# America COMPETES Act

# Negative

## 1nc

#### A compromised innovation bill will pass soon –Biden is pushing for the bill – framing it as counter inflationary and creating a sense of urgency

AIP 6/29

American Institute of Physics, “Congress Searches for Compromise on Landmark Innovation Bill” June 29, 2022 https://www.aip.org/fyi/2022/congress-searches-compromise-landmark-innovation-bill

Negotiations to reconcile the House’s America COMPETES Act of 2022 with the Senate’s U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) are in the final stretch, with Democratic leaders pushing to pass a compromise bill by the time Congress departs for its usual August break. The urgency stems from the dwindling time remaining to reach a deal before the November election diverts lawmakers’ attention and the current legislative session expires at the end of the year. The bills reflect broad bipartisan interest in improving U.S. capabilities in research and technology development relative to China and other competitor nations, and each includes $52 billion in direct funding for semiconductor R&D and manufacturing. However, the bills sharply diverge over matters such as how to shape a multiagency R&D push, how to build up regional R&D capacity, whether to expedite visas for technically skilled foreign citizens, and how to protect U.S.-funded research from exploitation by rival governments. Lawmakers also attached a host of provisions unrelated to science policy to each bill, opening up debates over far-flung matters such as trade and environmental policy. Any final bill will require the support of at least 10 Republican senators to avoid a filibuster, which gives the Senate additional leverage in the negotiations. Democrats narrow ambitions in search of deal Negotiators have been working behind closed doors since the 107-member conference committee tasked with reconciling the legislation held its first meeting in May. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) said earlier this month that they are “narrowing” the scope of the legislation in hope of reaching compromise, without indicating what they have dropped. She and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY), a key proponent of the legislation, met with their Republican counterparts last week to discuss prospects for a final deal. “We expressed our belief that there is no reason that we should not pass this bill through Congress in July,” Pelosi and Schumer said in a statement. “Democrats have already made accommodations in the name of reaching an agreement, which we are optimistic can happen soon.” However, some Republicans reportedly prefer to revisit the legislation next year since they may gain control of Congress after the midterm elections. Nevertheless, any final bill would still require support from both parties and the Biden administration. The semiconductor funding has put lawmakers under particular pressure to complete the bill, with some leaders in the industry warning a delay could lead them to invest in other countries that have already moved ahead with incentives. President Biden has also made the case for quick action on the legislation, arguing it has measures that will help reduce supply chain disruptions that contribute to inflation.“Pass the damn bill and send it to me,” Biden said in May. “It’s going to help bring down prices, bring home jobs, and power America’s manufacturing comeback.”

#### \*\*Plan saps PC – Insert Link

#### It’s a heavy lift and requires pc – investing pc secures GOP support

Trubowitz 2021

Peter, LSE US Centre Director Professor, “Biden’s foreign policy will likely focus on rebuilding bridges with allies, pressing China, and ensuring international relationships benefit Americans again,” January 20, 2021 <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/usappblog/2021/01/20/bidens-foreign-policy-will-likely-focus-on-rebuilding-bridges-with-allies-pressing-china-and-ensuring-international-relationships-benefit-americans-again/>

There are no magic bullets here, but there is much Biden can do. His campaign commitment to adopt federal “Buy American” policies to favor domestic producers is sensible and a political no-brainer. Investing in domestic priorities like infrastructure, education, and energy to create non-tradeable jobs and boost US competitiveness over the longer term is a heavier lift, politically. Still, some Republicans on Capitol Hill will find it in their political interests try to work with Biden on these efforts, especially if they are connected to recovering from the pandemic and making America more competitive vis a vis China. The more Biden invests intelligently here, the more it will ease anti-globalist pressures at home and strengthen US credibility as a reliable partner abroad. This is political capital well spent.

#### Successful reconciliation quickly revitalizes competitiveness versus China

Augustine 3-1-2022, retired chairman & CEO of Lockheed Martin and former undersecretary of the Army (Norman, “America's competitive edge is shrinking — Congress can reverse the trend,” The Hill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/596255-americas-competitive-edge-is-shrinking-congress-can-reverse-the-trend>)

Science and technology matter. Several studies, two of which led to Nobel prizes, have indicated that up to 85 percent of the growth in America’s GDP can be attributed to advancements in just two fields, science and technology. The United States cannot hope to compete with China, industrially or militarily, on a person-to-person basis given the latter’s four-times greater population. America’s competitiveness will depend on such assets as freedom, free enterprise, allies, innovativeness and prowess in science and technology. But in all-important basic research, America ranks 29th among nations in the fraction of R&D that is federally funded. In 2007, it was my privilege to lead a study of America’s competitiveness that was requested by Congress and overseen by the National Academies. Twenty individuals, university presidents, corporate CEOs, former and future presidential appointees and several Nobel Laureates performed the study. The 565-page document that was produced, known as the “Gathering Storm” report, concluded that America had moved onto a path that would lose the scientific leadership it had been building since the 1940s, and that this was largely due to the lack of investment in research and the failure of our nation’s primary and secondary public schools to produce a sufficient number of graduates qualified to pursue careers in science, engineering and mathematics. The most recent well-regarded international test of academic achievement of 15-year-olds placed the U.S. in 17th place in science and 37th in mathematics. China ranks number one in each, but only tests students in a few major cities. The qualifications and interest of America’s youth in pursuing careers in science and technology is suggested by the fraction of college students receiving their undergraduate degrees in, for example, engineering, wherein America ranks 76th worldwide — just behind Mozambique. Congress acted on the Gathering Storm report, enacting the America COMPETES Act of 2007. Subsequently, it legislated several bold plans to sustain U.S. leadership in science and technology, but it has, unfortunately, consistently failed to provide the funds needed to implement those plans. Ironically, China seems to have adopted many key parts of the plans and funded them. According to a new analysis by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, current annual federal expenditures on research (even with funding growth set merely at the rate of inflation in the years beyond those specifically addressed in the reports) are now $6.7 billion below where they would have been under the COMPETES Act of 2007 and $4.9 billion below where they would have been had the COMPETES Act of 2010 been funded. Had federal funding kept pace with China’s overall R&D growth rate during the period, the shortfall is $47 billion. It is, of course, not China that stipulates how much America invests in basic research (currently 0.2% of GDP — about what our citizenry spends on beer) or the quality of our public schools. As Pogo the Possum was prone to pronounce, “It is us.” Congress’s passage of the competitiveness legislation before it, along with the research investments it calls for, is essential if America is not to awaken one day in the not too distant future to find itself a formerly competitive nation.

#### US tech leadership solves nuclear war

Kroenig & Gopalaswamy 18, \*Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council \*\*Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council (\*Matthew Kroenig \*\*Bharath Gopalaswamy, 11-12-2018, "Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/>)

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation. This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

## U

### Will Pass – TOA

#### It will pass it’s Biden’s top priority – McConnell’s threat is meaningless – staffers are continuing work on a compromise that will pass both houses

Wasson and Dennis 7/1 [Erik Wasson is a Correspondent for Congress in the Bloomberg News with 58 videos in the C-SPAN Video Library; the first appearance was a 2011 Roundtable as a Staff Writer for the Hill, The. The year with the highest average number of views per program was 2022 with an average of 489 views per program. Most appearances with Bill Scanlan (12), Steve Scully (8), Greta Brawner (7). Most common tags: Federal Budget, Coronavirus Disease 2019, U.S. Economy. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-01/semiconductor-funding-bill-likely-to-survive-mcconnell-threat]//LP

A $52 billion package of incentives and subsidies to bolster US semiconductor manufacturing is far from dead, despite Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell’s threat to scuttle the legislation containing it in order to stall passage of President Joe Biden’s economic plan. Democrats have multiple paths to get the chips money, which has broad bipartisan support, through Congress. McConnell stunned Democrats on Thursday by tweeting he would stand in the way of the wider China competition legislation of which the semiconductor provision is a part so long as Democrats plan to use the partisan budget process to ram through a separate package of tax increases on the wealthy and corporations, incentives for green energy, and prescription drug price limits. While the ploy is aimed at stopping the budget package, it comes as Republicans have also been pushing Democrats to abandon plans to add big-ticket spending items to the China bill, which has been the subject of closed door talks for months. Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo, in an interview with the Washington Post, called McConnell’s threat a mere “bump in the road” designed to increase his leverage in negotiations. “The only entity in the world that benefits from this bill not passing is China,” she said in the interview. Enactment of the semiconductor incentives is a top priority for the Biden administration as well as manufacturers such as Intel Corp. and companies that are heavy users of chips. While the global semiconductor shortage has eased somewhat, there is still limited production for certain chips used in cars and home appliances. The wrangling over the bill comes as semiconductor stocks took a beating, driven by concerns arose about demand cooling for chips as the US economy faces recession fears. McConnell made his threat as Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer and Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia, a key Democratic vote, were nearing a deal on the specifics of a $1 trillion budget and tax package. Republicans have largely rallied behind their Senate leader, including those who supported the competition and chips bill. The McConnell move is not without political and procedural risks. Democrats, including House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s spokesman Henry Connelly, attempted to frame the effort as being soft on China while standing in the way of prescription drug cuts. That message could blunt efforts of Republicans to present themselves in the midterms as both tough on Beijing and fighting to lower spiraling costs. Democrats could ignore McConnell’s threats, pass their economic package with a simple majority in August and then hold a potentially painful vote on a completed China bill just before the elections to hammer the issue home. At that point, with no chance to stall the economic plan, some Senate Republicans could peel off and vote for the bill. Eighteen Republicans, including McConnell, voted for the legislation when it passed the Senate in March. In a second scenario, if Schumer and Manchin’s talks fall apart as Build Back Better talks did in December, then all sides simply let the China bill move forward. Given this real possibility, Republican and Democratic staff are continuing to work on the details of the House and Senate China bills to try to make progress on a unified bill that could pass both chambers. The biggest differences remaining on the competition bill revolve around trade policy, according to people familiar with the situation. Democrats are trying to add payments to workers displaced by trade deals under a program called Trade Adjustment Assistance. There is also controversy over restrictions on investments by Americans and American companies in China, and a research and development tax provision. Democrats are widely seen walking away from an attempt to add immigration visa expansion and climate provisions to the bill after earlier dropping a marijuana banking provision. In a third scenario, Democrats can under Senate rules add the $52 billion chips bill to the budget bill if Schumer and Manchin agree to do so. Other aspects of the China legislation can be tweaked from so-called authorizations to appropriations to make them comply with Senate budget rules. Provisions related to Taiwan policy, outward-bound US investment, research security and federal procurement may not be allowed in the budget package, however. Finally, Democrats have a Senate-passed version of the China bill sitting in the House. They could simply pass it and send it to Biden without adding more spending. McConnell Tactics McConnell’s gambit of holding a bipartisan China competition package hostage while Democrats try and jam through a scaled-back economic plan isn’t the first time he’s used the lure of a bipartisan deal as leverage to try and slow or kill Biden’s larger agenda. A year ago, McConnell insisted that Democrats separate the bipartisan infrastructure plan from the larger Democratic “Build Back Better” effort. That increased tensions and confusion in the Democratic caucus. House liberals eventually caved on their insistence of simultaneously passing the infrastructure package alongside a massive Democratic plan, while negotiations with Manchin dragged on. Ultimately Democratic divisions, rather than any McConnell ploy, led to the collapse of the $2.2 trillion Build Back Better plan, but McConnell exacerbated Democratic infighting.

#### Biden is pushing -- classified briefings are boosting momentum

Andrews 7/10

Natalie Andrews and Richard Rubin, Wall Street Journal, “Congress Juggles China Bill, Democrats’ Climate and Drug-Pricing Ambitions” July 10, 2022 https://www.wsj.com/articles/congress-juggles-china-bill-democrats-climate-and-drug-pricing-ambitions-11657458301

In recent weeks, several chip manufacturers have announced they would reconsider plans to build in the U.S. if Congress didn’t act soon. An all-senators classified briefing by Biden administration officials is planned for Wednesday to emphasize the national security implications, said several aides. Efforts are under way to put together a similar briefing for the House, said a person familiar with the matter. “Fundamentally we will not have the ability to protect ourselves as a nation if this bill is not passed,” Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo said in an interview, pointing to the U.S. dependency on Taiwan for semiconductors and overall supply-chain disruptions. Ms. Raimondo acknowledged Mr. McConnell has slowed down the process.

#### His push means it passes

Galston 6/14

Wiliam, Wallstreet Journal, “How Good Bills Die in Committee” June 14, 2022 <https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-good-bills-die-in-committee-competes-act-semiconductors-confer-senate-house-11655216426>

Noting that the Senate bill already represents a true bipartisan compromise, Mr. Young argues that it would be unreasonable to expect the final agreement to split the difference between the House and Senate versions. Instead, it should be much closer to the Senate bill. Mr. Schumer understands this, he said, as do Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo and the White House, but apparently Mrs. Pelosi does not. Mr. Young was candid about the trade provisions of the bill, a major sticking point. During Senate deliberations, he said, some Republican senators insisted on new trade language, and the ensuing disagreement was successfully resolved in negotiations between Senate Finance Committee Chairman Ron Wyden and Mike Crapo, the committee’s ranking Republican. This bipartisan agreement wasn’t acceptable to House Democrats, and the matter is being relitigated between Mr. Crapo and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Richard Neal. Describing their positions as “principled disagreement,” Mr. Young is “concerned” that their differences might prove difficult to resolve soon. Consumer groups and app developers believe that the Wyden-Crapo trade provisions will undermine the Europe Union’s regulatory framework for digital trade. Mrs. Pelosi also appears to believe this. Mr. Wyden defends his language as a serious effort to fight authoritarian forces engaged in “digital censorship,” although he is open to refinements distinguishing between censorship and regulations addressing data privacy, antitrust enforcement, and antiharassment regulations. Mr. Young says the conferees should focus on resolving disagreements that can be successfully negotiated while setting aside intractable disputes for another day. He expressed optimism that provisions concerning the National Science Foundation, national-security innovation, domestic chip production, regional technology hubs, and workforce development for advanced production fall into the “resolvable” category. He believes the government’s credibility is on the line. “We have an opportunity to show that regular order can produce a broad bipartisan bill,” he says, but this is unlikely to happen, he added, unless President Biden pushes it across the goal line. In remarks on the America Competes Act last month, a frustrated president exclaimed, “Pass the damn bill and send it to me.” Unless he gets directly involved, this probably won’t happen, and America’s best chance in decades to boost domestic innovation and manufacturing could die in committee.

#### It will pass this month – aggressive behind the scenes negotiations

Ambrose 6/29 [Mitch manages AIP's science policy newsletters and resources. He previously was a fellow at the Science and Technology Policy Institute and worked for the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. He received a B.S. in physics from the University of Minnesota. https://www.aip.org/fyi/2022/congress-searches-compromise-landmark-innovation-bill]//LP

Negotiations to reconcile the House’s America COMPETES Act of 2022 with the Senate’s U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) are in the final stretch, with Democratic leaders pushing to pass a compromise bill by the time Congress departs for its usual August break. The urgency stems from the dwindling time remaining to reach a deal before the November election diverts lawmakers’ attention and the current legislative session expires at the end of the year. The bills reflect broad bipartisan interest in improving U.S. capabilities in research and technology development relative to China and other competitor nations, and each includes $52 billion in direct funding for semiconductor R&D and manufacturing. However, the bills sharply diverge over matters such as how to shape a multiagency R&D push, how to build up regional R&D capacity, whether to expedite visas for technically skilled foreign citizens, and how to protect U.S.-funded research from exploitation by rival governments. Lawmakers also attached a host of provisions unrelated to science policy to each bill, opening up debates over far-flung matters such as trade and environmental policy. Any final bill will require the support of at least 10 Republican senators to avoid a filibuster, which gives the Senate additional leverage in the negotiations. Negotiators have been working behind closed doors since the 107-member conference committee tasked with reconciling the legislation held its first meeting in May. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) said earlier this month that they are “narrowing” the scope of the legislation in hope of reaching compromise, without indicating what they have dropped. She and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY), a key proponent of the legislation, met with their Republican counterparts last week to discuss prospects for a final deal. “We expressed our belief that there is no reason that we should not pass this bill through Congress in July,” Pelosi and Schumer said in a statement. “Democrats have already made accommodations in the name of reaching an agreement, which we are optimistic can happen soon.” However, some Republicans reportedly prefer to revisit the legislation next year since they may gain control of Congress after the midterm elections. Nevertheless, any final bill would still require support from both parties and the Biden administration. The semiconductor funding has put lawmakers under particular pressure to complete the bill, with some leaders in the industry warning a delay could lead them to invest in other countries that have already moved ahead with incentives. President Biden has also made the case for quick action on the legislation, arguing it has measures that will help reduce supply chain disruptions that contribute to inflation. “Pass the damn bill and send it to me,” Biden said in May. “It’s going to help bring down prices, bring home jobs, and power America’s manufacturing comeback.” Intel CEO Pat Gelsinger testified at a March hearing on the case for semiconductor industry subsidies. (Image credit – Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee) The semiconductor money would fund programs authorized in the CHIPS for America Act, which Congress passed in early 2021. Of the total, $39 billion is for manufacturing incentives and most of the remainder is for R&D initiatives, with almost all the money channeled through the Commerce Department. Backers of the CHIPS Act have also advocated for Congress to create a tax credit specific to the semiconductor industry, but lawmakers appear to have abandoned the idea of attaching it to the compromise legislation to avoid complicating negotiations. The top Republican for tax policy in the House, Rep. Kevin Brady (R-TX), argued at the conference kickoff meeting that the legislation should not include tax provisions, especially any that favor a specific industry. Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX), a lead advocate of the semiconductor tax credit, told FYI that he and Sen. Mark Warner (D-VA) attempted to include it in the original legislation. “We were told [the credit] wasn't going to be feasible in the Senate when we passed the CHIPS Act, and so we opted for the emergency spending. But I still think in the long term it’s going to take a reliable source of support, and that probably means an investment tax credit, not just spending,” he said. Budget targets for science agencies up in the air While the semiconductor funding is among the most consequential aspects of the bills, their R&D policy sections would also set ambitious targets for ramping up selected federal science agency budgets. Actually meeting those targets would still require Congress to supply the funding through the annual appropriations process. Nearly three years ago, Schumer first floated a proposal to create a massive new directorate at the National Science Foundation to drive progress in vanguard technologies such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing, and he teamed up with Sen. Todd Young (R-IN) to advance the idea legislatively. Senators substantially revised the proposal as it progressed through the chamber, paring back its spending goals for NSF, carving out large roles for the Department of Energy and Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and attaching a broad policy update for NASA. The bill the Senate ultimately passed, USICA, recommends Congress ramp up NSF’s annual budget from its current level of $8.8 billion to $21.3 billion over five years, with the technology directorate’s annual budget growing to $9.3 billion. It also recommends DOE and DARPA each receive about $17 billion above their base budget over the same period for complementary R&D on the technology areas funded by the new NSF directorate. Meanwhile, the House Science Committee disagreed with the Senate focus on technology development and advanced a distinct vision for the NSF directorate oriented around applying science to “societal challenges” such as climate change, social inequality, and cybersecurity. The committee also proposed Congress channel extra funds into existing programs across NSF, the DOE Office of Science, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. And in a further break with the Senate, it opted not to loop NASA into the legislation. The committee ultimately produced bipartisan legislation that recommends Congress ramp up NSF’s annual budget to nearly $18 billion over five years, with the new directorate growing only to $3.4 billion. Over the same period it also recommends increasing the Office of Science budget from $7.5 billion to $11.1 billion and the NIST budget from about $1 billion to almost $1.8 billion. The committee has argued its proposals reflect a deeper understanding of the agencies’ strengths and have broader support from science organizations than the approach taken by USICA. But critics counter that the point of the Senate legislation is to prioritize select technologies, and Young has said he plans to stand firm on his vision for the NSF directorate. The House ultimately made the committee’s legislation a central plank of the COMPETES Act, which it passed in February on a party-line vote, with Republicans primarily objecting to provisions not arising from the Science Committee. Some senators have embraced aspects of the House’s vision, with leaders of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee introducing legislation for the DOE Office of Science that hews closely to the Science Committee proposals. However, it is unclear whether their proposals would displace the funding recommendations for DOE in USICA or add to them, or how much support they have among senators.

### Will Pass – Industry Pressure

#### Industry pressure generates momentum – negotiators are aiming for this month

Meyer 7/1 [Theodoric Meyer is a national political reporter for The Washington Post and a co-author of the Early 202 newsletter. He joined The Post in 2021 from Politico, where he covered Washington's lobbying industry and the early months of the Biden administration. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/07/01/marjorie-dannenfelser-what-next-abortion-battles/]//LP

“Sen. McConnell is so beholden to PhRMA that he’s willing to help China, hurt American manufacturing, and screw over Americans with outrageously high Rx prices,” Justin Goodman, a Schumer spokesman, said in a tweet. USICA and a slimmed-down reconciliation bill are both Democratic priorities before the midterm elections. The trade measure received the support of 91 senators last year but was dropped from the competition bill this week because senators could not reach agreement with House Republicans and Democrats, two sources familiar with the negotiations who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe private negotiations tell The Early. The House's preferred trade provisions are expected to fall out as well, sources said. Schumer and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi have been working to speed up negotiations so they could hold a vote on a compromise bill in July as manufacturing industry pressure weighed on the negotiations. The microchip bill received the support of 18 Republican senators last year, and the car and technology industries are pressuring lawmakers to act quickly. Intel announced last week that it would put on hold a $20 billion microchip-manufacturing plant in Ohio unless Congress could reach an agreement.

### 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.

## Link

### L NATO – Domestic Focus t/o

#### Biden has to remain focused on domestic issues – American’s are no longer interested in defeating Russia

**Doyle 7-2**-22 - White House reporter for the Washington Examiner (Katherine, The Washington Examiner, “Public wants Biden to prioritize inflation over Russia: Poll”, July 1, 2022, <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/restoring-america/patriotism-unity/biden-inflation-russia-poll> )//RG

President Joe Biden vowed on Thursday that the United States would continue to back Ukraine for “as long as it takes” to stop Russia’s war, **but the public is showing** signs that **its appetite for assistance has limits.** Speaking at the close of the NATO meeting in Madrid, Biden said Americans should expect to pay record-high gas prices until Russia is defeated in Ukraine. “As long as it takes,” Biden said, "so that Russia cannot in fact defeat Ukraine and move beyond Ukraine.” “This is a critical, critical position for the world," he added. Over the course of six days of international summit meetings, the U.S. committed its largest military expansion in Europe since the end of the Cold War, and trans-Atlantic alliance members agreed to add two new formerly neutral Nordic countries to their ranks. But returning home to Washington, Biden confronts a stark political reality. Soaring inflation and gas prices are weighing on families **wary of more intervention** in overseas conflicts and **want the president to focus on domestic issues over defeating Russia**, according to a new poll shared first with the Washington Examiner. Conducted by YouGov for Concerned Veterans for America from June 23-29, the survey found that 38% of people believe Biden should prioritize the inflation crisis, compared to 8% who want the president to ensure Russia’s defeat in Ukraine. Forty-four percent are unhappy with Biden’s handling of the war.

### L Disinformation

#### Republicans view anti-disinformation initiatives as censorship

Curi 22 [Maria Cristina Curi will be joining Bloomberg Law next week, reporting on cybersecurity and telecom, including the FCC. Curi was a trade reporter at Inside U.S. Trade, a subscription-fee-based daily online news service from Inside Washington Publishers. Before that, she was an intern at Politico. Curi has also interned at The Iowa Center for Public Affairs Journalism-IowaWatch.org and American Public Media Group. She was also a Politico Journalism Institute participant. https://about.bgov.com/news/republicans-call-disinformation-board-dangerous-censorship/]//LP

Republican lawmakers are blasting a new Department of Homeland Security disinformation board as the latest Democratic effort to censor opposing views. Ahead of the November midterm election, the Biden administration and Democratic lawmakers are looking to tackle disinformation — deliberately deceptive messaging — on issues including the pandemic, the 2020 election, and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas told a House panel Wednesday that the governance board would counter the threat of misinformation and disinformation for elections and homeland security. Misinformation covers any falsehood portrayed as true. “We are addressing all aspects of election security, given, of course, the midterm elections that are upon us, and the fundamental integrity of our democratic processes that is at stake,” Mayorkas told the House Homeland Security Committee. Republican lawmakers call the board an attack on conservative views and the First Amendment. “It can only be assumed that the sole purpose of this new Disinformation Governance Board will be to marshal the power of the federal government to censor conservative and dissenting speech,” Sen. Josh Hawley (R-Mo.) said in a statement. “This is dangerous and un-American. The board should be immediately dissolved.”

#### Republicans are actively working to stop programs like the Plan

Shabad 22 [Rebecca Shabad is a politics reporter for NBC News based in Washington https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/republican-lawmakers-push-bill-dismantle-new-dhs-disinformation-board-rcna28354]//LP

House Republican leaders are calling on Congress to pass legislation that would shut down a new Department of Homeland Security working group tasked with combatting disinformation and block federal funds from being used for similar activities. The Biden administration has come under fire since Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas recently announced the creation of the group, called the Disinformation Governance Board, because opponents argue its purpose is vague. In response to the backlash, DHS released a fact sheet last week about the group's goals, which it said are to protect "Americans' freedom of speech, civil rights, civil liberties, and privacy" in the department's disinformation work. Mayorkas said at a Senate hearing about his department's budget request last week that DHS has worked over the last decade to prevent disinformation from threatening the nation but that he thought there weren't enough safeguards to ensure that its work doesn't infringe on fundamental rights. "And so we put together a working group to ensure that the guide, guardrails, are in place, that we have clear definitions, that we have good policies and practices in place, to protect the very rights that also are our responsibility not to infringe upon," he said. House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Calif., said Wednesday that the group, which he dubbed President Joe Biden's "ministry of truth," was an "un-American abuse of power," and he accused Democrats of aiming to use the group to "manipulate the facts and discredit the truth when it's inconvenient for their narrative." "It’s a scheme conjured up by Washington Democrats to grant themselves the authority to control free speech," McCarthy said at a news conference calling for the group's termination. "They fear Americans' having unfettered access to information because it will challenge the power that they want to have over people’s lives." McCarthy and other key GOP lawmakers claimed that the administration wants to exploit the office and manipulate information. They also accused the group's executive director, Nina Jankowicz, of previously spreading misinformation. Jankowicz was a disinformation fellow at the Wilson Center, a public policy think tank, where she studied the intersection of democracy and technology in Central and Eastern Europe. When her appointment was announced late last month, she tweeted that she would help shape the government's "counter-disinformation efforts" and said "a HUGE focus of our work, and indeed, one of the key reasons the Board was established, is to maintain the Dept’s commitment to protecting free speech, privacy, civil rights, & civil liberties." Rep. Lauren Boebert, R-Colo., who introduced the measure to dismantle the group, said Wednesday that "free speech is under attack here in America" and that it is part of the administration's efforts "to try to silence dissenting voices." "Misinformation has become a rallying cry for the left to discredit facts that are inconvenient to their liberal agenda," she said. "The Russia collusion hoax, Hunter Biden’s laptop, the Covid lab leak theory were all labeled misinformation by big tech until the truth finally prevailed." Boebert's bill has no chance of coming up for a vote in House, where Democrats have a majority. But Republicans could try to influence spending decisions, including discussions about defunding the group, in debate on the next government spending package. Separately, 20 state attorneys general sent a letter to Mayorkas last week threatening to take legal action against DHS over the board if it isn't disbanded. The GOP group wrote that “the existence of the Disinformation Governance Board will inevitably have a chilling effect on free speech” and that “the resulting damage to our political system and our culture will be incalculable.

#### Republicans like disinformation – they retaliate to any attempts to curb it

Feinberg 22 [https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/disinformation-board-dhs-republican-anger-b2073419.html]//LP

A longstanding Department of Homeland Security effort to combat foreign disinformation has touched off outrage amount Republicans who say the department is assembling an Orwellian “ministry of truth,” but experts and former GOP insiders say the sturm-und-drang over the DHS program shows how much the Trump-era iteration of the Party of Lincoln has come to depend on lying as a political strategy and therefore fears not being able to count on their lies going unchallenged. Last week, Fox News reporters began pressing White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki about a news item, first reported by Politico, which stated that DHS was standing up a “disinformation governance board” to counter foreign disinformation and misinformation “related to homeland security,” led by ex-Wilson Center fellow Nina Jankowicz. Ms Jankowicz, who holds a master’s degree in Russian, Eurasian, and East European Studies from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, is a well-known expert who has studied the nexus between democracy and technology and how disinformation can undermine democracies, with a particular specialisation in Central and Eastern Europe. But the appointment of Ms Jankowicz to helm DHS’s anti-disinformation efforts touched off a a geyser of grievance among Republican officeholders and their conservative media allies, citing public statements she’d made describing the October 2020 New York Post reporting on a laptop thought to have belonged to Hunter Biden as a “Trump campaign product” and other statements perceived to be at odds with conservative media narratives regarding Mr Biden and Mr Trump. Though a 2 May fact sheet released by DHS laid out the department’s aims, including a focus on “disinformation that threatens the security of the American people, including disinformation spread by foreign states such as Russia, China, and Iran, or other adversaries such as transnational criminal organizations and human smuggling organizations,” Republicans were animated by the false belief that the Biden administration was establishing some manner of universal arbiter of what is true and what is not for political purposes. At a Wednesday hearing before the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, Senator Rand Paul appeared to believe the DHS board would be retroactively fact-checking news outlets, and asked Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas if the board would have deemed the infamous dossier on Donald Trump compiled by a former MI6 agent, Christopher Steele, to be “Russian disinformation”. After Mr Mayorkas explained the board’s function, to ensure "guardrails, definitions,” and “standards" meant to safeguard civil rights, privacy, and free speech, Mr Paul resumed his complaints. "Here's the problem: We can't even agree what disinformation is. You can't even agree that it was disinformation that the Russians fed information to the Steele dossier," Mr Paul noted. "If you can't agree to that, how are we ever going to come to an agreement on what is disinformation so you can police it on social media?" The Kentucky senator said the “greatest propagator of disinformation” in world history has been the US government, and accused Mr Mayorkas of having “no idea what disinformation is”. "You think the American people are so stupid they need you to tell them what the truth is? You can't even admit what the truth is with the Steele dossier. I don't trust government to figure out what the truth is," he said. And on Thursday, more than 170 Republican members of the House of Representatives signed on to a belligerent letter to Mr Mayorkas calling the board “problematic” and suggesting that “an organization charged with securing the homeland engaging in anything that could have an impact on speech” raises ethical concerns because, in their estimation, it “could be utilized as a political tool under the guise of security”. The Republican representatives added that the DHS efforts to combat disinformation would take away from the department’s “primary mission sets,” including securing the US border. But Aaron Reichlin-Melnick, a senior policy counsel at the American Immigration Council, said combatting disinformation is a necessary aspect of the department’s core border security mission. Mr Reichlin-Melnick said human traffickers and smuggling operations have long preyed upon vulnerable people looking to come to the US through a variety of disinformation streams, including social media and traditional media advertising. “This is a bipartisan issue that has been something that the Trump administration struggled with, the Obama administration struggled with, and now the Biden administration is struggling with. Many people arrive at the southern border with false ideas about what US border policy looks like. That's because — not surprisingly — people who are fleeing their home countries are not going on to Google and checking for relevant US laws and policy before they leave,” he said. “People often receive their information about US border policy through WhatsApp groups, through Facebook memes, and through TikToks and other forms of social media that is often incorrect — there is also disinformation that is pushed out by migrant smugglers who are trying to drum up demand for people to pay to leave their home countries and come to the United States”. He said a significant number of families who arrived at the US-Mexico border during 2018 and 2019 — at the height of the Trump administration’s “zero tolerance” policy that separated parents from their children upon arrival — “sincerely believed” then-president Donald Trump had “passed a law allowing any migrant families arriving at the border to be admitted into the United States”. “Of course, the idea that President Trump was a pro-migrant president is absurd on its face, but many people arrived to the border truly, honestly, believing that because they have been told so by smugglers,” he said. Yet the real-world consequences of foreign disinformation don’t seem to be an operative concern for many in conservative media. According to Media Matters for America — a liberal group which monitors conservative news outlets including Fox News – Fox mentioned the DHS plan more in more than 100 weekday segments over the last nine days, with prime time hosts such as Tucker Carlson describing the effort in bizarre terms such as calling it Mr Biden’s “Ministry of Truth”. Kayla Gogarty, a researcher with Media Matters, said GOP and conservative media outrage over Ms Jankowicz and the DHS board is part of a familiar pattern in which Fox programming and Republican politicians stoke anger over some “shiny object”. “It's a lot of that same fearmongering and misinformation that we see coming out of the right,” she explained. It's this one big ecosystem, with Fox News, pushing it out to their large swath of audiences”. Michael Steele, the former Maryland Lieutenant Governor and Republican National Committee chairman, told The Independent members of the Trump-era iteration of his party tend to show “a particular sensitivity about disinformation” because they themselves traffic in what he called “some of the most profoundly corrosive disinformation there is”. “When you hear someone like Ron Johnson talking about how we should be afraid for our liberty and our values? Yeah, we've been listening to you for the last few years and we are concerned — that's why this was created,” he said. Republicans in both the House and Senate have already vowed to block DHS from spending any funds on combatting disinformation if they take control of Congress next year. But Mr Steele said there’s a better way for members of his party to short-circuit the need for DHS to do anything about disinformation. “If you want it to go away, you don't need to cut the budget, you don't need to defund it — just stop lying,” he said. “It’s amazing to me, but this is how they twist the narrative, and they wrap it in the flag and liberty and values. And they're crapping on all of that”.

