. CNN’s John Harwood has more. John Harwood (reporter hit) 00:00:27 I think there is some belief within the White House and on Capitol Hill that a package that includes some of the prescription drug reforms that they’ve been talking about, some tax incentives to try to accelerate the shift toward renewable energy sources and some revenue raising, more revenue raising than they would spend in the package. And because of that, it would reduce the deficit and in theory, help with inflation.

### ! Economy

#### Prolonged inflation crashes the economy---even without rate hikes.

Bartash 21, citing senior economist Sal Guatieri of BMO Capital Markets and Stanley of Amherst Pierpont (Jeffry, 9-25-2021, "The Fed has bet on a future of low inflation. Here's what could go wrong", *MarketWatch*, <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-fed-has-bet-on-a-future-of-low-inflation-heres-what-could-go-wrong-11632320184>)

Damage to the economy A prolonged bout of high inflation could cause consumer spending — the main driver of the U.S. economy — to slow. Consumers have already cut back on purchases of new cars and other goods because of record prices. A recent survey found that consumers say it’s the worst time to buy a car since the early 1980s. What could also pose a risk to the economy is if the Fed moves to squelch inflation by raising interest rates more rapidly than it plans. A series of rapid interest-rate hikes could choke off U.S. economic growth and sent stock markets plummeting. “That could rattle financial markets and the economy,” said senior economist Sal Guatieri of BMO Capital Markets. Yet the likelihood of the Powell Fed acting so aggressively appears dim, other analysts say. The central bank is more focused on ensuring a strong U.S. jobs market and low unemployment and less worried about a sustained period of high inflation. Stanley of Amherst Pierpont believes the Fed will raise interest rates slowly even if inflation remains elevated, possibly making it harder for the central bank to put the genie back in the bottle. The big risk, he said, is that consumers and businesses lose faith in the Fed’s ability to keep inflation low. Such an outcome could make the U.S. economy more unstable and prone to sharper ups and downs.

#### Post-COVID collapse wrecks geopolitical dominance---that triggers global conflict, EU collapse, and Chinese authoritarian dominance

Kempe 20, best-selling author, prize-winning journalist and president & CEO of the Atlantic Council, one of the United States’ most influential think tanks on global affairs. He worked at The Wall Street Journal for more than 25 years as a foreign correspondent, assistant managing editor and as the longest-serving editor of the paper’s European edition. (Frederick, Updated: 4-21-2021, “Op-ed: How the US can win the post-coronavirus race for global dominance,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/18/op-ed-how-us-can-win-the-post-coronavirus-race-for-global-dominance.html)

Place your bets for the coming race to growth. It will be an epic contest among the world’s most significant economies, with generational and geopolitical consequences. For context, think back to what the United States accomplished after World War II, when it rose as an economic power to shape a better world. The post-COVID19 race could determine whether the U.S. rebounds in a manner that allows it to retain the mantle of global leadership. More likely for the moment, Beijing could leverage its first-mover advantage – alongside a faster economic recovery across Asian markets – accelerating the trend toward a Chinese-centric globalization. Elsewhere, as President Macron [argued](https://www.ft.com/content/3ea8d790-7fd1-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) this week to the Financial Times, the coming months could determine whether the European Union collapses as a political and economic project. The days ahead also could trigger a dangerous widening of the economic gap between emerging markets and the developed world – with escalating conflict and surging migration. It may seem premature to reflect on which of the globe’s economies is likely to have the most robust and lasting economic comeback – and with what geopolitical impact. After all, this was a week in which the International Monetary Fund [projected](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2020/04/14/weo-april-2020) a 3% contraction in global GDP for 2020, the most dramatic drop since the Great Depression. Yet it is the details behind that dismal forecast that should raise concerns within the U.S. and Europe. Their steeper economic decline and slower recovery could lay the seeds for a long-lasting shift of global tectonic plates to China’s advantage. The IMF projected a U.S. economic decline of about 6% in 2020 and a contraction of the eurozone of 7.5%. That compares to projected Chinese economic growth for 2020 of 1.2% after a first quarter real decline of 6.7% – far less than the 10%-plus dip many experts had expected. The only group of countries in the world projected to be in positive territory are East Asian, at roughly 1%. Even if one accepts that Chinese coronavirus fatalities likely are greater than their public figures and that the growth decline is likely larger, that doesn’t change the potential for a scenario that Deloitte and Salesforce this week [referred to](https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/covid-19/covid-19-scenarios-and-impacts-for-business-and-society-world-remade.html) as “Sunrise in the East.” Describing this scenario, as one of four possibilities they list, they write, “The global center of power shifts decisively east as China and other East Asian nations take the reigns as primary powers on the world stage and lead global coordination of the health system and other multilateral institutions.” That comes with the broader acceptance of greater surveillance mechanisms as part of the public good, a faster recovery of East Asian countries with less economic impact from COVID19, and a significant ramping up of Chinese foreign direct investment to burnish its global reputation. Still, the U.S. has a host of incumbent advantages that could serve it well if it uses its economic recovery to also strengthen its infrastructure, if it reverses runaway unemployment quickly, if it can tame political polarization and, most significantly, if it rediscovers its taste for collaborative global leadership. In the economic race, no advantage is greater than the dollar. China may be the world’s second largest economy, but the Chinese yuan [makes up](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) only 2% of global payments and reserves while the dollar [accounts](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) for roughly two thirds of foreign exchange reserves. The dollar [underpins](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) four-fifths of global supply chains. The Economist [reckons](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) China could chip away at U.S. economic advantages through three underestimated strengths of its own: as a trusted debtor, an attractive creditor, and increasingly as a tech partner. As a debtor, China’s $13 trillion bond market is the world’s second largest and [has weathered the crisis well](https://www.ft.com/content/41044876-6ab4-11ea-a3c9-1fe6fedcca75). Chinese debt [returned](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/china-cuts-us-treasury-debt-holding-by-13/) 1.3% in the first quarter, vastly better than the 15.5% [decline](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) for other emerging market bonds. Over the same period, the Chinese market added $8.5 billion (60 billion yuan) in net inflows. As a creditor, China has remained willing and generous, an approach that served the U.S. well after World War II. For example, it [declared](https://www.ft.com/content/5f296d54-d29e-4e87-ae7d-95ca6c0598d5) its willingness to back a G20 deal to suspend bilateral loan repayments by poorer countries, a sizable benefit also at its own cost. On the tech front, few countries were as ready as China for money and people to go entirely online. Tencent and Ant Financial have more than a billion users each for their digital wallets, and they are expanding rapidly throughout Asia. OneConnect, an offshoot of China’s largest insurer, provides financial institutions in sixteen Asian countries with cloud-based services. So, what other advantages can the United States leverage in this race? Never underestimate the brittleness of an authoritarian country under stress. Its broad censorship, it’s opaque legal system, and the nature of its surveillance state are hardly models to emulate. Beyond that, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is not alone [in proposing](https://asia.nikkei.com/Editor-s-Picks/China-up-close/Xi-fears-Japan-led-manufacturing-exodus-from-China) that his country relocate high-value supply chains from China. If many countries do the same, the manufacturing foundation of China’s economy could erode. The Financial Times’ Gideon Rachman [adds](https://www.ft.com/content/2e8c8f76-7cbd-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) that the global trust in the dollar is just one of two built-in U.S. advantages that are difficult to dislodge. The other? “Where, outside your home country, would you most like your children to go to university or to work?” he writes. Most significant in this race would be if the United States regained its appetite for political and economic leadership as the world’s premier “convening power.” That need not be done at the cost of China – or anyone else. The race still can be won if U.S. leaders see it as a marathon and recall that much of the world long embraced their global leadership because partners learned they were more likely to win as American partners. This economic rebound from COVID19 will be patchy and uneven. Being first out the gate will be significant, and that is likely to be China. Yet history has taught the United States that it’s victory will be longest lasting if it can achieved alongside partners and allies.

#### Nuclear war

Henricksen 17, emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution (Thomas, “Post-American World Order,” *Hoover Institution*, <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>)

The tensions stoked by the assertive regimes in the Kremlin or Tiananmen Square could spark a political or military incident that might set off a chain reaction leading to a large-scale war. Historically, powerful rivalries nearly always lead to at least skirmishes, if not a full-blown war. The anomalous Cold War era spared the United States and Soviet Russia a direct conflict, largely from concerns that one would trigger a nuclear exchange destroying both states and much of the world. Such a repetition might reoccur in the unfolding three-cornered geopolitical world. It seems safe to acknowledge that an ascendant China and a resurgent Russia will persist in their geo-strategic ambitions. What Is To Be Done? The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union. What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by staying militarily and economically strong, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ hawkish behavior that might otherwise trigger a major conflict. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since all the countries boast nuclear arms and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously. There can be little room for error in fraught crises among nuclear-weaponized and hostile powers. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a waiting game in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

### I/L – Inflation 🡪 Recession

#### Unchecked inflation---triggers a Deep recession

Tully 11-3-2021, citing William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University (Shawn, "The Fed has two options on inflation—and neither are pretty", *Fortune*, <https://fortune.com/2021/11/03/fed-inflation-recession-forecast/>)

The two possible scenarios for inflation

The longer market participants view the big numbers arriving month after month, the more they'll lose faith that the Fed's committed to doing what's necessary to conquer inflation. The Fed could quell the outbreak now by raising rates and otherwise modestly tightening its monetary grip, notes William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University. But the central bank isn't moving. Although Fed-watchers expect the central bank to hike rates twice next year, those actions would simply mark the close of its super-stimulative stance, maintained to counter the pandemic. So far, the Fed's shown no intention of taking tough measures to slow jack rabbit prices. "Instead, all companies and consumers are witnessing is rising inflation when the CPI reports each month, and the Fed saying nothing about fighting it," says Luther. "If prices keep increasing at the current clip, producers will start baking expectations of higher inflation into their wage and procurement contracts." Those locked-in escalators will give the hot streak legs.

If strong inflation takes hold, Luther predicts, the Fed will face two options, both bad for the economy and stocks. "The first is that the Fed 'sticks to its guns' by pledging to wrestle the price trend back to 2%, and because it's waited so long, must radically contract credit to get there," say Luther. That course would cause a deep recession, pounding bonds and equities. In the second course, the Fed would simply accept and perpetuate the today's higher inflation as a new normal. "The market participants would be expecting 3% inflation, and the Fed would meet those expectations by delivering 3% inflation," says Luther. The appeal of taking that path: It would avoid an immediate recession. "The first 'stick to your guns' solution would be require such a steep downturn because the Fed delayed getting tough for so long," says Luther. "It might take the second option because the harder something is to do, the the less likely the Fed is to do it." Punting carries a cost. The central bank would be scrapping its longstanding, 2% goal, and adopting a new stance of tolerating high inflation to sidestep a recession. "That would greatly increase uncertainty for consumers, producers and investors," says Luther. "They'd worry that the Fed is no longer credible, that it could let inflation get out of control."

#### Tolerating inflation shatters growth

Tully 11-3-2021, citing William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University (Shawn, "The Fed has two options on inflation—and neither are pretty", *Fortune*, <https://fortune.com/2021/11/03/fed-inflation-recession-forecast/>)

Or, the Fed could take the low road and skirt the agony of a hard times. But embracing inflation of 3%-or-higher creates its own set of problems. Suppliers would avoid long-term contracts that provide their clients certainty on their future input costs. "Those suppliers would stand to lose money if they committed to multi-year contracts, and inflation raised their costs a lot more than they anticipated," says Luther. The bigger worry: America would become a far riskier place to do business, chiefly because consumers, companies and investors could no longer rely on the Fed to keep purchasing power steady, a pillar of our economic might. More uncertainty raises the "equity risk premium," the extra investors are willing to pay for stocks over super-safe Treasuries. A rising ERP means lower multiples, and lower equity prices. "If the Fed permits higher inflation to avoid recession, we know that it conducts policy not the way it promised, but the way it sees fit at the moment," says Luther. If the Fed's gone this far, market participants will fret, who knows if it will allow inflation to race even faster?

### ! Populism

#### Inflation fuels populism.

O’Sullivan 21, Senior Contributor at Forbes (Mike, July 17th, “Is Inflation A Boon for Populists?” *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikeosullivan/2021/07/17/is-inflation-a-boon-for-populists/?sh=49de49e93de7>, Accessed 11-06-2021)

My hunch is that inflation is about to become the latest populist focus. Recent data show that in the US and increasingly in Europe, inflation is awakening after a long slumber. Indeed, many professional economists and investors have never experienced high inflation. In the USA, some inflation measures and price components are the highest that they have been since the 1980’s. The consensus and official view on rising inflation is that it is ‘transitory’ – driven by a burst of coronavirus recovery spending. The risk, across many fronts is that it proves more enduring and thus can cause financial, economic and political pain.

Inflation is transitory?

This is where inflation becomes interesting to populists – anything that causes economic pain and social discomfort is populist ammunition. Indeed, there is plenty of evidence to show that inflation is often the offshoot of populist economic policies as the economic history of Latin America shows.

Inflation, if it is here to stay, will become a political issue in at least three ways. The first is housing where the OECD’s housing affordability gauge has gone vertical (i.e. housing is extremely unaffordable), easily surpassing the levels of 2008 (recall the housing crisis). In some countries like Ireland there is a persistent and acute housing crisis, the debate around which is becoming populist – though it should be said that there has been a broad failure to manage this issue from a policy point of view.

Rising prices cause pain

The second way in which inflation becomes an issue is where rising real living costs are not matched by wage rises (we may see this in about six months’ time as economic activity and policy normalizes) and ‘the price of things’ becomes a topic of political debate and increasingly, agitation. In the past, and particularly in emerging economies where households spend a large amount of disposable income on food, price rises can lead to unrest (i.e. the Arab Spring).

Third, rising inflation brings the prospect of rising interest rates which will not only make life more complicated for mortgage holders but will ignite a debate on indebtedness, its consequences and remedies. Lurking behind this is the fact that central banks by declaring inflation ‘transitory’ and not yet giving any sense that they are worried about asset price inflation nor the consequences of asset purchases, find themselves snookered. As we have seen with the tussles between Donald Trump and Fed Chair Jay Powell, central banks make easy targets for populists and can be forced into bad policy decisions by them.

So, inflation if and when it materializes, may be political fodder for populists and if it does, this will complicate the policy and political outlook. Populism is difficult to counteract, and often the best remedy for it is the incompetence of populists themselves. What might be the best solution for inflation – I propose that it is populism. As the study I mentioned earlier shows, populists tend to depress growth, and therefore inflation.

#### Goes nuclear.

Russell 19, citing T.V. Paul, James McGill professor of political science. (Nina, 11/5/19, "Experts discuss threats to the international nuclear order", *McGill Tribune*, http://www.mcgilltribune.com/news/6474654-110519/)

Experts convened to discuss threats to the global nuclear order on Nov. 1 at Thomson House. Hosted by McGill’s Centre for Peace and International Security Studies and moderated by Jennifer Welsh, Canada 150 Research Chair in Global Governance and Security at McGill, panellists discussed the shift in global power after the end of the Cold War.

T.V. Paul, James McGill professor of political science, emphasized the connection between global rising populism and the increasing acceptance of nuclear weapon use.

“Tradition has to be learned and socialized, and the new generation has to appreciate that this exists,” Paul said. “Unfortunately, our political leaders, including Mr. Trump, don’t give the impression that we’ve learned much from the past 70 years. The people who faced Hiroshima and Nagasaki […] are vanishing. And how can we teach our younger generation, especially when our leaders engage in cheap talk, and [use] this instrument for electoral purposes?”

The risk of populist leaders using nuclear weapons is present both in regional conflicts, such as rising hostility between India and Pakistan, as well as in global conflicts, like between the United States and Russia. Thomas Countryman, former United States Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation, believes that the greatest risk to the latter relationship is miscommunication.

### ! Rate Hikes

#### Inflation beyond current levels triggers fast and steep rate hikes---collapses the economy.

Kiersz 11-2-2021, Andy, Ben Winck: both reporters @ Business Insider ("3 ways the economic recovery could suddenly turn into a recession as red flags mount", Business Insider, <https://www.businessinsider.in/policy/economy/news/3-ways-the-economic-recovery-could-suddenly-turn-into-a-recession-as-red-flags-mount/articleshow/87494297.cms>)

The Fed could tighten too hard and fast in response to inflation

Pent-up demand from last year's lockdowns and ongoing supply chain difficulties have led to inflation hitting its highest level in over a decade. While price increases are in one way a sign of the recovery's strength - American consumers are desperate to buy things - moves to fight heightened inflation could crush that heightened demand.

The Federal Reserve's main tool for fighting inflation is raising interest rates. By making borrowing more expensive, the central bank can cool off an overheating economy by slowing consumer demand and business investment.

But historically, those monetary tightening cycles have often cooled the economy to the point of a recession. Nearly every recession of the last 60 or so years has come after the Fed began raising rates:
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The most famous of those Fed-triggered recessions was the "Volcker Shock" of 1980, when then-Fed Chair Paul Volcker raised rates to the historic highs seen in the above chart to crush the stagflation of the late 1970s.

Current Fed Chair Jerome Powell has remained adamant that inflation is likely to be temporary, and that the Fed will continue to accommodate the recovery with low rates, making a repeat of the Volcker Shock unlikely. However, if inflation persists or accelerates further, that could force the Fed's hand.