### L OCOs – AT StratCon Thumps

#### The plan costs pc – Strategic Concept proves – member states intentionally avoided defining OCOs – no consensus means the plan triggers a fight

Jensen 2022

Mikkel, Mikkel Storm, Institute for Strategy and War Studies, Royal Danish Defence College, Copenhagen, Denmark, “Five good reasons for NATO’s pragmatic approach to offensive cyberspace operations,” May 30, 2022 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14702436.2022.2080661

Unclassified information on the internal negotiations in NATO on OCOCs and the CyOC is not available, but it has probably been difficult to find common ground between the 29 members NATO had at the time. The elaborate wording used by the alliance to discuss the topic could indicate that OCOs were a controversial topic. While Denmark in 2018 pledged willing to provide “cyber weapons” and “offensive cyber effects” to NATO (Danish Ministry of Defence 2018), NATO has avoided these terms. Instead NATO have compromised on the rather ungainly term “sovereign cyber effects, provided voluntarily by Allies,” or SCEPVA (Goździewicz 2019).

Adding to the diplomatic delicateness of the matter to the alliance, difficulties are exacerbated at the legal level: All NATO-members agree that international law and the rules of armed conflict apply to offensive cyber capabilities and their effects (NATO 2020, 21). However, there is no well-established NATO, let alone international, consensus on interpretation of this in practice (Taillat 2019, 33; Smeets 2021).

### L Space Agreements

#### Multilateral agreements over space are politically deadlocked – 50 years of empirics prove secrecy and sovereignty concerns mean the plan drains pc

Goguichvili et al. 21 [Sophie Goguichvill is a Program Associate at the Wilson Center https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/global-legal-landscape-space-who-writes-rules-final-frontier]//LP

In an age where space is evolving and developing more rapidly than intergovernmental organizations can keep up, it is abundantly clear that the current global space governance framework—a product of the Cold War—is no longer adequate. In its current state, the global space governance framework excludes many space activities and allows actors to operate under wide-ranging and often conflicting interpretations of existing agreements. While there have been many attempts to improve the governance framework, progress in this area has stagnated, in large part due to diplomatic impasses between international actors and has negatively impacted the sustainable development of space. Of the five international agreements previously mentioned, the Outer Space Treaty (1967), Rescue Agreement (1968), the Liability Convention (1972), and the Registration Conventions (1974) require substantial clarification in order to apply many of their principles to new space activities and issues, such as satellite servicing, space traffic management, tourism, or space debris mitigation. The Moon Treaty (1979) has too few signatories to be effective altogether. Although countries have attempted to improve or complement these agreements over the years, no new multilateral agreements have been produced since the 1970s. In their place, non-binding norms have emerged in large part due to the ease by which they can be created and set into effect, however effective or ineffective they may be. Often slow to action, limited in authority, and bogged down by political deadlock, international bodies like COPUOS—and more indirectly, UNOOSA—which were established to advance global space governance, are failing to further their mission. While this has not dissuaded spacefaring nations from proposing new multilateral policies addressing evolving uses of space through international fora, important technological advancements—such as the rapid advancement of the commercial space sector—are often overlooked. This raises concerns, namely because private entities are not bound by the Outer Space Treaty or any of the other agreements. Another obstacle of note is that different States have different priorities when it comes to transparency and confidence building measures (TCBMs) and often, competing economic and military interests tend to stall those efforts. Satellite over California/Earth in spacePlay Video Seeking Strategic Advantage: How Geopolitical Competition and Cooperation are Playing Out in Space As our dependency on space grows, what are the implications for the world’s critical infrastructure? Do risks to space capabilities threaten global economic development and international security? Former NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine and experts from Aerospace Corporation discuss the future of governance in space in this event hosted at the Wilson Center. WATCH While easier to agree upon in the short-term, passive support from various states and private actors on nonbinding agreements—such as the UNGA principles as well as the Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities—will not hold in the long-run. One thing is clear: multilateral efforts have not proven completely effective, and more is needed to provide order as new space interests are pursued. In response to recent failures to advance international agreements, the development of national space policies is on the rise. Take the U.S., for example, whose concerted government-wide efforts to refocus its attention on space led to the creation of a new National Space Policy, as well as a series of Space Policy Directives, which outline and provide rules of the road for American space activities in the wake of pressing international challenges. These documents cover our human space exploration program (SPD-1); commercial space regulations (SPD-2); national space traffic management (SPD-3); the creation of the Space Force (SPD-4); cybersecurity in space (SPD-5); and space nuclear power and propulsion (SPD-6). With the addition of the U.S.-led Artemis Accords, these documents taken together are a means to establishing modern customary international law and norms of behavior beyond the Cold War-era provisions of the foundational U.N. space treaties. The growth of the commercial space sector has proven to be the single development related to space since the groundwork of international space governance was laid in the 1960s and 1970s. This has by and large contributed to commercial interests receiving greater prioritization as new national policies are developed. Although prioritized less than national security (i.e., military) or civil (i.e., science and exploration) space policy, commercial space has begun to emerge as a third component in national space policy strategies. The preference to develop domestic policies over international agreements reflects both the emerging value of commercial space and the stagnation of international space governance. The U.S. and Russia stand apart from other nations, as they have the most robust set of national laws and regulatory organizations designed with international space commitments in mind. But among the 28 nations with domestic space policies, there is little policy convergence. States’ decisions to develop unilateral space policies with little concern for international cooperation is creating more limitations than benefits. Failing to cooperate only aggravates existing policy confusion, stalling the development of commercial space activities. Prominent examples include satellite servicing operations and space traffic management, both of which hold significant economic value but cannot be fully developed without improved cooperation due to their need for shared norms and best practices, much in the same way civil aviation could not function effectively if states did not agree on norms and best practices for air traffic control or flight safety. As a global commons, if the goal is to take advantage fully of the economic value of near-Earth space, then unilateral national policies cannot replace international agreements. Current trends suggest that the number of space actors and their interests will increase over the coming years. Consequently, competition over the utilization of space will likely expand and intensify with more actors pursuing their interests and disagreements becoming more common. Current international space governance will not be able to handle the changing nature of space development. New governance, structured differently, is needed. Next Steps for Responsible Space Governance Space has unquestionably undergone some significant changes since the turn of the century and therefore, so has its threat landscape. Although space was once seen as a peaceful sanctuary for scientific purposes, it has become the new playing arena for great power competition between the U.S., Russia, and China. Besides the superpowers, there are now a greater number of nations and non-state actors partaking in space activities and the role of commercial actors in space is becoming more considerable by the day. Although the privatization of space has so-far proven to be primarily a Western phenomenon, nations around the world are beginning to adopt the public-private partnership model and will continue to follow suit. As such, since an increasingly democratized and more accessible space will inevitably bring with it more man-made threats and challenges to space sustainability, the current system of space governance will need to be strengthened to effectively deal with near-future challenges. The process of developing new rules of the road in space has been complicated by the rapid proliferation of space technology among novel actors. Throughout the Cold War era, when technology was in the hands of few states, reaching consensus on treaties was much easier due to a shared interest by the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council to control the spread of technology. Today, the same technologies that were in the hands of a select few are in the hands of dozens of countries. As such, there is less incentive to collaborate on amending or updating Cold War era provisions, which has led to gridlock in the international bodies originally established to advance global space governance. In the absence of multilateral consensus on managing space activities through intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), namely the U.N., and specialized international fora stemming from the U.N. (i.e. UNOOSA, UNCOPUOS, and the CD), non-state actors have played an increasingly influential role in the development of space law. Currently, the international space law regime gives legal authority to regulate and manage space activities to nation states, not international bodies, through Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty. International bodies—such as UNCOPUOS—play a critical role in establishing standards and facilitating coordination, but the licensing and enforcement of those standards is at the national level. Non-state actors' successful contributions to global space governance are directly correlated to the broader trend of a strained multilateral order where international norms, standards, and voluntary (or non-binding) agreements are preferred over legally binding treaties. The declining ability of IGOs to create widely accepted treaties and agreements that effectively manage space activities consequently means that non-space faring nations are losing what little access they already had to shaping space governance. Hence, it is no surprise that successful governance through the paragon of space law—legally binding and verifiable measures—has become impossible to achieve in the current international political climate. States today have shifted their attention to creating norms through voluntary, non-legal measures with the goal of achieving mutual understanding and reducing suspicion, competition, rivalry between states bypassing international legal bodies altogether. For space governance to continue being successful, states must think through modern challenges creatively and collaboratively—in the long-run, strictly bilateral agreements, national policies, and passive support on non-binding agreements will not be sufficient. It is important to note that ineffective and outdated multilateral treaties and agreements are not obstacles unique to global space governance alone, but rather, global governance and multilateralism more broadly.

### L Space Force

#### New space initiatives cause massive infighting between parties

Roeder 21 [Tom Roeder is a Space Foundation senior data analyst and editor whose work appears in The Space Report, which is considered the authoritative guide to global space activity. Before joining the foundation in 2021, Roeder worked for nearly three decades as a newspaper reporter and editor for publications including The Gazette in Colorado Springs, where he ended his tenure as city editor. Roeder’s reporting, mainly focused on defense, space and politics, has taken him all over the globe from street fighting in Baghdad to street markets in Seoul.https://gazette.com/military/space-force-abolished-house-bill-would-do-just-that/article\_7589e9f6-1bd5-11ec-9112-0f98af62e60b.html]//LP

A group of House Democrats introduced a bill Wednesday to abolish the nation’s newest armed service, eliminating the Space Force and giving the Air Force its responsibilities. Backed by five members of the House Progressive Caucus, which is composed of Democrats on the party’s left wing, the “No Militarization of Space Act” was introduced as congress debates its annual Pentagon policy bill. “It’s time we turn our attention back to where it belongs: addressing urgent domestic and international priorities like battling COVID-19, climate change and growing economic inequality,” said the measure's author, U.S. Rep. Jared Huffman, a Democrat from the wealthy San Rafael suburb of California’s Bay Area. “Our mission must be to support the American people, not spend billions on the militarization of space.” The move, trumpeted in a news release, comes amid increasingly rancorous budget negotiations between Democrats and Republicans in the Senate. Republicans have threatened to thwart Democratic efforts to raise the government's debt limit and tie up a Democrat-backed spending plan that's required to avert a shutdown of federal agencies on Oct. 1. Colorado Springs Republican U.S. Rep. Doug Lamborn bristled at the introduction of the bill to kill the Space Force, which came after it was rejected as an amendment to a wider Pentagon measure. “This is an frivolous bill that has no hope of passing," Lamborn said in an email. "The creation of the Space Force was a bipartisan effort from the beginning. This reorganization of our national security space enterprise resulted from the belated recognition of space as a warfighting domain and the increasing threat to critical space assets posed by our near-peer competitors." House Armed Services Committee votes to postpone Space Command’s move from Colorado Springs The measure would have to gain traction to pass the House, where the Space Force has had support from both sides of the aisle. Even if the House backed it, the measure would face almost certain defeat in the Senate, where Democrats hold control by the narrowest of margins and the space service has had bipartisan backing. The bill to kill Space Force is co-sponsored by U.S. Reps. Maxine Waters, D-Calif.; Rashida Tlaib, D-Mich.; Marc Pocan, D-Wisc.; and Chuy Garcia, D-Ill. The Space Force, approaching its second birthday, was created amid rising tensions in orbit between America, Russia and China. Pushed by President Donald Trump, the new service was intended to give space troops a seat in high level discussions of U.S. war plans while giving missions in orbit more prominence in budget discussions. Analysis: After Afghanistan, it's time to talk about troops, draft | Tom Roeder With four Space Force installation, Colorado is home to bulk of the new service's troops and its key capabilities. At Colorado bases, Space Force troops, dubbed guardians in Pentagon lingo, operate almost all of the Pentagon's spacecraft, including the Global Positioning System and missile warning satellites. This week at an Air Force Association conference, the Space Force's top general said the service is working to prevent war from reaching orbit rather than fighting battles beyond Earth's atmosphere. “I am convinced that if we can protect our critical capabilities and deny an aggressor benefit, or impose a cost they cannot bear, we may prevent war for extending to other domains,” Raymond told the conference. The new service, which falls under the Department of the Air Force, will eventually include an estimated 1,300 troops. Unlike the Air Force, Navy and Army, the Space Force doesn't include troops in supporting roles. The service relies on the Air Force for jobs including cooks, cops, lawyers and medics. In a departure from the partisan battles common on Capitol Hill in recent months, Lamborn said most lawmakers from both parties have backed the the new service. "Most Democrats don’t want to abolish the Space Force, as the Biden administration has endorsed our newest service, and congressional Democrats on the Rules Committee rejected this bill as an amendment to the Nation Defense Authorization Act," Lamborn said. "I continue to be a strong supporter of the U.S. Space Force." Lamborn, though, may agree that the Pentagon is spending too much on one aspect of its space enterprise. The congressman has argued that President Donald Trump's decision to uproot U.S. Space Command from Colorado Springs in favor of Alabama could waste billions of dollars. A Lamborn, amendment backed by House members, to the Pentagon policy bill would block funding of the move until investigations of the decision by the Government Accountability Office and the Pentagon's inspector general are completed.

#### Democrats hate space spending – especially when it involves the Space Force

Zhang 21 [Sharon Zhang is a freelance writer who covers climate change and race. She has a bachelor's and master's degree in environmental studies from the University of Southern California. https://truthout.org/articles/democrats-file-bill-to-abolish-flagrantly-wasteful-trump-formed-space-force/]//LP

On Wednesday, California Democratic Rep. Jared Huffman filed a bill to abolish the U.S. Space Force, which he describes as “flagrantly” wasteful. The Space Force was established by former President Donald Trump in 2019. Though it is the smallest branch of the Armed Forces, it’s been widely slammed by progressives for having 16,000 personnel and costing billions of dollars a year. Huffman’s No Militarization of Space Act would axe the Space Force completely. “The long-standing neutrality of space has fostered a competitive, non-militarized age of exploration every nation and generation has valued since the first days of space travel. But since its creation under the former Trump administration, the Space Force has threatened longstanding peace and flagrantly wasted billions of taxpayer dollars,” Huffman said in a statement. “Our mission must be to support the American people, not spend billions on the militarization of space,” Huffman continued, saying that money going toward the Space Force would be better spent fighting the climate crisis, COVID-19 and inequality in the U.S. Representatives Rashida Tlaib (D-Michigan), Mark Pocan (D-Wisconsin), Jesús “Chuy” García (D-Illinois) and Maxine Waters (D-California) joined Huffman in introducing the bill. Before President Joe Biden was inaugurated, progressive lawmakers wrote a letter to the incoming administration asking officials to eliminate the Space Force, criticizing its formation for being unnecessary and for further militarizing the U.S, which is already immersed in a culture of endless war. “Maybe, just maybe, we should make sure our people are not dying because they lack health insurance before we start spending billions to militarize outer space,” wrote Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vermont) in 2018. The Space Force is tasked with gathering military intelligence from space and monitoring and transmitting GPS signals from satellites — but although the force has now been in existence for over a year, its function is not exactly clear as yet. In 2018, retired astronaut Sen. Mark Kelly (D-Arizona) pointed out that the U.S. already had an arm of the military serving the same purpose as the Space Force: the Air Force Space Command, which was reorganized and reformed into its own branch. A press release on the Huffman bill says that the formation of a separate Space Force “creat[ed] bureaucratic confusion and further waste.” The branch received $15.4 billion in funding for the fiscal year 2021, though it was taken from the Air Force budget. The bill directs the Space Force to be reabsorbed into the Air Force. Critics worry that the Space Force’s existence as its own separate entity will eventually lead to further funding for the Defense Department. “Militarizing space is an unconscionable waste of billions of tax dollars, and it risks extending the worst mistakes of history to the final frontier by inviting conflict and escalation,” said Sean Vitka, senior policy counsel for Demand Progress. “Americans don’t want more wasteful military spending, which means Congress should pass the No Militarization of Space Act before the Space Force budget inevitably skyrockets.” Political experts have speculated that it is unlikely Biden will support getting rid of the military branch, which has bipartisan approval. Meanwhile, Congress this week is set to authorize the largest budget the Pentagon has ever seen.

#### Space Force policy causes congressional division

KHEEL 18 [Rebecca Kheel is a congressional reporter for Military.com. She previously worked as a defense reporter for The Hill, covering all things defense from the view at the Capitol, including negotiations over annual defense authorization and appropriations bills, fights about the foreign policy crisis of the day and more. https://thehill.com/policy/defense/415935-divided-congress-to-clash-over-space-force-nuclear-arsenal/]//LP

Space Force The Trump administration has said it wants the establishment of a “Space Force” included in next year’s defense policy bill. That position has contributed to increasingly diverging opinions between House and Senate lawmakers. Republicans in the Senate — who were initially skeptical of creating a separate branch of the military for space — have appeared more open to the idea since Trump got involved. Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman James Inhofe (R-Okla.), a Trump ally who will keep the gavel in the next Congress, has said he has an open mind but is awaiting more cost details. The Senate may lose one of its most vocal Space Force critics, albeit on the Democratic side. Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.), who led the chamber’s opposition to a similar plan from the House last year, is fighting for his political life in a reelection race that appears headed toward a recount. Meanwhile, Democrats in the House have grown more entrenched in their opposition to Space Force ever since Trump injected himself into the debate. Smith, who supported the House’s space corps plan last year, came out against Space Force in September. He said that while he believes the military needs to do a better job of prioritizing its presence in space, a separate branch is not the most cost-effective way to do so. Space Force still has some key Democratic support in the House. Rep. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.), who worked alongside Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Ala.) to lead the chamber’s space corps push, said in September that he hopes Trump’s involvement doesn’t “ruin the debate” about it. Smith has said this year’s defense budget of $716 billion is “too high,” and in a Thursday letter announcing his run for chairman he vowed to target “inefficiency and waste” at the Pentagon. The Washington Democrat has argued that lawmakers need to start making tough choices about spending and taxing as rising deficits have been compounded by the GOP’s 2017 tax-cut law. Defense hawks and the Pentagon pushed for the $716 billion to help address what they characterized as an urgent readiness crisis. Few Democrats argue that the military is not facing readiness issues, but Smith has said the military needs to be “smart” about how it spends its money. He has cited the Navy’s 355-ship goal, saying the focus on a number is flawed logic because “capability matters.” Senate Republicans argue that defense cuts would reverse any readiness progress that’s been achieved. They say the budget needs to continue the growth trend from the past two years in order to fully emerge from the readiness hole. Asked by The Hill in October about the potential House-Senate split and the looming return of budget caps, Inhofe expressed confidence that the defense budget would at least stay flat. “We have to catch up,” Inhofe said. “We have to keep that up, or all that we have done in catching up in those last two fiscal years will go out the window. So that’s not just going to happen.” But in this case, Democrats may actually have an ally in Trump, who recently ordered his administration to propose a $700 billion defense budget for fiscal year 2020 — a $16 billion cut from this year and $33 billion less than the initial plan for 2020.

### L Space Spending

#### The House and Senate Appropriations committees hate space spending

Erwin 19 [Sandra Erwin writes about military space programs, policy, technology and the industry that supports this sector. She has covered the military, the Pentagon, Congress and the defense industry for nearly two decades as editor of NDIA’s National Defense Magazine and Pentagon correspondent for Real Clear Defense. https://spacenews.com/house-appropriators-do-not-approve-space-force-request-call-on-dod-to-study-alternatives/]//LP

The House Appropriations Committee says it will not support DoD’s $72.4 million request to establish a Space Force headquarters, and wants the Pentagon to study alternative options. The committee is scheduled to mark up the defense bill on Tuesday. The draft report accompanying the committee’s proposed fiscal year 2020 defense spending bill notes that the decision to not back the $72 million request should not be read as a complete rejection of the idea of establishing a Space Force. “The Committee recommendation does not fully fund the request to establish the proposed Space Force,” says the draft report obtained by SpaceNews. “The Committee makes this decision without prejudice and includes funds for the Department to examine and refine alternative organizational options that will streamline the management and decision-making process and minimize overhead cost and bureaucracy.” The House and Senate Armed Services Committees are reviewing the administration’s Space Force legislative proposal and considering whether to authorize the new service in the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. Appropriators are not policy makers. Only the HASC and SASC can authorize DoD to establish a new military service. But it’s up to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to fund the new branch and decide how much. Defense officials have said they estimate the Space Force will cost no more than $2 billion over five years but have not provided detailed analysis to back that up, according to congressional officials. The Senate Armed Services Committee has done due diligence and directed the Congressional Budget Office to analyze the future costs of the Space Force, U.S. Space Command and the Space Development Agency. The CBO in a report laid out a number of scenarios. On the Space Force, it projects costs significantly higher than $2 billion over five years. The Pentagon has challenged those estimates. DoD has proposed legislation to establish the Space Force as a separate service within the Department of the Air Force, with an Undersecretary for Space and a Chief of Staff for Space. “While the Committee appreciates the intent of the proposal, the plan leaves many unanswered questions and lacks important details and supporting analysis to justify the proposed size, scope, cost, roles, and authorities for the new military service.” Appropriators say in the draft report that they support DoD efforts to advance the military’s space capabilities but are not convinced that requires setting up a new military branch. “The Committee is very concerned with the rapid advances potential adversaries are making to develop capabilities that threaten United States space assets on orbit,” the report says. The committee “understands that this is an urgent problem that will require the Department to reorient its strategies, organizational constructs, and program priorities to meet the reality of these threats.” However, the report notes that it is “fully within the Department’s current authority to make space a higher priority without creating a new military service and is not persuaded that the specific plan proposed justifies the additional overhead cost and disruption across the Department.” The HAC’s defense subcommittee last week agreed to give DoD $15 million to further study how a space service could be organized. Space policy analyst Marcia Smith noted that the House Appropriations defense bill is moving faster than HASC action on the NDAA, which is creating “a bit of confusion regarding the status of the Space Force debate.” The defense subcommittee could have approved the $72.4 million request contingent upon the passage of authorization legislation, but it did not, Smith wrote. “Their action is viewed as lukewarm support for the idea, at best.” Other space-related provisions National security space launch — The House Appropriations Committee in the draft report commends the Air Force for its launch procurement strategy to increase competition and eliminating its reliance on Russian rocket engines. “The national security space launch program is going through a critical transition as it phases out legacy launch systems and considers a variety of new and upgraded rockets to meet the full slate of national security mission requirements,” the report says. The committee also said it is concerned with the “significant level of technical and programmatic risk this transition entails, including risk of a potential gap if any of the new, unproven rockets develop problems or experience setbacks.” Appropriators agreed to fully fund the Air Force’s request for the National Security Space Launch program and “urges the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed expeditiously with its strategy in order to minimize the risk of a gap in assured access to space.” Satellite communications — The draft report calls for a restructuring the military’s satellite communications programs. “The current military satellite communications architecture comprises independently designed, purpose-built spacecraft; ground systems; and user terminals intended to meet differing mission requirements for strategic, wideband, and narrowband communications,” says the report. In fiscal year 2019, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force were tasked with developing an integrated architecture and acquisition strategy for wideband and narrowband communications and were directed to consider both government and commercial systems, user terminals, and network capabilities. The committee encourages the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force to consider transferring responsibility for future narrowband satellite communications systems from the Navy to the Air Force to help create an integrated communications architecture. Missile warning satellites — Appropriators question the strategy for the Next Generation Overhead Persistent Infrared (OPIR) program. The 2020 budget seeks nearly $1.4 billion, an increase of $752 million above the 2019 enacted level. The committee cut DoD’s request by $201 million. It agrees with DoD that there is an “urgent need to field a more resilient capability against growing space threats.” But in the report they raise flags about the “rapid budget growth and the Air Force strategy of relying on significant reprogramming requests to keep the program on schedule.” The committee questions whether the use of fast-prototyping authorities given to DoD under Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 is appropriate for this program. The committee also asked DoD to provide a long-term strategy for missile defense and hypersonic defense. The committee “views the current Next Generation Overhead Persistent Infrared Block O program as an important interim step to a currently undefined, but much needed, future comprehensive OPIR architecture,” the report said. It included a legislative provision requiring the Space Development Agency and the Air Force to lay out a plan to develop a “unified and integrated space architecture.”

#### The House is critical of space spending projects

Insinna 19 [Valerie Insinna was Defense News' air warfare reporter. Beforehand, she worked the Navy and congressional beats for Defense Daily, which followed almost three years as a staff writer for National Defense Magazine. Prior to that, she worked as an editorial assistant for the Tokyo Shimbun’s Washington bureau. https://www.defensenews.com/space/2019/05/14/house-appropriators-put-some-pressure-on-the-space-development-agency-in-fy20-funding-proposal/]//LP

Houston, the Pentagon’s new space acquisition agency may have a problem. In its proposed funding bill for fiscal 2020, House defense appropriators are seeking to cut off funding for the Space Development Agency until the Defense Department meets several conditions. While the legislation still has a long way to go before it becomes law, it could spell trouble for the newly established SDA — especially if Senate lawmakers raise similar objections. Acting Defense Secretary Patrick Shanahan signed off on the SDA in March. The agency is supposed to be a fast acquisition arm for emerging space capabilities that may not have a validated requirement, and its first task is to field a layer of low-Earth orbit satellites capable of transferring data among the military’s terrestrial and space assets. However, critics have contended that SDA’s purpose has not been defined clearly enough, a position that House defense appropriators seem to find valid. The bill stipulates that no funding can be spent on the organization until the Defense Department submits a detailed plan to establish the SDA, what projects it will take on over the next three years and how much funding will be required for those efforts. It also wants information about how SDA and the Air Force will collaborate on a holistic space architecture, and the process both organizations will use to guide prototyping efforts into fully fledged programs. Lawmakers also want to know where the SDA will be based and how many personnel will staff it — a prospect that could bring local jobs, a boon to any member of Congress — as well as a plan to transfer SDA from the Defense Department to the Air Force or Space Force by the end of FY22. The bill echoes concerns raised by Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson, who has vocally opposed the creation of SDA. In February, she told reporters that she didn’t understand why a new space acquisition agency was needed, given the establishment of the Space Rapid Capabilities Office and the Air Force’s own work to make the Space and Missile Systems Center more efficient. Even as Shanahan pressed forward with the establishment of SDA, naming Fred Kennedy as head of the organization, Wilson continued to speak out against it. “Let me be clear: The United States Air Force is funding the development of low-Earth orbit systems and commercially based systems for some of our missions,” Wilson told the audience at the Space Symposium in April. “But launching hundreds of cheap satellites into theater as a substitute for the complex architectures where we provide key capabilities to the war fighter will result in failure on America’s worst day if relied upon alone.” While the House appropriations bill can be seen as a modest victory for Wilson, it may be a Pyrrhic one: It also orders that funding the Air Force’s next generation of missile warning satellites be cut by half until the Defense Department meets its requirement to supply more information about SDA. The service’s next-generation Overhead Persistent Infrared program has been touted by the Air Force for its rapid approach. In fact, the service is seeking $632 million in FY19 because the program is moving so quickly that it has met milestones quicker than expected and needs more money to continue prototyping the sensor payload, its acquisition executive Will Roper said in April. House appropriators’ desire to put limits on the next-gen OPIR could stem from worries about whether that constellation may be too similar to one of the systems that the Space Development Agency intends to field. After fielding the initial “transfer layer” of low-Earth orbit satellites meant to augment the department’s data transfer capabilities, the SDA plans to launch a “tracking layer” of missile warning satellites, SDA head Kennedy said last month. Kennedy also suggested that the next-gen OPIR could be changed or reduced in scope if the tracking layer was successful. “Rather than wait to 2025” to get the next-gen OPIR in orbit, “what I’m arguing is that we try to put up some form of capability in 2022 and show that we can do it. We may not have perfect global coverage, but we’ll have some level of coverage — at least regionally — addressing most of that threat,” he said.