#### Post-COVID collapse wrecks geopolitical dominance---that triggers global conflict, EU collapse, and Chinese authoritarian dominance

Kempe 20, best-selling author, prize-winning journalist and president & CEO of the Atlantic Council, one of the United States’ most influential think tanks on global affairs. He worked at The Wall Street Journal for more than 25 years as a foreign correspondent, assistant managing editor and as the longest-serving editor of the paper’s European edition. (Frederick, Updated: 4-21-2021, “Op-ed: How the US can win the post-coronavirus race for global dominance,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/18/op-ed-how-us-can-win-the-post-coronavirus-race-for-global-dominance.html)

Place your bets for the coming race to growth. It will be an epic contest among the world’s most significant economies, with generational and geopolitical consequences. For context, think back to what the United States accomplished after World War II, when it rose as an economic power to shape a better world. The post-COVID19 race could determine whether the U.S. rebounds in a manner that allows it to retain the mantle of global leadership. More likely for the moment, Beijing could leverage its first-mover advantage – alongside a faster economic recovery across Asian markets – accelerating the trend toward a Chinese-centric globalization. Elsewhere, as President Macron [argued](https://www.ft.com/content/3ea8d790-7fd1-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) this week to the Financial Times, the coming months could determine whether the European Union collapses as a political and economic project. The days ahead also could trigger a dangerous widening of the economic gap between emerging markets and the developed world – with escalating conflict and surging migration. It may seem premature to reflect on which of the globe’s economies is likely to have the most robust and lasting economic comeback – and with what geopolitical impact. After all, this was a week in which the International Monetary Fund [projected](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2020/04/14/weo-april-2020) a 3% contraction in global GDP for 2020, the most dramatic drop since the Great Depression. Yet it is the details behind that dismal forecast that should raise concerns within the U.S. and Europe. Their steeper economic decline and slower recovery could lay the seeds for a long-lasting shift of global tectonic plates to China’s advantage. The IMF projected a U.S. economic decline of about 6% in 2020 and a contraction of the eurozone of 7.5%. That compares to projected Chinese economic growth for 2020 of 1.2% after a first quarter real decline of 6.7% – far less than the 10%-plus dip many experts had expected. The only group of countries in the world projected to be in positive territory are East Asian, at roughly 1%. Even if one accepts that Chinese coronavirus fatalities likely are greater than their public figures and that the growth decline is likely larger, that doesn’t change the potential for a scenario that Deloitte and Salesforce this week [referred to](https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/covid-19/covid-19-scenarios-and-impacts-for-business-and-society-world-remade.html) as “Sunrise in the East.” Describing this scenario, as one of four possibilities they list, they write, “The global center of power shifts decisively east as China and other East Asian nations take the reigns as primary powers on the world stage and lead global coordination of the health system and other multilateral institutions.” That comes with the broader acceptance of greater surveillance mechanisms as part of the public good, a faster recovery of East Asian countries with less economic impact from COVID19, and a significant ramping up of Chinese foreign direct investment to burnish its global reputation. Still, the U.S. has a host of incumbent advantages that could serve it well if it uses its economic recovery to also strengthen its infrastructure, if it reverses runaway unemployment quickly, if it can tame political polarization and, most significantly, if it rediscovers its taste for collaborative global leadership. In the economic race, no advantage is greater than the dollar. China may be the world’s second largest economy, but the Chinese yuan [makes up](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) only 2% of global payments and reserves while the dollar [accounts](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) for roughly two thirds of foreign exchange reserves. The dollar [underpins](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) four-fifths of global supply chains. The Economist [reckons](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) China could chip away at U.S. economic advantages through three underestimated strengths of its own: as a trusted debtor, an attractive creditor, and increasingly as a tech partner. As a debtor, China’s $13 trillion bond market is the world’s second largest and [has weathered the crisis well](https://www.ft.com/content/41044876-6ab4-11ea-a3c9-1fe6fedcca75). Chinese debt [returned](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/china-cuts-us-treasury-debt-holding-by-13/) 1.3% in the first quarter, vastly better than the 15.5% [decline](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) for other emerging market bonds. Over the same period, the Chinese market added $8.5 billion (60 billion yuan) in net inflows. As a creditor, China has remained willing and generous, an approach that served the U.S. well after World War II. For example, it [declared](https://www.ft.com/content/5f296d54-d29e-4e87-ae7d-95ca6c0598d5) its willingness to back a G20 deal to suspend bilateral loan repayments by poorer countries, a sizable benefit also at its own cost. On the tech front, few countries were as ready as China for money and people to go entirely online. Tencent and Ant Financial have more than a billion users each for their digital wallets, and they are expanding rapidly throughout Asia. OneConnect, an offshoot of China’s largest insurer, provides financial institutions in sixteen Asian countries with cloud-based services. So, what other advantages can the United States leverage in this race? Never underestimate the brittleness of an authoritarian country under stress. Its broad censorship, it’s opaque legal system, and the nature of its surveillance state are hardly models to emulate. Beyond that, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is not alone [in proposing](https://asia.nikkei.com/Editor-s-Picks/China-up-close/Xi-fears-Japan-led-manufacturing-exodus-from-China) that his country relocate high-value supply chains from China. If many countries do the same, the manufacturing foundation of China’s economy could erode. The Financial Times’ Gideon Rachman [adds](https://www.ft.com/content/2e8c8f76-7cbd-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) that the global trust in the dollar is just one of two built-in U.S. advantages that are difficult to dislodge. The other? “Where, outside your home country, would you most like your children to go to university or to work?” he writes. Most significant in this race would be if the United States regained its appetite for political and economic leadership as the world’s premier “convening power.” That need not be done at the cost of China – or anyone else. The race still can be won if U.S. leaders see it as a marathon and recall that much of the world long embraced their global leadership because partners learned they were more likely to win as American partners. This economic rebound from COVID19 will be patchy and uneven. Being first out the gate will be significant, and that is likely to be China. Yet history has taught the United States that it’s victory will be longest lasting if it can achieved alongside partners and allies.

#### Nuclear war

Henricksen 17, emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution (Thomas, “Post-American World Order,” *Hoover Institution*, <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>)

The tensions stoked by the assertive regimes in the Kremlin or Tiananmen Square could spark a political or military incident that might set off a chain reaction leading to a large-scale war. Historically, powerful rivalries nearly always lead to at least skirmishes, if not a full-blown war. The anomalous Cold War era spared the United States and Soviet Russia a direct conflict, largely from concerns that one would trigger a nuclear exchange destroying both states and much of the world. Such a repetition might reoccur in the unfolding three-cornered geopolitical world. It seems safe to acknowledge that an ascendant China and a resurgent Russia will persist in their geo-strategic ambitions. What Is To Be Done? The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union. What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by staying militarily and economically strong, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ hawkish behavior that might otherwise trigger a major conflict. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since all the countries boast nuclear arms and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously. There can be little room for error in fraught crises among nuclear-weaponized and hostile powers. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a waiting game in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

### I/ L Hikes Bad

#### Rate-hiking is the biggest risk to the economy

Long 21, economics correspondent. Before joining The Washington Post, she was a senior economics reporter at CNN and a columnist and deputy editor at the Patriot-News in Harrisburg, Pa. She also worked at an investment firm in London (Heather, “The economy isn’t going back to February 2020. Fundamental shifts have occurred.,” *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2021/06/20/us-economy-changes/>)

Then there is inflation, which hit a 13-year high in May, and is widely viewed as the biggest risk that could sink — or at least stall — the recovery’s progress. Although the Fed predicts this will be a short-lived phenomenon, businesses and consumers are already changing some behaviors. Many companies are shrinking the size of how many paper towels are in a package or how much cat food is in a can and still charging the same amount. Home builders are refusing to guarantee prices in fear that material costs will jump further, and investors are suddenly reviving interest in Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities. “Because there are now so many retirees, I think there will be more political pressure to tame any inflation,” said Lisa Cook, an economics professor at Michigan State University. “The general public has gotten used to low inflation.” All of this is coming at a time when workers are increasingly demanding more pay and better working conditions. They want more flexibility, more opportunities for workers of color and more understanding from employers of mental health and child care needs. Businesses are paying attention, largely because they are desperate for workers. There are an estimated 9.7 million job openings right now, according to job site Indeed. That’s a record, and several million more than the nation has seen before. It’s not a ‘labor shortage.’ It’s a great reassessment of work in America. How all of this will play out remains uncertain. In housing, prices in many markets are up 10 percent or more from a year ago, a very different dynamic than what the nation experienced coming out of the Great Recession. Many of the fastest growing prices are in smaller cities as Americans are relocating to places with more green space and sense of community. Advertisement A major concern is what happens now that so many first-time home buyers are being priced out because they can’t afford the hefty down payments. They will have to stay as renters. Susan Wachter, co-director of the University of Pennsylvania’s Penn Institute for Urban Research, predicts the nation is on the verge of a rental housing crisis. At the end of this month, the national eviction moratorium expires, and many landlords are eager to bump up rent and force out tenants who lost jobs in the crisis. At the same time, investors have scooped up cheap single-family homes in the hopes of renting them out for good profits. Single-family home rents were already up 5.3 percent a year as of April, according to research firm CoreLogic. “I see this coming year as a year where rents will increase by a surprisingly high amount,” Wachter said. “The affordability problem is going to extend out into more places, especially second and third-tier cities.” Advertisement In a worst-case scenario, it could lead to more homelessness, even in such a hot economy. It will almost certainly reinforce the divides between the haves and have nots. $1 million over asking: D.C. bidding wars escalate as U.S. housing crunch intensifies The same is true of the rise of automation during the pandemic. As companies looked for ways to reduce the number of people in an office, hotel or factory, they turned to robots and telework. They invested heavily in technology, which economists predict could result in one of the biggest boosts to worker productivity in years. This higher productivity forecast is one of the reasons the McKinsey Global Institute says the United States could see an economy that’s $3,500 per person bigger by 2024. But those gains are unlikely to be evenly distributed. Automation also has downsides, especially layoffs for workers without college degrees. “This is not a sure thing that we reap the benefits of faster growth without negative side effects. There are real worries about inequality,” said Susan Lund, head of the McKinsey Global Institute. “Are we able to create real opportunities for people who have been in low-wage, low skilled jobs?” Advertisement In addition to equality and housing questions, policymakers are also grappling with what will happen with inflation. The nation hasn’t seen sustained high inflation in 30 years. It’s unclear how Americans will react. There is perhaps no better illustration of the disruptive price and supply chain issues than lumber prices, which hit an eye-popping record of $1,670 per thousand board feet in May. There was a sigh of relief on Wall Street and in the White House as lumber prices on the commodities exchanges fell about $600 in the past two weeks. The price is still about three times higher than pre-pandemic norms, but it is trending down. But home builder Jerry Konter in Savannah, Ga., says reality on the ground is a lot different than charts on a Wall Street trading terminal. Sky-high prices for lumber remain at stores and many suppliers because they still have to sell all the wood they bought at the top. Konter doesn’t expect retail prices to change until August or September. Advertisement For the first time in his 44-year career building homes, Konter altered his standard contract to no longer guarantee a firm date or price. He has to explain to buyers that the price could jump and items like cabinets that used to arrive in 10 days now take four months. While hopeful for improvement, he’s preparing for high prices and supply bottlenecks to last. His expectations — and behaviors — have shifted. “I personally believe we are about to kill the golden goose in the economy with these supply issues,” Konter said, adding, “There are so many people that are being left out of getting a home because of the additional input costs. It’s almost impossible to build an entry-level home.” While many economists and Wall Street traders believe the Fed’s prediction that inflation will subside later this year, they are quick to say their biggest fear is that the Fed is wrong. If a lot of people start believing inflation of 5 percent a year is here to stay, then they will demand higher pay and businesses will respond by raising consumer prices again, igniting a vicious cycle. The Fed would have to respond to that cycle by hiking interest rates quickly, a tactic that typically causes recessions.

#### Fast hikes choke off the economy

Bizouati-Kennedy 21, citing Jay Hatfield, founder and CEO of Infrastructure Capital and portfolio manager of PFFA AND Jonathan Wiley, vice president and head of investments at Arch Global Advisors (Yaёl, 7-1-2021, "Consequences of an Unnecessary Interest Rate Hike", Yahoo, <https://www.yahoo.com/now/consequences-unnecessary-interest-rate-hike-183407629.html>)

Some observers are warning of the unnecessary consequences and issues an earlier rate hike could trigger, including slowing down the economic recovery and putting pressure on home prices. Jay Hatfield, founder and CEO of Infrastructure Capital and portfolio manager of PFFA, tells GOBankingRates that if the Fed surprises the market with faster than expected taper of quantitative easing, or even a rate hike, it could limit the economic recovery as the stock market would likely decline 10-20% with negative implications for financial conditions, consumer spending and business investment. “We do expect inflation to continue to surprise to the upside, but the Fed’s abandonment of its rigid 2% inflation target and newfound focus on its dual mandate, make a premature tightening unlikely,” Hatfield adds. The Fed indeed also significantly raised its inflation forecast, as according to meeting participants’ projections, the inflation forecast is up 3.4% from 2.4% in March, based on Fed data. Jonathan Wiley, vice president and head of investments at Arch Global Advisors, agrees, telling GOBankingRates that if the Fed decides to hike too quickly, there is a risk of them choking off the rebounding economy. “While there is clamoring for interest rates to rise soon to stem off inflationary pressures, we take the position that any price increases will only be transitory, as there are base effects. Falling yields on the 10-year of late would indicate as much. Further large, stimulative government expenditures could possibly change our opinion. However, progress remains slow in Washington. There is a delicate [Nik] Wallenda-like balancing act taking place, failing to signal properly can spook the markets as well,” he adds.

#### Rate hikes cause short- AND long-term downturn

Guida 11-2-2021, Economics Reporter @ Politico. (Victoria, "The Fed is ready to rein in its aid. Market tremors are already emerging.", *POLITICO*, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/11/02/fed-interest-rate-hike-518405>)

For the Federal Reserve, this could be a year of living dangerously. The central bank is expected to announce this week plans to begin withdrawing its massive support for the economy, the first step in winding down the historic cash infusions it launched to save markets during the pandemic. What could come next — interest rate hikes — is causing angst among the Wall Street investors who finance the nation's debt and creating potential peril for Democrats on the 2022 campaign trail. Weaker-than-projected economic growth in the last quarter, a jobs slowdown and supply chain snags that are likely to continue deep into next year are all sending warning signs for President Joe Biden’s economy, despite an overall positive outlook that has sent the stock market soaring. At the same time, top Fed officials are increasingly voicing concern that inflation will stay higher for longer than they expected. As a result, some on Wall Street are worried that the Fed might raise borrowing costs as early as the middle of next year to fight price surges, a move that could jeopardize the recovery. Political progressives have similar concerns, but their focus is on ordinary Americans. “What problems would an interest rate hike solve and what problems would an interest rate hike create?” said Lindsay Owens, executive director of the Groundwork Collaborative, one of many progressive groups that have pressed the Fed to keep rates low until full employment is reached. “How did the American economy end up in a place where our supply chain is so shoddy that we can’t stock frozen pizza? When you think about that, the answer is not related to monetary policy.” The prospect of the central bank raising interest rates during an election year could cause tremors in the political world, with Democrats seeking to maintain their hair-thin majorities in Congress. Biden’s stewardship of the economy is a make-or-break issue for voters, and GOP lawmakers have hammered away at his big-spending policies as the driver of price surges. The White House and many economists point to production and shipping delays as the main culprit. The clearest sign of concern in the markets over the economy? Rates on long-term U.S. debt recently dipped below those on some shorter-term debt, a rare event known as a yield curve inversion that shows expectations of slower growth and has been the harbinger of recessions in the past. A slowing economy is not just an American concern: Yield curves in the Euro-zone flattened last week after the European Central Bank confirmed expectations for rate increases beginning next year. Markets aren’t predicting a downturn yet, said Roberto Perli, founding partner of research firm Cornerstone Macro and a former Fed economist. But they are saying: “By tightening [credit] prematurely, the Fed will compromise the long-term prospects for the U.S. economy.” In an interview Sunday with Bloomberg News, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen said she wasn’t worried about the movement in Treasury yields: “No, not me. I think what we’re going to see is a good, solid recovery. The unemployment rate has gone down considerably, and this is nothing like the recovery from the 2008 financial crisis.” Fed policymakers begin two days of meetings today, after which they’re expected to announce plans to start pulling back the $120 billion in monthly bond purchases the central bank has carried out since the pandemic began, a move that was designed to depress interest rates. Fed officials have said that once that is completed, likely by mid-2022, they may begin a new cycle of raising rates That means the next year will be a delicate dance for the central bank, which hasn’t sent a definite signal yet whether rate hikes are likely, and the immediate challenge facing either Fed Chair Jerome Powell, if he is reappointed, or his successor. If the Fed moves too quickly to rein in consumer and business spending to cool inflation, it would be damaging to longer-term growth and job creation. If the central bank waits too long, it would have to act more aggressively to raise borrowing costs down the road, which could also trigger a recession. “It’s a no-win situation the Fed has been put in,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the American Action Forum and the former head of the Congressional Budget Office.

### I/L Hikes Bad – Emerging Economies

#### Rate hikes devastate emerging economies

Hoek 21, \*Jasper, PhD, Chief of Emerging Markets @ the Federal Reserve, \*\*Emre Yoldas, PhD, MA, Chief of the Global Monetary and Sovereign Markets Section @ the Federal Reserve, \*\*\*Steve Kamin, PhD, senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. (6-23-2021, "Are Rising U.S. Interest Rates Destabilizing for Emerging Market Economies?", Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/are-rising-u-s-interest-rates-destabilizing-for-emerging-market-economies-20210623.htm>)

Rising U.S. interest rates are often thought to be bad news for emerging market economies (EMEs) as they increase debt burdens, trigger capital outflows, and generally cause a tightening of financial conditions that can lead to financial crises. Indeed, as shown in Figure 1 below, the rise in the federal funds rate (the black line) during the Volcker disinflation of the early 1980s was associated with a sharp rise in the incidence of financial crises in EMEs (the green bars). However, on other occasions, such as in the mid-2000s, EMEs weathered rising U.S. rates with few difficulties.

Figure 1. Federal Funds Rate versus Incidence of Financial Crises in EMEs
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Figure 1. Federal Funds Rate versus Incidence of Financial Crises in EMEs. See accessible link for data.

Note: Fed funds rate data are from Haver. Crisis data are from Laeven and Valencia (2018) and run through 2017. Gray areas are times when the FFR is increasing.
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What accounts for differences in the so-called "spillovers" of U.S. monetary policy to emerging markets? Our recent research shows that financial spillovers to EMEs of U.S. monetary policy depend on two key factors.2 The first of these is the reason for the change in U.S. interest rates. A rise in interest rates driven by favorable growth prospects is likely to have relatively benign effects on emerging financial markets, since the benefits of higher U.S. GDP through increased import demand from its trading partners and increased investor confidence should mute the costs of higher rates. Conversely, if higher rates are driven mainly by worries about inflation or a hawkish turn in Fed policy, which we jointly describe as monetary news, this will likely be more disruptive for emerging markets. The second key factor influencing the spillovers from U.S. monetary policy is the domestic conditions in the EMEs themselves; financial conditions in economies with higher macroeconomic vulnerabilities tend to be more sensitive to a given rise in U.S. interest rates.

### AT Hikes Solve

#### Fed can’t check when there are supply constraints. If they try, that collapses the economy

Ip 7-21-2021 (Greg, “How Inflation Threatens the Recovery,” *Wall Street Journal*, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-inflation-threatens-the-recovery-11626876000>)

Surveys suggest higher inflation is now consumers’ biggest concern. It is also politically risky for President Biden, who this week said the Federal Reserve should deal with it. But the Fed’s tools, namely higher interest rates, work by cooling demand. They are useless when the problem is restricted supply. In fact, raising rates in the face of a supply shock could aggravate the economic damage and perversely make future inflation too low, as the European Central Bank discovered when it did just that in 2008 because of higher oil prices.

#### Hikes in this environment are uniquely damaging

Summers 21, a professor at and past president of Harvard University. He was treasury secretary from 1999 to 2001 and an economic adviser to President Barack Obama from 2009 through 2010. (Lawrence, 5-24-2021, "Opinion: The inflation risk is real", *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/05/24/inflation-risk-is-real/>)

It is possible that the Fed could contain inflationary pressures by raising interest rates without damaging the economy. But in the current environment, where markets around the world have been primed to believe that rates will remain very low for the foreseeable future, that will be very difficult, especially given the Fed’s new commitment to wait until sustained inflation is apparent before acting. The history here is not encouraging. Every time the Fed has hit the brakes hard enough to slow growth meaningfully, the economy has gone into recession.

### AT Tariff XO Solves

#### He probably won’t do it and it isn’t sufficient

Tan 6/20

Su-Lin, Senior Correspondent with CNBC, “Former U.S. ambassador says lifting China tariffs could slash inflation by 1% over time, help Biden in midterms” June 20, 2022 <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/06/21/former-us-ambassador-says-lifting-china-tariffs-could-cut-inflation.html> dmr

However, Robert Daly, director of the Wilson Center’s Kissinger Institute on China and the U.S. was skeptical about both Washington’s drive to lift tariffs and their contribution to inflation. He said the political pressure to stay tough on China would outweigh Biden’s desire to look after consumers and relieve them of the burden of bearing a higher cost of living. “If he simply unilaterally lifted those tariffs without getting anything from China, he would get a lot of pressure from Republicans, especially in the Senate, who would call him soft on China,” Daly said. Like Daly, Capital Economics’ Williams was also uncertain abolishing tariffs would do much to tame inflation. He said doing so would only reduce CPI by “a few tenths of a percent,” not 1% as others have predicted. “Putting the tariffs on didn’t cause inflation to rise much,” he told CNBC.

# Affirmative

## \*\*N/U\*\*

### Won’t Pass

#### Won’t pass – not enough time and Manchin and Sinema are far from onboard

Becker 6-21-22 [Bernie Becker is a tax reporter for POLITICO Pro, "Another week, another BBB update", POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-tax/2022/06/21/another-week-another-bbb-update-00040903] GBS-HW

It hasn’t been a fast-moving process. But Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer haven’t stopped talking about a slighter version of the Build Back Better agenda that Democrats were pushing last year. Manchin and Schumer met twice last week on a potential measure to raise taxes on the rich and corporations, and enact new climate and prescription drug provisions, as our Burgess Everett reported. Democrats also are sounding increasingly confident that a deal can be reached at some point before Congress breaks for the August recess. But as with everything BBB-related, it’s probably not wise to make any grand assumptions yet about whether Democrats will or won’t be able to work something out in the end. This much is clear, though — Democrats still have plenty of hurdles to clear before a slimmer BBB might make it to President Joe Biden’s desk. ABOUT THOSE HURDLES: The first obstacle for Democrats is pretty clear — finding a deal that Manchin will sign off on. But there’s a related issue there for Democrats, too: Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) hasn’t taken part in these Manchin-Schumer talks, by design — though she’s also quite busy with the gun control talks. Still, Sinema’s opposition to tax rate increases led Democrats to something of a grab bag of revenue raisers for the first BBB, so she’ll still have to bless whatever (if anything) might come out of the current discussions. And then there’s the calendar: Congress has a two-week recess after it completes its work for this week. Once lawmakers return, the House is only scheduled to be in session for three more weeks before it heads out for August recess. (The Senate has a fourth week on the books.) So Democrats don’t have a ton of time for this deal to come together, though Schumer and his team are already starting to bounce potential ideas off the Senate parliamentarian. To put that another way: Basically everyone acknowledges that the current talks between Schumer and Manchin are real. But some people closely watching the situation wonder if the discussions are moving quickly enough given that July is right around the corner. One final point: Everyone that Weekly Tax reached out to on Monday thought that a BBB-light bill wouldn’t die in the House, if it makes it through the Senate. There’s a variety of reasons for that. But perhaps first and foremost: People have a hard time imagining that a big bill like this would go down on Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s watch, especially as questions still swirl about how long she’ll stay as House Democratic leader. Actually, something else to consider: "Manchin resistance to clean energy provision could harm Biden’s climate goals," from our Josh Siegel and Kelsey Tamborrino.

Won’t pass – Manchin is a hater and legislative calendar leaves no room

Dillon 6/16

Jeremy, EE News Reporter, “Reconciliation redux? Pelosi, Schumer huddle with Biden,” June 16, 2022

https://www.eenews.net/articles/reconciliation-redux-pelosi-schumer-huddle-with-biden/dmr

Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) huddled with President Joe Biden yesterday afternoon to discuss a host of issues related to inflation that sound a lot like the contours of a potential reconciliation package. “They discussed their plans for fighting the global problem of inflation that is affecting every major economy, such as bringing down prescription drug and energy costs, and adding to the historic deficit reduction we have accomplished,” the White House said in a readout of the meeting. Prescription drugs, clean energy and deficit reduction have emerged as central tenets in the new reconciliation push underway by Senate Democrats to attract the support of Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.), whose opposition killed the House-passed, $1.7 trillion “Build Back Better Act” late last year. The White House readout did not specifically say the meeting was about reconciliation. Democrats in both chambers are working to advance legislation to address high costs in food and energy, though there is slim chance those measures pass the Senate. Manchin and his staff met with Schumer on Tuesday in the latest talks between the two lawmakers. Both declined comment following the meeting. Manchin has suggested he would support a package that would bring down the costs of prescription drugs while also unleashing a host of clean energy tax credits seen as critical to decarbonizing the electric sector. Those provisions must be accompanied by deficit reduction provisions, Manchin has insisted. Democrats had hoped to resurrect a deal on reconciliation by the Memorial Day recess, but the holiday passed without major action. A lengthy August recess looms over the congressional calendar.

### No PC – Gas Tax Thumper

#### Gas tax thumps.

Wagner 6-22 [John Wagner, 06-22-2022, "Post Politics Now: With new evidence coming in, Jan. 6 panel to continue hearings in July", Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/06/22/biden-gas-tax-jan6-committee/, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

Meanwhile, President Biden called on Congress to suspend the federal gas tax for three months in a bid to provide some relief to drivers. But the plan faces head winds on Capitol Hill, where even some senior members of his own party have questioned the wisdom of a gas tax holiday, suggesting that the savings won’t be passed on to consumers. During remarks from the White House, Biden called on gas companies to pass along “every penny.”

#### Biden is using PC to get it passed right now.

Olander 6-22 [Olivia Olander, 6-22-2022, "Biden blames Russia for gas prices as he presses Congress, states and oil companies", POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/22/biden-russia-gas-prices-tax-00041486, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

The White House on Wednesday again blamed Russia’s war in Ukraine for recent hikes in fuel prices, as President Joe Biden pushed for Congress to suspend the federal gas tax. Both Biden and Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm acknowledged on Wednesday that a gas tax holiday wouldn’t be enough on its own to counteract the forces raising gas prices, but framed it as an important step in a continuing process to help American consumers as oil supplies are constrained. “We could have turned a blind eye to Putin’s murderous ways,” Biden said in a short speech at the White House, referring to President Vladimir Putin of Russia. “The price of gas wouldn’t have spiked the way it has. I believe that would have been wrong.” The president contrasted the bipartisan support for Ukraine with criticism of his administration on rising gas prices. His administration has faced mounting disapproval for near-record levels of inflation. “Are you saying that we would rather have lower gas prices in America and Putin’s iron fist in Europe?” Biden said. “I don’t believe that.” Biden asked oil companies to increase refining capacity and pass “every penny” of their savings from the proposed gas tax holiday on to consumers. Earlier Wednesday he called for a three-month suspension of the 18-cent-per-gallon federal gas tax, but it seems unlikely to pass in Congress. The conversation between the administration and both Democrats and Republicans is ongoing, Granholm said. “I would hope that both sides of the aisle are listening to their constituents about getting relief,” she said at the daily White House press briefing.

### No PC 2ac

#### Biden spent all of his pc – low approval ratings preclude him bouncing back

Politi 6/23 [James Politi, WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF, 06-23-2022, "Biden’s blues: is the US president out of political capital?", No Publication, https://www.ft.com/content/3ed8d073-531e-480b-8ce7-44c848c03cfa, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

But it also reflected a more disturbing reality for the 79-year-old president: in the space of just 17 months, he has already burnt a lot of the political capital he had when he walked into the Oval Office in January last year. According to the Realclearpolitics.com polling average, just 39.6 per cent of voters approve of Biden’s performance in the White House so far, compared with 54.9 per cent who disapprove — a wide gap of 15 percentage points that will be hard to close. On its own, Biden’s ratings slump could bring a midterm loss big enough to cripple his legislative agenda for the rest of his first term in office. But it will also raise doubts about his viability as a candidate for re-election in 2024. He says he intends to run for a second term, health permitting. Things could still get worse. Biden is facing not just political polarisation and rising prices but the risk of a recession that could hit around the time that his re-election campaign begins. Having initially moved cautiously to tackle inflation, Federal Reserve chair Jay Powell is now being more aggressive in pushing for higher rates, and said on Wednesday that a downturn was “certainly a possibility.” Although Biden has backed the central banker, a sharply slowing economy may inflict a new blow to his own political prospects and those of fellow Democrats. All things considered, Biden is facing the worst possible environment for an incumbent in need of a bounce back. “What’s most important for Biden and his party is just how bad things look right now, with just five months to go until the midterms,” said Cameron Easley, a senior editor at Morning Consult, the data and polling group. “At this point in his presidency, Donald Trump was a good bit more popular than Biden is right now.”

### No PC – Inflation

#### No pc – inflation and polarization

Politi 6/23 [James Politi, WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF, 06-23-2022, "Biden’s blues: is the US president out of political capital?", No Publication, https://www.ft.com/content/3ed8d073-531e-480b-8ce7-44c848c03cfa, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

While both those presidents recovered to win second terms, it is far from clear whether Biden is able to engineer a similar comeback. He is now caught between his critics on the left, who believe he has failed to deliver on a promise of transformational economic and social change, and moderates within the party, who insist he has paid too much deference to progressives on both policy goals and personnel choices. Meanwhile, his key economic achievement of delivering a rapid recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic with a quick return to very low unemployment has been eclipsed by rising inflation. Consumer prices rose in May at an annual rate of 8.6 per cent, a 40-year high. Political analysts and pollsters say the unhappiness in the country is even broader than inflation. The gloom reflects disappointment that the US has failed to return to normal under Biden’s watch, they say, given the war in Ukraine, wave after wave of Covid and the arrival of supply chain disruptions redolent of a 1970s-style economy. The Federal Reserve now looks likely to increase interest rates much more aggressively than expected in the coming months to limit price gains. Such a heavy-handed tightening could lead to a slowdown in growth and in the labour market, with the odds of a recession over the next two years rising sharply. Unlike Trump, who repeatedly singled out Powell for criticism, Biden has pledged to respect the Fed’s independence as it decides the best way to tackle inflation. But that means he won’t be able to control or direct much of the country’s macroeconomic trajectory — and he will be aware of the list of presidents who failed to be re-elected due to economic malaise, from Jimmy Carter in 1980 to George HW Bush in 1992. “It’s a question of conditions and how people are feeling about their lives,” says Bob Shrum, a Democratic strategist and professor of politics at USC. “If you have a big recession next year, and we’re not out of it by 2024, [Biden] could find himself in the same position as Bush in 1992,” he adds. On top of all that, US politics remains starkly polarised, despite Biden’s goal of delivering more “unity” to a society torn apart in the wake of Trump’s four years in the Oval Office. Republicans have strenuously opposed much of Biden’s agenda, and there are bitter divisions over a number of issues ranging from abortion rights to the findings of the Congressional panel investigating the January 6 attacks on the US Capitol. “People are really, really down”, Biden conceded in an interview with the Associated Press last week.

#### Biden’s pc is gone – low approval ratings and rising prices will dominate the rest of his agenda

**Politi 6/23** – Financial Times Washington Bureau Chief (James, “Biden’s blues: is the US president out of political capital?” Financial Times, 6-23-22,https://www.ft.com/content/3ed8d073-531e-480b-8ce7-44c848c03cfa) //sg

At the Beverly Hills home of media mogul Haim Saban earlier this month, Joe Biden painted a **grim picture** for a group of Democratic donors to illustrate the political battles that lie ahead for the party. The US president said it was essential to protect against a Republican party dominated by Donald Trump’s Make America Great Again movement, which is gearing up for a fight in November’s midterm elections — and to try to take back the White House in 2024. “Here’s the deal, guys: what you’re doing here really, really matters. We cannot afford to let this MAGA Republican party win. We can’t.” “The rest of the world is looking to us,” Biden continued. “There really is [a question of] ‘What happens if the US goes back to a Trumpian government?’ It is a gigantic, gigantic setback.” The warning was intended to mobilise donor support for Democrats up and down the ballot ahead of the midterms, when significant defeats are expected, including the probable loss of control of the House of Representatives and a possible move to minority status in the Senate. But it also reflected a more disturbing reality for the 79-year-old president: in the space of just 17 months, he has already **burnt a lot of the political capital** he had when he walked into the Oval Office in January last year. According to the Realclearpolitics.com polling average, **just 39.6 per cent of voters approve of Biden’s performance** in the White House so far, compared with 54.9 per cent who disapprove — a wide gap of 15 percentage points that will be hard to close. On its own, Biden’s ratings slump could bring a midterm loss big enough to ~~cripple~~ [undermine] his legislative agenda for the rest of his first term in office. But it will also raise doubts about his viability as a candidate for re-election in 2024. He says he intends to run for a second term, health permitting. Things could still get worse. Biden is facing not just political polarisation and rising prices but the **risk of a recession** that could hit around the time that his re-election campaign begins. Having initially moved cautiously to tackle inflation, Federal Reserve chair Jay Powell is now being more aggressive in pushing for higher rates, and said on Wednesday that a downturn was “certainly a possibility”.

### No PC – Ukraine

#### Ukraine war is sapping his pc

**Wong 22** - senior congressional reporter for NBC News (Scott, “Russia's war in Ukraine upends Democrats' gathering — and election-year agenda,” NBC News, 3-6-2022, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/russias-war-ukraine-upends-democrats-gathering-election-year-agenda-rcna19670>) //sg

The stark reality, however, is that **Russia’s war**, now in its third week, **is sapping a lot of time, energy and political capital from Biden** and congressional lawmakers, and further jeopardizing the party’s already slim chances to repackage pieces of its stalled Build Back Better plan and pass it through Congress. Not only did they work furiously over the past several weeks to assemble and pass a bipartisan **$13.6 billion emergency** military and humanitarian aid **package** for Ukraine; Biden and lawmakers **also have been working on a series of economic sanctions** targeting Vladimir Putin, his oligarchs and Russian financial institutions. Next week, the House and Senate, with backing from Biden, are expected to vote to revoke Russia’s “most favored nation” trade status — the latest escalation in what has become an all-out economic war with Putin. “The idea that we’re going to send in offensive equipment and have planes and tanks and trains going in with American pilots and American crews — just understand, don’t kid yourself. No matter what y’all say, that’s called World War III, OK?” Biden said. “Let’s get it straight here guys.” The Biden administration this week killed a plan to transfer Poland's MiG 29 fighter jets to Ukraine, leaving some lawmakers surprised, frustrated and vowing to take matters into their own hands. “I think there’s a broad agreement in the Democratic Caucus … that we should provide MiGs and provide support,” Rep. Jason Crow, D-Colo., a combat veteran, said in an interview. “I just think that is a reflection of where the American people are and the pressure that we’re getting in our districts and in the country. The American people want us to help Ukraine survive and to do what’s necessary, short of going to war with Russia.” “The idea that we’re going to send in offensive equipment and have planes and tanks and trains going in with American pilots and American crews — just understand, don’t kid yourself. No matter what y’all say, that’s called World War III, OK?” Biden said. “Let’s get it straight here guys.” The Biden administration this week killed a plan to transfer Poland's MiG 29 fighter jets to Ukraine, leaving some lawmakers surprised, frustrated and vowing to take matters into their own hands. “I think there’s a broad agreement in the Democratic Caucus … that we should provide MiGs and provide support,” Rep. Jason Crow, D-Colo., a combat veteran, said in an interview. “I just think that is a reflection of where the American people are and the pressure that we’re getting in our districts and in the country. The American people want us to help Ukraine survive and to do what’s necessary, short of going to war with Russia.” So far, voters support Biden’s response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine. But Biden’s handling of the **war has not given a bounce to his sagging favorability numbers**. A Wall Street Journal survey out Friday showed that 57 percent of voters disapprove of Biden’s performance, while only 42 percent approve. Those numbers are likely driven by rising inflation and gas prices, which are hitting the pocketbooks of Americans even as the economy heats up and the unemployment rate falls.

### No PC – AR

#### Record low approval ratings prove his agenda is stalled

Patteson 6/23 – NY Post politics reporter (Callie, “Biden’s job approval rating slips to lowest level in months, NY Post, 6-23-22, [https://nypost.com/2022/06/23/president-bidens-approval-rating-slips-to-36-percent/#](https://nypost.com/2022/06/23/president-bidens-approval-rating-slips-to-36-percent/)) //sg

President Biden’s approval rating has continued to slip this month, hitting 36% — **one of the lowest levels seen in the past few months**, according to a new survey. A recent Reuters/Ipsos opinion poll finished Wednesday found that the president’s job approval rating **dropped three percentage points in just one week** and six percentage points from the start of June. Wednesday’s findings are just shy of the president’s average approval rating, which sits at approximately 39.8%, according to data collected by RealClearPolitics. The average rating hit a record low of 38.9% on June 13. Biden’s approval rating hit **a record low of 33% earlier this month**, a Quinnipiac University survey found, and the president has struggled to regain Americans’ confidence as inflation continues to soar. Even **members of his own party have lost trust in Biden**, with only 73% approving of the job he is doing as president — down one percentage point from the week before while also down a whopping 12 percentage points from a similar survey done in August.

### No PC – Covid/Gas Prices

#### PC’s burnt out---Covid, Gas, Ukraine, nosediving approval all tank influence

Barnini Chakraborty, Senior Investigation Reporter at the Washington Examiner, 6-25-2022, "At-risk Democrats distance themselves from Biden ahead of midterm elections ," Washington Examiner, https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/campaigns/at-risk-democrats-distance-themselves-from-biden-ahead-of-midterm-elections//DG

Biden has burned through almost all of the political capital he had when he was sworn into office last year. His popularity has taken a nosedive amid his struggles to contain the COVID-19 pandemic, soaring gas prices, and multiple foreign crises. His public approval rating fell for a fourth straight week to 36%, matching its lowest level seen in May, according to a Reuters/Ipsos opinion poll released Thursday. His overall approval rating has stayed below 50% since August. Sen. Rick Scott (R-FL), who leads the National Republican Senatorial Committee, told the Washington Post his organization is spending big to "make sure voters know that Senate Democrats have supported Joe Biden and his inflation-inducing, gas price-raising, border crisis-creating agenda almost 100% of the time." Biden's popularity problems are threatening to overturn gains in state legislatures.

### No PC – Saudi Visit

#### PC link thumped---he went all in on Saudi

Laura Kelly and Rachel Frazin, 6-12-2022, "Biden political gamble on Saudi trip unlikely to drive down gas prices," Hill, https://thehill.com/policy/3519473-biden-political-gamble-on-saudi-trip-unlikely-to-drive-down-gas-prices//DG

President [Biden](https://thehill.com/people/biden/)is using key political capital on a risky gamble – that meeting with condemned Saudi Crown Prince [Mohammed bin Salman](https://thehill.com/people/mohammed-bin-salman/)will convince the Kingdom to stabilize global oil markets and ease prices for Americans at the gas pump.   But experts say it’s not guaranteed that the trip will produce lower gasoline prices and the political cost may be far greater for the president.  “I don’t believe there’s an amount of oil the Saudis could provide that would substantially reduce U.S. gas prices. It will be difficult for Biden to come away with something he can call a win,” Samantha Gross, fellow and director of the Energy Security and Climate Initiative at the Brookings Institution, told The Hill.