#### The last time we tried to pass space spending it almost shut down the Federal Government!

Taylor 17 [Andrew Taylor began his journalism career in the late 1980s, clipping newspaper articles for the politics reporters at Congressional Quarterly. He now is a freelance journalist and writes for PBS https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/debate-over-these-bills-could-lead-to-a-government-shutdown]//LP

An early December government shutdown is a real possibility, since a divided Congress can’t agree on military spending, Democrats insist on help for young immigrants and President Donald Trump’s position can change with each lawmaker he talks to. Most of Washington is focused on overhauling the nation’s tax code, but lawmakers face a combustible mix of must-do and could-do items, with the current government spending bill set to expire Dec. 8. On the list are immigration and a U.S.-Mexico border wall; an impasse over children’s health care; pent-up demand for budget increases for the Pentagon and domestic agencies; and tens of billions of dollars in hurricane aid. There’s plenty at stake for Republicans controlling Washington. Politically, there’s an urgency to avoid a debilitating shutdown just as the GOP hopes to wrap up an overhaul of the tax code that’s its top priority. And legions of GOP defense hawks are adamant that the Pentagon receive a huge 2018 budget hike approaching $80-90 billion. Trump and many followers want the U.S.-Mexico wall. Democrats retain considerable power in the endgame — their votes are needed — and are pressing demands of their own. They want protections for immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as young children. They also demand budget increases for domestic agencies. “I think we’re headed in a good direction on the spending caps,” Sen. Roy Blunt, R-Mo., said Monday. “I don’t know that will get to immigration this year but that’s a pretty easy thing to settle if the Democrats will give the president some of what he wants. I think he would be willing to be pretty forward-leaning on kids who were brought to the country illegally.” For his part, Trump tends to waver depending on the situation — siding with Democrats on a debt deal in September, promising Republicans last week that the controversial immigration issue won’t be part of the year-end spending measure. Meanwhile, the tax debate is taking up energy, time and political capital, and GOP leaders seem reluctant to issue controversial decisions that might harm its chances. Here’s a rundown of non-tax issues facing Congress and Trump Ideally, top leaders in both parties would like to agree on new spending levels and pass a catchall bill by the Dec. 8 deadline. That’s looking increasingly unlikely. Another temporary funding bill would be needed to avert a government shutdown, but many Democrats say they won’t be able to support any measure that doesn’t include help for so-called “Dreamer” immigrants facing deportation. That increases the odds of a shutdown. Congressional leaders are conducting secret talks on raising the spending levels and say they are optimistic of a deal. But there’s no sign of one yet. A possible agreement could add perhaps $100 billion to the budget for the current year alone, which is sure to cause sticker shock among the GOP’s fiscal conservatives. Trump’s demands for the border wall — a nonstarter with Democrats — could spark a shutdown battle. Then there’s aid to areas devastated by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. The White House promises to submit a request later this month for “several tens of billions of dollars” aimed mostly at helping Texas and Florida. That’s likely to bring the total appropriated since September for hurricane relief to more than $100 billion, which is likely to rankle deficit hawks. House and Senate negotiators are putting the final touches on an annual defense policy bill for the 2018 fiscal year that’s expected to increase the Pentagon’s core budget by billions of dollars more than the $603 billion Trump requested. There’s some urgency to the talks since Senate Armed Services Chairman John McCain, R-Ariz., is battling an aggressive form of brain cancer. The defense policy bill is expected to expand U.S. missile defenses in response to North Korea’s advancing nuclear weapons programs. Lawmakers also are trying to resolve a long simmering debate over the creation of a new branch that would be in charge of the U.S. military’s space assets.
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#### Biden’s push is key to get it across the finish line

Sargen 7/7

Nicholas Sargen, Ph.D. is an economic consultant with affiliations with Fort Washington Investment Advisors and the University of Virginia’s Darden School of Business. He has authored three books, including “Investing in the Trump Era: How Economic Policies Impact Financial Markets.”   
“Biden needs an easy win: House Dems should pass the America Competes Act now” July 7, 2022 https://thehill.com/opinion/international/3548678-biden-needs-an-easy-win-house-dems-should-pass-the-america-competes-act-now/

In case you missed it, a bill totaling $52 billion to bolster America’s dominance in technology that passed the Senate overwhelmingly one year ago is now in danger of dying in Congress. It is not one more story about Republican obstructionism. Rather, it is about Democrats in the House of Representatives adding a series of pet projects to a bill that would otherwise have passed by now. Their actions and the attempt to resurrect parts of the Build Back Better program have caused Republicans, including Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) to have second thoughts. As William Gaston notes in a Wall Street Journal commentary, the original version, called the Endless Frontier Act, was drafted in May 2020. The main objective was to bolster domestic production of semiconductor chips and to boost federal support for applied research in technology. While nothing happened during the 2020 elections, an amended version passed the Senate in May 2021 by a 68-32 vote, with 19 Republicans including McConnell voting for it. Thereafter, the bill languished in the House of Representatives for nine months before being passed as the America Competes Act in February 2022 along partisan lines. Since then, it has been difficult to narrow differences between the Senate and House versions. So, why is it important that a bipartisan deal be struck? One reason is the importance of improving U.S. technology prowess from an economic perspective. The information technology sector represents over 9 percent of U.S. GDP. It’s the fourth largest sector, behind real estate, government and manufacturing. Moreover, it has been a key engine of economic growth and leads the global landscape in innovation, as highlighted in a 2019 report by the Brookings Institution. Meanwhile, China’s over-arching goal is to overtake the U.S. economy as it transitions from reliance on manufacturing to increased emphasis on developing its technology sector. And even though Chinese President Xi Jinping has made a series of mistakes on the regulatory front that may hinder its objective, the Chinese government is likely to marshal resources to promote it. Another consideration is national security: Over the past three decades U.S. production of computer chips has fallen from about 40 percent of global production to 10 percent. And despite the U.S. being a leader in chip design and research, President Biden has conceded “we don’t have the ability to make the most advanced chips now – right now.” Today, 75 percent of production originates in East Asia, and 90 percent of the most advanced chips are made in Taiwan. The authors of a report by the Center for a New American Security contend that the U.S. is already more dependent on Taiwan’s high-end microchips than it was on Middle Eastern oil in decades past. In their view, it has the potential at some point to incite a U.S.-China conflict. Meanwhile, the urgency of improving domestic capabilities in domestic production of computer chips has been highlighted by ongoing supply-chain disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. One year ago, U.S. officials were confident that the worst was over. But there is still no indication this is happening: PBS recently reported that new U.S. car sales plummeted by 21 percent in the second quarter over a year ago owing to shortages of computer chips, which have also driven up prices of new and used autos. On several occasions this year, Biden has singled out Intel for committing to build a fabricating plant in Ohio that would develop state of the art chip-making technology. In January, Intel CEO Pat Gelsinger said the company would invest up to $100 billion to build the world’s largest chip-making complex if it could be assured of receiving some federal support. But with the legislation now up in the air, Intel has since indicated that it is considering delaying its initial $20 billion investment, which was slated to be launched this month. Amid these developments, Biden has urged Congress to “Pass the damn bill and send it to me.” However, as David Ignatius observes, Biden appears unwilling to “crack some heads” to get the job done: “You can’t fix everything in our messed-up country. But you can deliver on your promise to create good high-tech jobs in the semiconductor industry and compete with China for the strategic high ground.” The impasse over the semiconductor legislation is emblematic of a larger issue. Namely, Biden’s legislative agenda has sought to enact the most sweeping social programs since LBJ’s Great Society when Democrats control both house of Congress by the narrowest of margins. One would hope that Biden and progressive Democrats would have learned by now that the way to produce tangible results is to narrow the focus of bills they consider. Indeed, the major economic accomplishment of the Biden administration was the recasting of the infrastructure bill to gain bipartisan support. Now it has an opportunity to demonstrate how the federal government can play a role in enhancing U.S. technology prowess by helping to develop state of the art manufacturing capability. If this isn’t clear to progressive Democrats, Biden should tell them in no uncertain terms that he wants the America Competes Act to be passed without further delay.

#### PC key – Biden push ensures passage

Mills 2021

Anthony, Senior Fellow American Enterprise Institute, “Funding Isn’t Enough to Fix Science” May 28, 2021 <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/funding-isnt-enough-to-fix-science/>

The Senate just spent a fevered 72 hours debating the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that aims to spur American innovation and bolster our competitiveness in science and technology by authorizing over $100 billion for federal research and development (R&D). With bipartisan support and the backing of the White House — not to mention a widely shared concern about China’s aspirations of scientific and technological dominance — some version of this bill appears likely to make it into law, eventually.

#### Biden must invest PC to ensure competitiveness bill passes

JD Supra 2021

Vinson & Elkins LLP, “Labor, Defense, And Rail Services Among Top Competition Concerns Targeted In President Biden’s Executive Order” July 19, 2021 https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/labor-defense-and-rail-services-among-5461441/

As has been well-publicized, on July 9, 2021, President Biden issued an “Executive Order on Promoting Competition in the American Economy” (the “EO” or “Order”).1 As the preamble articulates, the EO’s focus is to “promote the interests of American workers, businesses, and consumers.” The lengthy and detailed Order is sweeping in its breadth, aiming to enhance competition across dozens of industries, and sets forth federal agency-specific instructions as to how particular goals should be carried out. A Rallying Cry to the “Whole-of-Government” The EO seeks to harness the coordinated power of the full federal government, emphasizing “that a whole-of-government approach is necessary to address” competition concerns in the U.S. economy.2 To that end, the Order establishes a White House Competition Council, to be led by the Director of the National Economic Council (“NEC”).3 An integral part of the Office of White House Policy, the general bailiwick of the NEC is to advise the president on economic policy matters. By embedding the new council within the White House, President Biden is sending the strong message that competition is a focus area over which he intends to keep close tabs and invest his personal political capital.

#### Biden’s negotiating experience and PC are key. Now is key

Clift 1-18-2022, covers politics for The Daily Beast (Eleanor, “Democrats Can Salvage Biden’s Presidency With These Three Simple Moves,” *The Daily Beast*, https://www.thedailybeast.com/democrats-can-salvage-bidens-presidency-with-these-three-simple-moves)

Biden ran on his long experience in the Senate and his belief that he could make the Congress work again. He was able to pass significant legislation on infrastructure with bipartisan support, and he could burnish his record with the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA). It passed the Senate in June (68 to 32) but has been languishing in the House along with the Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors for America Act (CHIPS), which is a component of the broader bill, USICA. Republicans and Democrats love this legislation because it stands up to China and it establishes new semiconductor facilities in the United States, along with a National Semiconductor Technology Center. Anybody paying attention to the supply chain crises knows there’s a crippling shortage of semiconductors. An analysis by Goldman Sachs found 169 industries are affected, with automobiles and electronics hit the hardest. This legislation could have passed and been signed by Biden six months ago, alleviating some of the supply chain issues that the administration is grappling with today. There’s still no timetable for passage, and no apparent rush by the House, where the leadership indicated it wanted to write its own bill as opposed to accepting what was sent over by the Senate. Back in the spring of 2021 when the CHIPS Act sailed through the Senate with 68 votes, everything seemed possible to achieve. “The mood was the sky’s the limit, and to some extent the administration got caught up in that,” says Bill Galston, a senior fellow in governance studies at The Brookings Institution. “After their stunning early victory with the American Rescue Plan, the administration may have concluded the force was with them — and so they outran their political supply lines.” This always happens, says Third Way’s Matt Bennett. “Presidents’ reach far exceeds their grasp. It happened to Clinton on health care, Obama on cap and trade (carbon tax) and Biden on voting rights, George W. Bush on privatizing social security and Trump on getting rid of the ACA (Affordable Care Act). Presidents always try for the moon, and they often fall short. It’s not unusual, not surprising, and now is the time when you take what you can get.”

### I/L PC Key – Committee Action

#### PC is key to influence committee outcomes

Beckmann and Kumar 11, \*Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, \*\*Department of Political Science @ UC-Irvine (Matthew and Vimal, “How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 23.1)

Considering that roll-call votes ultimately decide the president’s legislative fate, executing a vote-centered strategy is not only important, but often integral, for an administration looking to marshal the president’s agenda to passage. What is more, because endgame expectations condition all earlier stages of the legislative process, the administration’s potential for prevailing on important roll-call votes casts the shadow in which all other bargaining takes place. Thus, it is for good reason that practitioners and political scientists alike have highlighted pivotal voters and vote-centered lobbying when discussing the presidential–congressional relationship. Yet even as vote-centered lobbying is one essential option in the president’s strategic arsenal, it is not the only option. As Charles Jones noted: However they are interpreted, roll call votes cannot be more than they are: one form of floor action on legislation. If analysts insist on scoring the president, concentrating on this stage of lawmaking can provide no more than a partial tally. Jones (1994: 195) It is an admonition that Congressional Quarterly (CQ) staffers have emphasized year after year when characterizing the president’s legislative record by analyzing roll-call votes12. Discussing President Eisenhower’s legislative success in 1953, CQ issued a nowfamiliar caveat: …the President’s leadership often was tested beyond the glare spotlighting roll calls…Negotiations off the floor and action in committee sometimes are as important as the recorded votes. (Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1953: 77).

#### PC is necessary all the way up to the finish-line

Beckman 10 Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 50

That said, in cases where the president and his leading allies do disagree---if not on policy preferences, on matters like priorities or strategy---the White House **must lobby their congressional leaders to ensure that they carry the president’s water** (rather than their own). Hence, presidents want supportive leaders to use their prerogatives to keep the president’s proposed policies among those from which legislators choose.17 Getting their leaders “onboard” with the president’s preferences is the administration’s first order of business, and the bargaining tactics they use for this purpose runs the spectrum, from personal appeals to public pressure to political deals.¶ But even upon securing their support, the White House’s work with these supportive leaders is **far from done**. If anything, it has barely begun. Now the White House and their leading legislative allies must work together to best promote their overlapping interests.18 To this end, they should share policy information and political intelligence, not to mention the burden of putting them to good use. In short, after first bargaining over what policy they will advocate, the president and his leading allies should coordinate efforts to best execute that advocacy.¶ 2.2.2.1.2 Deterring leading opponents. When the president and his leading allies advocate a particular policy alternative, ultimately deciding its destiny is the members’ distribution of preferences in light of rival alternatives. The key variables at this point, therefore, are the preference distribution and the rival alternatives. The first of these---that is, the White House’s endgame strategy of shifting members’ preference distribution via vote-centered lobbying---has already been discussed, but still unexamined is the administration’s strategy for affecting rival alternatives. Let me now consider this crucial component of the White House’s earlygame strategy. ¶ By way of introduction, it is worth emphasizing the president’s motivation for affecting rival alternatives: beating the status quo is almost always easier than beating a strategic opponent. Accordingly, rather than just pulling pivotal voters toward the president’s position (and away from opponents’), the White House may also want to cut a deal with leading opponents, getting them to “pull their punches” against the president’s proposal, or at least something close to it. The obvious theoretical question begging, then, is the same one White House officials actually ponder: **Why would an opposing leader ever endorse key planks of the president’s legislative agenda?**¶Well, one way to secure leading opponents’ submission is simply by fiat. If the president and his leading allies can prohibit, by rule, leading opponents from challenging their position, then the president’s policy options are constrained only by the range of potentially passable policies. But even if this brand of strategic censorship may occasionally occur via restrictive rules in the House of Representatives, it is not generally a viable strategy and certainly not a reliable one. First, the president’s party is often in the congressional minority, and second, even when in the majority, the Senate does not allow the president’s leading allies to impose restrictive rules on their leading opponents. Far from it.¶ Lacking the ability to censor leading opponents by decree, how can an administration keep leading opponents from challenging the president’s initiatives? To foreshadow, the basic answer is that **White House officials can deter leading opponents inasmuch as the president can convince them** that the intrapolicy benefits of fighting are low and the extrapolicy costs are high. Let me elaborate.¶ Figure 2.10 lays out the tenets underlying the White House’s options for deterring their leading opponents, adding to the now-familiar policy space a leading opponent, O, who joins the president, P, and pivotal voter, f (who can occupy any number of positions, f to f ). For the purposes of clarity, here I assume that the president and his supportive leader, S, agree on the policy and work together promoting it. Because an administration can rarely (if ever) get pivotal voters to support the president’s ideal outcome, **deterring leading opponents from challenging the president’s bill** (or some version of it) **requires that the White House lobby more than pivotal voters**; they must also target opposing leaders. The reason is that to be successful, presidential aides must convince their leading opponents that the policy loss they will suffer from “pulling their punches” is small and can be offset by gains on other fronts. In Figure 2.10, then, the nature of demobilizing the opposition lobbying should aim to minimize the opposing leader’s potential policy impact---that is, minimize the disparity between policies when he or she fights (say, f ) and policies when he or she does not (say, f )---and compensate the leader for the difference.¶ Developing this strategy further, it is worth reiterating that leading opponents’ decision is not a calculus about fighting to get one’s own preferences but rather fighting to get whatever the pivotal voter will ultimately support (f, or wherever f would end up after being targeted by the White House’s lobbying arsenal). Accordingly, the more pivotal voters’ preferences match the president’s proposal, the less incentive an opposing leader has to challenge that position (because he or she will get something close to it anyway). The first hypothesis for deterring the opposition, therefore, is somewhat surprising: the White House should lobby pivotal voters to make them more supportive of the president’s preferred position. Notice that although behaviorally equivalent to a pure vote-centered lobbying strategy, here the White House’s rationale for lobbying pivotal voters is not for their votes per se but rather to weaken leading opponents’ bargaining posture.¶ Beyond pulling pivotal voters’ preferences toward the president’s position, an additional way in which the administration can lessen opposing leaders’ incentive to fight the White House is to convince leading opponents to dislike the president’s position less (to move O toward f ). Importantly, this does not require that the White House induce leading opponents to support the president’s position, much less vote for it. Instead, the administration need only convince opposing leaders that the effects of their counteroffensive would be minimal or, at least, could be better served elsewhere. Accordingly, the second deterringthe- opposition hypothesis is that the White House should target leading opponents with the same lobbying tactics used in the legislative endgame; the president should engage his leading opponents with **arm-twisting and browbeating,** private appeals and public pressure.¶ Of course, a third way to diminish leading opponents’ incentive to fight is to compromise the president’s position (offer f instead of f ). This is not to say that the administration should capitulate all or even concede much; rather, the White House should compromise only enough to mollify leading opponents. Hence, this aspect of the demobilizing-leading-opponents hypothesis suggests that the White House should be willing to compromise with leading opponents, negotiating a “deal” that is more moderate than the best of the potentially passable policies but still better than what the president could get with an endgame floor fight. This is a point worth reiterating: the White House should only divert lobbying resources to leading opponents if doing so yields greater influence than would be possible through vote-centered lobbying alone.¶ This key point about agenda-centered lobbying leads to the final insight: because the president seeks a “deal” that is worse for leading opponents than what they could get by challenging him, the administration must **compensate these leading opponents to offset the difference**. This “**horse-trading**” **can be on exogenous issues**---**for example, a different bill**, an executive or judicial nomination, or some other executive-controlled offering---but often occurs within the confines of the same bill. Typically, the president’s part of the logroll is included as the bill’s first title, leading opponents’ part as its second.

#### 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 PC Fails – Biden Specific

#### 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.

#### The bipart infrastructure bill proves PC works

Schofield 11-9-2021 (Rob Schofield, Director of NC Policy Watch, has three decades of experience as a lawyer, lobbyist, writer and commentator, President Biden’s remarkable record of accomplishment under nearly impossible circumstances, <https://ncpolicywatch.com/2021/11/09/president-bidens-remarkable-record-of-accomplishment-under-nearly-impossible-circumstances/>)

Remind yourself for a moment of the scale and scope of the challenges Biden faced when he took office in January and the limited and inadequate collection of tools that were at his disposal to tackle them. Forty-one weeks ago, our nation had just survived a violent attempted coup d’état and the outgoing president who had spurred it on by refusing to acknowledge the fact of his defeat was about to be impeached for a second time. Meanwhile, daily deaths from a global pandemic were peaking at their highest levels, the national economy remained a mess, and a dire, worsening, and largely unaddressed environmental emergency continued to place the planet in an ever-tightening grip. Only Abraham Lincoln and possibly Franklin Roosevelt entered their presidencies under more difficult circumstances. What’s more, unlike Lincoln and Roosevelt who took office at a time in which their parties enjoyed large congressional majorities, Biden entered the oval office with no such advantage. Indeed, it was only thanks to two near-miraculous come-from-behind wins in a pair of January Georgia Senate runoffs that Democrats wield any authority at all on Capitol Hill. Now add to all this the fact that the impossibly narrow Democratic Senate “majority” (51-50 thanks to the presence of Vice President Harris) includes determined ideological conservatives like West Virginia’s Manchin and Arizona’s Sinema, and that the antiquated Senate filibuster rule that requires 60 votes to pass almost anything meaningful, and it’s a marvel that the nation has not descended into complete political gridlock and chaos. In comparison to Biden, the Apollo 13 astronauts were well-equipped when they jerry-rigged their spacecraft, quite literally on the fly, a half century ago. Amazingly, however, no national crash has ensued. Instead, under the President’s coherent, sober, and science-based leadership, the nation has aggressively locked horns with the pandemic by undertaking one of the largest and most successful mass vaccination campaigns in human history – a campaign that, despite persistent sabotage efforts from some on the political right, has saved millions of lives. Meanwhile, thanks in large measure to Biden’s aggressive and on-the-mark stimulus policies, the economy has revived at a record pace and huge strides have been made in slashing poverty – especially child poverty. And then there is the climate emergency, where, thanks to the President’s vision and simple common sense, the U.S. has rapidly transformed its role from that of science and reality-denying roadblock to a global leader. There are still miles to travel in this realm, but the massive infrastructure legislation finally approved this past weekend by small bipartisan majorities in both house of Congress further cements this vitally important policy 180. Now add to all this the literally thousands of talented and diverse appointees Biden has named to the judiciary, the ambassadorial corps, and the leadership of numerous regulatory agencies – most of whom have already effected huge and positive federal policy shifts in everything from student loans to toxic chemicals to human rights – and the magnitude of his administration’s accomplishments in less than 300 days looms even larger. Has the Biden presidency been perfect? Of course not. Like all of his predecessors, Biden has made his share of mistakes. Like Barack Obama, he’s likely wasted too much time in search of imaginary common ground with ideological conservatives determined to undermine him at every turn. While necessary, the Afghanistan withdrawal could have proceeded more smoothly. And as with many other presidents, one also yearns at times for a leader with the kind of rhetorical gifts that would enable him to easily skewer and deflate his adversaries and inspire widespread support for the kind of wholesale progressive changes the nation needs. But, in the end, this is quibbling. In light of the huge political challenges under which he’s been forced to operate (and especially in comparison to the lawless corruption and intellectual vacuity of his predecessor that inspired night terrors in millions – maybe even billions – of humans), Joe Biden has achieved a remarkable record of accomplishment. Whatever the future holds, our nation will be forever in his debt.

### AT PC Fails – Theory

#### Political capital is necessary and sufficient for the president to achieve priorities. Overwhelming empirics.

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).

### AT PC Fails – Party Unity

#### Presidents have PC to solidify party unity

Lee 2021

Barton, Phd Political Economics @ UNSW Sydney, New South Wales and Junior Research Fellow at University of Oxford (Magdalen College), “Essays in Political Economics” August 2021

Most organizations—in politics, business, and academia—feature leaders who can sway collective decisions. In business, a CEO may persuade her firm’s board to approve a project the board is initially skeptical about. She may do so by appealing to personal friendships with members of the board, or even by threatening to resign. In politics, U.S. presidents may coax Congress into passing legislation that does not have the initial support of the majority of members. They may, for example, claim a popular mandate for policies on which they campaigned, or appeal to party unity. Similarly, in academia, a senior faculty member may push to hire a job candidate the recruiting committee is initially inclined to reject, perhaps by exerting influence over junior colleagues. That leaders have the power to influence decisions is not controversial. Yet, power to influence is not an easy concept to define, as it includes both formal and informal components. For example, in Hollander’s (1958; 1960; 1978; 2009) theory of “idiosyncrasy credit” leaders have an account of credit with group members they can spend to deviate from group norms and assert influence (see also Bass, 1990, Ch. 17).1 These credits are “given and received as rewards” from a leader’s social exchange with her followers (Hol- lander, 1978). Therefore, power to influence derives from the leader’s network of friends and allies within the organization, the organization’s informal system of favor exchanges, and even the organization’s culture (March, 1981, pp. 216–219).

### AT Winners Win – 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 is finite and declines over time

Lee et al 2019

Barton, Phd Political Economics @ UNSW Sydney, New South Wales and Junior Research Fellow at University of Oxford (Magdalen College). Gabriele Gratton, UNSW Australia Business School, School of Economics, Richard Holden, University of New South Wales (UNSW), “Political Capital” UNSW Economics Working Paper 2019-04 March 30, 2019 https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3363382

We study how the leader chooses to spend her capital depending on her initial stock of capital, the precision of her information, and whether the issue at stake is more or less important for her. For example, the President of the United States may choose to spend her political capital only on issues that were central to her campaign. Similarly, senior faculty may choose to spend their political capital only on job candidates in their own fields. We show that the leader optimally chooses one of four leadership styles and that the chosen style affects the dynamics of power within the organization. Irrelevant leaders have too little capital to influence decisions and therefore never voice their dissent. Leaders with sufficient political capital but poor information choose to be patient: they save their capital and spend it only on issues that are important to them. Although patient leaders spend their capital sparingly, when they spend it they are unlikely to regain it and therefore their power declines over time. Leaders with intermediate precision of information choose to be loud: they spend their capital on all issues and their power declines over time. Finally, the most informed leaders choose to be strong: they spend their capital on all issues and their power grows over time. For a given stock of political capital, leaders with the least precise information are more likely to be patient. Therefore, conditional on disagreeing with the majority of the organization, leaders are more likely to spend political capital when their information is more precise. But the unconditional probability of spending political capital on any given issue is non-monotonic on the precision of the leader’s information—while loud leaders have less precise information than strong leaders, they are more likely to voice their dissent on any given issue. More political capital does not necessarily induce the leader to voice dissent more often. How more capital affects the leaders’ decision hinges on the marginal power of political capital and therefore on the shape of the mapping of political capital into power. Intuitively, when the marginal power of capital is greater after the leader’s preferred alternative is revealed to be better (respectively, worse) than the default, then a larger initial stock of political capital translates into a greater return (respectively, smaller loss) to voicing dissent. We give a concrete example within a linear framework. In this example, leaders with little political capital have a greater chance of becoming irrelevant if they choose to push for a decision today. Therefore they compare a small chance of influencing today’s decision with the risk of losing their power in the future. For such leaders, a marginal increase in today’s capital (and therefore power) increases the potential power loss in the future more than it increases today’s gains. Therefore, for small stocks of capital, the probability of spending political capital may be decreasing in capital. To put it another way: some patient leaders have more political capital and power than some loud leaders have. This relation is reversed for larger stocks of political capital, for which a marginal increase in today’s capital increases the incentives for the leader to voice her dissent. However, as the leader’s power increases, the relation is reversed yet again, as very powerful leaders can only achieve a small increase in power by voicing dissent.

#### 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 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.

### I/L Tech Leadership 1nr

#### The bill solves tech leadership:

#### 1. PPPs---it facilitates collaboration through public-private partnerships to guide research and better commercialize technology

#### 2. R&D---it unleashes private and public sector innovation.

Oxman 22 – Jason Oxman, B.A. cum laude from Amherst College, M.S. and J.D. from Boston University, President and chief executive officer of the Information Technology Industry Council; “Congress Must Reach Agreement on the Bipartisan Innovation Act;” 03-09-22, ITI, <https://www.itic.org/news-events/techwonk-blog/congress-must-reach-agreement-on-the-bipartisan-innovation-act>;

As President Biden meets with U.S. business leaders about the importance of keeping the U.S. competitive, ITI echoes the president’s call for the U.S. Congress to pass the Bipartisan Innovation Act. This legislation would strengthen U.S. technological leadership and fortify the U.S. economy by increasing manufacturing in America, strengthening supply chains, and addressing bottlenecks in key areas like semiconductors.

The Bipartisan Innovation Act is integral to the United States’ future economic success and competitiveness in the global marketplace. That’s why it is so important for the U.S. Congress to reach an agreement on the historic competitiveness bills that have cleared both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate – the United States Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) and America Creating Opportunities for Manufacturing Pre-Eminence in Technology and Economic Strength (COMPETES) Act.

As ITI outlined in a recent letter to Congressional leadership, these bills will maintain and expand the United States’ leadership in the technology industry, creating new investment in communities across the country. First and foremost, the bills will supercharge domestic semiconductor manufacturing, research, and design through funding for the Creating Helpful Incentives for the Production of Semiconductors (CHIPS) for America Act. This will help ensure companies can produce, design, and rely upon semiconductors to innovate, manufacture, and provide products and services to American consumers, businesses, and the U.S. government.

Semiconductors are essential for everything from 5G and artificial intelligence to automobiles and smart appliances, underpinning critical services like distance learning, telework, and healthcare delivery. By investing in the CHIPS Act, the United States will address a critical imperative for its national security and economic well-being. Congress should also pass a permanent investment tax credit for semiconductor manufacturing, design, and research. Another key technology area these bills would support is Open RAN, through the Public Wireless Supply Chain Innovation Fund, which provides a down payment towards developing next-generation mobile broadband technologies.

Congress has further shown an increased commitment in both the House and Senate bills to tech-focused research and development and manufacturing at agencies including the National Science Foundation (NSF), Department of Energy National Labs, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and the Manufacturing USA program. These elements of the Congressional competitiveness bills are critical for expanding America’s technology leadership and strengthening its national innovation ecosystem. Translating new research into commercialized technology will mean high-tech jobs and new firms around the country, ensuring that the benefits of these investments are broadly shared across the United States.

#### 3. Brain Drain---it allows the US to retain global talent and fix the shortage of STEM workers.

Rao 22 – Steve S. Rao, Morrisville Town Council member, board member of the American Immigration Council, serves on the N.C. League of Municipalities Race and Equity Task Force; “Opinion: Senate Must Pass COMPETES Act to Keep STEM Talent;” 04-18-22, Government Technology, https://www.govtech.com/education/higher-ed/opinion-senate-must-pass-competes-act-to-keep-stem-talent;

Our global competitors, like China, have been closing the gap with the United States for decades — building their economies, attempting to take over the manufacturing industry, funding innovation, and producing products that keep technology running worldwide.

Without action from Congress, those competitors could win the race for global talent, too, taking innovation and economic strength away from our shores.

To get ahead in this global competition, the U.S. House recently passed the COMPETES Act, which reforms the broken immigration system to allow educated and skilled STEM workers born in another country to stay and work for American businesses.

I’m proud to be the son of immigrants who came to our country to find the American Dream and I’m working now to ensure that dream is accessible to others in my community.

As a council member for Morrisville, one of the fastest growing towns in the Research Triangle Park, I know how crucial it is for the United States to remain the best destination in the world for top talent, minds and ideas.

To retain our spot as a global innovation leader, we can’t sit by as our competitive advantage in the market disappears. Congress should be laser-focused on making America the best place in the world to get an education, start a company, produce goods, and fund cutting-edge developments.

Right now, we continue to slip behind because our immigration system doesn’t promote highly-skilled workers in science, technology, manufacturing and engineering by giving them a pathway to stay and contribute to the U.S. after they receive an education.

Losing those students and professionals to other countries could prove detrimental to North Carolina’s economy. In fact, our tech industry adds nearly $49 billion to the economy each year, making N.C.’s technology sector the 13th largest in the country. That sector also employs more than 360,000 people and continues to grow.

However, that trend could soon reverse under current immigration policies — at a time when the U.S. needs more workers, not less.

We already face a national and statewide shortage of skilled professionals. Before the pandemic, there were nearly 170,000 open jobs in the tech and innovation sectors. Today, there are more than 3 million open jobs in various STEM, healthcare, and professional services roles nationwide. Creating options for international students to work in the U.S. — like the reforms in the COMPETES Act — could cut the STEM-related workforce gap by a quarter and add more than $230 billion to America’s economy over the next decade.

Until Congress acts, the self-inflicted brain drain of talented professionals who go to school in America and then are forced to leave and take their ideas with them will continue to benefit our competitors — like China. We need our leaders in D.C. to come together and find a bipartisan solution to address our talent, manufacturing, and workforce shortage before it’s too late.

#### 4. Semiconductor independence---the bill is vital to tech development and preventing inevitable supply chain disruptions.

Olson 4-12 – Tyler Olson, covers politics at Fox Business; “China bill could ease supply chain issues causing inflation, help US compete in 'dangerous world': Khanna;” 04-12-22, Fox News, https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/ro-khanna-china-competition-bill-conferees-congress-house-of-representatives;

When Congress returns later this month one of its top priorities will be coming to a compromise on Chinese competition legislation, with dozens of lawmakers set to meet in a "conference committee" to work out the details.

The effort is more than a year in the making, but may be more important than ever, according to Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Calif., who said it could help address the root causes of inflation.

"One of the reasons the price of cars have gone up, the price of some electronic goods has gone up, is we have a shortage of semiconductors, where it's too dependent on Taiwan and South Korea," Khanna said. "We need to make those have those good, high paying jobs here in the United States so that we also aren't dependent on shipping those products for thousands of miles. And with China's expansionist ambitions in Taiwan, it's critically important that that be in the United States."

"I am thrilled that Speaker Pelosi has named me as conferee for the House’s America COMPETES Act," Khanna also said. "This bill will spread opportunities while also strengthening our supply chains and lowering costs for hardworking Americans."

On Tuesday it was announced that inflation in the U.S. hit a 40-year high with the consumer price index rising 8.5% in March from a year ago. The increase was partially driven by the Russian war on Ukraine but also supply chain issues that have been dragging on the economy for months.