## \*\*AT I/L\*\*

### PC is Fake

#### PC is fake.

Waldman 12-2-2020, columnist @ Plum Line for WaPo (Paul, “Joe Biden has to move fast,” *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/12/02/joe-biden-has-move-fast/>)//BB

Slow-walking will absolutely be the Republican strategy, on both appointments and legislation. They won’t come out and say they’re going to stonewall every appointee and refuse to allow any legislation to pass; instead they’ll say that they just want to make sure Biden doesn’t stock his administration with radical leftists and propose far-out socialist laws. Send us the nominees and the bills, and we’ll consider them. It’ll just take some time. Weeks will then stretch into months, and the Biden agenda will languish. They’ve done it before — Obama himself describes how they endlessly dragged out negotiations on the Affordable Care Act by claiming they might support it — and they’ll do it again. That’s the Republican plan. The first step to getting around it is to understand that the public won’t blame gridlock on the ones who are causing it. They’ll just see a bunch of bickering in Washington with nothing getting done, and Biden will be the one who takes the blame. Once you realize that the public is neither aware of nor particularly concerned about process questions, you can stop worrying about whether Republicans will squawk at this appointment or that executive order — because they’ll squawk no matter what you do. If it’s a good idea and you think the results will be good, then just do it. As quickly and comprehensively as possible. As David Roberts of Vox observes: In 2009, Obama and his aides made the mistake of thinking that their major initiatives had to be rolled out one at a time in sequence, because he had a finite store of “political capital” that had to be spent carefully. But political capital is not something that exists apart from any particular issue; it isn’t a special sauce that has to be poured on a policy in order to make it palatable. And with the parties as polarized and unified as they are, political capital has become all but meaningless. There may have been a time when a popular president possessed so much capital that a senator from the opposition party would feel compelled to support him on part of that president’s agenda, but that time is long gone. There is no account Biden can draw on to turn Republican “no” votes into “yes.” So setting up a series of high-profile policy battles may be the opposite of what Biden should do. The unfortunate fact is that he may not have the opportunity to do much in the way of big legislation on health care or climate change or anything else, and if he has only executive power to work with, it makes it all the more urgent to move quickly. Which means getting staff in place immediately and then unleashing them. The Revolving Door Project argues that Biden should give as much authority as possible to the agencies to let them dismantle their particular corners of the Trump legacy on their own, because the task “simply will not happen if approached sequentially or micromanaged” by a White House staff with limited bandwidth. That means moving on every policy area all at once. There’s nothing to be gained by putting off any part of Biden’s agenda. Whatever he can do given the limits of his power, he should do as soon as possible, in a flood of policymaking. Even if Democrats win both Georgia races and control the Senate, Biden should acknowledge that he likely has two years until the 2022 midterm elections to pass whatever legislation he can. Not only will Democrats probably lose one or both houses in the inevitable backlash (as happens to most presidents in their first midterm), the only possible chance at forestalling that result is to get results, as many as possible, that he can show the voters. Republicans will complain that Biden is being partisan, uncompromising, taking a “my way or the highway” approach. It will be a strategy to convince everyone of the lie that Biden and Democrats might be able to find some way of winning them over, when in fact they’ll be implementing a strategy of total opposition. If Biden follows them on that fruitless quest, he’ll be running in circles while crucial time passes and nothing gets done. The only option for him is to decide not to care about Republican whining and do what he got elected to do with all haste. The alternative is failure.

### Biden Not K/

#### Schumer is pushing, not Biden.

Czuczka 6/19 [Tony Czuczka, 6-19-2022, "Biden Aide Says Inflation Fight Can Advance If Congress Helps", Time, <span class="skimlinks-unlinked">https://time.com/6189130/biden-inflation</span>/, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

“We’re working very closely with congressional leadership, with Senate leadership on that,” and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer is working with his caucus on, Deese said. “And we’re hopeful that we will see progress on that in the coming weeks.” “The single most impactful thing that we could do right now is to work with Congress to pass legislation that would lower the costs of things that families are facing right now,” he said.

### Compartmentalization

#### Lawmakers compartmentalize

Pergram 18 (Chad Pergram, Congressional reporter. “Amid Kavanaugh cacophony, Congress forges bipartisan agreements on key issues”. October 13, 2018. <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/amid-kavanaugh-cacophony-congress-forges-bipartisan-agreements-on-key-issues>)

Step back from the Kavanaugh cacophony. Examine what lawmakers from both parties in both chambers accomplished in September and early October, with virtually zero fanfare. Amid the turmoil, Congress approved the first revamp of national aviation policy in years. The Senate approved the final version of the legislation 93-6. This came after a staggering six extensions due to bickering and disagreement. Then, Congress approved a sweeping, bipartisan measure to combat opioid abuse. The House okayed the package 393-8. The Senate adopted the measure 98-1. And, there was no government shutdown. The House and Senate came to terms on two bipartisan bills which funded five of the 12 annual spending bills which operate the government. The sides agreed to latch an additional measure to one of the spending plans to fund the remaining seven areas of federal spending through December 7. President Trump briefly threatened to force a government shutdown if lawmakers didn’t include money for his border wall in the plan. But the President ultimately punted that battle until December. Democrats praised Republicans for keeping conservative “poison pill” riders out of the appropriations bills. That decision drew Democratic support for the measures. The Senate approved a bipartisan water and infrastructure package. McConnell hailed the bipartisanship which descended upon the Senate – even as the senators fought over Kavanaugh. Nearly in the same breath, McConnell derided boisterous, anti-Kavanaugh protesters outside the Capitol as a “mob.” McConnell insisted this week he needed the Senate to clear a slate of 15 conservative judges to lower courts before he could cut senators loose for the midterm elections. McConnell and Schumer appeared at loggerheads. McConnell’s goal was clear: extract the confirmation of these nominees – or tether to Washington vulnerable Democratic senators from battleground states to keep them off the campaign trail. Schumer knew McConnell would ultimately prevail on the nominees after the midterms. So the New York Democrat accepted McConnell’s ransom, permitting the Senate vote on a slate of nominees on Thursday night. Schumer also extracted a concession from McConnell: send senators home until November 13th. One may wonder how lawmakers can find themselves in an imbroglio over a major issue like Kavanaugh – yet forge major bipartisan accords on other. Frankly, that’s just politics. Politics always elicits strange bedfellows. Successful lawmakers know they should compartmentalize their disputes. The enemy today may be your best ally tomorrow.

### Winners Win

#### Winner’s win---spending PC rebuilds it

Kane 7-24-2021, The Washington Post's senior congressional correspondent and columnist (Paul, “Day-to-day, Biden’s agenda looks rocky. But congressional Democrats say things are far rosier if you take the long view.,” *Washington Post*, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/biden-agenda-democrats-congress/2021/07/24/83b776be-ebc0-11eb-ba5d-55d3b5ffcaf1\_story.html)

There is, so far at least, little fear that Democrats are spreading themselves too thin by eschewing the traditional practice of focusing on a handful of domestic policy issues in the first two years of an administration. “Political momentum and political capital is like a muscle. The more you exercise it, the more of it you have. It is not like a finite resource that you can run out of if you spend too much of it. What happens is that if we do a lot of positive things, then we’ve got more political clout to do even more positive things,” Sen. Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii) said. But there is an undercurrent of fear that Democrats lost focus on battling the pandemic and that those gains might be forgotten if current trend lines prompt new shutdowns. “We’ve done a good job over the last several months. But we’re going to have to continue to do it with aggressiveness and precision because the other side has no interest in governing and is going to spend all their time trying to mischaracterize public policy wins,” Rep. Hakeem Jeffries (D-N.Y.), who is in charge of messaging in Pelosi’s leadership team, said. Some worry that the Biden administration needs to stay focused on promoting the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan, fearful of mistakes similar to 12 years ago, when the Obama administration neglected to promote its roughly $800 billion economic recovery bill after it passed a month into office. “I don’t think they’ve gotten enough credit for the extraordinary logistical and managerial effort to manage the rollout of the vaccine. That was a big task. And I think it was managed effectively. And I think that’s maybe the most important thing and the least discussed,” Sen. Angus King (I-Maine) said. In late 2010, while he was still a college professor, King wrote an essay, “The Democrats Beat Themselves,” citing how poorly the Obama administration sold the economic recovery. “Basically, the President was subjected to a two-year, nonstop ‘Swift Boating’ and never really fought back,” King wrote after the 2010 political bloodbath for Democrats. So, yes, on Tuesday, federal health officials reported more than 62,000 new cases of the deadly virus as 314 Americans died of the virus. A day earlier, the stock market tumbled more than 700 points amid fears of the health crisis causing another economic shock. But exactly six months earlier — Jan. 20, the day Biden was sworn in under strict social distancing and masking guidelines outside the Capitol — there were more than 185,000 new virus cases and a rolling weekly average of almost 200,000, with 4,440 deaths caused by covid-19 that day. On Jan. 20, the Dow Jones industrial average stood at 31,188, far below the closing of 34,512 six months later. Labor Department reports this month showed strong wage growth amid steady job growth that suggests sometime next year, the economy will recover all the lost jobs from the pandemic. In June and most of July, Biden tried to move past the pandemic and focused his attention on the bipartisan infrastructure plan and the proposed $3.5 trillion budget plan that is favored by liberals. Those two packages are filled with campaign pledges to remake government support for the middle class, the most ambitious budgets since the Great Society proposals of the 1960s. Democrats will need to make Congress spend a lot more time in Washington if they want to get Biden’s agenda passed Democrats defend these proposals as worthy of the big moment the nation faces. “We are confronting a multitude of crises, including a once-in-a-century covid-19 pandemic, a democracy crisis, a racial justice crisis and a climate crisis all at the same time,” Jeffries said. Schatz views the old presidential model of focusing on a couple big things as outdated. “The model from the ’80s was if you do too many things, people are going to get freaked out. And I think the danger here is not doing enough rather than doing too much,” he said.

## \*\*AT Link\*\*

## No AI Ethics Link

### No Link – Dems Love LAWS Ban

#### Regulating LAWs is not politically controversial – the US is not developing LAWs and extending reforms to NATO wouldn’t change domestic policy

CRS 21 [Congressional Research Service, “Emerging Military Technologies: Background and Issues for Congress”, CRS Report, <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=859924>] GBS-HW

The United States is not known to be developing LAWS, nor does it currently have LAWS in its inventory; however, there is no prohibition on the development, fielding, or employment of LAWS. DODD 3000.09 establishes DOD guidelines for the future development and fielding of LAWS to ensure that they comply with “the law of war, applicable treaties, weapon system safety rules, and applicable rules of engagement.” This directive includes a requirement that LAWS be designed to “allow commanders and operators to exercise appropriate levels of human judgment over the use of force.” “Human judgment over the use of force” does not require manual human “control” of the weapon system, as is often reported, but instead requires broader human involvement in decisions about how, when, where, and why the weapon will be employed. In addition, DODD 3000.09 requires that the software and hardware of all systems, including lethal autonomous weapons, be tested and evaluated to ensure they [f]unction as anticipated in realistic operational environments against adaptive adversaries; complete engagements in a timeframe consistent with commander and operator intentions and, if unable to do so, terminate engagements or seek additional human operator input before continuing the engagement; and are sufficiently robust to minimize failures that could lead to unintended engagements or to loss of control of the system to unauthorized parties. Any changes to a system’s operating state—for example, due to machine learning—would require the system to be retested and reevaluated to ensure that it has retained its safety features and ability to operate as intended. In addition to the standard weapons review process, LAWS must undergo a secondary senior-level review by the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and either the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment or the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering prior to both development and fielding. DOD is reportedly in the process of developing a handbook to guide senior leaders through this review.

#### Congress supports LAW regulation – Democrats united

McGovern 16 [Jim McGovern is a Congressman from Massachusetts, "McGovern, House Democrats Call for White House to Strengthen Safeguards on “Killer Robots”", Jim McGovern Press Release https://mcgovern.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=396941] GBS-HW

Today, U.S. Congressman Jim McGovern (D-MA) led a group of House Democrats in a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry and Defense Secretary Ash Carter to push for meaningful human control as a safeguard on lethal autonomous weapons systems, also known as fully autonomous weapons or so-called “killer robots – an emerging and concerning military technology. The letter comes ahead of the upcoming Fifth Review Conference of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) to be held at the United Nations in Geneva on December 12-16, 2016. The CCW is five-year Review Conference and will focus on lethal autonomous weapons systems. Click Here to View the Letter Online. In today’s letter to the Obama Administration, Congressman McGovern and House Democrats write that these weapons “would constitute a new method of warfare – and one that would not be for the betterment of humankind. Once activated, these weapons would be able to select and attack targets without any further human involvement. While these weapons do not yet exist, technology is racing ahead, and experts say that they could be procured within years, not decades." Joining Congressman McGovern on today’s letter to the White House were Representatives Barbara Lee (D-CA), Chris Van Hollen (D-MD), Alan Grayson (D-FL), Mark Pocan (D-WI), John Conyers (D-MI), John Lewis (D-GA), Raul Grijalva (D-AZ), and Maxine Waters (D-CA). The lawmakers expressed their support of “the call for a preemptive prohibition on the development, production, and use of fully autonomous weapons. This call has been endorsed by thousands of artificial intelligence and robotics experts, including many of the most respected people in those fields, as well as two dozen Nobel peace Laureates, more than 100 prominent faith leaders, numerous humanitarian organizations and many more. This prohibition, which should require meaningful human control over target selection and engagement for each individual attack, could be achieved as a new CCW protocol.”

## No Biotech Link

### No L – Dems Love

#### Biotech is uniquely popular---democrats agreed to carve out exemptions in price control measures exclusively to support the industry

Brian Gormley, 12-2-2021, life science writer for the Wall Street Journal "Investors Say Drug-Pricing Measure May Shift Incentives for Biotech Venture Funding ," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/investors-say-drug-pricing-measure-may-shift-incentives-for-biotech-venture-funding-11638448200

Democratic drug-pricing measures passed by the House may steer more venture-capital funding to biological medicines, a field already drawing significant investor attention, some investors and analysts said. The roughly $2 trillion social-spending and climate bill, approved in November, enables Medicare to negotiate prices of certain older drugs it covers and introduces other measures to curb prescription-medication costs. Biological drugs, such as protein and antibody treatments, would be subject to Medicare negotiation 13 years after their market launch. Small-molecule drugs, chemical compounds typically taken as pills, would face Medicare negotiation after nine years. Companies refusing to negotiate would face a 95% excise tax on the sales of the drug. Medicare negotiations wouldn’t begin until 2025, and would be limited to 10 drugs initially, with the number increasing each year thereafter, rising to 100 by 2030. Negotiations would be restricted to the top-selling medicines in Medicare that have no generic competition. The bill also would cap annual drug-price increases at the rate of inflation. The Senate plans to consider the bill this month. The White House, which supports the drug-pricing measures, has billed them as making medications more affordable while preserving drugmakers’ ability to be rewarded for breakthroughs.

### No L – Bipartisan Support

#### DMIA both thumps perception of new investments and proves biotech is bipartisan

Mike Levin, 3-17-2022, U.S senator, writing a press release "Reps. Mike Levin and John Joyce Introduce Bipartisan Bill to Foster Innovation in Drug Manufacturing," No Publication, https://mikelevin.house.gov/media/press-releases/reps-mike-levin-and-john-joyce-introduce-bipartisan-bill-to-foster-innovation-in-drug-manufacturing//DG

U.S. Representatives Mike Levin (D-CA) and John Joyce (R-PA) introduced the bipartisan [Drug Manufacturing Innovation Act](https://mikelevin.house.gov/imo/media/doc/Drug%20Manufacturing%20Innovation%20Act.pdf) to foster innovation in drug manufacturing by building on the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) [Emerging Technology Program](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-drug-evaluation-and-research-cder/emerging-technology-program) (ETP). The program plays a critical role in supporting drug manufacturers’ efforts to develop new technologies and navigate the regulatory process, which can ultimately help address supply chain challenges and lower prices for consumers. The Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is holding a [hearing](https://energycommerce.house.gov/committee-activity/hearings/hearing-on-the-future-of-medicine-legislation-to-encourage-innovation) on the legislation and other related bills today. The bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to build on the ETP by facilitating stronger public-private partnerships in pharmaceutical manufacturing, conducting research and testing on innovative manufacturing technologies, supporting education and training for regulatory staff, advancing regulatory science related to development and review, and awarding grants or contracts to advance research and development or adoption of innovative approaches. The bill authorizes $20 million per year from FY2023-2027 to carry out this effort. “As families face high drug costs and shortages of the medications they need, it’s critical that we invest in new manufacturing technologies that can help address supply chain challenges and bring down prices,” said Rep. Levin. “I’m proud to introduce the Drug Manufacturing Innovation Act with Rep. Joyce to ensure HHS is fostering the next generation of manufacturing technologies and improving the regulatory process so these innovations can come to fruition. Today’s Energy and Commerce hearing on our bipartisan bill is a positive step, and I’m hopeful we can advance the bill soon.”

### No L – Manchin Loves Biotech

#### Manchin loves biotech---he’s consistently advocating for expanding scientific research

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 8-5-2021, "Manchin: Basic Scientific Research Is Critical To Addressing America’s Most Pressing Challenges, Strengthening Competitive Advantages," https://www.energy.senate.gov/2021/8/manchin-basic-scientific-research-is-critical-to-addressing-america-s-most-pressing-challenges-strengthening-competitive-advantages//DG

Washington, DC – Today, the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on the U.S. Department of Energy’s Office of Science and its role in America’s research and development ecosystem. Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV), Chairman of the Committee, highlighted efforts the U.S. Senate has recently taken to drive scientific innovation and stressed the need to continually invest in and support scientific research. Chairman Manchin questioned the witnesses about the greatest need and opportunity for the Office of Science and how the $16.9 billion authorized in the U.S. Competition and Innovation Act for the research and development at National Labs would be used. “We’re looking at numerous areas where investments could be made and have the most impact in innovation and they would include areas like quantum information science and microelectronics and systems biology, essentially across the whole range of these, what we consider to be critical and emerging technologies. These technologies will open the door to new businesses and there are significant research opportunities in these areas as well. We also need to invest in the scientific infrastructure to support those activities,” said Dr. J. Stephen Binkley, Acting Director and Principal Deputy Director at the Department of Energy’s Office of Science.Chairman Manchin also highlighted the importance of investing in the infrastructure needs of the DOE and its laboratories in addition to research and development.

#### Manchin supports new R&D projects---DOE proves

AIP 4-20-2021, American Institute for Physics, institute dedicated to the advancement of the physical sciences in America"Manchin Seeks to Include DOE in Endless Frontier Push," No Publication, https://www.aip.org/fyi/2021/manchin-seeks-include-doe-endless-frontier-push//DG

Manchin said in his opening statement, “I would argue that efforts to strengthen our R&D foundation and technology development ought to start with the Department of Energy and the national labs,” repeating the line for emphasis. He urged lawmakers to “stand strong” in support of DOE’s role “as this conversation around domestic R&D and global competitiveness grows.” To make their case, Manchin and Barrasso solicited testimony from Los Alamos National Lab Director Thom Mason, former DOE Under Secretary for Science Paul Dabbar, and innovation policy experts Sarah Ladislaw and Lara Pierpoint, respectively representing RMI and Actuate, nonprofit organizations that seek to catalyze clean energy technology development.

### No L – Sinema Loves Biotech

#### Sinema literally won an award because of how much she supports biotech!

AZBIO, 4-3-2019, Arizona Bioindustry association "Senator Sinema Honored as Innovator in Biotechnology," AZBio | AZBio is committed to building a top-ten life science industry in Arizona. We work with our member companies to do just that., https://www.azbio.org/senator-sinema-honored-as-innovator-in-biotechnology//DG

Senator Kyrsten Sinema was recognized today by the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO) for her leadership as an Innovator in Biotechnology. Senator Sinema received the award in conjunction with today’s BIO Legislative Day Fly-In. BIO’s Innovator in Biotechnology award recognizes Members of Congress who have been collaborative partners, advocates, and champions of the biotechnology and life sciences industries. “The life sciences industry in Arizona provides jobs for over 25,000 people. Senator Sinema has been an invaluable advocate for the biotechnology community – both in Arizona and the nation at large,” said Joan Koerber-Walker, President & CEO of the Arizona BioIndustry Association. “On behalf of the Arizona life science industry, we thank her for outstanding leadership and dedication to supporting the innovative capacity and job-creating potential of American life science companies.” “Senator Sinema has been a stalwart advocate for sound public policies that advance the jobs creating potential of America’s biotechnology industry as we address the most pressing medical, agricultural, industrial and environmental challenges facing our nation and the world,” said BIO President and CEO Jim Greenwood. “Her commitment to support the needs of America’s innovative life science companies allows them to focus on what matters – delivering life-saving and life-enhancing products.”

### L N/U – Biden Investments High

#### Link’s nonunique---Biden cut defense to invest in scientific research across the board

Science News Staff, 5-28-2021 Writers Representing Science.Org, , "Biden seeks big increases for science budgets," No Publication, https://www.science.org/content/article/biden-seeks-big-increases-science-budgets//DG

President Joe Biden today asked Congress to give big budget increases to most civilian science agencies. But military research would take a cut under his administration's first spending request to Congress, which lawmakers are certain to revise. The $6 trillion request calls for sweeping investments in infrastructure and social welfare programs in the 2022 fiscal year that begins 1 October. It also includes a 9% increase, or $13.5 billion, in total federal spending on R&D, bringing the total to $171 billion. Spending on basic research would rise by 10%, or $4.4 billion, to $47.4 billion, whereas applied research would get a 14% bump ($6.3 billion) to $51.1 billion. The budget "proposes historic increases in funding for foundational R&D across a range of scientific agencies," Biden said in a statement, including what he asserts is "the biggest increase in non-defense research and development spending on record." But not all agencies would see their research budgets rise under the plan. One big loser is the Department of Defense, which would see its basic research spending shrink by 11%, to $2.3 billion, and its applied science budget drop by 16%, to $5.6 billion. In contrast, Biden wants to more than double basic research spending at the Department of the Interior, to $171 million, and ramp up fundamental agricultural research by 26%, to $1.4 billion.

## No Cyber Link

### No L – Cyber Bipart – Allies

#### Broad support for cyber cohesion---bipartisan push to enhance cyber security cooperation with allies

Jacqueline Thomsen, 2-6-2019, Writer for the Hill "Lawmakers put Pentagon’s cyber in their sights," Hill, https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/428576-lawmakers-put-pentagons-cyber-in-their-sights//DG

Congress has a new rising target when it comes to cyber: The Pentagon. The U.S. military last year was given the green light to start offensive cyber operations against foreign adversaries, an area that one new Democratic subcommittee chair says he will keep a close eye on in the coming months. But recent internal reports have pointed to a lack of basic cybersecurity measures within the Department of Defense (DOD) itself, with one DOD report last week finding that the military is “at risk from adversarial cyber operations.” And lawmakers have indicated that they will use this upcoming Congress to look at the Pentagon’s cyber preparedness, both in terms of carrying out and fending off cyberattacks. Rep. [Jim Langevin](https://thehill.com/people/jim-langevin/)(D-R.I.), the chair of the House Armed Services Committee’s intelligence subcommittee, which oversees cybersecurity for the Pentagon, said he is particularly concerned about the offensive cyberattacks that the U.S. could carry out. He said that in the past, the U.S may have been too cautious in conducting cyber operations. But he warned against officials going too far and fast in exercising their newly found authorities and said that he plans to hold hearings on the topic. “Cyberspace, in some ways, it’s already a Wild West. We don’t want to make it worse,” Langevin said. “Wherever possible, we should working with our allies and friends in this space as we carry out the strategies — it’s important to have a whole of government approach.” The Democrat, who also co-founded the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, said that not all retaliation to a cyberattack has to actually take place in cyberspace. The U.S. will often deliver indictments or sanctions as a penalty for cyber acts, although that was largely before the military was given more power for offensive cyber actions. The Senate has wasted little time in questioning military leaders over their cybersecurity measures, grilling them about their preparedness at a hearing last week. Sen. [Mike Rounds](https://thehill.com/people/mike-rounds/)(R-S.D.), the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, said last week’s hearing on Pentagon cybersecurity is one of several his panel will have in the coming months. “What we’re looking at is how do we get to whole of nation or whole of country when we talk about cybersecurity protections, and that means you have to have input from both the private and the government sector,” he said this week. “Each is separate, but they’re got to coordinate.”

#### Bipartisan consensus on new cybersecurity policy---attacks escalating unlocks a collaborative spirit

Daniel Kroese, 1-25-2022, Senior Cyber Team director at Palo Alto networks "Bipartisan Cybersecurity Legislation — Continuing the Progress in 2022," Palo Alto Networks Blog, https://www.paloaltonetworks.com/blog/2022/01/bipartisan-cybersecurity-policy//DG

Whether it’s government networks storing sensitive information or critical infrastructure systems, no entity is immune to cyber adversaries. Fortunately, the strong bipartisan consensus on cybersecurity threats has led to bipartisan interest in cybersecurity legislation. At Palo Alto Networks, we appreciate the collaborative spirit on Capitol Hill, working with a wide range of stakeholders to get policy right. With the 2022 legislative calendar now in full swing, we see cybersecurity policy activity coalescing around several worthwhile pillars of activity. Investing in Proactive Cyber Resilience The American people understand the value of filling potholes on the streets and have recognized that our “digital potholes” demand equal attention. While there’s no silver bullet, we can’t ignore the economics. Better cybersecurity outcomes demand more dedicated cybersecurity investment. History has taught us that investing in cyber resilience before something bad happens will almost always be cheaper in the long run. That’s why Palo Alto Networks was encouraged to see a State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program included as a key provision in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The funds provided from this grant program will be cybersecurity game changers for jurisdictions all across the country. Similarly, the cybersecurity plans required to unlock those funds will promote a broad culture of cybersecurity vigilance that benefits us all. The multi-entity grant eligibility will promote innovative investments, such as security operations centers that span state lines. Properly resourcing the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) will act as a force multiplier to ensure that investment in cybersecurity resilience is met with technical assistance and services to help organizations with capacity building. Both the House and Senate continue showing eagerness to fund CISA’s necessary maturation. Investing in cybersecurity resilience will be foundational in gaining the upper hand on the ransomware epidemic. The White House has demonstrated strong leadership both domestically and internationally on this issue. That focus, coupled with dedicated funding, can meaningfully move the needle.

### No L – Cyber Security – Bipart

#### Link is thumped and false---information sharing bill indicates widespread collaboration

Roy Blunt 4-6-2022, Missouri Senator, writing a press release "Blunt, Klobuchar, Peters, Portman Introduce Bipartisan Legislation to Ensure Congressional Cybersecurity Defenders Receive Timely Cybersecurity Information," No Publication, https://www.blunt.senate.gov/news/press-releases/blunt-klobuchar-peters-portman-introduce-bipartisan-legislation-to-ensure-congressional-cybersecurity-defenders-receive-timely-cybersecurity-information//DG

Yesterday, U.S. Senators Roy Blunt (Mo.) and Amy Klobuchar (Minn.), Ranking Member and Chairwoman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and Gary Peters (Mich.) and Rob Portman (Ohio), Chairman and Ranking Member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, introduced the bipartisan Intragovernmental Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act to ensure sharing of cybersecurity information between operational cybersecurity staff in the Executive Branch and the Senate and House of Representatives. This legislation will ensure that cybersecurity defenders in Congress are able to work collaboratively and directly with cybersecurity defenders in the Executive Branch and will require regular reporting to Congress on the status of implementation. The legislation would ensure the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives receive direct, timely, and actionable cybersecurity information from the Executive Branch. “The federal government faces more cyberattacks from more directions than ever before,” said Blunt. “This legislation will help ensure Congress’s cybersecurity professionals have access to the timely and sensitive information they need to better protect the House and Senate from the alarming rise in cyberattacks.” “Cybersecurity threats against our government require a timely, coordinated response. Yet too often a lack of communication between the Department of Homeland Security and Congress leaves us vulnerable to damaging cyberattacks,” said Klobuchar. “This bipartisan legislation will better protect us against cyberattacks by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to increase cybersecurity information sharing with Congress.”

#### Cybersecurity programs are extremely bipartisan and popular

Patel 22 – Senior Manager at Signal Group (Pooja, “Cyber policy isn’t going away anytime soon,” Signal Group, 4-21-22, <https://signaldc.com/cyber-policy-isnt-going-away-anytime-soon/>) //sg

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.

### No L – OCO Bipart

#### Broad bipartisan support for OCOs

O’Donnell 19 – Multi-Branch veteran and military writer (Wes, “The US Enters a New Era of Offensive Cyber Operations,” American Military University Edge, 6-26-19, [https://amuedge.com/the-us-enters-a-new-era-of-offensive-cyber-operations/#](https://amuedge.com/the-us-enters-a-new-era-of-offensive-cyber-operations/)) //sg

That has changed. In August 2018, President Trump rescinded PPD-20 and enacted a new policy that allows agencies to make the determination on which cyber operations to pursue and the authority to pursue them.

**Offensive Cyber Operations Have Bipartisan Support**

These days, there is very little that Democrats and Republicans can agree on. However, punishing bad actors with America’s significant arsenal of cyberweapons has **received support from both sides of the aisle**. The 2018 policy drew praise from both House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Michael McCaul (R-Texas) and Senate Intelligence Committee Vice Chair Mark Warner (D-VA).

## No Disinformation Link

### No L – Bipartisan

#### Support is coalescing for fighting misinformation---the public is reaching a middle ground

Tanner Stening, 9-16-2021, Reporter at Northeastern University "Liberals and conservatives agree on need for social media ‘labeling’ to counter misinformation, problematic speech, study finds," News @ Northeastern, https://news.northeastern.edu/2021/09/16/bipartisan-support-for-countering-misinformation//DG

The study comes as governments try to exert control over the tech giants’ moderation policies. Just this week, Texas Gov. Greg Abbott, a Republican, [signed a bill into law](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/texas-social-media-bill-signed-law-governor-abbott/) requiring that social media companies disclose their content moderation policies and create an appeals process for banned users. Under the new law, users could sue companies to get their accounts reinstated. Florida approved [a similar law](https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-56952435) earlier this year.  Democrats have also tried to influence the companies’ policies. Over the summer, President Joe Biden [urged](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/biden-accuses-social-media-platforms-of-killing-people-through-covid-19-misinformation/) Facebook to take swifter action against posts that spread COVID-19 misinformation, saying the bad information circulating on the platform about the safety and efficacy of the vaccines was “killing people.”  “There is a huge need to try to figure out what tools and methods we need to use to combat disinformation and misinformation,” Wihbey says, summarizing the survey sentiment. “At the same time, I think people don’t believe that shutting down accounts and disabling share buttons is the [only] way to go.”  Wihbey says the study may indicate that the public is coming to some sort of middle ground. “We find that people want labels to link them to credible sources for checking, prepare them for thinking critically about misinformation, and slow the spread of misinformation by warning people about the content they may be trying to share,” its authors state.

#### Disinformation policy popular AND thumped---bipartisan commission proves

Maggie Miller, 11-15-2021, Cybersecurity reporter for Politico "Bipartisan commission urges US take immediate steps to curb online misinformation," Hill, https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/581634-report-urges-us-government-to-take-immediate-steps-to-curb-online//DG

A report from a bipartisan commission published Monday recommends that U.S. government and social media platform leaders take a series of immediate steps to curb the “crisis of trust and truth” stemming from online disinformation and misinformation. [The report, put out by the Aspen Institute’s Commission on Information Disorder](https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/commission-on-information-disorder-final-report/), puts forward recommendations that can be taken to address issues including election security and COVID-19 disinformation and misinformation online, painting a picture of an urgent moment to take action. “This crisis demands urgent attention and a dedicated response from all parts of society,” the commissioners wrote in the report. “Every type and level of leader must think seriously about this crisis and their role in it. Each can and should enter this conversation, genuinely listening to the problems and taking real ownership of solutions.” The report outlines dozens of recommendations to address the crisis, including creating a “national response strategy” to establish roles and responsibilities for fighting misinformation across the executive branch, investing in local journalism, diversifying social media platform workforces and investing in civic education.  “At the time of this writing, the Federal Government lacks any clear leadership and strategy to the disinformation problem, despite its own acknowledgment of the impact on public health, elections, businesses, technology, and continued campaigns on communities of color, including immigrants and refugees,” the report reads. “This lack of leadership, ownership, or strategy is hampering efforts, slowing response times, and duplicating efforts.”

## No Humanitarian Aid Link

### No L – Bipartisan Support

#### Bipartisan support for aid---Ukraine proves

WHBR 4-28-2022, White house briefing room, press releases "FACT SHEET: White House Calls on Congress to Provide Additional Support for Ukraine," https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/04/28/fact-sheet-white-house-calls-on-congress-to-provide-additional-support-for-ukraine//DG

At the same time, the Administration is delivering humanitarian, economic, food, and other security assistance to Ukraine and the region. This includes roughly $1.7 billion to ensure continuity of Ukraine’s democratic operations and provide other macroeconomic assistance to the region. It also includes $650 million in military assistance to Ukraine, eastern flank countries, and other partners in the region, as well as hundreds of millions of dollars in food, shelter, and other humanitarian aid to help Ukrainians who have been displaced by Russia’s war. Supplemental resources are also supporting efforts to hold Putin and his cronies accountable for their war of choice, helping the United States seize billions in assets and holdings. Continued bipartisan support in Congress is vital to ensuring that the Ukrainian people have the resources they need to win this war, and this Administration is committed to working with lawmakers and our global allies and partners to keep aid flowing to Ukraine uninterrupted and to support those devastated by the food crisis that Putin’s war has exacerbated.

#### COVID aid is entirely popular---specifically bipartisan in congress

TCH, Texas Childrens Hospital press release 4-26-2022, "Texas Scientists Urge White House To Commit To Global Funding Of Non-Patented COVID-19 Vaccine," No Publication, https://www.texaschildrens.org/about-us/news/releases/texas-scientists-urge-white-house-commit-global-funding-non-patented-covid-19-vaccine//DG

“Given that worldwide cases of COVID-19 are once again on the rise, federal support for the worldwide vaccination effort has never been more crucial,” said Dr. Peter Hotez, professor and dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine at Baylor College of Medicine and co-director, Texas Children’s Hospital Center for Vaccine Development. “Public health, both in the United States and abroad, hinges on our government’s willingness to engage in meaningful vaccine diplomacy. This requires Congressional funding to support worldwide distribution of CORBEVAX, the only safe, effective, low-cost, easily scalable vaccine currently available in the world. Bi-partisan support exists for this effort and represents the only path to eradication of the COVID-19 virus.”

#### Aid is uniquely bipartisan---it overcomes external division

Erin Collinson, 12-20-2019, Director of Policy Outreach GCD "Amid Partisan Rancor, Congress Reaches Bipartisan Agreement on Foreign Aid Spending," Center for Global Development | Ideas to Action, <a class="vglnk" href=<https://www.cgdev.org/blog/amid-partisan-rancor-congress-reaches-bipartisan-agreement-foreign-aid-spending>//DG

What else? Appropriators provided a modest increase in global health program funding, owing largely to a record contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. MCC received level funding for the third year in a row. With a presidential election year on the horizon, lawmakers seized a unique opportunity for bipartisan action, attaching several development-related authorizing bills to the large spending package (Division J), including the [Global Fragility Act](https://www.cgdev.org/blog/promising-us-fragile-states-strategy-taking-shape-key-questions-remain),  as well as legislation to support Venezuelans in crisis, step up efforts to fight neglected tropical diseases, prevent child marriage among displaced populations, and combat wildlife trafficking. While retaining a number of conditions on assistance to the Northern Triangle, the bill will help ensure certain forms of assistance are shielded from future cuts. On a wonkier note, the bill appears likely to force an agreement on the online publication of foreign assistance data—resolving an issue members of the development community refer to as “[dueling dashboards](http://modernizeaid.net/2017/08/redesign-data-dueling-dashboards/).”

## No NATO Link

### L = N/U

Biden is already under fire for close NATO cooperation

Kanno-Youngs & Cochrane 22 [Zolan Kanno-Youngs is a White House correspondent covering a range of domestic and international issues in the Biden White House, including homeland security and extremism and Emily Cochrane is a correspondent based in Washington, "After Biden’s Fiery Speech, Nine Unscripted Words Reverberate", New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/27/us/politics/biden-ukraine.html] GBS-HW

WASHINGTON — President Biden’s high-stakes speech in Warsaw on Saturday was crafted with the intent of throwing the full weight of the United States behind its European allies, while framing the Russian invasion of Ukraine as part of a global “battle between democracy and autocracy.” And although the forceful denunciation of President Vladimir V. Putin’s war resonated with some leaders, it was an unprompted ad-lib that captured the attention of foreign policy experts, members of Congress and NATO allies. “For God’s sake, this man cannot remain in power,” Mr. Biden declared, a comment that two White House officials said was not included in the president’s prepared speech. Even as top administration officials spent Sunday walking back Mr. Biden’s remarks, the statement had already sent ripple effects throughout the world, highlighting just how powerful nine unprompted words from the president can be, particularly during a foreign policy crisis. “I wouldn’t use this kind of words,” President Emmanuel Macron of France said in a television interview on Sunday, when asked to comment on Mr. Biden’s speech. He said he hoped to obtain a cease-fire and the withdrawal of Russian troops from Ukraine through diplomacy. “If we want to do this, we mustn’t escalate,” he said, “neither with words nor with actions.” Mr. Biden spent most of the speech summarizing the penalties his administration had imposed on Russia and its efforts to support refugees, while asserting that even though the United States would not send troops to Ukraine, it was prepared to defend NATO allies. Mr. Biden raised his voice when he warned Mr. Putin not to move “on one single inch” of NATO territory, a message of support for allies that the administration had intended to be one of the main takeaways from the address, according to officials. Until Mr. Biden’s unscripted moment, the speech had largely achieved its intended goals, lawmakers, allies and foreign policy experts said. But immediately afterward, Mr. Biden’s aides worried that his surprising remark might roil some of those allies the president was determined to keep unified. The White House has tried to ensure that each step taken against Russia is in line with European allies. Taken literally, the remark meant the United States would be reversing a policy of not pushing for regime change. Mr. Biden’s staff felt as if it had little choice but to play down the off-the-cuff comment. “We do not have a strategy of regime change in Russia or anywhere else, for that matter,” Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken said in Jerusalem after meeting with Israel’s foreign minister, Yair Lapid. “In this case, as in any case, it’s up to the people of the country in question. It’s up to the Russian people.” Michal Baranowski, a senior fellow and director of the Warsaw office of the German Marshall Fund who attended Mr. Biden’s speech, acknowledged that the president’s comment could be perceived as “a call for regime change.” But he said it was unlikely to lead to further escalation with Russia. But Republican members of Congress worried that the Kremlin, which has issued propaganda claiming the United States is determined to destroy Russia, would seize on the remark. Senator Rob Portman, Republican of Ohio, described Mr. Biden’s speech as “very strong, despite the ad-lib at the end.” The comment “plays into the hands of Russian propagandists and plays into the hands of Vladimir Putin,” he said during an interview on NBC’s “Meet the Press.” Indeed, Moscow was quick to respond. On Saturday, Dmitri Peskov, the Kremlin spokesman, said that it was not for Mr. Biden to decide who the Russian president should be. Vyacheslav Volodin, a senior Russian lawmaker, wrote on Telegram that neither Boris N. Yeltsin nor Mikhail S. Gorbachev, who led during the Cold War, was the target of similar comments from American heads of state. “The reason for this behavior will be more professionally explained by psychiatrists,” Mr. Volodin said. “U.S. citizens should be ashamed of their president.” Senator Jim Risch of Idaho, the top Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, said Mr. Biden made a “horrendous gaffe” in an otherwise good speech. “The administration has done everything they can to stop escalating — there’s not a whole lot more you can do to escalate than to call for a regime change,” he told CNN’s “State of the Union.”