Khanna also said Russias's brutal war on Ukraine is part of the reason why Congress shouldn't delay on the bill, as the U.S. faces major threats to its superpower status from multiple fronts.

"We need to have technology supremacy, technology leadership in the world, to make sure we're going to win in space, to make sure we're going to win with… hypersonic technology, with A.I. technology, quantum computing technology," Khanna told Fox News in an interview. "Putin's aggression shows us it's a dangerous world."

The House and Senate passed different China competition bills last year, leading to a nearly year-long stalemate between the two chambers. They again passed different versions of the more recent America COMPETES Act this spring, with the Senate bill getting a bipartisan majority of 68 votes while the House version got just one GOP vote.

The key for the conference committee will be to bridge the gap between the bills to allow it to clear 60 votes in the Senate without losing too many House Democrat votes that it doesn't pass.

Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wis., who was one of the leading co-sponsors with Khanna on the initial China bill last year, said the House version passed in February "is not a serious effort to make the US more competitive with China." A lack of guardrails on semiconductor funding was a major problem, Gallagher said. He also listed other issues including protecting U.S. research from China and ensuring investments in the bill are targeted at the right sectors of the economy,

Gallagher is not a conferee for the latest effort. But his office told Fox News Tuesday he is optimistic the conference committee can address those issues. Khanna also said he believes Congress can come to an agreement on the positive things in the bill.

"It passed the Senate with bipartisan support, the COMPETES Act, and it passed the House with bipartisan support," Khanna told Fox News. "It's based on the bill that's bipartisan, my bill with Sen. Schumer, Todd Young and Mike Gallagher. It's going to be the largest increase in technology and development the country has seen since the Kennedy years. It's going to bring back production to America. It's going to allow things like semiconductor manufacturing in Ohio."

### I/L Tech Leadership – Semiconductors

#### The entire America Competes Act must pass for it to be successful in retaining STEM competition

Post 7/2 [Editorials represent the views of The Washington Post as an institution, as determined through debate among members of the Editorial Board, based in the Opinions section and separate from the newsroom. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/07/02/semiconductor-legislation-china-competition/]//LP

Congress might be nearing the finish line on the bill supposed to safeguard the nation’s technological supremacy — at a crawl rather than the sprint lawmakers and the president alike seem to think is necessary. The package must pass now or never; yet, as important as getting the job done is getting it done right. Sign up for a weekly roundup of thought-provoking ideas and debates Despite some rhetorical cold water thrown by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), legislators and administration officials alike are hopeful that the America Competes Act is close to finally passing. The legislation would send billions into technological research from artificial intelligence to quantum computing to nanoscience, as well as to help foreign scientists and engineers stay in the United States. Perhaps most notably, it would funnel a whopping $52 billion into shoring up domestic manufacturing of semiconductors, $39 billion of that subsidizing new factories through $3 billion grants. While this sort of industrial policy has brought dubious benefits in the past, a new argument for the investment arrives every day. Under the current status quo, 75 percent of production of these critical computer chips takes place in East Asia — rendering this economy all too vulnerable to supply shocks, whether from pandemics, extreme weather events or geopolitical tensions. The last of these risks seems higher than ever as China adopts an increasingly threatening posture toward Taiwan, whose chipmaker TSMC alone makes up 50 percent of the global market. Meanwhile, President Xi Jinping’s regime has announced a $150 billion program to bolster its own domestic semiconductor industry. This fund, combined with similar offers from nations in Europe and elsewhere, might lure even U.S. firms away from home. Already, TSMC, as well as major American manufacturers Intel and GlobalWafers, have warned they might scale back their plans to construct facilities here if the promised incentives remain on hold. Still, that doesn’t mean Congress should give these firms a handout without doing all it can to ensure the money benefits the nation and its taxpayers rather than merely the manufacturers and their shareholders. Some safeguards are already in place, but there is plenty of room for tightening. Particularly important are protections that screen firms’ outbound investments to ensure they’re not redirecting funds into propping up competitors; so, too, is a robust process to review whether proposed projects will provide a national security benefit to the United States. Limits on stock buybacks by grant recipients would also help ensure this strategic giveaway doesn’t turn into a boondoggle. The biggest mistake Congress could make now is focusing solely on the tens of billions in factory-building subsidies and letting the rest of the America Competes Act fall by the wayside. These grants alone will not on their own catch the United States up to its East Asian peers. Other changes, some of them included in the bill, will prove even more important — from cultivating and retaining STEM talent here to coordinating with allies to keep enough chip-making capacity outside China. But as long as Congress is set on handing money to manufacturers, legislators should also make sure the manufacturers end up giving something back.

#### America Competes Act is key to American innovation

FAS 7/1 [The Federation of American Scientists is a nonprofit policy research and advocacy organization founded in 1945 to meet national security challenges with evidence-based, scientifically-driven, and nonpartisan policy, analysis, and research. After the devastating bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a group of atomic researchers, deeply concerned about the use of science for malice, created an organization committed to using science and technology to benefit humanity. The group they created – the Federation of Atomic Scientists – soon became the Federation of American Scientists in recognition of the hundreds of scientists across diverse disciplines who joined together to advance science policy and counter scientific misinformation.https://fas.org/press-release/competes-usica/]//LP

Today the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) calls upon Congress to reach a final agreement by the end of July on H.R. 4521, the America Creating Opportunities for Manufacturing, Pre-Eminence in Technology, and Economic Strength (COMPETES) Act, and S. 1260, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA). “The need for this legislation is broadly recognized, and delay or failure should not be an option. We believe sensible bipartisan compromises can be reached on many of the outstanding issues and that a final agreement coupled with supplemental funding would bolster U.S. competitiveness, address supply chain issues, and enhance U.S. security,” the letter reads. Congress is at the cusp of making major policy improvements and much-needed investments that will enable the U.S. to remain the global leader in science and technology. Without these improvements, however, the U.S. stands to not only lose its status as global innovator, but lose scientific talent seeking opportunity elsewhere. “American scientific excellence and technological leadership is not magically sustained – it is fostered by policy that nurtures and funds innovation. Congress should make a down payment on American competitiveness, sponsor a generation of world-class technological talent, and let the fruits of that talent make the case for America’s competitive edge,” says FAS CEO Dan Correa. “The need for a new American investment in research and development is widely recognized, so what better moment for Congress to invest than now? The bipartisan bills before Congress share a similar goal – to supercharge American science. Congress should seize the moment and make the robust investments we need,” says FAS Associate Director of Research & Development and Advanced Industry Matt Hourihan. “Congress has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to pass legislation that will strengthen our nation’s commitment to prioritizing science and technology, advancing American innovation and bolstering global leadership. We urge both chambers of Congress to support this bipartisan, bicameral legislation—investment in science and innovation is essential for America’s future,” says American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) CEO Sudip Parikh. “After nearly three years of bipartisan efforts to craft this legislation, it’s time to finish strong and deliver a final agreement that helps propel American science, innovation, and competitiveness into the next decade and beyond,” says Association of American Universities (AAU) President Barbara R. Snyder. “Congress is on the brink of passing legislation with the potential to bolster U.S. research and development investments to better support innovations that not only spark new discoveries, but also solve intractable challenges facing our country and world. APLU urges Congress to heed the recommendations of the research university community and pass this critical competitive legislation,” says Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) President Peter McPherson.

#### To stay competitive the US must pass USICA

Bajarin 22 [Tim Bajarin has been recognized as one of the leading industry consultants, analysts and futurists, covering the field of personal computers and consumer technology.https://www.forbes.com/sites/civicnation/2022/05/20/students-with-mentors-reap-personal-and-academic-benefits/?sh=251e630d22ed]//LP

I grew up in San Jose, CA. When I was born here, this city and area was filled with orchards of apricot, peach, cherry, and other fruit trees and was known then as "The Valley of Heart’s Delights." Two of the largest canning factories were only a few miles from my house, and during the summer, I would wake up in the morning to the smell of apricots, peaches, and plums cooking as the fruit was prepared for canning. However, with the birth of the semiconductor industry in the late 1950s, our region underwent a radical transformation that made it what is known today as Silicon Valley. Companies like Shockley Semiconductor, Fairchild, Intel, and dozens of others who created semiconductors and related technology took root in our region. Now thousands of tech companies call this area their home. Sadly almost all of the orchards are gone and replaced by business complexes and housing to support the growing tech companies in the Valley. In our digital age, semiconductors have become a foundational technology not only in digital devices but in everything from refrigerators and a plethora of home appliances to cars, planes, and just about every form of transportation that exists today. Initially, all semiconductor manufacturing was in the U.S. But by the end of the last century, that had primarily shifted to Asia. Today over half of the world's chip-making is in Taiwan, and only about 12% is in the U.S. In January of 2021, Congress passed the Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductor (CHIPS) for America Act. Then in June 2021, the U.S. Senate passed the United States Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) which appropriates funds to finance the programs outlined in the CHIPS Act. USICA includes $39 billion for chip plant construction over five years and another $11.2 billion for the CHIPS act for research and development. In a report from the Center for Strategic and International studies, they pointed out that- "USICA is a sweeping piece of legislation which includes a range of initiatives meant to boost innovation within the United States, including investment in regional technology centers across rural and micropolitan America. Despite passing the Senate with a 68-32 vote, some House Democrats disagreed with portions of the bill dealing with funding for federal research and technological innovation. After a failed attempt to attach USICA to the FY22 National Defense Authorization Act in November 2021, Senate Democrats agreed to wait until 2022 to reconcile the bill with their House counterparts. In late January, House Democrats unveiled their own version of USICA, titled the America COMPETES Act, which includes identical funding for the CHIPS Act ($52 billion) but cuts roughly $200 billion, which USICA dedicated towards other programs like regional technology hubs. The bill received praise from Senate Democratic leaders and President Biden, but the America COMPETES Act will still likely face a lengthy reconciliation period as lawmakers deliberate over provisions that the House bill omits.” While the Senate and House dawdle with this urgent issue, the threat of China taking control of Taiwan, a goal from which they will not be deterred, grows daily. Just imagine if China had Taiwan under their control and, by default, would be lord over 50% of the world's semiconductor manufacturing. Some legislatures argue that it is up to the industry to solve this problem. Yet, over history, the U.S. government and military-funded significant technological achievements that have benefited it and society. Moreover, this argument holds little water given the major threat of China's move on Taiwan and possibly controlling a large percentage of semiconductor manufacturing that it could hold hostage and use as bargaining chips to get its way in the future. Intel, Samsung, and even TSMC are working hard to build semiconductor plants on U.S. soil, but at best, they will not be up and running until 2024-2025. Add to that the concern that the U.S. cannot even field the amount of tech talent needed to run these plants when they come on line in the future. "A new report estimates the U.S. will need to add 70,000 to 90,000 jobs to serve up to 20 domestic fabs in coming years for the most critical semiconductor applications. To meet that number, the U.S. needs to increase its workforce talent by 50%, according to Eightfold A.I.'s report." Our legislatures need to wake up to this desperate need to bring control of semiconductor manufacturing back to the U.S. and allow the U.S. to control its technology destiny. These big semiconductor companies invest billions of their own money in these U.S. fabs. A significant boost of funds from the U.S. government could go a long way towards speeding up the process and also help train more tech workers needed to operate these new fabs. This week, GlobalWafers Co. said it planned to put a factory in Sherman, Texas, that would be the first U.S. silicon wafer factory in more than two decades in the U.S. and create as many as 1,500 jobs. However, the company stated that the plant would require financial incentives included in the CHIPS Act to move forward. The WSJ reported the following statement from GlobalWafers' president about the importance of passing the CHIPS act for them to proceed- "If the CHIPS Act is not passed, we have to pivot to South Korea," said the company's president, Mark England, who said costs there would be substantially less. “ All three branches of the U.S. government must prioritize and push this legislation with broad support from both parties and reconcile these bills quickly. Every day they wait to pass this vital act is another day closer to the potential of China's ability to control the future of at least 50% of semiconductor manufacturing.

### I/L Tech Leadership – Foreign Workers

#### USICA provisions for foreign workers are necessary for competition

Romanoff 22 [Tom Romanoff is the Director of the Technology Project at the Bipartisan Policy Center. Before working with BPC, he led IT initiatives for several US Federal agencies and advised executive leadership on the impact of new and emerging technologies on government operations. He worked for several years with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), publishing federal-wide IT/Cybersecurity policy and developing modernization initiatives. Before his work with the Federal government, Romanoff helped the United Nations Development Program modernize its global data collection and analytics system. He graduated from Carnegie Mellon University with a Master’s degree in Public Policy and Management and currently serves on their Alumni Board. https://bipartisanpolicy.org/blog/competition-needs-talent-why-success-for-usica-competes-means-letting-foreign-stem-workers-stay/]//LP

To continue to lead innovation, the U.S. needs more STEM-focused Ph.D.s and consider prioritizing green cards for immigrants with these skills. Not doing so yields the technological advantage and edge to countries with strategic interests in technology. The America COMPETES Act, “which is being conferenced with the Senate-passed USICA bill, includes an immigration provision under section 80303 that exempts advanced degree holders in STEM fields from green card caps. In 2020, international students supported an estimated 410,000 American jobs, particularly in STEM. In 2021, 54% of international students pursued a major in a STEM field, and in 2019 almost half of all masters and doctorates awarded in STEM fields went to international students. Yet, in 2019, over 918,000 IT jobs went unfilled. American companies, not only technology-focused ones, struggle to meet the STEM critical skills shortage and find it increasingly challenging to hire graduates with the degrees needed to drive innovation. To address this issue, the Department of Homeland Security recently announced an expansion to the Optional Practical Training program, a 12 month temporary work permit available to international students graduating from U.S. degree-granting institutions. The new measures add 22 qualifying fields of study to the STEM Designated Degree Program list, increasing the number of international STEM students in emerging tech fields. However, this will not be enough to meet the labor shortage. The United States Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) aims to develop domestic capacities in semiconductor R&D using $52 billion authorized through the CHIPS for America Fund, and in key technology areas such as artificial intelligence and quantum science, as part of the $120 billion Endless Frontiers Act investment to ensure the U.S. remains competitive in these fields. However, funding these fields means hiring qualified candidates to do the work. Many of those candidates are international students who want to stay in the U.S. after graduating from their programs. Expanding green card caps for international students graduating in these fields will go a long way toward filling that need for tech experts in the United States. This is not the first time the U.S. has expanded green card access to meet critical skill shortages. The Immigration Act of 1965 included a crucial provision that “gave preference to professionals with skills in short supply in the United States.” This brought thousands of medical professionals and engineers to the U.S. to fill labor shortages across the country. This program was widely considered a bipartisan success and led to the growth of critical domestic industries. Many of those families still reside in the U.S., and their children lead the next generation of innovation. The crucial difference between then and now is that the IT sector is globally competitive and projected to grow as more countries invest in their domestic tech capabilities. Demand for STEM skills in the U.S. and abroad Graduates of STEM programs are in high demand across the globe. As the IT sector grows, demand for STEM skills in the U.S. will also increase. In January 2022 alone, over 340,000 unfilled IT jobs were posted in the U.S., up by 12% from last year. Since 2016 the sector has grown 209%. Globally the shortage of IT workers is predicted to reach 82 million by 2030. Training these graduates in the U.S. and exporting them to their home countries fills unmet demand abroad, leaving U.S. companies without the labor needed for domestic innovation. Approximately half of the international students studying in the U.S. are enrolled in STEM-related programs. Nearly half of the 2019 graduate students in STEM fields were foreign nationals on student visas. At the master’s level, in 2019, 50% of all engineering degrees and 57% of computer science degrees were awarded to international students, and international students composed one-third of all doctorates in science and engineering. Even so, the U.S. is only third in the world in awarding science and engineering bachelor’s degrees, according to the National Science Board, behind India and China. However, the U.S. has produced the most Ph. D.s in science and engineering for many decades, although China has led since 2007 if you count only natural sciences and engineering. Partially due to the challenges in staffing, U.S. companies have been shifting their R&D operations overseas for many years. By 2015, U.S. multinationals had invested more than $50 billion in overseas R&D operations, with increasing shares in China, India, and Israel. Given the aims of USICA and America COMPETES to re-shore much of these operations in the U.S., ensuring access to the necessary skilled engineers, scientists, and inventors to continue this work will be essential. Debates over Green Cards for STEM Graduates Three relevant debates are being considered as Congress considers expanding access for green cards in USICA. The first is whether the H1-B Visa is the more appropriate mechanism for filling the labor gap. Green cards provide permanent residence and offer the possibility of citizenship, but currently are extremely backlogged due to annual per-country caps. We have previously described some of the tradeoffs between the two mechanisms. There is a need to dual-track reforms to each as there are issues with how they are administered, from wait times to expiring unused visas. For this piece, we are highlighting how green cards can address STEM skill gaps since USICA is explicitly addressing that issue. The second is the argument that U.S. workers will be displaced if we increase access to green cards for international students graduating in the U.S. This assumes that domestic U.S. citizens are available to compete in the labor market, but many of these roles are going unfilled. However, this argument also presumes that the market for graduates in STEM is fixed, but the intent of retaining graduates, from all countries, in key STEM fields is to kickstart innovation and R&D in the U.S., increasing demand for many more jobs. This is not an “either/or” situation. The U.S. should pursue domestic policies that provide education and retraining in the STEM fields for U.S. citizens, and we have recommended that Congress prioritize these areas. But we should also take advantage of the foreign talent already training in the U.S. to continue to keep our advantage and grow these critical sectors. The final common argument is that because the current green card process has country quotas, prioritizing STEM fields would disproportionally favor applicants from countries with a robust STEM workforce, such as China or India. Those who have been “waiting in line” but do not have a STEM education do not qualify for this new prioritization. Congress needs to address green card application procedures from a historical perspective, and reforms are required to streamline the process. BPC has recommendations on these issues. However, of critical importance to the U.S. as a whole, in the field of STEM, there is a national competitiveness issue that also needs to be addressed. India and China have advanced technology sectors that directly compete with U.S. interests. If the U.S. can keep international students in the U.S. to fill our labor needs and provide them a path to citizenship, we will not have to compete with those graduates once they return to their country of origin. Final Thought As Congress conferences on USICA, they should consider how the policy goals will get done with our current labor and skill shortages. Suppose we are to spend billions to boost our competitiveness in relation to countries with advanced STEM industries. In that case, we must increase the number of workers, including international students at American universities, with STEM skills in the U.S. By increasing the number of green cards for international Ph.D. students, the U.S. can ensure that we have the people in place domestically to remain competitive internationally. Requiring these critical graduates to return home means we are subsidizing the development of competitive labor markets abroad. Careful consideration should be made to reform the immigration process in the U.S. In this case, a minor tweak in the process will yield dividends for years.

## \*Impacts\*

## !---Tech Leadership

#### China will is key to US tech leadership. Prevents Chinese dominance.

Murray 12-19-2021 (Ashley, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, <https://www.post-gazette.com/news/politics-nation/2021/12/19/Tech-bills-U-S-Congress-Pittsburgh-China-Argo-AI-5G-robotics-USICA-innovation-competition-act/stories/202112190108>)

A proposal in Congress to boost U.S. competitiveness in advanced technology could mean millions of education and industry dollars for the region and be a “generational opportunity” for Pittsburgh, a city that boasts its status as the birthplace of driverless tech and the cradle of numerous start-ups. Bills in both chambers outline billions in investment to support initiatives all the way from K-12 STEM education to semiconductors, quantum computing, climate science research and “high intensity laser” exploration. And could ensure U.S. leadership and security — namely from China’s creeping dominance — for decades to come, advocates and lawmakers on both sides of the aisle say. While the D.C. spotlight has been focused on the massive bipartisan infrastructure law and President Joe Biden’s stalled social and climate spending bill, tech insiders in Pittsburgh see the innovation-focused legislation as one of the most significant moves the U.S. could make. Under consideration is an estimated $200 billion Senate bill titled the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, or USICA. The sprawling, bipartisan 2,000-page proposal aims to establish National Science Foundation programs for the commercialization of artificial intelligence, advanced computing and other areas while also protecting domestic research and expanding trade provisions with China. On the House side, bipartisan support is strong for multiple bills that would double the National Science Foundation research funding to $78 billion over five years and direct $50 billion over the same time period for Department of Energy projects. “This is a generational scale investment in that type of economic development, in strengthening our core research universities, but also putting money in there for translational research [to private industry],” said Brian Kennedy, senior vice president of operations and government affairs for the Pittsburgh Technology Council, which represents 1,000 companies in the Pittsburgh region. The tech leader estimates that in “the very short term” roughly $100 million to $200 million in funding could roll into southwestern Pennsylvania. “But in all honesty I think that’s just the tip of the iceberg,” said Mr. Kennedy, who cited what previous investments have done for the university lab-to-company pipeline. “If you look at Pittsburgh’s story in terms of tech, it’s really hard to tell it without mentioning Carnegie Mellon and the University of Pittsburgh,” he continued. Mr. Kennedy traced the thread from inside the robotics and computer science labs to the marquee Pittsburgh-based manufacturing hubs and tech companies across the city. Carnegie Mellon University’s Advanced Robotics Institute established itself where once the city’s steel mills sat on Hazelwood Green. Argo AI has led Pittsburgh to the forefront of autonomous vehicle testing, he said, and Astrobotic soon will direct a mission to the moon from its North Side-based control room. “It’s the kind of investments that are front-and-center on the planet right now — AI, biotechnology, cybersecurity. These are all the core capabilities of Pittsburgh, and they’re also the core things pressing everyone on the planet.” China China’s advances in technological innovation have become a top concern among tech leaders, defense officials and lawmakers. The world’s second largest economy became the top manufacturer of high-tech goods in 2020, and it either already has sped ahead or is poised to overtake the U.S. in the next decade in various advanced technologies, according to a report published this month by the Harvard Kennedy School. China has become a major competitor to the U.S. in artificial intelligence, and America’s 5G infrastructure rollout is years behind its rival, the study reported. Additionally, the report asserts that while the U.S. is a leader in other areas, including semiconductor design, green energy and cell therapy, China is building competitive capacity in manufacturing and biotechnology. This leads some experts to conclude that America’s plan is behind the curve. “I wish they passed this bill 10 years ago,” said Kevin Chen, a professor with the University of Pittsburgh’s Swanson School of Engineering. “This is really a no brainer. I can tell you what happens if this bill is not passed. The United States as a country is going to continue to under invest in technology, especially in this important technology,” he said. “Think about 5G. The U.S. government didn’t invest a lot of R&D into 5G. Who’s leading right now? I think you know that: Huawei,” he said, referring to the Chinese tech company. “... You don’t want to be in that situation for semiconductors.” In either substance or rhetoric, both U.S. chambers point to the innovation bills as an answer to this threat.

#### It's necessary and sufficient for US tech leadership

Krach 6-17-2021, unanimously confirmed as U.S. under secretary of State and is former chairman and CEO of DocuSign and Ariba. He also served as Chairman of the Purdue Board of Trustees. (Keith, “The Senate just passed the next Apollo program,” *The Hill*, <https://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/559065-the-senate-just-passed-the-next-apollo-program>)

It’s one small step for Congress, one huge leap for American competitiveness. By passing the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) with strong bipartisan support, the Senate went a long way in countering what Secretary of State Antony Blinken called “the biggest geopolitical test of the 21st century” — China’s growing military, geopolitical, and economic aggression under the leadership of General Secretary Xi Jinping. Xi’s biggest fear is for the United States to have another Sputnik moment and commit to the equivalent of a moonshot. USICA is designed to do exactly that by taking the technological advantage away from China Inc. and returning it to the United States. Ensuring tomorrow’s technology is trusted technology that empowers free societies facing perpetual authoritarian threats. From my experience of creating categories by building four market-leading companies, I can tell you securing these advanced industries is not cheap. However, when the government targets smart investment in research and development with partners from the private sector, we get a tremendous bang for our buck. Just look at the Apollo program. Our $140 billion investment (today’s dollars) put a man on the moon. The program not only led to American leadership in aerospace but resulted in hundreds of spin-off products — from kidney dialysis machines to micro-electronics. It’s still paying dividends. In 2018, U.S. leadership in aerospace and commercial aviation contributed $2.3 trillion in GDP to the U.S. economy. That initial $140 billion investment continues to yield $4.1 trillion in annual recurring GDP. Since the 1960s, however, U.S. government long-term investments in research have been declining. We once led the world. Now, we rank 9th globally in total R&D and 12th in publicly financed R&D. Corporate investments are crucial, but they are typically constrained to be shorter-term in nature due to the 90-day shot clock for quarterly earnings. For the sake of our national security and continued global leadership, it's critical that high-tech R&D is a public-private partnership. The U.S. Innovation and Competition Act has quite a few valuable provisions. The main one is its Endless Frontier Act component which authorizes about $150 billion over five years for scientific and technological research in 10 tech-intensive industries that America simply cannot cede to China Inc., including semiconductors, 5G, AI, clean energy, cybersecurity, quantum, robotics, biotechnology, and others. The CHIPS Act portion of the USICA is derived from our team’s historic $12-billion onshoring of Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company (TSMC), appropriates nearly $53 billion to bring back American semiconductor manufacturing after we lost it. The bill’s crucial emphasis on Taiwan puts real muscle behind the Lee Economic Prosperity Partnership and the Science and Technology Agreement we signed as a result of my trip to Taiwan last fall as the highest-ranking State Department official in 41 years. That Taiwan trip was one of the reasons why this small-town Ohio boy ended up No. 3 on Dictator Xi’s sanctions list. I received this distinction not for what I said as under secretary of State, but for serving my country and getting results. However, the main reason was building the Clean Network Alliance of Democracies, which defeated Xi’s master plan to control 5G through Huawei. The Wall Street Journal called the Clean Network “an undisputed success” and perhaps the “most enduring foreign-policy legacy” of the last four years. With Huawei now neutralized, USICA’s $1.5 billion infusion for 5G innovation will accelerate American companies’ efforts to get back in the 5G game. The Clean Network was a product of my mission to take economic statecraft to the next level by developing and operationalizing a Global Economic Security Strategy (GESS) — which later became another bipartisan bill, The Global Economic Security Strategy Act of 2019 — aimed at driving economic growth, maximizing national security, and combating economic aggression. It consisted of three pillars: 1) turbocharge economic competitiveness and innovation; 2) safeguard American’s assets, such as intellectual property, supply chains, financial and education systems; and 3) form a network of trusted partnerships comprised of like-minded countries, companies, and civil society that operates by a set of democratic trust principles for all areas of economic collaboration, which turned into the Clean Network. The Endless Frontier Act, initially conceived in October 2019, was one of the byproducts of the first pillar of the Global Economic Security Strategy. Our team at the State Department worked with Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer, a Democrat from New York, and Sen. Todd Young, a Republican from Indiana, to reboot America’s technological leadership at a time when we face an urgent threat from the Chinese Communist Party. The bipartisan legislation which was introduced a few months later was designed to spawn tomorrow’s trusted technology by boosting investment in high-tech research vital to our national security. Most significantly, USICA is a catalyst for such private-sector, and even allied, R&D investments. The strategic plan presented by Paul Touw, my senior advisor and fellow founder of Ariba, and me to senators and congressmen demonstrated how to grow this critical high-tech research investment to $500 billion with matches from the private sector and our closest technological allies. We later validated this and garnered significant interest from companies and countries that became members of the Clean Network. The beauty of this approach is that it not only compounds the government’s R&D funding in 10 national security sectors but also maximizes the commercialization of those investments by leveraging private-sector resources and know-how. From an economic diplomacy standpoint, it also enhances collaboration and increases economic competitiveness with our Techno-Democracies-10 (TD-10) partners to counter China Inc. The TD-10 was designed as a powerful coalition of 10 to 12 like-minded countries assembled to compete with China Inc. by focusing on the development, protection, dissemination, and use of emerging technologies. USICA’s focus on economic statecraft with its investment in alliances and partnerships, coupled with the increase of the Development Finance Corporation’s (DFC) funding from $60 billion to $100 billion, significantly bolsters the continued expansion of Clean Network beyond the original six lines of effort. USICA also gives a shot in the arm to the clean infrastructure initiative we rolled out as the Blue Dot Network, aptly renamed the Clean Green Network. It was gratifying to see the G-7 recently get behind this initiative because it serves as an equitable and unifying alternative to China’s “One-Belt One-Way Toll Road to Beijing,” as one Asian foreign minister called it. By passing the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, the Senate did its part to send a powerful message to our citizens, private sector, allies and the Chinese Communist Party itself that America is united in its commitment to preserve our precious freedom from authoritarianism. It’s now the House’s turn to take the baton and then, let’s get on with the moonshot.

#### Solves through start-up talent

PTI 1-26-2022 (“New legislation supported by Joe Biden proposes startup visas to attract talent,” *Business Today*, <https://www.businesstoday.in/latest/world/story/new-legislation-supported-by-joe-biden-proposes-startup-visas-to-attract-talent-320373-2022-01-26>)

The ambitious America COMPETES Act of 2022, which was introduced in the US House of Representatives on Tuesday, proposes to open up new visas for talented individuals from across the world with a new startup visa. President Joe Biden, who supports the legislation, said the America Competes Act, 2022 is an important step forward in advancing legislation that will make the supply chains stronger and reinvigorate the innovation engine of the country's economy to outcompete China and the rest of the world for decades to come. The Act, among other things, amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to create a new classification of "W" non-immigrants for entrepreneurs with an ownership interest in a startup entity, essential employees of a startup entity and also their spouses and children. According to the provisions of the bill released by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, the bill when signed into law directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish procedures for foreign nationals with an ownership interest in a startup entity to self-petition for lawful permanent resident status as an immigrant entrepreneur if the entity demonstrates a proven track record of success through job creation and significant revenue generation or receipt of investment capital. It also directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish procedures for foreign nationals with an ownership interest in a startup entity to self-petition for classification as a W-1 non-immigrant and to receive extensions of such classification for up to eight years if the entity meets certain growth benchmarks. It also provides for a limited number of W-2 visas for personnel who are essential to the growth and success of the startup entity if the startup serves as the basis for the W-1 status of a founder. The bill exempts from the numerical limits on immigrant visas certain foreign nationals (and the spouses and children of such aliens) who have earned a doctoral degree in science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) from a qualified US research institution or a foreign institution if the degree is the equivalent to a doctoral degree issued by a qualified US research institution. The bill provides the Secretary of Homeland Security discretion to classify an individual as a W-1 non-immigrant for a three-year period initially if the individual possesses an ownership interest of not less than 10 per cent in a startup entity, the foreign individual will play a central and active role in the management or operations of the startup entity or the applicant possesses the knowledge, skills or experience to substantially assist the startup with the growth and success of the business. During the 18-month period preceding the filing of the petition, the startup entity needs to have received at least USD 250,000 in qualifying investments from one or more qualified investors or at least USD 100,000 in qualifying government awards or grants, the bill notes. In a statement, Biden said the proposals laid out by the House and Senate represent the sort of transformational investments in American industrial base and research and development that helped power the United States to lead the global economy in the 20th century and expand opportunities for middle-class families. "They will help bring manufacturing jobs back to the United States and they are squarely focussed on easing the sort of supply chain bottlenecks like semiconductors that have led to higher prices for the middle class," he said. "Building on the historic investments in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law that I signed last year -- and on signs of progress like last week's Intel announcement and today's GM announcement -- comprehensive competitiveness legislation will power our economy to create good-paying jobs for all Americans, no matter where you live or whether you have a college degree, and will help tackle the climate crisis," Biden said. "Today, the House takes action to transport our nation into the future, with the America COMPETES Act: bold, results-oriented legislation that will strengthen America's national and economic security and the financial security of families, and advance our leadership in the world," Pelosi said. "America COMPETES makes historic investments to strengthen America's economy, security and global leadership. To compete effectively with the People's Republic of China (PRC), the legislation leverages our core strengths and values, and presents a positive, whole-of-government agenda that rises to the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century," said Congressman Gregory Meeks, Chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee. To bolster economic competitiveness, America COMPETES has provisions to secure critical supply chains, shape the rules and standards that govern global commerce and development, empower American workers and businesses, and invest in science and innovation, he said. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said the introduction of the vital America COMPETES Act of 2022 in the House is an important step forward to setting up a conference with the Senate-passed US Innovation and Competition Act, so that they can quickly negotiate a final bill for the president to sign into law. "We have no time to waste in improving American competitiveness, strengthening our lead in global innovation and addressing supply chain challenges, including in the semiconductor industry," he said.

### !---Leadership Terminal

#### U.S. leadership prevents nuclear war and global repression

Manville 18 Brook Manville is Principal of Brook Manville LLC, consulting on strategy and organization Why A Crumbling World Order Urgently Needs U.S. Leadership <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brookmanville/2018/10/14/why-a-crumbling-world-order-urgently-needs-u-s-leadership/?sh=2cfaf9a52e61>

Still angry about Justice Kavanaugh? Or are you anxious about the latest UN climate report, warning of faster-rising oceans? Or do you fret about wrong-headed immigration laws? Or can’t we just talk about the Red Sox getting to the World Series? No, we can’t. Read Robert Kagan’s new book, The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World (Knopf, 2018), and you’ll find a full-throated case for drop-everything-emergency aid for something more existential, the colorless oxygen of today’s civilization we dangerously take for granted: the liberal world order. This plain-spoken senior fellow of Brookings wants to grab you by the lapels and scream urgency in your face—because if we lose the American-guaranteed collection of laws, democratic values, economic and defense treaties that have produced seven unprecedented decades of peace and prosperity, you’ll wonder why you ever worried about anything else. If U.S. global leadership slides, Kagan asserts, the invisible protective bubble we’ve enjoyed since 1945 won’t just deflate. It will explode. Good-bye rules-based trade, hello shortages of food and essential products. Dictators not just threatening but using nuclear weapons. More innocents repressed or killed in civilized countries. Cross-border migrations magnitudes beyond the crises of today’s detention centers and Mediterranean rescues. Dark Forces Re-emerging The botanical metaphor in Kagan’s book title began our recent conversation. “We’ve been living in a tranquil garden of largely peaceful practices and liberal expectations across much of the world, ignoring the dark forces of jungle multiplying under the rocks. If we don’t defend civilization’s cultivation—especially American’s guarantee of peace and economic integration across the world—the toxic creatures and weeds will roar back.” Thus China’s determined military rise, Russia’s continuing aggressions, fiery authoritarians on the march in so many once democratic countries. As Kagan continued, “Trump has been damaging the system—he too seems to have forgotten what good it has delivered—but actually America’s desire for maintaining the global order has been diminishing for years. After the dissolution of the Soviet empire in the 1990s, people talked about ‘the end of history”—that America didn’t have to worry anymore about war or aggression. History doesn’t end, it simply paused. The ugliest aspects of human nature are surging again.” Vanishing Leadership, Vanishing Peace Kagan’s apocalyptic message, repeated in other recent writings, is lucid and terrifying, all the more devastating for its relentless use of history. It’s a footnoted plea that “we’ve seen this movie before.” He reminds us that Americans have frequently turned away from defending world order, with regrettably familiar outcomes: to be dragged in later at greater cost (e.g. helping to stop Hitler earlier might have prevented World War II); or, simply hoping that “the problem would go away,” to watch it get ten times worse (e.g. Obama’s policy in Syria). Kagan acknowledges that America has sometimes misstepped (e.g. Viet Nam, Iraq), but he still argues that overall our foreign engagement has produced more peace and prosperity than not. “History shows,” he summarized, “that world order has never been achieved without some constructive force to keep the peace. The relative harmony and fair play we’ve created in the modern world will vanish if the U.S. forsakes international leadership.”

### !---LIO

#### Tech leadership is key to US norm setting---saves the LIO

Allen 3-1-2021, analyst @ The Hill (John, “To outpace China on technology, the US needs a 'full-stack' strategy,” <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/540808-to-outpace-china-on-technology-the-us-needs-a-full-stack-strategy?rl=1>)

From the COVID-19 pandemic and a deeply struggling economy to the critical need for racial justice and immediate action on climate change, President Biden now confronts one of the most daunting inheritances of any U.S. president in at least a century. His administration also faces a looming strategic challenge: whether the United States and its allies and partners will be able to find common cause in accelerating the development of next-generation technologies. If the United States and its democratic partners develop and deploy next wave technologies first, they will generate significant strategic advantages and strengthen their position in rule-setting forums. In turn, this will enable them to help craft norms and regulations for emerging technologies that are reflective of democratic values. Simply put, technological competition sits at the core of great power competition and ideological rivalry for the 21st century and beyond. And with the U.S. and its democratic allies seeking to outpace authoritarian regimes such as those in Beijing and Moscow, tech innovation will be a critical determinant of the continued strength and resilience of the liberal international order.

#### LIO solves nuclear war, climate change and tech disruption---all existential.

Harari 18, Professor of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Yuval Noah, “We need a post-liberal order now,” *The Economist*, <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/09/26/we-need-a-post-liberal-order-now>)

The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it has been tried—and it failed spectacularly. All attempts to divide the world into clear-cut nations have so far resulted in war and genocide. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians. This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly. But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?” Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game. Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three common problems that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption. You cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or against global warming, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (AI) or bioengineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind. An AI arms race or a biotechnological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome. Whoever wins the arms race, the loser will likely be humanity itself. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.” Similarly, consider developing autonomous-weapon systems, that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”. The only thing that can prevent such destructive arms races is greater trust between countries. This is not an impossible mission. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans. Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, entire countries might collapse, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will destabilise the entire world. This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI. In order to survive and flourish in the 21st century, humankind needs effective global cooperation, and so far the only viable blueprint for such cooperation is offered by liberalism. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze.

### !---AI Leadership Good

#### U.S. AI leadership solves geopolitical conflict

Dukeman ’20 – senior fellow at FP21 and a Ph.D. student at Princeton University, where he researches institutional reform in U.S. foreign policy agencies

(Ryan Dukeman, Nov 25, 2020, “WINNING THE AI REVOLUTION FOR AMERICAN DIPLOMACY,” ability edited, War on the Rocks, https://warontherocks.com/2020/11/winning-the-ai-revolution-for-american-diplomacy/)

Precognition algorithms. System-of-systems [shutdown] ~~paralysis~~. An “all-seeing digital system of social control.” To nonexperts, these technologies may seem incomprehensible — the stuff of science fiction and 1984. But to authoritarian states’ military and political leadership, these are game-changing advances that could be the key **to upending the international system**. Perhaps most importantly, some of these technologies could be integrated sooner than one might think. According to one prominent journalist, in China and soon elsewhere, “the panopticon is already here.” Big data and artificial intelligence (AI) are restructuring the **geopolitical divide** between nations that harness its potential and those that do not, transforming the nature of conflict, empowering asymmetric and nonstate actors, and yielding increasing returns for first movers. **As oil factored significantly into the great geopolitical conflicts of the 20th century, so too will the politics of data and artificial intelligence** quickly become the politics of international security, for better or for worse. As the Department of Defense’s 2018 AI strategy notes, “AI refers to the ability of machines to perform tasks that normally require human intelligence — for example, recognizing patterns, learning from experience, drawing conclusions, making predictions, or taking action — whether digitally or as the smart software behind autonomous physical systems.” The United States is the global leader in such technologies for now, but its national security bureaucracy is poorly configured to capitalize on this advantage. In particular, the government is sidelining the very agency that could both lead on the global policy challenges of AI and benefit from applying AI to its way of working. I’m talking, of course, about the State Department. Yes, you read that right: For the United States to win the data wars, the State Department should become an interagency leader in AI. While the AI and national security debate has predominantly focused on its applications in warfare, espionage, and homeland security (including election security), it has so far missed the critical relevance of AI for American diplomacy. This is a mistake, because in the coming decades AI will be essential both as a top-tier agenda item in strategic competition against digital authoritarianism and as a tool for more responsive, informed, and effective foreign policymaking. AI is the next “gray rhino” security threat: a slow-building event that, when it finally hits, can be even more disruptive than conventionally recognized threats like **interstate rivalry** or **terrorism**. As such, it deserves an affirmative, **cross-issue digital democracy agenda** championed by the State Department. The department is uniquely positioned to lead on this agenda, leveraging the interdependent security, human rights, and economic dimensions of AI to advance governance in line with American values. Relatedly, the State Department can also help right the “institutional imbalance” of a militarized foreign policy and empower civilian diplomats by capitalizing on AI in its ways of working, including areas like strategic planning, crisis response, and other core diplomatic functions. A Digital Democracy Agenda for the Next “Gray Rhino” The ongoing pandemic has broadened the national security community’s conception of threats to include so-called gray rhinos. In addition to disease and the accelerating climate crisis, AI presents the third such threat, but is unfortunately under-resourced in current foreign policy budgeting. While the defense budget treats AI as a technological innovation for guarding against other threats, the national security and defense strategies do not treat it as a significant threat in its own right. This is a mistake. If poorly managed, the economic, security, and human rights impacts of authoritarian-enabling AI pose a serious threat to the American way of life, and should be planned for and prioritized accordingly. First and foremost, frontier technologies constitute a digital battleground for near-peer competition between the United States, China, and Russia. China in particular has focused diplomatic and state-capitalist efforts on shaping a global approach to digital governance that allows for unmitigated domestic surveillance and state infringement on free speech. This effort is not just a mercantilist attempt to supplant American firms’ AI leadership with that of Chinese state-owned enterprises — it is also meant to shape an international order reflective of China’s abusive domestic system. These techno-authoritarian models of digital governance are in direct opposition to American values and pose a threat to U.S. leadership on issues of human rights, economic security, and protection of intellectual property. AI similarly enables disinformation campaigns and election interference (e.g., through generative networks used to create deepfakes), as well as more advanced, detection-evading cyber attacks, and thus should be internationally regulated as an **anti-democratic force multiplier**.

### AT Tech Bad

#### 4th wave technologies are inevitable—the only question is does the U.S. get left behind

XR Association White Paper 21, THE INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY LANDSCAPE OF THE FUTURE AND THE SYNERGISTIC EFFECT OF IMMERSIVE TECHNOLOGIES, https://xra.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/EFA-White-Paper-Final.pdf

III. ENSURING THE UNITED STATES SHAPES THE FUTURE TECHNOLOGY ECOSYSTEM The new industrial revolution is already underway, and immersive technologies are playing a crucial role. In combination with other technologies, as well as on their own, immersive technologies will bring dramatic changes to society and to people’s individual lives. Currently, VR applications can be classified as industry applications or public applications. The former includes areas such as manufacturing, medicine, education, military, and e-commerce. The latter includes games, social networking, movies, and live broadcast. As noted above, according to Goldman Sachs, the VR/AR industry will reach USD $80 billion by 2025. The XR era has emerged. China recognized the outsized potential of immersive technology years ago and has taken impressive steps towards controlling its future. XR is featured prominently in the CCP’s Made in China 2025 strategy, and the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, the National Development and Reform Commission, the Ministry of Science and Technology, the Ministry of Culture, and the Ministry of Commerce have all released detailed strategies concerning XR. In addition, Chinese provincial and municipal local governments are proactively building industrial parks and labs to promote the development of local VR industries.14 China is not the only nation investing heavily in XR. Countries that had early 5G commercialization plans, including Japan and South Korea, planned for VR as a key 5G application field. Indeed, governments are generously funding XR research and development, and XR-related inventions are increasing exponentially. 16By the end of May 2017, the number of global VR patents had reached 59,000, with about 29,000 patent families. Those numbers have continued to grow. Now is the time for the U.S. to step-up its public investment in immersive technology and to forge mutually-beneficial XR development and production partnerships with U.S. allies like the countries of NATO, Southeast Asia, and India.

### AT Relations Turn

#### Relations low – Ukraine war

Quinn 3-13-2022 (Michelle, “Eyeing China, US Business Community Waits for Washington to Make Next Move,” VOA, https://www.voanews.com/a/6482856.html)

Sino-U.S. relations continue to be strained and further exacerbated by China’s close ties with Russia and Beijing’s desire to stay neutral on the war in Ukraine.

#### Relations are low and impossible

Qinggo 1-23-2022, Professor and former Dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University (Jia, “Waiting for spring to come in China–US relations,” *East Asia Forum*, <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2022/01/23/waiting-for-spring-to-come-in-china-us-relations/>)

At the beginning of 2021, there were modest hopes. The good news was that Joe Biden had won the US presidential election. Trump’s trade war had sent the relationship into a deep dive. His manipulation of the China question for domestic political gain contributed to its further deterioration. His handling of the Taiwan issue towards the end of his term increased the risk of accidental conflict across the Taiwan Strait. Biden is the polar opposite of Trump. He belongs to the US policy mainstream, characterised as professional, decent and cool-headed. Some believed this was a positive sign for China–US relations and held prospect a more pragmatic approach toward China. The Chinese government shared this view and signalled its willingness to work with the new administration. After the Biden administration officially took office, Yang Jiechi, in charge of China’s foreign relations, said ‘it is a task for both China and the United States to restore the relationship to a predictable and constructive track of development and build a model of interaction between the two major countries that focuses on peaceful coexistence and win-win cooperation’. But many in Washington interpreted Yang’s message as an effort to blame the United States for the problems between the two countries instead of an expression of goodwill. On assuming office, Secretary of State Antony Blinken defined the new administration’s approach towards China as a mixture of competition, confrontation and cooperation. It soon became clear that competition would continue to dominate US policy towards China. Washington blasted China’s behaviour on a range of issues, including Hong Kong, Xinjiang, Taiwan, the South China Sea and human rights. Blinken labelled China’s policies in Xinjiang as a ‘genocide’. The Biden administration also stepped up efforts to rally its allies to ‘push back’ on China. Washington’s uncompromising posture drew frustration and anger from Beijing. Many in China concluded that the Biden administration’s China policy was worse than the Trump administration’s since it sought to create an international anti-China front. A tit-for-tat exchange between Beijing and Washington followed. At the two countries’ first high-level face-to-face meeting in Alaska on 13 November 2021, there was a heated exchange. Despite some cooperation on particular issues, like climate change, the conflict between the two sides has increased. The issue that drew the most attention turned out to be Taiwan. Taiwan authorities’ efforts to push for independence coupled with increasing US endorsement and support elicited a tougher stance from China, which included sending military aircraft to patrol the vicinity of Taiwan. The vicious cycle of interactions between Beijing, Taipei and Washington increased the likelihood of a military showdown. Against this background, the virtual summit meeting between Chinese President Xi Jinping and Biden on 16 November was more about how to set guard rails for the relationship than exploring the possibility of substantive cooperation. Despite the summit, the relationship between Beijing and Washington continues to slide. The most recent bickering includes a US official boycott of the Beijing Winter Olympics, sanctions over Xinjiang and Chinese retaliation. Why has the relationship evolved in this way? The rise of China has elevated security concerns among US realists about China’s strategic intentions, especially in the light of China’s military moves to defend its proclaimed territorial sovereignty in the South China Sea and the Taiwan Strait. Political developments in China have also disappointed US liberals who had banked on the hope of encouraging political reform in China through engagement. Trump’s race-to-the-bottom anti-China rhetoric provided a vent for frustration with China for both US realists and liberals alike and contributed to a political atmosphere in the United States in which being tough is the right and only posture when it comes to China. Given the anti-China consensus in the US Congress and the slim majority the governing Democrats enjoy, Biden has had to remain tough on China to get anything done at home. This includes the appointment of cabinet officials, passing bills to contain COVID-19 and rebuilding infrastructure. How the two countries interacted with each other, which was characterised by megaphone diplomacy for domestic consumption, undermined any goodwill that remained for stabilisation and improvement of the relationship. In the short run, these factors are unlikely to change. The 2022 mid-term elections bode ill for China–US relations because the Republicans who stand on an even tougher policy toward China appear likely to win. Under these circumstances, the Biden administration is unlikely to be able to advance a pragmatic approach toward China. Ahead of the 20th Party Congress, China is also unlikely to compromise. The stabilisation and improvement of China–US relations is likely to remain a distant prospect for some time yet.

#### Taiwan and NDDA thump

Bala 22 (Sumathi, “Asia’s top risk in 2022 will be U.S.-China tensions over Taiwan, says political risk analyst,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/01/05/us-china-relations-over-taiwan-will-be-asias-top-risk-in-2022-analyst.html>)

The tense relationship between the U.S. and China over Taiwan will be the main challenge for Asia in the year ahead, according to a political risk analyst. Beijing sees any move by Washington on Taiwan as negative or infringing on its interests, said D.J. Peterson, president of Longview Global Advisors. he tense relationship between the U.S. and China over Taiwan will be the main risk for Asia in the year ahead, according to one political risk analyst. Beijing sees any move by Washington on Taiwan as negative or infringing on its interests, said D.J. Peterson, president of Longview Global Advisors, a research firm. “That is very much the top risk, I think in Asia in 2022. If you look at the relationship between the United States and China right now, it really is a ‘Cold War 2’ type relationship,” he told CNBC’s “Streets Signs Asia” on Tuesday. Late last year, President Joe Biden signed into law a defense bill known as the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for fiscal year 2022. Peterson said that has further eroded relations between the two countries. “The law, the NDAA that was signed just recently, has several provisions that the Beijing doesn’t like, including these overtures to Taiwan. Any overtures by any country to Taiwan is seen as a zero sum loss for Beijing — and they respond very harshly,” he noted.

#### US-China relations are impossible—only maintaining competition and deterrence can preserve the LIO and create long-term cooperation

Ward 21 (Alex is a reporter covering the White House, with a focus on foreign policy and national security, “Don’t expect the US and China to be friendly anytime soon” 3/23/21 <https://www.vox.com/22338506/usa-china-anchorage-alaska-strategy-relationship>)

If the first meeting between the Biden administration and Chinese officials last week underscored anything, it’s that the US and China are unlikely to be friendly in the years to come. The two sides’ views of how the world should run are diametrically opposed — and competition more than cooperation will guide how Washington and Beijing interact for a long time. US Secretary of State Tony Blinken told his Chinese counterparts at the meeting in Anchorage, Alaska, that the Biden administration wouldn’t accept an international system that runs on Beijing’s concept of power, which he described as “a world in which might makes right and winners take all.” That, the top American diplomat said, “would be a far more violent and unstable world for all of us.” But Yang Jiechi, China’s top foreign affairs official, rejected that China should abide by the US-backed “rules-based international order” Blinken advocated for, which Yang noted is also “advocated by a small number of countries.” Instead, Yang asserted it was “important for all of us to come together to build a new type of international relations, ensuring fairness, justice, and mutual respect.” The yawning gap between the two sides makes it clear: “This is the battle for the international system,” Elizabeth Economy, an expert on China at Stanford University’s Hoover Institute, told me. “The challenge,” she added, is “fundamental.” Which is why, even though discord between the two countries is higher now than it’s been in decades, most experts I spoke to said the Biden administration shouldn’t try to improve relations with China. Washington should instead push Beijing hard on issues such as human rights, military aggression, economic coercion, and much more. Anything less, experts said, would implicitly invite China to run roughshod over the world. Progress can still be made despite the tensions. Where interests align — on climate change, North Korea, Afghanistan, and other issues — both sides can find common ground. But the American Enterprise Institute’s Zack Cooper told me cooperation for cooperation’s sake shouldn’t be the desired outcome. “The goal should be a results-oriented relationship,” he said. “What’s the point of discussion if we’re not actually going to resolve any of the problems?” Experts said this isn’t quite a new Cold War, though it may feel like it. That’s because the real sticking points are about trade, technology, and the rules of cyberspace rather than the threat of nuclear annihilation. This is a superpower rivalry for a new era — and it’s likely going to get worse before it gets better. “The relationship has deteriorated to the worst point that I’ve seen in the last two decades,” said Economy. While ties haven’t reached rock bottom, “we’ve got conflict in pretty much every single policy area.” Engagement with China didn’t work. Biden is pursuing a course correction. Engagement with China, meaning consistent and significant dialogue on areas of mutual interest, defined Washington-Beijing relations since the Nixon era. There was bipartisan agreement on that in the US, and recent presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama both approached Beijing in this way. Both wanted China to become a “responsible stakeholder.” That’s a wonderfully wonky Washington term that mostly means they hoped Beijing would come to abide by the global rules of the game on everything from trade to military affairs to international relations, even as the country gained immense power. Instead of bullying or threatening China to force it to stop doing things like cheating on international trade rules, stealing other countries’ intellectual property, and grievously violating human rights at home (among other things), the strategy was to develop close economic ties with China and encourage it to become more integrated into the world economy. The hope was that would lead Beijing to start acting more responsibly on its own because it would be in its self-interest to do so. That didn’t happen, though. Instead, China under President Xi Jinping became more authoritarian internally and far more aggressive on the world stage. Among many acts, China has forcibly placed roughly 2 million Uyghur Muslims in concentration camps, stripped Hong Kong of its democracy, and turned Taiwan into a global flashpoint that could erupt into a much larger conflict. And its aggressive behavior toward the US and its interests continues. Beijing has stolen US technological and personnel secrets for its own advantage, antagonized US allies in the South China Sea, killed or imprisoned more than a dozen American informants, and taken millions of US jobs over the past two decades. Most recently, China reportedly hacked America’s payroll agency. The Trump administration, then, felt it was time for the US to correct course. “What do the American people have to show now, 50 years on from engagement with China?” Trump’s then-Secretary of State Mike Pompeo asked a crowd at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum last month. “The old paradigm of blind engagement with China simply won’t get it done. We must not continue it and we must not return to it.” Trump’s team confronted China mostly via a trade war, aiming to hurt Beijing’s economy by displacing it from the center of global supply chains and barring it from exporting some of its technology to the US and partner nations. That approach partially worked, in that some jobs in China moved elsewhere, Beijing suffered an economic slowdown, and certain allies were made more skeptical of Chinese technologies companies like Huawei. Trump’s actions also socialized the idea in Washington that competition with China was a worthwhile endeavor, even if his methods didn’t receive bipartisan support. But most experts warned that the administration’s unilateral plan of attack, without significant buy-in from other countries, wouldn’t be enough to compel Beijing to alter its behavior. They were right. As Trump left office, China, for example, proceeded to imprison Uyghurs and take more control of Hong Kong while doing little to change its trading practices with the US. All that bluster, then, didn’t accomplish Trump’s goal of fundamentally changing the way Beijing acted in the world. Enter the Biden administration. Biden’s China strategy is competitive by nature Biden has been clear on the need to counter China. “American leadership must meet this new moment of advancing authoritarianism, including the growing ambitions of China to rival the United States,” he said during a February speech. “We’ll confront China’s economic abuses; counter its aggressive, coercive action; to push back on China’s attack on human rights, intellectual property, and global governance. But we are ready to work with Beijing when it’s in America’s interest to do so,” he continued. Pushing Beijing to protect human rights and not use force or coercion to achieve its goals, while leaving the door to cooperate on areas of mutual interest, is the Biden administration’s China game plan. “Our relationship with China will be competitive when it should be, collaborative when it can be, and adversarial when it must be,” Blinken said during a March 3 foreign policy address. To do that, the Biden administration has two main plays. First, they hope to enlist allies and partners in an international effort to compel Beijing to change its ways. Biden firmly believes the US will only get the upper hand on China by proving it has a coalition of friends willing to thwart Beijing’s most troublesome policies in unison. Think of it like a geopolitical gang-up: the US and its crew versus a mostly lonely China. “We need to rally the democratic world together more than ever,” a former Biden staffer told me last year. “It’ll be a democratic alliance to save the world.” Biden’s meeting earlier this month with “the Quad” — a coalition of anti-China nations featuring India, Australia, and Japan — is case in point. While they don’t openly say the express aim of the group is to counter Beijing’s actions in the Indo-Pacific, most experts say that is very clearly the point of the group. Second, the Biden administration wants to revitalize America at home. That means, among other things, improving the nation’s democracy, pursuing racial equity, becoming more competitive economically and technologically, and rebuilding trust in the US as the world’s leader. This is an important part of the China plan, experts say. “We’ve got a lot of work to do,” said Bonnie Glaser, director of the China Power Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies think tank in Washington, DC. “It’s a whole issue of rejuvenating America.” The thinking, most experts and US officials note, is that a stronger America working in lockstep with allies will give it more leverage to challenge China’s aggressions and influence when working with Beijing on shared concerns.

#### Power competition with China is inevitable—recent changes in doctrine prove they are trying lead the world order—relations are impossible

Hass 21 (Ryan, Senior Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center for East Asia Policy Studies, John L. Thornton China Center The Michael H. Armacost Chair Interim Chen-Fu and Cecilia Yen Koo Chair in Taiwan Studies Nonresident Fellow, Paul Tsai China Center, Yale Law School, “How China is responding to escalating strategic competition with the US” 3/1/21 <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-china-is-responding-to-escalating-strategic-competition-with-the-us/>)

There seems to be a growing consensus in Beijing that U.S.-China relations will remain rocky for the foreseeable future. Even so, President Xi Jinping and others have been touting that time and momentum are on China’s side in its quest to move closer to the center of the world stage. Chinese officials recognize that they will need to overcome obstacles in their country’s pursuit of its national goals. To do so, China appears to be pursuing a three-pronged medium-term strategy: maintaining a non-hostile external environment in order to focus on domestic priorities; reducing dependence on America while increasing the rest of the world’s dependence on China; and expanding the reach of Chinese influence overseas. At the same time, China’s actions are generating significant reactions, both at home and abroad. Whether China can learn from this feedback loop to address its own vulnerabilities remains an open question, one that only China will be capable of answering. Understanding China’s evaluation of – and response to – sharp shifts in U.S.-China relations and its international environment have rarely been more important. Given its expanding economic reach and growing strategic weight, China’s actions now directly impact lives in the United States and around the world. Yet, in some respects, it has become more difficult to see clearly what assumptions and decisions are guiding China’s changing approach to America and the world. There has been more heat than light in many recent American debates about China’s ambitions. Travel restrictions due to COVID-19 have eliminated opportunities for both informal in-person exchanges with Chinese officials and first-hand observation of Chinese society, which often have served as one of the richest sources of insight into the policy zeitgeist in Beijing. And into this vacuum, many American scholars have come to rely more on interpreting official and semi-official Chinese texts to develop conclusions on China’s strategic direction. ​My previous government service at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing and in the White House National Security Council (NSC) has instilled me with humility about extrapolating China’s strategic designs from its publicly available statements and reports. Nevertheless, drawing from over 50 hours of Zoom-based dialogues with Chinese officials and scholars, a review of Chinese officials’ speeches and Chinese expert commentaries, and over a decade of interacting with senior Chinese officials on such questions, I do believe it is possible to draw some preliminary observations about China’s evolving approach to its changing international environment. ​The starting point of my analysis is to observe how far Chinese foreign policy has moved during the past two years. Writing for China Leadership Monitor in March 2019, former Obama administration National Security Council (NSC) Senior Director for Asia Evan Medeiros observed that, “China’s reaction [to President Trump’s overtly hostile China strategy] was far more cautious – and even conciliatory at times – than confrontational. Beijing was primarily focused on limiting down-side risk and, to a limited extent, exploring opportunities for upside gains.”[1] Medeiros concluded, “A pattern became very clear in 2018: in the face of confrontational U.S. statements and actions, China maintained substantial engagement with a wide variety of Americans, made very careful public statements, and advocated negotiated solutions. Calibration and proportionality were driving China’s playbook far more than the tactics of opprobrium, isolation, and push-back.”[2] ​This evaluation of China’s orientation toward the United States remained largely intact through January 2020, when both sides finalized negotiations on a “phase-1” trade deal. In the weeks that followed, the bilateral dynamic shifted sharply. Facing the humanitarian and financial losses resulting from the uncontrolled spread of COVID-19, President Trump shifted from touting Xi Jinping as his friend to branding China as his enemy and the source of the pain that many Americans were feeling. And China largely reciprocated, pointing its propaganda cannons at America’s response to the public health crisis and the cascade of social, economic, and political problems that flowed from it. In subsequent months, a tit-for-tat pattern emerged, e.g., on treatment of each side’s journalists, on consulate closures, on recriminations over each side’s involvement in the origin of COVID-19, and on sanctions of high-level individuals in both countries. Beijing began mirror-imaging America’s economic pressure toolkit. Like the United States, China developed laws and regulations for export controls, national security investment screening, policy-related visa sanctions, and extraterritorial provisions in laws and administrative regulations. Beijing also grew less restrained in its actions at home and abroad. Chinese authorities advanced a campaign of brutal suppression in Xinjiang, tightened control of Hong Kong, crushed dissent across the country, engaged in deadly clashes with Indian troops for the first time in 45 years, punished countries and individuals that challenged China’s preferred narratives on sensitive issues, and pointedly criticized the performance of Western democracies. These actions represented a significant departure from the foreign policy focus on calibration and caution that HAD BEEN observable as recently as spring 2019. CHINA’S EVALUATION OF THE UNITED STATES There appears to be broad agreement among officials and experts in China that America’s power in the international system is declining relative to China’s. Many Chinese experts diagnose America’s anxiety about its relative decline as driving its reflexive efforts to undermine China’s rise. Chinese State Councilor and Foreign Minister Wang Yi gave expression to this viewpoint, for example, in his end-of-year interview with Xinhua on January 2, 2021. Reflecting on U.S.-China relations over the previous year, Wang concluded: ​In recent years, China-US relations have run into unprecedented difficulties. Fundamentally, it comes down to serious misconceptions of U.S. policymakers about China. Some see China as the so-called biggest threat and their China policy based on this misperception is simply wrong. What has happened proves that the U.S. attempt to suppress China and start a new Cold War has not just seriously harmed the interests of the two peoples, but also caused severe disruptions to the world. …China policy toward the United States is consistent and stable.[3] ​In other words, Wang put forward Beijing’s boilerplate explanation for the downturn in relations – it’s America’s fault. ​There are a diminishing number of Chinese officials or experts who remain willing, at least visibly, to question this explanation of the downturn in U.S.-China relations. One of the few to do so, albeit subtly, is Wang Jisi, president of the Institute of International and Strategic Studies at Peking University. In a January 2021 op-ed, Wang observed, “Our actions at home and in the world determine to a large extent the attitude of the U.S. toward us. I believe that China, not the United States, can turn the tide of U.S.-China relations at historical junctures, although this position may be debatable.”[4] ​One issue where there does appear to be convergence of views inside China, though, is the expectation that there will be continuity in America’s strategic orientation toward China from Trump to Biden. Even as Chinese experts acknowledge that the Biden administration likely will adopt a more nuanced tone and professional approach for dealing with problems, they expect the root causes of American antagonism toward China will remain unchanged. Reflecting this view, Yuan Peng, an advisor to China’s top leaders and president of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR), assesses, “A divided United States and polarized politics will limit Biden’s room to maneuver and force him to focus more energy on domestic challenges. …Biden’s first priority is to reunite the United States. …The U.S. will be consumed with dealing with its own structural challenges for many years.”[5] Peking University’s Wang Jisi similarly has concluded, “American policy toward China will continue unchanged under Biden.”[6] Beijing appears to be preparing for a long-term struggle with a declining but still dangerous United States. Privately, according to a well-informed policy advisor, China’s leadership has re-evaluated long-term trends and concluded that it no longer can base its national plans on expectations of generally stable relations with the United States.[7] Partly as a result, Chinese leaders have pulled forward plans to promote a “dual circulation” economic strategy. In rolling out the strategy, President Xi Jinping explained, “Only by being self-reliant and developing the domestic market and smoothing out internal circulation can we achieve vibrant growth and development, regardless of the hostility in the outside world.”[8] China’s spokespeople and official Chinese state media have sought to set public expectations for a long-term struggle with the United States. Key security officials, such as Politburo member and domestic security chief Guo Shengkun, have warned of the likelihood of a long-term struggle with the United States.[9] ​CHINA’S EVALUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM China’s leaders now often refer to “profound changes unseen in a century” to describe their evaluation of the current fluidity IN the international system. These changes often are presented as a paradox, presenting both risks and opportunities for China. ​On one side of the coin, “profound changes unseen in a century” portend dangerous challenges to China. Politburo member and top diplomat Yang Jiechi framed the challenges by noting, “The world economy has been hit hard. …The pandemic has had a tremendous impact on international trade, investment, consumption, and other economic activities. …The pandemic [also] has exacerbated social cleavages, ethnic conflicts, and political confrontations. …The number of international security risks has increased.”[10] On the other side of the coin, Yang observed, “Reform of the international order has sped up. The PRC has taken the lead in controlling the epidemic on a global scale, and in achieving full resumption of work and production, all parties have increased their expectation and reliance on China.”[11] ​Thus, despite expectations of a protracted struggle with the United States, a view of China as an ever more central actor in the international system appears to be gaining traction inside China. At least outwardly, China’s leaders have grown self-congratulatory in their assessment of global trends working in China’s favor. In October, Xi Jinping told cadres at the 5th Plenum that “time and momentum are on our side.”[12] Similarly, Chen Yixin, secretary general of the Central Political and Legal Affairs Commission – the top oversight body for China’s domestic security – told a study session on January 15, “The rise of China is a major variable [in the world today]…the rise of the East and decline of the West has become a trend; changes of the international landscape are in our favor.”[13] CHINA’S STRATEGIC GOALS Discerning Beijing’s medium- and long-term strategic objectives has become one of the most heated debates in Western discourse on China. Proponents of viewing China as a malevolent power that seeks to impose its vision and its values on the rest of the world have been emboldened in recent years, largely as a result of China’s brutish behavior at home and abroad. China’s trampling of its citizens’ rights in Xinjiang and Hong Kong has undermined arguments outside of China that the country will pursue its national ambitions in a benign manner. From my vantage, Beijing sees itself as progressing along a continuum leading to China’s restoration as a central actor in Asia and a leading power on the world stage, a country with greater ability to shape rules, norms, and institutions toward its preferences. China’s leaders have consistently made clear their desire to have their political and economic models respected.[14] It also has been a consistent feature of Chinese foreign policy to push for deference to its “core interests.”[15] China’s foreign policy practitioners have explained that the country’s external relations should support its national goals, particularly its sustainable development.[16] These goals include realization of the country’s 14th five-year plan, its 2035 plan, and its second centenary goal of becoming a prosperous, strong, advanced country by the 100th anniversary of the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 2049.[17] In recent years, key Chinese voices also have become more willing to articulate China’s global ambitions. For example, Politburo member Yang Jiechi has written about the need for China’s foreign policy to lay a foundation “for national rejuvenation and provide an important guarantee for us to lead the world’s great changes and shape the external environment” (emphasis added).[18] ​To reach its long-term goals, Beijing recognizes it must first overcome near-term obstacles. One such potential obstacle is the formation of allied blocs to oppose Chinese initiatives and to obstruct China’s rise. Such concerns have taken on added urgency with Joe Biden’s election as President given Biden’s sustained emphasis on coordinating with allies and partners to push back against Chinese behaviors of concern.