### No L – Congress Loves

#### Bipartisan support to increase security cooperation with NATO

Shaheen 22 [Jeanne Shaheen is a U.S. Senator representing New Hampshire, "Manchin Calls For Immediate Action To End Putin's Ability To Use Energy As A Weapon", Joe Manchin Press Release, https://www.manchin.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/manchin-calls-for-immediate-action-to-end-putins-ability-to-use-energy-as-a-weapon] GBS-HW

(Washington, DC) – U.S. Senator Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH), Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation and co-chair of the Senate NATO Observer Group, introduced a resolution with SFRC Ranking Member Jim Risch (R-ID) and Chairman Bob Menendez (D-NJ), as well as Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY), Republican Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) and U.S. Senators Ron Johnson (R-WI), Ben Cardin (D-MD) and Chris Coons (D-DE) last Thursday in support of Finland and Sweden’s accession to NATO.

“As the Ukrainian people fight for their lives and freedom, Finland and Sweden’s commitment to join the transatlantic alliance at this pivotal time matters not just for Ukraine, but for Europe, global stability and the future of liberal democracies around the world. As co-chair of the Senate NATO Observer Group, I’m proud of the continued bipartisan efforts in Congress to ensure that Senate support for NATO remains strong, especially amid Putin’s unprovoked, bloody invasion of Ukraine,” said Senator Shaheen. “This new bipartisan resolution builds on that progress and I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues to ratify Sweden and Finland’s accession into NATO as soon as possible, and I encourage other NATO allies to do the same.”

#### NATO link is thumped and wrong---bipartisan support for expansion post-Ukraine

Scott Wong, 5-23-2022, Senior Congressional Correspondant at NBC "Schumer, McConnell urge Biden to move quickly on NATO expansion ," NBC News, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/schumer-mcconnell-urge-biden-move-quickly-nato-expansion-rcna30131//DG

Top Democratic and Republican leaders in the Senate have signed on to a resolution backing [Finland’s and Sweden’s applications to join NATO](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/biden-meets-heads-finland-sweden-show-support-nato-membership-rcna29621) and urging President Joe Biden to expedite the process. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., and Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., said Monday they were co-sponsoring the symbolic resolution, which signals strong bipartisan support for the pair of European countries’ applications to join NATO. The Foreign Relations Committee will mark up the nonbinding resolution Thursday. The Senate isn't expected to take up legislation to approve NATO expansion until this summer. It requires support from two-thirds of senators and is expected to pass easily. The [four-page resolution](https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/S.%20Res.%20%20-%20NATO%20Resolution%20(Risch,%20Menendez).pdf) — by Sens. Bob Menendez, D-N.J., and Jim Risch, R-Idaho, the leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee — says that Russia’s invasion of Ukraine "has dramatically changed the security situation in Europe" and that NATO expansion is critical to ensure the security of the U.S. and its European allies.  Finland shares an 800-mile border with Russia. The resolution also calls on the Biden administration to “move expeditiously” to complete all of the documents and reports needed for the Senate to sign off on NATO expansion, and it urges other NATO members to quickly complete their own ratification processes.

Today, there are no partisan differences on living up to America’s Article 5 commitment. But in 2015, the last time Pew Research Center asked this question, Republicans (69%) were far more likely than Democrats (47%) to back aiding allies in a confrontation with Russia. Since then, such Republican sentiment, now at 65%, has not changed much. Democrats’ willingness to offer military support (63%) has increased 26 points. A separate Pew Research Center survey in January 2017 also found that for the first time since 2005, more Democrats than Republicans saw Russia’s power and influence as a major threat to the U.S. And Democrats’ concern about Russia rose 30 points from 2016 to 2017.

#### Prefer stats---even if NATO is controversial, A5 isnt

Bruce Stokes, 5-23-2017, Fellow at PEW research center, "NATO’s Image Improves on Both Sides of Atlantic," Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project, https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2017/05/23/natos-image-improves-on-both-sides-of-atlantic//DG

Today, there are no partisan differences on living up to America’s Article 5 commitment. But in 2015, the last time Pew Research Center asked this question, Republicans (69%) were far more likely than Democrats (47%) to back aiding allies in a confrontation with Russia. Since then, such Republican sentiment, now at 65%, has not changed much. Democrats’ willingness to offer military support (63%) has increased 26 points. A separate Pew Research Center survey in January 2017 also found that for the first time since 2005, more Democrats than Republicans saw Russia’s power and influence as a major threat to the U.S. And Democrats’ concern about Russia rose 30 points from 2016 to 2017.

#### Prefer stats to hyperbole---renewed bipartisan support for NATO post-Ukraine

Richard Wike et al, 4-6-2022 , JANELL FETTEROLF, MOIRA FAGAN AND J.J. MONCUS, Researchers for the Pew global attitudes project"Seven-in-Ten Americans Now See Russia as an Enemy," Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project, https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2022/04/06/seven-in-ten-americans-now-see-russia-as-an-enemy//DG

Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has led to a dramatic shift in American public opinion: 70% of Americans now consider Russia an enemy of the United States, up from 41% in January. And on this topic, Democrats and Republicans largely agree, with 72% of Democrats and 69% of Republicans describing Russia as an enemy. A new Pew Research Center survey, conducted March 21-27, finds that just 7% of U.S. adults have an overall favorable opinion of Russia. Only 6% [express confidence](https://pewrsr.ch/3LmqXZG) in its leader, President Vladimir Putin. In contrast, 72% have confidence in Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. The ongoing war has brought renewed attention to NATO. Ukraine is not a NATO member, but it borders several member states, and NATO leaders have [worked together](https://www.nytimes.com/video/world/europe/100000008269719/nato-ukraine-russia-leaders-arrival.html?searchResultPosition=1) in recent weeks to coordinate their responses to the crisis. Attitudes toward the alliance have grown more positive since Russia’s invasion: 67% express a favorable opinion of the organization, up from 61% in 2021. Meanwhile, 69% say the U.S. benefits a great deal or a fair amount from being a NATO member. While both Democrats and Republicans (including those who lean to each party) hold largely positive views about NATO and U.S. membership in the organization, Democrats are consistently more positive, especially liberal Democrats. For instance, 85% of liberal Democrats think the U.S. benefits a great deal or a fair amount from NATO membership; among conservative Republicans, only 51% hold this view. Still, partisan differences over NATO have shrunk somewhat over the past year. The share of Democrats and Democratic leaners with a favorable overall opinion of NATO has held steady at nearly eight-in-ten, but among Republicans and GOP leaners, positive views have increased from 44% in spring 2021 to 55% today.

### No L – Manchin Loves

#### Manchin is a staunch supporter of NATO cooperation

Manchin 22 [Joe Manchin is a U.S. Senator representing West Virginia, "Manchin Calls For Immediate Action To End Putin's Ability To Use Energy As A Weapon", Joe Manchin Press Release, https://www.manchin.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/manchin-calls-for-immediate-action-to-end-putins-ability-to-use-energy-as-a-weapon] GBS-HW

Washington, DC – Today, U.S. Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) released the following statement calling for immediate actions to be taken to cut off Vladimir Putin’s ability to use energy resources as a weapon of war. “The brutal war that Vladimir Putin has inflicted on the sovereign democratic nation of Ukraine demands a fundamental rethinking of American national security and our national and international energy policy. The United States, our European allies and the rest of the world cannot be held hostage by the acts of one man. It is simply inexplicable that we and other Western nations continue to spend billions of dollars on energy from Russia. This funding directly supports Putin’s ability to stay in power and execute a war on the people of Ukraine. We cannot decry the atrocities of Putin while simultaneously funding his war. We as Americans must be willing to act now. More importantly, we must commit to leading the world in holding Putin and his oligarchs accountable, to strangle their financial lifelines and to hold all those who would support him equally accountable for the violence they have inflicted on Ukraine. “First, we must immediately ban the importation of all energy that is sourced from Russia. This ban must be enacted now. “Second, we must dramatically increase domestic production of energy to support the energy needs of American consumers without causing increased financial burden. “Third, we must compel every energy company – especially those in the U.S. and other Western nations – to immediately cease any and all investment, operations and production in Russia and in Russian allies. While some companies have already acted, there needs to be a complete commitment to destroying Putin’s economic weapons for the pain and horror he has brought to Europe. “Fourth, as a nation we must commit to once again achieving complete energy independence by embracing an all-of-the-above energy policy to ensure that the American people have reliable, dependable and affordable power without disregarding our climate responsibilities. “Finally, we must dramatically increase our military support to our NATO allies and position the necessary forces to deter any escalation or threats to NATO members. “While we must do everything possible to end this conflict through diplomatic means, we can no longer place the free world’s national or energy security in the hands of Vladimir Putin. The time has come for America to once again lead the world in the fight for democracy and securing freedom. We are the greatest and most powerful nation in the world and we must seize this moment through our leadership.”

### No L – Public Support

#### Strong public support for the alliance denies the link – especially true amid Ukraine war

Kull 22 [Steven Kull is director of the Program for Public Consultation (PPC), and Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM), University of Maryland, "Broad Bipartisan Support for US Engagement in European Security", WorldPublicOpinion.Org, https://worldpublicopinion.net/broad-bipartisan-support-for-us-engagement-in-european-security/] GBS-HW

In the wake of the Russian invasion of Ukraine the US government has responded by working closely with NATO allies, imposing a range of sanctions on the Russian government and its political elite, sending military aid to Ukraine, and sending troops to the neighboring countries of Poland and Romania. Americans are showing concern about the situation in Ukraine and support US actions. Two-thirds of Americans support sanctions on Russia in a recent ABC-Washington Post poll. A survey in February by Morning Consult found that 60% of voters agree, “the U.S. has a responsibility to protect and defend democracy in other countries,” including 70% of Democrats and 54% of Republicans. This is consistent with broader support for NATO and the principles of collective security. In the Program for Public Consultation’s 2019 survey on collective security and NATO, a robust 82% said it should, “be a high priority in U.S. foreign policy to uphold the principle of collective security, by contributing to collective military operations and/or using economic sanctions in response to international aggression” (Republicans 77%, Democrats 89%, independents 71%). An argument for collective security, that it is beneficial for countries to “join together to prevent any country from invading another,” was found convincing by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 86% (Republicans 80%, Democrats 92%). An opposing argument that the US should just “do what makes sense in terms of our own interests at any particular moment and let other countries look out for themselves,” was found convincing by a much smaller number of 46%, including just 34% of Democrats and half of independents (49%), although a majority of Republicans did find it convincing (59%). This support translates to specific policies, such as the US continuing to be part of NATO and defending its members. An overwhelming bipartisan majority of eight in ten Americans favored the US continuing to be part of NATO (Republicans 77%, Democrats 90%, independents 78%). The arguments in favor of continued participation in NATO–based on the persistent threat from Russia, the common bond of promoting freedom and democracy, and the value of having integrated militaries–were found convincing by equally overwhelming majorities.

## No Defense Spending Link

### No L – Bipartisan Support

#### Ukraine crisis has taken the wind out of anti-defense sentiment – strong bipartisan support to shore up defense and promote alliances

Weisman 22 - congressional correspondent, veteran Washington journalist and author of the novel “No. 4 Imperial Lane” (Jonathan, “Ukraine War Shifts the Agenda in Congress, Empowering the Center,” NY Times, 3-15-22, <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/15/us/politics/ukraine-politics-congress.html>) //sg

WASHINGTON — The escalating crisis in Ukraine is upending policy and political thinking on both the left and the right on Capitol Hill, as an immediate threat to the global order and soaring energy prices empower the political center at the expense of the two parties’ flanks. When lawmakers convene on Wednesday for a virtual speech by President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine, Republicans and Democrats will be confronting a changed environment, for better and for worse. “It’s bringing Congress together in a way, frankly, I haven’t seen in my 12 years,” Senator Chris Coons, Democrat of Delaware and a confidant of President Biden, said on Tuesday of the consensus to support Ukraine. “You’d have to go back to 9/11 to see such a unified commitment.” That has meant a retreat by both parties from the policy proposals and political messages that most thrill their core supporters. On the left, Democrats are **acquiescing to higher military spending** and dropping a bid to pull back rapidly from fossil fuels. On the right, **Trump-era isolationism** and attacks on the trans-Atlantic alliance are being **relegated to the fringe** in Congress. Plans to make the president’s son Hunter Biden and Ukrainian corruption front and center in a Republican-controlled House now seem far-fetched. “It’s grounding,” said Representative Peter Meijer, Republican of Michigan, who was once an intelligence analyst in Afghanistan and now faces a challenger on his right endorsed by former President Donald J. Trump. “You can propose something that outstrips the bounds of reality, that’s fine. Then you look at what’s happening in Ukraine, and it’s like a car accident, a near-death experience that snaps you back to reality.” Mr. Zelensky is expected on Wednesday to reiterate his request for a complicated swap that would send MIG fighter jets to Ukraine from Poland, and U.S.-made F-16 fighters to Poland. That could prompt accusations from some Republicans that the Biden administration, which has opposed the swap as a dangerous escalation of the conflict with no real military purpose, is soft on Russia. He is also likely to ask the United States to help close the airspace over his country to Russian aircraft, as he did on Tuesday when he addressed Canada’s Parliament. Republicans and Democrats alike have questioned the MIG deal now that the Defense Department has raised specific concerns about whether Ukraine could even fly the planes. Speaking to reporters on Tuesday, Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the Republican leader, said Mr. Zelensky would not get congressional support for a so-called no-fly zone over Ukraine, and he signaled ambivalence on the fighter jet transfer. “Exactly how to make that happen is still under discussion,” he said. It is unclear whether the moment amounts to a hiatus in the partisan wars over national security. Republican leaders continue to strafe the president, accusing him of being weak toward Russia, coddling “petro-dictators” and betraying America’s energy security. “President Biden continues to have this attitude of, ‘Well, I don’t want to help Ukraine too much’ because he might offend Putin,” Representative Steve Scalise of Louisiana, the No. 2 Republican, said this week on Fox Business, referring to Russia’s president, Vladimir V. Putin. Democrats are incredulous that Republicans — a vast majority of whom did not criticize Mr. Trump for repeatedly standing by Mr. Putin, undermining NATO and then withholding military aid from Mr. Zelensky to pressure him to dig up political dirt on Mr. Biden — have the gall to question the current president’s willingness to confront Russia. “If you are a reporter, and there is a battle for the free world led by Zelensky and Biden, you don’t have to pretend not to remember that Republicans exonerated Trump for extorting Zelensky,” said Senator Brian Schatz, Democrat of Hawaii. But beyond partisan potshots, there are signs of the war’s **very real impact**. In December, when the House passed defense policy legislation authorizing $768 billion in military spending, 51 Democrats voted no, mainly because they saw that as far too much money. Last week, when the House funded the military and provided even more money — $782 billion and billions more for Ukraine — the number of Democrats voting in opposition **dropped to 15**. “Defense budgets should be driven by our needs, not some artificial target, but it’s pretty clear we are living in a dangerous time,” said Representative Tom Malinowski of New Jersey, a Democrat in a difficult re-election fight. Representative Pramila Jayapal, Democrat of Washington and the head of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, conceded that the current crisis had **sapped momentum**, at least for now, from efforts to slash military spending. “I do think Ukraine has just made it harder,” she said. “We had thought with the ending of the war in Afghanistan, we could push for a real reduction in the defense budget, and there will be another opportunity. But look, this is an epic battle.” Republicans are getting their own reality check. Under Mr. Trump, a growing faction of the party was pushing isolationism, questioning alliances and trade pacts, and pressing an “America First” agenda that would have fit well in the national mood leading up to World War II, Mr. Meijer said. In recent days, Representative Tom Cole of Oklahoma, a traditionalist Republican, sat down with the German ambassador to the United States to thank her for her country’s commitment to NATO’s defense and its aid to Ukraine. In an interview, Mr. Cole even suggested reviving the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a landmark trade pact negotiated by President Barack Obama that would have tied together economies in Asia, Australia, New Zealand, North America and South America to isolate China. In one of his first acts as president, Mr. Trump scuttled the agreement. “Ukraine has got a lot of Republicans **rethinking** the importance of international alliances,” Mr. Cole said. “Other countries are not always a burden. They’re quite often an asset.” Fealty to Mr. Trump’s foreign policy suddenly seems like a potential liability. Former Gov. Pat McCrory of North Carolina, who is running for the Senate seat held by Richard M. Burr, a Republican who is retiring, hit his Trump-endorsed primary opponent, Representative Ted Budd, as pro-Putin in a new advertisement this week. “Budd’s votes have been friendly toward Russia,” Mr. McCrory says in the ad. “He voted against sanctions on Russia. These are serious times, and we need serious senators.”

#### Fears of emboldened China and Russia make defense spending extremely popular

Edmondson 22 - reporter in the Washington bureau of The New York Times, covering Congress (Catie, “War in Ukraine Rallies Support in Congress for More Military Spending,” NY Times, 3-7-22, <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/07/us/politics/ukraine-congress-military-spending.html>) //sg

“I haven’t picked a number yet,” he said, “but without question, it’s going to have to be bigger than we thought.” He added: “The Russian invasion of Ukraine **fundamentally altered** what our national security posture and what our defense posture needs to be. It made it more complicated, and it made it more expensive.” His shift signals a stark new reality facing President Biden on Capitol Hill, where Democrats had already shown they had little appetite for controlling the defense budget, even as Mr. Biden declared an end to the era of ground wars and indicated he wanted to reimagine the use of American power abroad. Now, facing a **military onslaught** by President Vladimir V. Putin **in Ukraine**, and **rising fears of** a protracted war in Europe and an emboldened **China**, lawmakers in both parties — including some who had resisted in the past — are pressing for **vast increases** in military spending to address a changed security landscape. As images pour out of Ukraine of cities devastated by a relentless and indiscriminate volley of Russian missiles, Democrats and Republicans who have struggled to coalesce behind meaningful legislation to aid the Ukrainian cause are rallying around one of the few substantive tools available to them: sending money and weapons. The House this week is poised to approve **$10 billion** in emergency funds to Ukraine, including $4.8 billion to cover the costs of weapons already sent to Ukraine and eastern flank allies, as well as the deployment of American troops. But already on Monday, Senator Chuck Schumer, Democrat of New York and the majority leader, suggested lawmakers could approve a $12 billion package, in a sign of how eager lawmakers were to send more aid to Kyiv. The United States alone has deployed more than 15,000 troops to Europe, while committing an additional 12,000 to NATO’s response force if necessary. Beyond funding immediate needs, the consensus around more generous Pentagon spending previews a dynamic that is likely to **drive negotiations** around next year’s defense budget, potentially locking in the kind of large increases that Mr. Biden and many Democrats had hoped to end.