### AT Semiconductor Turn

#### Zero the turn—it’s a cartoon—China won’t invade to get semiconductors because it would never work

Calhoun 21 (George, Quantitative Finance Program Director, at Stevens Inst. of Technology, the same guy who probably wrote the other team’s card, but this one is 17 days later, “Why China (Probably) Won’t Go To War Over Taiwan’s Semiconductor Riches” 9/29/21 https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgecalhoun/2021/09/29/why-china-probably-wont-go-to-war-over-taiwans-semiconductor-riches/?sh=4d55e1d42aa4)

In a recent column, I drew the parallels between the economic and geopolitical tensions entangling Japan in 1941 and the challenges facing China today. The storyline is cartoonishly simple. In 1941, Japan’s constricted access to a critical resource (oil) led them to launch military action in Southeast Asia and the Pacific (including Pearl Harbor). It also aligned with their expansionist pretensions (they were already in Manchuria and parts of the mainland by then). In 2021, China is feeling similarly constricted for a critical resource (semiconductors), and Beijing’s policy options for addressing this problem might seem to converge with its expansionary tendencies, and its long-term concerns over the status of Taiwan. Could taking over Taiwan also solve the semiconductor problem? China has tried for over two decades to achieve a degree of self-sufficiency in semiconductor technology, with very limited success. Meanwhile, Taiwan has become a dominant power in the global semiconductor industry. Something like 75% of the world’s integrated circuit manufacturing capacity is based there. When it comes to the most advanced fabrication technologies, Taiwan outshines even the U.S. today – for example, 92% of the world’s capacity for the manufacturing “nodes” of 10 nanometers and below is currently located in Taiwan. Is the prize ripe enough to provoke Beijing to start a war? Does this construct make sense? Is military action by China, aimed at annexing Taiwan and taking control of Taiwanese semiconductor assets, likely? Is it even feasible? The short answer is No. War would not solve China’s problem. We should assume that Beijing understands that. The counterarguments against a military scenario – at least one that is driven by China’s semiconductor constraints – are very strong. The caveats fall into three inter-locking categories: Technological Issues Industry Structure Issues Supply Chain Issues [In pulling together what follows, I want to acknowledge – and recommend – two particularly valuable sources: A Report issued in June 2021 by The White House (& the Department of Commerce for the relevant section on Semiconductors), entitled “Building Resilient Supply Chains, Revitalizing American Manufacturing, and Fostering Broad-Based Growth - 100-Day Review Under Executive Order 14017” A Report issued in April 2021 by the Boston Consulting Group and the Semiconductor Industry Association, entitled “Strengthening the Global Semiconductor Supply Chain in an Uncertain Era”] Technology Challenges The Japanese had it easy. In 1941, the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia) was the fourth-largest exporter of oil in the world, behind the U.S., Iran, and Romania. When Japan invaded Southeast Asia in late 1941 and early 1942, their military strategy was predicated above all upon surprise – to secure these oil fields intact, denying the Dutch or the British the chance to destroy the wells and refineries. Japan was largely successful, and once in possession, could pump the oil without difficulty (until American forces eventually forced them out). It was feasible to take over the assets by force, and maintain them in full operation. The grab worked. This is not the case for Taiwanese semiconductor manufacturing facilities (“foundries”). Integrated circuit (IC) fabrication is probably the most complex manufacturing operation ever developed. It is also one of the most fragile, in the sense that it operates with extraordinarily tight tolerances for both the purity of the raw materials, and “the subatomic level of precision” at which many of the steps in the fabrication process are carried out. The technological challenges are severe, and constitute a significant barrier to the success of any hostile takeover. Complexity as a Barrier IC fabrication is “an incredibly complex process, involving hundreds of steps completed over several months” (White House Report). (It is also incredibly expensive – but that is another story. If the solution was simply financial, China might have an easier time of it.) There are many stages in the conversion of raw silicon into a finished integrated circuit, as shown in this graphic drawn from the BCG/SIA Report: This is not a single-loop process. Stages 1 through 4 here may be “repeated hundreds of times with different chemicals to create more layers, depending on the desired circuit features” (BCG/SIA). For the most advanced IC fab techniques, it takes 2 to 3 months to complete the fabrication of a wafer. The complexity is challenging even for the industry leaders, who have decades of experience. Even Intel, the largest semiconductor company in the world by sales, and generally regarded as the inventor of the first commercially available microprocessor IC’s, has stumbled in its manufacturing program, falling behind Taiwan Semiconductor Mftg Corp. and Samsung in the development of the latest generation of chip fabrication technologies. This is not a plug-and-play business. There is an immense amount of human know-how and expert technical skill involved in operating this mega-machine. Even if China were to find itself in intact possession of the physical infrastructure in Taiwan’s foundries tomorrow, would they know how to run it on their own? Of course not. They don’t have the experience. (Mainland Chinese IC companies have been frantic to recruit Taiwanese experts to help get their operations going.) Following a takeover, the new Chinese owners would still be heavily reliant upon the highly-skilled Taiwanese workforce they had just “annexed.” It takes little imagination to see how disaffection, or outright defection, of key employees could become the proverbial monkey wrench. The cotton fields in Xinjiang may be workable with forced labor, but an IC foundry is not. Fragility As A Barrier: The Challenge of the “11 Nines” Every stage of IC fabrication is based on extremely tight tolerances. This applies to the raw materials, all the inputs to the production process, “ultra pure gases, ultra pure water” - even the electricity must be ultra-reliable. The entire process must take place in “cleanrooms” – “Typical ambient room air contains 35,000,000 particles for each cubic meter in the size range 0.5 μm or larger while an ISO 1 cleanroom permits no particles in that size range and just 12 particles for each cubic meter of 0.3 μm and smaller.” (Wikipedia) The extreme purity required for the silicon wafers is indicative: “The semiconductor chain begins with polysilicon of ultra-high purity – 99.99999999999 percent pure… often referred to as “11 Nines” – with impurities equal to just one grain of sand in 16 Olympic-sized swimming pools.” - White House Report In other words, two grains of sand, or 13 specs of dust (so to speak) will bring down the house. Leaving aside the possibility of sabotage, as well as the sort of disruptions that occur in military operations, or indeed with management changes of any kind, the traditional “happy with crappy” approach of many mainland Chinese manufacturers is not likely to mesh well with these super-tight tolerances. All in all, transferring an IC fabrication facility and capability under the conditions of a Chinese takeover would not be a turn-key proposition. Industry Structure Issues Although it is often referred to as if it were a monolithic category, the Semiconductor industry includes companies with very different business models. A very simplified breakdown into the key sub-sectors is shown here. (There will be a more detailed column on this coming soon.) All of these functions must interact to produce an integrated circuit, and all these businesses are thus mutually dependent. Control of one segment is not enough to constitute self-sufficiency. For that, a country would need to have a strong presence in all of these segments. A rundown of the current national positioning in these segments would show the following: Design: This segment creates 50% of the total value added to a chip (according to the BCG/SIA report). The U.S. dominates the Design segment (e.g., the fabless IC companies like Qualcomm and Nvidia and many others). China has virtually no foothold. Fabrication (Foundries): This segment creates 24% of the value-added. It is dominated by Taiwan (principally Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Corp., TSMC). China is trying to become a player, but they are several generations behind the leader and have only a very small market share. Semiconductor Manufacturing Equipment: This is the most tech-intensive segment, and accounts for 11% of the value-added. It is dominated by the U.S., with significant shares also held by Japanese and one Dutch company. China has no real share of this market. Assembly/Packaging/Test: This is the most commoditized segment, providing just 6% of the value-added. China has a modest presence in this business. Thus, even if we imagine that Taiwan’s presence in the foundry segment were to flip over, or be absorbed, without impairment, into the Chinese semiconductor economy, that would not provide Beijing with the self-sufficiency it wants. Foundries are expensive to build and challenging to operate, but the U.S. has the inherent capability to do it. It would be painful but we could cope. China as yet lacks the means to develop the Design and Manufacturing Equipment capabilities — without which the foundries cannot function. In other words, if there were to be a complete break – or, as the wonks like to put it nowadays, if there were a “decoupling” of the global semiconductor supply chain – which would hurt everyone, a lot, at least for a while – the U.S. would be in a better position to adjust than China would be. Supply Chain Challenges The reference to the global supply chain raises the third strategic obstacle to any plan to “solve” China’s semiconductor problem by annexing Taiwan and its foundries. As the White House Reports states, “The supply chains for semiconductor manufacturing are immense.” The micro-level technological fragility of the fabrication facility described above is mirrored at the macro-level by the tremendous complexity of the semiconductor supply chain, and the corresponding vulnerability of many of the linkages in those networks. The White House Report zeroes in on one example, involving one input category (chemicals) and one IC type (memory chips): “Aside from the immediately apparent inputs such as wafers and photomasks, the manufacturing of semiconductors requires hundreds of chemicals and dozens of gases. A 2018 study of chemical use in two memory device fabrication facilities found they each used over 400 chemical products weighing over 45,000 tons per year. As many as 49 gases alone may be used in semiconductor production. Many of these chemicals have their own extensive supply chains that may depend on limited or single sources of supply.” The networks created to support the production of a single IC can be vast. According to an Accenture report published in 2020 - “Each segment of the semiconductor value chain has, on average, 25 countries involved in the direct supply chain and 23 countries involved in supporting market functions. In fact, a semiconductor product could cross international borders approximately 70 or more times before finally making it to the end customer.” Individual companies are enmeshed in these networks to an astonishing degree of dependency. “The Semiconductor Industry Association notes that one of its members has over 16,000 suppliers, more than half outside the United States.” – White House Report Autarky Is Impossible The conclusion – that is, the rational conclusion – is that the military solution would not work for China. The Taiwanese dominance of the foundry segment is a very important feature of the semiconductor industry and indeed of the 21st century digital economy. But it is not a standalone asset, viewed from a macro perspective. It is part of a globalized eco-system that China cannot really escape from. Nor is it, as shown, a turn-key-able asset, a fungible capability that could easily be placed under “new management” in the event of a military takeover. The technological and logistical complexity of this critical sector invalidate any theory of “semiconductor autarky” or full self-sufficiency, certainly for China – and probably also for the U.S. (a caveat for the CHIPS bill and other measures gestating in Congress right now).

### AT China Peaceful

#### China is revisionist---the Xi doctrine declares Chinese territorial expansion and risks a CCP nuclear Pearl Harbor.

Thayer and Han 19, \*Bradley A. Thayer is Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas San Antonio. \*Lianchao Han is vice president of Citizen Power Initiatives for China and a visiting fellow at the Hudson Institute. (June 12th, 2019, “The ‘Xi Doctrine’: Proclaiming and Rationalizing China’s Aggression,” *National Interest*, [https://nationalinterest.org/feature/%E2%80%98xi-doctrine%E2%80%99-proclaiming-and-rationalizing-china%E2%80%99s-aggression-62402](about:blank))

Using the occasion of the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore this month, Chinese Minister of National Defense and State Councilor Gen. Wei Fenghe, delivered a sharp message to the United States, which may be termed the “Xi Doctrine” on China’s use of force, after Chinese premier Xi Jinping. Wei declaring both China’s resolve to aggress to advance its interests and a rationalization for the use of force. Wei’s de facto threat of war should not be lost in his nuances, deliberate ambiguity, or in translation. His remarks were so bellicose that the world has noticed, as was certainly intended by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

Empirical evidence of China’s aggression is increasingly common, from its attempt to dominate the South China Sea, the neo-imperialist effort to gain control of states through the Belt and Road Initiative, to its technological imperialism to control 5G and artificial intelligence technologies. What is rather less frequent are statements from high-level Chinese officials proclaiming the country’s intent to be aggressive and offering an attempted legitimizing principle justifying that aggression.

While much of the content of Wei’s remarks were in keeping with the gossamer pronouncements on China’s peaceful intentions, as well as a paean to Xi Jinping’s leadership, they still conveyed that China is ready and willing to resort to war if the United States stands in its way of global expansion; and they made clear that China must go to war, or even a nuclear war, to occupy Taiwan.

Specifically, there are four elements that comprise the Xi Doctrine and are indications of China’s signaling its willingness to use force. The first component is a new and alarming proclamation of the undisguised threats to use force or wage an unlimited war. China is becoming bolder as its military power grows. This is evidenced in Wei’s muscular remarks on the People’s Republic of China’s approach against Taiwan, his explicit statement that China does not renounce the use of force against Taiwan, and his effort to deter the United States and its allies from intervention should an attack occur. Wei forcefully stated: “If anyone dares to separate Taiwan from China, the Chinese military has no choice but must go to war, and must fight for the reunification of the motherland at all costs.” “At all cost” means that China will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons or launching another Pearl Harbor to take over Taiwan. This is a clear warning of an invasion.

Second, the Xi Doctrine legitimizes territorial expansion. Through his remarks, Wei sought to convince the rest of the world that China’s seizure of most of the South China Sea is an accomplished fact that cannot be overturned. He made bogus accusations, which included blaming the United States for “raking in profits by stirring up troubles” in the region. He insisted that only ASEAN and China must resolve the issue. He claimed that China’s militarization on South China Sea islands and reefs were an act of self-defense. Should this be allowed to stand, then the Xi Doctrine will set a perilous precedent of successful territorial expansion, which will further entice China and jeopardize the peace of the region.

Third, the doctrine targets the United States as a cause of the world’s major problems and envisions a powerful China evicting the United States from the region. Wei obliquely identified the United States as the cause wars, conflicts, and unrest, and sought to convey that the United States will abandon the states of the South China Sea (SCS) when it is confronted by Chinese power, a typical divide and conquer strategy used by the CCP regime.

The Xi Doctrine’s fourth element is the mendacity regarding China’s historical use of force and current actions. While the distortions of history were numerous, there were three major lies that should be alarming for the states of the region and the global community. First, Wei said that China had never invaded another country, which is a claim so transparently false it can only be a measure of the contempt he held for the audience. China has a long history of aggression, including against the Tibetans and Vietnamese, and perhaps soon against the Taiwanese. Second, Wei argued that hegemony does not conform to China’s values when, in fact, China proudly was Asia’s hegemon for most of the last two thousand years. Lastly, he claimed that the situation in the SCS is moving toward stability—from China’s perspective this stability is caused by its successful seizure of territory. In fact, the SCS is far less stable as a result of China’s actions. Efforts to counter this grab are denounced by Wei as destabilizing, which is a bit like a thief accusing you of a crime for wanting your property returned.

Wei’s belligerent rhetoric is an indication that the CCP regime faces deep external and internal crises. Externally, the Trump administration has shocked the CCP with the three major steps it has taken. First, it has shifted the focus of the U.S. national-security strategy and now identifies China explicitly as its primary rival—abandoning the far more muted policies of previous administrations. Second, Trump has acted on this peer competitive threat by advancing tangible measures, such as arms sales to allies and the ban of Huawei. Third, the administration has made credible commitments to assure partners and allies to counter China’s aggression and bullying. These have unbalanced the CCP regime, and its natural reaction is to bully its way out. Additionally, the CCP regime has perceived that the world today has begun to consider the negative implications of China’s rise, and the United States is determined to prevent what heretofore had been considered China’s unstoppable rise. From the perspective of CCP, conflict is increasingly seen as inevitable and perhaps even imminent. Wei’s bellicosity should be seen in this light, and the PLA is tasked with fighting and winning the war.

Internally, Xi’s anti-corruption campaign that selectively targets his political rivalries, and his abandoning the established rules such as term limited of presidency, have introduced deep cleavages into the unity of the regime unity. China’s economic slowdown, made worse by the U.S. trade war, is a fundamental challenge to the regime’s legitimacy. Xi’s repression and suppression of the Chinese people, particularly human-rights defenders, Christians, Kazakhs, Uighurs, and other minorities, have miscarried.

Drawing from the pages of unfortunate history, in a classic social-imperialist move, the regime wants to direct these internal tensions outward. At the same time, the nationalistic fervor advanced by the CCP’s propaganda and by the rapid military modernization have made many young militant officers in the PLA overconfident. This is infrequently noticed in the West. They can hardly wait to fight an ultimate war to defeat the arch-enemy. This plainly dangerous mentality echoes the Japanese military’s beliefs before Pearl Harbor.

The bellicosity evinced in Wei’s speech is serious and is not bluster intended to deter. The United States cannot meet China’s threat with half-measures, which are likely to further encourage China’s aggressive behavior. The United States must respond to China’s belligerence with greater strength, adamantine determination, and more vigorous diplomatic and military measures. With the Xi Doctrine, China has proclaimed and rationalized its aggression. A Trump Doctrine forged in response has to reveal to all global audiences, most importantly the CCP leadership, the recklessness of the Xi Doctrine and the supreme folly of aggression.

#### China rise is hostile---prefer our evidence---China is adept at portraying itself as non-confrontational.

Mastro 19, Assistant Professor of Security Studies at Georgetown University and Jeane Kirkpatrick Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. She is the author of the forthcoming book The Costs of Conversation: Obstacles to Peace Talks in Wartime, (Oriana Skylar, January/February 2019, “The Stealth Superpower: How China Hid Its Global Ambitions” Foreign Affairs Jan/Feb 2019 [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/china-plan-rule-asia](about:blank))

“China will not, repeat, not repeat the old practice of a strong country seeking hegemony,” Wang Yi, China’s foreign minister, [said](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-eu/trump-shaping-new-liberal-order-to-block-russia-china-iran-says-pompeo-idUSKBN1O3102) last September. It was a message that Chinese officials have been pushing ever since their country’s spectacular rise began. For decades, they have been at pains to downplay China’s power and reassure other countries—especially the United States—of its benign intentions. Jiang Zemin, China’s leader in the 1990s, called for mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality, and cooperation in the country’s foreign relations. Under Hu Jintao, who took the reins of power in 2002, “peaceful development” became the phrase of the moment. The current president, [Xi Jinping](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-04-17/chinas-new-revolution), insisted in September 2017 that China “lacks the gene” that drives great powers to seek hegemony.

It is easy to dismiss such protestations as simple deceit. In fact, however, Chinese leaders are telling the truth: Beijing truly does not want to [replace Washington](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-09-21/stop-obsessing-about-china) at the top of the international system. China has no interest in establishing a web of global alliances, sustaining a far-flung global military presence, sending troops thousands of miles from its borders, leading international institutions that would constrain its own behavior, or spreading its system of government abroad.

But to focus on this reluctance, and the reassuring Chinese statements reflecting it, is a mistake. Although China does not want to usurp the United States’ position as the leader of a global order, its actual aim is nearly as consequential. In the Indo-Pacific region, China wants complete dominance; it wants to force the United States out and become the region’s unchallenged political, economic, and military hegemon. And globally, even though it is happy to leave the United States in the driver’s seat, it wants to be powerful enough to counter Washington when needed. As one Chinese official put it to me, “Being a great power means you get to do what you want, and no one can say anything about it.” In other words, China is trying to displace, rather than replace, the United States.

Stay informed.

The way that China has gone about this project has caused many observers to mistakenly conclude that the country is merely trying to coexist with American power rather than fundamentally overturn the order in Asia and compete with U.S. influence globally. In fact, ambiguity has been part of the strategy: Chinese leaders have recognized that in order to succeed, they must avoid provoking an unfavorable response, and so they have refrained from directly challenging the United States, replicating its order-building model, or matching its globally active military. Although Beijing has pursued an indirect and entrepreneurial strategy of accumulating power, make no mistake: the ultimate goal is to push the United States out of the Indo-Pacific and rival it on the global stage.

Until now, China has succeeded in growing without provoking. Yet there is a limit to how powerful a country can get without directly challenging the incumbent power, and China is now reaching that point. Under Xi, China has begun confronting American power head-on. Given the country’s internal challenges, China’s rise could still stall. But history has shown that in the vast majority of cases in which a country was able to sustain its rise, the rising power ended up [overtaking the dominant power](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-08-15/china-vs-america), whether peacefully or through war.

That does not mean that the United States cannot buck the historical trend. To remain dominant, Washington will have to change course. It will have to deepen, rather than lessen, its involvement in the liberal international order. It will have to double down on, rather than abandon, its commitment to American values. And perhaps most important, it will have to ensure that its leadership benefits others rather than pursue a strategy based on “America first.”

## !---CLIMATE

### 1NC

#### USICA is key to disruptive innovations that solve climate change

Walker 21 Senior Vice President for Global Affairs and Chief Legal Officer at Google, Seizing the moment - A framework for American innovation, <https://blog.google/perspectives/kent-walker/seizing-moment-framework-american-innovation/>

Decades of government investment in R&D led to scientific breakthroughs that gave us the tools we use every day, and public-private partnerships have sparked innovations from the microchip to the internet. Government R&D investment has led to economic growth, jobs and new startups. As just one example, some of Google’s earliest work was made possible, in part, by the Digital Library Initiative, funded by the National Science Foundation. But if you fast forward to today, the U.S. government investment in tech has moved to the slow lane. Government-funded research in the U.S. has fallen by 60% as a percentage of GDP — from 1.9% of GDP in 1964 to just 0.7% today. Many countries around the world are investing significantly in research and development. For example, China has said that it will be increasing government R&D funding by 7% annually and recently announced a five-year plan to invest an additional $1.4 trillion in developing next-generation technologies. As a nation we now have a historic opportunity to put aside partisanship and come together on an issue that will determine our future competitiveness. The United States must seize the moment to cultivate science and technology by setting out a national innovation strategy, and we commit to doing our part. Senators Schumer and Young have introduced the bipartisan Endless Frontier Act — an important step in putting to work America’s strengths in science and technology to tackle some of the biggest issues of our time, from climate change to global health. Legislative proposals to increase funding for the National Science Foundation will accelerate innovation in the technologies of the future — including quantum computing, AI, biotech and genomics, advanced wireless networks, and robotics — and strengthen the U.S. innovation ecosystem through regional hubs spread throughout the country.

#### Climate change causes extinction

Alexander-Sears 21, PhD Candidate in Political Science at The University of Toronto, former Professor of International Relations at the Universidad de Las Américas (Nathan, “Great Powers, Polarity, and Existential Threats to Humanity: An Analysis of the Distribution of the Forces of Total Destruction in International Security,” Conference Paper: *International Studies Association, 2021 Annual Conference*, Research Gate)

Humanity faces existential risks from the large-scale destruction of Earth’s natural environment making the planet less hospitable for humankind (Wallace-Wells 2019). The decline of some of Earth’s natural systems may already exceed the “planetary boundaries” that represent a “safe operating space for humanity” (Rockstrom et al. 2009). Humanity has become one of the driving forces behind Earth’s climate system (Crutzen 2002). The major anthropogenic drivers of climate change are the burning of fossil fuels (e.g., coal, oil, and gas), combined with the degradation of Earth’s natural systems for absorbing carbon dioxide, such as deforestation for agriculture (e.g., livestock and monocultures) and resource extraction (e.g., mining and oil), and the warming of the oceans (Kump et al. 2003). While humanity has influenced Earth’s climate since at least the Industrial Revolution, the dramatic increase in greenhouse gas emissions since the mid-twentieth century—the “Great Acceleration” (Steffen et al. 2007; 2015; McNeill & Engelke 2016)— is responsible for contemporary climate change, which has reached approximately 1°C above preindustrial levels (IPCC 2018). Climate change could become an existential threat to humanity if the planet’s climate reaches a “Hothouse Earth” state (Ripple et al. 2020). What are the dangers? There are two mechanisms of climate change that threaten humankind. The direct threat is extreme heat. While human societies possesses some capacity for adaptation and resilience to climate change, the physiological response of humans to heat stress imposes physical limits—with a hard limit at roughly 35°C wet-bulb temperature (Sherwood et al. 2010). A rise in global average temperatures by 3–4°C would increase the risk of heat stress, while 7°C could render some regions uninhabitable, and 11–12°C would leave much of the planet too hot for human habitation (Sherwood et al. 2010). The indirect effects of climate change could include, inter alia, rising sea levels affecting coastal regions (e.g., Miami and Shanghai), or even swallowing entire countries (e.g., Bangladesh and the Maldives); extreme and unpredictable weather and natural disasters (e.g., hurricanes and forest fires); environmental pressures on water and food scarcity (e.g., droughts from less-dispersed rainfall, and lower wheat-yields at higher temperatures); the possible inception of new bacteria and viruses; and, of course, large-scale human migration (World Bank 2012; Wallace-Well 2019; Richards, Lupton & Allywood 2001). While it is difficult to determine the existential implications of extreme environmental conditions, there are historic precedents for the collapse of human societies under environmental pressures (Diamond 2005). Earth’s “big five” mass extinction events have been linked to dramatic shifts in Earth’s climate (Ward 2008; Payne & Clapham 2012; Kolbert 2014; Brannen 2017), and a Hothouse Earth climate would represent terra incognita for humanity. Thus, the assumption here is that a Hothouse Earth climate could pose an existential threat to the habitability of the planet for humanity (Steffen et al. 2018., 5). At what point could climate change cross the threshold of an existential threat to humankind? The complexity of Earth’s natural systems makes it extremely difficult to give a precise figure (Rockstrom et al. 2009; ). However, much of the concern about climate change is over the danger of crossing “tipping points,” whereby positive feedback loops in Earth’s climate system could lead to potentially irreversible and self-reinforcing “runaway” climate change. For example, the melting of Arctic “permafrost” could produce additional warming, as glacial retreat reduces the refractory effect of the ice and releases huge quantities of methane currently trapped beneath it. A recent study suggests that a “planetary threshold” could exist at global average temperature of 2°C above preindustrial levels (Steffen et al. 2018; also IPCC 2018). Therefore, the analysis here takes the 2°C rise in global average temperatures as representing the lower-boundary of an existential threat to humanity, with higher temperatures increasing the risk of runaway climate change leading to a Hothouse Earth. The Paris Agreement on Climate Change set the goal of limiting the increase in global average temperatures to “well below” 2°C and to pursue efforts to limit the increase to 1.5°C. If the Paris Agreement goals are met, then nations would likely keep climate change below the threshold of an existential threat to humanity. According to Climate Action Tracker (2020), however, current policies of states are expected to produce global average temperatures of 2.9°C above preindustrial levels by 2100 (range between +2.1 and +3.9°C), while if states succeed in meeting their pledges and targets, global average temperatures are still projected to increase by 2.6°C (range between +2.1 and +3.3°C). Thus, while the Paris Agreements sets a goal that would reduce the exis 6 - tential risk of climate change, the actual policies of states could easily cross the threshold that would constitute an existential threat to humanity (CAT 2020)

### IL---International Signal + GCF

#### It's a key international signal

Alejandro Pérez, 2/4/2022 (senior vice president of policy and government affairs @ World Wildlife Fund, “WWF Statement on the America COMPETES Act,” <https://www.worldwildlife.org/press-releases/wwf-statement-on-the-america-competes-act>, Retrieved 3/3/2022)

In response to the House of Representatives’ passage of the America COMPETES Act, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) released the following statement from Alejandro Pérez, senior vice president of policy and government affairs: “As part of the America COMPETES Act, the House has passed a number of key legislative initiatives to protect the global environment, recognizing the critical role that nature and the ecological integrity of our planet play in our future security, stability, and prosperity. “Provisions in the bill renew programs to protect tropical forests and coral reefs and prevent wildlife trafficking. They advance new measures to curb illegal fishing, halt deforestation, and stop the spillover of zoonotic diseases like COVID-19. And they direct the U.S. to take stronger steps to confront the grave and growing threat posed by climate change, including authorizing major new investments in the Green Climate Fund. “Taken collectively, these elements of the bill are an impressive move by Congress to tackle some of our most urgent global challenges. They also send a strong signal to other countries that international cooperation is paramount to making headway on these problems, and that the United States intends to help lead the way. “As the House and Senate work towards agreement on a final version of the bill, we urge Congress to ensure these environmental provisions remain in the legislation that is ultimately sent to the President’s desk.”

### IL---Technological Innovation

#### Bolsters all tech necessary to solve climate change

MICHELLE BURRIS, 3/1/2022 (a fellow at The Century Foundation, focusing on racial and gender equity in workforce development, “The America COMPETES Act Provides an Inclusive Vision for Technology and Manufacturing Competitiveness,” <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/america-competes-act-provides-inclusive-vision-technology-manufacturing-competitiveness/>, Retrieved 3/3/2022)

Manufacturing is the lifeblood for many communities, providing middle-class jobs and robust economic activity. Furthermore, manufacturing has special value to smaller cities and towns, particularly in the Midwest and Southeast, as well as for urban communities of color where deindustrialization has had lasting negative impacts. And, manufacturing has gained fresh attention over the past two years, starting with the nation’s need for medical goods during the COVID-19 pandemic, continuing now as snarled supply chains have driven up prices for cars and other critical goods, and looking ahead to electric vehicles, alternative energy generation, and other innovative technologies needed to addresses the existential challenge of climate change. A centerpiece of the America COMPETES Act is the CHIPS for America Fund, which allocates $52 billion to initiatives established by the CHIPS for America Act and paves the way for America to fabricate computer chips as well as reduce semiconductor supply chain disruptions. This fund could have an outsized impact on the entire manufacturing sector in America. As Mark Muro, Robert Maxim, and Stephen Ezell at Brookings argue, semiconductor devices are essential to today’s digital economy, as they operate most cars and all computers. The manufacturing and sale of these devices are dependent on a robust semiconductor supply chain, and the funding allocated by the act not only will ensure that the digital economy operates without disruption, but also will strengthen the nation’s capacity for technology and innovation. Historically, this fund has been particularly important, as the U.S. semiconductor industry for years has lagged behind those of competitor countries. Researchers, including those at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, found that only ten years after creating the semiconductor industry, the United States lost its global leadership, and the nation’s lack of attention to this critical industry meant U.S. competitiveness continued to erode. The $52 billion commitment to American computer chip production in the America COMPETES Act will once again put America in a winning place.

#### Mitigates warming

Jeffrey Mervis, 2/4/2022 (Jeff reports on science policy in the United States and around the world in an effort to explain to scientists how government works, “House passes sweeping U.S. innovation bill, teeing up talks with Senate,” <https://www.science.org/content/article/house-passes-sweeping-u-s-innovation-bill-teeing-talks-senate>, Retrieved 3/3/2022)

The effort, designed to maintain the country’s technological edge over China, took a major step forward today when the U.S. House of Representatives passed the America COMPETES Act. The 2900-page bill must now be reconciled with a similar, comparably massive bill called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) that the Senate passed in June 2021. But ironing out the differences will test the Democrats’ razor-thin majorities in each body. Although USICA (S.1260) was approved by a vote of 68 to 32, including 19 Republican senators, COMPETES (H.R. 4521) was supported by just one Republican and passed the House on a 220 to 210 vote. (One Democrat said nay.) Although key House Republicans have said they support many of the research-related elements in the bill, they strongly objected to other provisions, including language on trade and labor policy. Negotiating a compromise bill acceptable to enough lawmakers–and President Joe Biden–to make it into law will be a complex task touching on a wide range of issues. They include how to allocate new research funds, how to protect U.S. research from foreign interference while also reshaping immigration rules to make it easier for the United States to attract foreign-born technical talent, and whether to take a more aggressive stance to combat climate change. Both bills come with hefty price tags: $250 billion for USICA and $350 billion for COMPETES. And both include provisions that authorize the government to spend tens of billions of dollars on research across several federal agencies. The numbers are mostly aspirational; Congress would still have to approve most of the spending through its annual budget process. Higher education lobbyists hope legislators won’t repeat what happened in 2007 and 2010, when Congress failed to deliver promised big hikes in research spending that it had authorized. The increased investments include adding an NSF technology directorate and doubling the agency’s overall budget over 5 years. The Department of Energy’s Office of Science and its national laboratories would get a similarly large boost. And the Department of Commerce would get $7 billion to establish a network of new regional innovation hubs. The nation’s semiconductor industry would receive $52 billion, with the bulk of the money used to increase manufacturing capacity but some also going to microelectronics research facilities. Both bills call for tightening oversight of research collaborations with China and a handful of other countries deemed to exert a “malign foreign influence” on federally funded research. For example, both bills would prohibit scientists with federal grants from participating in Chinese talent recruitment programs and require universities to provide more information about any foreign gifts they receive. The two bills also seek to stamp out sexual harassment on college campuses, calling for a uniform policy on reporting allegations and findings to federal funding agencies. But there are also important differences between the two bills on research policy. For example, the Senate wants NSF’s new technology directorate to focus on 10 key disciplines, such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing. In contrast, the House bill asks NSF to combat climate change, reduce economic and social inequality, and build a robust scientific workforce along with advancing strategically important fields. “The Senate bill implies a trade-off between supporting key technologies to maintain our competitive edge and improving the quality of life for all Americans,” says a Democratic staffer on the House science committee, which crafted many of the research provisions in the COMPETES bill. “But we think that technology is simply a means to an end, and that you can do both things.” The House and Senate also have competing visions of how to spread federal research dollars more equitably across the country, including to institutions that enroll large numbers of students from groups traditionally underrepresented in science. The Senate bill requires that 20% of the money slated for NSF and DOE be spent in the roughly two dozen states that receive the fewest federal research dollars. In contrast, the House bill avoids any mandatory set-asides, instead creating new programs that target institutions in those have-not states. The COMPETES Act would also change immigration policy to allow more foreign students to stay after they earn advanced degrees in science and engineering at U.S. universities. One provision would exempt them from the existing cap on the number of applications for permanent residency status. The bill would also create a new visa category for budding high-tech entrepreneurs. Those measures are likely to be opposed by lawmakers who want to shut off the flow of immigration, especially from China and other countries seen as economic and military foes, and the Senate bill contains no such changes. The House bill includes a raft of provisions on climate change. For example, it would authorize a 2-year, $8 billion U.S. contribution to the United Nations’s Green Climate Fund, aimed at helping emerging economies respond to the climate crisis. It calls for spending $600 million annually through 2026 to help U.S. solar energy companies become “less reliant on solar components made in China.” And it would give the Department of State additional funds for climate-related foreign aid, and for developing a new 10-year strategy to mitigate global climate change impacts. The House bill’s sweeping scope is its strength, says Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson (D–TX), chair of the House science committee. “With this legislation, we are making investments to build clean energy solutions, address the climate crisis, reinforce our national security, enhance our semiconductor manufacturing capabilities, and so much more,” Johnson said in kicking off debate on the House floor that ended this morning. “In short, we are acting to address the critical needs identified by the scientific community, industry, academia, and other stakeholders as what they need most to succeed in the 21st century.”

#### Technological innovations are key to solve Climate Change

AIP 6/7/21 American Institute of Physics, FYI This Week highlights upcoming science policy events and summarizes news from the past week, https://www.aip.org/fyi/fyi-this-week/week-june-7-2021

Senate Poised to Pass Endless Frontier Legislation

The Senate is expected to pass the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act as soon as Tuesday after considering a final set of amendments. The legislation includes the Endless Frontier Act proposal to focus R&D funding on ten strategic technology areas as well as a provision allocating $52 billion in “emergency” appropriations for domestic semiconductor manufacturing and R&D. Once the Senate approves the legislation, attention will turn to the House, where Democratic leaders have not yet announced their stance on the bill and the top Republicans on all House committees have called for the House to develop its own competitiveness package through a full legislative process. House Republicans have also pointed to the report published by their China Task Force last year as a repository of ideas that should be considered for inclusion. The House Science Committee has already done extensive bipartisan work on alternative R&D policy proposals, advancing bills for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. In addition, the top Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee has also introduced an analogue to Senate provisions setting out U.S. foreign policy with respect to China. Science Committee Spotlights Regional Innovation, ‘OceanShots’ The House Science Committee is holding a hearing on Wednesday to discuss methods for “building regional innovation economies.” The witnesses are Dan Berglund, CEO of the State Science and Technology Institute; Paula Nas, director of the Office of Economic Development at the University of Michigan-Flint; and Erica Fuchs, a professor in Carnegie Mellon University’s Department of Engineering and Public Policy and an expert on advanced manufacturing. The hearing comes as Congress is considering major proposals to build R&D capacity in regions that are not already leading centers of innovation, such as the Endless Frontier Act’s provision creating a Commerce Department program that would aim to seed at least 20 “regional technology hubs.” Separately, a hearing on Monday is exploring options for a national “OceanShot,” meaning a “bold, ambitious vision for advancing ocean science and technology to address major challenges such as climate change.” A National Academies panel has begun to solicit ideas for OceanShots in support of the U.N. Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development. The panel launched in February and is currently co-chaired by President Biden’s nominee to lead the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Rick Spinrad. NOAA’s acting chief scientist Craig McLean is testifying at this week’s hearing alongside three leading oceanographers.

### IL---GCF

#### Key to Green Climate Fund support

Lillis and Marcos 1/26

Mike and Cristina, The Hill, “House Republicans bash Democrats' China competition bill” January 26, 2022 https://thehill.com/homenews/house/591530-house-republicans-bash-democrats-china-competition-bill

It’s a debate likely to be magnified by the Democrats’ new America Competes Act, which is already sparking partisan battles over those same thorny issues. Indeed, McCaul is focusing on one element of the package, sponsored by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Greg Meeks (D-N.Y.), which contains climate provisions designed to hold China accountable for its greenhouse gas emissions. That includes contributions of $8 billion over two years to the Green Climate Fund established by the United Nations to help developing countries respond to climate change.

#### Solves climate change

CMIA 2021

Climate Markets and Investment Association, “GCF and Climate Finance,” Feb 19, 2021 https://www.cmia.net/gcf-and-climate-finance/

"We can't solve climate change without private finance. The GCF and other climate funds are pivotal to leverage private sector capital and CMIA channels the private sector voice to provide solutions that are workable, bankable and scalable." Margaret-Ann Splawn, Working Group Co-Chair GCF and Climate Finance The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is the world’s largest climate fund. The Green Climate Fund was conceptualised at the Cancun COP in 2009 and fully operational since 2015, is the largest climate finance fund in the world – targeting the commitment of funding flows of US$100 billion per year with all pools of finance. Its specific mandate is to encourage and facilitate private investment in climate related activities. GCF aims to go much further than other public climate finance institutions in leveraging private capital for mitigation and adaptation, and using its own risk bearing capacity to enable innovation and funding at scale. The GCF has already gone some way towards integrating the private sector into its activities. Several of the institutions which have been approved to receive funding directly from the GCF are commercial entities. However, more private sector national and regional entities have become accredited over the last few years too. But the GCF needs to take more action to reach out to the business and investment communities. The GCF 27th Board meeting adopted the Updated Strategic Plan for the GCF 2020-2023 which includes a strategic priority of ‘catalysing private sector finance at scale’. CMIA holds one of two Active Private Sector Observer seats on the board of the GCF. Through its observer, CMIA has a unique ability to give the board direct feedback from its membership on key issues that will impact how successfully the GCF interacts with private actors.

## !---TURNS CASE

### !---Turns Economy

#### Key to US economic leadership

FYI: The ‘Endless Frontier Act’ was renamed the The United States Innovation and Competition Act. You can tell they are the same by content and by Schumer’s sponsorship

Sidney 21 Arthur D. Sidney Vice President of Public Policy for the Computer and Communication Industry Association, April 29, 2021, Multi-Association Letter Endless Frontier Act <https://www.ccianet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2021-04-29-Endless-Frontier-Act-Multi-association-letter.pdf>

The undersigned trade associations and private sector organizations write to express our strong support for the Endless Frontier Act, sponsored by Senate Majority Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Senator Todd Young (R-IN), which would provide much needed, and long overdue, investment in technology, entrepreneurship, science, research and development, and will promote the long-term, global economic competitiveness of the United States. We are encouraged by this bold and visionary bipartisan effort to ensure the U.S. can outcompete our foreign competitors, especially China. We encourage Congress to make passage of this bill a top priority as we move into a period of economic recovery and job growth post-COVID. Since the end of World War II, the United States has been the unequivocal global leader in scientific and technological ingenuity and innovation, and as a result, the American people have benefited through good-paying jobs, economic prosperity, and a higher quality of life. Today, however, America’s leadership of innovative technologies is being compromised by the aggressive and distortive practices of our foreign competitors. While the U.S. has been underinvesting in the very ingredients that made the country a global leader, namely our superior research and manufacturing capabilities, favorable regulatory regime and economic system, and skilled workforce, our competitors are deploying significant, and at times, distortive resources, engaging in anti-competitive practices such as intellectual property theft, and are exerting influence beyond their borders attempting to dominate the key technology fields of today and of the future. Without a comprehensive, national investment strategy in critical and emerging technologies, our country will continue falling behind in the race to create cutting-edge solutions to the world’s problems. It is crucial that the U.S. bolster its own approach to ensure that our values remain infused in the technologies of the future, especially as China and other nations significantly increase their investments in emerging technologies. Many regions and cities across the country are well-suited to foster innovation and others have tremendous innovation potential. But as a nation, we lack the comprehensive, wide-spread investment needed to build nationwide strength in new and emerging technologies. In order to remain the global leader in technology, the Endless Frontier Act instills within the U.S. government a commitment to prioritize science and technology advancements by creating a Directorate for Technology and Innovation at the National Science Foundation, and charges the foundation with creating and implementing a geostrategic investment plan focusing on 10 key technology focus areas. Additionally, this Act provides $100 billion to reinvigorate American leadership in the discovery and application of new technologies, as well as $10 billion to designate a minimum of 10 regional technology hubs, which will be the global centers for R&D, and to help regions throughout the nation develop strategies to build their tech economies. These efforts will provide a lifeline to the future of the American economy, prepare the U.S. workforce to compete globally, encourage new company formation, and create high skilled, good-paying American jobs. We are also pleased to see a strategic focus on manufacturing innovation through the enhancement and expansion of Manufacturing USA and by strengthening America’s critical supply chains, such as semiconductor supply chains.

### !---Turns Cyber

#### Successful reconciliation solves cybersecurity, global internet openness, and misinformation

Montgomery 3-14-2022, senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies (@FDD) and senior director of FDD's Center on Cyber and Technology Innovation (CCTI). He previously served as a senior adviser to the Cyberspace Solarium Commission. Annie Fixler is deputy director of CCTI. Follow the authors on Twitter @MarkCMontgomery and @AFixler. FDD is a Washington, D.C.-based, nonpartisan research institute focusing on national security and foreign policy. (Mark and Annie Fixler, “Reconciliation of China bills in Congress could produce big cybersecurity wins,” *The Hill*, <https://thehill.com/opinion/cybersecurity/598066-reconciliation-of-china-bills-in-congress-could-produce-big>)

Congress deserves mixed grades for its recent efforts to strengthen the nation’s cybersecurity and improve the resilience of its critical infrastructure. If Republicans and Democrats can find a path forward to integrate the Senate’s U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) with the House’s America COMPETES Act, Congress could make substantial, long-term investments in America’s technology future. The two bills would build upon important but insufficient cybersecurity provisions in recent legislation. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which President Biden signed into law in November, contained $1 billion to enhance the cybersecurity of state and local governments and established a Response and Recovery Fund for major cyber incidents. Yet that law’s support to specific critical infrastructure sectors was inconsistent and missed some glaring weaknesses, such as those of the water sector. Similarly, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2022, which the president signed into law in December, had 40 cybersecurity-specific authorizations. But during conference, Congress dropped some of the most significant provisions, such as mandatory incident reporting. Now, lawmakers get another bite at the cybersecurity apple as Congress sets up its conference committee to adjudicate USICA (which passed on a bipartisan basis last June) and the COMPETES Act (which passed last week on a nearly partly-line vote). House and Senate lawmakers have a $52 billion starting point: Both bills contain $52 billion in funding for the CHIPS Act, which establishes a grant program to support domestic semiconductor production. Congress passed the CHIPS Act on a bipartisan basis as part of the FY2021 NDAA. CHIPS funding is the most headline grabbing (and expensive) single issue in the two bills, but it is by no means the only important cybersecurity and critical infrastructure provision. The USICA and COMPETES bills have similar cybersecurity provisions in three arenas that House and Senate members can easily reconcile and embrace. First, both bills seek to rectify dramatic shortages in the federal cyber workforce. They invest in STEM education and create rotational cybersecurity positions giving federal employees the flexibility to gain experience and skills. The House bill also expands “CyberCorps: Scholarship for Service,” a critical, ROTC-like program for the federal cybersecurity workforce, from its current $60 million annual budget to $90 million by fiscal year 2026. This will increase both the number of students (future federal employees) and the number of universities and community colleges involved. Such a provision would likely receive bipartisan support in the Senate. Second, both bills invest in U.S. leadership in international technical standards-setting bodies like the International Telecommunication Union. This arena has become a crucial battlefront in the contest between Western values of a free and open internet and the authoritarian push for ever-greater state control and censorship. Beijing has aggressively sought to gain leadership positions and promote technically flawed proposals in these forums in order to distort and weaponize the bodies against the interests of America and its partners. Both bills thus strive to improve America’s response to Chinese maneuvering. Third, both bills increase funding for the State Department’s Global Engagement Center, an important agency for battling foreign disinformation campaigns. Next, the conference members should work to reach agreement in several other areas tackled only in one chamber’s bill. The House bill, importantly, requires the executive branch to develop a strategy for “information and communication technology critical to the economic competitiveness of the United States.” Such a strategy would ensure that America is not dependent on untrusted vendors beholden to foreign powers or who otherwise have lax security. Three other provisions of note: the House bill 1) designates “Critical Technology Security Centers to evaluate and test the security of technologies essential to national critical functions,” 2) creates international capacity-building programs to improve the cybersecurity of U.S. allies and partners, and 3) supports the software security and digital privacy work of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Meanwhile, the most significant provision unique to the Senate bill creates a National Risk Management Cycle to “identify, assess, and prioritize cyber and physical risks to critical infrastructure.” Understanding these risks is the foundational step to properly resourcing U.S. government efforts to defend against, mitigate, and deter these threats. In its comprehensive March 2020 report on U.S. cyber strategy, the Cyberspace Solarium Commission noted that the U.S. government “lacks a rigorous, codified, and routinely exercised process” for identifying risk. Even where the government has identified critical infrastructure risks, a lack of sustained funding has limited the mitigation and management of the risks over time. A National Risk Management Cycle would begin to rectify this problem. A chance to improve research The Senate version also includes provisions to create regional technology hubs built on partnerships among industry, academia, and workforce groups to support domestic high-tech job growth in areas of the country that have not been historic innovation centers. A successful bipartisan conference should result in numerous meaningful cybersecurity provisions enacted into law. While not as flashy as CHIPS, they collectively lead to more effective cybersecurity and more resilient critical infrastructure.

### !---Turns Democracy

#### Key to democracy

Palmer 6-25-2021, senior fellow on the National Security and International Policy team at the Center for American Progress, and was the attaché for the U.S. Department of Energy in Beijing (Nina, “The Innovation and Competition Act is progressive policy,” *The Hill*, <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/560198-the-innovation-and-competition-act-is-progressive-policy>)

Democrats and Republicans in Washington may have finally found an issue they can both support. Earlier in June, the U.S. Senate passed the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) which proposes significant changes to science and technology policy with an eye to U.S. China policy. Approved by a surprisingly bipartisan 68-32 vote, the bill merges Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer’s (D-N.Y.) Endless Frontier Act and Sen. Robert Menendez’s (D-N.J.) Strategic Competition Act. President Joe Biden has urged speedy passage of the bill in the House, where it’s headed next.

Progressives in the House should support and advance this $250 billion bill, which contains strong provisions that will smartly make the U.S. more competitive, through investments in communities, innovation, improving racial and gender justice and income equality. The bill authorizes the most extensive investment in U.S. innovation infrastructure in a generation, building technology hubs in disadvantaged areas, increasing federal funding for both fundamental and applied research, increasing STEM scholarships and modernizing U.S. technology policymaking. The bill introduces measures to combat systemic sexism in the scientific community and targets minority-serving institutions (MSIs) for additional grants, scholarships and support. The bill also makes strides in recognizing and funding climate change mitigation measures, including clean energy development and conservation mechanisms. Most notably, it expands the definition of STEM to include energy and environmental studies, which will refocus a range of federal policies on these fields. The bill also prioritizes clean technologies for inclusion in the regional technology hub program.

It should not be surprising that USICA has received support from a broad range of stakeholders, including many progressives. The Thurgood Marshall College Fund voiced support for the bill’s $750 million grant program to build research capacity at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and MSIs. The American Association of Universities, a group of 66 leading research universities, also praised the bill, calling it an “important step in renewing our country’s commitment to federally sponsored scientific research to better position the United States for a healthier, more secure, more prosperous future.” The bill also contains many of the policy recommendations from the Human Rights Watch regarding international responses to the Chinese government genocide of Uyghurs and other Muslim minorities in Xinjiang province.

So, what’s not to like? As USICA moves to the House, some progressive groups have voiced concerns about framing these investments around competition with China. But competition with China is not synonymous with conflict. We should ensure that we are building better, rather than racing to the bottom. That is precisely how this legislation is crafted. A competitive policy toward China that strengthens America should be welcomed by progressive, and all, policymakers.

Competing with China to innovate, provide international development aid and secure supply chains can result in positive-sum and highly progressive policies, pushing American innovation to greater heights and supporting a thriving economy for the American people. This bill is an opportunity to show the strength of democracy and deliver public goods domestically and abroad. This type of competition is not about China-bashing or xenophobia; rather, it provides an opportunity to address problems in the U.S. that need to be fixed. It creates space for healthy competition in areas where American strength and opportunity have atrophied and where we are being outpaced by China. Confronting the Chinese government’s human rights abuses, poor labor conditions, military excursions and instances of predatory aid are all fundamentally progressive positions that reinforce American values.

There are a few key areas of this bill that could benefit from more progressive activism in the House. The current bill expands research security initiatives and the role of the FBI in China policy without addressing systemic racism in these initiatives and institutions. It also authorizes $52 billion in economic aid to semiconductor manufacturers without assuring that the money is used for real investment and does not go to stock buybacks and other financial maneuvers. The bill can and should go further in protecting human rights in China. Progressives should advocate for inclusion of the main provisions of the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act and the Hong Kong Safe Harbor Act in this legislation, both of which have strong bipartisan support.

Ultimately, passing a bill with such significant bipartisan support is, in itself, a win for the American people. This type of cooperation demonstrates to Americans and our allies that democratic governance is viable, that no matter how stark our differences, we can come together to expand economic progress and increase security.

#### Democracy collapse is an existential risk [Restoring domestic supply chains is key]

Basu 12/24 (Kaushik Basu, a former chief economist of the World Bank and chief economic adviser to the government of India, is professor of economics at Cornell University and a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. “An existential threat to humanity: Democracy’s decline” 12/24/21 <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2021/12/24/commentary/world-commentary/protecting-democracy/>)

With democratic norms fraying from Southeast Asia to Central Europe, Biden was right to warn of “the sustained and alarming challenges to democracy and universal human rights.” But too few acknowledge that rising authoritarianism around the world, like climate change and the evolution of lethal viruses, can pose an existential risk to humanity. Most people do not appreciate the extent to which civilizations depend on pillars of norms and conventions. Some of these have evolved organically over time, while others required deliberation and collective action. If one of the pillars buckles, a civilization could well collapse. Efforts to counter the current threats to democracy should start with the fact that every economy is embedded in culture and institutions. As Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson have argued, long-run growth may depend more on institutions than on anything else. But institutions are not always exogenous. As the growing field of cultural evolution shows, human beings are adaptive learners who rely, often unwittingly, on social learning to entrench norms that are necessary for a society to flourish. Likewise, Avinash Dixit and Simon Levin argue that, in some contexts, we may need to take deliberate steps to instill pro-social preferences that can help us adapt to our changing world. We can do this through education, and by deliberating and deciding as citizens to promote certain kinds of collective behavior. That is what happened when delegates from American states convened in Philadelphia in 1787 to revise the existing Articles of Confederation and ended up drafting the U.S. Constitution, which became the cornerstone of the new country’s long-term growth and prosperity. We are in a similarly challenging situation today, as cross-border flows of goods, services, and capital flatten the world economically. The rapid advance of digital technology, accelerated over the last two years by the COVID-19 pandemic, is causing huge strains. Increased outsourcing of production has contributed to hypernationalism, which in turn is fueling the rise of anti-democratic leaders who exploit people’s desperation.

### !---Turns Disease

#### Turns disease

Bradley 21 Neil Bradley, is Executive Vice President, Chief Policy Officer and Head of Strategic Advocacy at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 5/27/21, U.S. Chamber Letter on S. 1260, “United States Innovation and Competition Act” https://www.uschamber.com/letters-congress/us-chamber-letter-s-1260-united-states-innovation-and-competition-act

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports the manager’s amendment to S. 1260, the, “United States Innovation and Competition Act,” and we appreciate the open, bipartisan regular order process by which this legislation was developed. For the United States to remain competitive internationally and tackle the challenges of future pandemics and jumpstart economic growth, the U.S. must maintain its leadership in technology. The United States Innovation and Competition Act represents a step toward achieving this goal by supporting research and development in key areas like autonomy, advanced communications, and artificial intelligence.

# Affirmative

### Won’t Pass – PC

#### GOP won’t let Biden secure a victory on USICA

Ignatius 22 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/01/13/biden-is-failing-politically-not-just-because-republican-obstruction/]//LP

President Biden hit a political wall this week in his push for voting rights legislation, just as he did last year in trying to pass his Build Back Better spending package. It’s time for Biden to ask himself why he’s in this morass. Sign up for a weekly roundup of thought-provoking ideas and debates It sticks in my craw to quote Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), who has often been a wrecker in our national politics. But he had it right when he said Wednesday that Biden was elected with a mandate to “bridge a divided country, lower the temperature, dial down the perpetual air of crisis in our politics.” Biden is failing in that mission. Republican obstructionism is a big reason, but it’s not the only explanation. Biden has been losing his way politically. As he chases support from progressives in his own party, he has failed to craft versions of his social spending package and voting rights legislation that he could pass with fragile majorities. He’s been spinning his wheels. A prime (but rarely discussed) example of Biden’s loss of momentum is the failure to enact legislation to improve American competitiveness in chipmaking and other technologies. This bill, known as the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (or USICA), passed the Senate back in June with a big majority, 68 to 32. Passage illustrated the strong bipartisan consensus that America must respond to China’s technology challenge. But USICA stalled in the House. Democrats there were miffed at what they saw as Senate attempts to dictate science policy. Some progressives didn’t want chipmaking to get in the way of battles for child-care credits and other Build Back Better programs. And House Republicans wanted to sabotage any potential success for Biden. So, the bill languished. Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) announced a House-Senate conference in November, but it never happened because the House hadn’t passed a bill. Rep. Bill Foster (Ill.), a leading Democrat on tech issues, told me the House should have gone to conference and approved the chipmaking portion of the bill, at least. But that didn’t occur, even though Biden’s national security team takes the China threat as seriously as Republicans do. Moderate Democrats are baffled. “It’s nuts that the House has been sitting on this good, important bill for months,” Sen. Mark R. Warner (D-Va.), one of its authors, told me in an email. A similar concern came from Thomas E. Donilon, President Barack Obama’s national security adviser. “It’s inexcusable that Congress hasn’t moved forward on this,” he told me. Pelosi’s aides say she wants to get a House version of the bill moving again soon. And one Senate staffer hoped a House bill could pass in a few weeks — clearing the way for a real conference to resolve differences. “We are working hard on trying to get USICA done in the House,” a White House official told me Thursday. But the official said it’s not clear if House Republicans will help. “To be blunt, it takes two to tango.” The larger question for Biden is whether there’s any space left for bipartisanship and conciliation. Political divisions have worsened over the past year, and Republicans, led by McConnell, have rebuffed nearly all of his overtures. He had bigger ambitions, on social and political revitalization. But with such fragile Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Biden will struggle now to pass meaningful legislation. USICA would be a good test. So would a scaled-back version of Build Back Better that could win support from Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.). But successful presidencies carry a sense of political momentum, going from success to success. Sadly, President Biden has lost much of that forward drive. It’s time for a restart, with less shouting and more of Biden’s trademark common sense.

### Won’t Pass – McConnell

Bade 6/30 [Gavin Bade is a reporter on the Pro Trade team covering the administration and Congress’ approach to industrial policy and other trade issues. He previously was on the Pro Energy team covering the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, electricity markets and state policy. He was previously senior reporter and editor at Utility Dive, an energy trade publication. Gavin is a graduate of Georgetown University, where he edited the campus alt-weekly, the Voice. https://www.politico.com/minutes/congress/06-30-2022/mcconnell/]//LP

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell laid down an ultimatum for Democrats on Thursday: If you pursue a reconciliation budget package, forget about about that economic competitiveness legislation you want for the midterms. Congress has been working on the competitiveness package for more than a year, and Democrats desperately want to pass its $52 billion in domestic semiconductor funding before the midterms. But McConnell said Thursday he would deprive that legislation of necessary Republican support if Democrats do not abandon their talks for a pared back climate change and social spending package that includes provisions to lower drug costs. McConnell tweeted Thursday, referring to the Senate’s version of the competitiveness bill, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act: The ultimatum is the greatest setback for Democrats’ reconciliation plans since moderate Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) killed the original package, labeled Build Back Better, at the end of last year. Democrats have since pursued a narrower agenda focused on climate change measures and incentives for domestic manufacturing to aid the clean energy sector, but no concrete plans have yet emerged from the talks. Dems respond: White House Press Secretary Karine Jean-Pierre called the tactic an "outrageous threat" and vowed that the administration would not back down. "Senate Republicans are literally choosing to help China out compete the U.S. in order to protect big drug companies. This takes loyalty to special interests over working Americans to a new and shocking height." Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer shot back through a spokesperson, saying McConnell "is holding American jobs in key U.S. industries hostage to help China and protect his friends in big pharma allowing them to keep screwing over Americans with outrageously high Rx drug prices.” Reminder: McConnell holds significant sway over the competitiveness package because the final legislation that emerges from a combined House and Senate conference committee will have to garner at least 10 Republican votes to be approved in the Senate. That committee has been negotiating since this spring, and the White House and Democratic leaders are aiming to conclude negotiations and pass the final package before the August congressional recess.