#### Spending is popular---bipartisan support for an increase

Jimmy Quinn, 6-16-2022, National security correspondant for the National Review"Congress to Rebuff Biden on Defense Spending for Second Year in a Row," National Review, https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/congress-to-rebuff-biden-on-defense-spending-for-second-year-in-a-row//DG

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved a version of the annual defense authorization bill that would result in an $847 billion defense budget, which is $45 billion more than what the White House requested. After the administration released its budget request earlier this year, lawmakers complained that the proposed budget would essentially fail to keep pace with exploding inflation and not match the 3–5 percent annual rise in defense spending recommended by a bipartisan panel in 2018. Politico reported that the House Armed Services Committee still needs to put forward its own version of the legislation but that it would likely also add money to the White House request. Congress also opted for a larger budget than what the president requested in last year’s defense bill, authorizing $749 billion in spending and enraging progressive defense-budget-cut advocates. The decision to approve a larger figure than what Biden proposed was supported by lawmakers from both parties, motivated in large part by rampant inflation. Senator Jack Reed, the committee’s chairman, called inflation “the first consideration” motivating the higher defense-budget figure, according to Politico. Another reason to support the larger proposal was the message that it would send about U.S. defense readiness. Senator Roger Wicker, the favorite to become the committee’s chairman if Republicans win a majority in the Senate next year, wrote on Twitter that the NDAA would “send a strong signal” to U.S. adversaries such as Russia and China.

### No L – Below Radar

#### SC programs fly below congressional radar

McLauchin et al. 22 - Associate professor at the Department of Political Science of the University of Montreal and Director of the Centre for International Peace and Security Studies. PhD in Political Science at McGill University (Theodore, Tracking the Rise of United States Foreign Military Training: IMTAD-USA, a New Dataset and Research Agenda.” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 59, no. 2, Mar. 2022, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00223433211047715#bibr25-00223433211047715>) //sg

The FMTR source data have several limitations. First, the reports do not systematically identify the use of military contractors. Second, FMTR includes total budgets and trainees for both classified and unclassified activities, but excludes additional details on classified activities and omits training by the Central Intelligence Agency. This creates biases. **Considerable US assistance goes under the radar** in order to provide plausible deniability for training the security forces of unsavory regimes, or **to limit escalation** in adversarial relationships (McManus & Yarhi-Milo, 2017). IMTAD-USA may therefore omit training activities in authoritarian states or in strategically sensitive areas. Analysts using these data may wish to introduce controls for regime type or for the type of strategic situation in which the United States has an interest in limiting escalation. These variables would then have to be interpreted as reflecting, in part at least, an interest in conducting training overtly or covertly.

### No L – Public Loves

#### Military is sacrosanct – public won’t criticize, or question calls for increased cooperation

Krebs and Ralston 21 – Krebs is a Professor of Political Science University of Minnesota and Ralston is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham (Ronald and Robert, “More Deferential But Also More Political: How Americans’ Views of the Military Have Changed Over 20 Years,” War on the Rocks, 11-17-21, <https://warontherocks.com/2021/11/more-deferential-but-also-more-political-how-americans-views-of-the-military-have-changed-over-20-years/>) //sg

Americans’ views on the relationship between civilian leaders and the military are disturbing. When it comes to decisions about the use of force, recent surveys demonstrate that **Americans are inclined to disempower civilians and defer to the professional military’s judgment**. Nor are Americans much troubled by active-duty, let alone retired, military leaders publicly intervening in policy debates. Moreover, Americans’ opinions on the subject are driven by their partisan political commitments. When Donald Trump was in the White House, this meant that Democrats were surprisingly deferential to the military, which they hoped would act as a check on this president whom they distrusted and often reviled. But is the public’s lack of commitment to democratic civil-military relations, and its politicized view of the military, a new problem? Or is it just the normal state of affairs, amplified into a crisis by the churn of the news cycle? It is hard to know because scholars and pollsters have not done regular, or even occasional, deep dives with identical questions that allow for direct comparisons. Over 20 years ago, in fall 1998 and spring 1999, the Triangle Institute for Security Studies conducted a comprehensive survey — more comprehensive than any before or since — of Americans’ views on civil-military relations. While occasional surveys have been fielded since, including by us, they have asked different questions. As a result, we do not know how Americans’ views on civil-military relations may have changed over the course of the last two decades. In June 2021, therefore, we fielded a survey, via the Lucid platform, to a representative United States-based sample of 913 respondents that replicated many of the questions asked by the Triangle Institute nearly a quarter-century ago. The Pull of Deference Americans across the political spectrum express considerably more deference to the military today than they have in the past. In 1998 and 1999, the Triangle Institute survey asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: “In general, high ranking civilian officials rather than high ranking military officers should have the final say on whether or not to use military force.” A majority — 53 percent — of respondents agreed. This result, among others, suggested that Americans in the late 1990s had not fully grasped the principle of civilian control of the military. But even fewer of our 2021 respondents concur — **just 43 percent. Deference to the military has increased among self-identified members of both major political parties**: Around 30 percent of both Republicans and Democrats in the late 1990s strongly agreed with the statement that civilians should have the final say on the use of force, but just 15 percent of Republicans and 24 percent of Democrats similarly strongly agree in 2021.

### No L – Manchin Loves

#### Manchin will always vote for defense spending – he consistently disregards inflation when it comes to the military

Cooper 21 [Ryan Cooper is a national correspondent at TheWeek.com, The Week, "Joe Manchin whines about $3.5 trillion — but he spent $9.1 trillion on defense", https://theweek.com/democrats/1005529/joe-manchin-whines-about-35-trillion-but-he-spent-91-trillion-on-defense] GBS-HW

Whether President Biden's agenda fails at this point depends on two people: Sens. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.). Earlier this week, Sinema appeared the more immovable obstacle. On Wednesday, Manchin made it clear he's still in the running for that infamous crown. "I can't support $3.5 trillion more in spending when we have already spent $5.4 trillion since last March," he wrote in a statement apparently ruling out any new programs whatsoever. "[S]pending trillions more on new and expanded government programs, when we can't even pay for the essential social programs, like Social Security and Medicare, is the definition of fiscal insanity," Manchin said. This is a complete crock, as Manchin's own actions prove: For years, he has been casually voting for bloated defense budgets many times the size of the Biden agenda. His squalling about overspending is dishonest nonsense, and he is utterly wrong about what America can afford. Traditionally, media coverage of government programs covers the estimated 10-year cost, because that's what the Congressional Budget Office typically publishes. Sometimes there are deviations from this rule — the genuinely enormous pandemic relief bills, for instance, were described by their one-year cost. Manchin is conveniently conflating the two metrics, as Eric Levitz explains at New York: The past year has witnessed the passage of three historically large stimulus bills, which were characterized in headlines as the "$2 trillion coronavirus relief bill," the "$900 billion COVID-19 relief bill," and the "$1.9 trillion relief bill," respectively. In each case, these headlines (roughly) described the legislation's immediate, single-year fiscal cost. By that metric, the Democrats' reconciliation package isn't a $3.5 trillion bill; it's a $350 billion one. [New York] The one institution that habitually gets the one-year treatment is the military, because troop worship is virtually mandatory in the American mainstream press, and 10-year budgets would risk public backlash. So let's redress that unfairness, and treat the Defense Department as the Biden agenda has been treated. Let's see exactly how much "fiscal insanity" Manchin routinely supports. Estimates of the defense budget vary between the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), but for convenience's sake let me use the BEA figures. (We only need ballpark accuracy for the argument.) By this measure, total federal spending on defense consumption and investment in 2020 was $881 billion. Assuming that will be static over 10 years (and it won't be) gives us a 10-year figure of $8.8 trillion. That's almost certainly an underestimate, however, because Congress keeps compulsively stuffing more money into the Pentagon — the House just added $24 billion to the 2022 military budget though Biden didn't ask for it and we just ended a major war. Manchin voted for the one-year portion of that $8.8 trillion — and so much more. He was first elected to the Senate in 2010, giving us a full decade of defense budgets under his watch. If we take the figures for each year from 2011 to 2020, adjust them for inflation, and add them all together, we get a total of $7.6 trillion in 2012 dollars. Then if we adjust again to get 2021 dollars, we get a total of $9.1 trillion over a decade. Again, these are rough figures, but they are certainly in the right ballpark. Manchin voted for every single one of the military budgets over the last decade — in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020. He voted for all $9.1 trillion. While he occasionally complained about wasteful military programs and asked for an audit of the Pentagon, these quibbles were never enough to get him to vote differently. He helped inflate the already-bloated war budget and regularly boasted about thus "supporting" the troops. This year, he did it again. So on one level, all this operatic moaning about $3.5 trillion is ridiculous hypocrisy. Manchin has casually voted for nearly three times that for defense spending — money that killed hundreds of thousands of people and turned half the Middle East into a smoking crater. A modest fraction of that total to help parents pay their bills, give seniors dental coverage, fight climate change, and so forth is not some intolerable burden on the economy.

### No L – Sinema Loves

#### Love for defense spending applies to Sinema too – NDAA proves

Jones 21 [Ja'han Jones is The ReidOut Blog writer for MSNBC, "Sinema, Manchin whined over infrastructure costs — but silent on UFO funds", MSNBC, https://www.msnbc.com/the-reidout/reidout-blog/sinema-manchin-defense-bill-rcna8359] GBS-HW

Conservative Democrats who have pushed back on what they saw as excessive spending in the bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Build Back Better plan had virtually nothing to say about the gargantuan defense spending bill the House passed this week. The National Defense Authorization Act, a bill introduced annually to fund military spending, breezed through the House in a 363-70 vote. It authorizes $770 billion for the military — some $25 billion more than President Joe Biden requested — and includes funding for naval ships and aircrafts, service member pay increases, nuclear weapons activities and the formation of a new office to study UFOs. And look, I enjoy extraterrestrial talk as much as the next person, but it doesn’t sit right with me that lawmakers who were up in arms about paying for things such as expanded health care access and child care costs seem to have no issue paying to investigate E.T. and ALF. Namely, I’m referring to conservative Democratic Sens. Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, who chirped all throughout House Democrats’ deliberations over the size and scope of the bipartisan infrastructure bill signed into law last month. We heard Manchin kvetch over “entitlement” as the House considered whether to include paid family leave in the social spending package. And in public, Sinema was a rather aimless holdout throughout the negotiations, taking issue with the price of Biden's legislative agenda without declaring what she’d like to cut. We later learned she played a key role in watering down a plan to lower prescription drug costs. Neither Manchin nor Sinema has complained about the size of the NDAA. Government largess is apparently only real to conservative lawmakers, including these two Democrats, when the spending involves actual people living stateside. But when there are weapons of war and thirsty defense contractors involved, these lawmakers suddenly have no issue abandoning their conservatism. How convenient.

### No L – Executive Action Shields

#### Executive action avoids the link.

Sovocool 9, \*Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization. He is also an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore AND \*\* Senior Research Associate at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore (Benjamin and Kelly, 34 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 333, “Preventing National Electricity-Water Crisis Areas in the United States,” Lexis)

Executive Orders also save time in a second sense. The President does not have to expend scarce political capital trying to persuade Congress to adopt [their] his or her proposal. Executive Orders thus save presidential attention for other topics. Executive Orders bypass congressional debate and opposition, along with all of the horse-trading and compromise such legislative activity entails. 292

#### They’ll stay hands off

Sovocool 9, \*Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization. He is also an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore AND \*\* Senior Research Associate at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore (Benjamin and Kelly, 34 Colum. J. Envtl. L. 333, “Preventing National Electricity-Water Crisis Areas in the United States,” Lexis)

The courts and Congress, in other words, do not want to deal with potentially controversial issues. Given the politicized nature of interstate conflicts over environmental pollution, Noah D. Hall argues that “the Supreme Court does not want the job, especially when technical and scientific uncertainty dominates these disputes.”297 Congress, in turn, has rarely taken formal action on those states violating the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, and is often reluctant to take on heated interstate controversies.298 This could be an especially important concern in areas of water policy, since the states with the largest populations will also have the most significant water needs and the most sway in Congress, giving them somewhat disproportionate control over the national water agenda. An Executive Order is a logical alternative given the constraints faced by environmental and energy related legislation and Supreme Court rulings.

## \*\*AT Impact\*\*

### Tariff XO Solves

#### Biden can unilaterally lift tariffs on China – that reduces inflation quickly and significantly

Tan 6/20

Su-Lin, Senior Correspondent with CNBC, “Former U.S. ambassador says lifting China tariffs could slash inflation by 1% over time, help Biden in midterms” June 20, 2022 <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/06/21/former-us-ambassador-says-lifting-china-tariffs-could-cut-inflation.html> dmr

Removing tariffs on imported Chinese goods will strip 1% off inflation in the U.S. over time and return confidence to the economy which could help President Joe Biden at the ballot box, former U.S. ambassador David Adelman says. “Inflation will be No. 1 issue in midterm elections in the U.S. in November,” Adelman told CNBC’s “Squawk Box” on Monday. “While the president is limited in his ability to control inflation, there is one important tool in his toolbox,” said Adelman, who served as U.S. ambassador to Singapore during the Obama administration. “That is the ability to relieve the pressure on the American economy and American consumers that is caused by these very high tariffs rates that are imposed on more than $370 billion annually of Chinese imports.” “Many economists are saying that over time, you can have a full 1% decrease in the CPI, something that is very meaningful for American consumers,” he said, referring to the consumer price index, a key measure of inflation.” While former President Donald Trump’s trade war with China was popular among American voters on both sides of the aisle in 2018, Adelman said the effort was economically futile and did not create “meaningful” trade benefits. “I think the proof is in the pudding. Not only was there no negative impact on the Chinese economy, it had an impact on the U.S. economy. It has acted as a boomerang on the U.S. economy,” Adelman, who is also managing director of KraneShares, said. “Biden is starting to realize as the election is shaping up, it’s going to be the economy that is most important to voters. If the president can do anything to ease pressure, he should do so. Ultimately, good economics should make good politics,” he said. The U.S. government is reviewing the Trump-era trade tariffs on Chinese goods, a process that was triggered by legal provisions rather than a U.S. political willingness for a reset in relations. A growing number of economists, political observers and analysts have called on the Biden administration to slash tariffs as inflation and recession fears grow. Former Treasury Secretary Larry Summers echoed Adelman’s comments earlier Sunday, saying lifting tariffs on Chinese imports was “the right to do.” “It will hold down prices [and] enable us to take a more strategic approach when dealing with China. It will take 1% or more off CPI over time, cutting tariffs is the right thing to do. I hope the administration will find a way to do it, ” Summers said on NBC News’ “Meet the Press.” Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen said some tariffs on China served “no strategic purpose” and that Biden was considering removing them as a means of cooling inflation. Not only did China not meet targets set by the U.S. in the trade deal, analysis from the Peterson Institute for International Economics show the tariffs increased inflation for both U.S. consumers and producers. In the year to November 2021, U.S. tariffs on Chinese goods added 0.26 percentage points to the CPI, PIIE’s non-resident senior fellow in trade policy Katheryn Russ said in an analysis earlier this year. In the year after the U.S. imposed tariffs on Chinese goods, producer prices also rose by 1%, Russ’s analysis also said. In March, PIIE’s senior trade policy fellow Chad Bown said China had not bought any of the additional $200 billion of U.S. exports it committed to purchasing under the phase one deal. As far as a dent to the Chinese economy was concerned, tariffs knocked off just over 0.5% of China’s GDP, Capital Economics chief Asia economist Mark Williams said in a note last week. “Some Chinese firms were able to evade them by re-routing shipments to the U.S. through third countries, mainly in south-east Asia. This may have offset as much as half of the drag,” Williams said. Adelman, the former ambassador, said Biden could remove certain tariffs without the onerous task of seeking permission from Congress in two ways. He could order temporary exclusions to certain tariffs or sign an executive order to lift the tariffs while protecting distinct U.S. industries that China was competing with. Not only will removing tariffs be good for American consumers in the short run and over time, it will help the President reset U.S.-China relations.

### Fed Solves

#### No risk of recession – the Fed will hike interest rates and solve OR a recession will be short – Congress is not key

Pickert & Martin 6-24-22 [Reade Pickert is a Bloomberg business reporter, Eric Martin is a Trade, IMF, World Bank, Latin America reporter for Bloomberg in Washington, "US Economy Will ‘Narrowly Avoid’ Recession in 2022 and 2023, IMF Says", Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-06-24/us-economy-to-narrowly-avoid-recession-in-2022-23-imf-says#xj4y7vzkg] GBS-HW

The US economy is likely to slow in 2022 and 2023 but will “narrowly avoid a recession” as the Federal Reserve implements its rate-tightening plan to curb inflation, the International Monetary Fund said. “The policy priority now must be to expeditiously slow wage and price growth without precipitating a recession” the IMF said in a statement Friday. “This will be a tricky task,” as global supply constraints and domestic labor shortages are likely to persist, and the war in Ukraine creates additional uncertainties, it said. The Fed’s plan of quickly getting its benchmark rate to 3.5% to 4% “should create an upfront tightening of financial conditions which will quickly bring inflation back to target,” Managing Director Kristalina Georgieva told reporters following the release of the concluding statement on its article IV consultation, the IMF’s assessment of countries’ economic and financial developments following meetings with lawmakers and public officials. Based on the policy path outlined at the June Federal Open Market Committee meeting, and an expected reduction in the fiscal deficit, the IMF expects the US economy will slow, Georgieva said. The fund has “also just concluded a very useful set of discussions” with Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen and Fed Chair Jerome Powell, she said. “We are conscious that there is a narrowing path to avoiding a recession in the US,” Georgieva said. “We also have to recognize the uncertainty of the current situation.” Georgieva at the press conference on Friday went on to say there are “very significant” downside risks this year and especially in 2023. If there ultimately is a recession, it would likely be relatively short, said Nigel Chalk, deputy director in the IMF’s Western Hemisphere department. Policy makers raised interest rates by 75 basis points last week -- the single-biggest move since 1994 -- and Powell signaled that another increase either of the same magnitude or of 50 basis points was on the table for July. The Fed chief and his colleagues have pivoted aggressively to fight the hottest inflation in 40 years amid criticism that they left monetary policy too easy for too long as the economy recovered from Covid-19. They’ve raised rates by 1.5 percentage points this year and officials forecast about 1.75 points of further cumulative tightening in 2022.

#### Recession not inevitable---fed checks inflation

John Cassidy , 6-22-2022, Staff Writer at the New Yorkey "A Recession Isn’t Inevitable," New Yorker, https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/whats-behind-all-the-talk-of-a-recession//DG

Pushing back against this gloomy narrative are the current leadership of the Federal Reserve—which raised a key interest rate by three quarters of a percentage point last week to fight inflation—and the Biden Administration. In testimony to Congress on Wednesday, the Fed chair Jerome Powell said, “The American economy is very strong and well positioned to handle tighter monetary policy.” On Monday, [Biden](https://www.newyorker.com/tag/joe-biden) said, “there’s nothing inevitable about a recession,” echoing an argument that the Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen had made twenty-four hours earlier. Yellen told reporters, “Staying in the neighborhood of tight labor markets, what people would dub full employment, I believe it’s possible.”