#### The Bill fails now - McConnell is withdrawing support

McPherson 6/30 [Lindsey McPherson is a Correspondent for Congress in the Roll Call with 15 videos in the C-SPAN Video Library; the first appearance was a 2015 Interview as a Staff Writer for Taxes in the CQ Now. The year with the most videos was 2018 with seven videos. The year with the highest average number of views per program was 2017 with an average of 428 views per program. Most appearances with Bill Scanlan (5), John McArdle (3), Stephanie Kaye (2). Most common tags: Immigration, Tax Policy, Federal Budget. https://rollcall.com/2022/06/30/mcconnell-threatens-support-for-china-bill-citing-budget-talks/]//LP

Republicans won’t back compromise legislation to boost domestic semiconductor manufacturing and U.S. competitiveness with China if Democrats continue to negotiate a partisan budget package that can pass without GOP support, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said Thursday. “Let me be perfectly clear: there will be no bipartisan USICA as long as Democrats are pursuing a partisan reconciliation bill,” the Kentucky Republican tweeted, using the acronym for the expansive competitiveness measure that passed both chambers in very different forms and is now in conference. McConnell’s pronouncement significantly complicates Democrats’ summer legislative agenda, which includes trying to pass both the competitiveness bill and the tax and spending package formerly known as “Build Back Better” before the August recess. McConnell made his statement shortly after Senate Democrats announced they reached agreement on a prescription drug pricing plan that’s a key piece of the budget reconciliation package they’ve been renegotiating to appease Sen. Joe Manchin III, D-W.Va. Manchin in December announced his opposition to the $2.2 trillion House-passed tax and spending bill, which was already scaled way back from Democrats’ earlier plans. “Sen. McConnell is holding American jobs in key US industries hostage to help China and protect his friends in big pharma allowing them to keep screwing over Americans with outrageously high Rx drug prices,” Justin Goodman, a spokesperson for Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer, said in an email. The White House took aim at the Republican leader as well, specifically calling out plans for chipmaking plant expansions in states like Ohio and Idaho that could be put on hold if the competitiveness bill stalls. Those two states are home to two of the Senate GOP negotiators on the bill: Rob Portman of Ohio, who’s retiring, and Michael D. Crapo of Idaho, the Finance Committee’s ranking Republican. “This takes loyalty to special interests over working Americans to a new and shocking height,” White House Press Secretary Karine Jean-Pierre said in a statement. “We are not going to back down in the face of this outrageous threat.” Intel Corp. last week put off a planned groundbreaking ceremony for its new $20 billion investment in Ohio, citing delays in getting the competitiveness bill passed. Boise, Idaho-based Micron Technology has been weighing an expansion in the southeast part of the state, in part prompted by state tax breaks; however, the state legislation is tied to enactment of federal incentives, according to local media. ‘Classic McConnell’ McConnell’s Thursday statement suggests a July vote is now out of reach unless Democrats abandon plans to resurrect their reconciliation package, which is unlikely. Schumer and Manchin have been holding private discussions on reconciliation for months, but the prescription drug pricing plan announcement is the first significant sign of progress to emerge from those negotiations. They’ve not yet reached agreement on climate or tax provisions, the other primary pieces of the downsized package they’re negotiating, and Schumer has said the legislation could be ready for floor action as soon as late July. Ways and Means member Donald S. Beyer Jr., D-Va., said in a Twitter thread that McConnell’s announcement that Republicans would block the competitiveness bill was just a public admission of a tactic he’s already deployed. “This isn’t new, Mitch McConnell has been stalling this bill for weeks; but now he’s admitting it,” Beyer said. “His obstruction is directly harming our economy, preventing job creation, and halting production of a key need to improve supply chains. Classic McConnell.” McConnell’s move has support within his conference. Sen. Thom Tillis, R-N.C., who was among the 19 Republicans who voted for the Senate bill a year ago, retweeted McConnell, adding: “Couldn’t agree more.” McConnell also voted for the original Senate bill. Members of both parties have pointed to the competitiveness legislation as desperately needed to help fix crucial supply chain issues that have contributed to high inflation. Democrats think their reconciliation package will also help cool inflation in the long term, but Republicans argue those spending and tax increases will just exacerbate the current problem. While Republicans are likely to continue to blame President Joe Biden and congressional Democrats for inflation, their decision to block the competitiveness bill could blunt their midterm campaign argument that voters should elect Republicans to Congress if they want real solutions to rising prices. “This McConnell threat to kill a bipartisan bill to improve American competitiveness unless we keep prescription drug costs high strikes me as a miscalculation,” Sen. Brian Schatz, D-Hawaii, tweeted. The GOP tactic could also risk angering corporate donors. It’s not just the big chipmakers pushing the measure — it’s also companies across the manufacturing spectrum that rely on a steady supply of semiconductors. CEOs of major companies ranging from Microsoft and Google parent Alphabet to defense contractors like Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman banded together earlier this month to call on Congress to act urgently to pass a bicameral compromise. “The rest of the world is not waiting for the U.S. to act,” dozens of CEOs wrote in a June 15 letter to Schumer, McConnell, Pelosi and House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy. “Our global competitors are investing in their industry, their workers, and their economies, and it is imperative that Congress act to enhance U.S. competitiveness.”

### No I/L USICA Fails

#### USICA fails –

#### IPR shortfalls

Mills 2021

Anthony, Senior Fellow American Enterprise Institute, “Funding Isn’t Enough to Fix Science” May 28, 2021 <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/funding-isnt-enough-to-fix-science/>//LP

There is an urgent need to shore up America’s research establishment. But inadequate funding is only the tip of the iceberg: More fundamental problems have dogged American science and innovation for years. Today, our breakthrough scientific discoveries appear less fundamental and less frequent than in decades past; scientists are spending increasing amounts of time on paperwork, administration, and bureaucratic compliance rather than on research itself; funding has become concentrated in a handful of well-established institutions; the average age of primary researchers continues to climb; and the so-called replication crisis has raised concerns about the reliability of many published findings. All of these point to deeper, structural problems in America’s R&D system. The goodwill provided by the current R&D push has created an ideal opportunity to implement much-needed reforms to U.S. science funding. Yet, as it stands, the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) does little, if anything, to address these problems. Yet, the USICA does little to address the many other systematic issues that have bedeviled the American research establishment for years. Most conspicuous, perhaps, is the so-called replication crisis. Independent confirmation of experimental findings — whether by reproducing experiments or replicating experimental results — is generally held to be an important, even essential, part of the scientific process. Yet, in recent years, it has emerged that an alarming number of published scientific findings cannot be reproduced or replicated. The problem is particularly acute in psychology, biomedical research, ecology, economics, and the social sciences. The crisis is not, so to speak, merely academic. The types of research potentially implicated by it include areas of science that have direct bearing on medicine, public health, and government regulation. Lawmakers have taken note. In 2018, Congress directed NSF to commission the National Academies of Sciences (NAS) to study the crisis and provide a diagnosis as well as potential prescriptions. There is deep and ongoing disagreement within the scientific community about the nature and extent of the crisis — including whether it is a genuine problem and what, if anything, can be done about it. Nevertheless, the NAS report points to a growing consensus that the replication crisis is symptomatic of deeper flaws with the way scientific research is currently organized and conducted. These include obstacles to sharing scientific data, inadequate statistical training among researchers, problems with the peer-review system and grant culture, misaligned financial and professional incentives, and the corrosive effects of publish-or-perish. Yet, the Senate bill hardly acknowledges — much less addresses — any of these problems. The USICA does give a nod to the problem of geographic and institutional concentration. It is well known that government research dollars are highly localized in a few wealthy regions of the country and their prominent institutions. The bill addresses this through a $10 billion program of regional “tech hubs” across the country with special provisions for historically black and other minority-serving colleges. But the bill includes no serious attempts to modify or reform existing funding formulas within the NSF or other funding agencies, much less combat the various systematic problems in American R&D that inhibit such geographic and institutional diversity in the first place. The latest version of the bill does include provisions intended to protect American research from undue foreign influence or theft, including bolstering intellectual property, cybersecurity, and supply-chain resiliency. These, too, are important goals. Yet, insufficient attention has been paid to whether and how these measures may help or hinder the other problems facing American research, especially the compliance costs associated with byzantine federal grant requirements. To be sure, these problems cannot all be solved by a single funding bill. But some are easier to address than others. Principal researchers should not be spending 42 percent of their time on grant maintenance and compliance. Besides diverting scientific talent from research to paperwork, this creates barriers to entry for smaller institutions with fewer financial and personnel resources. Lawmakers could experiment with different ways to reduce the compliance burden, from streamlining the federal grant process to waiving unnecessary regulations and administrative requirements. Such simple reforms should be tied to funding increases, rather than left as vague guidance to agency staff. Other problems — such as the replication crisis — are much harder to tackle. But there are a number of things lawmakers could do in the scientific spirit of evidence-gathering and experimentation. For starters, new R&D spending should include allocations for research to study the replication crisis and attendant problems and solutions (as the NAS report on reproducibility recommends). Next, lawmakers could introduce more oversight and accountability into the federal R&D system to see what kinds of funding models work well for which purposes.

#### STEM education shortages

Schneider 21 [Mark Schneider is director of the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Department of Education. https://www.yahoo.com/video/bill-doesnt-far-enough-investing-190100004.html]//LP

Efforts are underway in Congress to enhance the scientific competitiveness of the nation. These efforts are laudable, but I fear they do not do enough to establish the necessary educational foundation in science, technology, engineering and math, especially for Black and Hispanic youth. The United States Innovation and Competition Act (USICA), recently passed by the Senate and now being considered in the House of Representatives, would expand the National Science Foundation to include a new Technology and Innovation Directorate. The goal is to advance research and development in key technology areas, including artificial intelligence, semiconductors, quantum computing, advanced communications, biotechnology and advanced energy. USICA contains provisions to support work within NSF to bolster STEM in both the nation’s K-12 schools and institutions of higher education. For example, it raises the ceiling on NSF investments in STEM and workforce development from less than $1 billion this year to more than $4 billion in 2026. Funds are also authorized to increase the availability of undergraduate research experiences, community college scholarships, apprenticeships, graduate fellowships and traineeships. As a major effort to boost the future of American technology, USICA is a good start — but it’s incomplete. Attention to applied education research is missing, meaning the very foundation for so much of the work that USICA will support is weak. As a nation, there is a great deal that we need to learn about how to improve instruction in math and science. The evidence of the weakness of the educational foundation for American STEM competitiveness is clear from the performance of our students on both national and international assessments. There is also evidence from a large-scale international assessment of adult competencies that America’s historical advantage, based on having a skilled adult workforce, is eroding relative to global competitors, particularly China. For example, the most recent math and science results from the 2019 National Assessment of Educational Progress show that around a third of American eighth-graders are below basic in math and science, a proportion that climbed to 40 percent by 12th grade. The proportion of Black and Hispanic students who perform below basic is far larger: around two-thirds for Black 12th-graders and well over half for Hispanic 12th-graders. Students perform somewhat better on the technology and engineering literacy assessment, though large racial disparities remain. Blacks and Hispanics together represent around one-third of the nation’s population — and an even larger share of the student population. It is going to be difficult to build a diverse STEM workforce with so many students from these groups underprepared in core STEM disciplines. If we continue to neglect the education of these students and the raw talent represented by so many Americans, the U.S. will be trying to compete with at least one hand tied behind our back. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development administers two large-scale international assessments that give some additional insights into the ability of the U.S. to compete in the increasingly global economy — and the numbers are not good. The Programme for the International Assessment of Students (PISA) compares the literacy of 15-year-olds across the globe. In 2018, 77 nations and “education systems” participated in PISA. In mathematics, American 15-year-olds rank around the middle of the pack globally, whether looking at average scores or the scores of the top performers. Science performance is better, but still outside the global top 10. The organization also administers the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies. Most recently, the U.S. ranked 22 out of 33 on numeracy scores for young adults (24 or younger); but Americans ages 55 and above did far better, ranking 13th. The exam also tested for “Problem Solving in Tech Rich Environments.” The generational difference here is even starker: Americans aged 24 or younger ranked 20th, but those ages 55 and above ranked second among the 29 countries that participated in the problem-solving assessment. We seem to be replacing a relatively skilled cohort with a younger cohort that is far less internationally competitive. The key takeaway is that the U.S. education system is leaving too many students, especially Blacks and Hispanics, with less than a basic understanding of science, technology, engineering and math. And our young students and young adults are failing to keep up with their peers across the globe. Without improving foundational STEM skills, any edifice we build to enhance American competitiveness will be teetering on a weak foundation. And any hope of building a diverse STEM workforce will run into a supply constraint. Warnings abound. We must do better by the next generation of Americans as they face an increasingly competitive global environment in which STEM will play a key role. This challenge is clearly the motivation behind USICA, but considering the magnitude of the crisis facing the nation, it falls short, given the need for education R&D — especially for strong applied education sciences. This is why leaving the Institute of Education Sciences, the Department of Education’s science agency, out of USICA is a mistake.

#### “Buy American”

Ferrari 21 [John Ferrari is a nonresident senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), where his work focuses on the defense budget, defense reform and acquisition, and the US military. He is concurrently the chief financial officer at QOMPLX, a data analytics and cybersecurity firm. Over his 32-year US Army career, Major General Ferrari, who is now retired, served as the director of program analysis and evaluation, the commanding general of the White Sands Missile Range, a deputy commander for programs at the NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan, and a strategic planner for the Combined Joint Task Force Seven in Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom. His Army service also includes working at the US Army Materiel Command, as a platoon leader and executive officer for the 2nd Cavalry Regiment in Germany, and as a company commander and plans officer for the 3rd Cavalry Regiment.https://breakingdefense.com/2021/11/why-buy-american-isnt-the-answer-to-safeguard-national-security-supply-chains/]//LP

With their determination to “onshore” production of the supply chain, Biden officials are following the same path as former President Donald Trump. To the credit of both administrations, from an economic and national security point of view, they are entirely correct in identifying the problem — namely that critical American supply chains are vulnerable to sabotage by its rivals. But both presidents got the solution wrong. The answer isn’t to “Buy American,” it’s to “Attract Allies” by supporting production in partner nations and buy from them. Don’t hide from the global national security economy, diversify it. Currently China, through its grip on especially the electronics industry and its menacing of Taiwan, has the ability to sabotage and potentially destroy our economy, weapon systems, and critical information technology infrastructure. This gives Chinese President Xi Jinping an enormous advantage over the United States, similar to the way Russian President Vladimir Putin is subverting the Europeans over energy. While COVID has underscored the fragility of America’s supply chains, it is nowhere near what could happen during heightened tensions or hostilities with China. Imagine a scenario of no chips from Taiwan and no ships crossing the Pacific. Given this threat, we need to reduce our dependency on China specifically and the Pacific Rim more generally. But the instinct to simply make everything stateside, borne out in Trump’s and Biden’s “Buy American” plans, is extremely flawed despite polling well and being electorally popular. To find a different answer, we need to recognize several facts: Our military today is a small player in the commercial marketplace, both domestically and globally. The Defense Department is simply not going to be able to dictate a solution by itself. Second, the direct military and economic support of our allies, while we fight off Chinese coercion, or even war, is critical. Therefore, we need to “pool” our defense buying power when procuring common parts, information technology, and weapon systems. This is not just for interoperability, but also for efficiency in scale. Additionally, we cannot and should not create protectionist barriers to keep China away if those barriers also erect a wall between us and our allies or potential allies. The worst thing we can do is send a signal that it’s “every country for itself.” The solution? The Biden administration should change its goals and messaging from “Buy American” to “Attract Allies” even if it could be politically toxic. A new Cold War is upon us, and we need to admit that COVID has demonstrated that we are already vulnerable to being held hostage. Take the semi-conductor market for example. Right now, all roads lead to China and Taiwan. The current plan is to subsidize the production of new plants in the US. What we actually need is to diversify the production of these critical chips away from the first island chain in East Asia, and anchor production in the US, Europe, Australia, and India. The US military, along with allied military forces could then set standards for hardening and securing the chips themselves, for improving cyber security, while also diversifying production facilities so that we do not present China with a single targeting challenge. Subsidies from western militaries could pay for the cyber security hardening of the chips, while national governments could subsidize the production of several plants across the globe, similar to the current plan in the US to allocate $50 billion for chip production facilities. With every nation piling on debt to pay for the COVID pandemic, our military allies, not to mention our own forces, are already constrained by a lack of resources. We need to set up purchasing cooperatives with our allies to achieve economies of scale in production, and through interdependencies with friendly nations, gain efficiency, effectiveness, and security. A recent conference of the Association of the United States Army had many small defense firms from other countries sharing the convention floor with global defense giants. It was a good reminder that the giants could afford the cost of selling their products to dozens of national bureaucracies, while smaller firms could not. Imagine the benefits of having only one global military purchasing standard and contracting process with no special “Follow This ‘Insert Country Name’ Rules.” By contrast, today, in America, the administration’s provisions in “Buy American” would force these smaller international firms to either move production or partner with local firms, both of which are extremely inefficient. Interoperability between allied forces during war is also crucial. An everyone “roll their own” approach to procurement is a detriment on the battlefield from a resupply perspective, and even more critical when it comes to data sharing among weapon systems. During the Cold War, NATO enforced its standards for resupply and munitions. Today that process is gone in Europe and lacking in the Pacific. “Buy American” will only make this problem worse. Protectionism is fraught with the danger of reciprocity, and it is likely that no nation will want to make the first move. President Biden’s agreement with like-minded nations over global corporate taxes offers hope that global cooperation is possible. Therefore, the administration should move quickly now to establish a defense and economic security alliance, drop the “Buy American” rhetoric, and promote an “Attract Allies” security policy.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

# BBB Updates

## Negative

### Will Pass

#### It will pass – Manchin is on board with a slim BBB – includes drug prices, RE incentives, energy prices and corporate tax increases

Kapur 6/29 [Sahil Kapur is a senior national political reporter for NBC News. https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/senate-democrats-see-major-progress-biden-agenda-bill-hope-july-vote-rcna36041]//LP

Senate Democrats are close to a deal to lower prescription drug costs as part of a larger party-line package to advance a number of President Joe Biden's economic priorities, three sources familiar with the negotiations said. Democrats plan to submit a "finalized agreement" on allowing Medicare to negotiate prices with pharmaceutical companies to a key Senate official "in the coming days" to see whether it complies with the chamber's strict budget rules, one of the sources said. The source, who requested anonymity to discuss sensitive negotiations between Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., and Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., described the expected move as "major progress" that shows Democratic leadership wants to "move forward with a bill on the floor as early as next month." There's no final deal on the broader bill, however, as the other major parts of the "reconciliation" package — energy and climate policy provisions and tax changes to raise revenue — are still being negotiated between Schumer and Manchin. Unless an agreement can be reached quickly, it would be difficult to pass the bill before a scheduled monthlong August recess. Manchin’s office said Wednesday there is consensus and a path forward on drug pricing. “Senator Manchin has long advocated for proposals that would lower prescription drug costs for seniors, and his support for this proposal has never been in question,” Manchin spokeswoman Sam Runyon said. “He’s glad that all 50 Democrats agree.” What's in the drug pricing deal? According to a summary of provisions obtained by NBC News, the emerging deal would empower Medicare to directly negotiate prescription drug prices starting next year to lower costs for consumers. It would cap out-of-pocket costs for Medicare patients at $2,000 per year and allow the cap to be broken up into monthly payments. It also would impose a new "inflation rebate" policy forcing drug companies to send money back to consumers if they raise prices above inflation. In addition, the deal would add new incentives for drugmakers and insurers to limit drug price hikes, provide free vaccines for seniors, enhance premium and copay assistance for lower-income people and ensure the Department of Health and Human Services always negotiates for the maximum number of eligible drugs. And it would require negotiations to lower prices "if a drug company continues to block generic competition," the summary said. Manchin rejected the House-passed Build Back Better Act in December but later indicated openness to a slimmed-down version that includes drug savings, climate and energy policy and higher taxes on upper earners and corporations. The Senate has not taken any action since then. Schumer and Manchin have held private talks for weeks — so private that many Democratic senators say they've been out of the loop. One of the sources said Democrats are presenting the drug provisions to the Senate parliamentarian, who determines whether they adhere to arcane budget rules, because they know time is short and they want to be ready to act quickly if a larger deal materializes. Their intention to do that was first reported by The Washington Post. A separate source said the biggest unresolved issues on the energy front are the scope of incentives for electric vehicles and whether to let entities access cash directly as opposed to going through large financial institutions. It's unclear whether enhanced Affordable Care Act subsidies to prevent premium hikes for millions of people will be in the deal. Bypassing a Republican filibuster Any agreement, which would aim to bypass a Republican filibuster under a special budget process, is unlikely to include provisions like paid leave, child care and cash payments for raising kids, as Manchin, a pivotal vote in the 50-50 Senate, has said those issues should be dealt with through the regular 60-vote process. Republicans have made it clear they won't provide any votes for a bill focused on advancing Biden's safety-net agenda. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., has repeatedly blasted the Democrats-only reconciliation effort as a "tax and spending spree" and said he hopes the party doesn't revive it. Last month, Schumer told NBC News that he and Manchin agreed to keep their conversations quiet. "Manchin and I have an agreement: We're not discussing what we have discussed or will discuss," he said, adding that the reconciliation effort was still alive. Nancy LeaMond, the executive vice president of AARP, which advocates for older Americans, said the organization is "pleased that the Senate is ready to take action on a reconciliation package that includes allowing Medicare to be able to negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs. This is monumental and years in the making." AARP has run ads in West Virginia to defend Manchin on the issue as Republicans and pharmaceutical companies pressure him to reject any deal with fellow Democrats. Democratic pollster Celinda Lake said lowering drug prices could deliver political rewards for the party in the midterm elections. "If I were the Democrats right now, if I could tell them to pass one thing, it would be the prescription drugs," she said. "It would be negotiate drug prices, just like" the Department of Veterans Affairs. Lake said support for the idea is "off the charts" as many Americans, especially older voters, suffer from high medicine prices. "People are furious about it. They have wanted it forever," she said of a bill to lower costs. "They think that both parties are bought.

#### Manchin is on board – Sinema will get the version they’ve requested

Zeballos-Roig 7/2 [Joseph Zeballos-Roig is a senior economics reporter at Insider covering federal spending, unemployment and taxes among other topics. He's reported on the 2020 election, Congressional efforts to rescue the American economy during the coronavirus pandemic, and the ensuing push to improve infrastructure and the social safety net. He previously reported on national and foreign affairs for WNYC and CBS News. Joseph has appeared on CBS News, The Young Turks, Newsy, and iHeartRadio to discuss his reporting. His work has been cited in The Washington Post, Politico and MSNBC among other outlets. https://www.businessinsider.com/senate-democrats-sinema-deal-biden-economic-agenda-bbb-millionaire-tax-2022-7]//LP

Senate Democrats are inching closer to a deal with Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia to resurrect swaths of President Joe Biden's stalled economic agenda once known as Build Back Better. That has positioned the party to advance over GOP opposition a measure that would slash prescription drug prices, one of their chief priorities stretching back years. However, if Democrats led by Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer have any hope of securing other initiatives like an extension of enhanced Affordable Care Act subsidies, their attention must soon shift to another centrist with outsized influence over the party's agenda: Sen. Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona. Manchin and Sinema hold the power of the purse to opposite ends. While Manchin largely dictates how Democrats are spending their money, Sinema prescribes how they're raising it to pay for new clean energy and healthcare programs. "Her position is now is not the time to raise taxes in any way that would harm small business owners or individuals who are not super rich," John LaBombard, Sinema's former communications director, told Insider. "Senator Sinema is not somebody to announce as a position without thinking it through or has one position one day and a different position the next." The Arizona Democrat was tight-lipped throughout talks that dragged on for much of last year, often spurning questions about her positions from Capitol Hill reporters. She preferred negotiating directly with Biden and senior White House officials on the size and scope of their economic spending plan. Still, one expert says Democrats risk exacerbating inequality in the tax system. "When we start going down this path of using backdoor tax rate increases because some politicians think that's politically more tolerable, we raise less money, increase distortions, and increase inequities treating similarly situated taxpayers differently," Steve Rosenthal, a senior fellow at the Tax Policy Center, told Insider. "So that's bad for the tax system." The Arizona Democrat has said very little publicly about reviving the party's climate and tax agenda. In April, she pledged not to switch up her demands during a Arizona Chamber of Commerce event. Hannah Hurley, a spokesperson for Sinema, pointed Insider to a March statement on Biden's narrower agenda. "Any new, narrow proposal — including deficit reduction — already has enough tax reform options to pay for it," Hurley said. "These reforms are supported by the White House, target tax avoidance, and ensure corporations pay taxes, while not increasing costs on small businesses or everyday Americans already hurting from inflation."

### Will Pass – TOA

#### It's TOA – dems won’t give up – have to halt Obamacare premium hikes

Romm 6/27 [Tony Romm is the congressional economic policy reporter at The Washington Post, tracking infrastructure reform, government spending and the financial impacts of federal decision-making nationwide. Romm previously covered the tech industry for about 12 years, chronicling the myriad ways that tech companies like Apple, Facebook and Google navigate the corridors of government -- and the regulations that sometimes result. In his time at The Post, where he last served as senior technology policy reporter, he broke many of the most resonant stories on the beat, revealing once-secret information about state and federal probes into Silicon Valley’s largest firms. Romm arrived at The Post in 2018, after previously serving as a senior technology reporter for Politico and a senior editor for policy and politics at Recode, a tech business news site owned by Vox Media. Romm is also an on-air contributor to NBC News and MSNBC https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2022/06/27/manchin-schumer-build-back-better/]//LP

With inflation on the rise and the threat of a recession looming, congressional Democrats are scrambling to revive their long-stalled economic spending package, hoping to deliver relief to Americans whose finances have soured during months of political bickering. When Democrats last tried to advance the party’s $2 trillion initiative in December, hoping to overhaul the nation’s health-care, education, climate and tax laws, the economy seemed to be booming: Stocks traded high, gas prices were low and lawmakers saw an opening to advance the measure then known as the Build Back Better Act. More than six months later, however, the economy has shifted considerably. Along with Russia’s invasion of Ukraine and another resurgence of the coronavirus, the nation faces soaring costs for housing, gasoline, groceries and other goods, all made worse by the specter of another downturn. The economic peril has fueled new urgency on Capitol Hill, where Democrats hope to resolve their differences, re-craft their agenda and deliver before fall on at least some of the promises they made in the last election. “It’s essential to do because it responds to pocketbook concerns right now — financial concerns right now, it moves to cut costs right now — and it also lays the foundation for these smarter approaches for the future,” said Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), the leader of the tax-focused Senate Finance Committee. The situation didn’t seem as dire last year, when Democrats last tried to advance their agenda. Many in the party saw their proposed spending as a way to shore up the economy — offering financial help to Americans already grappling with high costs in the wake of the pandemic. But Manchin argued then that the economic package would add to the debt and worsen inflation. Although the House passed its $2 trillion version of the measure in November, the Senate ultimately concluded the year without even holding a vote. Since then, Democrats have insisted they are not giving up, even as time begins to run out. They have about three months to broker the sort of compromise that has eluded them for more than a year; otherwise, they may lose the ability to adopt the bill under a special legislative tactic that allows them to bypass a GOP filibuster in the Senate. To speed up their efforts, the party’s lawmakers are already huddling with the Senate’s parliamentarian, hoping to ensure their final package works within the confines of the process known as reconciliation, according to two people familiar with the matter, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe the talks. Speaking to reporters Wednesday, Schumer stressed after his latest meeting with Manchin that they are having “very good and productive discussions, but there are still some issues that have to be resolved.” Sam Runyon, a spokesman for Manchin, added in a statement that the senator “continues to engage in respectful conversations about the best way to move our country forward but is still seriously concerned about harmful inflation taxes hurting Americans and our nation’s lack of energy security.” Democrats scramble to resurrect ‘chunks’ of $2 trillion spending plan backed by Biden In the meantime, though, the stakes in their deliberations have grown exponentially higher. The party now faces an even tougher balancing act as it looks to whittle down a roughly $2 trillion package in a way that lowers costs, satisfies Manchin’s whims and shores up the economy — without making inflation worse. Some of the ideas Democrats initially proposed might have offered more of a direct, Fed chair acknowledges that higher interest rates could cause a recession Democrats do still believe they can secure prescription drug pricing revisions, empowering the government to negotiate some costs on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries. Wyden, who helped craft the provision, said that alone would help seniors who are “getting clobbered at the pharmacy counter just as they’re getting clobbered at the gas station.” An earlier version of the proposal also would have saved the government about $160 billion, according to estimates at the time. But some other health-care initiatives remain in doubt. That includes an existing federal program that lowers insurance costs for millions of Americans who purchase coverage through national health exchanges. These expanded subsidies under the Affordable Care Act are set to expire at the end of the year. Yet Democrats so far have not been able to strike a deal with Manchin to preserve them, according to three people familiar with the matter who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe the talks. The sources cited Manchin’s broader cost concerns as a key reason for the trouble, especially since he has rejected past Democratic attempts to proffer short-term extensions in a bid to save money. Manchin publicly has expressed mixed views on the idea, at times citing the need to restrict any benefits to lower-income Americans. Without action, however, roughly 13 million Americans could see higher premiums in 2023. The prospect prompted some Democrats this week to redouble their calls for action, with House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) telling reporters on a call Thursday that the provision “must be included” in any Senate deal. “Inflation is causing great shock at the pump and in the grocery store,” Hoyer added. “We must not let the cost of health care go up as well when we have the power to stop that from happening.”

## Affirmative

### No Link – Secret Congress

#### The plan is negotiated and passed in secret – Biden presidency is defined by big bills passing under the radar
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One seemingly safe assumption at the outset of Joe Biden’s presidency was that the primary avenue for legislative progress rested on its narrow Democratic majorities. Bipartisanship was a nice fairy tale for the voters, but everybody knew the Republican Senate would never give Biden any real wins. The Biden presidency has seen many surprises, most of them negative. But one positive surprise has been the Republican Senate’s willingness to work with the administration on areas of common ground. The recently announced gun-safety bill, which has the support of ten Senate Republicans, is only the most recent example of what has become a pronounced surge in bipartisan productivity. Less than a year and a half into Biden’s presidency, the list of bipartisan measures includes: —Investing more than half a trillion dollars in infrastructure, which includes funding not only for traditional bipartisan categories like roads and bridges, but also broadband and green priorities like public transit and rail, electric vehicles, and electricity transmission. —The U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, which creates new technology hubs and invests more than $100 billion in advanced technologies including artificial intelligence, quantum computing, semiconductors, and biotechnology. (This bill has passed the Senate, but not the House, a peculiarity that serves to highlight the phenomenon — Democrats, after all, control the House and could pass the bill with a straight majority vote.) — A ban on companies using forced arbitration to bury sexual-harassment claims. — The creation of a national holiday to commemorate Juneteenth. — Reform for the Postal Service that eliminated its burdensome requirement to prefund employee pensions for 50 years. —An updated renewal of the Violence Against Women Act. Republicans stripped a provision from this law that would have restricted gun sales to domestic partners convicted of stalking or domestic abuse (the “boyfriend loophole”). But the gun-safety compromise agreed to by the Senate would restore that provision. Assuming Congress passes the gun-safety compromise that ten Senate Republicans have agreed to support, this would add to an impressive record of bipartisan accomplishment. The cumulative impact of all these laws would still be relatively modest, and would not make up for the disappointment of Biden’s domestic agenda withering in the Senate. But it is not nothing. And the willingness of Senate Republicans to hand Biden a series of policy wins is a notable development in its own right. Before last year, most realistic observers believed polarization had made bipartisan legislation rare and minor. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell explained the dynamic with brutal frankness a decade before: “We worked very hard to keep our fingerprints off of these proposals. Because we thought — correctly, I think — that the only way the American people would know that a great debate was going on was if the measures were not bipartisan. When you hang the ‘bipartisan’ tag on something, the perception is that differences have been worked out, and there’s a broad agreement that that’s the way forward.” McConnell did not merely reserve this tactic for issues in which the two parties had philosophical disagreement. He consistently created partisan conflict even in areas where Republicans and Democrats had theoretical agreement. To some extent, the rise in bipartisan legislating reflects a trend that has been quietly happening for several years. Beginning at the tail end of the Obama era, and continuing through the Trump era, Congress has passed a number of important bills that have flown under the radar. Simon Bazelon and Matthew Yglesias called the phenomenon “Secret Congress.” The pattern is that the two parties negotiate the bills almost entirely in private, avoiding both media attention and partisan conflict. The product of the negotiation is brought onto the floor of Congress and approved with little public notice or debate. But there is more happening during the Biden administration than a mere continuation of the Secret Congress phenomenon. The bills are bigger, and the subjects they cover are less obscure. Infrastructure is a revealing window into the change. President Obama pleaded with Republicans to pass infrastructure upgrades that their business allies were begging for, to no avail. Republicans blocked all these investments by insisting they be paid for and then refusing to compromise on the funding. Under Biden, Republicans simply permitted the spending to be financed with a series of budget gimmicks and deficit spending. Last summer, I believed Senate Republicans were merely stringing Democrats along, using the infrastructure negotiations to stall out Democrats’ efforts to pass progressive social legislation without intending to pass a bill. But the Senate confounded that pessimistic assumption by passing the bill (only for the social legislation to fall apart on its own). The gun-safety bill provides an even stronger example. Its success is almost the complete opposite of the Secret Congress model: The bill concerns a policy that lies close to the nerve center of the culture wars, and it never would have come together if not for an intensive wave of national press coverage. And while its provisions are quite modest, most observers would have predicted that no bill at all would pass. In 2013, Senate Republicans killed a modest gun-control measure in the wake of an equally horrifying school massacre at Sandy Hook. This time, McConnell decided passing something made more sense for him than passing nothing.