### Bill Doesn’t Solve Inflation

#### Biden’s bill can’t undo tremendous surge of cash from relief bills and threats to increase taxes drive inflation and destroy business confidence

Buchanan 6/20

Republican Vern Buchanan represents Florida’s 16th District in the United States House of Representatives and is the co-chairman of the bipartisan Florida delegation. Buchanan is second in seniority on the Ways and Means Committee, where he serves as the lead Republican of the Health Subcommittee., “Biden and Democrats keep striking out on inflation – here are 4 ways to fix things fast” 6-20-22 <https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/biden-democrats-keep-striking-out-inflation-here-4-ways-fix-things-fast> dmr

U.S. inflation among highest in developed world Wall Street Journal Editorial board member Kim Strassel and Rightforge founding partner Christopher Bedford discuss the U.S.’s mounting inflation issue and the fed ordering largest rate hike in 28 years on ‘WSJ at Large.’ Like hapless baseball players in a big-time slump, President Biden and Democrats in Congress just keep striking out when it comes to lowering the historic levels of inflation they caused by massive spending and threats of tax increases. Eighteen months of unified Democratic control in Washington have taught us that it’s easier to break an economy than to fix it – and this economic hardship isn’t on track to end anytime soon. Still, there are some commonsense steps we can take to bring some relief to the American people. Democrats have taken their eye off the ball when it comes delivering economic relief and we are all paying the price. Gasoline prices have hit a record $5 a gallon and overall inflation has surged to its highest level in 40 years. Bidenflation has cut the pay of every American worker, causing real wages to drop nearly 4% since the current administration took office. Yet Democrats continue to double down on their same failed policies. They ignore studies from the San Francisco Federal Reserve, former top Obama-Biden economic advisers Jason Furman and Larry Summers and even the president’s own favorite economic forecaster, showing that Biden's agenda will make inflation worse. Grocery shoppers in New York and Virginia shared how the economy under Joe Biden has impacted them after the president's outburst during an AFL-CIO conference. President Biden and Democrats in Congress continue to swing and miss when it comes to finding workable solutions, opting instead to attack bogeymen like big corporations, COVID or the war in Ukraine. First, we should soak up some of the excess money floating around in the economy and reduce the deficit. Inflation skyrocketed immediately following passage of the $1.9 trillion Democrat/Biden backed American Rescue Plan (ARP). With supply chains still struggling to come back online, and a labor shortage induced by President Biden paying people more to stay at home than to go to work, this so-called stimulus flooded the economy with too much money chasing too few goods. With the public health emergency behind us, Congress should repurpose the unobligated ARP funding, estimated to be $200 billion, to deficit reduction. That would help remove some of the inflation-causing money from the economy. But you guessed it: Democrats in Congress show no interest in redirecting those funds. Second, let’s unleash American energy independence. With gasoline prices at all-time highs, we can make it easier to get permits to drill, transport and refine domestic energy, which would increase supply and lower prices. By rejecting Republican bills that expand American energy production, President Biden and the Democrats are committing economic malpractice. They claim inflation is their top priority, but their knee-jerk reaction against increasing the supplies of natural gas and oil and building pipeline infrastructure proves their war on fossil fuel is the real priority. American consumers and workers are the casualties. Third, remove the barriers that prevent our job creators from expanding. Too much red tape and burdensome federal regulations raise costs for businesses that then gets passed on to consumers. Whether it’s new Labor Department paperwork, burdensome environmental regulations, or lengthy permitting requirements, the Biden administration is building a mountain of new costs that directly lead to price increases for consumers. According to an analysis of Biden’s first year in office by the American Action Forum, his administration’s regulatory costs are three times that of Obama’s first year and nearly 40 times that of Trump’s. Each individual regulation may not increase inflation, but collectively the sum total of this activist regime drives costs and inflation higher. Fourth, make Republican tax reform permanent and lock in its historic achievement of higher wages for the lowest earners, the lowest unemployment in 50 years and rapid economic growth. President Biden's persistent threat to deliver on his campaign promise of repealing these tax cuts and raising taxes further fuels inflation. Businesses need certainty to create a stable environment to invest and grow, yet Democrats continue to talk about imposing ~~crippling~~ tax hikes and policies that expand welfare-without-work policies that keeps Main Street understaffed, store shelves empty and prices high. By doubling down on policies that have put us on the brink of a recession, the president is sending all the wrong signals when it comes to getting our country back on track.

#### Deficits don’t cause inflation – use logic.

Tamny 22 [John Tamny is editor of RealClearMarkets, Vice President at FreedomWorks, a senior fellow at the [Market Institute](https://marketinstitute.org/), and a senior economic adviser to Applied Finance Advisors, 3-8-2022, "Let's Be Serious For Once, Budget Deficits Do Not Cause Inflation", RealClearMarkets, https://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2022/03/08/lets\_be\_serious\_for\_once\_budget\_deficits\_do\_not\_cause\_inflation\_820120.html, DOA: 6-23-2022 //ArchanSen]

In 1815, Great Britain could claim government debt that was 261% of GDP. Did inflation ensue? No. The pound was tied to gold. In 1945, war spending had U.S. federal debt well north of 100%. Did the dollar subsequently collapse? No. The dollar was defined as 1/35th of a gold ounce. Too much gold for you? That’s fine. Let’s move to Asia. Japan in particular. Its government debt has soared over the decades. During that time the yen has risen pretty substantially against the dollar from 360/1USD to 114/1USD. And what about the U.S.? In 1980, total U.S. federal debt was a little bit above $900 billion. At the time, the yield on the 10-year Treasury note was over 11%. Fast forward to 2022, and total federal debt has zoomed upward to $30 trillion. The yield on the 10-year is 1.71%. If readers are confused, Treasuries pay dollar income streams. In other words, if all the debt amassed over the decades by the U.S. had resulted in inflation, Treasury yields would have risen, not fallen. The above stats are just a few data points to call into the question the increasingly popular narrative among economists, pundits, and very deep thinkers about the alleged relationship between government debt and inflation. There is none. To be clear about what was just said, this opinion piece is not a defense of government spending or borrowing. Government spending is a freedom and economy-sapping tax, period. When governments spend either thanks to taxation or borrowing, the economy-neutering effect is the same. And it’s harmful. If you believe otherwise, and most economists puzzlingly do, you believe Nancy Pelosi and Mitch McConnell are better capital allocators than Jeff Bezos and Peter Thiel. The main thing is that statistics or history aren’t necessary to show why government debt doesn’t cause inflation. Logic is all that’s required. Inflation is a devaluation of the currency. Yet budget deficits signal a willingness on the part of investors to buy future income streams from the government taking on the debt. Ok, so by the thought processes of the pundit and economics classes, investors eagerly fund the borrowing of the very nations that intend to stiff them with devaluation. No, it doesn’t work that way. Or it doesn’t have to. Indeed, it’s no doubt true that more than a few nations have devalued their way out of massive debt over the decades and centuries. But it’s a reminder that debt doesn’t cause inflation, as much as some nations choose to foist their profligacy on their citizens and creditors. Which means the pundit class is reversing causation. While nations that do a reasonable job of protecting their currencies can run up lots of debt, nations that inflate it away cannot. All of which is a long or short way of saying that inflation restrains government borrowing. Which is a statement of the obvious. Many in the pundit class will say “central banks” conduct just that sort of lending. Oh dear….So we’re supposed to believe that arms of government can finance government? If this were even remotely true, the Soviet Union would still exist today care of Gosbank. Despite the tendency of the deep in thought to get deficits and inflation backwards, they keep making their silly cases. In an opinion piece last week for the Wall Street Journal, Thomas Sargent and William Silber cited Milton Friedman’s quip in the 1970s that inflation had resulted from “ever more goodies” sans commensurate tax hikes as the cause of the 1970s inflation. Oh yes, nothing to do with the explicit devaluation of the dollar in 1971 whereby President Nixon severed the dollar’s link to gold. Naaah. Nothing to see there.

### No Recession

#### Inflation effects will be mild – well-supported banks, high saving, and plentiful jobs prove

Lee 6-22-22 [Don Lee covers the U.S. and global economy out of Washington, D.C, "Yes, a recession looks inevitable. But it may not be that bad. Here's why", Los Angeles Times, https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-22/recession-looks-unavoidable-but-will-it-be-that-bad] GBS-HW

WASHINGTON — Whether it’s President Biden insisting a recession is avoidable or his critics arguing that the wolf is at the door, both sides are acting as if the nation faces an unprecedented catastrophe. Partly it’s political theater — Biden fighting on behalf of an already beleaguered presidency and many of the doomsayers hoping a downturn could be the coup de grace for Democrats. Behind the rhetoric, the reality is that recessions are a normal part of American economic life. The U.S. has had one, on average, every 6½ years since 1945. And in the present case, most professional economists think any downturn now is likely to be relatively mild, with a fairly quick recovery. “We’re calling for a small ‘r’ recession,” said Jack Ablin, chief investment officer at Cresset Capital. “It means it’s not going to be protracted and things aren’t going to fall apart,” as they did during the Great Recession and again in 2020 when the pandemic struck. Many households are flush with cash, and jobs are plentiful with demand for new workers strong. Banks are well capitalized, which gives them a solid buffer against a business contraction. What may be different this time is the public’s state of mind, coupled with a handful of unusual factors — first among them the grinding war in Ukraine. For most Americans, the pandemic and its accompanying economic upheaval came after an extraordinarily long period of relative economic stability. The economy was not growing much and real incomes were stagnating, but unemployment was low among most population groups, prices were stable, interest rates were at rock bottom and stores were flooded with low-cost goods made overseas. Most people had adjusted to the status quo. So the COVID-19 downturn hit like a thunderbolt, and the outbreak of inflation — driven largely by consumers suddenly beginning to spend their pandemic-induced savings — was another jolt to popular expectations. Now, economic indicators look primed for a recession. The broad-based Standard & Poor’s 500 stock index is down more than 20% since its high Jan. 3. U.S. consumer confidence has sunk to record lows, thanks largely to high inflation. Retail spending, home-building and manufacturing output all declined last month. And consumers, who drive the U.S. economy, are starting to cut back on discretionary purchases, things such as appliances and services. Tom Straus, owner of Straus Carpets in Oakland, has seen a sudden drop-off in orders for new flooring jobs at homes in the San Francisco Bay Area. Typically his commercial business includes about $1 million in projects for schools during the summer; such orders so far this year total just $30,000. “Our future work is diminishing,” he said. Many other leaders of businesses, small and large, as well as workers, are bracing for harder times, with fears stoked by the Federal Reserve’s plans for more fat interest rate increases to combat high inflation. “We’re skating on the edge of recession, especially with the Fed bringing out these big guns,” said Christopher Rupkey, chief economist at the financial market research firm Fwdbonds. Larry Summers, Harvard economist and former Treasury secretary, notes that whenever inflation tops 4% (it was more than double that in May) and unemployment drops below 4% (it was 3.6% last month), that’s an indication of an overheating economy that in the past has always brought recession within a year or two. Whether inflation is avoidable, the real question may be: How bad and how long will the next downturn be? And on this score, there is greater consensus among experts that it’ll probably be nothing like the most recent episodes. One common definition of a recession is two consecutive quarters of negative economic growth, that is, shrinking gross domestic product. But an official designation is made by a nonprofit research organization, which looks at a broad set of data and declares a recession, usually months after it’s begun. The Great Recession that began in late 2007 lasted 18 months — the longest in 90 years — and was also one of the deepest. Millions of Americans lost their jobs and homes after the real estate bubble burst and large banking companies cratered. The unemployment rate shot up to 10%. The pandemic-inflicted recession in 2020 was the shortest on record, just two months from peak to trough, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research. But the sudden collapse in the economy was unparalleled as businesses across the country closed and consumers sheltered in place for weeks. Some 22 million jobs evaporated between February and April that year. The rebound since then has been fast and strong, largely because of unprecedented government aid to households and businesses. Several rounds of stimulus checks helped boost consumer spending and demand, contributing to higher inflation. Much of that money hasn’t been spent yet, which will provide a cushion for many households. Americans overall had excess savings of $2.7 trillion in the first quarter, according to Moody’s Analytics’ calculations based on Fed and other government data. Although more than half of that was held by households in the top 10% of income, those in the bottom 20% had on average about $5,700 more cash in hand than they otherwise would have without the federal aid and the effects of the pandemic. Those extra savings, along with historically low household debt and loan-servicing burden — many homeowners locked in low mortgage rates before the recent increases — suggest that most people are better positioned financially and could help make the next recession milder. At Bank of America Institute, economist David Tinsley saw a noticeable uptick in BofA customers using their credit cards last month, as was the case at many banks. High gas prices, he says, are hitting lower-income families hard and also cutting into spending for goods. But looking at BofA customers’ savings deposits and checking account balances, Tinsley said, “households continue to have high buffers relative to before the pandemic.” For John Barone, 58, the difference between where he was on the eve of the Great Recession and today is like night and day. In 2007, he was running his own home renovation business in Baltimore, making payments on a $1-million loan. When the housing market crashed, he laid off 20 workers and eventually lost his business, his home and his wife. Today Barone and a business partner operate out of Washington, D.C., giving tours with their seven golf carts. His business debts are modest — $32,000 in bank loans for two electric vehicles. Barone has seven seasonal workers and lives modestly in an apartment on Capitol Hill. “I don’t have a car, don’t have to buy gas,” he said. “I go to the day-old bread shelf and buy my bread for half price.” Barone is more sanguine than most. Nationally, small-business owners were asked last month by the National Federation of Independent Business how they see conditions over the next six months. The result was the lowest reading in 48 years. At larger companies, a May survey of 750 top executives by the Conference Board found that more than 60% of them see a recession coming or already here. Both surveys, however, suggest employers aren’t sure what that may mean as far as employment and potential for layoffs. Many employers are still struggling to fill job vacancies and could be reluctant to let go of workers right away. The jobless rate stood at 3.6% in May, a notch above the half-century pre-pandemic low, and there are still nearly two job openings for every person officially unemployed. New unemployment claims, a proxy for layoffs, have been edging higher in recent weeks but remain low by historical standards. Job growth in May was the slowest in 12 months, but still a robust 390,000. “Of course we’re slowing down, but let’s remember how fast we had been growing,” said Carl Tannenbaum, chief economist at Northern Trust in Chicago. One thing that worries Tannenbaum is the risk of knock-on effects from the Fed’s move to jack up interest rates. The pivot has already taken a big bite out of the U.S. housing market, but the tightening by the Fed and other central banks could also slam developing countries and the global economy as investors reshuffle funds. That could circle back to drag down the U.S. Economists say the Fed misread the threat of inflation and was slow to abandon its easy-money policies, but it’s now racing to catch up and raise its benchmark interest rate aggressively to cool demand and slow growth, including in the job market. “I think they’re seeing it like the worst of two worlds — either stagflation or recession,” said Beth Ann Bovino, chief U.S. economist at Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services. Stagflation — a condition of high inflation and stagnant activity — plagued the economy in the 1970s and ended only after the Fed raised interest rates high and drove the economy into a deep doubled-dip recession in the early 1980s. “My belief is that in order to avoid stagflation, I think they would risk the economy and go for the recession rather than suffer stagflation for however many years,” Bovino said. Jeffrey Korzenik, chief investment strategist at Fifth Third Bank in Tampa, Fla., said the country will avoid a recession, barely, largely because of the strength of the labor market. He figures the Fed’s tightening will create more layoffs but said, “We have so many openings, it’ll be easier to get workers recycled into the job market. It’s not bulletproof, but it means the economy is less likely to fall off a cliff.”

### Recession Inevitable

#### Wage-price spiral makes a recession inevitable

Philip Marey, 6-9-2022, "US: The inevitable recession," RaboResearch - Economic Research, https://economics.rabobank.com/publications/2022/june/us-the-inevitable-recession//DG

The negative supply shocks related to COVID and the Russian invasion of Ukraine are causing headwinds for the US economy, which contracted in the first quarter of this year. However, as consumption and investment remain robust, the US is likely to avoid a recession this year Meanwhile, a wage-price spiral has started that will be difficult to stop without the Fed hiking the economy into recession next year, Therefore, a recession seems inevitable: even if the US is able to absorb the exogenous shocks to the supply side of the economy, the response of the central bank to the wage-price spiral will cause a recession from within.

#### Recession is inevitable – politics can’t save the economy

White 6-22-22 [Ben White is POLITICO Pro's chief economic correspondent and author of the “Morning Money” column covering the nexus of finance and public policy, "Actually, a recession is inevitable", POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/politico-nightly/2022/06/22/actually-a-recession-is-inevitable-00041577] GBS-HW

RECESSION IS COMING! — You read it here first, people. Take it to the bank. The U.S. is headed toward an economic downturn. Because it always is. We have clearly not — as some hoped during recent booms — repealed the business cycle and entered a period of permanent growth. Recessions always arrive. So the question is not whether we are headed toward one. Because, well, duh. The questions are: When will recession hit? What will cause it? And how bad will it be? And while we may not be in one yet (though it’s possible we are), I’m sorry to report that the conditions are ripe for a slide in gross domestic product growth that lasts at least two quarters, the technical definition of recession. I say we may already be in one because growth in the first quarter slid 1.5 percent. And analysts are mostly downgrading estimates for the second quarter to close to zero, based on slipping retail sales, plunging consumer and business sentiment and an aggressive Federal Reserve bumping up historically low interest rates to battle runaway inflation of close to 9 percent. The Atlanta Federal Reserve’s “GDP Now” model pegs second quarter growth at 0.0 percent. For real. Exactly zero. They probably won’t nail it on the head. So the question is whether we’ll get just a tiny bit of growth or a small decline. If the latter, well, that’s a recession. But probably not one that people will notice very much — some of the recent declines had quirky inventory changes in them that should get reversed. Consumer and business spending (the big drivers of the economy) have held up remarkably well, meaning if we do get a negative second quarter, we should bounce back at least a bit in the second half of the year. The scary bit is really what happens next year and beyond. And economists, politicians, Wall Street traders and pretty much everyone else is growing more concerned that a significant downturn could arrive in 2023. The main reason is obvious: Steady and significant rate hikes from the Fed often trigger at least mild recessions. It’s a feature, not a bug. Fed Chair Jerome Powell and his colleagues will never say it out loud. But they’d take a recession rather than allow prices to continue to spin out of control. The intent of hikes, after all, is to slow down consumer and business spending and thus arrest rising prices. And the current Fed has its foot hard on the brakes at the moment, with a second three-quarter-point increase expected next month, followed by half-point increases in September and November, then by another quarter point in December. These would still get the Fed’s target rate only into somewhat normal range from effectively below zero. But mere anticipation of the moves has already driven mortgage rates to 6 percent. Interest rates on everything else, from auto loans to credit cards, will likely be headed significantly higher. And this will happen as consumers are already drawing down their significant Covid-era savings to keep up with inflation. Credit card debt is rising, and servicing that debt is growing more expensive. After booming during Covid, Americans’ savings rate has taken a major dive. The figure hit just 4.4 percent in April, the lowest since September 2008 during the Great Recession. Big companies like Tesla, Netflix and the trading platform Robinhood have spoken of hiring freezes and potential layoffs. The once-booming cryptocurrency market is a giant mess. JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon is talking about a “hurricane” possibly hitting the economy. Oh, and politics won’t help. The midterms could very well lead to divided government again in D.C., with Republicans taking at least one chamber on Capitol Hill. If that happens, it could easily take us back to the days of debt ceiling and government shutdown fights that plagued the economy and the Obama administration after the 2010 midterms. Mix it all together — big rate hikes, strapped consumers, freaked-out executives and possibly gridlocked government — and there is potential for a quite significant recession.